MISCELLANEA

A THIRTEENTH AGNUS DEI PENNY OF ÆTHELRAED II

In a paper 'Der Schatzfund von Maidla' on pp. 47-81 of Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Toimetised, xxvii (1979), 1, Mr. Ivar Leimus gives a very full account of a major coin-hoard (with two silver torques, two silver ingots, and a small quantity of hacksilver) which came to light on 31 January 1974 at Maidla in the north-west corner of the Estonian Republic of the U.S.S.R. The coins, including a few fragments, total 1,093, and today are housed somewhat exceptionally in the State Historical Museum at Tallinn (Reval) and not in the Coin Cabinet of the national Academy in the same city. Despite the fortuitous presence of one Anglo-Norman penny (no. 1048) of Stephen's first ('Watford') issue belonging to the later 1130s, concealment no later than the early 1060s must seem very likely. The twenty-three oriental dirhams (nos. 1-23) have dates extending over nearly four centuries down to 1004/5, while the regnal terminus post quern of the 871 German coins (nos. 24-894) claimed to fall perhaps as late as 1084 can be put back nearly a quarter of a century (cf. the discussion on pp. 75-6 and NNUM 1979, pp. 95-6), the latest coin of certain attribution being one of Archbishop Siegfried of Mainz (no. 701) who was consecrated in 1060. For the three Italian coins (nos. 895-7), one Bohemian (no. 898), and two Hungarian (nos. 899 and 900), the regnal termini post quern fall as early as 1026, 1034, and 1000 respectively, while for the twenty-five Danish coins (nos. 1068-92) the corresponding date would be 1047 with just one of the coins perhaps belonging as late as the 1060s. The single Swedish coin (no. 1093) is unlikely to have been struck much later than 1030, which leaves to be considered only the insular coins (and their anonymous Scandinavian imitations) of particular interest to readers of this journal.

Mr. Leimus's handling of the insular material is considerably more than competent, and there are only a very few places where we would question his identifications. For the Anglo-Saxon coins (four of cut halfpence with two large fragments) major revisions appear to be necessary only in the case of no. 924, the Agnus Dei penny the subject of this note, where the mint is Leicester and not Chester, no. 961 where the reverse legend is to be read +BR/EBT/NO/DEO (cf. BEH Cnut 493), and no. 986 where the moneyer is surely the well-attested Wynstan if only because an OE. prototype Thun- numismatically is nowhere recorded. Pace Mr. Leimus, too, no. 1047 does not figure on the plates where a number of the more important coins are illustrated by photographic enlargements of quite acceptable quality. A more serious correction involves the single Hiberno-Norse penny (no. 1049) which is identified as a 'reduced-weight' penny of Sihtric III, and given an implied terminus ante quem of 1029, whereas from the illustration it is clearly of 'Dunbrody' type (Dolley Phase III) and so belongs essentially to the 1040s. This is quite late for a Dublin penny to have left Ireland and found its way so far to the east, but not to be overlooked in this connection is the Phase IV penny in the Juura hoard found at the end of the last century rather less than two hundred kilometres to the south-east of Maidla (cf. Irish Numismatics, xii. 1 (1979), 22-5). Of the maverick Anglo-Norman penny of Stephen it may be remarked that the illustration suggests a mint if not a moneyer. The one letter-combination clearly decipherable is —VA— with the possibility of its being —NTVAR+ which might be compared with the CANTVA mint-signature for Canterbury found in the previous type (cf. BMC Henry I, 207). Nothing can be read from the plate of the moneyer's name, but the epigraphy could suggest one of perhaps no more than three or four letters so that lnn would be a plausible candidate (cf. BNJ xxxv (1966), p. 41, 6d). However this may be, and it is not easy to read as the letter preceding the VA, Mr. Leimus's identification of the reign and type is fully vindicated, as is his recognition of the piece's essential anachronism.

Already noted is the suggestion of the continental coins that the hoard was concealed no later than the end of the second third of the eleventh century, a generation that is before the find from Juura, and such a dating is more than borne out by a consideration of the insular element. The Hiberno-Norse coin belongs, as we have just seen, no later than the middle of the eleventh century, while the 147 Anglo-Saxon coins (no. 901-1047) end with two Hammer Cross pennies of Edward.
the Confessor from an emission provisionally dated to the years 1059–62. In the same way, none of the eighteen imitative pieces from the general area of the Baltic (nos. 1050–67) needs belong typologically later than the end of the 1020s, so that to put the concealment of the Maidla hoard somewhere around 1065 accords well with current thinking on the English and German series alike.

