A SMALL CARAUSIAN HOARD FROM THE WHEELER EXCAVATIONS AT VERULAMIAM

H.P.G. WILLIAMS

The report of the excavations undertaken by R.E.M. Wheeler and T.V. Wheeler at Verulamium was published in 1936. During the excavation of building V. 1., a hoard of nineteen coins of Carausius was discovered close to the exterior edge of the footings of the outer wall of Room 19. The coins are blackened, showing some degree of fire damage. A footnote in the report states that several coins originated from the same dies, but fails to publish any further details of the coins other than assigning them RIC numbers.

Close study of the hoard, which is in the possession of the Verulamium Museum (ref. 82.584 – 82.603), yields much interesting information. The details of the coins are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reverse Type</th>
<th>Mass (g)</th>
<th>Diam (mm)</th>
<th>Axis (o/c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>PAX AVS, Pax stg left holding branch &amp; cornu.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FOR. . . . Fortuna stg left holding baton &amp; cornu</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>As No. 1</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>As No. 1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>As No. 1</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>. . . AX AVG, Pax stg left holding olive br &amp; cornu</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pax type, overstruck</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PAX AVG, Pax stg left holding olive br, &amp; vert sceptre IM in exergue</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition the following coin (ref. 84.2478), was found in the removed topsoil from Insula V. It is quite possible that it once belonged to the hoard, and although its exact find spot is uncertain, it comes from the same area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reverse Type</th>
<th>Mass (g)</th>
<th>Diam (mm)</th>
<th>Axis (o/c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PAX AVG, as No. 8 but no mark in exergue</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PAX AVG, as No. 9</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FORTVNA AVG, as No. 2</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>As No. 1</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>As No. 1</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14*</td>
<td>As No. 1</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15*</td>
<td>As No. 1</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PAX AVG, with baton &amp; o.b. with in field left &amp; ML in exergue</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>As No. 16</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>As No. 1</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>As No. 1</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20*</td>
<td>As No. 1</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All coins, except for numbers 8 and 11, which are illegible, bear the same obverse legend: IMP CARAVSIVS PFAVG, and a radiate bust right.

A most fascinating aspect of this hoard is the number of coins sharing identical dies. No fewer than eleven coins (all marked with an asterisk) share the same pair of dies. The reverse of

Acknowledgements. My sincere thanks must go to the staff of the Verulamium Museum at St. Albans, and especially to Stephen Greep for supplying me with the photographs, and to Vivienne Holgate and Hazel Simons for so patiently finding all the Carausian coins at the museum for my examination.

NOTES ON THREE ROMANO-BRITISH HOARDS

DAVID SYMONS

PRESERVED in the collections of the Birmingham City Museum and Art Gallery are three unpublished groups of coins that either certainly or probably derive from hoards. This brief note is intended to bring their existence to the attention of students.1

Foleshill, Coventry, 1792/3.

Although the existence of this hoard has been on record since shortly after its discovery, the coins published here appear to be the first to be attributed to it. The hoard was briefly mentioned by W.A. Seaby2 and C.H.V. Sutherland3 who both cite VCH Warwickshire I as their reference.4 Both follow VCH in recording the existence of two hoards, whereas, as we shall see below, the two discoveries clearly form one hoard. VCH in turn relies on two reports in the Gentleman's Magazine for 1793.5 Since these form the only detailed account of the discovery of the hoard the relevant passages are reproduced here for the sake of convenience.

Gentleman's Magazine, January 1793, (in the 'Country News' section);

"On the 17th of December was discovered, in a meadow, at Foleshill, co. Warwick, belonging to

1 I am pleased to acknowledge the kind assistance of Professor A.S. Roberts who helped with references and of Dr C.E. King who commented on certain of the coins.
3 C.H.V. Sutherland, Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain (London, 1937) p. 166.
5 Gentleman's Magazine 1793, i. 83 and ii. 786-7 with Plate II, figs. 3 and 4.
Mr. Joseph Whiting, of that place, in digging a trench, about two feet below the surface, an earthen pot, containing upwards of 1800 Roman copper coins, principally of the Emperors Constantine, Constans, Constantius, and Magnentius; most of which remain in the possession of Mr. Whiting, for the inspection of the curious. And on the 12th of January, in continuing the same trench, he found another earthen jug, containing a great quantity of larger coin; but the latter were (I) in greater preservation.

Gentleman’s Magazine, September 1793, (a letter from ‘Explorator’ to ‘Mr. Urban’, the editor).

‘Mr. Urban.
Coventry, July 30.
I send you a drawing (plate II fig. 3) of the pot in which the 1800 Roman coins, mentioned in your present volume, p. 83, were contained; it was broken by the labourer, but the fragments have been cemented together, and the drawing is a faithful representation of its present appearance.

The second pot was much broken when discovered, but appears, from the fragments, to resemble the former, only is smaller; the coins, though said to be better preserved, and larger, were precisely the same sorts, &c. as those first discovered. I examined the coins found in the larger pot minutely, and was surprised to observe amongst that number only one scarce reverse, viz. Constantius Avg.; reverse, Sarmatia Devicta; of which, being rather uncommon, I send you a drawing, fig. 4. There were three of that type.’

‘Explorator’ then discusses the evidence for the existence of a Roman road running from Warwick to Mancetter. Inter alia he mentions ‘Foleshill (especially the farm on which the pots of coin were found)’ and ‘the farm at Foleshill (called Bullester Field farm)’.

From the foregoing accounts it is clear that the two deposits formed part of the same hoard. The coins in the two finds are expressly stated to be of the same sorts, they were buried in very similar pottery vessels and were clearly found very close together. It should also be noted that the entry in VCH perpetuates the misconception that the second find contained larger and better preserved coins than the first, although ‘Explorator’ had already corrected this error in his letter.

