MISCELLANEA

NOTES ON NINE ANCIENT BRITISH COINS FROM BATH

THE COINS

The excavation at the source of the spring below the King's Bath—conducted by Professor B. W. Cunliffe in December 1979—produced, among other items, a total of at least 8000 coins. The vast majority of these proved to be Roman, but nine of the number were Celtic silver or silver-plated pieces.

The Celtic coins came from two separate deposits: Section South-West 3 containing the first five coins listed below, and section Centre-South 3 (group IV), the remaining four. All are published here for the first time (Pl. IX).

1. A Gaulish minim, base silver or copper alloy. The identification of this coin is unfortunately rather speculative, since it is of previously unpublished type.

*Obv.* A bare clean-shaven head facing right, with a tore encircling the neck. In front of the head is a wheel with diagonal spokes.

*Rev.* A lion facing left, with a floral decorative motif in the field above the beast's head. There is a beaded line around the perimeter of this coin.

*Weight.* 0.35 grams.

The reverse of this coin corresponds very closely to that of a coin which A. Blanchet has ascribed to Eastern Armorica. The obverses of the two coins do not correspond so nearly. The Gaulish coin bears the inscription *ESVIOS* in front of the head, which is quite different from the Bath coin in point of style, and which faces left rather than right. No close parallel has been found for the head on the Bath minim, although since it is Romanized in character, it is likely to be late in the Armorican series, to which it is assumed that it belongs.

2. The Durotrigian quarter-stater (Mack 319).

*Obv.* This bears what is described by Mack as an 'uncertain' object. Interpretations of the design vary widely. It is sometimes regarded as an oared ship, sometimes as a degenerate helmeted head derived from a Greek prototype, while I would prefer to regard it as a stylized boar. A design very similar to this, unambiguously a boar, occurs on the Icenian silver coins (e.g. Mack 407) probably minted around 15 BC. It is hence plausible, at least on chronological grounds, that these copy Mack 319 or one of its forerunners.

*Rev.* A geometric design consisting of an angular crooked line engraved across the centre, with various abstract forms above and below.

*Weight.* 1.15 grams.

3. A Dobunnic uninscribed silver coin, class F (Mack 382). This coin is of cruder execution than the other coins of this tribal group in the assemblage, and has a distinct bend or fold, which shows as a depression on one edge of the obverse and a raised flap on the reverse.

*Obv.* Highly abstract head facing right. The facial features have been reduced to 0 and x ornaments. In the field, in front of the face, are two reverse s ornaments with a smaller s on its side inserted in between them. Also in the field are a series of pellets and pellets within circles.

*Rev.* Triple-tailed horse running to the left. The head, shoulder, and haunch are depicted by a pellet within a circle motif. Above the horse is a cross, below a pellet within a circle and a three-petalled flower. Beneath the tail is another pellet within a circle.

*Weight.* 1.25 grams.

4. A Dobunnic uninscribed silver piece, class F (Mack 382). This coin is of altogether finer preservation and workmanship than the previous example of its class.

*Obv.* and *Rev.* as above.

*Weight.* 1.03 grams.

5. A Dobunnic silver piece inscribed ANTED, class G (Mack 387).


Obv. Crude head facing right. The face is framed by cup and ball ornaments. The hair is depicted by a number of triangularly arranged pellets. Before the face are two reverse s ornaments with a smaller s placed on its side inserted between them. In the field are two pellets within circles and a further series of pellets.

Rev. Disjointed triple-tailed horse to the left, with a beaded mane. This latter feature is an attempt at increased realism, and occurs on six of the nineteen Anted silver pieces in the Index of Celtic coins housed in the Institute of Archaeology in Oxford. The horse is marked head, shoulder, and haunch with a pellet within a circle. The legend is arranged both above and below the horse—AN above, TED beneath—although whether A or A is intended is uncertain. Above the horse and below the legend is a large pellet. A variety of other pellets occur within the field including one on either side of the tail. A pellet within a circle is situated immediately under the horse's body.

Weight. 1.20 grams.

6. A Dobunnic uninscribed silver piece, class F (Mack 382). This coin appears to be a contemporary forgery. It is substantially corroded, whereas all the other coins are rather well preserved, and has a red copper or copper alloy core visible beneath the surface. These details are closely paralleled in two other known examples of contemporary forgeries of Dobunnic silver coins.

Obv. This is poorly preserved. No detail can be discerned beyond the outline of the profile facing right.

Rev. Triple-tailed horse to the left, the shoulder represented by a pellet within a circle. The diagnostic feature is the cross above the horse's back, which occurs only on coins of class F.

Weight. 0.84 grams, below average for a coin of this class.

7. A Dobunnic uninscribed piece, class E or F. The silver appearance of this coin has been well preserved. The obverse is distinctly more worn than the reverse, which is in good condition.

