

AN UNPUBLISHED PENNY OF HENRY I

A COIN of *B.M.C.* type 4 in Mr. Raymond Carlyon-Britton's collection is to be read as under:

Rev. +COLBRANDONCIS

Unpublished Moneyer for the reign.

Attributed by the writer to *Chichester*.

The great rarity of this type may be judged by the fact that there are only four of it in the British Museum and that there was only one (Lot 1052) in the Lockett collection. The total number of specimens in existence is unlikely to exceed a dozen, if, indeed, as many.

The appearance of a new specimen and one with such an intriguing reading as the above (a reading unknown to the late W. J. Andrew who made such a specialized study of the reign) is therefore of major significance and the Society is indebted to Mr. Carlyon-Britton for having given me permission to exhibit his coin at a recent Meeting and to publish it here.

As to its attribution to Chichester it is clear that I do not share the doubts expressed by Mr. King on page 536 of this volume of the *Journal*.

The reading of the inscription is unequivocal and had this been an early *eleventh* century coin instead of an early *twelfth* century one, the Chichester attribution would not have been open to question.

Doubts only arise because in the intervening eighty or so years the mint name had changed from CISECASTRE to CICESTRE and is retained in this latter form for the rest of this reign. This is in fact the only known instance of S for C as the third letter since the end of the reign of Canute.

However, having regard to the very many novel features of this reign and also to the extreme rarity of all the early types I am bound to say that I see nothing particularly surprising to find here on one coin a combination of (1) an unusual form of the mint signature, and (2) the name of an unpublished moneyer.

A study of the mint signatures throughout the reign reveals that 1100 to 1135 is a period when there is a reversion to early forms as well as being one of transition to new names and spellings.

The following examples may be quoted:

Early forms

1. *York* is unknown in *B.M.C.* types 1 to 6 but in types 7 and 9 the mint name reads EBO and EBOR respectively. In type 14 it has reverted to the traditional Norman EVER.
2. Not perhaps very significant, but in types 8 to 13 *Wallingford* reverts to the Saxon spelling of E for A and in type 14 onwards goes back to PAL.

Exceptional forms

1. In type 4 (the type of the coin under review) *Gloucester* is GLOPA

(B.M.C. 31), a form which seems to be transitional between the Saxon GLEPE and the Norman GLOECE.

2. In type 14 the normal LEP and a very exceptional LAPA both occur at *Lewes*.

New forms

1. The Saxon LEGC (type 3) is superseded by CESTRE in type 14 at *Chester*.
2. The Saxon GIFEL for *Ilchester* is superseded by the Norman IVELCE in type 10.
3. The mint name NICOLE for *Lincoln* first appears in type 14, is continued in type 15, and reverts to LINGCOL early in the next reign.
4. In type 14 the earlier DVNE for Durham becomes DVRHAM.
5. In type 14 NORHAM supersedes HAMTV for Northampton.

(*N.B.* Owing to the disappearance of the Saxon \eth in type 5 new spellings now occur for Southwark, Sudbury, and Thetford readings.)

In the absence of corroborative evidence from another specimen nothing is provable but in the light of the foregoing and, in particular, of the evidence of York, where a reversion to EBOR after something like 200 years seems to afford a most striking parallel, I certainly regard the attribution to Chichester as being far preferable to either of the only two possible alternatives.

These are either a new mint altogether or a blundered form of a known one, possibly Chester.

In my opinion the former may be ruled out as being quite improbable. The latter has to be considered because the name of this moneyer Colbrand, which is of very infrequent occurrence and is otherwise unknown at Chichester, does occur at Chester late in the reign of Edward the Confessor, and instances are known of the same name reappearing at the same mint after a lapse of many years and it has been suggested to me that EIS1 could be a mis-spelling for CES1.

Only one coin of Chester is known of this period, a coin of type 3 in the late Mr. R. C. Lockett's collection on which the mint signature reads the traditional LEGC so that EIS1 seems to be even more improbable for Chester in type 4 because in addition to a reversion to CEST (which incidentally prior to this only occurs on one die of William I, type 8) it is also necessary to import the mis-spelling of 1 for E into the inscription. Also the final 1 could be the start of an E for EISE but not half a T for CEST.

Two moneyers are known to have been working at Chichester in this reign, viz. Brand and Godwine. Brand is known in types 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 14, and Godwine (the later of the two) in types 12, 13, and 14 as well as in Stephen's first type.

Hitherto no coins of Chichester have been recorded between William II, type 5 and Henry I, type 6 but that does not imply that

the mint was inactive. I have not made a mint-by-mint analysis of these early types of Henry I (nor, I think, would this serve any real purpose) but their extreme rarity may be judged by the fact that of types 1 to 12 (inclusive) there are only two specimens recorded in B.M.C. for Chester, and only three for York. In no conceivable circumstances can these figures bear any relationship to the actual output.

It is possible that there may be some inter-connexion between the names Colbrand and Brand but this is not a matter on which I am qualified to speak.

The name is otherwise unknown until it occurs at Stafford early in the reign of Henry II. Is it particularly surprising that it should appear at Chichester in this one type? Here one has to consider the extreme rarity of the type and that it is probably no exaggeration to say that any new specimen of it will bring to light a new moneyer. A striking instance of this recently occurred in type 8 (see R. H. M. Dolley, *B.M.Q.* 1953, p. 55, and pl. xv. 14) which brought to light an entirely new moneyer for Wallingford.

F. ELMORE JONES

AN INTERESTING NEW VARIETY OF THE LATE THIRTEENTH-CENTURY STERLING OF NAMUR

THOSE who have had occasion to work on English hoards from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries will be only too familiar with the numerous imitations of the Edwardian penny emanating from the seigniorial mints of the Low Countries and the adjoining territories. The great majority of the coins are listed in Chautard's *Imitations des Monnaies au Type Esterlin*, but this classic work was published more than eighty years ago and it is perhaps inevitable that there are omissions and even errors. To the former category would appear to belong a coin (Pl. XXXVII, 11) recently discovered in the course of Ministry of Works excavations at St. Nicholas' Church, Colchester. In addition to being heavily corroded with a significantly cuprous deposit, the sterling in question has been repeatedly mutilated by a sharp instrument—very probably the point of a knife—and sixteen of the damages have completely pierced the metal while others have so distorted the flan that the greater part of the legends are quite illegible. These damages are clearly ancient, and we may suppose that they were inflicted by the disgruntled possessors when the coin was detected and condemned as a "lusshebourne".

The obverse type seems completely obliterated but on close examination we may see sufficient to be reasonably certain that it consisted of an uncrowned bust. Most of the legend is obliterated but it is possible to read some of the letters as follows:

*M •• CHION •••••