In the aftermath of the deaths of Offa of Mercia in late July 796 and of his son and heir Ecgfrith shortly afterwards in December, Mercian control over some outlying areas of the expanded kingdom slipped into the hands of local usurpers: Eadberht ‘Præn’ in Kent,¹ and Eadwald in East Anglia. The rest of the Mercian kingdom passed into the hands of Coenwulf, a distant relative of Offa, who spent the first years of his reign restoring the dominant position Mercia had enjoyed in the south east earlier in the eighth century. Kent was not recovered until 798, when, the kingdom having been ravaged by war, Eadberht was captured and taken to the royal monastery of Winchcombe in Gloucestershire. There his hands were cut off and his eyes put out, and he is said to have remained in Winchcombe as a prisoner until 811.² The only evidence for events in East Anglia comes from coinage, which suggests that Eadwald came to power immediately after Offa’s death, and remained in control for several years before the kingdom was retaken by Coenwulf – certainly until 798, and conceivably down to 805 or even later.³

The products of the moneyers of Canterbury and the East Anglian mint reflect the rise of these local rulers, and for the first years of his reign Coenwulf’s coinage was restricted to London. Die-cutters at all three mints stuck initially to the design instituted in the last years of Offa of Mercia (Fig. 1a), which arranged the king’s name and title in three horizontal lines divided by bars. Offa and Coenwulf’s coins had an uncial M for Merciorum taking up the first of the three lines; a feature which was not adopted by the die-cutters of Canterbury and the East Anglian mint, who entitled their kings simply rex on the new coinage (Fig. 1, d, e and f). There was no major change in the complement of moneyers at any mint, and in general the only substantial break between the coinages of Offa and his successors was in the name of the king: moneyers, design and also weight and fineness remained quite stable.

Even among the scarce surviving specimens of Coenwulf’s Three-Line coinage there are a number of coins that prefigure the full Tribrach type, which would become standard at London and Canterbury by the end of the century (Fig. 1, b). As the name suggests, this type was characterised by a reverse design featuring a three-branched design known as a tribrach. This shape could be charged with a great deal of significance: a three-pointed cross was commonly found in Christian art from an early date, and could be understood to signify the

Acknowledgements: The new coins of Eadberht Præn and the fragment of Eadwald published here are only known via the records and photographs of Derek Chick. Thanks are also due to Tony Abramson, who provided information concerning and images of an important sceat in his collection, and to Mark Blackburn, who read and commented on an earlier draft of this paper. A full catalogue and analysis of all southern issues from the death of Offa down to the Lunettes coinage is in preparation by the author, where some of the issues touched on here will be expanded.

¹ Præn means ‘priest’ in Old English, and presumably indicates that Eadberht had at some point been a priest, and thus theoretically was unable to rule as king. He may well be the English Odberhtus presbiter mentioned as an exile in Frankia and Rome in a letter written from Charlemagne to Offa earlier in 796 (Dümmler 1892, no. 100; and Whitelock 1979, no. 197), and was referred to as a renegade priest in another letter of 798 (Dümmler 1892, no. 127; and Whitelock 1979, no. 205).

² These events are recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle s.a. 796 and 798 (Plummer and Earle 1892, I, 56–7; and Whitelock 1979, no. 1, pp. 181–2). See also Brooks 1984, 121–5; and Story 2003, 139–42.

³ The chronological problems of Eadwald’s issues will be discussed below. On the chronology in general, see MEC I, 293. The fundamental study by Blunt, Lyon and Stewart 1963, 26 suggested that Eadwald’s coins be dated 796–8, like those of Eadberht Præn.
Trinity, or as an emblem of the choices – the two roads branching from one – that man faced in life, making it an *exemplum vitae humanae* according to Isidore of Seville (d. 636). A recently discovered sceat now in the Abramson collection (Fig. 2 below) foreshadows this widespread use of the voided tribrach at the end of the eighth century, as does an East Anglian penny of Offa, and it can also be found on a range of other Anglo-Saxon artefacts. Other coins of the same group of London Three-Line pennies include further highly symbolic designs, such as a tall standing cross on a unique coin of Pendwine, or an unusual variant of the tribrach on another unique coin of Winoth. This carries on the reverse a long pelleted cross with uncial-M-like devices at the terminals, with one of the limbs framed by two lines, creating another form of standing cross. Despite the lack of portraits or other figural elements, the crosses and tribrachs on this early London coinage clearly belong to a background in which variation and subtle meaning could be appreciated.

The beginnings of the Tribrach coinage can thus be found among the earliest Three-Line coins for Coenwulf of the London moneymen Ciolhard, Diola, Ibba and Winoth, who are only known in this earliest (796–7/8) phase from coins with a tribrach design on the reverse, suggesting that these types were current from the very beginning of Coenwulf’s coinage.

---

4 Gannon 2003, 163.
5 *Etymologiae* Liii.7 (Lindsay 1911 I, 27).
6 Chick 2008, no. 162 (moneyer Botred).
7 EMC 1997.0115.
8 EMC 2005.0123.
date when the tribrach was combined with the new circumscription obverse type and made common to all moneyers was previously believed to be 798, coinciding with the recovery of Kent in that year.\(^9\) No other coins of Coenwulf from Canterbury used an earlier type,\(^10\) and it appeared that this new tribrach design accounted for all production at London and Canterbury until the establishment of a new portrait coinage in about 805.

A number of recent finds have altered this understanding of the introduction of the Tribrach type significantly, and have important ramifications for the nature of coin production in eighth- and ninth-century England. The coins in question include one Three-Line/Tribrach penny (Fig. 3) and two Tribrach pennies in the name of Eadberht Præn (Figs 4–5), and two unusual Three-Line pennies (Figs 7–8) and one Tribrach penny (Fig. 6) in the name of Eadwald. All were discovered in the last twenty years, but for various reasons have for the most part escaped publication until now.


\(^{10}\) One moneyer, Seberht, struck a type for both Coenwulf and Cuthred with an unusual reverse design similar to one used in Offa’s heavy coinage based on a bone-like device separating the legend into two lines (Blunt, Lyon and Stewart 1963, 7). These unusual issues could belong early in the Tribrach coinage when more flexibility may have been tolerated, although Seberht’s absence in earlier phases might indicate that his coinage began slightly later. Either way, the existence of these Two-Line coins combined with the survival of regular Tribrach-type pennies by Seberht for both Coenwulf and Cuthred and of Cross-and-Wedges pennies for Coenwulf alone suggests he probably produced coins for both rulers simultaneously.
The crucial point for the chronology is that the fully-fledged Tribrach type must have been introduced before the defeat of Eadberht Præn in 798. Given the rarity and tribrach reverse design of many surviving examples of Coenwulf’s Three-Line type, which must have been very short-lived indeed, it might be possible to push the introduction of the Tribrach type at London back even into 797. There can only have been a short time between the establishment of the Tribrach type and the end of Kentish independence, perhaps resulting in a short final phase of swift change and greater receptivity to different and widely-accepted coin designs at the Canterbury mint around 797/8, which saw certain moneyers adopt the new Tribrach design and related devices. This is suggested by the comparative rarity and limited uptake of Tribrach-influenced designs: only one Canterbury moneyer, Duda, is known from the full Tribrach type and another, Æthelnoth, from a Three-Line/Tribrach type, yet both of them also struck the regular Three-Line coins that account for most of Canterbury’s production under Eadberht Præn (Fig. 1d). Æthelnoth’s Three-Line/Tribrach penny spans the gap between the two designs, presumably inspired by coins of similar type from London: it bears

---

11 Seven of fifteen known examples of this type, representing the work of two out of seven moneyers, bear a tribrach on the reverse. No moneyer struck more than one type in this phase, presumably because of its short duration.
a tribrach on the reverse,\textsuperscript{12} and a variant on the standard Three-Line obverse design, with hooks on the horizontal bars that are universal on Three-Line coins issued at London (Fig. 1b).

Unfortunately, no clear chronological conclusions are possible for East Anglia at present. The Tribrach penny of Eadwald is a poorly-preserved fragment, found at Elmsett, Suffolk, in the early 1990s; and the two Three-Line/Tribrach pennies of Eadwald include one fragment (of which only line drawings are available) found at Ramsholt, Suffolk, in 1989, and an almost whole coin found at Newark, Nottinghamshire, in August 2007. The Three-Line/Tribrach pennies belong to the moneyer Botred, and like their Canterbury counterpart of the same type replicate the hooked bars of the London coins and an adapted form of the tribrach reverse – though in this case it is almost identical to a reverse design that had already been used by Botred in the light coinage of Offa.\textsuperscript{13} These are the only coins of Eadwald known for Botred, and presumably belong to much the same time as the other Three-Line issues from East Anglia, or perhaps slightly later. The Tribrach fragment bears the name of Eadnoth, a moneyer well-known from other issues of Offa and Eadwald,\textsuperscript{14} who was also responsible for the only other known type of Eadwald to deviate from the Three-Line obverse (Fig. 9): a Circumscription type, on which the king’s name was arranged round a central cross (e.g. EMC 1989.1001, 1990.0196 and 2001.0150; one other specimen is known). This too must have been a small type, as all four surviving specimens are struck from two obverse and two reverse dies. The design of the Circumscription type bears a general resemblance to the Tribrach obverse, but is simple enough that it could have been created independently. All three of Eadnoth’s designs use the same reverse design.

This and other aspects of the chronology and organisation of East Anglian minting will be revisited in more detail in future. The two separate but related questions that must be addressed for now are when and in what sequence Eadwald’s coinage was produced, and when it ended and Coenwulf’s East Anglian coinage began to be produced. In terms of date, there is nothing to confirm when after 797/8 the Tribrach and Circumscription types were struck: they could conceivably belong to 800 or after, and there are only portrait coins of Coenwulf from East Anglia, which would suggest that minting in that part of his kingdom did not begin until 805 or after, when a portrait type was adopted at all other mints under his control. An earlier date is not out of the question: East Anglia did not always keep in step with numismatic developments elsewhere, and the portrait type could have begun earlier than at other mints, or alternatively there could have been a hiatus in minting following Mercian reconquest. But general adherence to a common design was a significant concern under Coenwulf, as suggested by the adoption of the Tribrach type at Canterbury upon its reconquest, and in the time of Offa and Coenwulf it was more common for East Anglia to follow developments

\textsuperscript{12} It is interesting that Æthelnoth’s Three-Line/Tribrach coin bears a tribrach of two lines, whereas the full Tribrach pennies of Duda (probably struck at around the same time) have a tribrach of three lines. The Three-Line/Tribrach issues of London all use a three-lined tribrach, but there are many examples of two-lined tribrachs in the main Tribrach type from London moneyers. Two- and three-lined tribrachs thus seem to have both been current from quite an early date, and there is probably no chronological significance to them.

\textsuperscript{13} Chick 2008, no. 162.

\textsuperscript{14} Another moneyer with the same name produced coins for Beornwulf, Ludica and Æthelstan of East Anglia in the 820s and later. He is presumably a different individual, though the shared name may indicate a familial connection of some sort – perhaps father and son.
at other mints than to set numismatic trends – which would imply a reconquest of East Anglia in 805 or after. At present, all that can be said with confidence is that Eadwald’s coinage began c. 796 and lasted for at least a couple of years, and conceivably for more than a decade.

Unravelling the relative chronology of the coins of Eadwald is problematic as well, and there is little evidence for how the Tribrach and Circumscription coins of Eadnoth related to those of other moneyers. It is possible that he alone continued to strike coinage later in Eadwald’s reign, moving from one type to another after other moneyers had fallen by the wayside. Alternatively, several moneyers may have continued to produce Three-Line coins throughout Eadwald’s reign, and Eadnoth was alone in changing type. This is perhaps more likely, as Eadnoth is also the sole moneyer of Eadwald who did not survive to strike coins for Coenwulf. Either way, the most probable internal chronology of Eadnoth’s own types would put the Three-Line type first, as it is closest to the coinage of Offa and to that produced by other moneyers of Eadwald. Second comes the Tribrach type, and third the Circumscription type. The logic behind this arrangement derives from the interpretation of the Tribrach obverse design. This was based on a central uncial M, which completed Coenwulf’s title of rex Merciorum, and was probably inspired by the design used on the coinage of Offa’s queen, Cynethryth, produced a decade or so earlier at Canterbury.15 Obviously it is strange to find the kings of Kent and East Anglia theoretically styling themselves ‘king of the Mercians’, as is implied by straightforward adoption of the Tribrach type. It is possible that Eadnoth – or even Eadwald himself – noticed this oddity and altered the design accordingly to the more innovative Circumscription type. Sensitivity to the political significance of the Tribrach design was not unique to East Anglia. In contemporary Canterbury, coins of Coenwulf’s brother, Cuthred, who was appointed sub-king of Kent in 798,16 omit the central M. Similarly, in Wessex the Tribrach type influenced the coinage of one moneyer of Beorhtric (786–802) by the name of Weohthun (or possibly Peohthun) (Fig. 1g).17 In this case, the central uncial M was subtly reinterpreted as an omega by conjoining it with an alpha, and an inconvenient political message was neutralised as a religious emblem whilst retaining general similarity with the dominant Mercian coinage.

The decade immediately after 796 stands out as one of the most eventful and best known in Anglo-Saxon history, and is extremely well served by coinage as well as letters, narratives and other sources. However, changing political fortunes in southern England may be followed more effectively through numismatics than any other single category of evidence, and the coins provide a vital counterpoint to the account extrapolated from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and other texts. One of the greatest benefits of coinage is that new evidence is constantly emerging to revise earlier interpretations and fill in some of the gaps in the story. Thus it can now be seen that the Tribrach type did not appear in the wake of Coenwulf’s reconquest of Kent, but was already in existence by that time; indeed, it seems to have prompted a certain amount of emulation at Canterbury and in Wessex and East Anglia. Mercian coinage, and that of London in particular, evidently enjoyed some sort of special status, and it set the trend for design at the other southern mints for much of the late eighth century – perhaps as a reflection of the greater economic importance of London, or of the military and political strength of Mercia, or as a hangover from the reign of Offa, when it appears that London’s die-cutter(s) exercised considerable influence.18 This is all the more striking given the relative size and output of the three mints: by the last years of Offa’s reign London’s production was already significantly smaller than that of Canterbury,19 and in the Tribrach phase of

16 This can be deduced from the regnal years occasionally given in contemporary charters: Sawyer 1968, no. 40, for example was issued in July 805 and is dated to the eighth year of Cuthred’s reign. However, it does not automatically follow that Cuthred produced coins from the outset of his reign: for the possibility of an early phase of coinage issued by Coenwulf alone, see Blunt, Lyon and Stewart 1963, 72.
17 Weohthun’s coinage for Beorhtric is represented by just one surviving specimen in the British Museum; however, the moneyer is also known from two recently discovered pennies of Egbert (EMC 2008.0137 and 2008.0138 – see Naismith 2008).
18 Chick 1997.
19 Chick 2008.
797/8–805 London's output declined even further so that it became merely a fraction of that of Canterbury. East Anglia too came to eclipse London in productivity by the second half of Coenwulf's reign.