According to Museum records 15 coins found at Foleshill were acquired in 1875 as part of a collection of several hundred coins, medals and tokens that had belonged to William Staunton, a Warwickshire antiquarian. Staunton (1765-1848) was born at Kenilworth. After an education at Rugby and St John’s College, Oxford, he was called to the bar. However, instead of following a career in law he opted to join the army, was commissioned a lieutenant in the Life Guards and lived in London. He soon became known as one of the foremost numismatic collectors of the day, buying coins from (among others) Matthew Young.

Staunton later retired to his family seat at Longbridge, a village on the south-western outskirts of Warwick. Eventually, in addition to his numismatic material, he amassed a collection of drawings and deeds and some 2000 books and manuscripts, all dealing with his native Warwickshire. In 1875 his son John sold the whole collection to the (then) Birmingham Town Council for the bargain price of £2,235. Tragically the bulk of the collection was lost only four years later in the fire that destroyed the Birmingham Free Library buildings. Fortunately the coins, tokens and medals and assorted antiquities had previously been transferred to the care of the Art Gallery Committee and so escaped the blaze. Virtually all the manuscript records of the numismatic collections were destroyed in the fire, but the Foleshill provenance of the coins discussed here was noted on the envelopes in which they were stored. How the coins came into Staunton’s possession is unknown.

Of the 15 coins originally acquired by the Museum two (nos 14 and 15 below) have been missing since at least January 1961 and cannot now be traced. The information given about these coins is derived from notes made on the envelopes, which have survived. Of the remaining thirteen coins one (no. 13) is almost certainly not from Foleshill. While nos 1–12 are generally in a very good state of preservation and have a uniform black patina, no. 13 is very worn and has a dark green patina with the remains of a white encrustation. Presumably it has at some time been substituted for a hoard coin that cannot now be traced or it was erroneously included in the hoard material before coming to the Museum.

The coins: (pl. 23–24)

1. (Accession no. 1527’85–385 B). Constantine I, Sarmatia Devicta. RIC VII Lyons 214. AD 323-4. 19.5mm, 3.867g, 0°.
2. (1527’85–385A). Constantine I, Gloria Exercitus (2 standards), officina S. RIC VII Trier 537. AD 332-3. 18mm, 2.363g, 350°.

6 The first pot discovered is shown in Plate 23, which is a copy of the illustration given in the Gentleman’s Magazine (see previous note). I am advised by Mr P. M. Booth of Warwickshire Museums that this vessel is likely to be a specimen of the local grey ware and would fit well with the mid fourth century date of the hoard.
3. (1527'85-385 D). CONSTANTINOPOLIS, off. p. RIC VII Lyons 256. AD 332. 18.5mm, 1.959g, 350°. (Some ?varnish on reverse).
4. (1527'85-385 C). CONSTANTINOPOLIS. RIC VII Arles 386/401. AD 334/6. 18mm, 2.238g, 340°.
5. (1527'85-385 E). Constantine II Caesar, GLORIA EXERCITVS (2 standards), off. s. RIC VII Trier 350. AD 333/4. 18 mm, 2.566g, 350°.

A few of the coins called for individual comment. No. 1 may be the coin shown illustrated in the Gentleman's Magazine (see p. 23, 'Fig. 4') but it is hard to be sure given the sketchy nature of the drawing and the fact that the hoard contained at least two other specimens of the type. At 6.297g no. 9 seems to be unusually heavy, RIC VIII Trier 240. AD 348-90. 22mm, 5.581g, 190°.

11. (1527'85-385 M). 'Magnentius. FELICITAS A VOT/REPVBLICE Emperor + Victory. RSLG'.


The four Tetrarchic folles described here were left at the Museum for identification at the beginning of 1951. They were added to the Museum's collections as accession numbers A.387'51 to A.870'51. During the 1950s the coins became 'detached' from these numbers and were recatalogued in 1961. The 1961 numbers have been retained in the list given below.

One of the letters sent by the Museum to the depositor includes the sentence 'I understand that they were found in a field near Oxford and form part of a hoard'. This statement is amplified in the accession register where the coins are described as 'Part of a hoard found during the building of an aerodrome at Oxford'. In the light of this information and hearing in mind that the coins arrived at the Museum in 1951 it seems very likely that they were part of a larger hoard found during the construction of a wartime airfield, of which there were a number that could be described as 'near Oxford'. It has not been possible to identify such a hoard and it is likely that the find was dispersed without a record being made.

The coins: (pl. 24)

1. (A.33'61-41). Diocletian, SACRA MONET AVGG ET CAESS NOSTR, off. p. RIC VI Ticinum 45a. AD 300-303. 28mm, 8.894g, 180°.
2. (A.33'61-56). Maximian, GENIO POPVL ROMANI, off. % RIC VI Lugdunum 108a. AD 301-3. 27mm, 8.925g, 180°.
3. (A.33'61-54). Constantius I Caesar, GENIO POPVL ROMANI, off. A. RIC VI Lugdunum 165a. AD 301-3. 27mm, 10.162g, 10°.
4. (A.33'61-53). Constantius I Caesar. GENIO POPVL ROMANI, 80 mm. RIC VI Londinum 37a. AD 303-5. 28mm, 8.693g, 180°.

Assuming these coins to be representative of the find a date of deposit soon after AD 305 seems likely.

3. 'Waltham, Gloucs.', 1900?.

The five coins considered here were discovered uncased in the Coin Room in 1978. They are included in this note on the basis of the information recorded on the envelope in which they were found. This was marked 'Waltham, Gloucs. 5 4th century coins from brick works site (1900)'. Added, in another hand, was 'with 230/55'. A.230/55 is a penny of Edward I which was found in Birmingham. If the latter note has any significance it may give a rough date for the arrival of the coins in Birmingham. The coins form a quite tightly dated group which closes between AD 392+ (no. 5 should post-date the death of Valentinian II because of its broken obverse legend – see RIC IX, p. xxxvii) and AD 395+ (no. 5, depending on the mm). While they may represent individual site finds it is perhaps more likely that they formed all or more probably part of a hoard. Unfor-
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In their publication of the provenances of the Anglo-Saxon coins recorded in the British Museum Catalogue, R. H. M. Dooley and J. S. Strudwick wrote: 'Among important hoard provenances [for the coins of Æthelred II] we may note especially the Russian hoard acquired in 1850 through a French firm of dealers. Unfortunately it has proved impossible to establish a more exact find-spot – and we must remember that Finland, the Baltic States, and much of Poland, all areas rich in Anglo-Saxon coins, were then technologically part of Russia.'

