BETWEEN 1990 and 1996 seven silver units of the 'Bury' type, and a gold quarter stater, were found in a field in the parish of Barham, near Ipswich in Suffolk. The coins, which were found by two metal-detectorists operating with the landowner’s permission, have been reported to the local coroner, but owing to the dispersed nature of the find a decision over their Treasure Trove status has been delayed pending further searches of the area.1

The coins are listed in the table below and illustrated on Pl. 23. They were scattered over an area of nearly four hectares, with nos. 3, 5, 6 and 8 being found within an area of one hectare, and nos. 1, 4 and 7 in a similar sized area approximately 100 m downslope to the south-west. The final coin, no. 2, came from a point 90 m north-west of the first group. While it is possible that the coins come from a single deposit, their dispersed nature points to extensive agricultural disturbance and no clear point of origin, or a container, has yet been identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>wt.</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>discovery</th>
<th>CCI no.</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bury A</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>95.0024</td>
<td>different dies from 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bury A</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>96.3627</td>
<td>different dies from 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bury C</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>95.0025</td>
<td>R/ die as 4, 6 &amp; 7, mis-struck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.18g</td>
<td>Bury C</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>95.0015</td>
<td>O/ die as 7; R/ die as 3, 6 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bury C</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>95.2597</td>
<td>different R/ style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.39g</td>
<td>Bury C</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>95.2598</td>
<td>R/ die as 3, 4 &amp; 7, mis-struck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bury C</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>96.2600</td>
<td>O/ die as 4; R/ die as 3, 4 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>British LX4</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>96.2590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The field where the coins were found lies on a gentle south-west facing slope between two small dry valleys, about 600 m from the river Gipping. This natural corridor formed a significant route from the coastal area of south-east Suffolk to the densely settled region around Bury St Edmunds to the north-west. The Gipping meets the tidal Orwell estuary at Ipswich 7.5 km downstream, and the Roman small town of Combretovium (Coddenham) is 2.5 km upstream, where the Pye Road2 crosses the valley before heading north to Caistor by Norwich. Although Barham lies well to the south of the area generally defined as Iceni territory, it is on a major route that would have given access to the Breckland core of the Iceni kingdom in north-west Suffolk and Norfolk.

The possible presence of this Iron Age hoard was obscured in the first few years of searching by an extensive scatter of late medieval and post-medieval coins and artefacts. While some Roman material has also been found in the area of the coins, only one Iron Age artefact – a copper alloy strap fitting – has been identified. Small-scale excavation has however identified two Iron Age settlements on the ridge some 500 m above the area of the coins, and the Gipping valley in general is well-known for later prehistoric activity. In addition, extensive searching by metal-detector users has recovered a number of stray finds of Iron Age coins on the ridge overlooking the ‘hoard’, from an area that went on to hold a substantial Roman settlement.4

1 We are grateful to the metal-detector users for diligently recording and reporting their finds. All of the finds are in private collections.
4 Other coins from Barham recorded in the Celtic Coin Index include a stater of Addedomaros (VA 1633), an uninscribed quarter stater possibly of Addedomaros (VA 1623), an uninscribed quarter stater of the Iceni (VA 628) and a silver pattern/horse ECEN unit (VA 720) of the same tribe, a silver unit of Cunobelin (VA 2047) and an uncertain north Thames bronze unit.
Fig. 1. Distribution of Bury types
Lower case letters indicate one coin; upper case two or more. The site at Barham is indicated by an asterisk.

Seven of the eight coins belong to the series popularly known as Bury types. These coins were first clearly defined by Gregory, who described three types (A, B and C), all featuring a finely-detailed head and horse, with much emphasis on the headgear shown on the obverse. At the most basic level, the three types can be differentiated according to the combination of head and horse: head left and horse left for A, head right and horse right for B, and head right and horse left for C. The A type had previously been recorded by Allen
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AN OVERSTRUCK SILVER UNIT OF VERICA

G.L. COTTAM

ONE of the means whereby the sequence in which different coin types were minted can be confirmed is through the study of overstrikes. By identifying the underlying design (or designs) on a restruck coin the relative sequence in which the types were struck can be determined, although this does not necessarily prove that the uppermost design on the coin was current after a lower one, merely that at worst it was current at the same time, since both types clearly would have had a finite currency. Nevertheless, overstrikes allow sequences which have been determined via other means to be confirmed, and incorrect sequences that have been proposed to be refuted with confidence.

Although in most coin series overstrikes of coins may not commonly be found, they often exist, have generally been published, and provide valuable assistance in confirming the sequence in which the coins were produced. However, overstrikes are practically unknown in the British Celtic series. In fact, apart from a small number of uninscribed silver units from the central southern part of Britain they have not otherwise been recorded and this, together with the

---

6 H. R. Mossop, 'A horse from the same stable as Mack 438', SCMB, 1979 (no. 730), 181.
7 Figures from A. Chadburn, postscript to Gregory's paper in n. 5, p. 69.
9 Provenances in addition to Barham are Clacton, Colchester, White Roding (2), Chelmford and Epping in Essex; Long Melford (Suffolk); Essendon (Hertfordshire); Castor (Lincolnshire); Folkestone (Kent); and, less reliably, Alton (Hampshire).

---

10 See for example, P. de Jersey, 'Gaulish or British? A quarter stater from both sides of the Channel', Celtic Coin Bulletin 2 (forthcoming); or some varieties of the so-called Snettisham quarter staters (BMC 3420ff.).
almost complete absence of die linking between successive issues,\(^4\) has meant that the study of the British Celtic coinage has lacked some of the more incontrovertible evidence which in other series has helped confirm the sequence of different types.

It was, therefore, of great interest when an overstruck inscribed silver unit of Verica recently came to light. Figure 1 shows \(\times 2\) photographs of both the obverse and reverse of the coin, while drawings which clarify the images are illustrated at the same scale in Fig. 2. The undertype is VA 471-1 and \(\times 2\) photographs of a coin of this type are shown in Fig. 3,\(^6\) although, unfortunately, due to the distortion of the surface that took place when the coin was restruck (particularly since, in the process, the coin underwent a rotational double strike), it has not proved possible to identify the particular dies used. The coin was then restruck with dies bearing a variant form of VA 505-1. This has a linear cross superimposed on the central shield shaped object normally seen on the obverse of this type. In this case the dies used to restrike the coin can be identified, the obverse being one of only two known dies of this variant type. Figure 4 shows \(\times 2\) photographs of a coin struck from one of these dies.

No examples of VA 471-1 had been catalogued prior to the appearance of coins from Wanborough,\(^7\) although Evans\(^8\) and Mack\(^9\) both catalogued VA 505-1 (as Evans III 3 and Mack 123 respectively). Whereas Evans did not attempt to organise Verica’s coinage into different issues, Mack, recognising three different types of staters, arranged the coins into three series, placing VA 505-1 in his second series (which will be seen to correspond to the place the coin is given in Van Arsdell’s arrangement below).

Van Arsdell would appear to have based his organisation of Verica’s coinage on the study of the gold coins begun by Allen and completed by Haselgrove.\(^10\) He arranged the silver coins, according to their legends, to fit the three stater groups that were defined in this study,\(^11\) cataloguing his type 471-1 as part of a first coinage of Verica, and type 505-1 with a second coinage.\(^12\) Although a number of questions arise from the selection of coins that Van Arsdell assigns to each of these coinages (such as the inclusion of coins that were clearly not struck under Verica, eg. VA 473-1, VA 474-1, VA 482-1, VA 483-1), the striking sequence exhibited by the newly discovered coin does not contradict the sequence Van Arsdell proposes for these two types with VA 505-1 following VA 471-1.

Bean, in a major revision to previously proposed structures for Verica’s coinage, sees two mints issuing coinage during Verica’s reign with VA 471-1 and VA 505-1 both being the product of a mint at Cavella.\(^13\) In his arrangement VA 471-1 precedes VA 505-1, a sequence which is confirmed by the order in which the different types were struck on the new coin.

It is thus clear that, notwithstanding any interest that might be created by the appearance of what is probably the first recorded example of an overstruck inscribed British Celtic coin, the discovery of this silver unit presents us with no new insight into the arrangement of Verica’s coinage. However, it does

---


\(^{5}\) Catalogue numbers from R.D. Van Arsdell, *Celtic Coinage in Britain* (London 1959) are prefaced by the abbreviation VA.

\(^{6}\) Photograph courtesy of the Oxford Institute of Archaeology’s Celtic Coin Index.

\(^{7}\) See, however, G.C. Boon, ‘A Dobunnic Note’, *SCMB* 778 (June 1983), 145.

\(^{8}\) J. Evans, *The Coins of the Ancient Britons* (London 1864).


confirm a sequence that the different studies of Verica's coinage have proposed for two of his silver types and the very existence of this overstruck coin raises the possibility that further restrikes of inscribed Celtic coins might exist, possibly unrecognised as such among coins already residing in some collection. More importantly, although the existence of overstruck uninscribed Celtic coins of this series can be explained on socio-political grounds, the restriking of an inscribed coin under the same issuing authority as the one responsible for its original production hints at a sophistication in the management of coinage in the late pre-Roman Iron Age that has hitherto been unsuspected and provides one more step in extending our understanding of the first indigenous coinage of Britain.

A SECOND COIN OF KING EARDWULF OF NORTHBUMBRIA AND THE ATTRIBUTION OF THE MONEYER COINS OF KING ÆLFWALD

MARK BLACKBURN AND ANDY GILLIS

In August 1994 the first coin of Eardwulf, king of Northumbria (796–806?, 8087–810?) was discovered at Burton Fleming, North Humberside and promptly published by Elizabeth Price. Only three years later, in September 1997, a second specimen came to light with a metal-detector on a productive site near Driffield in South Yorkshire, which has yielded many coins of the eighth and ninth centuries. The coin was found by James Hewitt, who showed it to one of us (AG) and has kindly allowed it to be recorded here. The new coin is subtly different from the first and as a result it sheds considerable new light, not only on Eardwulf's coinage but on that in the name of Ælfwald as well. The coin, which is illustrated on Pl. 24, 3, from a video image, may be described as follows:

**Obv.** +EA-RDVL-F R, pellet in beaded inner circle  
**Rev.** CVDFEVRT, small cross  
Weight reported as: 1.00g (15.4gr). Die-axis: 90°. Diameter: 13.5mm.

Both Eardwulf coins were struck by the same moneyer, Cuthheard, who is also known from coins of Æthelred I's second reign (790–6), Eanred (810?–840/1), and a King Ælfwald who could be Ælfwald I (778/9–788) or Ælfwald II (806?–808?).

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to the finder James Hewitt for drawing the coin to our attention and allowing us to publish it here. Stewart Lyon, Hugh Pagan, and Elizabeth Pirie have read this note in draft and offered helpful comments. Photographs have kindly been supplied by the British Museum, through Dr Gareth Williams, and Mr Lyon.

14 Such as the restriking of coinage issued under the authority of (and possibly received from) one chieftain by the types of another chieftain prior to the distribution of largesse by him in order to ensure that the recipient has visible evidence of the direct source of that largesse.


The attribution of this latter group has been much debated over the last forty years. Ælfwald's coins fall into two categories, one showing on the reverse a prancing animal and no inscription which certainly belongs to Ælfwald I's reign, and the other with the name of the moneyer Cuthheard around a small cross. In recent years the number of specimens of the moneyer group has grown from two to at least seven today and it is the attribution of these that has been problematic. While all commentators admit that the arguments are finely balanced, Ælfwald I was favoured by Lyon (1956), Booth (1984, 1987), and Metcalf (1994), but Ælfwald II was preferred by Pagan (1969), Pirie (1987, 1995, 1996), and Booth (1997). The new coin published here gives powerful support to the claims for Ælfwald II. This by implication would give to Æthelred the attribution of this latter group has been much paralleled in the coinages of Æthelred I and Eanred, although both types have pellets rather than a cross in the centre, although both types have pellets in the obverse legend.

Far more distinctive on the Driffield coin is its reverse which is exactly like those of Ælfwald, lacking an initial cross, using a round C and uncial h, inverting the second T as a A, and spelling the name with a final T. It is indistinguishable from reverses of Ælfwald and Eanred are quite different. Ælfwald's coins spell the name with a final T rather than a D, omitting the initial cross, they use a round C and a uncial h rather than H, and they occasionally invert the A as a V (Pl. 24, 4-5). Eanred's coins are different again, spelling the name with a capital H and final D but omitting the E in the second element, thus CVDHARD (Pl. 24, 6). The various forms of reverse inscription are set out in Table 1.

### Table 1: Reverse inscriptions on coins of the moneyer Cuthheard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Reverse Inscription</th>
<th>Plate No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Æthelred I</td>
<td>+CVDHEARD (square C)</td>
<td>Pl. 24, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eardwulf</td>
<td>+CVDHEARD (square C)</td>
<td>Pl. 24, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eardwulf</td>
<td>CVDHEVRT (round C)</td>
<td>Pl. 24, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfwald II</td>
<td>CVDHEVRT, CVDHEART (round C)</td>
<td>Pl. 24, 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eanred</td>
<td>+CVDHARD (square C)</td>
<td>Pl. 24, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new Eardwulf coin from near Driffield has a different obverse design from the Burton Fleming specimen, having a pellet rather than a cross in the centre, although both types can be paralleled in the coinages of Æthelred I and Eanred. There appears to be no abbreviation mark above the A for rex, although what appears to be a slight scratch in the die may perhaps be the remnants of such a bar. Otherwise the lettering and the occurrence of pellets in the obverse legend are fairly similar on both Eardwulf coins.