The new finds of coins from the period 796–805 discussed here also highlight the distance there could sometimes be between kings and moneyers. The apparently apolitical use of the Tribrach type in Kent and East Anglia reinforces the impression that those who designed and cut dies were not always particularly concerned by the political significance of what they were producing, and presumably received quite scant and sporadic instruction on design from the ruling authorities. The focus instead may have been on conforming to established standards of weight and fineness as well as appearance, and also on proper recognition of royal authority on coinage – though this normally did not go much further than including the appropriate king's name. For these reasons, the coins of this period are doubly valuable for providing a unique insight into not only high politics and the unfolding of historical events, but also into the more obscure workings of moneyers and die-cutters.
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BURGRED ‘LUNETTE’ TYPE E RECONSIDERED

GARETH WILLIAMS

In December 2003, metal detectorists Mark Ainsley and Geoff Bambrook uncovered a small Viking hoard on a riverine site in North Yorkshire. This is a multi-period productive site, showing evidence of occupation/use from prehistory to the post-medieval period, but with a particular concentration of activity from the eighth to tenth centuries. The site has been investigated by the York Archaeological Trust (YAT), and forms the subject of a joint research project between YAT and the British Museum. This includes YAT's fieldwork, the hoard and other Treasure finds from the site, and a group of over 800 single finds from the site, uncovered over a period of several years, of which the majority are Anglo-Saxon or Viking. The Viking element of the finds assemblage has marked similarities with the assemblage from the Viking site at Torksey,1 and is apparently of similar date, beginning with the take-over of an existing Anglo-Saxon site in the mid 870s, and remaining active into the early tenth century. A preliminary note on the hoard, which has been acquired by the British

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Marion Archibald, Adrian Lyons, William MacKay and Hugh Pagan, all of whom made useful (if sometimes conflicting) comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Any mistakes are, of course, the responsibility of the author.

1 Blackburn 2002.
Museum, has already been published in the *Treasure Annual Report*,\textsuperscript{2} and a full report on the project is currently in preparation. The scope of the current note is therefore limited to a specific point of numismatic interest.

The core of the hoard (which was found together with a number of non-precious metal objects of Anglo-Saxon and Viking manufacture) was a group of precious metal items. This included a late Saxon gold stud with blue glass cabochon; one silver ingot; four ingot droplets (only two of which contain more than 10\% silver), six pieces of hack-silver and ten coins.

Of the coins, one is a fragment of an Islamic silver dirham of the Umayyad dynasty (AH 41–132/ AD 661–750), of the reformed coinage (AH 79–132/ AD 690–749).\textsuperscript{3} Fragmentary Islamic coins are typical within Viking hoards of the late ninth and early tenth centuries from Britain, as well as from productive sites linked with Viking activity.\textsuperscript{4} These coins are often in fragmentary condition and should be regarded as hacksilver rather than as coins *per se*.

The remaining nine coins are all of the Lunette type, issued jointly as part of a monetary and political alliance between Mercia and Wessex during the reign of Burghred of Mercia (852–74).\textsuperscript{5} This type circulated freely in both kingdoms, and therefore across most of England south of the Humber (apart from East Anglia), although the Northumbrian system prior to its collapse in 867 was completely separate from that south of the Humber. Seven of the coins are in the name of Burghred, with two in the name of Alfred of Wessex (871–99).

The classification of the majority of these coins is straightforward:

- Alfred, type A, moneyer Heremod
- Alfred, type B, moneyer Cuthulf
- Burghred, type A, moneyers Cenred, Cynehelm, Dudwine, Eadulf.

However, three of the coins (moneyers Beagstan, Beornheah and Tata) do not fit the main existing classification of the Lunettes type. This contains four main sub-types, classified by reverse designs, labelled A-D. Christopher Blunt identified a fifth sub-type, which has been labelled as E, but this is so rare that Hugh Pagan argued in his 1965 survey that it should perhaps be regarded as a variant rather than a separate sub-type, since it is similar to the reverse design of sub-type D, which contains a number of varieties.\textsuperscript{6}

The three new coins all share a single reverse design, with strong similarities to Blunt’s sub-type E. Like sub-type D, the three lines of the reverse inscription are divided by two horizontal lines with a crook at each end. On sub-type E, the top and bottom lines of the inscription are divided by a shape which may perhaps represent an elongated version of the uncial M common on Mercian coins of the eighth and ninth centuries, or perhaps simply another ornamental divider. The new design is very similar, but the ‘M’ shape is divided, with two uprights rather than one, suggesting more an ornamental divider than an M.

This reverse design is known, to the best of my knowledge, from only one other example, in the name of the moneyer Eadnoth, which was acquired by the British Museum in 1969. With only four examples, should this be considered as a distinct sub-type, or as a variant of sub-type E, or should both this design and sub-type E indeed be regarded as varieties of sub-type D?

There are a number of reasons for regarding the new variety as entirely separate from sub-type D. The fact that it survives in the names of four different moneyers indicates that it was

\textsuperscript{2} Ager and Williams 2004.

\textsuperscript{3} I am grateful to my colleague Dr Vesta Curtis for this identification.

\textsuperscript{4} Lowick 1976; Brooks and Graham-Campbell 1986 (reprinted in Brooks 2000); Graham-Campbell 2001; Blackburn 2002; Naismith 2005. See also Williams 2008 (this volume), and Williams forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{5} Pagan 1965; Keynes 1998; Lyons and MacKay 2007; Lyons and MacKay 2008 (this volume).

\textsuperscript{6} Blunt 1958–9; Pagan 1965, 26. This classification by reverse type alone is unsatisfactory. Pagan discusses a wide variety of bust types and provides a partial descriptive classification, and Lyons and MacKay argue elsewhere in this volume for the need for a more comprehensive classification incorporating both obverse and reverse designs. Such a re-classification goes well beyond the scope of the current paper, and my interpretation is thus set within the current reverse-based classification framework.
produced on a significant scale, and it is notable that two of the four (Beornheah and Eadnoth) are only otherwise recorded in sub-type A, while Beagstan also issued in sub-type B (known from a single example), and while Tata alone issued coins of sub-types C and D as well as A. Tata also issued in types A, B and C for Alfred. Pagan's dating of the main sub-types of Burgred places C as the earliest sub-type, followed by D, followed by A, although he notes that there are exceptions. On this dating, the overlap of moneyers with sub-type A suggests that the new variety is also a late issue. Although the main typology is based on the reverse designs, it is also notable that the new coins have very similar busts to coins of sub-type A, although there is some variety in the drapery even within these few examples. This bust is also found on coins of sub-type D, but these represent very much a minority, with other bust types rather better represented. These associations with sub-type A rather than D are also consistent with the fact that the other Lunette issues in the hoard were of Burgred sub-type A, and Alfred, all of which point towards the latter part of Burgred's reign. In addition, it should be noted that while none of the new variety or existing type E coins have been fully analysed, all have a dark colour, and several have traces of green corrosion, and the overall impression is of a very base issue with a heavy copper content, which would again point towards the latter part of the series.

Furthermore, the most plausible dating for the Viking occupation of the site is in the period following Burgred's death. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that the Viking micel here over-wintered at Torksey in 872–3 and Repton in 873–4, and then divided in 874, with one part of the micel here going to Northumbria and the other to East Anglia. In 875, the Vikings under Halfdan divided up Northumbria and settled. Although the Vikings had earlier occupied Northumbria in 866 and 869, this pre-dates the Alfred coins in the hoard, while the scale of the Viking occupation of the site suggested by the single finds indicates that the hoard is unlikely to be entirely independent of the activities of the micel here.

Given that Burgred was forced to abdicate abruptly in 874, it is possible that the new variety should be seen as a substantive sub-type introduced at the very end of his reign, and then abandoned almost immediately as a result of his abdication and the temporary collapse of Mercian royal authority. This would be consistent both with the striking of the variety by multiple moneyers, and also its rarity, and would also fit with the likely dating of the hoard. Irrespective of the precise dating, there seems to be little doubt that this variety represents a substantive sub-type, distinct from both D and A.

Whether it is distinct from Blunt's sub-type E is less clear. This sub-type is known from two examples, in the names of the moneyers Cenred and Ecgulf. Cenred issued in sub-types A and D, and Ecgulf in A, while the bust on the Cenred coin is again similar to both sub-type A and the new variety. Stylistically, all of the coins are very similar, and all can be linked with a London die-cutting style shared by both Burgred and Alfred. The difference between the reverse design of sub-type E and the new variety is also minimal. If the element between the letters of the moneyer's name is seen as a decorative divider, rather than a stylised Mercian M, then the difference is even less significant, and with both varieties so rare in comparison to sub-types A-D, it seems more reasonable on current evidence to see the two as varieties of the same sub-type rather than as distinct sub-types, although that is something which might change in the light of further discoveries. For now, however, I propose to label the existing sub-type E as Ei, and the new variety as Eii.

---

7 Pagan 1965. Lyons and MacKay argue elsewhere in this volume that the division into sub-types is more geographical than chronological, but since the two articles have been prepared at the same time, and I have not been able to consider their arguments fully, it seems more appropriate to accept the established position, with the caveat that this may need to be revised, rather than to follow uncritically a new interpretation which has not yet been widely accepted.

8 For discussion of the bust varieties, see Pagan 1965, passim.

9 ASC, sub 873[872], 874[873] and 874[875] (MSS. A and E).

10 ASC, sub 874[873] (MSS. A and E).

11 This was fairly quickly revived, at least in part, again in alliance with Wessex, but with a clear break in the coinage: Keynes 1998; Blackburn 1998; Blackburn and Keynes 1998; Blackburn 2003.

12 Blunt 1958–9, 10–11; SCBFI 17 (Midlands), no. 94. The Ecgulf coin, in Nottingham Museum, is represented in the Sylloge by a reverse drawing only.

13 See Lyons and MacKay 2008, this volume.
Accepting the two varieties as a single sub-type, the question remains as to where it should be placed in the series. There are no coins close in style in either the Gravesend hoard (deposited c.871) or in the St Albans hoard (deposited c.873/874?). The new type is also absent from the Croydon hoard of c.871–2.14 This would suggest that sub-type E is either too early to be included in Gravesend and Croydon, placing it between the end of D and the beginning of the main group of A, or that it was issued after the St Albans hoard, and therefore towards the very end of Burgred’s reign. The arguments for placing it at the end of the reign have already been mentioned, and the rarity of the issue combined with the variety of dies and moneyers provides a convincing picture of a substantive sub-type which was quickly aborted, which seems more likely to fit the later dating.

However, all of the coins of sub-type E are struck on wide flans, while the latest coins of Burgred otherwise seem to have been struck on rather smaller flans (e.g. SCBI (South-Eastern Museums) 659, 662, 670, 677 from the St Albans hoard). The larger flan size is more consistent with an earlier dating, and would have required a move back to a larger flan size right at the end of the reign if the later dating is preferred.15 Nevertheless, an earlier dating on the basis of size does not account so readily for the rarity of the type, still less for the absence of the type from hoards and site finds of the early 870s. The evidence is thus ambiguous. There can be no doubt that the type is relatively late in Burgred’s reign, but dates of c.870 and 874 are both feasible, depending on which element of the evidence one sees as the most important. My own preference remains on balance for the later interpretation, but in the absence of further evidence this remains uncertain.

One last point of interest concerning the three examples of Eii from the North Yorkshire hoard, although unrelated to typology, is that each has been centrally pierced, although the other coins in the hoard have not. The most likely explanation in my opinion is that this was in preparation for use as insets in lead coin-weights of a type common in the late ninth century.16 These coin-weights include a type where the coins are secured to the lead with pins, and the sort of piercing present in these three coins would be appropriate for use in this way. Analysis by my colleague Sue La Niece established that there were no traces of lead on the surface of the coins which would indicate that they had been so secured, and the presence of lead weights both with the hoard and amongst the stray finds indicates that lead might have been expected to survive if it was present. However, the weight assemblage does include lead weights with insets, and the finds generally indicate that metal working took place on the site.

Fig. 1. Coins of Burgred, sub-type E.
(a–c) The three new types from the North Yorkshire hoard, sub-type Eii (Beagstan, Beornheah, Tata)
(d) Coin of the same type, findspot unrecorded (Eadnoth)
e) Penny of sub-type Eii, findspot unrecorded (Cenred)
Reproduced by kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum

14 Brooks and Graham-Campbell 1986.
15 I am grateful to Hugh Pagan for raising the question of the hoard comparisons and the flan size of the coins.
so it is perfectly possible that these coins had been prepared for use in weights, but had not yet been used. It is also possible that the coins had been pierced for suspension as ornaments, although single or double piercing towards one edge would be more typical for this. Given the base appearance of all of the sub-type E coins, it is also conceivable that they were marked so dramatically to indicate that their silver content was unsatisfactory, although if that were the case it is surprising that they were then hoarded with other more satisfactory coins. The finders have suggested an alternative possibility that the central piercings represent a symbolic ‘killing’ of the coins, reflecting the defeat of Burgred and the take-over of Mercia. This would be difficult to substantiate on the basis of the coins alone, and has no parallel elsewhere, and seems to me to be considerably less likely than the other possibilities suggested above.

