

HACVN are beyond doubt. Until now this moneyer has been known from only one coin—the Type II of the Thetford mint purchased by the British Museum in 1950 from the executors of the late L. A. Lawrence (*Pl. XV, 7*).¹ This is almost certainly the coin mentioned by Brooke in *BMC*² where he quotes the reading HALUN given in both the sales through which it had passed.³ Although the mint signature on the 'new' coin is not fully legible the remaining letters are sufficiently clear that it too may be attributed with certainty to Thetford. It is only the second known coin in Type VII of this mint.⁴ The other is *BMC* 215 of the moneyer Gefrei (*Pl. XV, 8*) whose obverse die is shared by the 'new' Hacun coin. Of the two the Hacun must

be the earlier striking since the obverse die flaw running from the right hand fleur of the crown is just beginning to show whereas on Gefrei's coin it has spread as far as the letter 'e'. Mr. F. Elmore Jones who has made a detailed study of this type⁵ informs me that this is the only instance known to him of an obverse die being shared by two moneyers but that he thinks this may not be surprising in view of the great rarity of the type. Gef(f)rei is otherwise known only in Type I and Hacun in Type II. As at most other mints there seems to have been a clean sweep of moneyers at Thetford in 1158 and neither Gefrei nor Hacun reappears in Henry II's Tealby issue.

M. M. ARCHIBALD.

AN UNPUBLISHED LONDON FIND OF EARLY THIRTEENTH-CENTURY PENNIES

THROUGH the kindness of the American dealer, student and collector Mr. David H. Hess of Baton Rouge, I am able here to put on record fairly full details of an interesting parcel of 26 'Short-cross' pence of King John and of 2 cut halfpence of the same reign, which came to light in the course of excavations consequent on the demolition in 1878 of an old London building. A note on the find originally appeared in Mr. Hess's December 1966 price list⁶, but the descriptions there of no more than a selection of the coins are very abbreviated, and the more detailed account given here has been made possible only by Mr. Hess's characteristic generosity in making available to me his own very full notes on all the coins which passed through his hands. It is the view of both of us that the 28 coins in fact constitute the whole of an until now unpublished find which is of some interest for the serious student of John's English coinages. A list of the find is as follows:—

LAWRENCE CLASS Vb	
<i>Bury St. Edmunds</i> , Fulke	1
<i>Canterbury</i> , Iohan	1
<i>Ipswich</i> , Iohan	1
<i>King's Lynn</i> , Iohan	1
<i>Lincoln</i> , Andreu	1
<i>London</i> , Adam	3
„ Ilger	1
„ Ricard B	1
„ Willelm T	1 + $\frac{1}{2}$

¹ Published by R. A. G. Carson in 'The Mint of Thetford', *NC* 1949, p. 230, No. 7 & *Pl. XV, 8*.

² *P. cexliii* in footnotes containing published readings which he had not been able to check.

³ Sotheby, 25. 1. 1860, lot 127 and E. Burns, Sotheby, 17. 12. 1869, lot 49.

⁴ *BMC* 214, *Pl. LVI, 10*, of the moneyer Driv is of Hereford, not Thetford. See *NC* 1955, p. 243.

LAWRENCE CLASS Vc	
<i>Canterbury</i> Goldwine (?)*	— + $\frac{1}{2}$
„ Iohan M	1
<i>Ipswich</i> , Iohan	2
<i>London</i> , Abel	1
„ Adam	1
„ Beneit	1
„ Ilger	2
„ Rauf	4
„ Walter*	2
„ Willelm B	1

* a coin illustrated in sale-catalogue cited.

What will be noticed at once about the find is its brief chronological span, but no less significant is how it looks towards Eastern England. Only three of the coins had been struck at a mint south of the Thames, and the absence of coins from the other provincial mints outside East Anglia is quite remarkable.

Concerning the date of the hoard, a *terminus ante quem* seems clearly indicated by the total absence of coins of Lawrence Class VI. Recently it has been argued cogently by Mr. J. D. Brand of Rochester that this Lawrence Class VI was introduced quite a number of years earlier than Lawrence had supposed, and most probably in or about the year 1210⁷. According to the same modern authority on the series, too, Lawrence Class Vc would have been put in issue c. 1208, so that a date of concealment for our little London find c. 1209 ± 1 might be

⁵ 'Stephen Type VII', *BNJ* XXVIII, pp. 537-554. I am grateful to Mr. Elmore Jones for his advice in the preparation of this note.

