


BURIED TREASURE :

SOME TRADITIONS, RECORDS AND FACTS.¹

BY W. J. ANDREW, F.S.A., *Honorary Secretary.*

OR ages before the discovery of the art of writing, man was solely dependent upon oral tradition for whatever knowledge of the past, or even rudiments of religious or superstitious belief he possessed. The conversational powers of primitive man, in such limited form as they may have existed, would thus be restricted to the recounting of passing events and emotions in his own experience, and the relation, over and over again, of those traditions which had similarly been handed down to him. Hence, by concentration, his mind would develop a perfection of memory far in advance of its more useful powers of invention, construction, and thought for the future ; and it may be that our inborn contempt for a falsehood has descended to us from that early period when tradition and accuracy were a synonym. Some of these legends must have been told and re-told from almost the oblivion of time ; for, throughout the globe, nearly every race of mankind² has preserved a precise tradition of some overwhelming flood of a remotely geological past.

Perhaps it was to illustrate his stories that Palæolithic Man carved the pictures of the mammoth and other contemporary animals on pieces of ivory and bone ; and, as time went on, and language developed, a natural attempt would be made to present word-pictures to the mind and harmony to the ear, until oral tradition attained its

¹ Under this heading the writer contributed a paper to the British Archæological Association, printed in New Series, vol. ix, p. 8 of its *Journal*, and which forms the nucleus of the present much extended treatise.

² *The Mammoth and the Flood*, by Sir H. H. Howorth, chap. xiv.

perfection in the poems of Homer. Thus, poetry and song became the cradle of religion, tradition, and history. We find them in the Song of Miriam and in the Psalms of David, in the mythology of the Greeks and Romans, and in the sagas of the Northmen; in the festivals of the Orientals, and in the war-dance of the savage: for every race of man is subservient to their stirring influences.

Most of our early traditions are therefore preserved to us in rhyme, and, the older they are, the more probable is it that their foundation rests upon truth. Their subjects are varied; but those which concern us for the moment are limited to the deposit of treasure within our own Isles. That there is nothing racial in the character of such folk-lore is at once apparent from the fact, that to four familiar instances which have been verified, each of the three kingdoms and principality contributes its share. They are too well known to require more than a brief reminder of the confidence which such legends warrant, before passing on to the theories of this Paper.

At Buckton Castle—an earthwork following the natural lines of the summit of that hill on the borders of Yorkshire and Cheshire—an ancient tradition tempted the country-people in 1730 to spend days in fruitless search, with pick and shovel, for the missing treasure which lay hidden there. The saw is, as usual, in rhyme; but as its modern rendering is not in harmony with the character of these pages, it needs no repetition here. Since then, accident has twice disclosed some verification of the legend; for, in the middle of the eighteenth century, various ornaments and a chain of gold beads were discovered at the foot of the hill;¹ and, half a century later, a number of similar gold beads were found close to the camp, and examined by the grandfather of the writer.

Ireland supplies the oft-quoted example of the verification of the Celtic ballad of *Moirá Bórb*, the revised version of which is—

“In earth beside the loud cascade,
The son of Sora’s king we laid,
And on each finger placed a ring
Of gold by mandate of our king.”²

¹ *Archæologia*, vol. v, p. 88.

² *Book of Days*, vol. i, p. 338.

Another verse speaks of "plates of pure gold over his breast and back." The "loud cascade" suggested a tumulus at the famous waterfall—the Salmon Leap—at Ballyshannon, and a search resulted in the discovery of a skeleton and two plates of pure gold, each about $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter, chased with Celtic ornamentation of probably the eighth or ninth century, and which had doubtless been riveted upon a leather hauberk.

Near Mold, North Wales, was a cairn known as Bryn-yr-Ellylon, which means "The Goblin, or Fairy Mound." As its name implies, it was the subject of ancient superstition, and a spectre "of unusual size, clothed in a coat of gold which shone like the sun," was said to have been seen entering it. In 1833, when the mound was removed, a skeleton was discovered lying beneath a beautifully wrought piece of highly-ornamented gold, 3 feet 7 inches long and 8 inches broad in the middle, which has been variously described as a corslet, a shield, and horse-armour.¹ The superstition, however, attached to this mound can only be explained by some lingering tradition, passed down through a thousand years, of the burial of this remote chieftain in all his splendour.

Scotland's contribution is the instance of Norries Law, a tumulus near Largo, in Fifeshire, where tradition had it that a leader of a great army lay buried in his *silver* armour, and from which, in 1819, was taken a quantity of "curiously-wrought antique silver, including a shield, the silver mountings of a sword, and numerous lozenge-shaped scales of the same metal, which no doubt had been stitched to a leather hauberk."

ROMAN RIBCHESTER.