The geographical and chronological distribution of the new find's Anglo-Saxon element is summarized as follows:

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Long Cross</th>
<th>Last Small Cross</th>
<th>Quatrefoil</th>
<th>Pointed Helmet</th>
<th>Short Cross</th>
<th>Jewel Cross</th>
<th>Fleur-de-lis</th>
<th>Arm-à-Breaste</th>
<th>Paix</th>
<th>Radiate/Small Cross</th>
<th>Trefoil Quadrilateral</th>
<th>Small Plain</th>
<th>Expanding Cross</th>
<th>Peint Cross</th>
<th>Sovereign/Seal</th>
<th>Hammer Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilchester</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymford</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldon</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romsey</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totten</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 13 7 1 20 17 36 20 8 7 1 3 6 1 1 1 1 12 147

* All of the diademed variety.

and is one familiar enough to students of the essentially eleventh-century hoards from south of the Baltic as opposed to those from the Viking lands proper. Particularly to be noted is the enhanced incidence of coins from Lincoln at the expense of those from York and, to a lesser extent, Winchester, a phenomenon which we believe to be characteristic of finds from 'Balticum'—it is reflected in the coins in the Berlin collection—and a pointer, especially in the context of Miss Christina Colyer’s excavations at Lincoln, to the Anglian emporium enjoying in the later Viking period a special relationship with the eastern Baltic.

Where individual coins are concerned, minor
variants in the spelling of moneyers' names from the forms recorded by Hildebrand are noted by Mr. Leimus in the case of no. 907 (Chester, Æðric beside Edric), no. 938 (London, Lywine beside Lyfine), no. 960 (Winchester, Liofwine beside Leofwine), no. 987 (Rochester, Ælffeh beside Ælfgell), no. 1021 (Lincoln, Othgrim beside Othnrim, etc.), no. 1024 (York, Aðgelwine beside Ægelwine), no. 1035 (London, Wulgar beside Wulfgar), no. 1040 (Winchester, Ælfiwine beside Ælffwine etc.), no. 1044 (Norwich, Ringulf beside Rincullf), no. 1045 (London, Osmund beside Osmund), no. 1046 (London, Ælfward beside Ælffward), and finally no. 1047 (Stamford, Wilgird beside Wilgrid—recte Wilgrip?), but all the spellings are readily explicable on epigraphical or phonological grounds. That they become more frequent in respect of the post-Cnut coins reflects the fact that Mr. Leimus had perforce to rely on Hildebrand's classic work of 1881 which for the period after 1035 becomes less and less representative of the Anglo-Saxon coinage as a whole, though it is also true to some extent that towards the end of the Old English period there appears to have been less emphasis on strict orthography in the die-cutters' rendering of personal names. Though admittedly 'new', too, where Anglosachsiska mynt is concerned, Slenging at Lincoln (no. 969) and Le(o)frið at London (no. 1037) are moneyers by no means unknown for the mints and even the types in question (cf. Mossop, pl. xlviii, no. 3: BMC Edw. Conf. 983 etc.).

The Maidla hoard's outstanding English rarity, then, is the Agnus Dei penny of Æthelraed II, only the thirteenth specimen of what was clearly an abortive issue known to have survived into modern times (cf. BNJ xlvii (1977), 131–3). Like several of the other coins of the type it is furnished with a silver suspension loop, and, while a small proportion of coins of most types present in Scandinavian finds exhibit this feature, the incidence of this attachment among the handful of coins of this particular type known today must suggest that the Christian iconography was recognized as such by some at least of their early possessors. Devotion is further attested by the circumstance that the mounting is aligned with reference to the typography and not haphazard. In this connection it will be recalled that in England medals with the type of the Lamb were being produced no later than the second quarter of the eleventh century (cf. P. A. Clemoes and K. W. Hughes, edd., England before the Conquest (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 333 ff., and the forthcoming publication of a further specimen from the Winchester excavations), while the volume of Scandinavian imitations of coins of so exiguous an issue is an argument that the copies were produced in part at least to satisfy a demand for pieces of a quasi-amuletic kind.