CORPUS OF TYPE E

Ei
1. Moneyer: Cenred
   Obv: +BVRGREDÆ
   Rev: M|ON / CENRED / ET|A
   Weight: 1.13 g
   Diameter: 22 mm
   Die axis: 0°
   Provenance: C.E. Blunt (pres.)
   Location: British Museum, BM 1962, 11–18, 1
2. Moneyer: Ecgulf
   Obv: Unrecorded
   Rev: M|ON / ECCVLF / ET|A
   Weight: Unrecorded
   Diameter: Unrecorded
   Die axis: Unrecorded
   Location: Nottingham Museum, SCBI 17, no. 94
   Comments: Badly chipped around edges and so fragile that it was embedded in a perspex disc to prevent further deterioration.

Eii
3. Moneyer: Beagstan
   Obv: BVRGREDÆ
   Rev: NM|ON / BEA[G]ZTA / ET|A (NM ligated)
   Weight: 0.85 g
   Diameter: 23 mm
   Die axis: 0°
   Provenance: 2004 hoard from North Yorkshire productive site.
   Location: British Museum, 2008, 4199, 7
   Comments: Pierced with large hole centrally. Green corrosion clearly visible.
4. Moneyer: Beornheah
   Obv: BVRGREDÆX
   Rev: HM|ON / BER_EA / ET|A (HM ligated)
   Weight: 1.37 g
   Diameter: 22.5 mm
   Die axis: 180°
   Provenance: 2004 hoard from North Yorkshire productive site.
   Location: British Museum, 2008, 4199, 8
   Comments: Pierced with large hole centrally. Green corrosion clearly visible.

5. Moneyer: Eadnoth
Obv: BVGR[E]DR
Rev: MI[ON/ EADNO]/ ET|A
Weight: 1.08 g
Diameter: 21 mm
Die axis: 270°
Provenance: Findspot unrecorded. Ex Mrs Baker.
Location: British Museum, 1969, 5–6, 1
Comments: Chipped and cracked, signs of green corrosion.

6. Moneyer: Tata
Obv: +BVGRG[REDRE
Rev: M[ON/ TATA]/ ET|A
Weight: 1.26 g
Diameter: 22 mm
Die axis: 180°
Provenance: 2004 hoard from North Yorkshire productive site.
Location: British Museum, 2008, 4199, 9
Comments: Pierced with large hole centrally. Green corrosion clearly visible.
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THE COINS FROM THE VALE OF YORK VIKING HOARD: PRELIMINARY REPORT

GARETH WILLIAMS

In January 2007, metal detectorists Andrew and David Whelan discovered the most important Viking hoard in England since the Cuerdale Hoard (AD 905–10) in 1840. The precise identity of the findspot is being protected at the request of the finders and landowner, and the name Vale of York Viking Hoard has been selected to avoid confusion with other hoards in the region. The hoard attracted substantial publicity when it came to inquest in July 2007, at which point it was still known as the Harrogate Area Hoard, as it was found within the jurisdiction of Harrogate Coroner’s District. The hoard was declared to be Treasure on 18 July 2007. It is intended that the hoard should be acquired jointly by the British Museum and the York Museums Trust, but at the time of writing the Treasure valuation has not been completed, so the future disposition of the hoard is not yet certain. Full cleaning and conservation will not be carried out until the hoard is acquired, and the detailed study of the hoard will begin then, but the hoard has generated so much interest that it seems appropriate to make available a listing of the coins in the hoard, together with some initial comments.

Overview of the hoard

The hoard is in many respects a typical mixed Viking hoard of the early tenth century, containing intact jewellery, ingots and hack-silver, as well as 617 coins. Discussion here will largely be confined to the coins, but the non-numismatic contents of the hoard are also of interest. The most important piece is a silver-gilt Frankish vessel of the mid-ninth century. This is decorated with six roundels, each of which contains an animal, with bands of stylised vine-scrolls above and below, and stylised foliage in between. Comparison with other Frankish vessels of the period suggests that this may be a church vessel of some sort, perhaps a pyx. This vessel contained virtually all the hoard, with the exception of a few ingots too large to fit in. Fragments of lead found with the hoard may have formed some sort of outer container, or cover.

The other particularly important item is a gold arm-ring. The ring is of typical Viking workmanship, with punch-marked decoration on a flat strip, and has parallels in style in both the British Isles and Scandinavia. Viking ornaments are well known in gold as well as silver, but it is unusual to find gold ornaments within predominantly silver hoards. The presence of two such high-status items in the hoard, both intact, may point to the hoard being the personal property of a wealthy high-ranking individual, since otherwise one might expect them to have been broken up for bullion.

The hoard also contained five silver arm-rings of various styles, together with ingots and ingot fragments, and a wide variety of hack-silver. In common with other Viking hoards from northern England, the hack-silver is made up of fragments from all over the Viking world, including amongst other things a fragment of a so-called ‘Permian ring’ from northern Russia (with a parallel in Cuerdale), and fragments of penannular brooches from the Irish Sea area, with parallels in several hoards from northern England, including Cuerdale.¹

Acknowledgements: I am particularly grateful to Barry Ager for helpful discussion of the hoard as a whole. I have also benefited from discussion of different aspects of the numismatic component with Marion Archibald, Mark Blackburn, Jayne Carroll, Stewart Lyon, Michael Sharp, Veronica Smart and Lord Stewartby. However, the interpretation presented here is mine, as is the responsibility for any mistakes.

¹ Interpretation of the non-numismatic items and the Islamic coins in the hoard follow the respective contributions of my colleagues Barry Ager and Dr Vesta Curtis to the Treasure report 2007 T2, which is not yet published.
The coins

The make-up of the coinage is also what one would expect of a hoard from the Danelaw in the early tenth century, although it is very slightly later than other recorded hoards of related type, with a fairly firm date of c.927–9 (see below). The coins are predominantly Anglo-Saxon, ranging from Alfred's London Monogram type to the Rex Totius Britanniae type of Athelstan, although the majority (over half the hoard in total) are Two-Line issues of Edward the Elder. There is also a significant group of Viking issues, all from the northern Danelaw, and including no St Edmund coins, issues of the Cuerdale phase, or Swordless St Peters. There are also four Carolingian deniers, and fifteen Samanid dirhams (several of them fragmentary). Totals are listed in the summary catalogue below (pp. 232–4). Since, as previously stated, the coins have not yet been thoroughly cleaned, the identifications on this list should be regarded as provisional, rather than as definitive. No attempt has yet been made to divide the Edward Two-line issues by period, or to study dies within the hoard.

The coins are mostly in good condition, having been preserved inside the silver vessel. However, a number of them had fused together, and were separated during the initial phase of conservation at the British Museum. In most cases, this separation was entirely successful, but one of the coins (a Two-line type penny of Athelstan, fused to a dirham of Ismail b. Ahmad) proved to be unusually fragile, and broke into three pieces during conservation. One of these remains attached to the dirham, and additional conservation will not be attempted at this stage. Many of the Islamic coins are fragmentary, having effectively been converted into bullion in the Viking period. The coins produced in England include three cut halves and one half of a coin which was broken in antiquity. A few other coins show cracks and minor buckling, but none are fragmentary, and the later coins in particular show little sign of circulation.

Dating

The dating of the hoard is unusually clear, with close agreement in dating between the different components of the hoard. The Anglo-Saxon component ends with a single coin of the Rex Totius Britanniae type of Athelstan, together with thirty-six examples of another Athelstan type showing a building, usually interpreted as a church. All of these show only minimal wear, and were clearly relatively freshly minted when the hoard was deposited. Within the Church type, twenty-two coins carry a clear York mint signature, and the type has been plausibly interpreted as the first issued by Athelstan after he gained control of Northumbria in 927.2 The type is normally extremely rare, suggesting that it was relatively short-lived, and the concentration of coins of this type in freshly minted condition suggests very strongly that the hoard was deposited relatively shortly after the type was introduced. This impression is reinforced by the single Rex Totius Britanniae coin in the hoard. Similar regal styles were also adopted by Athelstan in charters, and it appears likely that the style was introduced following a meeting between Athelstan and other kings from around northern Britain and Wales at Eamont Bridge near Penrith on July 12th, 927.3 According to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Athelstan 'brought into submission all the kings in this island'.4 While the title 'King of all Britain' certainly exaggerates Athelstan's position following the meeting, it is likely that the other rulers present acknowledged some form of overlordship, which probably involved the payment of tribute, although not necessarily on a regular basis. By contrast with the Church type, the Rex Totius Britanniae type is extremely common, and was apparently minted throughout the latter part of Athelstan's reign. To find a single example in over six hundred coins suggests that the hoard must have been buried very shortly after the type was introduced. On the basis of both these types, the hoard can not pre-date 927, but is unlikely to be much later, and I would suggest that a date of c.927–9 is appropriate.

2 Blunt 1974, 55.
3 Blunt 1974, 55-6.
4 ASC, sub 926 (MS D), 107.
The Viking component in the hoard reinforces this, with no coins that can be dated before the 920s, with four different Sword issues from the northern Danelaw. These issues would have been current in Northumbria immediately before Athelstan took control, and again show little sign of wear, indicating a short circulation period. A number of the coins listed below as uncertain/blundered are probably anonymous Danelaw imitations, and the hoard also includes a new imitative type, which crudely copies the Church type of Athelstan discussed above. Once again, this was freshly struck when deposited.

While the Carolingian coins do not permit such precise dating, they are entirely consistent with the dating suggested by the Anglo-Saxon and Viking coins. The Islamic coins cover a date range between the reign of Nasr b. Ahmad I (AD 864–892) and Nasr b. Ahmad II (AD 913–932). The latest firmly dated Islamic coin is a dirham of Nasr b. Ahmad II, issued in al-Shash in AH 303/ AD 914–5. There is generally a delay of between ten and fifteen years between the latest issue date on Islamic coins and their deposition in Danelaw hoards of the early tenth century, so this is entirely consistent with the deposition date of AD 927–928 proposed above. While the undated fragment of Nasr b. Ahmed could conceivably be a little later, there is no reason to assume that this is the case, and the earlier part of his reign is again entirely consistent with the suggested deposition date.

This makes the Harrogate area hoard the latest in a growing group of Viking hoards dating from the mid-late 920s, including Warton (Carnforth), Lancs. (c.925), Thurcaston, Leics. (c.925), Goldsborough, N. Yorks (c.925), Flusco Pike 2, Cumbria (c.925) and Bossall/Flaxton, N. Yorks. (c.927). It is also the largest of these hoards by a distinct margin, although it is considerably smaller than the better known hoard from Cuerdale, Lancs. (c.905–10).

**Interpretation**

There seems little doubt that the hoard was deposited a short while after the meeting at Eamont Bridge in 927. Although contemporary chronicles say little of what followed, and imply by their silence that Athelstan had firm control of the kingdom of Northumbria thereafter, more detailed accounts appear in various twelfth-century chronicles, which clearly had access to an earlier chronicle from the north of England which is no longer extant. These indicate that there was an attempt by the Viking ruler Guthfrith, supported by Earl Thurferth, to gain control of the kingdom of Northumbria of which Guthfrith’s brother Sihtric had previously been king. He failed to gain control of York, and was forced to retreat.

The hoard was deposited along the valley of the River Nidd, which provides a natural route to cross the Pennines to the relative safety of the Irish Sea. Interestingly, Goldsborough lies on the same route, and several other Viking hoards of the early tenth century lie along similar east-west routes. While there is insufficient evidence to associate the hoard directly with Guthfrith or Thurferth, it is clear that there was continued disturbance in the area around York in the period following the Eamont Bridge meeting, and it seems reasonable to assume that the hoard was deposited for safety by a Viking of high status during that period.

The picture of substantial but incomplete authority for Athelstan in that period also provides a plausible context for the minting of the imitation of Athelstan’s Church type. Coins of the moneyer Ragnald, both in the Church type and the Rex Totius Britanniae type, show that official minting in York was firmly under Athelstan’s control, and the other official coins of the Church type should probably be associated with other mints in the northern Danelaw.

---

5 For a recent comprehensive discussion of the Sword issues, see Blackburn 2006.
6 Williams forthcoming. The gap appears to be a few years shorter in the late ninth century: see Naismith 2005.
7 A date of c.925 was long accepted for the Goldsborough Hoard (see, for example, Shetelig 1940). A re-dating to c.920 proposed by David Wilson (Wilson 1957, 72–3) has generally been accepted in more recent publications. I am not aware of any published arguments to support this earlier dating, which seems too early to me on the basis of the numismatic evidence, and I have argued for the restoration of a date of c.925 in the discussion of the hoard in the forthcoming publication of Cuerdale and related hoards in the British Museum, and in Williams forthcoming.
8 Williams forthcoming, passim.
9 E.g., Whitelock 1955, 280.
Given the rarity of the type, and its limited circulation, it seems likely that the imitation was produced in the same region. The imitation is much cruder work than the official issues, and probably not the work of a practised die-cutter, and may reasonably be interpreted as an indication that while Athelstan had control of all official minting, his authority within the northern Danelaw was not sufficient to prevent the minting of unofficial issues. However, this does not mean that the imitative coin was issued by a political rival rather than an opportunist would-be moneyer. Nor does a single coin indicate widespread minting.

Detailed analysis of the hoard as a whole must wait on further research, but a few points of numismatic interest can already be identified. Firstly, the hoard probably represents at least two separate parcels, or periods of hoarding, rather than simply representing what was current in Northumbria in the late 920s. Given the number of Edward the Elder coins in the hoard, together with the strong presence of Athelstan’s coinage, coins from the middle and late periods of Edward’s reign appear to be under-represented. This needs to be seen together with the complete absence of coins of the early Danelaw types, and also the limited date-range of the Kufic coins. This is in marked contrast to the mixed contents of the Bossall/Flaxton hoard, also deposited in Yorkshire around the time that Athelstan took control of the kingdom of Northumbria, although probably slightly earlier than the Vale of York hoard.10 The initial impression is therefore that the Vale of York hoard contains a significant component, representing a purely Anglo-Saxon hoard (or other store of wealth), ending comparatively early in the reign of Edward, and certainly before the 920s. This was then combined, at some point before the hoard was finally deposited, with coins in circulation in Northumbria in the 920s, including Danelaw issues, coins of Athelstan, the imported coins, and some of the earlier Anglo-Saxon material. Clearly there is no way of stating definitively which of the earlier coins falls into which group, since one would expect some early coins still to be in circulation in the 920s.

