SHORT ARTICLES AND NOTES

TWO NEW HALFPENNIES OF EDWARD THE ELDER AND

ATHELSTAN

M.A.S. BLACKBURN

Halfpennies of the tenth century must have been produced on a small scale, for they remain rare even among the prolific metal-detector finds, which generally favour the smaller denominations. This note publishes two new finds that have been acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum – an unrecorded type of Edward the Elder (899–924) and the first known halfpenny of Athelstan (924–39).¹

Edward the Elder, Hand type

The first piece is of Edward the Elder’s Hand of God type (pl. 12, 1). Some sixteen pennies of this issue are known by six moneyers (Aldstan, Athulf, Deormod, Eadred, Fugel and Gunne), who form a group distinct from the moneyers of the other ‘Exceptional’ types of Edward the Elder. The type emanates from a mint or mints in West Mercia, perhaps Shrewsbury, and Lyon dates it to the middle of the reign, c. 910–15.² The design of the divine hand takes a variety of forms: a ‘mailed’ hand, an ‘open’ hand pointing down or up, a hand in benediction, etc. A penny of the ‘Mailed’ Hand variety in Mr Lyon’s collection is illustrated here (pl. 12, 2). The reverse inscription on the pennies usually gives the moneyer’s name and an abbreviation of moneta in two or more lines either side of the hand. On one die of Deormod the name is preceded by the letters DX,³ which so far as I am aware have never been commented upon. There is a fair degree of die-linking among the Hand pennies, fifteen of them being struck from seven obverse and ten reverse dies, which suggests that the issue was not very extensive.

The new halfpenny was found in 1993 on a ploughed field near Clare, Suffolk, by Mr Peter Carter using a metal-detector. Unfortunately, the silver was highly mineralised, and as the soil was removed the coin fell into three pieces, breaking along the lines of two ancient bends, for it had been almost curled up in the Anglo-Saxon period. The pieces have since been stuck together in a more open form, so that the design can be seen, although in consequence they do not make close fitting joints.

The coin can be described as follows:


Obv. +EADVVEARD REX, small cross (saltire-wise)
Rev. DEX TE / HRD DB / ERHT, nimbate (‘mailed’) hand downwards, with three parallel lines to the left of it and two to the right, the triangular cuff decorated with two rows of crescents.

Weight: 0.54g (8.04gr.), chipped, broken and metal leached. Die-axis: 90°.

There are several interesting features to this coin. The moneyer is clearly Hrodberht, and the ‘o’ (a small letter typical of this West Mercian style) was probably placed above the letters HR because there was insufficient room after them. Hrodberht was not previously known from coins of the Hand issue, or indeed from any of the ‘Exceptional’ types, but there is one coin of ‘Rodberht’ in the British Museum of the Horizontal type (HT1) in a style that Lyon has classified as West Mercian from late in Edward’s reign.⁵ His appearance, then, in this issue is not surprising. From subsequent reigns there seem to be two moneyers of this name recorded, one operating in the north-east under Athelstan (BC type) and Anlaf Sitricsson (HT1 type), and another in West Mercia under Eadred (946–55; HR1 type).⁶ It is doubtful whether either is Edward the Elder’s West Mercian moneyer.

The word DEXTE in the first line of the reverse, preceding the moneyer’s name, is evidently a

¹ Fitzwilliam Museum nos CM.299–1993 and CM.730–1992, respectively. I am grateful to Andrew Morris and Andrew Norman for photographing them.
³ BMC Edward the Elder no. 108.
⁵ CTCE, p. 69, no. 236.
⁶ CTCE, p. 143, no. 170; p. 229, gp. III (g); p. 306. There is also a coin of Edmund (HT1 type) in a style that is unlocated.
contraction or abbreviation of the Latin dextra, meaning 'hand' or 'right hand'. However, the precise form on the coin requires explanation. As Michael Lapidge has pointed out, if the T (with a suspension mark above it) appeared in a manuscript it would stand for ter; in which case DEXTE should be expanded dextere. This is the genitive ('of the hand [of God]'), but surely the nominative (dextera) is more likely to have been intended. It may be that the die-cutter was a poor Latinist and made a mistake in giving it an ending -E rather than -A. Alternatively, the bar above the letters TE may in fact be a mark of abbreviation, as it is when used elsewhere on Edward the Elder's coinage above the letters M0, MON or MONE, standing for monete.3

The occurrence of a West Mercian coin as a find in East Anglia is surprising, for the currency in this period had a distinctive regional character, and a pictorial issue such as this cannot have been familiar in eastern England. Five other official halfpennies of Edward the Elder are recorded, all of the Horizontal type, by the moneys Biornwald, Ciolulf, Leofhelm, Wyneman?, and Wynberht. The fact that these are in various styles (Winchester, London, and West Mercian) and from different periods in Edward’s reign suggests that they were a general issue and produced in larger numbers than the surviving specimens would imply. Although this is the first official halfpenny of the ‘Exceptional’ types, an irregular halfpenny of Edward’s Floral type was acquired by Stewart Lyon, together with two pennies, also irregular, of similar type.9 This suggests that official halfpennies of the Floral type were also issued.