The parcel from the 'Russian find' included 101 coins of Æthelred II and 19 of Cnut. It was the largest single acquisition of coins of Æthelred II made by the British Museum in the nineteenth century, accounting for some 25 per cent of the coins of this king in the 1893 catalogue. Although no new information on the find-spot has become available, the general background of the Russian and Baltic finds with 'topography' of the Russian and Baltic finds with 'topography' of the Russian and Baltic finds with foreign currency.

The first of them was found in 1846 at Borovskaya near the town of Oranienbaum. Nowadays known as Lomonosov, the former Oranienbaum is situated opposite the fortress of Kronstadt at the bottom of the Gulf of Finland: it now belongs to the administrative region of Leningrad. The little that is known of the hoard suggests a terminus post quem of 1027, and this fits well enough with the fact that all the three coin types of Cnut were represented among the 120 coins which were bought by the British Museum. The Borovskaya hoard was first described by the orientalist P. S. Savelev who in 1846 published a 'topography' of the Russian and Baltic finds with foreign currency. He knew, however, of only 278 coins, namely 264 Anglo-Saxon of Cnut, Æthelred and other kings, German, and 14 Kufic' (the latter described by him in detail). According to the landowner who had presented these coins to the St Petersburg Academy of Sciences, they had also been some 200 other coins and a silver bracelet which the peasant who made the find had already sold.

Soon afterwards information on the Borovskaya hoard was also published by B. von Koehne, editor of the Mémoires of the St Petersburg Numismatic and Archaeological Society. In his articles he gave the number of coins first as 2,500 and later as 4,000; he also said that most of them had been acquired by the well-known collector Jakob Reichel (1778-1856). Koehne described a number of the German and other coins, and this forms the basis of what is known of the Western coins from the find today. Koehne also helped Reichel to edit a catalogue of his large collection, which was acquired later by the Hermitage Museum. Unfortunately the Anglo-Saxon coins were included in vol. iii published in 1843, three years before the Borovskaya hoard was found. However, in

THE 'RUSSIAN FIND' OF ANGLO-SAXON COINS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM

Tuukka Talvio

In their publication of the provenances of the Anglo-Saxon coins recorded in the British Museum Catalogue, R. H. M. Dooley and J. S. Strudwick wrote: 'Among important hoard provenances [for the coins of Æthelred II] we may note especially the Russian hoard acquired in 1850 through a French firm of dealers. Unfortunately it has proved impossible to establish a more exact find-spot – and we must remember that Finland, the Baltic States, and much of Poland, all areas rich in Anglo-Saxon coins, were then technologically part of Russia.'

The parcel from the 'Russian find' included 101 coins of Æthelred II and 19 of Cnut. It was the largest single acquisition of coins of Æthelred II made by the British Museum in the nineteenth century, accounting for some 25 per cent of the coins of this king in the 1893 catalogue. Although no new information on the find-spot has become available, the general background of the purchase is not difficult to reconstruct. It is even possible to name two hoards as the possible source of the coins.

The first of them was found in 1846 at Borovskaya near the town of Oranienbaum. Nowadays known as Lomonosov, the former Oranienbaum is situated opposite the fortress of Kronstadt at the bottom of the Gulf of Finland: it now belongs to the administrative region of Leningrad. The little that is known of the hoard suggests a terminus post quem of 1027, and this fits well enough with the fact that all the three coin types of Cnut were represented among the 120 coins which were bought by the British Museum.

The Borovskaya hoard was first described by the orientalist P. S. Savelev who in 1846 published a 'topography' of the Russian and Baltic finds with foreign currency. He knew, however, of only 278 coins, namely 264 Anglo-Saxon of Cnut, Æthelred and other kings, German, and 14 Kufic' (the latter described by him in detail). According to the landowner who had presented these coins to the St Petersburg Academy of Sciences, there had also been some 200 other coins and a silver bracelet which the peasant who made the find had already sold.

Soon afterwards information on the Borovskaya hoard was also published by B. von Koehne, editor of the Mémoires of the St Petersburg Numismatic and Archaeological Society. In his articles he gave the number of coins first as 2,500 and later as 4,000; he also said that most of them had been acquired by the well-known collector Jakob Reichel (1778-1856). Koehne described a number of the German and other coins, and this forms the basis of what is known of the Western coins from the find today. Koehne also helped Reichel to edit a catalogue of his large collection, which was acquired later by the Hermitage Museum. Unfortunately the Anglo-Saxon coins were included in vol. iii published in 1843, three years before the Borovskaya hoard was found. However, in