Two ancient traditions are still told in the old-world town of Ribchester—on the Ribble, eight miles north-east of Preston—one of which is, that its great Roman fortification was finally overthrown by the Picts and Scots, and its defenders burnt within it. Recent excavations by Mr. John Garstang, F.S.A., have verified this story ; for

¹ *Archæologia*, vol. xxvi, pp. 422-431.

he has discovered a layer of charcoal remains in all quarters of the fort, interspersed with human bones.¹

Then it would be that the so-called helmet, now in the British Museum, was lost or hidden for safety. It is one of the finest specimens of Roman bronze workmanship ever discovered; but, as a helmet, it is impossible, for its wearer would be helpless, and smothered within it. Dr. Whitaker long ago realised this, when he suggested that it might be the head of a statue to Minerva. Tacitus tells us that when the statue of Victory fell at Camulodunum (Colchester), the head turned round, which is evidence, not only of the custom of erecting such statues in England, but also of the fact that the head was not cast as part of a solid statue. The metal work found at Ribchester, therefore, probably covered a wooden figure, and, as a life-sized bronze finger has also been discovered there, it seems highly probable that the Ribchester relic was the head of the statue of Mars, to whom, as Mr. Garstang has demonstrated, a temple in the fort was dedicated. The head is a complete carving of the human face, with ears, eyes, lips, etc., wearing a helmet decorated with battle subjects, and there are rings for its suspension (probably to stay it within the temple), and fastenings to attach it to the body of the statue.

THE CUERDALE HOARD.

The second tradition of Ribchester is famous because of its apparent exaggeration. Camden quotes it as :—

“It is written upon a wall in Rome
Ribchester was as rich as any town in Christendome.”

And adds that “where so many marks of Roman antiquity, as statues, coins, pillars, pedestals, chapiters, altars, marbles, and inscriptions are commonly dug up, this hobbling rhyme of the inhabitants does not seem to be altogether groundless.” Later writers have invariably adopted Camden’s explanation of the couplet and the error has remained unquestioned for three hundred years. But

¹ “Roman Ribchester,” by John Garstang, p. 4, and “The Ribchester Temple,” in *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Historical Society*, 1903.

apart from its improbability, the use of the word "Rome" as a place-name in an old English rhyme should, ere this was written, have raised a suspicion of the true meaning. This would have become obvious upon comparison with the remarkably similar couplet in a MS. ballad, known as *Torrent of Portugal*, edited by J. O. Halliwell, 1842, p. 6 :—

"Yt ys [written] in the boke of Rome
Ther was no Knyght of Krystendome," etc.

In both cases, therefore, the "Wall of Rome" and the "Boke of Rome" mean nothing more than the pages of *romance*, and in the ballad the phrase is so used in no fewer than ten instances, *e.g.*, another verse is :—

"Ase the boke of Rome tellys
They tornyd xxxij tymys
In armys walloyng fast
Yt tellythe in the boke of Rome."

Torrent of Portugal is one of the valuable manuscripts preserved in the Chetham's Library at Manchester. It is on paper of the fifteenth century, but, as its editor is careful to inform us, it

contains so many obvious blunders and omissions that it may be conjectured with great probability to have been written down from oral recitation . . . it was probably, like the second copy of the romance of Horn, a modernised version of an older English romance which was translated from the French.¹

That Halliwell is right in this view is abundantly proved by comparison with our early ballads. Running through nearly all these, and from the very earliest times, is the constant recurrence of the phrase "As the Romance tells."² We find it in *Giraldus Cambrensis* and even in the ancient poem *Merlin* under the form "So the Romauns seyth elles where."

The term applies to the *Roman* or *Romance* language which according to Ellis "began to supersede the Latin as a colloquial language in Gaul about the beginning of the ninth century," and he adds that the invasions of the Danes in the ninth and tenth centuries

¹ *i.e.*, Norman-French.

² The ballad, *Sir Bevis of Hampton*.

resulted in its division into an almost infinite number of dialects. The *Song of Rolland* chanted by the minstrel Taillefer on the battle-field of Hastings was in this language as, indeed, were all the metrical romances of that day. When, therefore, our early minstrels translated these Norman-French ballads into the English form in which they have been preserved to us, they constantly tell us that the "boke of Romance" is responsible for their story, *e.g.* :—

"As it is written in romaunce
And founden in books of antiquyté
At Seynt Denyse Abbey in Fraunce,
There as chronicles remembrede be."¹

There are a multitude of quotations to this effect ; but a careful, though necessarily not an exhaustive, search amongst these old ballads has not resulted in the discovery of any other instances of the use of the words, "boke of Rome" for "boke of Romaunce" than those in *Torrent*. As the earlier form of the word was *Roman* it follows that "book of Rome" should be an earlier form of the phrase than "book of romance," and as it occurs ten times in the manuscript, and the later form is entirely absent, *Torrent* may be assumed to be a very early poem. It is true that there are certain comparatively modern interpolations in it, such as the "maister-shepman's" story concerning the "forest of Brasille," which probably was the transcriber's own composition, but other verses have an early Norseman's ring in them which throws one's mind back to the Scandinavian Sagas of Wieland, the Smith, and to the mystic traditions of "Excalibur," the sword of Arthur, as instance the following :—

"Adolake, his good swerd
Thorow *Velond* wrought yt wase."

When we are told that "Adolake his good sword, by Wieland (the smith) wrought it was," the idiom is being carried back right through its mediæval and Norman phraseology to its origin in Danish and Saxon times, when the manufacture of iron weapons was still regarded as one of the wonders of the age. This is evidence that

¹ The ballad *Sir Ferumbras*.

when *Torrent* was first sung, verses from an older Saxon or Scandinavian minstrelsy were introduced, and this again proves the ballad in its original form to have been one of our earliest English metrical romances.