Also of interest is the presence of an apparently literate but previously unrecorded Sword type, relating to the St Peter and Sihtric issues. The reverse, which has a cross design, has the inscription OTARD MOT. Otard is a Continental Germanic name, and MOT is a normal contraction for MONETA in this period, so the reverse is entirely literate. This encourages confidence in the obverse, which appears to read RORIVA/CASTR in two lines, separated by the sword, with a Thor’s hammer in the bottom line as on St Peter issues, although here it is between the S and the T rather than a letter forming the handle as on the St Peter coins. This shows that the type is secondary to the St Peter types, as one would expect given the comparative rarity.

The initial letter is unusual, and might conceivably be taken as an h or a D, but it has parallels with manuscript forms of lower-case R from the period, and this seems the likeliest interpretation. This gives an apparently literate place name ending in –castr, derived from Latin castra (fortification). The form in –castr, rather than –ceastre, appears to be Old Norse, and is peculiar to the Danelaw, and the same element is visible in blundered inscriptions of the Sihtric group. Although the form Rorivacastr is otherwise unrecorded, I believe that it can most plausibly be identified with Rocester in northern Staffordshire, for reasons which I shall discuss in more detail elsewhere.11

It may or may not be significant that this new type has a cross reverse, and all of the St Peter coins in the hoard also have cross reverses. Since this is the latest Danelaw hoard of the Sword phase, and since all the Sword/cross coins appear relatively freshly struck, this is at least suggestive that the Sword issues with cross reverse are later than those with hammer or mallet reverses. However, this is not conclusive. It is also notable that the hoard contains two coins of Sihtric, one with mallet and one with hammer. In his recent discussion of the Sword types, Mark Blackburn argued that the Sihtric coins were issued south of the Humber, and one element of his argument was that Sihtric coins do not appear in hoards north of the

10 Stewart 1991.
11 Williams 2008.
Humber.\textsuperscript{12} The new hoard, and another recent hoard from the Penrith area, provide evidence to the contrary, although this does not necessarily affect Blackburn’s general argument.\textsuperscript{13} A final point of interest at this stage is what the hoard tells us about currency in the York area in the late 920s. It has become customary to refer to the ‘Kingdom of York’ (although contemporary documentary sources still tend to refer to the kingdom as Northumbria), and to argue for a distinction between coin-issuing York on the one hand and the North-West with its links to the mixed economy of the Irish Sea on the other. This distinction is entirely artificial, with both coin-hoards and mixed hoards in both Yorkshire and the North-West.\textsuperscript{14} The presence of another mixed hoard (along with Goldsborough and Bossall/Flaxton) in the hinterland of York is a useful reminder that minting does not necessarily equate with the exclusion of imported coinage, or even of other forms of currency.

Further research

Although the hoard already raises a number of issues, its full significance will only be apparent following much more extensive research. A number of directions for that research are already emerging. Firstly, the hoard contains over four hundred coins of Edward the Elder and, not surprisingly, appears to contain a number of new moneyers. Together with hoards from Brantham, Essex (2003), Flusco Pike, Cumbria (2005) and Lewes, East Sussex (2006), the Vale of York hoard provides a significant addition to the corpus of Edward’s coinage, and it will be necessary to establish whether the new evidence supports or challenges the established interpretation set out by Stewart Lyon in 1989.\textsuperscript{15} Secondly, as discussed above, the additions to Blackburn’s recent corpus of the Sword types may add to our understanding of both the chronology and minting places within the group. Thirdly, the cluster of types around the period of Athelstan’s assumption of authority north of the Humber have the potential to clarify both the numismatic and political history of the northern Danelaw in the mid-late 920s. Finally, the hoard will undoubtedly add new dimensions to the ongoing discussion of the nature of Viking silver economies and the classification of Viking hoards, and it is hoped that the hoard will provide a focus for a major comparative study of Viking hoards in Britain and Ireland.

These different strands of research will take some time to deliver. However, it is already clear that the Vale of York Viking hoard has the potential, especially when taken together with other recent finds, to make fundamental changes to our understanding of coinage and economy in the early tenth century.

SUMMARY CATALOGUE

\textbf{Anglo-Saxon}

\textit{Alfred (871–99)}

\textit{London monogram (without moneyer)}

3

\textit{Two-Line}

47

Æthered × 10, Æthelwulf × 7, Byrhelm × 3, Deorwald, Dunna, Hereferth, Heremund, Humberht, Wulfred × 21, Uncertain

\textit{Rex Doro}

1

Diarwald

\textsuperscript{12} Blackburn 2006, 212.

\textsuperscript{13} Williams forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{14} The distribution and classification of hoards is discussed at some length in Williams forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{15} CTCE, 20–96.
Edward the Elder (899–924/5)

Two-Line
Æthelferd × 6, Æthered × 39 (one cut half), Æthelsige, Æthalstan × 3, Æthelwold × 2, Æthelwine, Æthelwulf × 22, Badda × 6, Beahred × 5, Beahstan × 8, Beornere × 13, Beornferth × 2, Beornwald × 7, Beornwulf, Beorhtred × 2, Beornard, Beornred × 4, Beorhthelm × 2, Bonus Homo, Beoce × 3, Byrnelm × 4, Byrnulf (probably), Cenbreh, Céolwulf,
Ciolhelm × 2, Clip × 3, Cynestan, Deorwald × 16, Diormod Dryhtwald × 4, Dunning × 3, Eadelm, Eadgild × 2, Eadmund × 5, Ealhstan × 5, Eclaf × 3, Egenulf × 2, Eigmund × 2, Frithesbert × 11, Fulchrad × 2,
Rihard, ‘Rothnard’, Samsun × 8, Sigebrand, Snel × 3, Stæfman × 2, Thæg, Thurel × 2, Tila × 8, Torhthelm × 3 (one broken half), Walter × 2,
Warmer, Weardhelm × 3, Wigmere, Wighard × 3, Wihtmund, Wihtwulf, Wilric,
Winegar × 2, Wulfgar, Wulfheard × 7, Wulfred, Uncertain/blundered 17
(one cut half).

Bust
Andreas, Beahstan × 3, Byrnelm × 3, Deorwald × 3, Dudig, Ealhstan, Eawulf,
Gareard × 2, Liofhelm × 3, Man, Manna, Wulfred × 21, Uncertain × 6

Floral varieties
Æthalstan, Brece, Doiga

Burh
Waltere, Wulfisige (cut half)

Rose
Wulfheard × 9

Athelstan (9245–39)

Two-Line
Æelfred, Æthelferd, Æthered, Æthelsige, Æthelwulf × 2, Abba × 2, Alfeau × 2,
Berhtheid, Biornard × 2, Byrnelm × 4, Byrnwig, Cenbreh, ‘Cia_elm’,
‘Cioehecm’, Deorwald, Dryhtwald × 3, Eadmund × 2, Garwulf × 3, Grimwald,
Heremod, Hungar, Igere × 2, Ioohann × 8, Man, Mana, Regenulf, Sigebrand × 2,
Sigeland × 2, Snel × 2, Thurel, Tietes, Torhthelm × 3, Wælhelm × 3,
Wulfheard × 4

Bust
Æthered

Church, with York signature
Ragnald × 22

Church, moneyer only
Adalbert × 5, Etram × 4, Frotier × 2, Turstan, Wyltsige × 2

Rex Totius Britanniae
Maegred

Archbishop Plegmund (890–923)
Æthelfred × 2, Æthelwulf, Bierhtelm × 2, Wilric × 2, Uncertain

Anglo-Viking

Sword St Peter (c.921–927)

Cross reverse
### SHORT ARTICLES AND NOTES

#### St Martin (c.921–27)

- **Silfric I (921–926/7)**
  - Hammer reverse
  - Are
- **Mallet reverse**
  - Uncertain
- **‘Rorivacastra’ sword type**
  - Otard
- **Danelaw imitation, Athelstan Church**
  - Uncertain

#### Carolingian

- **Sancta Colonia**
  - Gratia Dei Rex (post 864)
- **Corbie, Quentovic, Uncertain**

#### Islamic (Samanid dynasty)

- **Nasr b. Ahmad I (AD 864–892)**
  - 1
- **Ismail b. Ahmad I (AD 892–907)**
  - 3
- **Ahmad b. Ismail II (AD 907–914)**
  - 4
- **Nasr b. Ahmad II (AD 913–932)**
  - 2
- **Nasr b. Ahmad (I or II)**
  - 1
- **Caliph Al Mu’tamid (AD 870–892)**
  - 1
- **Uncertain Samanid**
  - 3

**Total**: 617

### REFERENCES

- CTCE. See Blunt et al.
AN ENIGMATIC PENNY OF HENRY I

ERNEST W. DANSON

The illustrated penny of Henry I, Profile left/ Cross Fleury type, BMC Norman Kings ii, actual diameter 17 mm, was found near Newark, Nottinghamshire, in April 2007, by Mr and Mrs W. Severn using a metal detector. The find was duly reported to the Portable Antiquities Scheme and is registered in the Fitzwilliam Museum’s Corpus of Early Medieval Coin Finds as EMC 2007.0156.

The specimen shows little sign of wear, is well centred and generally well struck up with the obverse reading +HENRI[R]. The form of the reverse legend is here more exactly rendered:

The end of this may be normalized as ON TAMP and interpreted as ‘at Tamworth’, as on Tamworth mint coins of William II, Cross in Quatrefoil type, BMC Norman Kings ii.1 However, what should be the moneyer’s name poses considerable problems. The first letter has a wedge jutting horizontally from the base of the upright, rather than from the crescent, as is more usual for an R. Without the crescent it would clearly represent L. The fourth letter appears to be the same and the second letter is somewhat similar, although both the crescent and the wedge have lost their shapes to form an almost colon-like group. The small O, from a broken punch, leaves no room for doubt; it reappears in the ON. So letters 3, 4 and 5 could read ORD or OLD, suggesting that letter 2 might be a wen (F), making the name perhaps LWORD or LWOLD, with a contraction mark after the first letter.

However, these musings suggest no convincing moneyer and the impression grows that the die-sinker deliberately blundered the name. If this really is a case of evasion, the reliability of the Tamworth mint attribution is thrown into doubt. No coins of the Tamworth mint are known to have been struck between the issues of William II BMC Norman Kings type ii and Henry I BMC Norman Kings type xiv, a span of c.1093–1131, except for a specimen by the moneyer Lefwine of Henry I BMC Norman Kings type xiii, which type has recently been.

Acknowledgements: The writer wishes to thank the finders, Mr and Mrs W. Severn, for allowing him to examine the coin and also for supplying photographs. He is also grateful to Dr Martin Allen for commenting on the piece and encouraging the writing of this note.

1 SCBI 17 (Midlands), no. 747, moneyer Bruninc, and no. 749, moneyer Colinc.
redated by Mark Blackburn to c.1101–1103 and therefore close to the probable date of issue of the coin under consideration.²

There seems little doubt that the dies of this coin were prepared by a competent worker, using possibly official punches, and that the striking itself was done with more than average care. However the weight, 1.02 g, is very low,³ and, although the fineness of the metal has not been tested, the suspicion remains that this is a product of the nefarious minting practices for which this reign is notorious.

Postscript

Subsequent to the writing of the above Note, the coin in question has appeared in Dix Noonan Webb sale 77, 12 March 2008, lot 196. In the catalogue entry, the moneyer’s name has been read as LPORD and expanded to Lifword.

REFERENCES

BMC Norman Kings. See Brooke 1916.

TWO NEW COIN BROOCHES OF TOURNOIS TYPE

B.J. COOK

The production and use of a particular type of coin brooch in England in the later thirteenth century is now well-established. The coins utilised are typically either the new groats of Edward I (1272–1307), introduced in 1280, or gros tournois of the French kings Louis IX, Philip III or Philip IV. The cross side of these coins (the reverse of the groats and the obverse of the gros tournois) is gilded, to be the side on view, and a pin and catchment are attached to the other side. Usually these attachments have not survived, although portions of the base or signs of where they were fixed are often visible. Included in the illustrations is an image of a replica of a groat of Edward I with an attachment in place (Fig. 1). This was shown at the British Museum in the late 1980s, when the replica was made, although it was not possible to acquire the item. It subsequently entered trade and the gilding and attachment were removed, presumably for commercial advantage: it is recorded by Martin Allen in his survey of the Edward I groats in this later condition.¹

Fig. 1. Groat of Edward I with an attachment.

² For discussion, see Eaglen 2006, 76–7.
³ BMC Norman Kings, II, 270–1. The six specimens of this type catalogued vary in weight between 1.21 g and 1.37 g with an average of 1.27 g. For this note, the recorded grains have been converted to grammes.
¹ Allen 2004, no. 41 at p. 37.
Although single coins are not normally regarded as eligible to be considered as Treasure, coins converted to other purposes are so considered, following the passage of the Treasure Act in 1996. Coin jewellery has thus been treated like other precious-metal decorative items as falling within the purview of the Act, allowing the better recording and, sometimes, the acquisition of these items by museums. The purpose of this note is to publish two relatively recent finds of coin-brooches that have passed through the Treasure system and which represent new types of coin for the phenomenon. Each has been, or will be, covered in volumes of the *Treasure Annual Report* (hereafter *TAR*), but it seems worth flagging up their status in more detail in this Journal.

Brooches from thirteenth and fourteenth-century England are overwhelmingly annular or ring brooches.\(^2\) In the six existing volumes of the *Treasure Annual Report*, published 1997–2004, there are 117 later-medieval brooches of gold, silver gilt or silver which are annular, or otherwise consist of a frame (rectangular, heart-shaped, hexagonal, etc) and a pin; the other types of brooch represented are six coin brooches and two brooches with figurative designs, one a fragmentary item that is perhaps a pilgrim souvenir (if it is a brooch at all: *TAR* 2000, no. 127) and the other an unusual piece depicting a man fighting a lion (*TAR* 2003 no. 145). Coin brooches, therefore, form a quite distinct and unusual group and it is possible they were intended for use by a specific group of people or in a specific context. It is probably a legitimate assumption that they were intended to express a religious message, since, without exception, they were created in such a way as to emphasise the cross depicted on the original coin.