### Additional Notes

3 A corpus of the coins of this period is included in Booth, 'Coinage and Northumbrian history'.
7 H.E. Pagan, ‘Northumbrian numismatic chronology in the ninth century’, *BNJ* 38 (1969), 1-15. Pagan does not expressly attribute these coins to Ælfwald II, but as Booth pointed out in 1984 (‘Sceattas in Northumbria’, p. 86), it would have been a natural interpretation based on his attribution of the moneyer coins of Æthelred I to a hypothetical King Æthelred reigning c. 810.
10 The strongest evidence against the attribution to Ælfwald II had been the absence of these coins from the Hexham hoard (dep. c. 845) although it contained a number of coins of Æthelred I (Metcalf, *Thrymsas and Sceattas*, p. 596). However, this may not be statistically significant, since the scale of Æthelred's coinage appears to have been very substantial. Moreover, as Mr Pagan has pointed out to us, Grantley said that his specimen was first seen with a mass of base stycas and it had copper-like metal adhering to it, from which he inferred that 'it may have formed part of some hoard of later copper stycas of which it was an early silver representative' (Lord Grantley, 'On the North-Humbrian coinage of A.D. 758-808', *NC* 3rd series, 17 (1897), 134-44, at 138-9). This, of course, is no more persuasive than the Hexham evidence.
Long term monetary trends may also be relevant, for the reign a change in spelling from CVDHEARD to CVDvHEART/CVDvHEART, showing that these do indeed represent the same man, and CVDHEARD appears to be the earlier form. The number of Northumbrian coins from the late eighth and early ninth century is still comparatively small, but even so a pattern is emerging whereby the complement of four or five moneyers under Æthelred I was reduced to perhaps one sole moneyer (Cutheheard) under Eardwulf and Ælwald II, before gradually expanding again under Eanred. The occurrence of the same moneyer on the coins of Eardwulf and Ælwald endorses the attribution to Ælwald II, as does the close similarity of some of their reverse dies. Whether the new Eardwulf coin was produced shortly before he was driven into exile by Ælwald (806?) or after his restoration (808?) is impossible to tell on the present evidence — either seems feasible.

Lyon, Pagan and Booth had each drawn attention to the absence of coins from the mid 790s until c. 810 or later. The fact that some nine coins can now be attributed to this period should not necessarily change our general interpretation, since compared with the number of coins surviving from immediately before and after that period they are few indeed. Moreover not only are the coins rare, but the York mint, as we have seen, seems to have reduced its complement of moneyers temporarily. Whether this contraction of mint activity was an effect of the Viking raids on Northumbria beginning in 793 as Booth argues, or an interruption in North Sea trade as Metcalf would see it, or a result of the political uncertainty that generally plagued Northumbria in the later eighth and early ninth centuries it is difficult to tell. Long term monetary trends may also be relevant, for the debase ment that was to become endemic in mid-ninth century Northumbria may already have begun by c. 800. Evidently there were problems either with the viability of the Northumbrian penny (as it may well have been known) at its current value or with an adequate supply of silver for monetary purposes. These may have been particularly acute at the turn of the eighth century. Any interpretation will remain speculative, but the evidence from single finds is clear. While we can reasonably expect a few more coins of Eardwulf and Ælwald to be found over the coming years, unless a hoard turns up they will always be considerably rarer than the coins of Æthelred I and Eanred. Æthelred I’s coinage marked a new departure in terms of design, perhaps mint administration, and probably output — Booth recorded more than sixty coins from the six-year second reign of Æthelred I, compared with only thirty-five from the preceding thirty-two years. Was Æthelred’s issue part of a renovatio monetae in which the preceding coinages were reminted, thus according for the greater mint output? There is much that could be learned about the coinages of this period from one substantial Northumbrian hoard of the early ninth century.

KEY TO PLATE
1. BMC Æthelred II 293.
3. Near Driffield find.
4. Lyon, 'A reappraisal', pl. 18, 7.
5. South Newbald find; Booth, 'Coinage', pl. 2, 3.
6. C. S. S. Lyon collection.

A PARCEL OF SILVER PENNIES FROM THE BLACKHILLS HOARD

SALLY-ANNE COUPAR

On 11 April 1911, the tenant farmer of Blackhills Farm, Kirkcudbrightshire (NGR: NG760750) discovered a coin hoard while ploughing. The hoard consisted of over two thousand Edwardian silver pennies, and it had been buried in a wooden bowl. The hoard was declared treasure trove and was passed into the hands of the Royal Exchequer. This important find was analysed by Sir George Macdonald who published it in accordance with the state of research at that time. When he had

10 Booth had pointed out that this was an assumption that could not be taken for granted; Booth, in a discussion note within Pirie, 'Phases and groups', p. 133.
11 Booth's suggestion that the Burton Fleming specimen could belong to Eardwulf's second reign seems very unlikely; Booth, 'Northumbrian coinage', p. 20.
12 Booth, 'Coinage and Northumbrian history', pp. 72-6.
13 Metcalf, in a discussion note within Booth, 'Coinage and Northumbrian history', at p. 84.
15 The terms 'sceat' and 'styca' are ? applied by modern numismatics.
16 G. Macdonald, 'Two hoards of Edwardian pennies recently found in Scotland', NC 13 (1913), 57-118.
completed his report, the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland in Edinburgh retained eight of the coins, presumably returning the rest to the landowner, a Mr Whitby, as was then the customary practice.

During the course of 1993, a parcel of 380 Edwardian pennies was handed in to Dr Donal Bateson, Curator of Coins and Medals at the Hunterian Museum, University of Glasgow. These coins had been found some years previously in a solicitor's officer which was being cleared out prior to refurbishment. The coins were contained in a tin along with a piece of paper upon which was written 'from the Blackhills hoard'. This provenance is accepted as secure owing to the large number of coins involved and the number of coins in the parcel which matched descriptions given in Macdonald's report. Since the discovery and original publication of the hoard by Macdonald, the coins of the Edwardian period have been subjected to intensive study. The parcel of coins from the Blackhills hoard provided an exciting opportunity to reappraise the hoard in the light of modern research.

The Blackhills hoard comprised 2059 coins which displayed the usual homogeneity of the larger hoards of this period (see Table 1).

TABLE 1: The composition of the Blackhills hoard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English pence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Hull</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scottish pence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander III</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Balliol</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irish pence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign pence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gui de Dampierre, Flanders (c. 1288-1292)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John de Avecnes, Hainaut (c. 1293-1297)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert de Bethune, Flanders (1305-1322)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaucher de Châtillon (1313-c. 1322)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTEROP Imitation (early C14th)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sterling Imitations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwre Series (C13th)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Denominations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halfpence (Berwick)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farthing (London)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blackhills is notable in that it only contained twelve continental sterlings (0.6% of the hoard) which is considerably less than the 1-3% which featured in other hoards. It was also thought to have been fairly remarkable in having a very low number of continental imitations (0.1%). However, the evidence from the parcel shows that there were imitation sterlings with English legends which went unnoticed by Macdonald. These are probably concealed amongst the equivalent of the Fox 10b issues, so it would seem likely that the percentage of continental imitations would be higher than originally thought. The relative proportions of sterling types in hoards is not an accurate indication of date of deposition, but the revised picture of Blackhills in the light of the parcel evidence shows it to have a profile very similar to that of Berscar, Loch Doon and Lochmaben, suggesting a concealment date in the 1330s.

The relative proportions of the classes of English pence in hoards is thought to be a more reliable guide to the date of concealment. Mayhew suggests that the best results are given by the percentage of coins comprising Fox classes 11-15, but these figures can only be estimated for Blackhills and cannot be worked out at all for Lochmaben. However, an analysis of the percentage of coins comprising Fox classes 10-15 was possible, and shows that Blackhills has a hoard profile which again suggests a date of concealment in the 1330s (see Table 2).

2 I am grateful to Dr James McKay for allowing publication of this Blackhills parcel, which has now been returned to him.
4 Revised Stewart and North figures used, see I. Stewart and J.J. North, 'Edwardian sterlings from Lochmaben, Blackhills and Mellendean reclassified', NC 150 (1990), 179–204.
5 The hoard contains at least five C14th imitations which were listed in the English pence, probably under the equivalent of Fox 10b.
6 See also N.J. Mayhew, 'The Aberdeen Upperkirkgate Hoard of 1886', BNJ 45 (1975), 34-5.
TABLE 2: The percentage of the English pence in hoards, by Fox class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Fox Class Date</th>
<th>1-8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>10-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boyton</td>
<td>c1325</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>c1331-5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperkirkgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berscar</td>
<td>c1331-5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Doon</td>
<td>c1331-5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackhills</td>
<td>1330s</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochmaben</td>
<td>1330s</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen 1983</td>
<td>mid 1340s</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen 1984</td>
<td>mid 1340s</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrave</td>
<td>1360s</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parcel of coins from the Blackhills hoard contained 351 English pence, twenty-four coins from the mint at Berwick and five continental imitations. Of these, the more unusual examples have been illustrated (Pl. 23). Included are the 9b2 coin of Canterbury reading CASTOR (1) and the ‘true’ 9c coin of Bury St. Edmunds (2). The Berwick coins were an interesting group (3–8) especially the possible unrecorded variety of Blunt class 2 (4) and the crude local reverse die of class 5 (8).

The continental imitations in the parcel (9–12) show that, apart from the EDWRE series imitations identified by Macdonald, there were other imitation sterlings with English legends in the hoard which went unnoticed by him.

The latest coins in the parcel are class 15b dated to between c. 1320 and 1322. The possibility that coins of 15c and 15d were in the hoard cannot be discounted. Analysis of Macdonald’s report on the Berwick pence, in the light of evidence provided by the parcel, shows that he sometimes failed to notice the gothic N, as well as more obvious features like the form of the crown. The anomalies in his report can be attributed to the pressure of time upon him, the generally worn state of the coins, and the crude appearance of many of the Berwick coins. It seems unlikely that he would have failed to notice the pellets in the legend of the English 15d coins, but a case for the presence of 15c issues can be made.

Using the numismatic evidence to place Blackhills in a relative chronology of hoards suggests that it is a hoard of the 1330s rather than the 1320s as is traditionally believed (see Table 2). This conclusion is supported by the composition profile of the hoard and the degree of wear of the coins. The historical evidence also lends weight to this view, placing Edward Balliol in Kirkcudbrightshire in 1332 when a surprise attack forced him to flee to England. It is tempting to see the Blackhills hoard as either a Balliol bribe to a potentially useful ally, or money sent ahead by Balliol to a supporter to make preparations for his campaign, such as payment for supplies. Although his family estates had been awarded to the Douglas family by Robert I, Balliol maintained a core of loyal supporters in the area, and perhaps the incursion of the enemy into ‘pro-Balliol’ territory explains the deposition of the hoard. Regardless, it seems that both the numismatic profile and the historical evidence suggest a date of concealment in the early 1330s, and a date of c. 1332 seems most likely.

THE BLACKHILLS PARCEL: CATALOGUE

All weights are in grams

Coins which have been illustrated are marked with *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a4–4b</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a1</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>Barred Ns, Star on breast. Traces of double strike on rev. in fourth quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>Barred A on obv. Barred Ns. Small pellet in TAS. Possible star on breast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a2</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Barred Ns on obv. Possible pellet on breast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10ab1</td>
<td>Trifoliate crown. 1.37 Reverse of 9b with pothook Ns. Barred Ns on obv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10ab1 Bifoliate crown 1.41, 1.35, 1.42, 1.38. Three have reverse of 9b with unbarred Ns.