The weight of the new coin from Maidla with its mounting is given by Mr. Leimus as 1-76 g. (27-2 gr.) which is exactly that of the unmounted coin of the same type and mint from the Naginsčina hoard in the Esthonian Academy's trays. The die-axis is approximately 0°, and the obverse and reverse readings +ÆDELRÆD REX ANERULUM and +ÆDELPI LEH RA EESTR respectively. Stylistically, too, the new coin conforms very closely to the two coins of the same mint but of the moneyer Ælfric which are already known, the Naginsčina specimen and SCBI Copenhagen 507, and particularly to be noted is the trapezoidal tablet traversed by the leg of the Lamb. Thus the position that now obtains is that the one die-engraver supplied at least three pairs of dies to two moneyers at Leicester, further evidence surely that 'we are faced with an intended substantive coinage which was early interrupted, and not with a series of patterns'. What should not be overlooked, on the other hand, is that the moneyer of the Maidla coin has the same name as that of the moneyer who strikes the Hereford coin of the same type (BEH 1332), and this must raise the question of whether one and the same individual could have struck both pieces, an issue by no means academic in the present intellectual climate in England where a number of inter-mint die-links is fostering the concept of the peripatetic moneyer.

Where Hereford and Leicester are concerned the greater probability must be that we are dealing with two men who happened to have the same far from uncommon name. Æthelwig at Hereford is known for the Long Cross, Helmet, Last Small Cross, Quatrefoil, Pointed Helmet, Short Cross, and Jewel Cross types, a career clearly extending over as much as a third of a century. Under Æthelraed, moreover, the prototheme of the moneyer's name is rendered consistently Æthel-, but later no less consistently Æle- and Eel-. At Leicester, on the other hand, the Æthelwig only begins striking with the new Agnus Dei coin—a further argument that the issue can have nothing whatever to do with the Millennium—and continues no later than the last type of Æthel, a career that need not have occupied much more than twenty years. At Leicester, too, Æthelwig's prototheme is consistently rendered Æthel- as late as Quatrefoil, and then is replaced by the spelling Egel-. This is despite the fact that already by Pointed Helmet the
two mints appear both to have been served by the same two die-engravers operating on a 'nation-wide' basis, a situation very different from that prevailing c. 1009 when it is easy to show that Hereford and Leicester sent to different centres for their dies. The point is sufficiently made by Fig. 1 where illustrated side by side are (a) the new coin from Maidla and (b) BEH 1332. Hereford and Leicester are situated some ninety miles apart as the crow flies, and the centres serving them with dies could be as remote as Chester and London if not Winchester. To judge from the paucity of surviving coins, too, it is doubtful if the striking of Agnus Dei pieces, where they were struck, extended over more than a very few days. Especially if it was the moneyer's duty to collect his dies in person from the engraver—as seems to have been the case at the end of the Anglo-Saxon period—a single Æthelwig would have been hard pressed to strike so ephemeral an issue at the two mints. Mr. Leimus's publication of the 1974 hoard from Maidla is, then, a timely shot across the bows of a tendency among English amateurs to make insufficient allowance for coincidence. The early eleventh-century Old English onomastic corpus was relatively limited, and it is only when an individual personal name is clearly exceptional, which Æthelwig with its well-attested conjunction of two unexceptionable elements clearly is not, that one can be reasonably confident that two different men with the same name are not involved.

It only remains for us to acknowledge the kindness of Mr. Leimus and of the authorities of the State Historical Museum at Tallinn in answering our inquiries with signal courtesy and dispatch, and again to congratulate them on the publication in depth of a recent coin-hoard in a format so immediately intelligible to Western European scholars without Esthonian.

MICHAEL DOLLEY and TUUKKA TALVIO

**A FURTHER SMALL PARCEL OF COINS FROM THE OULTON HOARD (1795)**

The sale catalogue of the collection of coins, 'the Property of the Rt. Honble. the Earl of Northesk', sold at Sothebys on 29 and 30 July 1915, included a small group of coins which may be seen to come from the major hoard of late Saxon and Norman coins found at Oulton, near Stone in Staffordshire, in 1795. A preliminary account of this badly known hoard appeared in BNJ xxxviii (1969), 24-30. This new parcel, although small in size, is nevertheless of considerable importance not merely in supplementing our meagre knowledge of this major find, but because it provides only the second strict sample from it, the other being the small group of coins forming lot 329 in the sale of Captain R. T. Hinckes collection at Sothebys on 21 November 1921. The other coins identifiable from the hoard are chiefly of the mints at Stafford and Shrewsbury and are selective rather than coming from a true sample.