A number of coin brooches of the gros tournois type have now been published in successive volumes of the *TAR*: gros tournois of Louis IX (*TAR* 2001, no. 89, Hants); Philip III (*TAR* 2000 no. 116, Norfolk) and Philip IV (*TAR* 2000, no. 132, Norfolk), issued 1285–90.\(^3\) A number of older examples are also known, such as one of Philip IV from North Walsham in Norfolk reported in the Coin Register 1998, no. 189, and another fragmentary one, though with two hooks still *in situ* on the back, discovered in the nineteenth century and now in the Department of Prehistory and Europe in the British Museum (*ex* Charles Roach Smith Collection, BM registration number 1856,0701.2745).

It has also become clearer that a range of differently-sized coins was utilised in this way, not just the groat-sized pieces. A demi-gros of Marguerite of Constantinople, Countess of Hainaut, issued in the period 1275–80 was recovered in 2007 and will be published in a future *TAR* by Dr Adrian Marsden. The number of English pennies transformed in this way is also accumulating: Edward I, class 2 (*TAR* 2000, no. 117, Norfolk) and Edward I, class 3 (*TAR* 2004, no. 141, Isle of Wight). The latest-issued English coin treated in this way so far recorded is a penny of class 9b, Canterbury mint, first shown at the British Museum in 1991.\(^4\) Also, there is a penny of class 4b converted into a pendant, rather than a brooch (*TAR* 2000, no. 151, Kent): the cross side is still the focus, but there is evidence that fragments of coloured glass may have been added to the centre and ends of the cross for further decoration. This item has been acquired by the Department of Prehistory and Europe in the British Museum (registration number 2001,1108.1). A denier tournois of Philip IV pierced with 3 holes was recovered from West Rudham in Norfolk (Coin Register 1994, no. 338) – this may have been sewn onto something or else the holes might have been for rivets, as described in the *TAR* entry for the Isle of Wight just mentioned.

The coins presented in this note, however, are full gros, but versions issued by lesser rulers, rather than by the French kings; these coins are not in themselves commonplace.

---

\(^2\) See comments in Hinton 1982, 16.

\(^3\) Published also in Popescu 2001, no. 55 at p. 692.

\(^4\) Information from the records of Marion Archibald.
1. Wickmere, Norfolk (2003 T236)
Gros tournois of Henry VII, Count of Luxemburg (1288–1309), struck at Méraude (Fig. 2).
This coin-brooch was found by Mr E. Snyder while metal-detecting in August 2003 at Wickmere in Norfolk. The coin is a silver gros tournois issued by Henry VII, Count of Luxemburg (1288–1309) and was struck at the mint of Méraude (also known as Poilvache) no earlier than 1300, since it was in that year that Henry shifted his coinage to the tournois standard.5 It was first published by B.J. Cook and J.P. Robinson in TAR 2003, no. 161.

Obverse. Cross in centre (significant remains of gilding)

Inner legend: +MARCHIO ERLOM
Outer legend: +HENRICVS COMES LVCEBVRGENSIS ET RVPE
(In both legends M is represented by reversed N)

Reverse: Border of five-petalled roses within circles; stylised castle in centre; the remains of an attachment are present

Legend: MONETA M[ ]AVDE
(reversed N in MONETA; legend partially hidden by attachment)
Wt: 4.05 g  Die axis: 200˚
Ref. Weiller 1977, 18–19, no. 24i

Acquired by the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum (2008,4095.1)

Fig. 2. Gros tournois of Henry VII, Count of Luxemburg (1288–1309) (2003 T236).

Gros au portail of Gui IV, Count of Saint-Pol (1292–1317), struck at Élincourt, 1300–1317 (Fig. 3).
This brooch was discovered by Mr D. Everingham in September 2007 while metal-detecting on cultivated land; it was recovered at about 2 inches below the surface.
In 1300 Gui IV of Saint-Pol inherited the lordship of Élincourt in the Cambrésis, a region belonging to the Holy Roman Empire and technically under the suzerainty of the bishops of Cambrai. He opened a mint there which was maintained by his successors for decades, despite the protests of the bishops.

Obverse: cross in centre (remains of gilding visible)

Inner legend: +G COMES SPAVL
Outer legend: +GRACIA DOMINII DEI NPI FACTV SS I I
(No punctuation in either legend, in outer legend Lombardic M in DOMINI, P in place of R in NOST)RI
and unbarred final M)

Reverse: Border of five-petalled roses in circles; stylised castle in centre

Legend: +MOHE] LINET
(Legend partially hidden by remains of attachment; Lombardic N in LINET)
Wt: 3.95 g  Die axis: 70˚
Ref: see de Mey 1987, 89, H2, though different in details of punctuation and lettering.

Acquired by the Hull & East Ridings Museum.

Fig. 3. Gros au portail of Gui IV, Count of Saint-Pol (1292–1317) (2007 T626).

5 Weiller 1977, 15.
The find-spots of these items are interesting, in that the brooch from Yorkshire, added to other finds from Kent and Hampshire, at least suggests a wider usage of this type of item than might have previously seemed the case. The dominance of East Anglian, and specifically Norfolk, find-spots is manifest, but it seems likely that this is, in part at least, a distortion created by the biases of the reporting record.

The significance of these two new brooches, other than their relatively unusual points of origin, is their period of issue. Neither can have been produced before 1300, which would appear to demonstrate that the production period of the brooches extended perhaps a decade or two into the fourteenth century. Some, at least, of the converted gros tournois of Philip IV might belong to the post-1300 period, but none of the examples I have examined belongs to the issues that have been identified as probably belonging to the end of the reign, according to Van Hengel’s classification.6 These new finds do, therefore, have a useful contribution to make to the chronology of this phenomenon.

The largest single group of this type of object appears to be that represented by groats of Edward I: fourteen out of Allen’s corpus of 59 examples show signs of mounting and/or gilding. This is a good proportion and furthermore is likely to be an under-representation, given the evidence that the gilding and mounting are sometimes removed in modern times. This coinage was concluded by 1281. A small number of Long Cross pennies are known to have been converted in this way. The Edwardian pennies converted into jewellery known by the author range from classes 2 (1279) to 9b (c.1299–1301), though the latter is the only one later than class 4b (1282–9). There is a tradition that gros tournois of Louis IX were popular as amulets within France, especially around the time of his sanctification in 1297 and were reported as still being in use in the seventeenth century. It is unclear how accurate this tradition is, but it might well support a late thirteenth-century date even for the conversion to jewellery of such earlier gros.7

A very tentative chronology might suggest that this particular manifestation of the fashion for coin brooches in England became significant, if it did not begin, in or around 1280, possibly even inspired by the appearance of the new groat. At this point, furthermore, there would still be pennies of the previous Long Cross coinage, recalled in 1279, available for a similar conversion. As the groats ceased to become available, the French gros tournois took their place. Of course, there could easily have been a chronological overlap, but the two new finds published here may perhaps help to support the idea that the utilisation of non-English coins might have come somewhat later. It is the case that we are dealing with a relatively restricted body of material, and as more is recognised and assembled, the patterns will likely become clearer.
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7 See Beaune 1991, 108.
‘ABJECT ORTS AND IMITATIONS’: SOME VARIANTS IN THE ‘BLACK FARTHING’ COINAGE OF JAMES III

N.M. MCQ. HOLMES

Introduction

The small copper coins which are grouped together under the collective heading of ‘black farthings’ have been described in general terms in various reference works on Scottish coinage,¹ and in one specialist paper devoted to the copper money of the later fifteenth century,² but they have never been the subject of an in-depth typological study, and indeed such a study would at present serve little purpose. The small size of the flans and the poverty of the die-sinking and striking, combined with the corroded condition of so many of the surviving specimens, preclude any serious attempt to classify the coins in any greater detail than the five varieties which have been familiar to students of the Scottish series for many years. However, a number of individual coins which have come to light during recent decades, and which display features which may be regarded as non-standard, do suggest that the overall picture may have been somewhat more complicated, and it may therefore be helpful to bring together descriptions of all these coins in one place for future reference.

The coins which will be described and discussed here are all variants or imitations of just two of the five varieties, none being related to the three types which have traditionally been described as ‘ecclesiastical’ issues. Nonetheless, it may be useful to outline the overall picture as represented in previous publications, in order to place these coins into context. Edward Burns described and illustrated three specimens of each of two varieties,³ quoting from various Acts of the Scottish Parliament which referred to ‘black money’. The earliest of these, dated 9 October 1466,⁴ authorised the striking of copper coins ‘four to the penny’ and included this description of the intended designs: ‘...on the ta parte the crois of Saint Androu and the croune on the tother parte, with superscripctione of Edinburgh on the ta parte and ane R with James on the tother parte’. An Act of 12 October 1467⁵ called for the cessation of striking of black money, but subsequent Acts make it clear that the coins continued to circulate. Further information is provided in the account for the period up to 22 June 1468 submitted by the moneyers Alexander Tod and William Goldsmyth.⁶ This refers to copper coins which had first circulated as halfpennies before being reduced in value to farthings.

Farthings of Burns’s first variety bear a crown on the obverse, surrounded by a legend comprising a version of the king’s name and title. On the reverse is a large saltire with a much smaller one to either side; the legend is a version of VILLA EDINBURGH (Fig. 1). The legends of the second variety are similar, but the obverse design comprises a crown above the letters IR. On the reverse is a crown superimposed on the upper part of a large saltire, with smaller saltires in the side and bottom angles (Fig. 2).

---

2 Murray 1997.
4 Cochran-Patrick 1876, vol. i, 31–2, document II.
5 Cochran-Patrick 1876, vol. i, 32–3, document III.
6 Cochran-Patrick 1876, vol. i, 44–5, document XXIII.
The remaining varieties of black farthing were not brought to the attention of scholars until after the recovery of a quantity of them during excavations at Crossraguel Abbey, Ayrshire, in 1919. In addition to nine specimens of each of the above two varieties, along with twenty specimens in brass, the excavated coins included eighty-seven copper and five brass specimens of farthings which George Macdonald (later Sir George) believed to have been minted at Crossraguel, and which are still regularly described today as ‘ecclesiastical’ types. The first of these bears the same obverse design and legend as Burns’s second variety, but on the reverse is a long cross pattee with crowns and six-pointed mullets in alternate angles; the legend is MONE PAVP (money of the poor) (Fig. 3). The other two Crossraguel types (Macdonald’s third and fourth varieties) bear on the obverse a trefoil, with a fleur-de-lis on each leaf and a five-pointed mullet in the middle. A crown is set in each of the upper spandrels. The reverse bears a floriate long cross with a five- or six-pointed mullet in each angle. The legend is either MONE PAVP or MO PAVPER (Fig. 4).

In the first edition of *The Scottish Coinage* Ian Stewart (now Lord Stewartby) followed Macdonald in classing the Crossraguel types as ecclesiastical issues, but by the time the revised version was published, he was inclining to the belief that they had in fact formed part of the regal coinage, with one coin of type II or III apparently having IACO in the reverse legend. This theory was supported by Mrs Joan Murray in her paper published in the

---

7 Macdonald 1920, especially pp. 37–8.
8 Stewart 1967, 197 and 208.
proceedings of a 1977 Oxford symposium. In the same paper she suggested that the first of the farthing issues published by Burns might have pre-dated the 1466 Act of Parliament, and might thus have been the coins which had initially circulated as halfpennies, with the second variety immediately following the Act. Some of the coins to be described below, which are mules combining the obverse of the second type with the reverse of the first, may be regarded as supporting the idea that the two issues were not greatly separated in time. In the absence of any surviving contemporary documents relating to the ‘Crossraguel’ type farthings, however, there is very little evidence to assist in dating these issues.

**Descriptions of variant coins**

All the coins described here have been recovered during archaeological excavations or by metal-detectorists in Scotland, and all except the example from St John’s Tower in Ayr have been examined by the writer. For a description and photographs of the Ayr coin I am grateful to Dr Donal Bateson, of the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow. As is often the case with copper coins excavated from Scottish soil, these examples are mostly in poor condition, and it is appreciated that details which were evident when the coins were examined may not be apparent in the photographs, some of which are old images of coins no longer accessible for new photography. On occasions such as this it is necessary to request that readers grant to the writer a modicum of trust in terms of what he has personally observed on the coins. Present locations of the various coins (where known) are appended to the descriptions, in case sceptical readers should wish to check the latter for themselves.

1. Variant of second variety, with royal titles on both sides (Fig. 5).
   - Obv.: +[I]ACOBE[DEI-GR]; crown above I R
   - Rev.: +IACOBVS[DEI-GR]; crown over upper part of large saltire; small saltires in side and lower angles
   - 14.0 × 15.0 mm; 0.67 g; die axis 270˚
   - From excavations at St Giles Cathedral, Edinburgh, 1981 (Holmes 2006, no. 5)
   - Edinburgh City Museums and Galleries

![Fig. 5. James III farthing, second variety variant with royal titles on both sides (St Giles Cathedral, Edinburgh).](image)

2. Mule of second variety obverse and first variety reverse (Fig. 6).
   - Obv.: legend illegible; crown above I R
   - Rev.: +[VIL]L[ER]DI[B]VR; large saltire with small saltire to either side
   - 15.0 × 14.0 mm; 0.46 g; die axis 0˚
   - Metal-detector find from The Glebe, Aberlady, East Lothian (Holmes 2004, 265)

![Fig. 6. James III farthing, second/first variety mule (Aberlady, East Lothian; National Museums Scotland collection).](image)

---

9 Murray 1977, 120–1.
3. Another similar, but much damaged (Fig. 7).
Legends illegible, but designs still distinguishable
From Scottish Urban Archaeological Trust excavation at Blackfriars Wynd, Perth (list of coin finds omitted from published report)
Perth Museum and Art Gallery

Fig. 7. James III farthing, second/first variety mule (Blackfriars Wynd, Perth) (enlargement; actual diameter uncertain).

4. Another similar, possibly a contemporary forgery (Fig. 8).
Legends illegible, but designs still distinguishable
Struck on angular and mis-shapen flan; 0.36 g
From excavations at St John’s Tower, Ayr, 1986 (Bateson, forthcoming)
Present location unknown

Fig. 8. James III farthing, second/first variety mule (? contemporary forgery; St John’s Tower, Ayr) (enlargement; actual diameter c.10.5 mm).

5. Another similar, apparently a contemporary forgery (Fig. 9).
Legends illegible, but designs clear
Struck off-centre on an undersized and angular flan; 0.28 g
From excavations at Linlithgow Friary, 1984 (Holmes 1989, no. 279)
Present location unknown

Fig. 9. James III farthing, second/first variety mule (? contemporary forgery; Linlithgow Friary) (enlargement; actual diameter c.10.0 × 11.0 mm).