⁶ *Dave Hess 1966 price lists*, Baton Rouge, 1966, p. 90, nos. 1154-1162.

⁷ J. D. Brand, 'Some Short Cross Questions', *BNJ* XXXIII (1964), pp. 57-69.

thought unlikely to be wide of the mark by more than a few months. English finds, however, concealed at this juncture are not in fact all that numerous. What I believe to be one which likewise had been overlooked by the *Inventory* is the 1885 (?) find of 35 silver pennies from Stockland near Honiton in Devon—I owe the reference to Mr. J. D. Brand who has included such details as are still available in his privately distributed list (November, 1966) of the 'Short-cross' coins in the Royal Mint Museum. It is to be hoped that Mr. Brand will publish the hoard in these pages, and the remarks that follow are concerned only with the relevance of the find to that made only a few years before in London, though it is perhaps worth recording that my friend Miss M. A. O'Donovan, B.A., of Exeter University, has made extensive enquiries which suggest that there is no local record of the discovery. It appears that the Stockland find was composed of 33 English coins—all it would seem 'Short-cross' pence—an Anglo-Irish penny of John struck at Dublin, and a Scottish penny of William the Lion. On any telling, the Anglo-Irish coin provides a *terminus post quem* of 1204/5, and it is my belief that a good case can be made out for the hoard having been concealed a little later than that but not substantially later than c. 1210. In the Royal Mint Museum in 1874 there were only nine 'Short-cross' pennies later in date than Lawrence Class Vc, and in 1906 this number still had not risen beyond a dozen. Yet, in 1885 the Mint Museum had been able to take its pick from 35 coins, and had selected ten, of which eight were English. Had the Stockland parcel in fact included coins of Lawrence Classes VI and VII, it seems scarcely credible that to this day the Mint Museum collection lacks coins of three of the four common London moneyers in Class VI, and of four of the five common London moneyers in Class VII—the three post-Class Vc pieces acquired by that institution between 1874 and 1906 being two Class VII coins of Canterbury and one coin of the same class from Bury St. Edmunds. Complete certainty, of course, is still not possible, but it is a wry thought that if the Stockland find in fact had ended—as we may well suppose—with English coins of Lawrence Class Vb or Vc, and had been published by the British Museum authorities even in outline, the Irish numismatist would have had for many years now that elusive hoard-evidence for the date of the inception of the REX coinage of Dublin which he still awaits (cf. *North Munster Studies*, ed. E. Rynne, Limerick, 1967, pp. 437-78—the Stockland find unfortunately came to my notice too late for its inclusion in the inventory there given of those

hoards believed to have contained Anglo-Irish coins of John). The Stockland hoard excepted, our nearest analogues to the 1878 London find in point of presumed date of concealment seem to be the vast but ill-recorded and perhaps dubious Sudbourne treasure (*Inventory 344*, cf. *BNJ XXIX*, ii (1959), pp. 307-311; *North Munster Studies*, p. 450 etc.), and a small find from Normandy (cf. *SNC 1966*, p. 30).

The interesting suggestion has been made to me that the 1878 London find could be a parcel from the great Sudbourne hoard which supposedly came to light in 1879. It is perfectly true that in its composition the London parcel has marked affinities with a parcel from the Sudbourne hoard published in the 1959 *British Numismatic Journal*, and an analysis of the two parcels does suggest very strongly that they had been concealed at the same period. Perhaps, though, this is not very surprising, as the years in question were those when we might have thought it more than likely that owners of coin were committing a proportion at least of their riches to the safe-keeping of the soil. Nor is Sudbourne so removed from London that we need be surprised that there are resemblances between the content of two distinct finds concealed on the same occasion. There is the further point that in 1959 the owner of the Sudbourne parcel, an elderly gentleman but by no means a centenarian, stated explicitly that the coins had been found in his youth. In other words, there is very real reason to think that the Sudbourne hoard was not discovered as early as 1879, and it has already been suggested that the real date of discovery was in the first years of this century, the 1879 date being a 'smoke-screen' to discourage official interest, it being well-known that the British Museum authorities—very properly one hastens to add—were and still are generally reluctant to initiate proceedings in the case of coins discovered in the comparatively distant past. The fact, too, that the curiously precise date 1878 should have been preserved as part of the tradition of the London parcel suggests very strongly to the historian that it is right—it may perhaps be observed at this point that Mr. Hess did not acquire the coins in England, so that the question of treasure trove regulations did not and could not arise. On balance, therefore, we see no reason to doubt the family tradition that the coins here published were found in 1878 and in London. As we have seen, the years c. 1210 were years when coins were likely to have been committed to the ground, and especially where south-eastern England was concerned, and one does well to remember that the Iona (*Inventory*

198) and 1950 Chester (*Inventory* 86) hoards came to light within four months of one another.