Obv. Crude head in profile to the right. The face is fringed by cup and ball ornaments, and the facial features have been reduced to a pattern of o and x elements. The head occupies most of the obverse, and hence the diagnostic items which occur in the field before the face are not included. Only one reverse s ornament is visible.

8. A Dobunnic silver piece inscribed EISV, class H (Mack 389). This coin again retains its silver appearance and is generally in good condition.

Obv. Crude head facing right, fringed by a series of cup and ball ornaments, and with the facial features reduced to a pattern of o and x elements. A reverse s ornament and pellets within circles occur within the field.

Rev. Triple-tailed horse running to the left. The animal's head, shoulder, and haunch appear as pellets within circles. The legend EI appears above, and sv below the horse. The creature is surrounded by four carefully positioned pellets, above, below, before, and behind.

Weight. 1.06 grams.

9. A coin tentatively identified as a silver piece of Bodvoc. Like no. 6 this coin appears to be a contemporary forgery. A red copper-looking core is clearly visible beneath the surface where the latter has flaked off. It is also considerably under weight, assuming that it is a silver coin of Bodvoc or indeed any Dobunnic silver issue. Both obverse and reverse are highly corroded which renders certain identification difficult.

Obv. This shows fairly certainly a bare, beardless head facing left, with a legend positioned in front of the face. The nearest parallels are the silver issues of Bodvoc or the silver coin of Cunobelin (Mack 215). The Bath coin seems to resemble the Bodvoc issue rather than the other, but the illegible inscription is of no help in this instance.

Rev. This too is inscribed, a feature unknown on a Bodvoc issue although something which does occur on the coin of Cunobelin mentioned above. The reverse is in poor condition, and as far as anything can be made of the design, it appears to be geometric rather than figurative, and is perhaps similar to the design on the reverses of the coins of Tasciovanus (Mack nos. 174 and 175). The reverse of this enigmatic coin does not in any case carry either the classic Dobunnic emblem, the horse, or the seated figure of Victory, which on the evidence of the obverse one might expect to find.

Weight. 0.53 grams.
THE GEOGRAPHICAL CONTEXT

Bath lies well within the southern limit of Dobunnic territory as inferred from the plotting of coin finds. While few Dobunnic coins have been recorded from Bath itself, the surrounding area has been a rich source, probably overweighted in relative importance by the discovery of the Nunney hoard. This contained five coins of class D, about 180 coins of classes E and F, 16 plus coins inscribed ANTED, and 27 with the legend EISV.

The boundary between the Durotriges and their northern neighbours was fairly certainly the Wylye valley, as Professor Cunliffe\(^3\) suggests, but in the vicinity of the city itself, the divide is less sure. The main weight of Durotrigian coinage lies well to the south of Bath, and a few isolated examples only have come to light in Dobunnic territory. No coins of type 319 have, as far as I can ascertain, been found previously in the lands of the Dobunni.

Gaulish minims are found infrequently in Britain, and I have not discovered a published example of this particular coin. It is perhaps relevant in this context to note that eight Esvios minims were found in the 1875 Jersey hoard.\(^4\)

DATING

Examples of the Durotrigian coin were found in the Le Catillon hoard on Jersey. Allen\(^5\) deduces that the date of the deposit of these coins 'must be between Caesar's campaign against the Veneti in 56 b.C. and the completion of his campaigns in 51 b.C.' Since the coins of type 319 included in the hoard were in very fresh condition, it is possible that they were minted somewhere within this date bracket, but Allen's secure terminus ante quem is now the subject of some doubt. The Mack 319 quarter-staters were certainly in circulation very much later than this, on the evidence of the Holdenhurst hoard. This contained coins of type 319 in association with a number of Roman issues, the latest of which was dated to the final years of the Emperor Hadrian c. AD 138, which is generally assumed to be the date of deposition for the hoard.

As mentioned above, eight examples of the Esvios minim—the closest parallel to the Bath coin—were discovered in the 1875 Jersey hoard. S. Scheers\(^6\) considers that the Roman issues with which these were associated provide an acceptable terminus post quem of 39 BC. The dating of the Dobunnic series is also somewhat approximate. Roman and Celtic issues were found associated in the Nunney hoard. From this grouping it can be inferred that the developmental sequence of the Dobunnic uninscribed silver issues classes B-F was complete by AD 41, a date provided by the latest Claudian issue. The Dobunnic oppidum at Bagendon, founded in the early years of the first century AD, has a coin series which commences with class B. These two fixed points give some indication of dating, although any attempt at refinement within this chronological bracket is highly speculative.

Allen\(^7\) suggests that the coins inscribed ANTED and EISV, which correspond fairly closely in stylistic terms with classes E and F, were minted approximately within the decade AD 30-40. The Bodvoc coins, which mark a break in tradition, and are the most Romanized of the series, are generally regarded as the latest Dobunnic issue, minted a few years on either side of AD 43. It seems, however, that Dobunnic coins were in circulation well after the invasion, since at Hengistbury Head coins of classes C, F, I, ANTED and EISV were found in a late-first-century AD context.