10ab5 1.45, 1.46, 1.37, 1.43, 1.35, 1.41, 1.42, 1.40, 1.43, 1.35, 1.43, 1.43
with hYB' 1.45, 1.44, 1.43, 1.43
with reversed N in DNS 1.45
with sinister jewel broken 1.29
with broken O in LON 1.43

10ab6 1.45, 1.40, 1.41, 1.43, 1.39, 1.45, 1.43, 1.42, 1.44, 1.38, 1.34, 1.41, 1.40, 1.46, 1.41, 1.42, 1.35, 1.41, 1.14, 1.39, 1.35, 1.45
with dexter side lis struck separately and obv double-struck 1.45
with unusual drapery 1.42

10cf2 1.39, 1.43, 1.44, 1.40, 1.44, 1.37, 1.27, 1.39, 1.35, 1.41, 1.40, 1.46, 1.41, 1.42, 1.35, 1.41, 1.43, 1.37, 1.38
with dexter jewel missing. Pellet on right side of face 1.39
with double-struck 1.45

10cf3a 1.35, 1.42
10cf3b 1.37
10cf4 1.32, 1.37

10cf3a 1.35, 1.42
10cf3b 1.48, 1.44, 1.33, 1.37, 1.42, 1.40, 1.42, 1.45, 1.45, 1.46, 1.39, 1.44, 1.43, 1.32, 1.43, 1.40, 1.41, 1.38, 1.24
with dexter side lis struck separately and obv double-struck 1.45

10cf3a 1.35, 1.42
10cf3b 1.37
10cf3c 1.51, 1.42
10cf4 with broken O 1.39
11a1 with broken O 1.46, 1.43

10ab4 Unbarred Ns contractive marks. EDWRR 1.42
10cf1 1.47, 1.45, 1.51, 1.37, 1.37
10cf2a 1.41, 1.35, 1.39, 1.40, 1.46, 1.37, 1.45, 1.45 with obv reading EDWAR ANG ANGShYB. Double-struck 1.38
10cf2b 1.44, 1.39, 1.46
10cf3a 1.35, 1.42
10cf3b 1.40, 1.32
10cf5b with straight-sided I 1.43
10cf uncertain 1.37

11a2 1.47, 1.42
rev double-struck reads CANAN in third quarter 1.34
11b1 1.38, 1.33
11b3 1.23, 1.37
13 1.37
with broken dexter jewel in crown 1.42
reads EDWARR 1.39, 1.47
14 EDWARR 1.40, 1.42
15b EDWARR sinister jewel in crown broken 1.43

Durham

9b1 cross moline Roman Ns contractive marks and star on breast 1.43, 1.19
9b1 plain cross unbarred Ns, 1.34, 1.39, 1.10, 1.42 as above with star on breast 1.43
unbarred Ns and double-barred A on rev 1.44
Roman Ns and contractive marks 1.49
9b2 plain cross with unbarred/pothook Ns and star on breast 1.36, 1.46, 1.42 as above with obv struck off-centre. Sinister side-fleur appears bifoliate 1.39
10cf1 cross moline 1.43, 1.38, 1.41, 1.31, 1.36, 1.03, 1.17, 1.47 as above with pellet after CIVI 1.33
10cf2a cross moline 1.47, 1.39, 1.31, 1.51, 1.64, 1.15, 1.46, 1.26 as above with rev double-struck 1.55
10cf2b initial mark uncertain 1.58
10cf2b initial mark uncertain 1.48
10cf2b initial mark uncertain 1.42
10cf3a3 cross moline 1.36
10cf3b1 cross moline 1.35, 1.23, 1.35, 1.39, 1.26, 1.37, 1.46, 1.37, 1.56, 1.16, 1.31 as above with possible pellet on breast 1.33
with broken chin 1.50, 1.32, 1.58, 1.50 with I and M straight-sided 1.48
with odd initial mark, either broken moline punch or moline over plain cross 1.36
10cf3b1 initial mark uncertain 1.44, 1.35
10cf3b2 cross moline with large serifs to A and N 1.42 with straight-sided I 1.40
10cf3b2 initial mark uncertain with straight-sided I and M 1.45
10cf4 cross moline 1.32
10cf5a cross moline with straight-sided I and M 1.37 as above with vertical stroke joining drapery to chin 1.46
10cf5b initial mark uncertain 1.37
10cf uncertain. Initial mark uncertain 1.42

Canterbury

4e with pellet before TOR 1.36, 1.37, 1.29
pellet uncertain 1.36
9b1 with unbarred/pothook Ns 1.39, 1.26, 1.45, 1.37, 1.39, 1.39, 1.38 as before with star on breast 1.32, 1.40, 1.41, 1.37 as before with contractive marks 1.37
with unbarred/pothook Ns and possible star on breast 1.40
9b2 with unbarred Ns 1.42 as above with star on breast 1.40, 1.47 as above with rev reading CASTOR 1.41* (1) with unbarred Ns, contractive marks and barred A on obv 1.38
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11a1 cross moline 1.29, 1.26
11a1 initial mark uncertain 1.48
as above with top-tilted S 1.34
11b1 crozier 1.34
11b3 crozier 1.48
as above reading EDWARR 1.41, 144
11b3 initial mark uncertain EDWARR 1.36
12a crozier Crown 1. EDWARR 1.16
13 crozier EDWARR 1.35, 1.31, 1.48, 1.36, 1.40, 1.40,
1.47, 1.26
as above with unusual drapery 1.46
with TAS: on rev 1.29
with broken dexter jewel in crown 1.45
13 lion and lis EDWARR 1 lis before lion 1.38
with 2 lis before lion, double-struck 1.22
EDWARR 2 lis before lion 1.32
13 initial mark uncertain 1.61
14 lion and lis with 1 lis before and after lion 1.55,
1.58, 1.32, 1.25, 1.28
as above reading EDWARR 1.46, 1.62, 1.25, 1.42, 1.48,
1.39
with 1 lis before lion EDWARR 1.41
with 1 lis after lion EDWARR 1.47, 1.47
with 2 lis before lion EDWARR 1.36, 1.36
with 1 lis after lion 1.29
with lion and lis worn 1.40
as above reading EDWARR 1.42, 1.30
15b lion and lis with 1 lis before lion EDWARR 1.42,
1.13
with 1 lis before and after lion EDWARR 1.38, 1.47
with 2 lis before lion EDWARR 1.39
with lion and lis worn 1.55

Bristol

9b1 with unbarred Ns 1.41
as above with contractive marks 1.36
9b2 with unbarred Ns and star on breast 1.38, 1.36,
1.36
with unbarred Ns, star uncertain 1.37

Bury St Edmunds

9b1 Roman Ns, contractive marks and star on breast
1.37
9b2 unbarred/pothook Ns obv, barred Ns rev and star
on breast. Possible 9b obv muled with earlier rev 1.39
as above with star on breast 1.41
9c unbarred Ns, barred A obv, contractive marks 1.38*
[2]

Exeter

9b2 unbarred Ns, star on breast 1.36

Hull

9b1 unbarred Ns obv, double barred N rev, star on
breast 1.43

Newcastle

9b1 unbarred Ns and contractive marks 1.40

York Royal

9b1 unbarred Ns 1.43 as above with star on breast 1.38,
1.33

Berwick Upon Tweed

1 VILL/ABE/REV/VICI with wide face 1.23
as above with barred A on obv 1.32
with barred A on obv and narrow face. Obv reads hYD
1.39* (3)
with legand uncertain and face unclear 1.37
2b with bifoliate crown, EDWAR ANGL DNShYB,
VILL/ABE/REV/VICI 1.46
2 uncertain with bifoliate crown EDWAR ANGL
DNShYB, VILL/ABE/REV/VICI class 2a/2b mule or
possible unrecorded variety of class 2 1.43* (4)
3a2 VILL/ABE/REV/VICI 1.63, 1.41, 1.42, 1.39
with unbarred As, reading WIL/LAB/ERE/VICI 1.53
rev legend unclear 1.45
3b VILL/ABE/REV/VICI with unbarred As and pellet-
barred Ns 1.44
VILL/ABE/REV/VICI with barred As on obv and pellet-
barred Ns 1.36
4a VILL/ABE/REV/VICI with pellet on breast and
trifoliate crown 1.40, 1.41
4b VILL/ABE/REV/VICI with pellet on breast and
bifoliate crown. Crown made from modified trifoliate
punch? 1.36* (5)
5 VIL/LAB/ERE/WYCI 1.49, 1.48* (6) 1.36
5 mules class 5 obv with class 4 rev. rev reads
VILL/ABE/REV/VICI. revs have Roman Is and V with
large serifs 1.37* (7), 1.23, 1.46
class 5 obv with local rev die. Lettering on rev very
crude 1.34* (8)

Continental Imitations with English Legends

Attributed to a continental source obv EDWR ANGL
DNS(hYB?) rev CIVITAS LONDoy, trifoliate crown,
reversed N in ANGL, barred A both sides, wedge
contractive marks, obv double-struck 0.83* (9)
with reversed Ns on obv. rev reads CANTOR 1.33* (10)
Unattributed Imitations of the EDWARRA series
obv EDWARR ANGL DNShY1, rev CIVITAS CANTOR
1.19* (11)
obv EDWARR ANGL DNSh, rev CIVITAS CANTOR 1.36*
(12)
obv EDWARR ANGL DNS(hYB?), rev CIVITAS DUREME
with plain cross initial mark? 1.24
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A MID-FOURTEENTH-CENTURY HOARD FROM LLYSDINAM, POWYS

EDWARD BESLY

On 30 August 1996, Mark Walters of the Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust reported to the National Museums & Galleries of Wales the recent discovery of a scattered hoard of silver coins near Newbridge on Wye, Powys. The coins were found by Messrs Steve Wood and John Boyle, using metal-detectors on farmland at Llysdinam in the area of SO 003584, and were delivered to the writer in Cardiff between September and November 1996. It appears that the coins had originally lain together, but had been scattered by a combination of tree root activity and cultivation. About thirty coins found within a few square metres formed a nucleus, with the remainder scattered more widely. Archaeological examination of the spot by C.P.A.T. provided no obvious evidence for the method of deposition, but brought to light three more coin fragments and two Edward III halfpennies, found adhering one to the other in a former tree root channel. The find was declared Treasure Trove at a coroner’s inquest at Llandrindod Wells on 15 April 1997; it has been acquired by Powys County Museums Service for the Radnorshire Museum, Llandrindod Wells.

The hoard comprises 102 complete or fragmentary silver coins of Edward I, II and III (98 pennies and four halfpennies), found adhering one to the other in a former tree root channel. The find was declared Treasure Trove at a coroner’s inquest at Llandrindod Wells on 15 April 1997; it has been acquired by Powys County Museums Service for the Radnorshire Museum, Llandrindod Wells.

The hoard comprises 102 complete or fragmentary silver coins of Edward I, II and III (98 pennies and four halfpennies), and three pennies of Alexander III of Scotland. There are no Irish or Continental sterlings. As may be expected with a mid-fourteenth-century find, many of the coins are well worn. In addition, many are broken or buckled as a result of repeated disturbance of the deposit and their physical preservation varies. A detailed ‘North’ classification to the standards of SCBI 39 has therefore proved to be achievable only in part. 1 There is a record of the uncleaned weights at the National Museum & Gallery Cardiff, but too few coins are intact and sufficiently well-preserved for useful interpretation. The clipping of at least six coins, one of them down to 0.88g (13.5gr), may be noted.

The Llysdinam find closes with three pennies (two of them fragmentary) and two halfpennies of Edward III’s ‘Florin’ coinage of 1344–49 and appears to be the first hoard from the period around 1350 to be recorded from Wales. Hoards which close with coins of the 1340s are generally scarce, perhaps because of the modest output of English silver coinage during the 1320s–1340s: the disruptions of the French war and the Black Death of 1348 might perhaps otherwise be expected to yield rather more. 2 A partial account from 10/11 Edward III (1336–7) from Radnor Castle provides some local evidence of money payments of wages at about this time: six men of the garrison were paid 42s. 9d. for fifty-seven days (£1/9d. per man per day) and the porter and forester 2d. per day each. Payments are also recorded for clearing the ruined foundations of the castle bridge at 2d. per day, and for two sawyers working on timber for the bridge: 5s. per week, or about 3d. per man per day. 3

SCHEDULE OF COINS

**ENGLAND**

Edward I–II pennies

1–4. Berwick: 2a; 3b; 4a/3 mule (clipped); 4c

5–6. Bristol: 3c–d (two fragments); 3g

7–13. Burton: 12cf2 (3); 13cf2[b1?] late lettering; 11a2 (2); 14; 15c

14–39. Canterbury: 9b (frag.); 10cf2 (3); 10cf2γ; 10cf1 or 2; 10cf2 (3, one clipped); 10cf2(?) (frag.); 10cf3(a3); 10cf3 Mayfield; 10cf3 late lettering; 10cf3[3?] (frag.); 10cf5 (2); 10(cf?); 11a2; 11b7?, 11b3 (2); [17?]; 14 (2); 15a; 15b

40–47. Durham: 9[b?: star on breast?] (frag.); 10cf3 Bek, Mayfield; 10cf3 Bek, late lettering; 10(cf?) (worn and incomplete); [10–11?] (clipped and worn); 13 Keelowe; 14 Beaumont; [142]

48–83. London: 2b (frag.); 3c–d; 3f; 4a–b; 4b–c; 4e; 8 (clipped); 9a; 9a (frag.); 9a[?] (clipped); 9b (frag.); [9?]; 10ab5ε/9 (clipped); 10ab5ε, 10ab5 (frag.); 10cf2 (2); 10cf2 (4, one fragmentary); 10cf5 Mayfield (2, one fragmentary); 10cf5 late lettering (2); 10cf5[3?] (2); 10(cf?) (2, both fragmentary); 11a2 (clipped); 11b7; 14; 15; 13–15 (frag.); uncertain (frag.)

84. Newcastle: 10x (9b/10 mule)

85–86. York: 2–3; 9b

87–95. Uncertain mints, fragments: 1d–3; 2b; 9 or earlier; 9; 10[ab5?]; 10cf2; 11[b?] 14; uncertain

---

1 I am very grateful to Nicholas Mayhew for his patient help with these identifications.

2 B.J. Cook, ‘Stanwix, Cumbria’, forthcoming, summarises the English hoard evidence for the 1340s and 1350s.

Edward III
London
96.-7. 'Star-marked' halfpence
98. 'Florin' coinage, penny, type 2? cf. SCBI 1078
99.-100. 'Florin' coinage, pennies, fragmentary
101.-102. 'Florin' coinage, halfpence
[nos 101-2 found adhering to one another at site of 'nucleus' of hoard]

SCOTLAND
Alexander III, 2nd coinage c. 1280–6
103. Penny Stewart & North class B (chipped)
104. Penny class E (fragment)
105. Penny class M
Total face value: 103 pence, or 8s. 7d.

THE RASHLEIGH HENRY IV HALF-GROAT
E.J. HARRIS AND MICHAEL SHARP

In W.J. Potter's paper on 'The Silver Coinages of Richard II, Henry IV and Henry V' he illustrated the British Museum's specimen of a Heavy Coinage half groat of Henry IV; it seemed useful to have in this Journal an illustration of the Die 2 obverse. This is provided by the Grantley (1386) = Rashleigh (698) specimen (PL. 23). The bust of Die 2 is narrower than that of Die 1 and the clearance between the fleurs on the crown band and those on the tressure arcs is greater. There is no evidence for a mark such as a cross or star on the breast on this or on the Die 1 specimen Potter described. There is however a faint image of a fleur on the tressure at this point to be seen on the specimen found with the second Reigate hoard. The present illustration provides a clearer image of the reverse Die 1 than that previously published. The weight of this specimen is 32.3 grains (2.08 gm).