1. (N.163'78). Theodosius I, SALVS REIPVBLICAe (2), CONSE[...]. Possibly LRBC II 2184 or 2192. AD 383-92/393-5. 14mm, 0.847g, 30°.
2. (N.164'78). Arcadius, a VOT/MVLT inscription, the numbers and mm illegible; obverse legend, ARCADI-VS. AD 383-7. 14.5mm, 0.831g (chipped), 96°.
3. (N.165'78). Arcadius. SALVS REIPVBLICAe (2), mm lost; obverse legend, ARCADI-VS. AD 392-3. 12.5mm, 1.041g (chipped), 315°.
4. (N.166'78). Theodosius I, VOT/X/MVLTXX, mm illegible. A Vota issue of AD 383. 12mm, 1.371g, 180°.
5. (N.167'78). Theodosius I, VOT/X/MVLTXX, mm probably SMHA. Probably LRBC II 1968. AD 383. 13mm, 0.888g, 180°.
a letter to the Swedish State-Antiquarian B. E. Hildebrand, Reichel himself reported in June 1847 that "a few thousand" Viking-Age coins had been found near St Petersburg, of which 'nearly half' had been pennies of Æthelred II and Cnut, and he had acquired some 1,200 coins for himself.\(^1\) One year later, after receiving from Hildebrand a copy of the 1846 edition of Anglosachsiska mynt, he wrote that his own collection included "no fewer than some 50" monceys of Æthelred II and Cnut which were not to be found in the catalogue. 'This shows how enormous the minting was during that period, as I don't have more than 4 or 5 hundred of these coins', he added.\(^2\)

The coins which were acquired by the Hermitage Museum from the Borovskaya find either directly or via Reichel have long ago lost their provenances.\(^3\) The 120 coins which ended up in the British Museum are, on the other hand, still lying on their original tickets. Perhaps their patina and colour could be compared with similar unprovenanced coins in the Hermitage, now that the Leningrad coins are to be published in the Sylloge series.

The other hoard which must be considered was found in 1847 at Zvenigorod in the neighbourhood of Moscow. According to Koehne, there were c. 1,000 coins, most of them Anglo-Saxon and German. He gives details, however, only of the German coins, the terminus post quem of which seems to have been 1034. The 'best' pieces were acquired by Count A. S. Stroganov (1815-1864), another well-known numismatist whose collection later was to be incorporated with the Hermitage.\(^4\) According to Koehne's obituary of him, he owned over 1,000 medieval English coins, among them 'une quarantaine de la Heptarchie et quelques centaines de deniers d'Æthelred II, de Knut, de Harthacnut, détéress en Russie'.\(^5\)

A summary of the coins in London can be presented as follows: Æthelred II. Cnut type, 15 (Canterbury 2, Ilchester 5, London 5, Lydford, Maldon, Norwich, Rochester, Southwark, Tonnes, Winchester);

- Long Cross type, 35 (Bath, Chester 2, Dorchester, Exeter 4, Gloucester, Lincoln 5, London 14, Stamford 2, Winchester 2, York 3);
- Helmet type, 12 (Exeter, Ipswich, Huntingdon, London 6, Wallingford, Winchester, York);
- Last Small Cross type, 29 (Chester, Lewes, Lincoln 5, London 12, Lydford, Stamford 5, Thetford, Winchester 3);
- Imitations, 10,\(^6\) Cnut. Quatrefoil type, 9 (Lincoln, London 4, Winchester 2, York 2);
- Pointed Helmet type, 6 (London 5, Winchester);
- Short Cross type, 2 (Chester, York);
- Imitations, 2,\(^7\)

To sum up. Although we do not even know whether all the coins come from the same find, the most likely single source for the 'Russian find' in the British Museum nevertheless seems to be the Borovskaya (Oranienbaum) hoard of 1846. The letters quoted above show that Jakob Reichel acquired several hundred coins of Æthelred and Cnut from the find and identified them with the help of Hildebrand's Anglosachsiska mynt. There must have been many duplicates, and it would have been natural for him or Koehne to put them on the market; both of them had excellent connections with foreign collectors and dealers. We may also note that although several very large hoards are known from Russia, the large ones usually belong to the end of the eleventh century and consist mainly of German coins; the Borovskaya hoard is the only one on record to have contained (probably) over a thousand Anglo-Saxon pennies.

It is also possible that the coins come from the little-known Zvenigorod hoard of 1847, or from a wholly unknown find, not mentioned by Koehne. He has been blamed for withholding information in order to protect the rich collectors with whom he had close relations;\(^8\) but he was also a scholar who collected material for a monograph on the finds,\(^9\) and undoubtedly the work benefited from those relations. There must have been many finds which escaped his notice, but it would probably have been too much of a coincidence if a Russian hoard had been sold by a foreign firm without his knowledge at the same time when he was involved with the sorting out of the large finds discussed above.

---

\(^2\) Reichel to Hildebrand, 16/18 June 1848 (see note 7).
\(^3\) Bauer, 'Die Russischen Funde', p. 79.
\(^5\) Revue de la Numismatique Belge, 4e serie, 111 (1665), 274.
\(^6\) Three of the imitations have now been attributed to Siguna, see B. Mahner, The Siguna Coinage c. 995–1005 (Commentations de Nummis Societatem IX–XI, Nova Series 4), Stockholm and London, 1989, p. 129.
\(^7\) Bauer, 'Die russischen Funde', pp. 8–9, 78.
\(^8\) See note 3.
ANOTHER ROUND SHORT CROSS HALFPENNY

N. MAYHEW and A. SMITH

In the autumn of 1990 Mr. Smith found a round Short Cross halfpenny of Henry III (class VII, 0.56g), while prospecting with a metal detector on the Westbury Farm Road works, Milton Keynes. By agreement with the Milton Keynes Development Corporation, the coin was reported to the Buckinghamshire County Sites and Monuments Record (ref. MK644/31), and subsequently acquired by the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. The coin is the second of its type to be published, the other having been reported by Peter Seaby1 and acquired by the British Museum. Both coins are of the London mint, but the BM piece is by the moneyer Terri, while the Ashmolean coin is by Elís, reading: E L I S O N L Y N D E N (pl. 25).

As with the Terri halfpenny the crescent mintmark is clear enough, but the possible star or pellet above the crescent remains unclear. A newly discovered farthing, also by Terri, now in the BM (0.289g) definitely has crescent and pellet. The Oxford coin has four piercings around the edge, suggesting that it may have been sewn to a garment for decoration, and its weight is correspondingly lower. The obverse dies of the two halfpennies differ.