It only remains for me again to indicate my indebtedness to Mr. Hess's great courtesy and disinterestedness in supplying me with full details of the coins which had come to him from an Australian vendor, a direct descendant of the actual finder. Unfortunately in the intervening years the coins had been mounted to form a necklace, though admittedly it could be argued that it was due to this circumstance that the hoard had been kept until then intact, and a consequence is that we are unable to give meaningful weights for the individual coins. Finally, users of Mr. Thompson's *Inventory* may find it useful to have the following summary of the find in a very slightly modified version of the normal format:—

LONDON, unknown site, 1878.

28 R English pence and cut halfpence.

Deposit: c. 1209 ± 1.

ENGLAND. John. 'Short-Cross' coinage—*Bury St. Edmunds*: Lawrence gp. Vb. Fulke, 1. *Canterbury*: Lawrence gp. Vb. Iohan, 1; gp. Vc. (Gold) wine, $\frac{1}{2}$; Iohan M, 1. *Ipswich*: Lawrence gp. Vb. Iohan, 1; gp. Vc. Iohan, 2. *King's Lynn*: Lawrence gp. Vb. Iohan, 1. *Lincoln*: Lawrence gp. Vb. Andreu, 1. *London*: Lawrence gp. Vb. Adam, 3; Ilger 1; Ricard B, 1; Willelm T, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$; gp. Vc. Abel, 1; Adam, 1; Beneit, 1; Ilger, 2; Rauf, 4; Walter, 2; Willelm B, 1.

(R.H.) M. Dolley, *B.N.J.* XXXVI (1967), pp. 193–5. The hoard was taken to Australia and is now dispersed.

MICHAEL DOLLEY.

A NEW HALFGROAT OF RICHARD II

I WISH to report the finding of a new halfgroat (*Pl.* XIV, 17) which is a mule between Potter series II and III.

The obverse is identical to type II² (this is the die having a small pellet above the central fleur of the crown) and the reverse is similar to IIIb A, but is as far as I can tell a completely new die.

A mule between series III and II was recorded in the article by W. J. W. Potter in *BNJ* XXIX, 1959. The class II series represents the long period of intermediate coinage and the class III coins are

immediately noticeable by the so-called 'fish-tail' lettering.

It is interesting to note that the letter 'r' on this late lettering was certainly used as a privy mark as the bottom right-hand serif is filed through. An identical mark to this I have noticed on all other denominations of type III, both at London and York; vide my article in *BNJ* XXXI, 1962, plate 8, no. 77.

FRANK PURVEY.

A BOY BISHOP TOKEN OF PROFILE TYPE

THE lead tokens associated with the Boy Bishops who 'ruled' between St. Nicholas' Day (December 6th) and Innocents' Day (December 28th) are well known.¹ Most previously recorded English examples have reverses closely following the sterling type. Their obverses are less uniformly copied from the coins but where a bust type was used it has, until now, shown the Saint's head either full or three-quarter-face. A token of hitherto unpublished types (*Pl.* XV, 9) has recently been presented to the British Museum through the generosity of Mrs. Jennifer Edmunds.

Obv.: Rosette of pellets ORA PRO NOBIS PIE NICHOLAE

Profile head of St. Nicholas to left.

Rev.: SAN/CTE/NICH/OLAS read outwards

Arms—s in the first quarter, n in the third quarter and a mitre in the second and fourth quarters—over a cross fourchée which divides the

legend.

Lead Wt.: 79.1 grains ↑ ↑

The prototype of this token is clearly the profile groat of Henry VII. The head is realistically modelled and the reverse is a close copy of the coin both in the choice of the shield type and in the layout of the design. It therefore cannot have been produced earlier than 1504, the date of the introduction of the profile coinage. A slightly later date would be preferable since the mixed Lombardic and Roman letter fount does not appear on the coins until Henry VIII's second issue in 1526. The provenances of English Boy Bishop tokens so far recorded have been confined to Bury St. Edmunds and its immediate neighbourhood. The profile one was found fifteen miles to the south-east in the church yard of Lavenham.

M. M. ARCHIBALD.

¹ 'The Money of the Boy Bishop at Bury St. Edmunds' by J. B. Caldecott in the *Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress*, London,

1936, pp. 366–371 summarises the English tokens and lists the earlier publications.