Athelstan, Horizontal type

The second halfpenny (pl. 12, 3) is the only coin of this denomination to be recorded for Athelstan. It was found in 1990 near Stowting, Kent, some ten miles south of Canterbury,10 and purchased by Spink and Son Ltd. In 1992 it was acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum in an officially sanctioned exchange for six duplicate Anglo-Saxon coins from the collection of C.E. Blunt,11 and it now resides among his outstanding series of Athelstan's coins.

Athelstan, silver halfpenny, Horizontal or Two-line type, HP6 (Blunt Athelstan12–); North 668/1, this specimen). Uncertain southern mint, moneyer Clip.

Obv. +EDELSTAN REX (NR ligatured), small saltire-cross. Rev. • / CLIP: • / • • / MO = / • (the O lozenge-shaped).

The moneyer Clip was not previously known for Athelstan or subsequent kings, but several of his coins for Edward the Elder survive. They are in a die-cutting style attributed to Wessex, probably Winchester, and belong to the Middle II and Late I phases of Edward’s coinage as defined by Lyon.13 A specimen in the Blunt collection is illustrated here (pl. 12, 4).

The lettering on the halfpenny, however, is of a style associated with the die-cutter at Canterbury,14 as shown particularly by the form of the A, M, and S, the alignment of the central cross on the obverse (saltire-wise), and the minutely serifed contraction mark on the reverse (cf. Blunt 19, moneyer Alfeau). The association of the halfpenny with this die-cutting style is confirmed by the usual use of an NL ligature in the obverse legend. This ligature is extremely rare, but it is to be found on some coins of Burhheim (SCBI BM v 12), Folcled (Blunt 55), and Wealdhelm (SCBI Edinburgh 140 = CTCE pl. 3.25) all of Canterbury style; indeed Folcled is a Kentish (Dover) moneyer. Two features of the design are quite foreign to Athelstan’s coinage and hark back to that of Alfred. First, the lozenge-shaped O, with wedges at the corners, is characteristic of dies cut at Canterbury under Alfred, but is not found on coins of Edward the Elder or Athelstan. Second, the arrangement of three pellets across the centre of the reverse and one at top and bottom (class HP6) is only found on dies of Alfred and the very earliest ones of Edward, and again it is typical of the Canterbury style at that time. Evidently the Canterbury engraver when producing dies for the halfpenny in the mid-920s chose to model the reverse on coins struck at Canterbury some 30 years earlier. The archaic nature of many of the designs used for halfpence in the third quarter of the tenth century has also been noted,15 their types often harking back to those of Alfred or Edward the Elder. Why this should be is something of a mystery, although it may imply that they were not a regular element in the monetary system, a view supported by their great rarity. Clip was not alone in drawing dies from two different die-cutting centres, Winchester and Canterbury. In other cases it has been seen as evidence that the moneyer was perhaps operating at some intermediate mint, although only occasionally can it be identified, e.g. for the moneyer Iohann who subsequently struck mint-signed coins of Chichester.16
A NEW TYPE OF EDWARD THE CONFESSOR FOR THE 'NEWPORT' MINT

M.A.S. BLACKBURN, M.J. BONSER, AND W.J. CONTE

TWO specimens of Edward the Confessor's Expanding Cross type with the mint-signature NIPEPOR ('Newport') have recently come to light. They increase the number of known coins of the mint in the eleventh century from five to seven, extend its activity back to the earlier, Light phase of the Expanding Cross issue, and provide a new moneyer, Siwar, for the mint. These two coins (pl. 21, 1-2) are:

1. Expanding Cross type, Light issue.
   Obv. +EDPA.: / RD RE
   Rev. +SIPAR ON NIPEPOR, pellet in 1st and 4th heraldic quarter.
   Wt 1.09g (16.8 gr.), pierced. Die-axis 180°. Diam. 18 mm.
   W.J. Conte collection; bt Baldwins 1991; no previous provenance, but peck marks and bending suggest that it is a find from Scandinavia or the southern or eastern Baltic.

2. Expanding Cross type, Light issue?
   Obv. +EDPA.: / RD RE
   Rev. +SIPAR[ ]IPEPO:R, pellet in 1st and 4th heraldic quarter.
   Struck from the same reverse die as no. 1, but from a different obverse.
   Wt 0.85g (13.1 gr.), fragment missing. Die-axis 0°. Diam. 18 mm.
   Found near Bury St Edmunds, 1993 (findspot recorded confidentially).