If, therefore, "the boke of Rome," can be traced to a remote period in English literature the expression, "wall of Rome" in the Ribchester couplet must be, at least, equally archaic, and it is no marvel that its meaning had been long forgotten in the days of Camden. The use of the term "wall" for book in the Ribchester version suggests even a still earlier period, for as a comparison, we, to-day, use the same idiom in the word *muniment* for an ancient record without a thought that its literal meaning is a *wall* or bulwark; but it may be that a corruption of *vellum*, a parchment or roll, into *vallum*, a wall, may explain the variant, but either explanation implies great antiquity to the saw.

Again, the Roman name for Ribchester was *Bremetennacum*, and therefore it was not until the advent of the Saxons or Danes that the place could have been called Ribchester, "the city on the Ribble," so the legend cannot well be earlier than the seventh or eighth century. This digression has now run its length, but its object has been to prove that all associations of the Ribchester tradition with the coincidence of its Roman history must go by the board, that the origin of the old rhyme probably dates from Saxon times, and that it can only be read, "It is written in the pages of romance, Ribchester was as rich as any town in Christendom."

Such is the tradition as it has been handed down to us by the inhabitants of Ribchester. But it is only one version of the story, for another is told by the people who live a few miles lower down the Ribble, at Walton-le-Dale. Here, it was always reputed that if you stood on the headland and looked up the valley of the Ribble, *towards Ribchester*, you would gaze over the greatest treasure that England had ever seen. So firmly was belief in the truth of the legend impressed on the minds of the farmers that several attempts were made to discover the treasure; indeed, only some thirty years before its discovery, one of them ploughed a field near the actual site, twice

over in the same furrows, in the hope of gaining the trove ; and Major Creeke tells us of a story that in still an earlier search the services of the divining-rod had been enlisted for this purpose. Even after the discovery the country people were far from satisfied, for they had faith in their tradition, and believed that it was but a foretaste of what was to come.¹ Read together, these two ancient traditions record the memory of the loss of a great treasure somewhere in the valley of the Ribble between Walton and Ribchester ; and for the discovery of which there is ample evidence that repeated attempts were made.

Where intention failed, accident succeeded. On the 15th of May, 1840, some workmen were employed in repairing the southern bank of the Ribble close to Cuerdale Hall, and for this purpose were removing earth at a distance of about forty yards from the river, when they discovered within three feet of the surface of the pasture, the most valuable treasure ever found on English soil. To commemorate the site a willow tree was subsequently planted and is now at its prime. It faithfully complies with the tradition, for if you stand upon the head-land, on which is Walton Church, looking towards Ribchester, the tree is in full view, and only a mile away. The real extent of the Cuerdale hoard will never be known, for much was dispersed by the finders. What was ultimately recovered has been described as a mass of silver consisting of ingots, armlets, amulets, neck chains, rings and other ornaments weighing 1,000 ozs., exclusive of over 7,000 silver coins. This may be estimated at perhaps three-quarters of the true treasure-trove, although contemporary newspaper reports doubled the quantity. The whole was enclosed in a leaden case within a strong wooden chest, both of which, however, were so decomposed that, as we are told, a portion of the earth under the spot where the treasure lay having been previously removed, they were crushed to pieces by the fall aided by the weight of the superincumbent soil.

Of the coins examined the following is a comprehensive summary, and is based upon that given by Mr. Hawkins, but, especially in the case of the smaller figures, it can only be accepted as proportionate ; comprising, perhaps, three-quarters of the real number.

¹ Charles Hardwick's *Traditions, Superstitions and Folklore*, p. 252.



TYPES OF COINS FOUND AT CUERDALE.
IX.-X. CENTURIES.

ENGLISH.

Athelstan of East Anglia	24
Ceolwulf II. of Mercia	2
Ethelred	3
Alfred the Great	919
Edward the Elder...	51
Archbishop Ceolnoth	1
„ Ethelred	1
„ Plegmund	59
Total English —					1,060

NORTHUMBRIAN.

Ecclesiastical	2,020
Earl Sitric	2
Siefred	238
Alwald	1
Cnut...	2,534
Halfdan	2
Total Northumbrian —					4,797

CONTINENTAL.

Principally French but some German and					
Italian	1,047

ORIENTAL.

Various	31
---------	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

ILLEGIBLE.

About	65
-------	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Grand total examined 7,000

It was evidently a Viking treasure, for the bulk of the coins had been issued by the Danish Kings of Northumbria, whose headquarters were at York, and very many of them bore the name of that city as their mint, or place of origin. When we remember how rarely coined money was in demand in the ninth and tenth centuries, and that it was not until two hundred years later that even the king's taxes were paid in cash, we may be quite certain that this was no private hoard, for none but an army or government could at that time have possessed so

much coined money—to say nothing of the silver ingots—and therefore, taking all the circumstances together, we may safely assume that it was the treasure chest of a Danish army. It may not be the only chest buried or lost at Cuerdale, but with it alone Ribchester in those days, so far as actually *coined* money was concerned, would have been one of the richest towns in Christendom.