A JACOBEAN SILVER HOARD FROM BULL WHARF, LONDON
GARETH WILLIAMS
with a contribution by CAROLINE R. CARTWRIGHT

On 30–31 October 1996 a hoard of 164 silver coins from England, Ireland, Scotland and Spain was discovered at Bull Wharf, near the Queenhythe Dock, by Mr. A.G. Pilson and Mr. I. Smith, who were metal-detecting under permit from the City of London. The coins were found closely grouped together at a depth of around 5 to 5.5 feet. The find was reported to the City of London coroner's office, and sent to the British Museum for examination. Fortunately the coins had not been fully cleaned before their arrival at the museum, and it was possible to submit them for microscopic examination of the associated organic material, before passing them on for cleaning and conservation. The results of this examination, by Caroline R. Cartwright of the Department of Scientific Research, are given in detail as the Appendix to this paper. A photographic record of the hoard, together with a list of weights, remains on file at the British Museum.

The hoard contains 164 coins distributed across more than a century between the earliest coin (1497 or later) and the latest (1613–15). However, this chronological spread is artificially wide, since the only coin dating from before 1553 is a Spanish real of Ferdinand & Isabella, which may well have entered England during the reign of Philip and Mary (1554–8). The hoard can thus be seen as extending from the sole reign of Mary in 1553–4 down to some point in the reign of James VI and I (1603–25). The hoard ends weakly, with only a single coin later than 1608, but this coin, a halfgroat with the cinquefoil mintmark (1613–15), shows considerable signs of wear, suggesting that it had been in circulation for some time prior to the deposition of

1 BN: 30, 124–150.

I am grateful to my colleagues John Kent and Barrie Cook for helpful discussion of the contents of this hoard, and to Barrie in particular for reading through a draft of this paper. Any errors which remain are of course my own.
the hoard. The majority of the earlier coins are also in a very worn condition, many being chipped or cracked. As coins of Mary not infrequently survive even in hoards of the mid-late seventeenth century, it is difficult to provide a firm terminus ante quem for the deposition of the hoard. However, the absence of any coin later than the middle of the reign of James suggests that the hoard was probably deposited in the later years of James’s reign, although the majority of the hoard could have been assembled some years earlier.

The English coins have a face value of £2 19s. 5d., while the other coins had an English value of approx. 5s. 9d., giving a total of £3 5s. 2d., or something over three months’ wages for a common labourer, or the value of at least twenty-four cows at contemporary prices.

Analysis of organic material attached to the coins suggests that they may originally have been deposited in a box of ash wood (approx. 25 per cent of the coins show traces of the wood), which agrees with the close grouping of the coins in the ground as reported by the finders. Traces of flax and leather on a few of the coins may indicate the presence of bags within the wooden box. (See below for a more detailed discussion of the scientific analysis.) The deposition of the coins in bags in a box may be linked to the composition of the hoard. While none of the coins in the hoard is unusual, it is slightly unusual for a hoard to be made up predominantly of small change. This suggests that, rather than being a savings hoard, this group of coins represents the cash supply of someone reasonably prosperous doing business in low-value commodities.

This is consistent with the findspot of the hoard. The coins were found on the foreshore below Bull Wharf, and examination of old maps of the area, together with the archaeological record, suggests that the findspot would have been out in the river at the date when the coins were deposited. This suggests accidental loss from a boat, adjacent to a busy harbour, rather than the deliberate deposition of the hoard for safe keeping. Because the coins were not apparently deposited with intent to recover, they were found not to be Treasure Trove by a coroner’s inquest.

The coins themselves are mostly fairly unremarkable. However, the hoard does contain one curiosity – an Elizabethan groat disguised as a sixpence (Pl. 32). Since coins at this period did not carry denominations, the only way to distinguish between groat and sixpence (apart from size and weight) was the presence of a rose behind the queen’s head on the obverse of the sixpence, and the date of issue above the shield on the reverse. In a period in which the clipping of coins was rife, this was a more immediate guide to the value of the coin than the size. The coin itself is quite worn, and someone has simply scratched in crude marks in the appropriate places for the rose and the date. This does not stand up to close examination, nor does the size of the coin. It seems likely that this alteration was designed to fool people when it was used in the sort of transaction where large amounts of relatively small change (especially groats and sixpences) were changing hands quickly, and close examination was unlikely. While we cannot know whether the owner of the hoard was actually fooled, the presence of the false sixpence amongst so many other groats and sixpences suggests that the hoard as a whole was the product of just that sort of transaction.

The composition of the hoard is consistent with others of the period. While Jacobean hoards are relatively rare, it is not unusual for those which do turn up to contain predominantly lower denominations, by contrast with the higher denomination hoards later in the seventeenth century. The Bull Wharf hoard particularly invites comparison with the 1990 Barrow Gurney hoard which, though smaller, had a very similar composition, from Mary down to James, and even including two silver reales of Ferdinand and Isabella. The hoard is also consistent with other Tudor and Jacobean hoards in that groats of Mary predominate over those of her successors.

### CONTENTS OF THE HOARD: TYPES AND WEIGHTS (all weights in grammes)

#### Mary

**Groat (32)**

- 1.81, 1.63, 1.34, 1.57, 1.53, 1.54, 1.46, 1.48, 1.29, 1.35, 1.78, 1.37, 1.45, 1.45, 1.42, 1.49, 1.29, 1.64, 1.52, 1.41, 1.57, 1.34, 1.31, 1.34, 1.53, 1.45, 1.55, 1.94, 1.54, 1.55.

#### Philip and Mary

**Groat (10)**

- 1.70, 1.53, 1.61, 1.66, 1.44, 1.46, 1.36, 1.39, 1.52, 1.50.

#### Elizabeth I

**1st Issue (1558–61)**

**Shilling**

Cross-crosslet (2) 5.61, 5.64; Martlet (3) 5.16, 5.34, 5.35

---

2 I am grateful to Hazel Forsyth of the Museum of London for this information.

3 B.J. Cook, 'Four Seventeenth Century Treasure Troves', *BNJ* 60 (1990), 87–98.


**SHORT ARTICLES AND NOTES**

**James VI & I, England**

**1st Coinage (1603-4)**

*Shilling*

Thistle (2) 5.61, 6.00; Lis (1) 5.70.

*Sixpence*

Thistle (2) 1603: 2.85, 2.81.

*Halfgroat*

Thistle (2) 0.97, 0.81; Lis (1) 0.88.

**2nd Coinage (1604-19)**

*Shilling*

Lis (4) 5.70, 5.80, 6.00, 5.87; Escallop (3) 5.49, 5.71, 5.86.

*Sixpence*

Lis (1) 1604: 2.76; Rose (1) 1605: 2.99; Coronet (2) 1607: 2.80; 1680: 2.52.

*Halfgroat*

Cinquefoil (1) 0.93.

**James VI & I, Scotland**

1st coinage (1604-7)

*Shilling*

Beli (3) 2.11, 1.99, 2.11; Martlet (2) 1.98, 2.08.

2nd coinage (1604-7)

*Shilling*

Martlet (1) 3.73; Rose (2) 4.19, 4.13.

**Spain, Ferdinand & Isabella**

*Real*

B (1) 2.22.
PLATE 23

DE JERSEY AND NEWMAN: IRON AGE COINS FROM BARHAM, SUFFOLK

COUPAR: BLACKHILLS HOARD

HARRIS AND SHARP: RASHLEIGH HALF GROAT
APPENDIX: EXAMINATION OF ORGANIC REMAINS ASSOCIATED WITH THE COINS FOUND AT BULL WHARF

CAROLINE R. CARTWRIGHT

Introduction

A hoard of 164 silver coins dating from the 16th and 17th centuries found at Bull Wharf on the Thames was submitted for examination as possible Treasure Trove. Initial assessment for surviving organic remains on the coins revealed positive traces in 55 instances.

Microscopic examination

Standard techniques of optical microscopy using reflected (incident) light were used to examine and identify surviving organic traces. Table 1 contains a breakdown of the material identified. Mineral-replaced wood accounted for over 27 per cent of the organic remains. Sufficient diagnostic anatomical detail survived to enable identification to be made to *Fraxinus excelsior*, ash wood. The following features were observed: a ring porous arrangement of vessels, dense alternate vessel pitting, simple perforation plates, mostly bi- and tri-seriate homocellular rays (with a few heterocellular rays present) and paratracheal circumvascular axial parenchyma. These fall within the key characteristics recorded by Schweingruber for *Fraxinus excelsior*, ash. Since all the identifiable traces of wood were ash, it is possible that these traces may represent a wooden box, originally containing the coins. Examples of coin hoards within wooden boxes have been recorded from around this period.

A few flax fibres were identified from two of the coins and vestigial traces of leather were found on four of the coins (mostly in association with one or more of the other categories of organic remains — see Table 1 for full details). It is not clear whether these can be attributed to linen wrapping of the coins and/or possibly even a leather bag for containing some or all of the coins (within the wooden box). Examples of leather for bagging coins have also been recorded for the period.

More recent (i.e. non mineral-replaced) grass stems and roots were found on ten of the coins, and presumably come from the burial environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Analysis of organic remains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wood &amp; wood, &amp; grass &amp; no organic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of coins with traces each material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AN EARLY SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY HOARD FROM ARDNAVE POINT, ISLAY

J. D. BATESON

This hoard of ninety-two European silver coins was recovered in sand dunes on Ardnave Point, Islay, the most southerly of the Hebridean islands at NGR: NR 294749. The majority of the coins were found by Edward Wilks, the young son of Major and Mrs C.L. Wilks, during the summers of 1996 and 1997. While holidaying on Islay in 1996, they were walking on the extensive sand dunes at Ardnave Point when they discovered the bulk of the coins where they had tumbled down from their hiding place when the face of a large dune had collapsed. A further search, with the aid of a metal-detector the following summer of 1997.

---


8 Seventeenth Century Treasure troves, p. 89. A hoard of coins deposited with the Court of Chancery c. 1700 (now on loan to the British Museum) was also contained in leather bags.
retrieved the remainder of the coins with one exception.

About the same time the site was visited by Dr David Caldwell, of the National Museums of Scotland, along with Mr Roger McWee, who found a final specimen after a very thorough search of the area also using a metal-detector. It would thus appear that the complete hoard has been recovered. No trace of a container came to light and nothing of archaeological interest, either associated finds or structural remains, was noted. There is nothing now visible that might once have served as a marker to aid the owner in the recovery of his hoard, but Mr McWee pointed out that the site’s elevated position would have allowed sightings on more distant landmarks. The find was declared to be Treasure Trove. Since this is the second seventeenth-century hoard from these sand dunes, it may be referred to as Ard nave No. 2.

The ninety-two coins are composed of eighty-eight ‘dollars’ and four ‘half-dollars’. Half are rijnshaalders of the United Netherlands, mainly issues of West Friesland, Zeeland and Gelders ranging in date from 1592 to 1631 but with most belonging to the 1620s. A dozen talers are of Austrian origin and these are accompanied by eleven pieces struck at a number of the Imperial cities. A further sixteen taler and two half-talers, represent no fewer than seventeen of the multitude of German states which had the right to coin. Apart from four issues of Denmark, the remainder of the find is made up of one specimen each of Liège, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland and Transylvania. The last is one of fifteen coins in the hoard dating to before 1600.

Only four of the coins found are dated 1630 or later. These consist of a taler of 1630 of Sigismund III of Poland, two speciedalers of Christian IV of Denmark struck in 1630 and 1632, and a Zeeland rijnshaldor of 1631. All four are in fairly worn condition and must have been in circulation for a few years at least, but beyond that they should then be expected to be accompanied by issues of the earlier 1630s and perhaps later years. A date of deposition for the hoard of about 1635 would not seem unreasonable. The Scottish issues of Charles I from 1637 are not uncommon and his English issues, especially sixpences, shillings and halfcrowns, came north in some numbers as the situation degenerated after 1638. This hoard does not therefore appear to belong to the Civil War.

It is in fact an unusual hoard to come from Scotland in view of its containing only Continental issues. Among over a dozen hoards deposited between 1600 and 1640 three did not contain Scottish or English coins: a hoard from Kincardine containing about forty Spanish ‘dollars’, of which the latest was of 1623; three ‘dollars’, one of 1631, found on the beach at Banff; and a discovery of twenty-two ‘dollars’, not dissimilar in range of origin to Ard nave No. 2, unearthed at Peterculter in Aberdeenshire, but unfortunately of uncertain date.

However a mixture of Continental crown-sized ‘dollars’ and English and Scottish halfcrowns and smaller denominations is more usual, as seen in the forty-three coins from Cromarty deposited after 1635 and the larger hoards from Strathblane and Irvine, both from the West of Scotland and probably concealed between 1635 and 1640. The English element dates back to an apparent influx of Tudor, mainly Elizabethan, issues after the accession of James VI to the English throne, and these along with subsequent issues played an important part in the Scottish currency until about 1670. Hoards from Castle Maol and Snizort on Skye and Ardmaddy Castle in Argyll show that such issues circulated in the West and Islands from early in the century. The fact that Ard nave No. 2 consists solely of Continental coins would suggest that it was hidden immediately after arriving in Scotland and before it had time to join the local currency pool and mix with native issues.