The five coins of 'Newport' previously known, as noted by Freeman, can be listed as follows (continuing the numerical sequence from above (pl. 21, 3-7)):

1. Expanding Cross/Pointed Helmet mule, NIPEP, moneyer Sired (SCBI American collections 601). Ex Lockett 820; ex Drabble 532.
2. Expanding Cross/Pointed Helmet type, NIPEPORT, moneyer Sired (BMC 1086). British Museum; ex Chancton hoard (1866).
3. Expanding Cross/Pointed Helmet type, NIPEPOR, moneyer Siredd (BMC 1088). British Museum; ex Chancton hoard (1866).
4. Pointed Helmet type, NIPEP, moneyer Siredd (BMC 1087); ex Norweb lot 1255; ex Elmore Jones 584; ex Lockett 820; ex Drabble 532.
5. Pointed Helmet type, NIPEPO, moneyer Siredd (BMC 1088). British Museum; ex Chancton hoard (1866).
6. Hammer Cross type, NIPEP, moneyer Scewan; pellet in 1st and 4th heraldic quarters. National Museum of Wales; ex Lockett 3818; ex Colman, Money Talks. Reconstructing Old English (1992), pp. 158, 301. It has also been normalised as 'Scewan'.
7. As last, same dies. British Museum; ex Morgan 1915; ex Evans; ex London ('Walbrook') hoard (1872).

In the table of types, mints, and moneyers in the first edition of North's English Hammered Coinage 1 (1962) a moneyer Siwar is recorded for 'Newport', and Expanding Cross is noted for the mint. This suggests that an Expanding Cross coin of the moneyer Siwar was already known by c. 1960, although it has never been formally published. Unfortunately Jeffrey North cannot now trace the source of his information, although in general he has maintained remarkably full notes to back up the information in English Hammered Coinage. The chances are that the coin reported to North in the 1950s or early 1960s was the first of the two specimens we describe here.

The new coins, then, provide a further moneyer, Siwar (Sigeuward), to add to those of Sired (Sigward) and Scewan (Sewine). It is curious that such a short lived mint should have been operated by three successive moneyers, though it may also be noted that:

1 In the tenth century, coins with the mint-signatures NEPE, NIPE and NIPE were struck for Eadwig and NIPEPOR for Edgar. They are generally attributed to Newport Pagnell, while Reform issue coins of Edgar and Edward the Martyr reading NEPP and NIPEPO are given to Newark.

3. The form 'Sewine' is unusual. Colman, who read the BM specimen wrongly as 'Sewain', regarded the fourth letter as an epigraphical error, and normalised the name as Sewine; F. Colman, Money Talks. Reconstructing Old English (Berlin and New York, 1992), pp. 158, 301. It has also been normalised as Scewan; K. Jonsson and G. van der Meer, 'Mints and moneyers c. 973-1066', Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon Coinage, ed. K. Jonsson (Stockholm, 1990), pp. 47-136, at p. 91. In personal correspondence, Dr Colman has discussed various explanations for the form SÆWAN — epigraphic substitution, reduced stress on the vowel, or confusion of final elements. She concludes that there is no very satisfactory solution, and she thinks that Sewin and Scewan are both possible, while slightly preferring the former.
the output at ‘Newport’ may not have been as small as the surviving coins at first imply. The seven coins are struck from six obverse and five reverse dies, which suggests that there are more still to be found. In Expanding Cross at least three obverse dies were used and at least three reverse dies in Pointed Helmet. Evidently, the moneys had caused to order more than one pair of dies per type. It is worth noting that both the Expanding Cross coins of Siwar and the Hammer Cross coins of Sæwan have pellets in the first and fourth quarters of the reverse. The significance of such symbols, which are found occasionally at other mints, is not known, but they may reflect in some way the status of the moneys or the mint. Sigeward is not recorded at any other mint in Edward the Confessor’s reign. Sigeread occurs as a moneyer at Canterbury and London, and since the London moneyer struck the Pointed Helmet type, he may have been the same man as worked at ‘Newport’. Sæwine occurs at a number of Edward’s mints, but in issues close to Hammer Cross the name is recorded only at Exeter, Milton, and Northampton. Saeman is not attested in Edward the Confessor’s coinage.

The new coins do not really take any further the arguments concerning the identification of the mint. Carlyon-Britton attributed it to Newport Pagnall, essentially because it is the only ‘Newport’ known to have enjoyed burgal status in the eleventh century, and this has been followed tentatively by subsequent writers. If SÆPAN was Sæwine and the same man as the Northampton moneyer of that name, this would favour Newport Pagnall. An alternative candidate, Newport, Essex, is somewhat closer to Bury St Edmunds, where the second of the new coins was found (43 km, compared with 100 km from Newport Pagnall), but this is not decisive. Both locations have some claim to be considered the mint, as Dr Cyril Hart has kindly pointed out to us. Newport Pagnall was a Domesday borough, but not a royal one. It was mediatised, and held by the thegn Ulf in the time of Edward the Confessor, which is an argument against it being a mint, as virtually all mints at this time were royal boroughs. Newport (Essex), although not a borough, was an ancient royal estate, and it had as a herewick the Aldewerke of Shelford, Cambridgeshire, which may have been the site of the SCELDFOR mint coins temp. Alfred. Although rare, there are other cases of a late-Saxon mint not being a Domesday borough; e.g. Aylesbury, Bucks., Berkeley, Glou., Horndon, Essex, and Petherton, Somerset. Newport (Essex) was also larger than Newport Pagnall, with c. 180 inhabitants against c. 100, and it was growing. Unfortunately, on present evidence there seems no way of determining the location of Edward’s NIPEPOR mint conclusively.