The Anglo-Saxon coins in the Northesk collection were only of Edward the Confessor and formed lot 222, which was purchased at the sale by Baldwins. The coins are as follows:

**Expanding Cross**
- Chester, Leofnoth. Rev. + LEOFNOBONLEIC
  (Cf. SCBI Chester, 307 which may be this coin.)

**Helmet**
- Leicester, Ægelric. Rev. + [L]RICONLEHR
  (Cf. SCBI Midlands, 408.)
- York, Arngrim. Rev. + ARNGRIMONFOFER
  (Cf. SCBI Yorks, 289.)

**Sovereign**
- Chester, Huscarl. Rev. + HUSCARLEIC
  (Cf. SCBI Chester, 337 which may be this coin.)

**Hammer Cross**
- Hastings, Brit. Rev. + BRID:ON:HEANTI
  (Cf. SCBI Cambridge, 915.)
MISCELLANEA

London, Ælfwine. Rev. +ÆLPINEONLVLNDE
(Cf. SCBI Oxford, i. 954 and 955.)

Pyramids
Chester, Æflige. Rev. +ÆLFONLEGEEE
(Cf. SCBI Chester, 368-72 and 387-8 which
are clearly from the same reverse die.)

Shrewsbury, Godwine. Rev. +GODPIONLRB
(Cf. SCBI Midlands, 499.)

The general contents of the collection suggests
strongly that it was formed in about the first half
of the nineteenth century. These are the only Saxon
coins in the collection: their compactness in date
and the general pattern of the mints represented
suggests that they form a parcel from a hoard. The
presence of a Hammer Cross type penny of the
Hastings mint might initially suggest that the parcel
had been contaminated with coins from one of the
hoards from the south coast area, concealed at the
time of the Norman invasion. In view, however,
of the small size of the group—an indication that
the collector or collectors responsible for building
up the collection had otherwise eschewed Saxon
coins—and its compactness in date and mints
represented, it seems more likely that all the coins
do belong together. The strong emphasis on the
mints of the central and north-west midlands—
Leicester, Chester, and Shrewsbury—point clearly
to the Oulton hoard as the ultimate source for the
coins, and this is further suggested by the fact that
the final coin in the list above is a die-duplicate in
its reverse at least of two coins already identified
as from that hoard, from the collections of Captain
R. Hinckes and Thomas Sharp. When one remem-
ers that William, 7th Earl of Northesk, had
married in 1788 the niece of Sir John Jervis, who
later became Viscount St. Vincent and whose
residence was Meaford Hall in Staffordshire, very
close to Oulton, and that she was, significantly,
one of the heirs to his estate, then it seems highly
probable that part of the Northesk collection of
coins had been formed by a member of the Jervis
family at Meaford Hall. This small group of coins
can, then, be ascribed with some confidence to the
Oulton hoard.

The group of coins from the Oulton hoard in
the Hinckes collection had included no coins of
Harold II and one only of William I, a Bonnet
type penny of Worcester by the moneyer, Refwine
(cf. BMC 164 and SCBI Midlands, 527, which may
be this coin). In my previous discussion of this
collection I did not propose that this coin should
be ascribed to the Oulton hoard as it was not so
described in the sale catalogue and because BMC
164 was found before 1795, a suggestion that the
Hinckes coin may also have come to light before
the Oulton hoard was found. However, as that
hoard did include coins of the Bonnet type and as
coins from mints in the west midlands pre-
dominated in it, then it seems quite likely that the
Hinckes coin may have nevertheless come from
Oulton.

The Northesk collection also lacked coins of
Harold II. There were, however, two coins of
William I:

Br. I Winchester, Anderboda.  
Rev. +ANDERBOODENNP
(Cf. BMC 53.

Br. V London, Godwi. Rev. +GODPIONLVD
(Cf. BMC 349.

The latter coin can be disregarded as there is no
evidence to suggest that the Oulton hoard included
coins as late in date as this. The former coin might
be from the hoard for it is quite likely that coins
from this major mint were present. Beyond this,
however, there is nothing to suggest with convic-
tion that the coin was indeed from the Oulton
hoard, and it can only be ascribed to it with
caution.

At the present state of our knowledge, the
identifiable coins from the Oulton hoard are as
follows: (H, N, SS, S, and W below stand respec-
tively for the collections of Captain Richard
Hinckes, the Earl of Northesk, the Revd. Stebbing
Shaw, Thomas Sharp, and the Revd. William
Woolstone).