6. Very crude contemporary forgery, apparently as first variety (Fig. 10).
Designs comprise arrangements of rectangular and lozenge-shaped blocks, apparently forming the outline of the upper part of a crown on one side, and approximating to part of a large saltire between two small ones on the other. Rectangular marks in ‘legendary’ circles.
Squarish flan with cut corners; 1.19 g
From excavations at Whithorn, Kirkcudbrightshire, 1987 (Holmes 1996, 348 no. 28)
Stranraer Museum
Discussion

Coin no. 1 is a normal second variety farthing except for the presence of the king’s name and titles instead of the mint name in the reverse legend. This is, to the writer’s knowledge, the first recorded example of this phenomenon on a coin of this type (although, as stated above, Stewart had by 1967 encountered an ‘ecclesiastical’ farthing with IACO on the reverse). Since the majority of excavated farthings have legends which are illegible as a result of a combination of poor striking and corrosion, it is at present impossible to state whether coins with the royal title on both sides constitute distinct varieties, or whether the known coins are simply the result of die-sinkers’ errors.

The four coins (nos 2–5) which combine a second variety obverse with a first variety reverse make up an intriguing group, but since each of the coins is very different in appearance from all the others, it is difficult at present to know what to make of them. In particular, it is uncertain how many of them are official issues and how many are contemporary forgeries, but such doubt also exists in relation to many coins which belong to the previously defined types. There is considerable variation in diameter and weight, as well in style, between individual specimens. There is but one surviving documentary reference to counterfeit black money at this time,10 and it is hard to understand why anyone would have taken the trouble to strike such items, given the frequently attested unpopularity of the coins and the severity of the penalties for those convicted of forgery. (Copies of the roughly contemporary ‘Crux Pellit’ coppers are generally accepted to be of continental manufacture, and are very rarely found in Scotland.) Nonetheless, it seems probable that counterfeiting did take place, as some of the coins are clearly the products of very crudely engraved dies. Coin no. 5, from Linlithgow Friary, comes into this category, and no. 4, from Ayr, may do so as well, although its poor condition obscures details of the designs, particularly on the obverse. Coin no. 2, on the other hand, is relatively well struck, with a literate legend on at least the reverse, and this seems likely to be a product of an official mint. It is worth noting that these ‘mule’ coins can be seen to conform more closely to the description in the 1466 Act of Parliament than does either of the normal varieties. On one side (‘the ta parte’) are the saltire (the cross of St. Andrew) and the Edinburgh legend, and on the other side (‘the tother parte’) are the crown and an ‘R with I’ (for Iacobus/James).

Coin no. 6 is clearly open to various interpretations. Had it not been found during an archaeological excavation which also yielded many other fifteenth-century coins, including black farthings, there would have been no particular reason to associate it with these coins at all, but given its provenance the ‘eye of faith’ may be permitted to see an extremely crude attempt to reproduce the designs of a first variety farthing. Aside from the designs, this item resembles many genuine farthings in size and weight, and in having an angular flan. It would certainly not have fooled anyone who looked closely at it, but in the context of a religious building, and given the well-attested propensity for people to deposit foreign and counterfeit coins in church collections, its identification may perhaps be regarded as credible.

10 Cochran-Patrick 1876, vol. i, 35, document VII.
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A FARTHING OF HENRY VII WITH MINTMARK

LORD STEWARTBY

In spite of the advent of metal detectors farthings of Henry VII have remained very rare. When the weight of a silver penny was lowered from 15 gr. to 12 gr. in Edward IV’s recoinage, the farthing was reduced to 3 gr. At this weight the coin was so small as to be almost impracticable, and it is therefore no surprise that very few farthings seem to have been struck under Edward after 1464, or under Henry VII.

Lawrence was concerned about the difficulty of distinguishing between halfpence and farthings of this period. He quoted Ruding’s remark that, when a new type was adopted for the farthing in 1523, confusion between the two smallest denominations had been due to the fact that “farthings and halfpennies were struck with one coin.” This he very reasonably interpreted to mean that the same dies had been used for the striking of both denominations. He therefore suggested that the only means of telling them apart was by weight – if above 3 gr., halfpence; if below, farthings.

There is, however, a surer way of resolving the issue. Since it is now clear that the same dies were not used for both halfpence and farthings, the latter can be shown to have been struck from smaller dies. The key is the measurement of the beaded inner circle, 8–9 mm on halfpence, 6–7 mm on farthings. The difference is usually obvious to the eye.

All farthings of this reign published hitherto seem to be without mintmark, and to read henric Di Gra Rex, or Rex A, with or without saltire stops. However, a specimen that I was so fortunate as to obtain from Messrs Baldwin in 1999 shows a mintmark before the king’s name and a consequent shortening of the inscription, henric ( ) Gra R, with a saltire before R. The arch of the crown is lost in the dotted circle, but the cross on top of it is clear. To its right is a horizontal shank, terminating at the left end with two arms and a small point in the centre. The right end of this object is not fully visible as a result of ‘ghosting’ of the reverse cross-end at this point, but it seems to have another limb on the lower side. This object is certainly not a letter, or part of one, since the h of the king’s name is level with the side of the crown and

1 Lawrence 1919, 265-8.
2 Ruding 1840, I, 302.
3 e.g. BNJ 31 (1962), 122; Withers and Withers 2004, 45.
not above it. The only Henry VII mintmark that would fit what can be seen on the coin is anchor, which was probably introduced not long before 1500. The excrescence at the lower end on the right would be one of the flukes, while the two arms at the other end would represent the anchorstock.

The new farthing weighs 0.173 g (2.67 gr.), the deficiency of weight being at least in part due to its having a broken edge between 180° and 270°.

Fig. 1. Twice actual size.
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THE 1533 ISSUE OF JAMES V PLACKS

N.M.MCQ. HOLMES AND LORD STEWARTBY

In the revised edition of The Scottish Coinage, I.H. Stewart (now Lord Stewartby) described and illustrated an example of a previously unknown type of billon plack, which he had obtained at the dispersal of the collection of H.J. Marr by Messrs Spink in 1965.1 Despite the reverse being of the type normally found on placks of James IV, this coin was attributed to a post-1526 issue of James V, of which at that time no documentary record was known. Although discussion of this coin by Stewart, by R.B.K. Stevenson and by Mrs J.E.L. Murray continued in the late 1960s and early 1970s, nothing further was ever published. The recent acquisition by the National Museum of Scotland of a second coin of this type,2 from different dies, has provided an impetus for this full publication of both coins along with an outline of that earlier research and the conclusions to which it led about the probable date of issue.

The two coins are illustrated in Figure 1. Although they are from different obverse and reverse dies, and the reverse of the Stewart coin shows evidence of double-striking, the readings appear to be identical and are as follows:

Obverse: + IACOBS : DEI : GRÆ : REX : SCOTORVM; shield of arms of Scotland within tressure of four arcs; crown above and to each side of shield; annulets in upper two spandrels

Reverse: : VILL / A : DE : / EDIN / BVRG; floreate cross fourchée with plain saltire in middle; crowns in all four angles

Fig. 1. James V 1533 issue placks: (1) Stewartby collection, (2) National Museum of Scotland collection.

1 Stewart 1967, 203 and 210, and Pl. XXII, 301.
2 A metal-detector find from Seton Sands, East Lothian (2004); Bateson and Holmes 2006, 183 and 192.
The lettering is basically Roman in form, with lob-topped A as on the normal placks of James V, but the G is of a more Gothic form, resembling a figure 6 with incomplete loop. On the coin published by Stewart the REX has been overpunched on SCO in the die, but this is not the case on the NMS specimen.

One notable difference between the two obverse dies concerns the punches used for the crowns. On the Stewart coin the same large punch was used for the three crowns around the shield as was used for the reverse die (as noted by R.B.K. Stevenson in 1966; see below). On the NMS coin, however, there are two different crowns, with those on either side of the shield from a smaller punch than that used for the crown above the shield and those on the reverse.

The two coins are also markedly dissimilar in other respects. The Stewart coin is struck on a full flan, measuring 23.5 × 24.5 mm in diameter, with a weight of 2.06 g and a die axis of 315°. Its appearance is very coppery. The NMS coin is on an undersized flan of 23.0 mm diameter, with a weight of 1.57 g and a die axis of 120°. Surface enrichment remains, giving the coin an overall silvery appearance.

At the time when the first example of this issue came to light, R.B.K. Stevenson was already studying the plack coinages. His first recorded observations, in a letter to Stewart dated 18 August 1966, included a suggestion that the reverse die must have been made early in the reign of James V, since the design was that of the previous reign but the trefoil ornament at the end of the cross arms was as that on early placks of James V. Stevenson suggested that it must have been set aside as having an incorrect design and subsequently put into use, possibly in around 1526, in association with the groats with annulet stops, on account of the presence of the annulets on the obverse of the plack. After a period of further study of the series, Stevenson wrote again to Stewart on 20 March 1967. This letter included a more detailed comparison of aspects of the new coin with those on normal issues of James IV and V, but no further suggestions on dating.

A breakthrough came in the form of the discovery, by Mrs Murray, of a documentary reference which provided a context for the coinage. This was discussed, along with details of the Stewart coin, in a paper read by Mrs Murray at a meeting of the British Numismatic Society in January 1971. The following is an extract from the typescript of this paper.

In March 1533 the king ordered a coinage of billon, 120 stone weight coined, in placks or otherwise. The specified fineness, at two deniers, was probably lower than at the beginning of the reign, but presumably the currency value was again 4d. This may reflect the rise in the silver price, or a desire for an even higher rate of profit, to meet the urgent necessities which the king claimed; the stated reason for this coinage was frankly to raise money, both for ordinary expenses and for the resisting of our auld inemiys of Ingland quhilk dailie invadis our realme. I suspect that the defence aspect was brought in to put the case in the most favourable light possible, since the history books don't mention any invasion then.

I found this record not long after Mr Stewart had secured a remarkable plack, which we independently decided must be dated to the period of James V's groats and abbey crowns. Crowns and central saltire agree with James IV, but regnal numeral absent. Villa [instead of Oppidum in the reverse legend] would at first suggest not later than class I groats, but may be the result of copying from an earlier issue of placks. Annulets in spandrels, otherwise unknown. Lettering – ornamental O, C very distinctive, S that of the groats, not earlier Roman lettering placks. Broad unpeaked D and waisted I as late class III groats, broken I in class IV. Colon stops. Lion's tail. [The latter is a reference to an apparent annulet on the tail, as noted in Stevenson's letter of 20 March 1967, where he compared it with this feature also found on a few James IV placks with Old English lettering. He subsequently discussed this detail in his published paper on the groat coinage of James V.]

If the whole of the 120 stones authorised in 1533 were struck, this issue of placks may have been spread over several years, but the lack of any other known specimen suggests that the issue was in fact smaller.

Mrs Murray did not remark on the difference in the form of the letter G from that used on other Roman letter placks, but this is not distinct in either legend of the only coin then available for study, although comparison with the NMS coin, on which this letter is particularly clear on the reverse, does demonstrate that the same letter form was used on all four dies.

---

3 The documents recording this are: Registrum Secreti Sigilli Regum Scotorum (RSS) vol. II, no. 1514; Acts of the Lords of Council in Public Affairs (ADCP), p. 399, 2 March 1533. The latter states the 'urgent necessite and defalt of money to furnis our expens'.

4 RSS II, 1514.

The fact that, forty years after the publication of the first recorded specimen of this coinage, there is still only one other known to exist, despite the number of coins recovered by metal-detectorists in the intervening period, would tend to support the idea that far fewer of these coins were actually struck than had been authorised, but the possibility remains that others may not yet have been recognised, having been assigned to the reign of James IV without the detailed examination necessary to establish their true identity. Since we now know that at least two discrete pairs of dies were used for this coinage, it seems reasonable to assume that further examples of the issue remain to be discovered.
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MEDIEVAL AND LATER COINS FROM NEAR ORFORD CASTLE, SUFFOLK
RICHARD KELLEHER

Introduction
The coins discussed below were found with the aid of a metal detector by Mr Alan Calver in fields surrounding Orford Castle in Suffolk over a period of 10 years. Mr Calver has exclusive access to fields around the castle by permission of the landowner and the present writer is indebted to him for kindly making his finds available for examination and reporting.

Site background
Orford Castle near the River Ore at Orford on the Suffolk coast is one of the iconic fortifications of the twelfth century. It was built between 1165 and 1173 by Henry II at a cost of over £1,413. The building of a castle at this location has traditionally been seen as an attempt by Henry II to assert the power of the crown, particularly as the powerful baron Hugh Bigod, earl of Norfolk (1095–1177) dominated the area from his castle at nearby Framlingham. The period of castle building at Orford was accompanied by a series of other local alterations and improvements which are helpfully documented in the Pipe Rolls. These included the draining of surrounding marshland which helped shelter the port and provide extra farmland, and the building of a causeway and a tidal mill. These works signify a shift in the significance of Orford, at least in the short-term. In Domesday Orford was a part of the manor of Sudbourne and is not mentioned as a separate entity until the market and tolls of Orford were granted by Robert Malet to a priory at Eye between 1071 and 1100. In the following centuries Orford became a thriving little port.

The coins
Figure 1 shows the location of the castle and its immediate environment, indicating the fields in which the coin finds were made. Precise findspots were not recorded for each coin but the general trend, as observed by the finder, was that the medieval pieces clustered in field A

1 See Allan Brown et al. 1963. Recent research suggests that the positioning of the castle might also have served to protect the coastline against invasion by continental allies of Thomas Becket during his exile: Potter et al. 2002, 36.
2 Potter et al. 2002, 44.
and diminished in number through fields B and C. The seventeenth-century material was said to have been found almost exclusively in the south-western edge of field C, along with contemporary objects such as musket balls.

Seventy-seven coins and five jettons have so far been recovered from the area and the coins are summarised in Tables 1 and 2 below. They fall broadly into two groups; the first peaks with issues struck in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and the second from around 1560.