---

**A NEW MINT FOR STEPHEN – RVCI (ROCHESTER)**

M.A.S. BLACKBURN

In December 1992 Roy Owens, a United States serviceman based at RAF Lakenheath, found a penny of Stephen’s type 6 (Profile/Cross-and-Piles) while detecting in a field in the parish of Lakenheath, Suffolk (pl 12, 1).1 The style of the portrait and lettering is typical of the type, and there can be no doubt that the dies were cut at the official die-cutting centre, which was situated in London. The inscriptions read:

---

1. I am grateful to Mr Owens for showing me the coin and allowing me to publish it here.

2. On coins of type 6 of Castle Rising the same name is spelled variously as RODBERT, RODBERET, ROBET, and ROOT.
hand, while very clear, is novel and requires explanation.  

Rodbert is a common personal name in this period, and as a moneyer in Stephen’s reign it occurs at Brabourne (type 7), Bristol (Matilda), Canterbury (types 1, 2, 6, and 7), Castle Rising (types 2 and 6), Gloucester (‘Henry’), Hastings (1, 2, 6/7 and 7), London (types 1, 2 and 7), Trellech (types 1 and 27), Shrewsbury (type 1), and Steyning (types 1 and 7).  

Of these, the only mint with a signature beginning with R is Castle Rising, which can be ruled out, for the 30 or so known coins of that mint have RISINGE or an abbreviation, RIS or RI, and philologically RVC1 cannot be interpreted as a meaningful variant of Risinge. Other mints beginning with an R known to have been active under Stephen are Richmond, Yorks (RI) in type 1 and Rye (RIE) in types 1, 2, 6, and 7. Again, for neither of these mints would RVC1 be an acceptable form.  

Looking to the next reign, that of Henry II, there were no mints beginning with R, but in the previous reign, under Henry I, we find mints active at Rochester (types 1, 7, and 10) and Romney (types 11, 13, and 14). Romney, spelled Romene in Domesday Book or Rumenel in the 1130 Pipe Roll, on Norman coins takes the from RVMNE, RUME, RVM, or RVN, and unless we interpret the C in RVC1 as an error for M it is not a plausible attribution for the new coin of Stephen. Rochester is a possible candidate, however. The normal form of mini-signature for Rochester on late Anglo-Saxon and Norman coins is ROFEC, ROFEC, ROFC, ROFI, ROF, etc., but the two latest coins, of Henry I’s types 7 and 10, read ROV and RUV respectively, and when the mint next appears in the Short Cross coinage of 1205 it is as ROVE, ROV, etc. These later forms with V are paralleled by that used in the Domesday Book, Rovecst, and the Pipe Rolls for 1130 and 1155, Rovec*. Had the new Stephen coin read ROVC1, there could be no doubting that it was of Rochester. The elision of a vowel is not common in a mini-signature, but it is by no means unparalleled, as one finds, for example, DRBI for Derby, HRFD or HRFI for Hereford, GLDF for Guildford, MLDF for Malton, and DTF for Thetford. Seen in this light, RVCl could be regarded as an acceptable mint-signature for Rochester.  

The alternative to Rochester is an otherwise unknown mint. Under Stephen a number of totally new mints sprung up, only to wither rapidly (Brabourne, Castle Rising, Dunwich, Hedon, and Richmond). In each of these cases, however, the place was or was to become a borough. If one looks through the list of medieval boroughs for those that begin with R and that lie within the region of east and south-east England where type 6 was struck, there are really no plausible candidates for the RVC1 mint-name, save perhaps for Rockingham, Northants. (Rochingham in the Domesday Book and 1130 Pipe Roll) but its burghal status is not testified until 1307. It is conceivable that RVC1 represents a place that failed to achieve burghal status, or enjoyed it only briefly leaving no documentary evidence of this. However, Rochester is a much more likely attribution for the RVC1 coin, given that it was an important borough, with ancient minting rights, and it lay within the area that type 6 was struck.  