THE DEPOSIT

The problem of the date of the deposit, whether Iron-Age proper or post-invasion, is an intriguing one. Matters are complicated by the fact that the archaeological deposit within the reservoir contained an amount of residual pre-Roman silt, most certainly indicated by the presence of Mesolithic material. It is hence possible that the Celtic coins may also be residual within the Roman context, and there are several reasons for thinking this to be the case. Six, and possibly seven, of the nine Celtic coins are within the area of contemporary circulation. All the coins with the exception of the forgeries are in fair, and some in very good, condition, which argues against lengthy circulation.

Other features of the deposition are, on present evidence, common to Romano-Celtic temples: the presence of forged coins and a degree of selection, which perhaps would explain the presence of the Durotrigian coin and the Gaulish minim, both foreign to the area. It should also be noted that the

---

\(^{3}\) B. W. Cunliffe, 'The Late pre-Roman Iron-age, c. 100 B.C.-A.D. 43', VCH Wilshire, i (2), 435.
\(^{4}\) S. Scheers, Traité de numismatique celtique, la Gaule Belgique (Paris, 1977), ii. 886.
\(^{6}\) S. Scheers, Traité de numismatique celtique, la Gaule Belgique (Paris, 1977), ii. 886.
two last-mentioned coins are also potentially a rather earlier deposit than the rest of the Celtic group.

Currently there is no record of pre-Roman Iron-Age activity at the site of the Baths, and in the absence of such evidence, the precise nature of the deposit must remain uncertain.

LYN SELWOOD

THE FIND-SPOT OF THE ALRESFORD HOARD

In about 1880 a hoard of gold coins of Verica was supposedly found near Alresford in Hampshire (NGR SU58.33). Notice of this hoard does not, however, seem to have reached the numismatic world until 1890, when Sir John Evans, into whose possession some of the coins had come, included the hoard in his supplement to the Coins of the Ancient Britons.1 He mentioned a small hoard only, but in 1891 no less than sixty-four staters of Verica and four of Epaticcus were sold in the sale of J. W. Shaw of Alton, Hampshire, at Sotheby's, clearly the whole or part of a hoard. Evans bought some of these and marked on their tickets 'From the Alresford hoard' with or without a question mark afterwards, and subsequent scholars have treated the two sets of coins as part of the same hoard.2

The matter is further complicated by the doubts which exist over the find-spot of the hoard or hoards. In 1960 Derek Allen added a note to his conspectus of the principal hoards of Celtic coins found in Britain to the effect that two coins (a stater of Verica and one of Epaticcus) handed down in a local farming family suggested that the true find-spot of the so-called Alresford hoard may have been Bentworth, near Alton, Hampshire.3 Subsequently, however, Allen annotated his own copy of the article with the comment that Commander R. P. Mack, having interviewed the farmer, doubted this suggestion, which seemed to close the matter as far as he was concerned.

In the light of these doubts, the following letter from F. Jenkinson of Trinity College, Cambridge, to George Payne, the Kentish antiquary, which has recently come to light in Rochester Museum,4 is of no small interest.

April 4 1880

Dear Payne,

Four of the coins were lost by the delay. I had just time between trains to secure the rest and be off to town with them.

One was from Farnham:

1. Obverse: TINC
   Reverse: A horseman

Three from Bentworth near Alton:

2 and 3. Ob: VERI—a leaf
   R: A horseman Co.Fl

4. Ob: A horseman above VIR below REX
   R: Co.M.F

I gave £5 for them. The last three in very good condition. The other fair. All are gold . . . .

The remainder of the letter deals with other matters. It was written from Sunninghill, presumably the Sunninghill, near Bagshot, Surrey. From the description of the coins, there seems little doubt that these are the four unprovenanced gold staters from Jenkinson’s collection given to the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, in 1923.5

Unfortunately, the letter gives no indication of where the coins were bought. 'Town' is presumably London, but there is no way of knowing whether 'between trains' indicates a junction or the decision to leave a through train to purchase the coins and catch the next one. From the provenances, one would surmise that the coins were bought in Hampshire or Surrey, possibly at Sunninghill itself,6 although if Payne furnished the information they could well have been bought elsewhere.

