

of Stafford (GODPINE ON STÆF) in the Carlyon-Britton sale 1913, lot 1194. Unpublished mint for this mule. From Ryan sale, lot 873.

6. Henry I type 15 of Sandwich.

Obv. + HENRICVS:

Rev. + A [] ON SÆNDP

Possibly Adalbot. Unpublished mint for this type.

R. P. MACK

A NEW TYPE FOR ARCHBISHOP CEOLNOTH

IN the Supplement to Brooke's *English Coins*, on revising the Anglo-Saxon portion of which I assisted Mr. C. A. Whitton, I suggested, not without some misgivings, the inclusion of a fragment of a penny of Archbishop Ceolnoth which formed lot 324 of the Montagu sale, 1896. This was described in the catalogue as having a tonsured bust facing, with, as reverse type, a floriated cross with a leaf in each angle; the cataloguer noted that certain rare coins of Æthilberht have a similar reverse. Misgivings about the coin arose from the fact that it had been "passed" in the Montagu sale, normally a sign that its genuineness was suspected, but a manuscript note in my copy of the catalogue read "Only a piece, passed over" which suggested that this might not be the case here.

It is therefore a pleasure to be able to record not only that the coin has now turned up again and proves to be undoubtedly genuine, but also that, through the generosity of Major R. M. Simon, it has been presented to the British Museum. With it Major Simon presented a number of other coins "passed" at the Montagu sale, all of which seem rightly to have been condemned as forgeries.

The Ceolnoth coin reads:

Obv. + CE ----- CHIEP-

Rev. ----- LDMONET (Pl. XXV, 12).

The Montagu catalogue says that "the moneyer's name is undoubtedly CENVEALD as on Æthilbert's coin". This may well be so: Cenweald was a moneyer of Ceolnoth's on the "moneyer's name on cross" type as well as of Æthilberht's. But a moneyer Herebeald also struck the floriated cross type for Æthilberht and one cannot rule out the possibility that he was responsible for the Ceolnoth fragment.

It does not appear to have been sufficiently recognized what an important reform in the coinage was marked by Æthelwulf's introduction of the "moneyer's name on cross" type. For the first time a uniform coinage, common both to the kings of Wessex and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, was introduced. This practice continued until some time in Alfred's reign when once again a variety of types appears, though what may be called a basic type, the one with a cross on the obverse and the moneyer's name on the reverse, was then

introduced and continued alongside the more varied types for nearly another century.

Meanwhile Æthelwulf's uniform type was continued initially by his successor Æthilberht, but towards the end of his reign he changed it to the floriated cross type here recorded as of Ceolnoth also. Æthilred, who succeeded Æthilberht in 866, four years before the death of Ceolnoth, introduced the so-called "lunette" type which was also struck by Ceolnoth and the Mercian king Burgred and continued by Alfred. This appears to have been a substantial issue in the regal series, though the coins of the Archbishop have survived in few specimens.

That a reform calling in this type must have taken place is suggested by the fact that it is seldom found in hoards mixed with later types. The great Cuerdale hoard, with its 920 coins of Alfred, had none of the lunette type. The reform was doubtless prompted by the debased state of the coinage.

The uniform coinage was not, however, abandoned on the reform taking place. Alfred's type V is also found struck by Ceolwulf II of Mercia and by Archbishop Ethered.

We thus get a period dating from about 855 to perhaps 880 during which only four reverse types, all struck consecutively, are found in middle and southern England. The first two were struck by the Wessex kings and the Archbishop of Canterbury; the last two by the Mercian kings also. The legislative measure that resulted in this uniform coinage has not survived, but one is justified in believing that it marked a major attempt at monetary reform. It may also be significant that East Anglia was not a party to this currency union.

C. E. BLUNT

THE EARLIEST COINS OF THE MINT OF ROCHESTER

THIS note is no more than a vindication of an attribution made by Rev. Daniel Haigh as long ago as 1869 but since then so completely ignored by later writers as to lead anyone who chanced to light on it to believe that it must be untenable. Writing in the *Numismatic Chronicle* for that year¹ Mr. Haigh said: "I am not aware whether the unique coin of Ceolwulf (I), once in the cabinet of the late Mr. Cuff, with the reverse legend DOROBREBIA CIBITAS, has ever been correctly assigned, as it ought to be, to Rochester." This coin (P1. XXV, 13) is now in the British Museum (B.M.C. 112).

His grounds for this attribution were, of course, that Dorobrevia was the British name for Rochester just as was Dorovernia for Canterbury.

Among subsequent writers Kenyon, in the third edition of Hawkins's *Silver Coins of England*,² attributes the coin to Canterbury and does not mention the possibility of Rochester; Keary in the first volume of the British Museum *Catalogue* does the same;³ so does

¹ p. 193.

² p. 46.

³ p. 41.