The latest Rochester coins of Henry I (types 7 and 10) are in fact by a moneyer Rodbert, but it is doubtful whether he could be the same man as struck the coin of Stephen type 6 some 40 years later. As mentioned above, the name is a common one, and if one is to associate this man with a known moneyer it is more likely that he is the Canterbury or London moneyer Rodbert. Rochester was a very minor mint in the late eleventh and early twelfth century, and it may even have ceased operation before Henry I’s rationalisation of the mints in c. 1125. Many of the mints suppressed then, resumed operation during Stephen’s type 1, but not apparently Rochester. Our knowledge of Stephen’s later substantive issues (types 2, 6 and 7) is weak, and evidence may yet come to light to show that it struck several of these on a modest scale. However, it did not survive Henry II’s restructuring of the mint system in 1158, and was only called into operation once thereafter, in 1205, to facilitate the general recoinage of light Short Cross coins.  


4 I am grateful to Miss Marion Archibald for advising me about the form of mini-signatures on the coins from the Wickenbwoodd hoard.  

5 Type 7, SCB1 Stockholm Anglo-Norman 274; and type 10, British Museum, ex Lincoln hoard (illus. *Coin Hoards I* (1975), fig. 19.8; Miss Archibald has confirmed the reading).  

1. Fobund

Some years ago Mrs Murray and I discovered that we had each, independently, wondered whether the moneyer Fobund, who struck BMC type I of Stephen and variants of it at Durham in the 1140s might have been the same man as the Folbold whose name appears, in many different spellings, on Scottish coins of David I and William I at various mints. The Scottish moneyer’s known output may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Cross moline</td>
<td>Roxburgh</td>
<td>Folbold</td>
<td>B.24D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Crescent and pellet</td>
<td>Roxburgh</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Stewartby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>Fol GDP</td>
<td>B.24B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Fobalt</td>
<td>B.28B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Cross fleury</td>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>Fobalt</td>
<td>B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Fobalt</td>
<td>B.21A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>Fobalt</td>
<td>B.25B,C,D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Fleur-de-lis</td>
<td>Roxburgh</td>
<td>Fobalt</td>
<td>B.30-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Crescent and pellet</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Fobalt</td>
<td>B.25B,C,D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attribution of coin d to Newcastle, which I offered very tentatively in 1971, may be thought to gain support from the discovery of coin c, from the same obverse die, which appears to be of Berwick, and from a reference supplied to me by the late John Brand a few years later linking Folbold to these two places. In a list of the debts and debtors of the financier William Cade, compiled in the 1160s, are two entries naming Folbold monetarius, one relating to ‘unam lestatam lane et est de Berewic in Isodois (Lothian) vel in novo castello super tinam in Northumberland’, the other to ‘xxxii. libras in Norhumber-land’. It would not be at all surprising to find such a man at Durham as well as at Berwick and Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Indeed, I ought to record a suggestion made some years ago by Mrs Murray (not then knowing of the Cade reference), which she has kindly allowed me to quote here, that coin d might itself be attributed to Durham, with the reading ONI‘VT interpreted not as on(?) Nivt but as on(sola) (?) Cut (berti). The Scottish type, she writes, ‘would be understandable in the period 1141–4, when the temporalities of the see were enjoyed by William Comyn, chancellor of King David, whom the latter endeavoured to get elected as bishop of Durham. The temporalities were granted to him by the Empress Matilda, although it was still only by force that he held them’. Either Newcastle or Durham would be an acceptable mint for the crescent-and-pellet coins of this moneyer, and the question cannot be settled with confidence on current evidence.

So far as the name is concerned, this is Continental Germanic (Folbald, with loss of k between consonants) and its spelling clearly posed problems for English or Scottish die-cutters. It does therefore seem possible that Fobund was yet another attempt to represent an unfamiliar sounding name.

2. Cristien

In 1956 I acquired from Spink a Durham coin of the first coinage of Henry II, by the moneyer Cristien, with

---

1 R.R. Mack, ‘Stephen and the Anarchy 1135–1154’, *BNJ* 35 (1966), 38–12, nos 12a and 188; for a fuller discussion see M.R. Allen, ‘The Durham Mint before Boldon Book’, in Anglo-Norman Durham, edited by M. Harvey, M. Prestwich and D. Rollason (Woodbridge, forthcoming). W.J. Andrew appears to have identified Fobund with Folbold: ‘of the coins of Durham found at Nottingham’ (which are by Fobund), be wrote ‘the workmanship and lettering are Scottish and they bear the name of a Scottish moneyer’ (*BNJ* 35 (1910), p. 48).


4 A second specimen from this reverse die was in the Prestwich hoard. It appears to be from the same obverse die as coin b, of Roxburgh (I am indebted to Mr Nicholas Holmes for information about this coin, which is from the Whithorn excavations).

5 I owe this information to the late Dr Olof von Feilitzen.
a large hole above the crown. When I showed it to F. Elmore Jones his first reaction was anxiety that it was in fact his property. As can now be seen from his sale catalogue, Glendining, 13 April 1983, lot 1135, he possessed a die-duplicate with an almost identical piercing. All Cristien's coins, which are rare, are from the same pair of dies as BMC 250, of which the obverse, with bust Cl, is distinctive in lacking the usual lock of hair to the right (pl. 12, 1).