The problem raised by the three coins from Bentworth is twofold. First, there is the question of

2 For example, D. F. Allen, 'The Belgic Dynasties of Britain and their Coins', Archaeologia, xc (1944), 10 n. 7.
4 Letters on Kentish Archaeology to George Payne FSA, 1880, vol. 3, MS Rochester Museum. I am indebted to Tony Merson for drawing my attention to this letter.
5 SCBI Fitzwilliam Ins. 57 (Mack 96), 62 (Mack 121), 67 (Mack 125), and 71 (Mack 125).
6 Farnham seems a not unlikely candidate. The Tincnumus stater was actually found there, while the Verica stater from Bentworth in the Lewis collection is known to have been bought at Farnham on 17 Jan. 1880 (T. Volk, pers. comm.). This latter coin was presumably part of the same batch, and in view of the delay which Jenkinson alludes to, might even conceivably have been one of the four coins he missed.
whether these staters derive from a hoard. That this was indeed the case seems likely both from their similar condition and the fact that there is another stater of Verica (Mack 121) in the Lewis collection, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, which is labelled as having been found at Bentworth in 1879, as well as the two coins in the farming family. Secondly, there is the problem of whether this hoard is one and the same as either Evans's hoard found near Alresford 'some years ago' or the hoard dispersed in the Shaw sale in 1891 or both. Unfortunately dies help us little here. Two of the Jenkinson coins are linked to Alresford coins only, but the third has links with both an Alresford and a Shaw coin. The Lewis collection specimen has no die-duplicates. There are several die-links between Alresford and Shaw coins, but in view of the very limited range of dies represented by the series as a whole, this can hardly be regarded as conclusive evidence that they were one and the same hoard. Moreover, Evans also acquired a coin which was found at Avington, near Alresford, in 1899, which is die-linked to an Alresford coin and could reasonably be regarded as a hoard stray.

It could be argued that as most of the provenanced staters and, in all probability, most of the unprovenanced staters as well, derive from the Alresford hoard or the Shaw collection, we have a far from representative sample of Verica's staters and thus that the die-links between the Bentworth coins and the other hoard coins are significant, but against this one must point out that only four of the ten single finds known are not linked to attested hoard coins.

What then may one safely conclude? The Jenkinson coins, the Lewis specimen, and the coins in the farming family all strongly imply that a hoard was found at Bentworth in 1879. The fact that one of the family's coins was a stater of Epaticcus, and that Shaw lived at Alton, lead us to suppose that Bentworth was also the find-spot of the coins in his collection. Were it not for the single find from Avington, near Alresford, one would have little hesitation in further suggesting that the Alresford and Bentworth hoards were one and the same; as it is, the matter must remain open, although the coincidence of the only two hoards ever recorded containing staters of Verica having come to light at roughly the same time and only a few miles apart, is one that I would be most reluctant to accept.

In any event, it is clear that the commonly held estimates of the number of Verica's staters from the hoard or hoards, must be revised. The Shaw sale included 64 staters of Verica and 4 of Epaticcus, while by 1890 Evans seems already to have owned 13 staters of Verica from Alresford. To these must be added the 6 Bentworth coins, 5 of Verica and 1 of Epaticcus, making a total of 82 staters of Verica and 5 of Epaticcus, an interesting point when it is remembered that in all only 93 staters of Verica were traceable in 1976.

COLIN HASELGROVE

A HOARD FROM EARLY IN THE REIGN OF ÆTHELRED II FOUND AT SPETTISBURY RINGS HILL FORT, DORSET

Mr D. A. Hinton has drawn our attention to the fact that the second edition of Hutchins's History of Dorset contains an account of what appears to have been a small hoard of coins of Eadgar, Edward Martyr, and Æthelred found at Spettisbury Rings in about 1790. The range of issues represented brings the Chester hoard to mind, and the location near the coast suggests that the background to its concealment may have been the Viking raids along the south coast. Other hill forts were reused at much the same date, notably of course Cissbury and Cadbury.

W. G. Maton wrote in a letter dated from Salisbury on 28 November 1792 that 'the coins here engraved, which are of silver were found at an entrenchment called Spettisbury Ring, adjoining to the village of the same name, which is distant about three miles from Blandford. A ploughman discovered them at the time when the ring was prepared for sowing, about two years ago. No. 1 [illustrated by a line-drawing which appears to be quite faithful, and from which the legends are transcribed below] was plainly a penny of Eadgar (Æ)ADGÆÆRÆXÆNGLÆO); the coiner's name on the reverse seems to be Wynstan (+ÝÝÝ)NSTANþ0T0TTA) ... No. II (after a most diligent examination ...) I have every reason to conclude is a penny of Edward the Martyr (+ÆADPEAPþDÆXÆNÆÆ); on the reverse the legend is clearly +PVLÆCÆRMÆQTÅNTF ...
A coin of Æthelred the second, in as fine preservation as the two above described, was found likewise at the same place, but some time after. That however is not in my possession.

The possibility of three or even two separate losses cannot be altogether ruled out, but it seems remote, and it is likely therefore that we are considering a hoard. The three coins referred to would seem to be all that came to Mr Maton's attention: they aroused his interest to such a degree that he would doubtless have mentioned the existence of other specimens if he had heard of them, even if he had not seen them. It is possible, of course, that the plough scattered the hoard, and that not all of it was recovered. 2

But if Maton heard about the discovery only at second hand, and perhaps even after an interval of up to two years, one cannot be certain that other coins may not have been dispersed. We have wondered whether the group of four coins all of the Reform/First Small Cross type, three of Edward, and one of Æthelred, which apparently came from near Wimborne (only a few miles from Spettisbury) could have been from the same source, having lain in private possession locally for many years—or alternatively whether they might represent another small Dorset find concealed in the face of the Viking threat to the south coast. But the northerly mint-places of the four coins, and the similarity of three of them to coins now missing from the Willes parcel, 4 may argue for their having come to light in the Oakham hoard of 1749. This hypothesis involves an even longer period during which the coins had 'gone to earth'. And northern coins could very quickly reach the south coast—as the Spettisbury Rings hoard now demonstrates.