It will be noticed that amongst the Anglo-Saxon money examined were nine hundred and nineteen specimens of the coinage of Alfred the Great and fifty-one of that of Edward the Elder, whose reign was the latest disclosed in the hoard. There was also a considerable quantity of Continental money, evidently gathered from the western coasts of Europe, especially from the districts at the mouth of the Seine. It is therefore quite possible to ascertain the actual date of deposit, almost to a year. Mr. Hawkins, in 1843, “came to the conclusion that this great mass of coins was deposited somewhere about the year 910”; and although in *Silver Coins of England*, he subsequently modified this to “about 905,” in which he has been followed by the *British Museum Catalogue*, his first deduction was, as we shall see, very nearly correct. It was the custom of the Saxon kings to issue fresh coinages every three or four years, and we know that Edward the Elder issued six : for omitting mere varieties, we have six distinct types representing the twenty-four years of his reign. Hence as three of these were found at Cuerdale it follows (for a treasure until hidden or lost would be constantly augmented by coins of the most recent issues), that to crowd these three coinages into the first four years of the king’s reign, and to deduce the year 905, is impossible. The third type was certainly current at the date of deposit, and so we may take the true date to be between 909 and 912. The hoard tells us a little more. It will be noticed that the proportions of King Alfred’s coins to those of Edward the Elder were eighteen to one, and it was no doubt this undue proportion which prompted Mr. Hawkins to reconsider his original date. There can, however, be but one explanation of this, namely : that the Vikings had gathered the bulk of the English portion of the treasure late in the reign of King Alfred, who died in 901 ; that they had then proceeded to the districts at the mouth of

the Seine, where they had levied the large French section of it; and that at the date of deposit they had but very recently returned to England, to add the comparatively few specimens of King Edward the Elder, all of which were current in 909–912. That this is an unbiased assumption may be shown by two quotations from Mr. Hawkins' account of the find, for he, at least, had no theory to prove, and yet he seems to have arrived at the same conclusion through totally different channels of observation: "it may be supposed," says he, "that the Cuerdale treasure was deposited upon the arrival in the neighbourhood of the party or parties who brought it from a distance"—"there is every appearance of this treasure having been collected in the south, and transferred in one mass to the place of its deposit."¹

The remainder and great bulk of the coins consisted of the current money issued under the Danish kings and ecclesiastics of Northumbria. In this section were two coins bearing the name of a King Halfdan, which, according to a common custom of the time, were imitations of two of the types of Alfred the Great. Nothing proves more clearly the falsity of the supposed date of 905, than the amusing straits to which its exponents have been put to explain the presence in the hoard of these two coins. Prior to that year, the only recorded king of the name was the Viking chief who raided London in 874, and to him they are assigned in *The Silver Coins of England* without comment. But in 1893 a new theory was advanced which although it recognised that (with the exception of one class) "all the coins which were struck by or under the influence of Scandinavian conquerors in England, are no more than debased imitations of the current coinage of the country,"² it reversed its own rule in order to accommodate these two coins, one of which, we are told, "is without doubt a coin of Halfdan struck at this period [874] in London";² and it is suggested that Alfred—of all kings—imitated it for his famous monogrammic coinage of London [figs. 7–12]. This is the peroration, "This first London monogram, then, was introduced [by Halfdan] in A.D. 874. But Halfdan only remained a short time in London. It is

¹ *Numismatic Chronicle*, vol. v, pp. 45 and 98.

² *British Museum Catalogue*, II, cxxvii, cxxiii, and cxxiv.

highly probable that after his departure the Londoners continued to strike coins with this monogram, but placed upon it (*sic*) the head and name of Alfred."¹ What their own king, Ceolwulf II., thought about this we are not told, nor why the bashful Alfred, after so plain a hint that London was going a-begging for him, "never was near London" until years afterwards. Nevertheless our mentor will have it that "we must consider Halfdan the originator of this important type in the coinage of Alfred."¹ Any explanation of the other of the two coins, however, which is also assigned to the same Halfdan, is left severely alone, because it is a *halfpenny*; and, if it is a coin of that Halfdan, it is the first halfpenny ever known in England. So we are asked to believe that London is indebted to an Hiberno-Danish marauder—who came to take, not to make—for the origin of the custom of placing its name upon our money, and that Alfred selected these two little strangers in the hoard, the assumed inventions of his racial foe, the one for the prototype of his *subsequent* London coinage, and the other for that of the whole halfpenny series itself. Truly, Halfdan was a great monetary reformer. But, in 1899, the first theory is abandoned, to give place to a second which is worthy of Sir Boyle Roche himself. It is that the penny in question "was probably struck by Halfdan during his occupation of London in 874,"² for "the reverse type is similar to that of the London coins of Alfred, of which it may have been a *copy*," and that the halfpenny *is* copied from coins of Alfred, and was probably issued about the same time as the preceding piece."² Yet we had just been informed in the same work that Burgred and Ceolwulf II. were then successively Kings of that portion of England,² and that King Alfred had nothing whatever to do with London until the year 886, when, for the first time, his "coins with the London monogram were struck," or 12 years after the Halfdan *copies* were made. After these very Hibernian achievements, Halfdan, as we are naively reminded by the serious exponent of this remarkable theory, was expelled and returned to *Ireland*.² In 1903³ the same writer harks

¹ *British Museum Catalogue*, II, xxxvii and xxxix.