Pierced specimens of this coinage are relatively uncommon. Out of more than 800 in the Elmore Jones collection, only six others were pierced. There is only one pierced coin on the plates of the British Museum Catalogue. Both Elmore Jones and I wondered whether the piercing of Cristien's coins might have been connected with his name (which is a rare one and may have been well known locally), for the coins to be used as religious talismans. Whether or not this was the case, it is certainly most unusual to find two coins of this period from the same pair of dies holed in a similar and distinctive way, and it may well have been that they were pierced on the same occasion, or at least by the same person. Large holes of this kind were presumably designed to take a ribbon rather than a thread, as later in the case of gold angels of James I and Charles I pierced for use as touchpieces. They seem to be found more in the silver coins of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries than at other periods.

3. Pieres

Two obverse and three reverse dies have been identified for the small issue by the moneyer Pieres at Durham early in class VII of the Short Cross coinage (1217/18). In Allen's study of the Durham mint the obverse dies were labelled DU713 and 716, the reverse dies du 712, 715 and 718. The five combinations known to Allen, out of a possible six, were also illustrated by Stewart in his paper on classes VI–VII, the plates of which are sometimes easier to use because they were photographed from casts. The purpose of this note is to place on record the first known coin, a cut halfpenny, from dies DU716/du712, the missing combination (pl. 12, 2). The obverse die is in an early state.

For convenience I append a concordance between the Allen die numbers and the Allen and Stewart plates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allen, BNJ 49</th>
<th>Stewart, BNJ 49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Die nos</td>
<td>Plate IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716/712</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716/715</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716/718</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713/712</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713/715</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713/718</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 The note to this effect on FEJ's ticket is reflected in the sale catalogue entry for lot 1135.

7 In BMC Henry II (p. cxxxi), D.F. Allen cites Reginald of Durham as recording that a miracle of St Cuthbert occurred 'to' Christianus, but his part in the story was in fact a discreditable one, which would hardly have contributed to a pious reputation.

MaaSTRICHT, 'the ford of the Meuse', is the most southerly town of the Netherlands. It has an unexpected feature of apparent interest to English historians in one of the old streets running parallel to the river. This street is called the Munstreest (Mint Street or Coin Street), it is not certain why it was given this name, but today it is deceptively appropriate since over the door of one of the houses there is a fairly accurate carving in stone of the obverse of a rose noble (ryal) of Edward IV. It bears the inscription EDUARD DEI GRA REX ANG ET FRAN DNS IBE and depicts the crowned king standing in a round bottomed ship facing forward, sword raised in his right hand and a shield on his left arm bearing the arms France and England quarterly. On his right, in the stern of the ship, is a square banner with a capital letter meant to be an E but looking more like a reversed B. On the side of the ship is a large five petaled rose. The inscription differs slightly from that of the genuine rose noble which reads EDWARD DEI GRA REX ANGL ET FRANC DNS IB and the rigging of the carved ship has four strands (as did the half noble) where the original coin has three. These differences may be due to repeated copying but considering the difficulty of working in stone the imitation of the original is quite a good one.
It has been stated several times that the coin is there because the house was once a mint and that coins were struck there during Edward's exile in the Low Countries from October 1470 to March 1471. That coins were struck there then is highly unlikely. There is no evidence that there was a mint in Maastricht at this time. In addition Maastricht is far away from the places Edward stayed during his exile and he could have found far more convenient places to oversee such an important activity if he had wished or been allowed to strike his own coins on this occasion. Since the right to strike coins within a realm was jealously guarded it is highly unlikely that a ruler so mindful of his sovereign rights as Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, would allow such an activity in any case. Despite occasional comments to the contrary there is absolutely no evidence, in the published Dutch mint records for example, that Charles allowed Edward to use Burgundian mints or even struck English coins for Edward.

The hypothesis that English coins were struck in Burgundy has been backed up by the existence of several specimens first described by Walters. These are groats, with one half groat, of somewhat crude design with several abnormal features in the inscriptions (FRANCV or FRANCV on the obverse for example). The most likely conclusion with such coins is that they are forgeries, either English or Continental, a conclusion that Blunt and Whitton came to in their discussion of one of them. These coins do not appear to be associated with the Continent in any way, but large numbers of official and unofficial copies of English coins did circulate there during the whole of the late middle ages. There is no doubt that Charles of Burgundy made a grant of 50,000 florins (perhaps equal to £20,000) to Edward at the end of 1470, paid (according to Commines) in St Andrew's cross florins, that is Burgundian gold coin, not specially struck English coin. Only one andriesgulden has been found in England so far and it seems most likely that the grant was actually paid in Burgundian double patards (with perhaps a little gold) since Edward's first need for the money was to hire ships and mercenaries, who would have had to be paid in usable (lower denomination) coin. Burgundian double patards were legal tender in England so far and it seems most likely that the grant was actually paid in Burgundian double patards (with perhaps a little gold) since Edward's first need for the money was to hire ships and mercenaries, who would have had to be paid in usable (lower denomination) coin.