The documentary evidence relevant to this issue is quite plentiful. Elias the goldsmith of Worcester was first presented as moneyer by the mayor, sheriffs and citizens of London in 1216, and he is listed with Jiger the Goldsmith, Radulf de Frowic and Abel as sworn moneyers just after All Saints the same year.2 Some kind of problem seems to have arisen between them, for in 1221 Ilger, Radulf and Abel refused to accept Elias as one of their number.3 The outcome of the dispute is unknown, though some accommodation must have been reached; Elias was still listed as a moneyer in 1222, and by then Abel had been replaced by Terri the Changer.4 It was in this same year, 1222, that a concerted effort was made to introduce round halfpennies and farthings and to end the circulation of cut halves and quarters. The writ to all sheriffs was issued on 21 February 1222 (n.s.) announcing that the King’s council had resolved that fifteen days after Easter round halfpennies and farthings would be current throughout England, and that from that day no other halfpence or farthings would be permitted.5

Eight dies for halfpence and farthings were issued to the moneys at the beginning of Lent, and a further eight dies for pence, eight dies for halfpence, and eight dies for farthings were issued to the moneys on Maundy Thursday.6

The administration required for the introduction of round halfpence was all in place, but the survival of so few halfpence and farthings suggests that relatively few round fractions were actually produced. Although the discovery of more may be anticipated, they will always be extremely rare compared with the pence. All the new fractions were to be struck at London, although in this year three times more silver was struck at Canterbury.7 Moreover, unless there was a specific requirement to strike a certain proportion of total output in fractions and no such requirement is known – the moneys themselves may have been assumed to have not favoured the production of pence. Moneys were remunerated at a fixed rate per pound struck, and the extra work in making 480 halfpence or 960 farthings instead of 240 pence must have been a strong disincentive to the production of fractions. Indeed later in the middle ages the requirement to strike a fixed proportion of fractions was rarely honoured, even when the fractions attracted a higher rate of mintage.

The documents give no clue as to why round fractions may have been thought desirable. Although this may well have been a period of increasing monetization, and although there must often have been a need for halfpence and farthings at a time when for many a penny was about a full day’s wage, these needs had customarily been met by the simple expedient of cutting pence as required. The call for round fractions probably came not so much from an increasing need for small change, but from concern by government about the quality of the circulating medium. Legitimate cutting of pence to produce fractions, perhaps in increasing numbers, must have encouraged illegitimate cutting and clipping for profit.

2 LTR 2 H III, m.3 (PRO transcript. Round Room 7/47 p. 177) and m.5 (p. 193).
3 LTR 6 H III m.3(2)id. (p. 66).
4 LTR 6 H III m.3d (p. 34–5), m.4d (p. 43).
6 LTR 6 H III m.3d (pp. 34–5).
8 Actually there were probably 242d. struck to the pound weight at this date.
MAYHEW AND SMITH: SHORT CROSS HALFPENNY

SEABY: SHELLEY HOARD
On a number of occasions during 1989–90 Mr M. G. Williams of Monkstown, Shirley, using a metal detector, has unearthed silver pennies of the period of John and early in the reign of Henry III on open ground near Shelly Coppice. Altogether fourteen whole pieces and two fragments of a fifteenth have been recovered within an area of a few square yards. Eleven are Short Cross from the mints of London, Canterbury, Northampton, Ipswich, Norwich and Lincoln and four are pennies of King John struck in Dublin by the moneyer, Robert. The size of this hoard may be compared with that from Loxbeare, Devon (somewhat earlier) and that from Hickleton, Yorkshire (about the same date). The first recorded reference to Shelly is in a deed of the later twelfth century when William de Beaumont, third earl of Warwick (1153–84) granted the manor of Monkspath, adjoining Shelley to the south and west, to Roger de Ulehale of Tanworth together with other land in the district. There were perhaps a dozen families living in this hamlet in the early thirteenth century and the fields were farmed communally in strips. A trackway ran from Shelly Lane eastwards to Bentley Heath and Knowle in medieval times, and it was close to this path where the coins were discovered. It can therefore be presumed that here was lost or hidden a 'purse' dating probably not later than about 1230, the contents of which have become somewhat spread by the plough. The most interesting thing about this little hoard is the high proportion of Dublin coins. Could it have belonged to an Irish traveller?

The Birmingham coroner was informed but, owing to the nature of the discoveries over a period of eighteen months or more, decided, since a full record had been made, not to proceed with a treasure trove inquest. The coins remain in the possession of the finder.

A full list is as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Die Axis</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 4b</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Meinir</td>
<td>1.41g</td>
<td>315°</td>
<td>One curl either side of crude head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 5a</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>Alisandre</td>
<td>1.035g</td>
<td>195°</td>
<td>Damaged edge, cross pommée X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 5a</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Johan</td>
<td>1.33g</td>
<td>185°</td>
<td>Cross pommée X, reversed S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 5b</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Rauf</td>
<td>1.38g</td>
<td>135°</td>
<td>Cross pattée X, normal S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 5b</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>1.325g</td>
<td>135°</td>
<td>Cross pattée X, normal S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 5c</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Rauf</td>
<td>1.35g</td>
<td>100°</td>
<td>St. Andrew's cross X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 6bl</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Ilger</td>
<td>1.35g</td>
<td>60°</td>
<td>Rounded ends cross X, round letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 6bl</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Ilger</td>
<td>1.36g</td>
<td>60°</td>
<td>Rounded ends cross X, round letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 6bl</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Ilger</td>
<td>1.24g</td>
<td>195°</td>
<td>Rounded ends cross X, pointed face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 6c2</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>1.305g</td>
<td>20°</td>
<td>Ornamental letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 7b</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Roger R</td>
<td>1.39g</td>
<td>210°</td>
<td>Squat bust, no stops on reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. c.1204-11</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Roberd</td>
<td>1.35g</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>Seaby 4228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. c.1204-11</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Roberd</td>
<td>1.285g</td>
<td>0°</td>
<td>Seaby 4228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. c.1204-11</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Roberd</td>
<td>1.10g</td>
<td>180°</td>
<td>Seaby 4228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. c.1204-11</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Roberd</td>
<td>(2 frags)</td>
<td>90°</td>
<td>Seaby 4228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to Mr Philip Wise for taking the photographs and to Mr Brian Walkeden for the prints of the coins at 1/1 scale.