The Totnes moneyer Wynstan in Eadgar's Reform type is known to modern numismatists only by the specimen which was in the Montagu collection. It was described there as unique. 3 It could well be one and the same as the Spettisbury Rings coin. Wulfgar is a very well-attested moneyer during the reign of Edward the Martyr. A dozen specimens are known, and it is difficult, therefore, to identify the Spettisbury Rings find today.

As the coin of Æthelred was not described we cannot be sure whether it was of the First Small Cross type, or whether (as in the case of the Chester hoard) coins of the first validity-period after the reform were still in circulation alongside the early issues of the Hand type. It is tempting to consider that in 982, according to the Chronicle, three Viking ships arrived in Dorset and ravaged in Portland. One can very rarely be certain of the circumstances in which any one particular hoard was concealed; but in any case, English hoards are our only direct evidence for the composition of the English currency in Æthelred's reign, and there are so few of them that even these few crumbs of information from Dorset seem worth reinstating.

D. M. METCALF and KENNETH JONSSON

THE DIES OF EDWARD V'S SILVER COINS

UNTIL 1895, when Montagu 1 made the (entirely subjective) proposal that sun-and-rose dimidiated was more likely to be a mark of Edward V than of his father, the rare coins with this initial-mark had generally been assigned to Edward IV. In reviving this attribution Mr Blunt used the evidence of dies and mint accounts to argue that the surviving sun- and-rose coins represented too substantial an issue to correspond with the tiny totals of bullion which passed through the mint in May and June 1483, but the much rarer Edward coins with the boar's-head mark could well fit this period. 2 Blunt published 3 C. E. Blunt and C. A. Whitton, 'The Coinages of Edward IV and of Henry VI (Restored)', BNJ xxv (1945-8), 13-14, 299, 303-4, and 325-7.

2 In Sweden many hoards have been found bit by bit over a period of decades.

3 M. Dolley, 'A Further Parcel of Reform-type Pence from an Eighteenth-century Find from N.E. England', Spinks, Numismatt Circular, lixiv (1976), 141.

4 C. E. Blunt and C. S. S. Lyon, 'The Oakham Hoard of 1749, Deposited c. 980', NCiv (1979), p. 117, item k.

5 Sotheby, 18 Nov. 1895, lot 730.


similarly altered, remarking that, since the dies of all the Edwardian boar’s-head angels and groats were also known from coins with sun-and-rose as the original mark, it seemed possible that no new dies were prepared for Edward V. He commented that the groats were from four obverse dies, three without and one with a pellet below the bust. In their subsequent work on Edward IV, Blunt and Whitton listed eleven varieties of type XXII (sun-and-rose) groats, nos. 1–5 with fleur on breast and pellet below, nos. 6–9 without pellet, and nos. 10–11 without fleur or pellet; adding the comment that ‘nos. 1, 6, 7, 8, and 10 are also found with the obverse I.M. overstruck with the Boar’s Head’. The implication of this statement is that five sun-and-rose obverse groat dies, including all three varieties, are also known with the mark altered to boar’s head, but this does not appear to be the case. Blunt and Whitton nos. 6, 7, and 8 seem to be from the same die (a), which develops characteristic flaws between the circle and tressure under EDW and above the fleur at the right shoulder; most of the known Edward V groats are from this die. Blunt and Whitton no. 1 is the only type XXII die (c) with the pellet below the bust that has been noted also with boar’s head. I have not been able to trace any boar’s-head groat from the same die as no. 10, or indeed any Edward V groat at all without a fleur on the breast. However, it may be that ‘10’ was a slip for ‘9’ since the die of type XXII no. 9 (Parsons 1929, lot 393) does appear to be known from a boar’s-head coin (Baines 1922, lot 34); it can be identified by a small nick in the die just to the left of the top of the breast fleur. Both these coins are reproduced on Pl. IX, 10, 11 from the sale-catalogue illustrations. I have not noted any other examples from this die (b), either before or after alteration of the mark.

Details of groat obverse dies involved may be summarized as shown below.