² *Handbook of the Coins of Great Britain and Ireland*, p. 17.

³ *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1903, pp. 352-3.



TYPES OF COINS FOUND AT CUERDALE.

PI. II.

IX-X CENTURIES.

back and assures us that "As a rule the Viking coins struck at this time, south of the Humber, were copied from English types ; but this monogram type of London could well have been an exception¹ . . . We may therefore take it that the London monogram type was instituted by Halfdan and continued by Alfred."² Why not suggest, at once, that Halfdan was Alfred's godfather ?

It was advisable to point out these little errors of date and consequent misappropriation of the two coins, before the theory to account for the actual loss of the Cuerdale treasure could be accepted. But if we now transfer the coins from Halfdan I. to King Halfdan II. of 911, mentioned below, no contradictions or bulls are necessary to meet the facts of the case.

The Cuerdale treasure had evidently been collected in four sections, and its internal evidence would meet the following propositions for such collection. First, in England late in the reign of Alfred the Great, say 890-97 ; second, on the coasts of France and in the districts at the mouth of the Seine from 897 to 910 ; third, in Northumbria in 911 for the expenses of a raid into England ; fourth, in Mercia in that year during the raid.

With these points in view, a reference to the chronicles of the period should offer some explanation of the loss of the treasure :—

- 897. "In this year the (Danish) army went, some to East Anglia, some to Northumbria ; and they that were moneyless got themselves ships, and went south over sea to the Seine.
- 910. "And a great fleet came hither from the south, from the Lidwicas [Brittany] and greatly ravaged by the Severn ; but they there, afterwards, almost all perished.
- 910. "In this year the Angles and Danes fought at Tettenhall on the viiith of the Ides of August, and the Angles gained the victory.
- 911. "In this year the army in Northumbria broke the peace . . . and harried over the Mercian's land . . . When the King learned that they [the Northumbrians] had gone out to ravage, he sent his force, both from the West Saxons and from the Mercians, and *overtook* the army when it was returning homeward, and fought

¹ The obverse type is also copied from a coin of Alfred.

² *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1903, pp. 352-3.

against them and put the army to flight, and slew many thousands of them; and there was [were] King Eowils slain and King Hålfðan, and Ottar jarl [the Earl] and Skurfa jarl and Othulf hold [the governor] and Benesing hold and Olaf [Anlaf] the Black and Thurferth hold and Osferth 'hlytte' [the Collector of the Revenue, or Treasurer] and Guthferth hold and Agmund hold, and Guthferth."¹

The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which was a contemporary history, is quite clear that there were two battles, one fought by the Angles, and the other by the West Saxons and Mercians, and that the battle in which the two kings Eowils and Hålfðan were slain was not that of Tettenhall. Florence of Worcester, who wrote in the twelfth century and other later chroniclers, confuse the two as one, and call it the battle of Wodnesfeld.² But Wodnesfeld (now Wednesfield) was only another name for Tettenhall, as the two villages in Staffordshire, in which county Florence tells us Tettenhall was, practically adjoin. Any doubts are, however, dispelled by Ethelwerd, who gives the date of Wodnesfeld as being the eighth of the ides of August, which, as we have seen, was that of Tettenhall. The latter account adds that the battle commenced as the Danes were withdrawing homewards with their spoil, and passing over a bridge on the eastern bank of the Severn, usually called Cantbridge. Cambridge, near Berkley, in Gloucestershire, is generally accepted for this place, but is far too remote to be connected with the battle. Ethelwerd, alone, tells us that King Hingwar also fell at Wodnesfeld, and Florence mentions that the Kings Eowils and Hålfðan were brothers of King Hingwar. The brothers Hingwar and Hålfðan are first mentioned under the year 878, but then as merely Danish chiefs. They were possibly sons of Hålfðan I., of 874-77, as he was a chief as early as in 855, and slain in 882-3.³

When the Danish army divided in 897, it is probable that the elder, or at least first-named, brother Hingwar, would return to Northumbria, and that King Hålfðan commanded the fleet which sailed

¹ *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Rolls Series, vol. i, pp. 174, 175, 184, 185, vol. ii, pp. 73, 77, 78.

² *English Historical Society*, 23, pp. 120, 121.

³ Simeon's *History of the Church of Durham*.

to the Seine. Assuming the Cuerdale chest to be the paymaster's chest of Halfdan's army, it would, in spite of his being described as "moneyless," probably contain sufficient of Alfred's coinage to pay current expenses, which would in turn have gradually been changed for, or augmented by, the money current in France during the thirteen following years, whilst that country was the scene of Halfdan's operations. This would account for the large proportion of French coin in the hoard. In 910 the fleet returned from Brittany, and landed its army by the Severn. It was to join forces with his brother Halfdan on his march overland, that King Hingwar no doubt advanced from Northumbria into Staffordshire, and suffered defeat at Tettenhall. Whether the two armies had already come together before that battle is immaterial; but Hingwar was slain, and the remnants of the army returned to Northumbria. In the natural order of events, King Halfdan, whose original territory may have included Lincolnshire and part of East Anglia, would succeed his brother in Northumbria, probably at York; and if one may speculate on so indefinite a subject, Eowils the third brother would hold the country north of the river Tyne: for, in 876, Halfdan I. had so divided Northumbria into two kingdoms.¹