2 J.D.A. Thompson, Inventory of British Coin Hoards A.D. 600–1500 (1986) p. 69, no. 189, and NC Ser. 6, ii (1946) 152.
1. More Tower shillings of Charles I discovered

Four previously unrecorded shillings have come to my attention: A D4 obverse muled with a halfcrown reverse, m.m. portcullis (pl.26, 1) an E1/2 mm. crown (over bell obv.) an F1/1 with large mark of value, m.m. anchor to left (over tun rev - pl.26, 2) and an F5 obverse muled with a reverse of Briot's hammered issue, m.m. triangle (perhaps over anchor rev. - pl.26, 3).

The F1/1 coin, which Mr David Holt kindly drew to my attention, is a particularly interesting discovery since the type has hitherto been known only with m.m. tun and small mark of value. Since the obverse mintmark is clearly not punched over: tun and the mark of value not punched over the smaller one, it has to be concluded that this type was re-issued with the anchor mark and large mark of value after the issue of type F2. m.m. tun and (very rarely) m.m. anchor (over tun obv.), ceased. Although the portrait is slightly double struck, giving an appearance suggestive of type F3, the presence of the double arched crown establishes its identification.

The discovery of the Briot mule exciting though it was, came as no surprise in view of the occurrence of mules with Briot's obverse and Tower reverses with small or large cross ends.

2. An Interesting Parliamentarian Issue of 1642/3

It has generally been considered that there was continuity of type production after Parliament's seizure of the Tower Mint on 10 August 1642. There are, however, very rare shillings, halfcrows and crowns with mintmark triangle in circle which are different from the norm and which I consider to form a distinct, and possibly experimental, currency issue.

The shillings are those of Group F bust 7. Production of Group F shillings was otherwise discontinued during the use of the triangle mark when the prolific issue of Group G commenced. The striking of Group G coins continued during the use of mint marks star and triangle in circle. No Group F coin is known with the star mark and the issue of the F7 shillings with their recut F3 portraits must be regarded as an unusual one.

There was also a change of halfcrown type which occurred during the use of the star mark. Type 3a², known with mintmarks tun, anchor, triangle and star, was replaced by type 4, known only with mintmarks star and triangle in circle (it has been noted as occurring with mintmark P in brackets but the only piece I have seen has m.m. P in circle and is an obvious contemporary forgery¹). Parliament discontinued type 4 and reverted to type 3a² but adopted new obverses (Osborne's 60's and 80's) and reverses (Osborne's 97 and 99). These coins occur with m.m.'s (P), (R), eye and sun. However, as with the shillings, an odd issue appears with m.m. triangle in circle. This issue was recorded by Osborne who acquired two examples which are die duplicates.² Their obverse is from a type 3a² m.m. triangle die overstruck with the triangle in circle mark and their reverse (Osborne 95) is that of type 4. It is perhaps strange that these pieces, technically mules, occur with m.m. triangle in circle as opposed to the earlier star mark during the use of which the type change occurred.

In the light of the foregoing it seems both necessary and appropriate to consider the status of the so-called, pattern crown with m.m. triangle in circle. It has presumably been regarded as a pattern because of the use of a Briot equestrian portrait with a mintmark not associated with any of his coinages, its rarity and the non-existence of an ordinary Tower type with that mintmark. Cooper considered that the obverse mark was probably punched over anchor and that the coin possibly belonged to Briot's hammered coinage.³ The X² illustration of the obverse mark on the British Museum's specimen clearly shows the ring, stem and bar of an anchor immediately to the left of the triangle in circle. The obverse die does not seem fine enough for it to be regarded as suitable for use in connection with Briot's second milled coinage and I therefore consider it to have been intended for his hammered issue. Lozenge stops (one of Briot's 'hallmarks', as Cooper mentioned) are evident but with commas above; an unusual combination, but it is the portrait which is of particular interest since it is taken from that of a Scottish sixty shillings and not, as one might expect, from that of an English crown. The king is shown wearing the Scottish crown instead of the rounded English one, his sword extends to the edge of the coin (as it does on the Scottish piece but does not on the English) and his features are those found on the Scottish coin (pl. 26, 4).

In view of the absence of a crown from both Briot's second milled and hammered coinages, there is nothing else with which the obverse of the triangle in circle crown may be compared but this absence does perhaps enable the conclusion that no reverse die was made by Briot to match his anchor or mark obverse. Assuming this, it seems possible to further conclude that Briot realised his mistake in using the Scottish

² Glendining's 23.4.91 (lots 170 and 171).
³ F.R. Cooper, 'Silver crowns of the Tower Mint of Charles I' BNJ 37 (1968), 116.
SHARP: THREE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY NOTES
portrait and put the die to one side. He may also have noticed that the portrait punches were not properly aligned since the backward leaving body of the king seems slightly detached from his hips. I therefore think it likely that this die was picked up after Parliament's seizure of the mint and matched with an ordinary Tower reverse die with the star mark, both dies being overpunched with the triangle in circle mark before use.

The wear sustained by the three known examples coupled with the knowledge that crowns of the triangle in circle mark were tried at the pyx on 29 May 1643 must establish these as currency pieces since no other type bearing that mark is known. Furthermore there are otherwise no known patterns produced by parliament and its only known (to me) trials are in the form of shilling bust and shield punches struck on roughly cut lozenge shaped flans. The crown is therefore argued to form part of a rather strange and very limited issue made when the mint was under parliament's control.