Only one half-groat is known of this period. Brooke comments that the mark is doubtful, but Blunt has noted a reverse die-link with Richard III which reinforces the likelihood of it being a boar’s head. In my view there is no real doubt about this, or about Blunt’s identification of the same mark on a London penny. I have not been able to trace the sun-and-rose penny that belonged to R. Carlyon-Britton, but that in the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow, is here illustrated for the first time (Pl. IX, 12). The dies differ from those of Mr Blunt’s Edward V penny, but the characteristic broken cross-end punch is to be noted on the reverse of both coins. Mr Blunt has recently drawn attention to a note by William Webster, the mid-nineteenth-century dealer, which reads ‘Edw. V Penny m.m. boar’s head. I have seen, but very poor’. As Mr Blunt remarks, it is doubtful whether the mark on his coin would have been identified correctly at that date, and Webster’s note could refer to a second specimen.

As to the question of attribution, part of Mr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Die</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Whitton, BNJ xxiv</th>
<th>Blunt and Whitton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Fleur on breast; no pellet below. Barred A. Flaws at top of tressure and by fleur on right shoulder.</td>
<td>s.R.</td>
<td>1, 3, 6</td>
<td>6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Fleur on breast (with small nick at top left); no pellet below. Barred A.</td>
<td>s.R.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Fleur on breast; pellet below. Unbarred A.</td>
<td>s.R.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5 In the 1932 Walters sale lot 359, under Edward V, consisted of two groats, one sun-and-rose without fleur on breast, and the second described as ‘another, with m.m. boar’s head, in fair state, broken’. Although this could be read to imply that the boar’s-head specimen also lacked a fleur on the breast, to do so would probably be to assume too high a degree of precision on the part of the cataloguer in his use of the word ‘another’.

6 English Coins, p. 150.

7 BNJ xxii (1934-7), 221 and pl. nos. 9-10.

8 Ibid., pl. no. 12.

9 I am indebted to Professor Anne Robertson, then Keeper, for the photographs.

SELLWOOD: BATH
Blunt's original argument was that there were too many sun-and-rose obverse dies for angels to be compatible with the minimal amount of gold minted in May and June 1483. The theme was developed by Stubbs, who suggested that the numbers of obverse dies with this mark and with boar's head for both angels and groats corresponded remarkably to the proportions of gold and silver bullion minted respectively in February-April and May-June 1483. Borrowing from Blunt and Whitton's list, Stubbs compared the figures for great obverse dies, six with sun-and-rose only and five with both sun-and-rose and boar's head, with silver bullion of 573 lb. in the former period and 434 lb. in the latter. Since the five dies that were altered produced some groats with their original mark, more than six-elevens of the output of the eleven dies would probably have had the sun-and-rose mark (an inference supported by the fact that boar's-head Edward groats are substantially rarer than those with sun-and-rose). This thought seems to underly the observation by Stubbs that not all the unaltered sun-and-rose coins necessarily belonged to the reign of Edward IV.

The point is reinforced if the proportion of altered great dies is reduced to one-third (three out of nine). Assuming that the introduction of the sun-and-rose mark is correctly dated to February 1483, the bullion figures would then suggest that a good deal of the May-June coinage may have been struck from unaltered sun-and-rose dies. The total number of sun-and-rose obverse dies needs to be rechecked before any more precise estimate could be attempted and, in order to protect against the effects of unequal die-output where so few are involved, the actual numbers of surviving specimens with each of the two marks ought also to be counted. But such information seems unlikely to disturb the conclusion that, while the bulk of the sun-and-rose coinage must be attributed to Edward IV, the dies were not altered immediately when minting was resumed for Edward V. Perhaps that happened a little later when Richard as Protector had tightened his hold.

I am most grateful to Mr Blunt for many helpful comments on the foregoing.

IAN STEWART

CROWNED LEOPARD’S HEAD WITH COLLAR

In his work entitled ‘The Coinage of Edward VI in His Own Name’, Potter deals with the last secondary mark on the 6 oz. shillings. Owing to the great rarity of this particular mark, Potter tentatively describes it as ‘pelt’, or martin’s skin outstretched. The mark is only found on the 6 oz. issues (6 oz. silver, 6 oz. alloy) and all known specimens are dated MDL. Of the four examples that I have examined two are muled with ‘martlet’ on the obverse from the same dies. The other two, which are die-duplicates, are the same as the Potter coin with ‘pelt’ on both sides.

Comparison of weights is as follows:

1. Mule, 80.7 grains. British Museum.
2. Mule, 83.2 grains. R. Lax.

Although the coins vary in weight it seems that they were an attempt at the 80-grain issues. Coin no. 4 which was auctioned by Glendining & Co. on 22 November 1979, lot 247, will, I hope, solve the question of this mark. The obverse (Pl. X, 1) has much wear, as do most examples of the mark, but the reverse mark (Pl. X, 2) is well struck up so enabling a positive identification to be made. The mark was made with three punches and four blows of the hammer and is, I believe, crowned leopard’s head with collar. As the enlarged photograph of the mark (Pl. X, 3) shows, the last blow, putting in the second v to make up the collar, was struck on the side. This had the effect of pulling down one side of the v punch and causing a burr to occur at the side of the w mark. Miss Marion Archibald of the British Museum consulted Dr Swan, York Herald, about the mark at the base of the leopard’s head with the aid of the photographs, but it was his opinion that the mark was numismatic rather than heraldic. He went on to suggest that the mark could be the erased throat of the leopard although this was usually shown clean cut at the base of the head in heraldry.