The large proportion of Dutch rijnshalders, exported in some numbers to the Baltic, along with the four coins of Christian IV of Denmark of which two are the latest pieces in the hoard, may indicate an ultimate Baltic origin for its contents. This may have been the route taken by a Scots mercenary returning home from the Thirty Years War. His savings may have been hidden once he had reached Islay, but it would seem rather ironic that after surviving the dangers of war some misfortune prevented him from recovering his cache.

Alternatively the coins may have come with a merchant who paid them out in exchange for food or other commodities. Islay, although no longer the centre of the defunct Lordship of the Isles with its seat of power at Finlaggan on the eastern half of the Island, was nevertheless still of some importance and wealth and is a not unexpected stopping place for a trading venture. Again misfortune may have prevented the new owner of the money from retrieving it and adding it to a wider range of currency.

However, misfortune in the form of shipwreck, may provide a third and more satisfactory explanation for the deposition of this hoard at Ard nave Point. It is a dangerous coast for ships and the sand dunes would have provided the nearest and quickest hiding place for...
the purse of an exhausted survivor coming ashore. Many reasons could then have prevented him from returning to the hiding place or perhaps the sand had shifted and the spot remained forever hidden from its luckless owner.

Although the Irvine hoard, noted above, contained 351 coins, most of the other early seventeenth-century Scottish hoards are somewhat smaller, usually with fewer than one hundred coins in each. Ardnave No. 2, with ninety-two coins, is therefore quite large for a Scottish pre-Civil-War hoard especially as the bulk of its contents consists of crown size coins. In terms of local value the ninety dollars in the find were worth over the not inconsiderable sum of £250 Scots. This was at a time when a labourer in Glasgow received approximately thirty shillings Scots per week and a mason around double that sum. A cow could be bought for £10 Scots and a sheep for £3 Scots.\(^5\)

This may be compared with the eighty-one coins from the Ardnave No. 1 hoard found in 1968 in sand dunes about half a mile to the south-west at NGR: NR 290747.\(^6\) However the latter contained only thirty Continental coins, mostly rijksdaalders, patagons and Austrian talers, mixed with English shillings from 1550 to 1640 and halfcrowns from 1632 to 1638. This clearly constitutes a Civil War hoard and appears to have no connection with Ardnave No. 2 other than one of fortuitous location. However both, fully recorded, are a valuable contribution to the build-up of a comprehensive picture of the currency pattern in the West of Scotland in the first half of the seventeenth century.

### CATALOGUE

#### UNITED NETHERLANDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rijksdaalder</th>
<th>West Friesland</th>
<th>1592 (1), 1593 (1), 1598 (2)</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch rijksdaalder</td>
<td>Gelders</td>
<td>1619 (1), 1620? (1), 1621 (1), 1623 (1), 1624 (2), uncertain (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friesland</td>
<td>1613 (1), 1620 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>1621 (1), 1623? (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overijssel</td>
<td>1618? (1), 1620 (1), uncertain (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Friesland</td>
<td>1612 (1), 1619 (1), 1620 (2), 1622 (2), 1622? (1), 1623 (1)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeeland</td>
<td>1620 (1), 1621 (1), 1623 (3), 1624 (3), 1625? (1), 1631 (1)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>1621 (2), 1620 (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| half Dutch rijksdaalder | Holland | 1625? | 1 |
|                         | Overijssel | 1628? | 1 |

#### AUSTRIA

| Ferdinand I as King of Rome | taler 1548 (Joachimstal) | 1 |
| HRE Rudolf II               | taler 1603 (Hall), 1607 (Hall, Ensisheim) | 3 |
| HRE Matthias                | taler 1614 (Kuttenberg - chicken) | 1 |
| HRE Ferdinand II            | taler 1624 (Brunn) | 1 |
| Archduke Ferdinand (1564–95) | taler, nd (Ensisheim x 2, Hall) | 3 |
| Archduke Leopold (as Bishop of Strassburg) | taler 1620 (Hall) | 1 |
| Salzburg, Archbishop of, Paris Von Lodron | taler 1623, 1625 | 2 |

#### IMPERIAL CITIES

| Frankfurt                  | taler 1622 (1), 1623 (1) | 2 |
| Hamburg                   | taler 1607 (1), 1621 (1), 1629 (1) | 3 |
| Kampen                    | rijksdaalder 1596 (2), 1598 (1) | 3 |
| Lübeck                    | taler 1627 | 1 |
| Nuremberg                 | taler 1623 | 1 |
| Zwolle                    | rijksdaalder nd (1594–1600) | 1 |

#### GERMANY

| Anhalt, Joint rulers       | taler 1624 | 1 |
| Bavaria, Maximilian I (as Elector) | taler 1625 | 1 |
| Germany, Brandenburg, Georg Wilhelm | half taler 1629 | 1 |

---


### SHORT ARTICLES AND NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coin</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, Heinrich Julius (Bishop of Halberstadt)</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>(Zellerfeld)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick-Bayreuth, Friedrich Ulrich</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1619, 1628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick-Lüneburg-Harburg, Wilhelm</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>(Moisberg?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick-Lüneburg, Christian</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>(Bishop of Minden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erbach</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugger, Maximilian of Wollenburg</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanau-Münzenberg, Catharina Belgica Regent</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessen-Cassel, Moritz</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagerndorf, Georg Friedrich of</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Brandenburg-Ansbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxony – Albertine Line, August</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxony, Johann Georg I and August of Naumburg</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Freiburg</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENMARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian IV</td>
<td>Speciedaler</td>
<td>1630, 1632</td>
<td>(Norway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holstein, Glückstadt, Christian IV</td>
<td>Speciedaler</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holstein-Gottorp, Friedrich III</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard de Groesbeeck</td>
<td>Rixdaler</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigismund III, Thorn</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus Adolpus</td>
<td>4 Marks</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Gallen</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSYLVANIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigmund Bathori</td>
<td>Taler</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A MIS-STRUCK SHILLING OF GEORGE III: MANY QUESTIONS AND A FEW ANSWERS

**P.P. Gaspar and H.E. Manville**

**Recently** the Royal Mint received an early nineteenth-century mis-struck coin that helps to illustrate aspects of minting in the then-new Royal Mint on Tower Hill but also raises many questions. The Royal Mint does not possess any examples of unstruck blank flans from the period of the George III 'New Coinage' (1816-1820) - nor does it seem likely that coin blanks in other hands could be assigned with confidence to that era. Thus it is fortunate that a coin that is nearly an unstruck blank, a shilling of 1820 struck 90 per cent off-centre in area (Pl. 24, 1), has been discovered. Its characteristics suggest how an unstruck flan of this era might have appeared: its diameter and thickness, weight, density (specific gravity) and, above all, a crucial aspect which normally would have been completely altered by striking - its edge.

**Description of the Coin**

This coin, having been struck between two dies, although barely, may be described as follows: approximately 90 per cent of obverse and reverse are blank and show a directional pattern of parallel...
scratches most evident along the axis 10 o'clock-4 o'clock on the obverse. These may be remnants of the rolling operation that converted an ingot into a metal strip, eliminating in the drag-bench when the strip was squeezed down to its final thickness before round coin blanks were punched from it by a blanking press. Another possible explanation of these scratches, that they were caused by an adjustment of the weight of a heavy blank by a filing operation seems to be ruled out by: 1) a description of the adjustment process in the period just after the move of the Mint to Tower Hill as 'filing the edges, to bring them to the exact weight', and 2) since this piece is so light that it is outside the remedy, it may be inferred that it was not adjusted.

Aside from the 10 per cent struck portion, the diameter of the flan is quite uniform. 0.9108 ± 0.0003 inch (23.14 ± 0.008 mm) in the direction 10 o'clock-4 o'clock, 0.9109 ± 0.0003 inch (23.14 ± 0.008 mm) along the 2 o'clock-8 o'clock line, and 0.9106 ± 0.0001 inch (23.13 ± 0.003 mm) along the 3 o'clock-9 o'clock axis. The lack of elongation in the direction of the pattern of obverse scratches is puzzling if they are artifacts of the rolling operation. These dimensions can be compared with the 23.16 mm (0.9118 inch) 6 o'clock-12 o'clock and 23.19 mm (0.9130 inch) 3 o'clock-9 o'clock diameter of an 1820 shilling obverse die (Hocking ii, 601)2 in the museum of the Royal Mint. The thickness of the coin at its centre is 0.0503 inches (1.28 mm). The coin weighs 5.62127 ± 0.00018 grams (0.52 grain), which is outside the remedy for grains (5.655 grams). Thus the coin is light by 0.034 grams (86.75 grains), compared to the official issue weight of 66 shillings to the Troy pound or 87.272727 parts (4.7 parts per thousand or 0.027 gram (0.41 grains). The density (specific gravity) of the coin is 10.37 ± 0.03 grams/cubic centimetre, which compares favourably with the value of 10.36 given by Caley.3

There are differences between the obverse and reverse of the 10 per cent struck portion. The obverse remnant shows the last digit of the 1820 date, the pointed tip of the truncation of the bust, a portion of the X, and the ED of the legend BRIT:REX F:D:. These are sharply struck and depressed below the 'obverse' surface of the flan (Pl. 24, 2). The reverse remnant consists of HONI of the motto HONI SOIT QUIL MAL Y PENSE on the Garter band, but it appears smeared toward the edge and is almost level with the surface plane of the 'reverse' (Pl. 24, 3).

Position of the Dies and the Striking Sequence

It is well known that the upper die is under greater stress from the blow that impresses the designs on both surfaces of a coin blank than is the lower die, because the blank cushions the lower die from the impact. In the period of the hammered coinage the more easily replaced die, the reverse, was usually the upper die or trussel. The practice of placing the reverse die above and the obverse die below generally continued into the milled series, even when steam-driven machinery was used and there was no difference in the ease of production of obverse and reverse dies.

In the case of the George III New Coinage shillings (1816-1820), the use of the reverse as the upper die can be verified from existing die-caps. These occur when a struck coin adheres to one of the dies (almost always the upper die when a collar is employed) and causes brockages when struck against an incoming blank flan. The illustrated 1817 die-cap in the Royal Mint collection (Pl. 24, 4) strongly suggests that the reverse die was uppermost: the reverse design has retained its sharp image from adhering to the die after the coin was struck normally, while at least one brockage was struck with the coin's lower surface (the obverse design) acting in place of the reverse die, and the die-cap coin has begun to cup around the reverse die. Conversely, the obverse image on the coin has begun to spread after impacting at least once on a blank.

In attempting to reconstruct the striking sequence for the 1820 mis-strike, it seems likely that: (a) the blank flan was seated 90 per cent off-centre on the lower (obverse) die, (b) the mis-alignment prevented the collar from surrounding the blank during the descent of the upper (reverse) die, and (c) the blow from the upper die on the 10 per cent of the flan between the dies produced unequal impressions of the dies on the struck portion of the coin. The impression of the obverse (lower) die is sharper and further below the surface of the unstruck portion of the flan. The impression of the reverse (upper) die is somewhat blurred, as if the blank curved slightly around the neck of the upper die.

Edge Marking and the Concave Edge

Two types of blank flans have been distinguished for the milled coinage. Type I flans are the round disks just as they are produced by a blanking press. Their edges

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to Graham Dyer, Librarian and Curator of the Royal Mint, for valuable discussions, access to Mint documents, and measurements of an 1820 shilling die. We also thank Eric P. Newman and David Sellwood for helpful advice. Photographs were provided by Michael Dudley, lately photographer at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

have a characteristic partially torn, partially sheared appearance that can be seen on specimens of eighteenth-century farthings and halfpennies struck in the mint at the Tower. Type II flans have been passed through an upsetting mill or edge-marking apparatus (these machines have been given various names as indicated below). This apparatus compresses the edge of the blank, reducing its diameter and raising a shallow ridge around the rim of the flan. The purpose of this operation is to reduce the force exerted by the press that was required for the dies to produce a crisp impression of the designs (e.g. beading or denticles) near the coin edge and a square edge that will enable the coin to pile and stack and offer some protection against wear.

The 90 per cent off-centre 1820 shilling is virtually a Type II blank and offers the first opportunity to examine the product of the edge-marking apparatus in the ‘new’ Royal Mint relocated from the Tower to the handsome Smirke building on Little Tower Hill in the previous decade. There is very little information about the edge-marking apparatus employed in the early days on Tower Hill. This is not surprising, considering the similarity between the process employed to upset the edge of a blank and that used to impart lettering or graining to the edge in the old Mint within the Tower. During the entire period of its use from 1662 until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the personnel entrusted with the edge-marking process were sworn by special oath to keep the operations of this device secret.

The anonymous article on “Coinage” that appeared in 1820s editions of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, and is attributed to Robert Mushet in a copy in the library of the Royal Mint, contains engravings dated 1818. While much of Boulton’s steam-driven machinery is illustrated, the edge-marking machinery is a hand-operated parallel-bar machine that resembles the seventeenth-century Paris apparatus of Castaing, itself repatriated from London where it had been transplanted by Blondeau by 1656 and put into use at the Tower in 1662.4 The Castaing apparatus was illustrated by Boizard in 1692.

The coin that is the subject of this paper is c. 0.003 inches (0.08 mm) thicker at its rim than at its centre (0.054 versus 0.051 inch or 1.37 versus 1.29 mm). Dimensions for the mis-struck 1820 shilling are compared in the following table with those of a normal 1817 shilling and with data provided by Pettiford for cupro-nickel and 50 per cent silver shillings and a Mauritius 0.9166 fine silver rupee.5 These data allow a comparison to be made of the edge-marking operation in 1820 and later versions of the edge-marking process.