In 911 the English King was engaged in fitting out an expedition by sea, which was probably intended against Northumbria; so, the Danish Kings, thinking "they could go unopposed whithersoever they wished,"² collected their forces for another raid into Mercia. Then, no doubt it was that the bulk of the money would be drawn from the York and Chester-le-street treasuries for the payment of the troops, and so we find nearly five thousand coins in the hoard, representing a coinage then only current in Northumbria. The Danes advanced into Mercia, and "harried the land"; but, on hearing of the forces raised against them, they retreated without offering battle. That the raid was on the western side of England seems certain, for the West Saxons and Mercians were sent against it. All authorities agree that the West Saxons and Mercians "*overtook*" the Northumbrian army as it was "returning homewards" from Mercia; which expression is

¹ Simeon of Durham, Anno 876.

² *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Anno 911.

wholly inapplicable to the site of Tettenhall and Wednesfield. The Viking force had probably taken the same direction as in the previous year, and its retreat would follow the Roman road which crosses Cheshire and Lancashire to the "Pass of the Ribble" at Walton le Dale, and thence branches to York and Carlisle. The expression above quoted would therefore exactly tally with the Northumbrian army being overtaken on the confines of the debatable land between the Mersey and the Ribble, owing to the delay caused by the crossing of the latter river into Northumbria proper.

Simeon of Durham practically tells us that this was the fact, for he says :—

"The indomitable King Edward, because the Danes had broken the peace which they had made with him, sent an army of West Saxons and Mercians *into Northumbria* ; who, when they came there, slew many of the Danes, and compelled their kings and chiefs to renew with King Edward the peace which they had broken."

It must be remembered that the burial of this great army chest was an event which could not have been forgotten by those concerned, and therefore only one explanation of its never having been recovered is possible. That explanation must be the sudden death of those who hid it. Surely, the person directly responsible for its safety was Osferth, *the treasurer* or paymaster, and he, as the chronicles tell us, was slain in the battle. This coupled with the date and character of the hoard, is strong evidence of the identification of the treasure with the battle, and it is strengthened by the presence in it of the two coins of King Halfdan II., also one of the slain. The chronicle of Ethelwerd, as already demonstrated, confused the battles of 910 and 911 as one event, but his description commences as follows :—

"When they (the Danes) had withdrawn homewards, rejoicing in the richness of their spoils, and passed over a bridge in regular order, on the eastern bank of the Severn, which is usually called *Cantbridge* ; the troops of the Mercians and West Angles suddenly met them in battle array."

¹ *Chronicle of Fabrius Ethelwerd*, by the Rev. J. Stevenson, pp. 437-38.

Without attaching too much importance to modern place-names it may be pointed out that within a mile of the place of deposit of the treasure, and upon the direct line from the Roman road to the ford at Cuerdale, is *Canbridge*, where the road crosses the River Darwen, at Higher Walton, which certainly agrees with Ethelwerd's account that the battle commenced as the Danes were passing over a bridge usually called Cantbridge. The Danes when overtaken would defend the crossing of the Darwen; and half a mile higher up the river is a ford, a little below the conflux of the Beasting Brook. Here, perhaps, Benesing the Hold was slain, and gave his name to the brook, now corrupted to Beasting. Meanwhile, Osferth the treasurer and his men would hasten forward with their treasure chests to the ford over the Ribble at Cuerdale; for when that was passed they were once more safe in Northumbria and in that part of it which to-day is still known as Amounderness, or Agemundrenesse according to *Domesday*, after Agmund, the Hold, who, as mentioned in the chronicles, also fell in the battle; and where the ancient road on the north side of the river is still called the "Danes' Pad."

Why Osferth the treasurer should choose this ford instead of that at Walton may have been because he was cut off from the latter, or because the river was in flood, or the tide high, and so he tried the passage higher up the river. The ford is, however, at its best dangerous, and has fallen into disuse, and no doubt he and his men found it impossible to carry the heavy wood and leaden chest with its silver contents across; hence, exactly forty yards from the only place where the river is fordable, the treasure was hidden in the earth. This would again cause delay, and probably the victorious Saxons fell upon the fugitives; for unless the latter could cross the ford they were caught in the centre of a bend in the river, and here Osferth and all those who had buried the chest would perish, and their secret would die with them. If but one had lived to tell the tale, the chest would assuredly have been recovered when possession of the district was regained by the Northumbrians; but under the circumstances here pictured, those who had stayed to defend the rear at the crossing of the Darwen would know that their treasure was hurried away towards

the ford at Cuerdale ; that it never crossed the river with the remnants of the army ; and that their victors never rejoiced over its capture. Therefore, all they could tell was that, in accordance with the custom of their times, it must have been buried somewhere near the Cuerdale ford, on the southern bank of the Ribble, for it would be within their sight until the actual valley was reached. Hence, a tradition which has survived for nearly a thousand years, and some variation of which, probably in referring to a ford, suggested to the farmers of the district the selection of Cuerdale for the abortive search for the long-lost treasure.