![Fig. 1. Location map showing Orford Castle and the fields where coins have been found (indicated by shading).](image)

**TABLE 1. Medieval coins by period.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Penny</th>
<th>Halfpenny</th>
<th>Farthing</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Cross</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279–1351</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351–1412</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412–1464/5</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464/5–1544</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18(+3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34(+3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* three coins could not be definitely attributed but fall somewhere in these periods

3 Although not a common occurrence, this coin appears to have been deliberately cut into a quarter penny. This practice belongs to the earlier Long Cross phases and preceding times, when no provision was made for striking fractional denominations.
Despite the intense level of activity that would have accompanied the castle-building phase we have no coin finds in our area until the class 4b Short Cross penny of John (struck c.1200–1204). The Cross-and-Crosslets coins of the previous issue are, in comparative terms, much more of a rarity than Short Cross, but even so one might have expected to make finds, consistent with the presence of a large workforce in Orford for a period of some years in the 1160s and 70s. Perhaps the masons were careful with their wages, or maybe our later finds represent losses that allude to a rather more everyday activity – a market site. It was suggested above that the medieval finds concentrate in field A; it could further be suggested that the coins are losses accumulated by the presence of a minor market in or close to field A. As noted above an early market is mentioned at Orford in a grant of the late eleventh century, but there is little else to confirm its existence until 1298, when one is recorded as being held by Robert de Ufford.4 If the market was already in existence prior to 1298 then the chronological spread of coin finds could suggest just such a phase of activity in the hundred or so years up to and following this date. The site lends itself to such activity, located on the main road on the northern fringe of the village. When documentary evidence is completely absent, market and fair sites can sometimes be posited from coin finds alone. A site at the Albany near Ipswich yielded 45 coins, and has been interpreted as the location of an otherwise undocumented minor fair.5 The finds at the Ipswich site show a broadly similar pattern to Orford in the dominance of late twelfth to late thirteenth century pieces.6

Figure 2 shows the consistent pattern of losses with a clear peak in the Short Cross phase (12 coins). Although the Long Cross phase has only seven coins, one must remember this period is shorter than its predecessor, and calculating coins lost per year gives results of 0.18/year against 0.17/year respectively. The Edwardian sterling period then follows with ten finds, which is probably less than we might expect given their comparative proliferation as metal detector and excavation finds. The final three periods see minimal loss but this does not necessarily signify an economic downturn as several factors could contribute to this pattern.

TABLE 2. Post-medieval coins by reign and issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>12d</th>
<th>6d</th>
<th>4d</th>
<th>3d</th>
<th>2d</th>
<th>1½</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>½</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry VIII – 3rd coinage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth I – 1st issue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth I – 2nd issue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth I – 3rd issue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I AR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles AE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685–1800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801–1900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bullion famine in this later period meant that many coins struck after 1279 continued in use through the weight reductions of 1351, 1412, and 1464/5; this is supported by copious excavation, single-find and hoard evidence over the country as a whole. Most of the pennies of Edward I and II at Orford are of good weight, indicating they were lost earlier rather than later, but the halfpennies of Edward III do show wear, suggesting longer use and deposition in the fifteenth century. A curious piece is illustrated as Figure 3 below. It is a sterling penny

---

4 S. Letters, *Online Gazetteer of Markets and Fairs in England Wales to 1516*, citing Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, iii, no. 469.
5 Newman 1994, 129.
6 Ibid. The Albany losses begin somewhat earlier than those at Orford with a single cut farthing of Stephen. Direct comparisons between the two sites are impossible because the Cross-and-crosslet and Short Cross issues up to 1216 are combined in the Albany table, as are the 1216–47 Short Cross and Long Cross issues, and the reigns of the three Edwards.
of Edward I which appears to have been cut down to form either a halfpenny which was subsequently broken or an intentional farthing in the same fashion that we see in the issues before 1279. If this is genuinely cut (and the straight edges certainly give that impression) then it supports contemporary concerns over the lack of provision of halfpennies and farthings after Edward’s recoinage, which proscribed the cutting of one’s own change. Cut coins of this type are uncommon but comparable examples have been found at Meols on the Wirral coast.

There are also three pennies that cannot be more accurately identified than to the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries. The full penny to fraction ratio is 21:16. It has been suggested elsewhere that a coin loss profile with a significant proportion of cut halves and quarters is an indicator of a degree of sophistication in coin use. If so the Long Cross phase is distinctive in its coins being cut fractions only, and this might therefore represent a more active phase at the site.

The post-1526 profile is modest apart from the peak of thirteen coins of Elizabeth I’s Second issue. At first glance an explanation of this could be that some or all of the coins are from a purse hoard scattered by the plough. While not disregarding the possible presence of a purse hoard within this group it is more likely that the majority are in fact single losses made up until the great recoinage of 1696, when all the old hammered issues were removed from circulation. The survival of Tudor small change (especially of Mary and Elizabeth) into the

---

7 E. Screen (pers. comm.) has suggested that examination of the edges under a microscope could indicate whether the coin had been cut or broken. This method has been successfully applied to Anglo-Saxon coins: see Screen 2006.

8 Metcalf 1977, 10; a recent listing of the Meols material with discussion by Simon Bean appears in Griffiths et al. 2007, 304–50. This includes coins of Edward I-III cut into halfpennies (4), a farthing (1) and a round halfpenny cut in two. Ibid., 318. A discussion of the small change shortage in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries appears in Allen, 2007, 192–4. He describes a petition of 1445–6 which asserts that ‘travellers were being obliged to break pennies in two to pay for a halfpenny purchase . . .’.

9 Bateson 1989, 183.
Stuart period and beyond has been discussed by Barrie Cook for South Ferriby,¹⁰ and the finds from Orford should be viewed as subject to the same processes. Both assemblages show similarities in the low number of royal farthing tokens of Charles I: there are just three at Orford, against a much larger proportion of contemporary silver issues.

**Conclusion**

Small assemblages where find spot information is known have a part to play in illuminating something of the past character and development of sites. The physical remains combined with documentary evidence tell us of the castle building at Orford, and archaeology is beginning to fill the gaps regarding the more prosaic elements of the structure of the town. What detector finds can add is some indication of the prosperity and function of particular locations around the town; in this case revealing a potential candidate for Orford’s medieval market.

**CATALOGUE**

Coins on display in Orford Castle Museum and unavailable for examination are indicated by schedule numbers in bold in the catalogue. Numbers 10 and 77 were only recently discovered and were identified from a low-resolution scan. Conventions are as follows: underlined = ligatured; nr = weight not recorded; c = corroded; f = fragment; sw = some wear; w = wear; ew = extremely worn; b = broken; ds = double struck; ch = chipped; cl = clipped; p = pierced; i = incomplete.

**Short Cross coinage (1180–1247)**

1. 4b London Willelm 1d. +WILLELM.ONLvND 1.04 g
2. 5a2 Lincoln Alain 1d. 1.30 g
3. 5b1 Canterbury Goldwine 1d. +GOLDWINE.ONC 1.19 g
4. 7bD London Elis 1d. 1.34 g
5–8. 1d. nr
9. ½ 0.65 g
10. ½ [ ]NLVNDE nr
11. ¼ 0.64 g w
12. Irish ¼

**Long Cross coinage (1247–79)**

13. 1–4 uncertain uncertain ½ [ ]E 0.26 g c,f
14. 3a London Nicole ½ [ ]OLE|ONL 0.65 g
15. 3a-c Shrewsbury Peris ½ PER|ISE 0.59 g
16. 3c London Nicole ½ [ ]OLE|ONL 0.71 g
17. 3–4a uncertain Nicole ¼ [ ]HIC| 0.38 g
18. 4–7 London/Cant Nicole ¼ [ ]OLE| 0.23 g
19. 5a–7 Canterbury uncertain ½ [ ]ON|CAN 0.64 g w

**Edward I-II (1272–1327)**

**Pennies**

20. 4a–c Canterbury 1.19 g w,ch
21. 9b¹ uncertain this coin appears to have been deliberately cut 0.29 g b?
22. 10cf London 1.32 g
23. 10cf² London 1.22 g
24. 10cf³a London 1.22 g
25. 10cf³b London 1.07 g

**Edward III (1327–77)**

**Second ‘star-marked’ coinage halfpennies (1335–43)**

26. 4b London * after ANG and DON 0.55 g w
27. (²4) London 0.53 g w,ch

**Florin coinage (1344–51)**

28. halfpenny London 0.49 g b

**Pre-treaty series (1351–61)**

29. Series C penny Durham 1.05 g
30. Series C penny London 0.55 g b
31. Series D penny London 0.40 g b,ch

¹⁰ Cook et al. 1998, 105.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14th-15th century uncertain</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. Penny York</td>
<td>0.84 g w,ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Penny</td>
<td>0.48 g w,ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Henry IV – Edward IV uncertain</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. Penny</td>
<td>0.45 g w,ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Henry V (1413–22)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Penny, class G (?) York</td>
<td>0.73 g w,ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Henry VI (first reign 1422–61) Leaf-trefoil issue (1435–38)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. Halfpenny London saltire stops, leaf on breast</td>
<td>0.41 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Henry VII (1485–1509)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Groat, profile</td>
<td>2.01 g w,i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. 'Soverein' penny Durham (Abp Sherwood), D to left of shield</td>
<td>0.57 g w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Henry VIII (1509–47)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Penny London no i.m.</td>
<td>0.29 g b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mary (1553–58)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Groat (sole reign 1553–4)</td>
<td>1.87 g ds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Groat (sole reign 1553–4)</td>
<td>1.01 g ew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elizabeth I (1558–1603), First issue (1558–61)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42. Groat 156? i.m. martlet</td>
<td>1.91 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Groat ?</td>
<td>1.40 g w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Groat ?</td>
<td>1.10 g vw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second issue (1561–82)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Sixpence 1561 i.m. pheon</td>
<td>2.59 g w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Sixpence 1561 [i.m. pheon] nr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Threepence 1562</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Sixpence 1563 i.m. pheon</td>
<td>2.71 g sw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Threepence 1563</td>
<td>0.52 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Threepence 1563 nr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Threepence 1564 nr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Sixpence 1565 i.m. coronet</td>
<td>2.59 g w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Penny 1567–70 i.m. coronet</td>
<td>0.52 g sw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Sixpence 1575 nr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Threepence 1578(i?) i.m. plain cross</td>
<td>1.23 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Threepence 1582 i.m. sword</td>
<td>1.43 g p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Halfgroat 1582/3 i.m. bell</td>
<td>0.83 g w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third issue (1583–1603)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58. Halfgroat 1589/90–91/2 i.m. hand</td>
<td>0.77 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Halfgroat 1589/90–91/2 i.m. hand</td>
<td>0.72 g vw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Sixpence 159[ ] Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irish 'fine' coinage of 1561</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61. (?) halfgroat illegible</td>
<td>0.50 g vw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>James I (1603–25), First coinage (1603–04)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63. Halfgroat i.m. thistle</td>
<td>0.74 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second coinage (1604–19)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64. Halfgroat i.m. illegible</td>
<td>0.76 g w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Penny no initial marks</td>
<td>0.53 g sw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charles I (1625–49)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66. Shilling group D, fourth bust i.m. ?harp (1628–9)</td>
<td>4.52 g w,c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Halfgroat group D, fourth bust i.m. star (1640–1)</td>
<td>0.81 g w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Halfgroat group D, fourth bust i.m. star (1640–1)</td>
<td>0.75 g w,ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Penny group D, fourth bust i.m. pellet</td>
<td>0.50 g p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Penny group D, E or G i.m. two pellets</td>
<td>0.48 g w,ds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>71–3. Rose farthing tokens</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.m. crescent</td>
<td>0.93 g, 0.80 g, 0.70 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles II (1660–85)</td>
<td>Fourpence</td>
<td>1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne (1702–14)</td>
<td>Fourpence</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria (1837–1901)</td>
<td>Shilling</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTLAND</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander III (1249–86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jettons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (c.1364–1422)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (c.1380–1422)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France – Tournai (c.1415–97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France – Tournai (c.1497–1521)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremburg – Matheus Laufer (Master 1612, died 1634)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REFERENCES


**A TOKEN-ISSUING MERCER OF WITNEY**

**ALAN WERGE-HARTLEY**

The family history of a seventeenth-century token issuer in Witney, Oxfordshire, connects him with an issuer in Burford, Oxfordshire, and also to Scandinavia or Germany. His copper-alloy tokens,¹ which may be assumed to have been farthings, have on each of two obverses a shield bearing the Maiden (the device of the Mercers’ Company) surrounded by the name RALPH-WERGE, and on their common reverse the inscription **OF·WITTNEY·1653** around ·W·R·M· (see Fig. 1).

---

¹ Williamson 1889–91, 937, Oxfordshire 244; Milne 1935 nos 180–1; Norweb 1993 nos 3849–50.
These letters stand for Werge, Ralph and Mary, see below. The second obverse die could indicate an output of more than £20 worth of farthings, unless the first wore out prematurely.2

Ralph Werge was indeed a mercer of Witney in the middle of the seventeenth century. The Worshipful Company of Mercers is the premier livery company of the City of London, with records dating back to 1348. The term ‘mercery’ was first mentioned in the 1130s with the meaning ‘wares or merchandise’, but it came to refer specifically to luxury fabrics. The Maiden of the Mercers’ Company appeared in 1425 on their first seal.3

The Werge family was located in Oxfordshire from the sixteenth century.4 Their name is of Scandinavian or German origin, and can still be found in southern Norway, Denmark, and northern Germany. In those countries, although the spelling may be the same, the pronunciation is vergay, but in sixteenth-century England it was quickly anglicized, the v becoming w, and pronounced werg with a hard g, or werj with a soft j, and with a variety of spellings.5 Seventeen variants are known, and even Ralph used or permitted the use of Wirg, Wirge, Werg, Werge and Wyringe, the last being the signature on his will.