Edward the Confessor. BMC V = Expanding
Cross: Chester, Leofnoth (V). BMC VII =
Helmet: Leicester, Ægelric (N). Shrewsbury,
Godesbrand (S). York, Arrgrim (N). BMC
IX = Sovereign: Chester, Huscarl (N); Shrews-
bury, Leofstan (S). BMC XI = Hammer Cross:
Hastings, Brid (V); Shrewsbury, Godwine (H)
and Wulmier (H); London, Ælfwine (N). BMC
XIII = Facing Bust: —. BMC XIV = Facing
Bust Orb: Droitwich, Heathewith (SS). BMC
XV = Pyramids: Chester, Æflige (N) and
Huscarl (H); Shrewsbury, Godwine (3—N, H,
and S), Wulfnoth (S) and Earnwine (S); Stafford,
Godwine (2—W and H).

Harold II.

William I. Br. 1 = Profile left: ? Winchester, Ander-
boda (N). Br. 1/2 mule: Stafford, Godwine (W).
Br. 2 = Bonnet: Stafford, Godwine (W) and
Wulfnoth (W) ?Worcester, Refwine (H).

The sequence of coins starts with the Expanding
Cross type and the evidence of other multi-type
hoards concealed at the time of the Norman
Conquest or shortly afterwards suggests that there may have been no earlier coins present. The latter from John Dent, quoted in full in the previous account of the Oulton hoard, records that there were '10 different sorts' of coin present in it. It is preferable to see this figure as referring to substantive types rather than either to 'mules', to the 'interim type' BMC XIV of Edward the Confessor, or to so-called 'transitional types', where the obverse of the Pyramids type of Edward the Confessor was 'muled' with a reverse of a coin of Harold II or of William I's Bonnet type, for examples of these may have been present in the hoard only in very small numbers. (While no examples of 'transitional type' coins have been identified as from the hoard it is theoretically possible that some may have been present as the group is well known from the Shrewsbury mint.)

However, only seven substantive types are present among the coins as yet identified as from the hoard and as the evidence suggests that the latest type present was the Bonnet type of William I, then there are only two substantive types missing (Edward the Confessor BMC XIII = Facing Bust and Harold II) which brings the total to nine. Edward the Confessor Facing Bust type coins are invariably present in hoards of this date but tend to be under-represented numerically in them, no doubt because of their lighter weight. It is then reasonable to suppose that coins of this type were present in the Oulton find. All the sources for the hoard suggest strongly, however, that no coins of Harold II were present. Therefore either John Dent's figure of 'ten different sorts' of coin must be taken as including two non-substantive types (such as the Edward the Confessor BMC XIV penny of Droitwich and the William I Br. I/2 mule of Stafford), or else coins of two types dating either before Edward the Confessor's Expanding Cross type or after William I's Bonnet type must have been present.

The writer, finally, would like to acknowledge the help given by Christopher Blunt in preparing this note and to thank Hugh Pagan for bringing the Northesk catalogue to his attention.

P. H. ROBINSON

A SMALL HOARD OF CLIPPINGS FROM FARNHAM PARK

Early in June 1976 a B.B.C. engineer, Charles Seamons, was experimenting with a metal detector in Farnham Park, Surrey, when he found a group of metal fragments which were subsequently recognized as clippings. The remainder of the hoard was recovered during a second visit to the spot, in the company of a member of the archaeological group of Farnham and District Museum Society, again making use of the metal detector to ensure that all the pieces were recovered.

The find-spot (Grid reference SU 839473) was a small hole apparently about the size of a loosely clenched fist and no more than four to six inches deep in relation to the present ground surface. The hole was a few yards from the edge of the moat of Farnham Castle, a few feet north-west of what was then the second tree in the northern line of the two lines of trees forming The Avenue. The date of The Avenue is uncertain but it is thought that the trees may have been first planted around 1700. Apart from this, the find-spot is not connected with any obvious landmark and the available evidence, including the location, suggest that the clippings were probably concealed hurriedly.

The sixty-eight clippings were declared treasure trove at an inquest held in Farnham on Friday, 6 August 1976. They were subsequently purchased by Farnham Museum. A small piece of wood was found about 1 inch under the turf and it was at first thought that this might have been a part of a container. It is now thought that this was probably a more recent deposit and unconnected with the hoard. In any case, the wood fragment has been lost subsequent to the inquest and it may not now survive.

The clippings are listed below. The numbers in brackets are the numbers of pieces from the same original coin. One or two more pieces might be found to fit together, particularly among the fragments or uncertain items, thereby reducing by one or two the original number of coins from which the clippings were taken.