### TABLE 1: Effects of Edge-Marking and Striking on the Dimensions of Selected Coins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin</th>
<th>Diameter of Struck Coin</th>
<th>Rim Thickness of Struck Coin</th>
<th>Rim Thickness of Marked Blank</th>
<th>Unmarked Blank Thickness</th>
<th>Diameter of Marked Blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1820 shilling (mis-struck)</td>
<td>0.9017&quot; ± 0.0003&quot;</td>
<td>0.0630&quot; ± 0.0005&quot;</td>
<td>0.0537&quot; ± 0.0007&quot;</td>
<td>0.0504&quot; ± 0.0003&quot;</td>
<td>0.9017&quot; ± 0.0003&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817 shilling</td>
<td>0.921&quot;</td>
<td>0.0585&quot;</td>
<td>0.063&quot;</td>
<td>0.0504&quot; ± 0.0003&quot;</td>
<td>0.921&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.500 Ag shilling (1932)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Ni shilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9166 Ag Mauritius rupee</td>
<td>1.179&quot;</td>
<td>0.063&quot;</td>
<td>0.069&quot;</td>
<td>0.0504&quot; ± 0.0003&quot;</td>
<td>1.179&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Maximum dimensions

The difference between the rim thickness and the thickness over most of the flan of the mis-struck 1820 shilling, (0.0537 ± 0.0007) - (0.0504 ± 0.0003) = 0.0033 ± 0.0010", is smaller than the thickening of the rim during the edge-marking process for the two twentieth-century examples for which data are provided by Pettiford: cupro-nickel shillings, 0.063 - 0.0585 = 0.0045"; and Mauritius silver rupees, 0.069 - 0.063 = 0.006". The further increase in rim thickness during the striking process, as approximated by the difference

---

between the rim thicknesses of an unworn, normal 1817 shilling and the mis-struck 1820 shilling: (0.0630 ± 0.0005) - (0.0537 ± 0.0007) = 0.0093 ± 0.0012", similar to that given by Pettiford for cupro-nickel shillings: 0.072 - 0.063 = 0.009".

Twenty-first-century practice, according to Pettiford, was to 'mark' blanks so that their diameters were c. 0.002" smaller than that of the collar within which they were struck. The diameters of the finished coins, however, are c. 0.002" greater than the inner diameters of the collars in which they were struck, due to 'spring' upon being forced out of the collar.

One further feature of the mis-struck piece should be noted: its slightly concave edge. The concavity is quite shallow. Measurements of the diameter at its maximum value with a standard micrometer and at its minimum with a 0.25" ball micrometer gave identical measurements within the 0.0007" statistical error of the intercalibration of the measurements. This places only concavity, together with a slightly raised rim, the slight concavity of the mis-struck 1820 shilling, among cases they are flat or slightly convex. The purpose of virtually a Type II blank, is uncertain. It may be that for cupro-nickel shillings: 0.072 - 0.063 = 0.009".

Questions about edge marking raised by the mis-struck 1820 shilling

It is quite clear that the blank on which this piece was struck was edge-marked (Pl. 24, 5). Since the rim was thickened only about one-half as much as in later practice, one wonders whether this difference reflects different capabilities of the apparatus employed. What do we know about the edge-marking apparatus in the new steam-powered mint at Tower Hill?

There is, in the library of the Royal Mint, a manuscript 'Inventory of Machinery of His Majesty's Mint' signed by George Rennie and dated 25 August 1818. It mentions a 'milling room' with three sets of 'milling frames' but these may well be machine tools for dealing with disused crucibles rather than edge-marking apparatus. The absence of recognizable edge-marking apparatus from this inventory of the new mint may reflect the continued use of the old hand-powered parallel-bar machines of the Blondeau/Castaing type.

As already stated, the description of edge-marking in the article 'Coinage' in the Britannica of the 1820s is anachronistic, describing the application of grained or lettered edges to blanks before being struck by the dies in a Boulton steam-powered coining press which employed collars that could not be used with grained or lettered blanks.

There is an article entitled 'Coining Machinery' in The American Edition of the New Edinburgh Encyclopaedia, Conducted by David Brewster. Along with engravings of the new steam-driven machinery at Tower Hill, there are illustrations of a hand-operated blanking press, parallel-bar 'milling' machine, and screw press. The text says of edge-marking: 'this operation, as before mentioned, is not shown in our mint, but we believe that Mr. Boulton has improved this process as well as the others; at least some of his coins have milling of a kind very different from any other, and which, we think, could not be done by the machine we have represented on plate CCl'.

A copy of a later manuscript in the library of the Royal Mint entitled 'Moneyer's Hand Book', written after 1856 by R.W. Franklyn, one of the last apprentices of the Company of Moneyers, also describes a hand-operated parallel-bar apparatus. Franklyn added: 'this is merely an illustration of the old hand machine not now in use, having been superseded by steam machinery / though the principle is the same d'.

A rotary apparatus called a 'marking machine' or 'edge-compressor' was described and illustrated by George F. Ansell in 1862. The machine illustrated by Ansell was designed and constructed by Meredith Jones. The blank is fed horizontally into a pair of grooves: one on a stationary block and the other cut into the face of a rotating disc. The blank is compressed and forced to revolve by the motion of the rotating disc, its diameter reduced and its edge thickened. The output of this machine was 700 blanks a minute. The eight coining presses struck at the rate of sixty to eighty coins a minute, so one rotary edge-marking machine could supply all of the new Boulton presses.

Ansell also informs us that: 'up to 1861 the best machine for this purpose was that invented and patented by Messrs. R. Heaton and Sons, ...'. We have seen the abridgment of patent no. 1855, 11 August 1839 to R. and G. Heaton. While the inventions described are feed mechanisms for machines that mill the edges of blanks and strike them into coins, the machines...
themselves are diagrammed. The Heaton edge-marking apparatus forces a blank to revolve in a channel between the edge of a rotating disc and a curved shoe or jig. This is similar to the twentieth-century apparatus described by Pettiford.

From the Newton papers it can be worked out that the hand-operated parallel-bar edge-marking apparatus of Blondeau worked at the rate of c. twenty blanks a minute. It thus seems unlikely that such apparatus was kept in use at Tower Hill. Indeed Craig tells us that in the new mint: 'edge-marking machines were dropped for the nonce; they were revived for putting inscriptions on the edges of Waterloo medals, and from the 1830s were restored to general use for perfecting and raising the rims of all coins'. The mis-struck 1820 shilling that is the subject of this paper demonstrates that some form of edge-marking apparatus was in use in 1820, so if Craig’s statement is read as suggesting the contrary, it must be dismissed.

What kind of edge-marking apparatus was employed in 1820? Pettiford describes a power driven, automatically fed, parallel-bar machine in use at Tower Hill in the 1940s for the production of grooved ‘security edges’ on the blanks before they were struck within a collar in a coining press. The speed of this machine is not given, but it resembles the old hand-operated apparatus modified by a power source to give reciprocating motion to the slide to which one of the parallel bars is attached, and a feed mechanism. The blanks are fed horizontally and fit into grooves on both parallel bars, one fixed, the other attached to the slide. Movement of the slide forces the blank to revolve between the two bars impressing the security groove in its edge. An earlier version of such a power-driven parallel-bar machine may have been in use in 1820. This would allow edge-marking at a faster rate that was possible with a hand-actuated machine.

Conclusion

The mis-struck 1820 shilling discussed in this paper provides a glimpse of a vital but incompletely and inconsistently documented phase in the production of coins in the new Tower Hill mint: the treatment of the blanks before they were struck in a coining press. That an edge-marking process was used to compress the edges of the blanks and cause their rims to become thicker is demonstrated by the physical characteristics of this specimen. It is hoped that this piece will help elucidate the nature of the apparatus employed.

WHO WAS ‘R.Y.’?
SEARCHING FOR AN IDENTITY

D.W. DYKES

The Gentleman’s Magazine, first published in 1731, was the archetype of those general-interest monthlies which, together with the novel and the newspaper, were a yardstick of the growth of a reading public in eighteenth-century Britain. The first periodical to use the word ‘magazine’ in its title, it boasted ‘more in quantity and greater variety than any book of the kind and price’. And, as a ‘treasury of genteel opinion’, The Gentleman’s Magazine brought a wealth of enlightenment to a leisured readership: Parliamentary reports – which it pioneered – news items, notices of appointments, bankruptcies and deaths, poetic offerings, feature-articles and reviews all jostled for a place on its closely-printed pages; with Goldsmith’s precept of being ‘never . . . long dull upon one subject’ continually in mind, all were presented in what was hoped would be a lively and diverting manner.

With the Humanities still at the heart of polite culture and with enthusiasm for the material remains of antiquity – increasingly the subject of collection, description and classification – the mark of the virtuoso, it was only natural that the current pervasive taste and curiosity in things of the past, extending into the relics of Britain’s own history, should be reflected in the country’s best-selling magazine. Antiquarian topics, superficial as their treatment might be, were thus recurring themes. And, in its heyday before the appearance of The Numismatic Journal and The

1 Mr. Robert Thompson first aroused my interest in the identity of ‘R.Y.’ by asking me if it could have been the collector I suggest in this note; my thanks are due to him, therefore, for setting me on the trail. I must stress, though, that what follows is purely an exercise in surmise and little more than a personal jeu d’esprit.
2 Despite competition from an increasing number of rivals – most notably The Monthly and The European Magazine – The Gentleman’s Magazine soon established itself as the leading monthly of its sort, surviving – if latterly only as a shadow of itself – until after the Great War.
Numismatic Chronicle in the 1830s, The Gentleman's Magazine, with its notices of coin finds, questions of identification, essays and correspondence, was something of a storehouse of numismatic intelligence. Obviously the emphasis was on ancient and medieval coinage but, in a magazine of eclectic taste embracing the interest of layman as well as connoisseur, even the present-day found a place in a medley of topical themes from talk of new coinages, accounts of crime – and especially its punishment – to reflections on the state of the currency.

The seventeenth-century trade token, having achieved some degree of antiquarian respectability thanks to Thomas Snelling, was a constant subject of notice, but in the latter years of the eighteenth century its contemporary successor also attracted at least occasional attention. What was, as far as I know, the first illustration of an eighteenth-century token appeared in the Supplement to the magazine at the year's end of 1787 when, in a plate of miscellaneous coins, pride of place was given to the first substantive issue of the Parys Mine Company (the '0' penny) which had ushered in the new token era in the early spring of that year. An engraving of a Cranebane halfpenny followed in 1789. To readers of The Gentleman's Magazine, in any case probably not too directly affected by their circulation, such tokens were essentially curiosities. And, as currency, so long as reasonable standards were maintained, they were, on the whole, unexceptionable. It was not until an increasing mass of inferior pieces began to flood the market in 1794 that tokens became the subject of critical debate – or indeed any debate – in the magazine. Then, for a few months between the December of that year and the following spring, a vigorous, if brief, exchange of letters gave vent to mounting disquiet over a provincial coinage that was perceived to be increasingly dominated by low-weight and debased issues of questionable provenance and redemption little better than the ever-present dross of counterfeit halfpennies that had been the bane of the copper coinage for so many years. In March 1795 the correspondence exhausted itself in an exasperated cri de coeur:

Whenever the din of war is over, which I sincerely pray may be soon, let those who are in authority, and to whom it belongs, encourage a Bolton [sic], and altogether suppress the Birmingham counterfeits and the tradesmen's tokens altogether?

It was not to be renewed for eighteen months and then, in September 1796, not in terms of tokens as currency but rather, since provincial coins had by now become established as the quarry of the connoisseur although the 'token mania' of the previous year was on the wane, their collection. And, in particular, the 'arranging' or classifying of one's cabinet. Or ostensibly so, for although a new correspondent, 'R.Y.', set out to suggest a complex classification of tokens to save collectors 'much valuable time . . . in the same sort of trifling research', picking up the earlier theme his real purpose (which he confessed was the object he had in view) was to prevent:

the circulation of a great quantity of base metal, which is coined under the pretence of supplying persons who are collecting what are (as the business is now carried on, improperly) called Promissory Tokens. To those whom real taste, or a spirit of encouraging the Arts, has induced to form collections of this nature, the imposition, which has for a great length of time been practising, has long since been too apparent.