1 See for example John Craig, The Mint. A History of the London Mint from AD 287 to 1948 (Cambridge, 1953), p. 94. Here reference is made to the Annual Report of the Mint of Holland, 1908, i.e. Muntverslag over het Jaar 1908 (Utrecht, 1909), for a picture of the 'coin'. This report does indeed have a photograph of the stone on its front cover but does not mention it within. For the exile of Edward IV see Livia Visser-Fuchs, Richard in Holland, 1470-71 (The Ricardian 6 (1983), 220-8; P.W. Hammond, The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury (Gloucester, 1989), pp. 38-40, 48-55.

2 The evidence for the mint at Maastricht is limited and confounded for the early middle ages. However the Dukes of Brabant certainly had coins struck in the town from 1204 to 1427 and this was resumed by Philip the Fair, grandson of Charles the Bold, in 1506; see H. Enno Van Gelder, De Nederlandse Munten (Utrecht/Anvers, 1980), pp. 201-2. In the fifteenth century houses in the present Muntstraat were said to be 'at the old mint' and coins were struck elsewhere in the town.


4 F.A. Walters, 'The Coinage of the Reign of Edward IV', NC, 4th s. 9 (1909), 183, 218. We would like to thank David Rogers for helpful correspondence on the whole question of these coins and for cautionary remarks on the circulation of Burgundian coins in England.


6 Philippe de Commines, Memoires, edited by J. Calmette and G. Darville, vol. i (Paris, 1924), p. 212, 'cinquante mil florins à la croix Saint André'; P. Spufford, Monetary Problems and Policies in the Burgundian Netherlands 1433-1468 (London, 1970), p. 165, note 3; The Chronicle of Flanders, Brussels, Bibliotheque Royale Albert I Ms. 13073-74, f.269, a well informed contemporary chronicle written at Bruges, says that the grant to Edward IV was about 100,000 riders. The rider was also a gold coin, of about the same value as the andriesgulden (P. Spufford, Money and its Use in Medieval Europe (London, 1958), p. 409), and the grant thus perhaps twice as large as Commines says. Commines was quite capable of trying to present Charles as meaner than he actually was.
England since an agreement in 1469 between Edward and Charles and would thus have been acceptable to Edward for payments in England. They may not have been as acceptable to his subjects of course, as the 1469 agreement would hardly have had time to become operative before Edward was forced into exile. Patards are known to have circulated in England in the 1470s although there is no evidence that they did so as early as 1471. Since it therefore seems unlikely that any coins were struck in Maastricht in 1471 and that Edward IV was supplied with money by Charles and so would have had no need to strike any himself anyway, the ‘coin’ on the house in Maastricht must have another explanation.

The presence of coins carved in stone on the front of a house is not in fact unusual in the Low Countries. Such pictorial carvings are not common in England, but in the Netherlands they were used universally to distinguish one house from another and they survive in situ in great numbers. Signboards which were also used only survive in museums. Almost every possible human or animal figure or inanimate object was used to illustrate the name of a house. In the seventeenth century people sometimes derived their surnames from them and became known by such curious names as ‘in St Andrew’ or ‘preekstoel (pulpit). In towns frequently visited by English merchants English names were common. In Middelburg in Zeeland for example one could find the ‘King of England’ and the ‘Queen of England’, the ‘Arms of England’, the ‘Great Leopard’, ‘London’ and ‘Norwich’ as well as the ‘Noble’, the ‘Golden Noble’ and the ‘Old Noble’. Coins, both local and foreign occurred. Amsterdam had several houses called Reaal (ryal), both gold and silver, and at least one Gouden Nobel (golden noble). The rose noble is known to have been used in Middelburg and Delft as well as Maastricht and may have appeared elsewhere too. Especially popular was the symbolic ‘Last Penny’ (het Laatste Stuivertje) frequently seen on inns.

It could be argued that Maastricht had no obvious connection with England and that there must be a specific historical reason for the appearance of the noble in this particular place, but this is to overlook the popularity of English gold coins in the Low Countries in the later middle ages. This started in 1344 when Edward III first struck his gold nobles in England and Calais. These found their way into Burgundy and were prized as valuable and safe. The nobles of Henry VI in particular, known as Henricusnobels, circulated in the Netherlands in great numbers until well into the seventeenth century. Nobles were popular enough to be imitated by Waleran of Ligny in 1415 as well as by Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy (1384–1404), with his own arms on the shield held by the standing figure on the obverse and his own inscription. This was repeated by Philip’s successors as Dukes of Burgundy, John the Fearless (1404–1419) and Philip the Good (1419–1467) but apparently not by Charles the Bold who succeeded Philip the Good.