1 Brief details of the find were reported in Coin Hoards, iii (1977), 346, and the author's account of the find and the background to clipping was published in the Farnham Herald of 25 June 1976. It should be noted that any future user of a detector in the Park faces prosecution by the local authority.

2 The author visited the spot a few days after the find was made and would suggest that early reports that the find was about a foot below the surface did not accord with the visible remains of the hole.

3 The proceedings of the inquest were reported in the Farnham News and Mail of Tuesday, 10 August 1976, and the Farnham Herald of Friday, 13 August 1976.

4 Willmer House, West Street. There are now sixty-nine pieces as one has broken.
Edward VI
Fine Coinage Shilling: Tun (2)  
Philip and Mary
Sixpence or Groat (1)  
Elizabeth I
Shillings: Tun (2), uncertain (1); Sixpences or Groats: Coronet (1—complete circle); Ermine (2); Egantline (2); Plain Cross (2); A (1—complete circle); Two (2), uncertain (2), (2), (1—complete circle), (1—complete circle), and 2 pieces, and 5 fragments (of which one is m.m. Egantline and two may be smaller denominations)  
James I
Shilling: 2nd issue (1); Sixpence: 1st issue (2)  
Charles I
Shillings. Six-pointed star (2); Eyé (1), (1); Sun (1); uncertain (1); Sixpences: Triangle-in-circle (1 large piece, about 50% of the original coin); Sceptre (3)  
Charles I or II
Shillings: 6 pieces; Sixpences: 3 pieces  
Charles II
Sixpence (1); Sixpence or smaller? (1)  
Uncertain: 15 pieces—most appear to be sixpences or groats but 3 or 4 may be from smaller denominations  
Total 68

Plus small ingot of silver, approximately shield-shaped with rounded base and top edge rough, either from breakage or, more probably, from casting.

It is very difficult to distinguish between groats and sixpences and to identify with certainty the denominations of many of the very small fragments. The sixty-eight pieces have come from no more than fifty-six coins with a total face value calculated to have been less than £2, a comparatively small sum. These figures exclude the ingot. The total weight of the find has not been accurately recorded but is approximately 60 grams, the ingot accounting for about a quarter of this total. The ingot has not been assayed, it is reasonable to assume that it would be found to be of sterling silver fineness and it is probably melted clippings.

The lettering on the Edward VI shilling is fairly sharp. The clippings of Philip and Mary, Elizabeth I, and James I are in general more worn than those from coins of Charles I and II. It is probably a coincidence that the clippings identified as coming from coins of Charles I are all late in the reign, dating only from 1640 onwards. The hoard contains both primary and secondary clippings, that is, some consist of the outer part of the coin and some show only the lower parts of the letters of the legend and the inner circle, or even the inner circle alone, indicating that they have come from coins which had already been clipped at least once. The individual weights of the clippings have not been recorded as these are not considered to be of significance. The clippings range in size from tiny fragments to the complete outer circle of the coin and, in the case of one of the sixpences of Charles I, about half the original coin, present in one piece with little more than the portrait and part of the adjacent field missing. Small flat pieces and complete circles, similar to those from the finds illustrated in BNJ i, pp. 151 and 161, are both present, together with clippings of the corkscrew-shape type. However, the small pieces do not possess the same bevelled edges characteristic of those in the Marcham find, and it would appear that all the clippings in the hoard have been cut with shears. The majority of the hoard consists of corkscrew-shape pieces. The presence of all three types together in the same hoard might be an indication that the clipping was carried out over a period of time rather than that all the clippings were taken at the same time from one small group of coins.

The hoard is different from most or all of those which have previously been published in containing the different types of clippings together, and the small lump of silver, which may probably be melted clippings. Previous finds of clippings are listed in Brown and Dolley, Bibliography, p. 36, to which should be added the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALDERWASLEY</th>
<th>Derby — c. Aug. 1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R approx.</td>
<td>Daily Telegraph, 28.8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 lb. wt.</td>
<td>BNJ x, pp. 192, 198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hoard was found in a butter jar near to the site of the 1846 find (Brown and Dolley EVI) and was purchased by a local museum. It is believed that it remains unpublished.

In conclusion, the evidence of wear, the large area clipped from some of the coins, and the presence of coins of Charles II, all point towards the probability that the clipping was carried out and the hoard concealed at the time of the Great Recoinage which was begun in 1696 and during which, for a short period, the old hammered coins could be handed in at their face value regardless of how badly worn or clipped they were. However, as is the case with most hoards, the exact circumstances behind the concealment of the pieces must remain unknown.

R. A. MERSON