He went on:

The traffick on this sort of article has now got to so great a height, and is so systematically promoted by means of printed catalogues and other publications, that it seems fulltime [sic] to endeavour at the relief of a number of well-meaning individuals from the frauds which are creeping upon them; which are increased and increasing in such a degree as to make a pursuit, which at its commencement was an elegant, but not costly, Holyhead, by Hugh Davis, 1666, is here copied, fig. 3) is coined in Birmingham for the use of the great copper mine in the Isle of Anglesea, called Paris Mountain, they not being able to procure good halfpence for the payment of their labourers'. It was, though, as much a deficiency of silver for wage-payments as the Parys Mine Company's lack of 'good halfpence' that brought about the Anglesea tokens, and, critically, Thomas Williams's jockeying for a regal copper coinage contract.
one, an object of very great expense; indeed, of an expense great in proportion as the art of coining is disgraced.8

Prima facie, 'R.Y.'s criticism was directed at the mules and concoctions fabricated for the seedier London dealers and puffed by their catalogue.s9 Charles Pye, he noted, had 'so long ago as September 1795, to his honour, disdained to let his name appear any longer to the publication he had been conducting [i.e. Pye's serial octavo plates of engravings, Provincial Copper Coins and Tokens, published between June 1794 and August 1795]. He considered the productions then daily issuing as a disgrace to the age he lived in; and, having presented the publick with the representations of all that had any merit, very properly closed his work'.10

'R.Y.'s letter, which also contained a critique of the accuracy of some of Pye's drawings, elicited a reply from the engraver himself in the December issue of the magazine. (In the meantime, 'R.Y.' had had an opportunity of seeing for himself, 'from the respectable hands in which they were at Birmingham', some of the actual tokens Pye had used for his engravings and had sent in an emendatory postscript on 7 October 1796.)11 Pye's rejoinder was corrective but courteous, and supportive both of 'R.Y.'s 'mode of arrangement' and of his strictures on the current spate of concoctions:

So long as they [provincial coins] were manufactured with reputation [wrote Pye], it was to me a pleasing systematically brought forward; and collectors have purchased without considering that they were manufactured for no other purpose than to impose on them.12

The pleasantries of this cosy colloquy were rudely shattered in the January 1797 issue of the magazine by a blistering attack on 'R.Y.' from one 'CIVIS', writing from the 'Banks of the Tay'.13 The over-earnest 'CIVIS' had been piqued by 'R.Y.'s 'lofty tone', 'frigid disgust' and 'affectation',14 and there was little that he could agree with in the latter's letter.

'R.Y.'s elaboration of 'seven different descriptions' was both 'troublesome and unnecessary'.15 But, of all 'R.Y.'s grievances, what especially affronted 'CIVIS' was the former's attitude to political pieces. Recalling to 'more regular collectors of provincial tokens ... the objects they had in view when they first entered on the pursuit' 'R.Y.' had commented in a craftily disingenuous paragraph:

Judging from myself, I say that those objects were the collecting and preserving a particular species of coinage, which hereafter might be a curiosity, would do credit to the Artists who had assisted in it, and shew posterity to what an improved state the art had advanced at the present times. They little meant to lend their sanction to the clumsy and paltry productions which are hourly issuing from every dirty alley in London or Birmingham, for the purposes of imposition, in some instances for purposes of a more serious and premeditated ill-tendency: much less to the encouragement of a very extensive circulation of base coinage [my italics].16

That 'R.Y.' was as much concerned with the subversive nature of tokens as with the fraud of concoctions is brought out again by his advice to 'more regular' collectors on the 'division of their cabinet': having suggested six heads, he had added, pointedly, that 'such as wish to drink from the very ditch of this dirty traffic may make a seventh division for political pieces'.17

While agreeing with 'R.Y.' that 'a very large proportion of these pieces ... from their mean execution and design ... [were] unworthy of the patronage of any person of good taste and good sense', the latter's 'very peevish humour' was too much for 'CIVIS':

Pye's dates (1749–1830) are frequently confused with those of his elder son, also Charles (1777–1864) and also an engraver.

GM 1796, Part II (September), 752–3; 753.

9 'Christopher Williams', A Descriptive List of the Provincial Copper Coins (London [John Hammond, 12 St. Martin's Lane] 1795); T. Spence, The Coin Collector's Companion (London [Thomas Spence, 8 Little Turnstile, High Holborn] 1795); J. Hammond, The Virtuoso's Guide (London [John Hammond in association with Matthew Denton, Hospital Gate, West Smithfield] 1795); M. Denton, (T. Prattent, from April 1797), The Virtuoso's Companion and Coin Collector's Guide (London [Matthew Denton from September 1796 at 139, St Johns Street West Smithfield]) 1795–97): for a survey of these catalogues see David Dykes, Virtuoso's Companions (London forthcoming).

10 As in n. 8, p. 753; see Charles Pye, Provincial Copper Coins or Tokens issued between the Years 1782 and 1796 (London and Birmingham 1795), 'Advertisement'.

13 The over-earnest 'CIVIS' advocated a basic alphabetical classification of one general class of tokens 'as Mr Birchall [Samuel Birchall, A Descriptive List of the Provincial Copper Coins or Tokens ... (Leeds 1796)] has very properly done'.
... the trifling political jettons of Spence and others, sedition pieces (improperly put into Birchall's List, p. 3) &c. ... can produce no effect more important than that of licentious caricatures, which excite laughter, or incur contempt ... Surely R.Y. does not 'do well to be angry,' and ascribe a grovelling taste for dirty ditch-water to such of his brother collectors as may be disposed to set apart a cell or two in a miscellaneous drawer for such luxae monetae. The enlightened medallist is of no party.16

In April 'R.Y.' responded to 'CIVIS' s 'ill-tempered reflexions', justifying his 'arrangement' with its potential for comparison whereby 'pieces of merit would continue to find their way into cabinets' while 'the trash would be thrown aside'. Again, it was political pieces that were uppermost in his mind:

[The Trial-tokens, when seen together in the same drawer, will appear what they really are, with a very few exceptions, beneath the notice of any friend of the Arts. By classing the political pieces together he will observe better how little merit is to be found in them. For the most part, they are despicable in their designs, and most clumsily struck on the basest metal.19]

While 'CIVIS', perhaps, would have found 'R.Y.'s censure of The Virtuoso's Companion for its promotion of Spence's and Denton's own mules that followed unexceptionable, he would hardly have been mollified by 'R.Y.'s condemnation of the 'Trial Tokens': he had himself, after all, expatiated on 'the cruel imprisonment of Ridgeway and Symonds and the glorious and memorable acquittal of Hardy and others' in The Monthly Magazine of the previous December.20 It is also unlikely that a later paragraph would have passed 'CIVIS' by:

It is not long since I called at Spence's shop, and saw many many thousands of different tokens lying in heaps ... I confess, considering the number I saw struck, and what the subjects of them were, I thought myself justified in supposing that it was the intention to circulate them very widely ... [I]t is not because a jetton proceeds from the shop of one of the three

Thomas's that I would reject it, but because, having no merit in the execution, I see no good, but many bad purposes answered by encouraging its circulation [my italics].21

Again an artful statement capable of being read in more than one way: the working of a lawyer's mind, perhaps, which was only too aware of the insidious nature of radical propaganda and Spence's command of it.

The Convention of The Gentleman's Magazine, by tradition, tended to be anonymous or pseudonymous and although the identity of some of its correspondents can be traced from the Nichols File in the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C., that of the majority still remains a mystery.22 Such is the case with our writers on provincial coins who, in adopting an incognito, consigned themselves to limbo. While we know from a variety of sources that 'CIVIS' was the irrepressible radical merchant James Wright, Junior, of Dundee,23 the hapless 'R.Y.' has defied recognition. There are, though, a few internal clues in the letters which perhaps go some way to suggesting who he might have been. What follows is an attempt, admittedly slightly speculative, to unmask him.

We must start with 'R.Y.'s letter in the April 1797 issue of The Gentleman's Magazine. Here he tells us that he lives 'in the neighbourhood of a very populous manufacturing town, the principal inhabitants of which long since cautioned their fellow-townsmen against taking the base metal in circulation'.24 This, I feel, is little more than a thinly veiled reference to the widely reported decision of the magistrates and inhabitants of Stockport in January 1789, famously quoted by Matthew Boulton to Lord Hawkesbury, to take 'no other halfpence in future but those of the Anglesea Company'.25 If I am right it would mean that 'R.Y.' lived not too far from the mushrooming industrial sprawl of Manchester.

Secondly, in his letter of 7 October 1796, as we have seen, he indicates that he had had the opportunity, if a hurried one, of looking over the tokens that Charles Pye had used for the engravings in his Provincial Copper Coins or Tokens.26 The implication of this statement is that at some point between 21 August - the date of his first letter - and 7 October he had himself been to Birmingham.

16 GM 1797, Part 1 (January), 34; 31: 32. 'CIVIS', as someone with extreme radical leanings, had good reason to underplay the revolutionary spirit and language of the political pieces. Equally, he could readily appreciate the satirical intent of Spence's productions. On the nature of Spence's tokens see Marcus Wood, Radical Satire and Print Culture 1790-1822 (Oxford 1994), pp. 54-95.
19 GM 1797, Part 1 (April), 267-68.
20 The Monthly Magazine. December 1796, 869. In GM 1798, Part 1 (March), 215, another correspondent [Charles Shephard] was to take 'CIVIS' to task for thus introducing 'the uncertain subject of politics and anti-ministerial defamation in essays of a very different and more invariable nature'.
21 GM 1797, Part 1 (April), 269.
26 GM 1796, Part 11 (October), 838; 1797 (April), Part I, 267.
In the third place, although, in the face of the onslaught from Wright, 'R.Y.' had stressed the crudity of the fabric and the paucity of the design of political pieces, one is never left in any real doubt about his instinctive suspicion of the seditious intent of such tokens and his total lack of sympathy for extreme radical politics.27

These clues - if such they are - are admittedly sketchy in the extreme, but, taken with 'R.Y.'s initials, they do point to a particular contemporary collector who had more than a passing interest in provincial coins, who was rigidly orthodox in his political opinions and who had a virtually professional sensitivity to seditious propaganda, real or perceived.

It was not an unusual eighteenth-century practice to invent a pseudonym simply by using as initials certain letters of one's name, the first letter of a forename and the last of one's surname, for example. If this is the case here then 'R.Y.' might conceivably suggest the collector William Robert Hay (1761-1839). Although Hay's well-provenanced collection was, of course, his preferred Christian name - inherited from his uncle and godfather Robert Hay Drummond, archbishop of York (1761-76) - seems to have been Robert; and, to his radical detractors, in the days of his notoriety after 'Peterloo', he became known as the 'Reverend Robert Rednose'.28

If Hay is our man then the other clues could fall into place. In 1796 Hay, the third son of the Honourable Edward Hay and grandson of the seventh earl of Kinnoul, was a barrister practising on the Northern Circuit and holding the office of steward of the Manorial Court of Manchester. His biographer, Canon Peter Spence (1750-1814), tells us, however, that 'his briefs were few, and not succeeding in his first oratorical efforts, he had the prudence to abandon the pursuit of the law' and entered a Manchester surgeon, William Wagstaffe, and widow of John Astley of Dukinfield in Cheshire and lived at Dukinfield Lodge, both as a barrister and as a clergyman, until his presentation to the rectory of Ackworth in the West Riding in 1802. In 1796-97 Hay, still a barrister, would have been resident in Dukinfield which happened to be a township of the parish of Stockport a bare eight miles from the centre of Manchester, already 'a very populous manufacturing town' of some 80,000 souls.

Hay was a numismatist with a particular interest in eighteenth-century provincial coinage, and together with two Manchester colleagues, Thomas Tomlinson, a surgeon, and William Orme, a drawing master, he was responsible for the issue of the 1796 'private' Buxton token [Dalton & Hamer – Derbyshire 1-3].29 He had evidently subscribed to Pye's original octavo plates and to The Virtuoso's Companion, and possessed what Hamer concluded was a presentation copy of Birchall's Alphabetical List of Provincial Copper Coins or Tokens, which he used as a sort of catalogue of his collection. Hay was an inveterate jotter and grangerizer and his bound copies of 'Pye' and of 'Denton' are quite heavily annotated with comments that have become valuable primary evidence for the numismatist.30

There are some remarkable congruences between a number of these notes and what 'R.Y.' has to say especially in respect of 'Pye' and 'Denton' which I do not think can be explained away simply on a prior reading of The Gentleman's Magazine, although Hay makes it plain that he had digested Pye's letter of December 1796 and refers to it in his copy of the plates. While there is no clear indication as to when his notes were composed, some of those in 'Denton' seem to span a considerable period of time, up to 1818 at least; the notes in 'Pye', on the other hand, appear to have a more immediate contemporary quality.

Two entries in Hay's 'Pye', for example, catch the eye. In respect of Plate 3, no. 2 [Roe & Company's 'Bust' halfpenny dated 1792] Hay writes 'I have one of these, dated 1790, which is the original. Indeed as I understood from Mr. Abraham Mills, who at present is one of the partners in the same Copper Works, all other dates are counterfeits, as only one die was ever cast', 'R.Y.', in his letter of September 1796, states 'Of that [the Macclesfield halfpenny] with Mr. Roe's head, I am informed the only genuine one is of the date 1790'.

With regard to Plate 34, no. 1 [Rebello's 'Hackney Promisory Token'] Hay tells us 'This representation is


29 That the Buxton token was stricto sensu 'private' is questionable. Buxton, on the high road between Manchester and Derby, and being developed as a spa to rival Bath by the fifth duke of Devonshire, was a natural resort for the elite of Manchester; the token was probably intended as a momento for visitors to the shops, lodgings and hotels that comprised Buxton Crescent, at the time regarded in the north as a remarkable architectural achievement.
taken from a genuine one given to Mr. Pye by Mr Rebello. . . . After his death [Rebello died in May 1796] a counterfeit was struck for which I gave 25/- which see Denton. Plate 102, N° 408, and the obverse and reverse were struck on Penny Tokens and interchanged with others'. ‘R.Y.’, in the April 1797 issue of *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, has this to say about the Rebello token: ‘No sooner was the proprietor deceased, but a counterfeit token was struck from very inferior dies, and sold at 2s. each. Impressions were taken on penny pieces . . . and the dies were interchanged and crossed into others’.