I was at first of the opinion that the mark below...
the leopard’s head was the initial-mark of the under-treasurer at whose mint the coin was struck, but no such official had a name beginning in w. The only person it could have applied to was Warwick who headed a commission with Sir William Herbert and Sir Walter Mildmay in 1550,3 the year when the shillings were minted, to examine the accounts of the principal mint officials who were responsible for producing the debased coin. But Warwick’s crest, a bear with a ragged staff, was nothing like the mint-mark under consideration here and, in any case, as far as we know coins were marked by the heads of the mints and no one else.

At this point it would be beneficial to discuss the martlet issues to see whether they can throw light on this intriguing mark. The martlet has on occasion been attributed to Thomas Fleetwood because of his position as under-treasurer during Elizabeth I’s reign. However, although he had undoubtedly attained high office under Edward VI, as assaymaster and comptroller, he had not by then become head of a mint and, for the reason just given in connection with Warwick, was thus unlikely to have had any say as to the choice of martlet at this time.

Because coins with martlet mark have long been known, the mark must be connected with one of the four London mints issuing debased coin during Edward’s reign; Tower I, Tower II, Southwark, and Durham House. The heads of these mints and the marks usually attributed to them in so far as the debased issues are concerned are as follows:4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Under-treasurer</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower I</td>
<td>Sir Martin Bowes</td>
<td>Arrow, Pheon, Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 March 1544–29 September 1550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir John Yorke</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 September 1551–25 March 1552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower II</td>
<td>Stephen Vaughan</td>
<td>Grapple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 1548–25 December 1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Throckmorton</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 December 1549–25 March 1552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>Sir John Yorke</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 March 1545–29 September 1551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham House</td>
<td>John Bowes</td>
<td>Bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 December 1548–October 1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As may be seen, hitherto numismatists have been able to assign specific marks to each of the under-treasurers with the exception of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, and it would be my contention that we should now go one step further and assign the martlet mark to him. As the fourth son of Sir George Throckmorton of Coughton, Warwickshire, he would have been entitled to use the mark as a mark of cadency. The use of the martlet to denote the position of the fourth son was standardized in the early part of the sixteenth century.

If this attribution be correct, then the mark with which it is muled must also be attributed to the same mint. In my view, therefore, the mint-mark which Potter termed ‘pelt’, but which I prefer to call ‘crowned leopard’s head with collar’ came from Tower II in 1550 when it was headed by Sir Nicholas Throckmorton. J. BISPHAM

M. B. SHARP

MORE ON THE TOWER SHILLINGS OF CHARLES I

Since my paper on this series,1 three further pieces have come to light which warrant recording. The first, an exciting discovery which appeared in auction,2 is a mule of a Group B5 obverse with a Group C5 reverse (Pl. XI, 1). It is the first mule between groups to be recorded and is a further reflection of the somewhat complicated transition between Groups B and C.

The other two coins are both of Group F and provide previously unrecorded instances of mint-mark for type. One is a coin of type F2/1 and the other of type F5/1. The former (Pl. XI, 2) has mint-mark anchor, flukes to right, over tun on the obverse and anchor, flukes to left, on the reverse. Assuming the overmark indicates this to have been a late tun obverse, the presence of the large mark of value would seem to provide final confirmation that this followed the use of the smaller mark of value with this obverse type, hitherto known only with the tun mark. The F5/1 coin (Pl. XI, 3) has the anchor mark with flukes to right on the obverse and vertical anchor on the reverse. The vertical anchor is commonly encountered on F3 coins but is so far unrecorded on an F5 obverse. It seems reasonable, therefore, to conclude that a reverse die used with the earlier F3 obverse was subsequently reused with this F5 obverse. This coin was said to have come from the Messing hoard (1975).