It is curious that the moor which at that time would extend over the field of battle, still bears the remarkable name of “ *The Anglezarke*,” which is exactly what the Northumbrians would name it—The Anglesæc=The Battle of the *Angles*. Nevertheless modern etymologists derive the word from Anlaf’s hargh, *i.e.*, the field or temple-hill of Anlaf. If they are right, and they base their derivation on a thirteenth century reading, the Anlaf referred to may have been Anlaf the Black, who was amongst those slain in the fight.

THE BEAWORTH HOARD.

On the 30th of June, 1833, was found in a field known as the “ Old Litten,” attached to the Manor House, at Beaworth, near Winchester, a leaden chest, or cylinder, containing, as Mr. Carlyon-Britton, F.S.A., our latest authority on the coinage of William I., and II., informs us, from 8,000 to 9,000 silver pennies of William the Conqueror. The coins were carefully packed in rolls, and the chest, which originally had been bound with iron, showed every indication of having been made for the express purpose of containing them.¹ The internal evidence disclosed that, although the coinages represented extended over a period of about twelve years, ceasing with the death of the King in 1087, the money was as fresh as when it came from the die. Specimens from the mints of nearly every county in England were present, and all were of full weight and pure silver. Hence we may almost infer that the money came from

¹ *Num. Chron.*, 1902, pp. 218–19. Ruding’s *Annals of the Coinage*, I., p. 851, and from information kindly supplied by Mr. W. H. Jacob, of Winchester.



PI III

TYPES OF COINS OF WILLIAM I FOUND AT BEAWORTH.
XI CENTURY.

the Royal Treasury at Winchester, and had consequently passed through the Exchequer tests which were held half-yearly at that city. This only would account for the extended sphere of its gathering ground, as the sheriffs brought the currency of every county to the Exchequer; and Malmesbury incidentally mentions that the coin in the Treasury was of the best quality. It must not be forgotten that in Norman times the silver penny was the only denomination of money coined.

Having arrived at some probability that these 8,000 to 9,000 pennies came out of the Winchester Treasury, which was only about six miles away, we have but to refer to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, under the year of King William's death, to find a very natural explanation of their disbursement from the treasury.

"1087. William II. went to Winchester and inspected the treasury, and the riches which his father had before gathered; it was not to be estimated by any man how much was there gathered in gold and in silver, and in vessels, and in robes, and in gems, and in many other precious things which are difficult to recount. The King then did as his father had commanded him ere he died: he distributed the treasures for his father's soul, to every monastery that was in England; to some he gave ten marks of gold *and to others six.*"¹

Presumably the archbishoprics of Canterbury and York received the ten marks, and each of the bishoprics and abbeys the six marks. But a mark of silver or gold was only a denomination, represented by so many silver pennies.

Now six marks of gold were 8,640 silver pennies, which would exactly tally with the "eight thousand to nine thousand pennies" found at Beaworth, and we may almost assume that this was the real number of coins contained in this hoard. The see of Winchester, as one of the principal bishoprics, would receive its share, and certain entries in the *Annals of Winchester*² raise more than a suspicion that the treasure which was found within six miles of the city, was the Conqueror's actual bequest to that church intact.

¹ *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Rolls Series, 23, I., p. 356.

² *Annales de Wintonia, Annales Monastici*, vol. ii, pp. 36-9, or Stevenson's edition, pp. 357-59.

"1088. On the death of Ralph, Abbot of Winchester, the King assigned the abbey to Ralph Passeflabere [Flambard], his chaplain . . .

(1092). But the aforesaid Ralph, a man who exceeded all others in evil, rifled the churches that had been entrusted to him of all their property, and reduced both rich and poor to such a state of penury, that they deemed death itself preferable to life under his despotism."

"1090. *The King carried off a large treasure from the Church of Winchester.*"

1098. Death of Walkelin, Bishop of Winchester. "The King had given orders on the day of the Nativity of Our Lord, just after the commencement of the service of mass, that he should send him without a moment's delay £200. But he, well knowing that he could not do that at the moment, without plundering the poor, or rifling the treasury of the Church, was rendered weary of life by this *and other things of the like sort*; and having offered up a prayer, begged that he might be delivered from his unhappy existence; and this actually took place ten days afterwards . . . One thing occasioned him exceeding pain, namely, that he had deprived the monks of lands to the value of three hundred pounds [*'ad c. c. c. libratas terræ'*],¹ which he had appropriated to himself and his successors in the bishopric."

The spot where the treasure was found is within the curtilage of some ancient foundations. These would mark the site of a—if not *the*—residence of the Bishop of Winchester, for he and his predecessors held the Manor of Beaworth and had "a hall or palace there,"² just as the Bishops of Hereford had their palace at Ledbury, and the Archbishops of York theirs at Cawood. The manor house at Beaworth to which the Old Litten where the hoard was found was attached, is probably the modern survival of that hall. What is more likely than that the Bishop, to save it from the grasp of the extortionate Ralph Flambard, removed the Conqueror's bequest, in a chest made for the purpose, to his own residence outside the city, and buried it in secret; which was the usual precaution for safe-keeping in those days?

¹ *Librata terræ* may mean either land worth 20s. yearly, or 52 acres. See *Court Hand Restored*, p. 39.

² *Diplomatarium Anglicum Ævi Saxonici*, p. 160. Ruding's *Annals of the Coinage*, I., p. 152.