Ralph Werge, the youngest son of Thomas and Margaret Wirge of Chipping Norton in Oxfordshire, was christened in the parish church on 27 July 1604, in the second year of the reign of James I. The town was a major wool trading centre, with a market established in the thirteenth century, and in 1607 the town was granted a Royal Charter.6 Both of his parents had been born in the town, and his grandfather Thomas Wyrge lived there. On 5 April 1630, at the age of twenty-six, Ralph married Mary Goodwin at Great Rollright, four miles to the north, and they moved south to Witney on the river Windrush, a town noted for blanket-making. There his wife bore him two sons and four daughters, who were all christened at the parish church of St Mary.7

He was a mercer in Witney for thirty years. In 1653 he issued his farthing token, presumably to cope with the shortage of small change under the Commonwealth. The Ashmolean Museum Catalogue of Oxfordshire Seventeenth-century Tokens refers to his hearth tax payments, the variations in his signature appended to the minutes of Vestry meetings of St. Mary’s, and to his service as churchwarden in 1638 and 1659.8 Milne concluded that Ralph Werge was buried on 30 September 1685, but this is incorrect.

---

2 Thompson 1994, 110–12.
3 http://www.mercers.co.uk. The sole surviving complete impression from the 1425 seal is illustrated in Sutton 1998, 8.
5 Bahlow 1967, 135, 138, 521 relates Verg(e) to Ferg and Fehr, meaning ‘ferryman’.
6 Weinbaum 1943, 93.
7 Oxfordshire Family History Society, Witney births, marriages and deaths [microfiche].
8 Milne 1935, 47.
He made his will on 9 August 1664, 'being sicke of body but of perfect mind and good remembrance', and it may be assumed that he died almost immediately since the will was proved on 28 September 1664 at the Prerogative Court of Canterbury.\(^9\) The actual date and place of his burial are not known because there is a gap in the Witney burial records from April 1652 to August 1678, but the grave would have been within the parish church since his widow Mary, in her 1682 will, expressed a wish to be buried 'in the parish church of Witney aforesaid by my late husband Ralph Werge deceased'.

His sons John and Ralph predeceased him. His eldest daughter Elizabeth married John Sindrey of Burford in 1652; the second daughter, Mary, married Richard Broome of Oxford in 1664; Hester was born and died in 1643; and the youngest, Sara, born in 1648, was still unmarried at the age of thirty-four when her mother made her will in 1682.

Ralph Werge was reasonably prosperous, owning houses and land. His will ensured that Mary had a generous provision for life and, in what must have been a mark of his confidence in her abilities, made her the sole executor. He gave thoughtfully to his relations (including his second-best hat), donated alms to eighty of the parish poor,\(^10\) and asked to be buried in the church or churchyard.

Ralph's son in law John Sindrey was a member of the Worshipful Company of Grocers (or Grossers), who were bulk importers of spices, drugs and tobacco, and were responsible until 1666 for regulating the use of the King's Beam for weighing heavy imported goods.\(^11\) He issued a token in 1653 which had many similarities in design to the token of his father-in-law, and they may have been ordered at the same time. Other Oxfordshire tokens dated 1653 may be noted, even though they shed little light on the process by which tokens were ordered from the moneyers in the Tower of London:\(^12\)

Banbury: Manasses Plumton, Fruiterers' arms (Milne 15), or MANASLES with a tree (Milne 16; Dickinson 14A; Norweb iv.3574).

Burford: Edmund Castle at the Three Sugar-loaves (Williamson 47; Milne 45; Norweb iv.3607).  
Burford: John Sindrey, Grocers' arms (Williamson 52; Milne 53; Norweb iv.3602).

Obv. ‘JOHN SINDRY’ around the Grocers’ arms  
Rev. ‘OF BURFORD 1653’ around ‘S’ above ‘I · E’, signifying Sindrey, John and Elizabeth [née Werge] (Fig. 2).

Deddington: Thomas Nutt, mercer (Williamson 82; Milne 84; Norweb iv.3630).

Thame: John Burges, Unicorn (Williamson 195; Milne 123; Norweb iv.3787).

Witney: Ralph Werge, Mercers’ arms (Williamson 244; Milne 180–81; Norweb iv.3849–50).

Woodstock: Thomas Paynter at the Three Cups (Williamson 249; Milne 186; Norweb iv.3860).

---

\(^9\) PRO/National Archives, Prob/11/315.

\(^10\) 'Item I give and bequeath more unto my said brother Robert Werg my best cloake to be delivered unto him presently after my decease together with my second best hatt. Also it is my will that the three pounds herein bequeathed to Sara Werg daughter of Charles Werg of Witney shall be paid unto her father Charles Werg for her use within three yeares next after my decease. Item I give and bequeath unto the poor people of the parish of Witney forty shillings to be paid unto them att my funerall or the morrow next after by six pence a house. And lastly I give and bequeath unto Mary Werg my wife all the rest of my estate whatsoever unbequeathed. And I make her whole and sole executrix of this my present will. And I entreat my loving friend Mr John Dodd and my loving cosen Thomas Weg to be my overseers of this my present last will and testament. And for their pains taking herein I give and bequeath unto each of them two shillings and six pence apeece to buy them gloves.'

\(^11\) http://www.grocershall.co.uk.

\(^12\) Thompson 1989.
Mary Werge probably died in December 1687, for the parish records note the burial of a Mrs Werge on 16 December, the honorific, and the lack of a Christian name, probably indicating a proper respect for a prominent and aged parishioner. Her will was proved by her son-in-law Richard Broome on 17 April 1688 at the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. Despite much of her property being hers only for life (as indicated in Ralph's will), she was able to leave her unmarried daughter Sarah well provided for, with many items of furniture and £300, together with further bequests to her daughter Mary, her grandchildren, and others, amounting to £75 10s. 0d. Her house was evidently well furnished, and the proper disposal of the contents was important to her, as can be seen in the detailed descriptions of pieces bequeathed to specified persons, and the fact that, five years before her death, many items were marked in chalk with the initials of the intended recipient.

Ralph and Mary Werge were two ordinary people who lived during an eventful period of English history: the reign of James I; Charles's problems with Parliament, followed by the Civil War when the royal court was centred on the Oxford colleges (1642–46); the Commonwealth of the Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell, who slighted the defences of Oxford in 1651; the Restoration of the monarchy in the person of Charles II, and the brief reign of James II. Ralph was born the year after Queen Elizabeth I died, and Mary died the year before the Glorious Revolution ushered in the joint rule of William and Mary. In the midst of change and turmoil they seem to have lived quiet, God-fearing lives of service to their family, and to the town of Witney, leaving two wills, and some tokens.
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13 PRO/National Archives, Prob/11/391.
14 ‘Item. I give and bequeath unto my daughter Sarah Wirge three hundred pounds of lawfull English mony to be paid her within six moneths next after my decease by my executor hereinafter named. Moreover I give and bequeath unto my said daughter Sarah Wirge one bedsted standing in my best chamber with the curtaines and valense and all the other materialls thereunto belonging and alsoe one feather bed two flock beds foure bolsteres foure blanquets two greene ruggs foure pillowes one compterpaine four carpets one red coverlid one round table all the chaires and stooles fringed with greene and yellow all my wrought chaires and stooles which usually stand in my best chamber six cushions marked with the letters S W and all other things whatsoever marked with the same letters and the two chests in the hall chamber and alsoe one paire of andirons one paire of tongs one fire shovell and one paire of fire doggs standing in my best chamber a folding bed and foure joint stooles my biggest brasse pann one brasse kettle and all manner of brasse pewter linnen and woollen with all other things that shall bee found at my decease within the chest given to her by her uncle John Kendall deceased. Likewise I give her all my books not already bequeath and one halfe of my wearing clothes and the other halfe of them I give unto my said daughter Mary Broome to bee equally devide betweene them except such as I shall by order other ways dispose of.’
OCTAGONAL TOKENS FROM WAPPING FOUND NEAR SHUDY CAMPS, CAMBRIDGESHIRE, AND ASSOCIATED FINDS

R.H. THOMPSON

The seven octagonal tokens of the seventeenth century recorded here were kept together because they could not be identified by the finders, Mr and Mrs Bob Spall, who also found the Ashdon hoard. Identification of the tokens, however, raises as many questions as it answers. They were not found together but singly, over more than twenty-five years, while metal-detecting in an area which, though only about sixteen miles wide, extends from South Cambridgeshire (Shudy Camps) into north Essex.

Yet all seven are from the same dies of the same rare type. The low relief, of the engraved obverse in particular, makes reading and photography difficult, but reading Greene in the third line took one via an index of ‘Token Toponyms’ to Green Bank in Wapping, which still exists in London E1, curving with the Thames just north of Wapping High Street. The token is not in Williamson, but is catalogued in Dickinson as London 3321B.2

Michael Dickinson, amongst other help, kindly reports that this derived from John Wetton’s reporting of his specimen (‘Unrecorded’ no. 9, according to Nigel Clark) as:

Obv. John Packman at ye Greene Bancke in Wapin

By mistake in the abbreviated entry D.3321B he gave the denomination as a farthing. The surname is corrected below, but from none of the specimens is it possible to be sure of at ye (though there is space for that), to read a final e to Bancke, or a second n to Wapinn, but happily the location is not in doubt.

It is likely that the Wetton specimen was the same as that in Roger Shuttlewood’s collection, auctioned by Spink in 2001, although only John was certain on the obverse. The destination of that specimen has not been ascertained.3 The token seems to have been known only from this and one other specimen until the finding of seven in South Cambridgeshire or nearby. These are unexplained, but seven finds remote from their place of origin probably indicate a dispersed hoard, even though nothing in the finding suggested a hoard. Their condition varied, with verdigris present on just two specimens. Perhaps there was dumping of rubbish from Wapping when it became feasible to transport it the length of Essex, or the deposit of spoil from excavations in Wapping for the London Docks, opened in 1805. It is believed that there have been no such deposits since London Docks were closed in 1969, and redeveloped from 1981. In the same metal-detecting area a few other London tokens have been identified, from St Clements Lane and Turnmill Street.

Associated finds

The following six tokens were also unidentified by the finders:

2. Catworth, Gt: Talbott, John, 1668 1/2d. Williamson Hunts. 3, as Norweb iii.2314.
5. Bartholomew Close (City, Farringdon ward Without): [Kempe, Richard?], 1664.

Acknowledgements: I owe the challenging photography to the skills of Mr Philip Mernick.

1 Blackburn 1989, 13-14.
2 Dickinson 1986, 155.
3 Spink 15 March 2001, lot 649 (part).
Obv. Turk's head, no letters visible
Rev. ·IN· | GREAT·SÆ | BARTHOL· | MEWES· | CLOASE· | 1664
Williamson -,. cf. London 129 and Norweb vii.6521 (1666 1/2d.). Chipped and pierced.
6. Obv. ·WILL·GIVE·FOR·THIS·A·PENY·I670 around arms
Rev. ·HIS·HALFE·PENNY·I667 around merchant's mark. Overstruck by the dies of Williamson, Shropshire 5, = Norweb iv.3879.4

Examination of the octagonal tokens
Obv: ~John [clear beyond doubt]
  Prestman [Pre. . .man is clear in a slanting light, and st is likely]
  . . . Greene [before that word any letters are illegible, but at y' is possible]
  Bank in [there seems to be corrosion between the two words]
  Wappin [both ppin and any subsequent letters are uncertain]
Rev: ·HIS·HALF·PENNY around an anchor supported by the right hand of a facing figure in a long dress with a belt around her waist (or wearing a jacket), on her head a 'bun' of hair or a small hat, upon her extended left hand two birds, and below it the letters P | I E. Octagonal. 21–22 mm.

Weights (corrected to two decimal places):
0° (1): 1.23 g.
180° (5): 0.96, 1.57, 1.89, 2.06, 2.67 g.
? (1 with obverse totally obscured by verdigris): weight not recorded.

On signboards a female figure accompanied by an anchor personifies Hope, as suggested by Hebrews 6:19, 'Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul', and the usual name of the sign is Hope & Anchor.5 The only token in the Norweb Collection with such a device is the halfpenny of Richard James in Nightingale Lane.6 The two birds may be doves from Noah's ark, so reinforcing the message of hope. They do not have the appearance of crows, birds which were associated with Hope through supposedly calling Cras, cras, Latin for 'Tomorrow, tomorrow'.7 This particular establishment was named, vice versa, as the Anchor & Hope, the earliest evidence for which seems to be the tokens. Otherwise the tavern was recorded from 'before 1746' to 1855, noted by Dodsley as having given its name to Anchor and Hope Alley.8 This alley ran north off Green Bank from at least 1695 (see the will below); it was shown at no. 41 on Gascoyne's 1703 map ‘The Hamlet of Wapping Stepney’, and also on later maps until it was absorbed in 1891 into Red Lion Street. This street in 1938 became Reardon Path and Reardon Street.9

As a variation on round tokens John Prestman's belongs to the last phase of the phenomenon, octagons in particular being dated 1667–71.10 The following in the published parts of the Norweb Collection bear witness:

4 On the reverse at least, see Dickinson (forthcoming).
5 Larwood and Hotten 1866, 333; 1951, 202; Dunkling and Wright 1987, 127.
6 Williamson 1889-91, London 2072.
7 Hall 1974, 156.
8 Lillywhite 1972, no. 2234, citing 'Dodsley 1761' in the typescript at Guildhall Library.
Documentation

The will of John Presman senior, mariner, dated 14 February 1694[-5], was proved in the Commissary Court of London on 16 August 1698 by his daughter Anna Maria Clarke:

To son John Presman that messuage he now lives in, at the lower end of Salters Alley near Green Bank, and one shilling;

to granddaughter Elizabeth Beckford one messuage containing five rooms in Anchor and Hope Alley;

to granddaughter Rachel Barber two messuages in Anchor and Hope Alley and Pump Alley;

to granddaughter Mary Clarke the house next that I live in now (all in Stepney);

to daughter Anna Maria Clarke household stuff and the residue of the estate; she to be executrix.11

Presumably his son was the John Presman of Stepney, carver, aged about 26, who intended on 3 May 1676 to marry Mary Wilkinson of the same parish, widow, aged about 28.12

Thanks to the finding of seven specimens near Shudy Camps, Cambridgeshire, the description of the token can be (incompletely) revised as follows.

WAPPING (Middlesex). Green Bank

[Anchor & Hope tavern]: Prestman, John, [mariner, d. 1695x8]. Undated 1/2d. [1667x71].

Obv: John | Prestman | [at ye?] Greene | Banck in | Wappin |

Rev: · HIS · HALF · PENY around an Anchor supported by the right hand of [Hope], a facing female figure, on her extended left hand two birds, and below her hand P | I E

Octagonal.

Dickinson, London 3321B but Prestman, 1/2d., Banck.
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