Such parallels, I recognise, by no means establish any positive correlation of identity between Hay and ‘R.Y.’ but one other entry in Hay’s copy of ‘Pye’ deserves some attention in this excursus:

The principal die sinkers [of eighteenth-century tokens] were J Milton of the Tower, Boulton and Watt of Birmingham, Wyon of Birmingham, Hancock of the same place, under whom Jorden learnt the art, and Mainwaring. In September 1796, I learnt at Birmingham that Mainwaring was dead, one W. Lutwyche then living at the top of Temple St. had bought his dies. Hancock had given up the business, as had Jorden and who had gone into a Manufactory for Patent Window frames, and lived at N° II Great Charles St. Jorden told me Wyon had left off business, but I understood otherwise, and that he was executing dies for Kempson and Nevill. . . . Mr. Cha; Pye the publisher, and engraver, lived in the suburbs of Birmingham, at a place called Deritend.

This gloss is important for its vignette of the Birmingham token industry in what were its terminal days; for our purpose, though, its significance lies in the reference to Hay’s having been in the town in the September of 1796. Doubtless his visit was in connection with the manufacture of the Buxton token, but it is clear that he took the opportunity to find out all he could about token production more generally. He had met both Jorden and Lutwyche and put on record their addresses; in my view his mention of Pye’s locale carries with it at least the hint that he had taken some trouble to seek out the engraver. Other comments, elsewhere in the book, such as ‘Pye told me . . .’ suggests to me that at some time they did meet. My feeling is that this meeting took place in September 1796 and that it is the self-same meeting which ‘R.Y.’ intimates took place between 21 August and 7 October of that year.

Hay was an avid collector with a wide range of like-minded correspondents and acquaintances: Birchall, Bisset, Pye, and Miss Banks who supplied him with pieces for his collection. His copy of ‘Denton’ records the purchases he made of Henry Young and, according to Raines who came into possession of the manuscript catalogue of Hay’s coins and medals, his ‘spolia opima were rare and genuine’: after his death they sold for £200. We do not know what happened to them or, after Raines’s time, his manuscript catalogue. In 1903 Hamer had his copies of ‘Birchall’, the octavo ‘Pye’ and *The Virtuoso’s Companion*; at the present time Mr R.H. Thompson owns Hay’s *Virtuoso’s Companion* while the ‘Birchall’ and ‘Pye’ have recently come into the possession of the writer.

What clearly emerges from Hay’s annotations of ‘Denton’ is his twofold detestation of Matthew Denton’s sedulous foisting of mules on unsuspecting collectors and Thomas Spence’s radical propagandising. Hay was sufficiently exercised to compose his own ‘introduction’ to his copy of *The Virtuoso’s Companion*. He wrote inter alia:

Denton was an engraver & printer, but a man of no eminence in his art; and was intimate with all the inferior manufacturers and jobbers in provincial Tokens – indeed it is probable that the work was supported by them in order to induce hasty collectors to buy the trash they circulated. Thus we may account for many of the disgraceful dies here represented, as well as the infinite interchange and pirating of dies.

And later:

The publican. was principally supported by the Jobbers in Medals. All Spence’s trash was introduced – and the interchange of dies, a mere jobbing trick, were [sic] here inserted in a way that no respectable author or tradesman would have ventured to have done.

These privately-confided anxieties are resonant of the more public disquiet expressed by ‘R.Y.’ as indeed are Hay’s further comments about Spence:

---

32 Hamer, as in n. 31, column 6054; *GM* 1796, Part II (September), 753; Hamer, as in n. 31, column 6056: *GM* 1797, Part I (April), 268. As the whereabouts of Hay’s ‘Birchall’ and ‘Pye’ were unknown when this article was written I had to use Hamer’s transcriptions but I now find that, in detail, these are not always strictly accurate.

33 Hamer, as in n. 31, column 6053. William Mainwaring had died on 10 December 1794: *Aris’s Birmingham Gazette*, 15 December 1794.

34 Miss Banks mss., British Museum (Department of Coins and Medals); Raines, as in n. 28, p. 314.

35 Raines, as in n. 28, p. 314.

36 Most of Hay’s large collection of scrap- and commonplace-books, including his political ephemera, is (through Canon Raines) in Chetham’s Library, Manchester, but it seems to contain no material relating to coins or tokens: information from Dr. M. D. Powell, Chetham’s Librarian. The John Rylands Library also contains Hay mss., but I am not aware of their scope.
ECCE HOMO.

To the Immortal memory of the
Rev. William H. R. R. of &
Who, on the fatal, but ever memorable
16th of August, 1819,
was translated, from this Life to a better.

"The Ashes of the Just
"Smell sweet, and blossom in the dust."

Perish, for Life, read LIVING.

Fig. 1. The Reverend W.R. Hay (Detail from a political satire c. 1822).

37 From a lithograph in the British Museum (Department of Prints and Drawings: BMC 14363); reproduced by permission of the Trustees of the Museum.
[whose dies] he, as others did, interchanged to an indefinite extent... estimable as showing the industry of this Spence & those who led him on, in the cause of democracy, and as they may be explained by the circumstances of the day...

...[Dies] which tho not apparently mischievous in themselves, were capable of making a strong impression when mixed with others... One could scarcely conceive how industrious and ingenious these jacobins were, in the instance of medals, to poison the minds of the Community.38

Like 'R.Y.' Hay, too, had an unerring appreciation of the true intent and likely popular appeal of Spence’s token production. He had, after all, an almost professional interest in the activities of political dissidents. He built up a large collection of seditious pamphlets, broadsides and notices, and his obviously extensive cabinet of political tokens equally reflected his recognition of the similar demagogic power of the latter's tone and symbolism.

In 1798 Hay had been ordained a priest, but about this time he became a magistrate and in 1802 he was appointed stipendiary chairman of the Salford Quarter Sessions. A high-Tory in politics, suspicious alike of democracy and dissent, he was always more the magistrate than the clergyman. Background, inclination and training made him so. Cultured and sociable he was; fervent beacon of a reviving Church he was not. His clerical labours, it has been said, were 'both tepid and marginal... he never discussed religious questions outside the pulpit'.39 A pluralist, he was rector of Ackworth and a prebendary of York, and in 1820 he became vicar of Rochdale, a living worth £1,730 a year and popularly thought to have been given him through government influence because of his part as a magistrate in the 'Peterloo Massacre' barely five months before.40

Certainly, it was as a justice of the peace that he was most diligent and vigorous - though there was never any suggestion of his being vindictive in his judgements - and, in a period of revolutionary turmoil, the Home Office records of the period are replete with his reports of radical disaffection in the industrial north. Vigilant but never alarmist, Hay was undoubtedly one of the most conscientious local links with Lord Sidmouth, the Home Secretary. As someone who was frequently in London it would have been very much in character for him, like 'R.Y.', to have visited Spence's shop to see what was going on in Little Turnstile.

Hay's obituarist described him as someone 'to be remembered by his friends with admiration and affection, and by his political enemies (for personal enemies he could have none) with feelings of great respect'.41 But history has dealt otherwise with Hay. Brought in to advise the local committee of Manchester justices at the time of 'Peterloo' on account of his legal knowledge and standing 'Parson Hay', largely because of his swift clerical advancement to Rochdale, became the most maligned of the magistrates involved in that unhappy episode. And it is for the 'massacre' that he will always be remembered.42

Canon Raines tells us that Hay occasionally contributed articles to The Gentleman's Magazine. One of these he identified as a piece on the origin of Manchester's 'New Bailey' prison. Not unnaturally in this instance Hay subscribed himself 'MANCUNIENSIS': if my hunch is right some, at least, of his other contributions were initialled 'R.Y.'43

38 Morley, as in n. 31, Part I, p. 4; Part XIII, p. 16; Part III, p. 46; Part V, p. 109.
40 This was officially denied in the House of Commons, but false or not it was a radical perception that Hay had to live with for the rest of his life. R. C. Bell, Tradesmen’s Tickets and Private Tokens 1785-1819, p. 16, says that Hay owed his preferment to Canon Raines: this is not so; Raines was a curate of Hay and would have been fourteen at the time of 'Peterloo'.
41 GM 1840, Part I (January), 96 [Obituary by the Rev. Richard Parkinson].
42 Hay's role at 'Peterloo', if influential, was only advisory: he was not chairman of the special committee of magistrates as is frequently asserted, nor did he read the Riot Act or order it to be read as stated by S. H. Hamer, in his 'Notes on the Private Tokens, their Issuers and Die-sinkers', BNJ, Vol. I (1900/4), 324 and other accounts derived from Canon Raines (as in n. 28, p. 293).
43 Raines, as in n. 28, p. 312; GM 1819, Part II (November).
SHORT ARTICLES AND NOTES

BENEATH THE FLOORBOARDS:
TWO WEST COUNTRY FINDS OF TOKENS

P. H. ROBINSON

Blandford, Dorset (1997)

Hoards of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century bronze coins are notably extremely uncommon. Those which consist of or include tokens from the series struck at the end of the eighteenth century or in the early nineteenth century have been conspicuous by their absence. This small group of eighteen coins – eight regal coins and ten tokens – was found beneath the floorboards of the upstairs room of a house in Blandford in 1997. All, apart from one penny and one penny token, are halfpennies. As with finds of eighteenth-century copper coins there are no farthings. There was no evidence of a container: the coins may have been concealed, perhaps by a child, either without a container, or perhaps in one made of fabric which has since deteriorated. The coins consist of:

Regal Coins
1. George III Third issue halfpenny 1799
2. George III Fourth issue penny 1806
3. George III Fourth issue halfpenny 1806 (2)
4-8. George III Fourth issue halfpenny 1807 (4)

Tokens
10. Hampshire, Portsea, Edward Sargeants. Halfpenny 1791 D&H 71. Diam. 28.8mm
11. Lancashire, Liverpool. Halfpenny 1791 D&H 79c. Diam. 30.7mm
12. Middlesex, Lackington’s series. Halfpenny 1795 D&H 357a. Diam. 28.5mm
15. Somerset, Bath. Halfpenny 1790 D&H 38 Diam. 27mm
17. Warwickshire, Birmingham. Halfpenny 1793. D&H 50. Diam. 28.7mm
18. Wales, Anglesey, Parys Mine Company. Penny 1788. D&H uncertain Diam. 24.1mm

The tokens consist firstly of local issues from Hampshire and Somerset that are found in circulation throughout the West Country. The absence of tokens from Dorset itself or from Devon or Wiltshire is not surprising in a sample as small as this. The remaining tokens are either from London or from the north-west. The presence of London tokens may be due to the importance of Blandford on the coach route from the city to the south-west of England, while those from Birmingham, Liverpool and Anglesey may reflect the very large numbers of tokens struck at these places. Certainly tokens of these places do occur elsewhere as individual finds in the West Country.

All the coins show some wear, in particular the 1807 regal halfpennies, suggesting that the date of deposition need not be either in or soon after that year. The next issue of regal pennies and halfpennies was in 1826, which provides the terminus ante quem date for this part of the find. For the tokens, the absence of nineteenth-century tokens which were struck from 1811 is not helpful. In the West Country they were only issued in any numbers in Bath and Bristol, while none were struck in Dorset. Tokens of this series are also rare as finds in the region. There is then no safe terminus ante quem date for the concealment of the coins.

The Blandford find suggests that eighteenth-century tokens continued to circulate in parts at least of England well after 1797. This is shown also in the west Midlands by the issue of tokens by William Horton in Stafford in 1801 and 1803 which, from the writer’s observations, are regularly found in worn condition and must have circulated freely in the first decade of the nineteenth century and perhaps later.

Devizes, Wiltshire (1975)

The thirteen lead tokens listed below were found together beneath a floorboard in the attic of 2 The Brittox, Devizes and were subsequently presented to Devizes Museum (accession number 1976.81). At the present day, the Brittox is the principal shopping street in Devizes, but in Georgian times it was perhaps second in importance in this respect to the Market Square. The tokens, which include a number of mould-duplicates are as follows:

1–4 obv profile male head to right
   rev I M
   diam 24mm
5–7 obv profile male bust to right, similar to 1–4
   rev I M
   diam 24mm
8 obv profile male bust to right, similar to 1–7
   rev I. M over v & t
   diam 24mm
9 obv wheel (?) design – central pellet in small circle with eight lines radiating from the circle to the edge; a pellet in each space (cf. Evesham hoard 19)
   rev shield with 2H in upper register
   diam 21mm
10 obv six spoke ‘wheel’ design
    rev eight spoke ‘wheel’ design
    diam 21mm
11 obv birds in a tree (?) design – a vertical line terminating in a pellet, with parallel horizontal lines spreading from each side. Pellets are irregularly placed among the lines
Fig. 1. Tokens from the Devizes hoard.

The particular interest of this find lies in the presence of duplicate tokens from the same mould (as with the lead token hoards from Evesham and Coombe, Oxfordshire) and tokens with the same design from different pairs of moulds (as again in the Coombe, Oxfordshire, find). The IM tokens could be from a multiple token mould as that from Brinsworth, now in Sheffield Museum. Token no. 8 may show a blundered, reverse date on the reverse side, probably to be reconstructed as 1777 rather than 1747 but this is far from certain.

The bloom still visible on several of the IM tokens as well as upon some others in the group suggests that they have seen little if any use. The inference is that they were made in Devizes, possibly in the building in which they were found. The occupant of 2 The Brittox in around 1787 was John Mayo, a linen draper (Devizes Borough Lease Book), who had possibly moved there only a short time previously as his trade address in 1783 is given as the Market Square in Bailey's Western and Midlands Directory. He is most likely to have been the issuer of the IM tokens. There were, however, other tradesmen with the same initials in Devizes at this time — his brother John Mayo, who was a mercer and draper, and James Maynard, an apothecary who died in 1786. Either of these might have been the issuer of the tokens, so the identification is, strictly speaking, not absolutely certain.