

It is unrecorded in William II and hitherto has been unrecorded in Henry I. In this instance the lapse of time is even greater than previously and cannot have been much less than forty years.

Coin No. 3. came from the large 'Canterbury' Find of 1901 which Carlyon-Britton partially published in *BNJ* XIX (1909) where (p. 97) its reading —*FFINE: ON: HVN*— is recorded under Huntingdon. Actually only *IV*— is visible on the coin but this is sufficient to establish the attribution. There is no reference there to coin No. 4 but it is certain that there were a considerable number of 'strays' from this partially recorded find with its somewhat 'sketchy' background<sup>1</sup> and my guess is that coin No. 4 also came originally from the same source as No. 3.

It is also certain that Brooke did not know of the existence of these two coins as even coin No. 3 is not mentioned in *BMC Norman Kings*. Presumably, and quite understandably, Brooke regarded the *BNJ* reading by itself, and without his being able to verify it, as too speculative even for inclusion in his

list of doubtful attributions at the foot of the table of moneyers in the Introduction to *Norman Kings*.

The exceptionally fine collection of coins of the Huntingdon mint, whence these came, must have been formed over a considerable period and one which probably spanned the first twenty years of the century. It seems remarkable that the owner of it should have recognised the die-link between coins Nos. 3 and 4 and, having done so, should have kept the knowledge to himself. Coin No. 3. was certainly in Carlyon-Britton's possession in 1909 but it is equally certain that it was not there when Brooke examined his collection coin by coin preparatory to the publication of *Norman Kings* in 1916. If my guess that coin No. 4. was a stray from the 'Canterbury' Find, acquired by Carlyon-Britton sometime during the intervening six or seven years, could ever be proved to be right then obviously the credit for the discovery of the die-link must be given to him.

F. ELMORE JONES.

#### TWO FURTHER COINS OF HENRY I FROM LLANTRITHYD

THE purpose of this note is to put on record two further coins of Henry I which have come to light in the course of the excavations conducted by Mr. T. F. R. Jones at the site of a mediaeval manor at Llantrithyd some ten miles to the west of Cardiff. The coins were found at different times and at different parts of the excavation in the course of the 1963 season, and all the evidence indicates that they had been lost on different occasions. One is clearly a 'stray' from the scattered find recorded in pp. 74–79 of the 1962 *British Numismatic Journal*, and adds disappointingly little to our knowledge of the coinage of that period, but the other, unfortunately a cut halfpenny and chipped into the bargain, is perhaps the earliest coin that can be attributed with absolute confidence to the mint of Cardiff, antedating as it does by some fifteen years the sensational penny of Henry I type XI discovered on the same site in 1962.

The 'stray' from the hoard is a whole coin. It can be described as follows:—

*BMC* type XI = North 867 = Hawkins 258  
*Obv.* *hēx* |||||  
*Rev.* Outer: |||| | |||| | *MA* | *NO* Weight: 20.2gr.  
 Inner: + ||||| *DE*: Die-axis: 180°  
 [*Fig. 1 a*]

The inner legend on the reverse can be restored with confidence to read +*NLUNDE*— indeed the initial

<sup>1</sup> For evidence of this see Mr. Dolley's article in *BNJ* XXVI (1951) where (p. 345) 6 coins are listed which may well have been 'strays' from this find

*N*, the completion of the locative preposition begun in the outer legend, can be made out on the actual coin — and so the mint is incontrovertibly London. The identification of the moneyer is not so easy, though as it happens the deutertheme —*MAN* is not particularly common where the names of Henry I's London moneyers are concerned. The obvious candidate is *Blac(a)man* who is actually known for the type (*cf.* *NC* 1901, p. 82) but the coin is from different dies. Moreover, even if we allow the spelling *Blacman*, the need to allow for an initial cross as well precludes a strictly symmetrical disposition of the letters of the outer legend. It is not pretended, though, that this objection is decisive, and it may well be thought that a reconstruction +*BL* | *AC* | *MA* | *NO* or +*B* | *LAC* | *MA* | *NO* is very plausible. On the other hand, there is a *BMC* type XV moneyer *Derman* whose name allows of the absolutely symmetrical division +*D* | *ER* | *MA* | *NO*, and it could be argued that it is purely fortuitous that he has still to be recorded in *BMC* type XIV, the only intervening type that could be described as at all common. Although, then, *Blac(a)man* on balance seems the stronger candidate, the question is one that should be left open. So little is known as yet concerning the London moneyers of the middle years of Henry's reign that it is by no means inconceivable that the missing proto- and also the 12 coins listed on pp. 347–8 of the same volume to which the same possibility applies.

theme will be shown by a future discovery to be neither *BLAC-* nor *DER-*.