When Edward IV struck his own new and heavier (and thus more valuable) rose nobles in 1465 they became even more popular on the continent than their predecessors. The rose noble was double the weight of most contemporary gold coins and both artistically and intrinsically of fine quality. These coins of Edward came to be imitated officially and unofficially, the former being distinguished by the names and titles of the issuer (as were the previous official imitations), the latter looking very similar to the originals. We have evidence that such copies were made in the Low Countries from 1525 although it seems probable that examples must have circulated before this. The existing examples are coarser than the original, the face of the king is larger, he wears a spread crown, his sword is longer and broader and the rose on the side of the ship clearly larger and flatter. In the Maastricht carving the appearance of the rose especially, which is very coarsely modelled, but also the broad four pointed crown, reminiscent of the brim of the hat of the Dutch Carnival Prince rather than the English crown, indicate that it was probably copied from an imitation rose noble and not from an original.

Both genuine and imitation rose nobles continued in use until well into the seventeenth century (the type was struck spasmodically in England until 1606), there is still mention of them in the eighteenth century but by then they had become rare, perhaps collectors items. In the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, there is an example struck in Holland in 1589–1591 which has been set in an ornamental ring and has a loop for suspension. The rose noble may have been chosen for the Maastricht carving, possibly carved as late as 1737, because of the attractive rarity of this particular coin.

The name of the Muntstraat and the presence of the name of a house in Middelburg was actually changed from the ‘Noble’ to the ‘Rose Noble’, apparently to ‘update’ it.

---

9 We are grateful to Mr P.W. Synke, the town archivist of Middelburg, for information on the subject. See also M. Fokker, Proeve van eene lijst, bevattende de vroegere namen der huizen in Middelburg (Uitgave van het Zeeuwsch Genootschap, 1904). It appears that in at least one case the
Coins were certainly struck in Maastricht as early as the Merovingian period, possibly on this spot. This conclusion is supported by a study of street names and the fact that as early in 1290 one Jutta, the widow of the money changer Winandus, lived in this street in a house supra monetam (above the mint). It is in fact quite common for the name of a house and its stone carving to preserve the memory of a building or the former use of a site. Since the Dutch word *munt* means both 'mint' as well as 'coin' the owners of the house may at some time have chosen to visualise the name of their street in this way. As noted above the present carving probably does not date from before the eighteenth century, but it may have been copied from earlier versions of the same coin. Certainly the present carving does not look as though it was copied from an actual example of a coin.

The Maastricht stone and houses with such Yorkist names as 'The White Rose' have also been linked to the Yorkist cause and the presence of the Yorkist pretenders Edmund and Richard de la Pole, Earls of Suffolk, with the assumption that they were rallying points of their supporters or otherwise connected with them. It is true that Edmund de la Pole, who left England in August 1501 in search of continental support in his attempt on the English crown, stayed in nearby Aix-la-Chapelle from May 1502 to early 1504, and his brother Richard and some of his supporters lived in Aix, Maastricht and Liège during those years and later, but there is no reason to believe that the names or carvings were the result of their presence. It is of course quite possible that exiles congregated in a place with such an appropriate name as 'The White Rose', particularly if it was a tavern. The towns in this area were frequently visited by Englishmen, both supporters of the lost Yorkist cause and adherents of the new Tudor dynasty and the red rose. Apparently there were clashes between them, since at the end of December 1503 the town council of Maastricht was compelled to issue a warning that no one, native or stranger, male or female, young or old, was to harass the English living there in word or deed, in particular they were not to call anyone 'white rose' or 'red rose'. The penalty for transgressing these regulations was a pilgrimage to St James of Compostella, or a fine. One can imagine how the local youths may have heckled visitors, or English merchants provoked each other, causing outbursts of xenophobic or partisan violence in streets and taverns. In such a situation it seems unlikely that any house owner would newly name his property so as to potentially cause trouble for himself. In addition the rose, colourless, red, white and gold, bloomed in stone all over the Low Countries as house names.

The rose noble, genuine or forged, was the most popular and impressive coin in the region for more than two centuries. As the French proverb has it:

*Un noble, s'il n'est à la rose,
Vaut parfois bien peu de chose.*

...and any house owner at any time up to the late eighteenth century could have found the coin an appropriate and attractive decoration. Its appearance on a house need have no more significance than such free choice, and the 'coin' nothing whatever to do directly with England or the English.

---

16 We are grateful to Mr Andreas of the Maastricht municipal archives and to the Archivist for information and photocopies of J. Schaepkens van Riempst, 'Eenige bijzonderheden omtrent straten, pleinen en bewoners van het oude Tricht', *Publications* 43 (1907), 218-21.


18 The text of the ordinance is in the *Rijksarchief, Maastricht, Raadverdragen van Maastricht (stad)*, 1495 (1502/3), December 30. It is printed in Lambert Parette, *Reflexions sur la croix engrelée* (Olne, 1972), p. 22. A similar ordinance was made at Bruges in the same period.

19 Which may be translated as 'A noble, if it does not have a rose, is worth but little I suppose'. This proverb is found in Poswick, *Le noble à la rose*. 