3. A Badge of Colonel Hammond and a counter of Charles I

The badge of Colonel Hammond, Governor of the Isle of Wight (pl.26, 5) is made from a bust of Charles I cut from a medal (c.f. MI 373/ 267-270) and affixed to an engraved convex plate, pierced to enable it to be stitched to a garment. It is dated 18 September 1647, the day on which Hammond was elected and sworn as a burgess of Newport. On 1st October he was appointed (by parliament) Vice-Admiral of the county of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. The following month he took charge of his royal 'guest', Charles I, who had escaped from Hampton Court on 11 November.

The counter of Charles I and Henrietta Maria (pl.26, 6) is in the style adopted by Simon de Passe but of coarser workmanship. It is dated 27 January 1649, the date on which sentence of death was passed on the king who is shown wearing the tall hat he wore during the proceedings at Westminster Hall.

THE TEYNHAM, KENT, HOARD OF COINS AND BANKNOTES

B. J. COOK and VIRGINIA H. HEWITT

This small hoard represents a rare example of coins and banknotes apparently forming part of the same hoard. The material was found on 19 August 1989 in a sixteenth-century farmhouse in Deerton Street, Teynham, Kent, hidden beneath a false cupboard. The finder was the owner, Mr John Trevor, who was engaged in renovating the interior of the property. Twenty-three coins were found wrapped up in an old handkerchief, with the seven banknotes close by. A further coin was discovered two weeks later lodged on a beam a little distance away.

The twenty-four coins and the notes were brought to the British Museum for examination. Reports were provided on the basis of which an inquest was held on 18 October. Not being of precious metal, the banknotes could not be considered as potential treasure trove but as apparently part of the deposit, they had to be taken into account. Their presence contributed to the value of the material when deposited, and thus was relevant to the question of whether the hoard was deliberately concealed. The inquest jury decided that the twenty-three coins found in the handkerchief constituted treasure trove. These have since been acquired by the Kent County Museum Service. The coin found apart from the others was not declared treasure trove and was returned to the finder, as were the banknotes. The case well illustrates some of the limitations of the treasure trove laws, with a single find split up and museums not having the option to acquire the banknotes.

The contents of the find are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coins</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Weight (oz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George II</td>
<td>guinea</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George III</td>
<td>guinea</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intermediate head</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second head</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>third head</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fourth head</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fifth head, spade</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>8.29, 8.28,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shield</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fifth head, spade</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>8.37, 8.38,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shield</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Wt not recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half-guinea</td>
<td>fourth head</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fifth head, spade</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>4.19, 4.16,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shield</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This is the coin found apart from the others, not contained within the handkerchief, which was declared not to be treasure trove.
Commercial bank century have been fairly common: Brown and Dolley Faversham Bank £5 November 1798 considerable suspension of disbelief to equate security with a store of gold and silver hidden at home. In list eight with deposit dates between 1793 and 1804. 2 the eponymous miser did not anticipate being robbed Marner George Eliot gives an amusing account of why of the gleaming gold beneath his floor:

... hoarding was common in country districts in those days: there were old labourers in the parish of Raveloe who were known to have their savings by them, probably inside their flock-beds; but their rustic neighbours, though not all of them as honest as their ancestors in the days of King Alfred, had not imaginations bold enough to lay a plan of burglary. How could they have spent the money in their own village without betraying themselves? They would be obliged to ‘run away’ – a course as dark and dubious as a balloon journey. 3

Even allowing for the novelist’s art, the simplicity of outlook described here has to be remembered along with economic and political circumstances as an important factor in determining the chaotic but remarkable changes in British currency in the early nineteenth century.

While hoards were seen by those who amassed them as personal insurance policies for the future, their cumulative and immediate effect was to exacerbate other problems with the country’s money supply. War-time hoarding removed coins from the circulating currency at a time when the Bank of England’s gold reserves were being steadily eroded by demands for cash from other banks, unfavourable exchange rates, and repeated government requests for advances to cover military expenditure. This last was the cause of some animosity between the government and the Bank: the Committee of Treasury minutes for 10 October 1795 record an exchange between the Bank’s Governor and Pitt in which the Prime Minister, put on the spot, had to admit that he had no idea what gold reserves the country had. 4

The decisive action which produced lasting change in British currency came in response to the potentially calamitous combination of falling gold reserves and rising public panic. Local banks’ calls for cash and the instinct of individuals to hoard were fuelled by fears of invasion, which rose to fever pitch with news of a French landing in Wales on 25 February 1797. Two days later, on Monday the 27th, the Bank of England issued a public statement. It began with comforting assurances of the Bank’s prosperity, but went on to warn that because of ‘ill-founded or exaggerated Alarms . . . there may be Reason to apprehend a Want of a sufficient Supply of Cash to answer the Exigencies of the Publick Service’. Then came the crunch: by Order of the Privy Council the Bank would cease ‘issuing any Cash in Payment until the Sense of Parliament can be taken on that Subject’.

The suspension of cash payments lasted for twenty-one years, during which time the Bank of England issued one and two pound notes to compensate for the lack of coin. Although the new low denomination notes were to some extent a logical progression from the introduction of a £5 note in 1793, when the outbreak of war caused panic runs on banks, their inconvertibility was a major change of status for paper money, demanding a great measure of faith on the part of the public. The notes of country banks were legally still redeemable in coin, but in fact the lack of coin and the Bank of England’s example were an encouragement to local note-issuing banks, whose numbers more than doubled from some two to three hundred in the late 1790s to at least eight hundred by the early 1810s. The incentives were, however, double-edged: in such uncertain times the inherent worth of gold coins seemed to offer security, yet the public was obliged to come to terms with inconvertible notes which had been acceptable in the past largely because they were exchangeable for gold. Furthermore, until 1826 there was little legislative control over banking, and no guarantee of a private bank’s stability. Often banks were made vulnerable by their partners’ other business interests and many came to grief during succeeding commercial crises in the first half of the nineteenth century. Popular reaction to banks was understandably mixed, and this may explain the apparent irony of the Teynham hoarder hiding his wealth at home, rather than depositing it with either of the local banks of which he held notes. Indeed, it may well have been safer there than in James and Francis Tappenden’s Faversham Bank, which went out of business in 1814–15 with the failure of their ironworks in South Wales.