M. B. SHARP


2 Spink Coin Auctions no. 11, 8–9 October 1980, lot 200.
### SOME UNPUBLISHED COUNTERMARKS ON COPPER COINS

Since my book *British Countermarks on Copper and Bronze Coins* appeared in 1975 many unrecorded pieces have turned up. The vast majority of these are countermarked names or initials without trade or town. While these are worth recording, not many are of much significance. A few traders' items, mainly shop tickets, have come to light. Twelve of these, typical of the pieces concerned, are described in the table below. There follow some brief notes giving background information on some of the issuers, based largely on research in local directories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countermark</th>
<th>Incuse (I) or in relief (R)</th>
<th>Obverse (O) or reverse (R)</th>
<th>Coin type</th>
<th>Source reference author's collection (A) other private collection (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Penny 1797</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTLER/READING/LOTT/READING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (1 and 2) and medium (3 and 4) letters with serifs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Canada halfpenny token 1812 (Charlton 219)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-HAY/CRAFT/TRURO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very small letters with serifs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Irish halfpenny 1805</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+S/MAR/1831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium letters with serifs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Penny 1797</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-BUCK/124 NEWGATE ST/LONDON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium letters with serifs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ THE PENNY SUNDAY TIMES (curved)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Penny 1861</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium letters with serifs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILTSHIER/8 LONG LANE/(rosette)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Halfpenny 1806/7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small letters with serifs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Penny 1797</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-HUNTER/MORPETH/MORPETH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (w. Hunter) and small letters with serifs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counterfeit halfpenny 1751</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAYSHIER *(curved)/GUNMAKER/GUILDFORD (curved) in an oval indent</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small letters with serifs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Halfpenny George II</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEIGH in crescent-shaped indent</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium plain letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (crown) R/GOWEN &amp; CO</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Penny 1797</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small letters with serifs (also crude dotted i obv., c rev.)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Penny 1825</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL &amp; H/SARGANT/SARGANT &amp; SON/WARRANTED (curved) (elephant standing, facing right), Medium serifed italic (1, 2), small serifed italic (3, 4), medium letters with serifs (5)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Penny 1806/7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILL WAGNER/ODESSA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small letters with serifs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes on issues

Berkshire
Reading
Butler, Lott

Charles Butler was a cutler in Fisher Row (1824), 28 Middle Row (1830), and 21 London St. (1847-8). Ewell Lott was a gun maker in Minster St. (1824).

The piece is presumably a shop ticket (repair or discount check) dating from the 1820s.

Cornwall
Truro
Haycraft

James Haycraft, cutler, St. Mary's Street, is listed in the Post Office Directory for 1856. I have found no trace of R. Haycraft in Pigot's Directories for 1824, 1830, or 1844.

Kent
Sheerness
Sheerness Dockyard

Similar pieces, with countermarks in relief, and dated Jan 1841 and Jun 1845, are recorded in my book (nos. 18.8A, B), and are tentatively attributed to Sheerness Dockyard. They are assumed to be stores' checks. The dockyard opened in 1814 and by 1900 covered 60 acres and contained 3 basins and 5 docks.

London
Buck

Joseph Buck, tool maker, is listed in directories as follows:
1826-7 1 Gibson St., Lambeth
1832-4 1 Waterloo Rd., Lambeth, and 245 Tottenham Court Road
1838 3 Gt. Waterloo St., Lambeth
1839-67 124 Newgate St., and 1 Waterloo St. (1842), 91 Waterloo Road (1845-54), 164 Waterloo Road (1867)
1875 Holborn Viaduct, etc., and 164 Waterloo Road
1922 56 Holborn Viaduct, etc.

Penny Sunday Times

This is apparently not Lloyd's Penny Sunday Times (no. 22.28A in my book), which is earlier (1846-7). On a penny of 1861, such a countermarked advertisement ticket would have been illegal. (Act to prevent the defacing of the current coin of the Realm 1853—16 & 17 Vict. c. 102.)

It is not clear which newspaper was responsible. The Penny Times (London) was started on 22 February 1860, while The Sunday Times Racing Record and Handicap Book (London) also first appeared in 1860. The Sunday Times, founded in 1822, cost twopence in the early 1860s.

Wiltshire

Jonathan Wiltshier, cutler, was at 8 Long Lane, Smithfield, 1832-47. By 1850 George Henry Matthews, cutler, was at the same address. Wiltshier was at 20 Crescent Street, Euston Square, in 1854.

Northumberland

Morpeth
Hunter

William Hunter, blacksmith, Scotch Arms Yard, is listed in Pigot's Directory for 1828-9. He would be a more probable issuer than others of the same name—a confectioner in Bridge St. and a baker and flour dealer in Thompson's Buildings.

Surrey

Guildford
Glaysher

There is no Glaysher on the mark plate of the Gunmakers' Company, nor is there any trace of him in directories for 1784, 1798, 1826-7, 1832-4, 1839, 1845, 1851, 1855. Three Glayshers are listed in the Guildford Almanacs for 1873, one a dressmaker, and the others at private addresses.

Unattributed

Leigh

The mark is distinctive, but there is no clue as to trade or location. A gunmaker is a possibility.
Owen & Co.
This could well be a cutler's mark. Owen, Boon & Co. were working gold- and silversmiths at 11 Thavies Inn, London, in 1857.

Sargant
No trace has been found in Sheffield Directories for 1787, 1797, 1828, 1837, 1845, or 1877.

Wagner
Wagner was probably engaged in the tool-making or cutlery trades—at Odessa Works in some as yet unidentified town rather than in the capital of the Ukraine!
No trace has been found in Sheffield Directories for 1787, 1797, 1828, 1837, 1845, or 1877.

GAVIN SCOTT