Still there are not known more than two dozen coins of *BMC* type XI, and so Llantrithyd with its eight coins from at least six mints has an assured place in any new study of the coinage of Henry I. The two dozen coins are from fourteen mints, and so the type might be considered relatively common beside *BMC* type V where the number of known coins is fewer than twenty, and the number of mints until now only ten. Perhaps the most remarkable of all the coins from Llantrithyd is a chipped cut halfpenny which can be described as follows:—

*BMC* type V = North 861 = Hawkins 267

*Obv.* +////////// E+ Die-axis: 270°.

*Rev.* ////////// RDIAFIE ?

[*Fig. 1, b*]

The portion that remains of the reverse legend is quite satisfyingly sharp and, the only real uncertainty is whether the *E* is followed by another letter or by the initial cross. It may be thought too, that the *R* which precedes the *D* is of rather unusual form, the loop being abnormally large in proportion to the tail, but even if the letter be accepted as indeterminate the letter-combination *DIAFIE* on a coin found within ten miles of Cardiff leaves room for only one prototheme, the Welsh

*caer-*, on the coin almost certainly rendered *CAR-*.

There seems little room for doubt, then, that the cut halfpenny from the Llantrithyd excavations ranks as the earliest known coin of the Normans in Morgannwg — in the earlier note it was pointed out that the Carlyon-Britton attribution of the 'Devitun' pieces to a hypothetical mint at St. Davids and Brooke's identification of *CAIRDI/CARITI* as Cardiff are open to objection on a number of grounds. It is unfortunate that the halving of the coin gives no hint of the name of the moneyer. Presumably the missing portion of the legend amounted to at most nine letters and in all probability no more than seven or eight. Four of these would be taken up by the locative preposition and the first two letters — *CA* — of the mint-signature, and so the moneyer's name must have been very short. This is not a fatal objection — more than a dozen of Henry I's moneyers have names of only three or four letters — but it may just prompt speculation as to whether we are right automatically to preclude the possibility that there may have been no moneyer's name at all. Granted that the dies are very obviously of 'London' work, it is still within the bounds of feasibility that the first element of the reverse legend could be a Latin, Old English or even Norman French noun indicating that Cardiff was a fort or



FIG. 1.

castle or town. A 'marcher mint' is so often a law unto itself, and this hypothesis, and it is nothing more, has the advantage where the new coin is concerned that it dispenses with a preposition and so adds two letters to the prototheme. However this may be, the //RDIAFIE? of the new coin must surely denote a mint established at Cardiff not much later than the end of the first decade of the twelfth century, and the more so because the *BMC* type XI coin found in 1962 provides incontrovertible

evidence of the operation of the mint at the site only a very few years later. It only remains to add that the two coins that form the subject of this note have been acquired by the National Museum of Wales, and to put on record the writer's regret that these pages appear too late for them to have been perused by the late Major John Youde for whom the Norman coinage of Wales had a very special fascination.

R. M. H. DOLLEY

## TWO INTERESTING SITE FINDS

### 1. Anglo-Saxon Sceatta

THE finding of a silver sceatta with a secure and somewhat unusual provenance seems worthy of record. The sceatta (wt. 10.5 grs.) is an example of type 23(e) (*BMC* 117) with whorl on obverse and helmeted figure holding two long crosses on reverse (Fig. 1). The coin is from the excavation of a

round barrow near Temple Guiting in Gloucestershire and was found in the top of the ditch surrounding the barrow. The excavator, Mrs. H. E. O'Neil, with whose permission this coin is published, reports that the find spot was not far from a Saxon grave inserted into the edge of the barrow.

FIG. 2.

FIG. 3.



FIG. 1

### 2. Imitation sterling

An extremely rare and interesting imitation sterling penny was found in 1963 in the excavations at the deserted mediaeval village of Gomeldon in the Bourne valley north-east of Salisbury. The coin was turned up in a yard area constructed over a building of late 12th century date.<sup>1</sup>

The coin is, unfortunately, rather worn and the detail difficult to decipher, but it is clearly a second example of the previously unique piece of John the Blind of Luxembourg of the mint of Arlon (Fig. 2), published by Bernays in the supplement to his account of the coins of Luxembourg.<sup>2</sup> The details of the coin are as follows:

*Obv.* Bust, crowned, facing.

+EDWANNES o DNSREGYB'

*Rev.* Cross with 3 pellets in each angle.

MON/ETA/ERL/ONS Wt. 12.6 grs. (Fig. 3).

The original example in Bernays' collection provided the evidence for the establishment of the mint at Arlon in 1346 in the reign of John the Blind and not in that of Charles IV whose coins had previously been the earliest on record from this mint. Only two known examples suggest a very small issue but it should be noted that the example from Gomeldon is from a different pair of dies.

The coin is now in the Salisbury Museum and I am indebted to the curator, Mr. H. de S. Shortt, for permission to publish this rare piece.

R. A. G. CARSON

<sup>1</sup> For another unusual sterling found in Wiltshire see *BNJ* 1960, p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> Bernays, *Histoire numismatique du comté puis*

*duché de Luxembourg et ses fiefs, Mémoires, Académie royale de Belgique, 2<sup>e</sup> série, t.X, p. 52 ff.*