The Teynham find would seem to represent a person’s accumulated savings, and the combination of coins and notes may give clues to the way these different forms of currency were used in that area. The total value of all coins and notes found was £77

The absence of low value coins or banknotes of denominations smaller than five pounds, when at least one of the two banks is known to have issued one pound notes, suggests that the hoard represents material of intrinsic value or high denomination put aside for safekeeping. No local bank is known for Faversham, so Faversham would have been one of the nearest towns providing local notes. It is likely that the Faversham banks did not issue notes for sums above £10, and the presence of a Bank of England note for the relatively large sum of £20 again suggests a collection of money hidden away for security. The coins were perhaps put aside in the early 1790s, though it is difficult to be sure given the uncertain status of the 1792 guinea. This may originally have been part of the hoard before coming adrift, a later addition to the hidden store, or even a completely separate accidental loss. The banknotes were presumably deposited in the hiding place in late 1800 or 1801. For the unknown hoarder this secret cache was part of a personal drama: with its unusual combination of coins and notes it has survived for us as vivid evidence of a country at war and a currency in transition.

MEMBERSHIP MEDAL OF THE BRITISH NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

G.P. DYER

The idea that the Society might institute a membership medal took root during the summer of 1989. It had its origin as part of a broad package of measures to promote the Society, not only by expanding the benefits offered to existing members but also in the hope of attracting new recruits. At the same time the Society was not unmindful of a wider responsibility, as a national society, to encourage British medallic art by direct and practical contact with those artists who specialised in this difficult field.

For the Society to act in this responsible and imaginative way, however, required more money than could be made available from normal income. Accordingly, certain senior members were approached for donations to meet the cost of obtaining designs for a membership medal, and thanks to their ready generosity the necessary sum was soon firmly in prospect. Additional assistance in kind was promised by the Royal Mint which, as a mark of its continuing support for the Society, generously offered to prepare master tools and dies free of charge.

With the financial arrangements thus looking increasingly secure, a committee was set up to decide how best to proceed. This committee consisted of the President, who took the chair, Mark Jones, Tim Webb Ware, Graham Dyer, and the sculptor Raphael Maklouf, who very kindly consented to place his professional knowledge and expertise at the disposal of the Society. Meeting for the first time on 22 February 1990, the committee decided that its objective of obtaining an appropriate, appealing design and one which would bear comparison with other contemporary medals would be most likely achieved by organising a competition. Sufficient funds were available to offer artists a fee for taking part in such a competition, with a rather more substantial payment for the winning design.

For the size of the medal it was decided to match the 1.75 inches of the Society's Sanford Saltus medal, and there was no dispute that since the coins which members study are normally struck, the medal should also be struck rather than cast. As regards design, it was agreed that while the artists should be left as much freedom as possible they should be informed that there was a preference for allegorical designs representing either the Society or the 2000-year span of coinage in Britain. To help them further in what the committee feared would not be an easy task it was suggested that they might draw inspiration from the figure of Britannia on the Society's seal but with the warning to avoid too close a resemblance to the Britannia of the Sanford Saltus medal. Also to be avoided were portraits of members past or present, as well as designs which related to a specific coin or to a specific period rather than to the Society and its interests as a whole.

The harmony of the committee's discussions was not disturbed by the choice of the six artists to whom it made sense to restrict the competition. Mary Milner Dickens, Annabel Eley, John Lobban, June McAdam, Ian Rank-Broadley and Avril Vaughan all had some particular or general claim for consideration and between them provided a promising blend of the young and the experienced, the conventional and the modern. Had funds permitted, other talented artists could have been added to the list but the committee felt confident that the six artists whom it had selected would provide a range of designs which, by their inevitable variations in style, treatment and subject matter, would offer a challenging choice.

All six accepted the invitation to take part in the competition and by the closing date of 27 April a total of twenty-two drawings had been received (pl. 27-29). These were photographed at the Royal Mint and, identified only by letter and number, prints at medal size were circulated to members of the committee in advance of its second meeting on 22 May. At this meeting, held with the kind permission of the
Deputy Master at the London office of the Royal Mint, the respective merits of each design were canvassed. Two from a group of six submitted by John Lobban, his seated Britannia and his impudent magpie stealing from an open drawer of coins, quickly emerged as front runners. But other designs were not without support and it was some time before Annabel Eley's Warburg Institute and Avril Vaughan's spinning coin finally yielded to the charmingly apposite Lobban designs.

In asking John Lobban to model these two designs, the committee suggested certain minor modifications. It was a little concerned, for instance, that Britannia's trident seemed to be without any visible means of support and it recommended a slight adjustment so that the trident rested on top the letter E. It also suggested that an Alfred the Great monogram penny and a 1672 halfpenny should be substituted for two of the coins in the drawer so as to give a more representative, if perhaps less realistic, range of types. In addition, for technical reasons, John Lobban was asked to distance certain features, such as Britannia's helmet, from the edge to prevent loss of detail when the medals were trimmed after striking. To these suggestions the artist raised no objection and his plaster models were available by the beginning of August.

Photographs of these models having been circulated and approved by the committee, the Royal Mint put in hand the reduction of the designs and the preparation of a pair of dies. Sample medals (pl. 29) were struck in November in the presence of the President and unveiled by him at the Anniversary Meeting at the end of that month.

Note: Membership medals may be ordered from the Secretary at a cost of £29.50 for a specimen in bronze, and £65 in silver for those whose membership extends over a period of twenty-five years or more. All medals are personalised on the edge with the name of the member and the year of election to the Society.
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