Probably, in the year 1090, the King had demanded "a loan" of the treasure for the purposes of "his great bribes" to Philip of France in that year,¹ and the Bishop took the Conqueror's bequest from the treasury into his own custody ostensibly for the King, but with every intention of preserving it for the Church. This would account for the entry in the *Annals* that "the King carried off a large treasure from the Church of Winchester," for so it would be believed by the general body of the clergy and by the writer of the *Annals*. Even the greed of Rufus could not extort a confession of the hiding-place from a Bishop, but it would have fared badly with any less powerful participator in the concealment, so Walkelin would no doubt be the sole custodian of his secret. But in 1098 the King's patience was exhausted, and after "other things of the like sort," his orders became peremptory that the Bishop should personally pay £200 without a moment's delay. The claim had perhaps been increased owing to the procrastination of the Bishop, but it is significant that he should pray for death rather than rifle the treasury of the Church. His death was evidently sudden, and he may not have had an opportunity of divulging his secret. Nevertheless the story that "one thing occasioned him exceeding pain, namely, that he had deprived the monks of lands to the value of three hundred pounds which he had appropriated to himself and his successors in the bishopric," is so foreign to his general character that it raises a suspicion that he was endeavouring to reveal this treasure in his last moments but was misunderstood, and his secret died with him. The expression "appropriated to himself and his successors" would certainly tally with the deposit of the hoard within the precincts of his official residence.

Such coincidences as the nature of the treasure and its origin, its corresponding value and packing, its place and date of deposit, the curious entries in the *Annals*, and lastly, the sudden death of the Bishop, cannot all be accidental, but point to collective identification of the treasure with the Conqueror's bequest to the Church of Winchester.

¹ *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Anno 1090.

THE NOTTINGHAM HOARD.¹

It is remarkable that a passage in the continuation of Florence of Worcester's *Chronicle*, which seems to record the very incident of the loss of this treasure, should for so long have escaped attention. To quote the account of the discovery. In January, 1880, "some workmen, whilst making excavations at the back of old property in Bridlesmith Gate, Nottingham, for larger cellaring in connection with bonded stores, came upon a hoard of pennies,"² nearly two hundred in number, all being of the reign of King Stephen; with the exception of a very few of David, King of Scotland, and some twenty-three of Henry I.

The internal evidence of the hoard is curious. The coins had evidently at some time been subjected to an intense heat, for most of them were blistered and cockled by fire to such an extent that they can be identified in a collector's tray at sight, as the hundred specimens carefully preserved by Mr. G. H. Wallis, F.S.A., in the Castle Museum at Nottingham, will demonstrate. This is a feature peculiar to these coins, for no other find has ever disclosed anything of the kind. As they were found in the heart of the oldest part of the town, and in excavating for cellaring, we may assume that they were originally hidden or deposited in the basement of some then existing building. The date of deposit is ascertained with unusual accuracy, for two or three coins issued by the Empress Maud during her strife with Stephen for the Crown, were present. One of these was coined at Oxford and another at Winchester; and as it was not until March 3rd, 1141, that she was received into Winchester, and March 30th, into Oxford, the date must have been subsequent to that month. On the other hand, the find contained no specimens of any of the coinages current after December in the same year, so the date is narrowed down to between April and December, 1141.

Before quoting the passage from Florence, it may be remarked

¹ For a more detailed account of this hoard, see my *Numismatic History of the Reign of Henry I.*, pp. 347-49, *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1901.

² *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1881.

that the chronicler rarely gives yearly dates, and the incident in question is inserted amongst some events which occurred in 1140. But this is corrected by the *Hexham Chronicle*, which places the event subsequently to the Battle of Lincoln (February 2nd, 1141). The references in the account to there being no force to defend the town, and to the Earl of Warwick, again prove this; for Nottingham's defenceless condition is explained by the fact that William Peverell, Stephen's Castellan of Nottingham, had been taken prisoner by Maud's forces at Lincoln, and the Earl of Warwick did not join her party until the spring of 1141. Hence the Earl of Gloucester must have carried out the raid during the siege of Winchester, namely, about September 8th of that year, which exactly agrees with the numismatic evidence of the date of deposit of the hoard.

“Before the Nativity of St. Mary [8th September] Robert, son of King Henry [the Earl of Gloucester], instigated by Ralph Paynell, taking with him the horsemen of the Earl of Warwick, with those he had brought from Gloucester, and very many private soldiers, suddenly raided the town of Nottingham; and finding no force to defend it, commenced to plunder it, the citizens from all quarters taking refuge in the churches. One of the citizens who was reputed to be of the wealthier class, was seized, and, being conducted under restraint to his house, was compelled to disclose his money. He, however, led his pillagers, who were only bent on spoil, into an underground chamber [*in subterraneum*] where all his household wealth was to be seen. Whilst they were intent on pillage and breaking open doors and bolts, he cunningly slipped away, and gaining the [upper] rooms [*cameras*], and thence the entrance [*aulam*], closed all the doors behind him, fastening them with bolts; then by setting fire [to his house] he consigned his property and all his household wealth, together with the pillagers themselves, to the flames. It is asserted that more than thirty men who had entered the underground chamber perished in that fire.”¹

Comment is scarcely necessary, for a subterranean chamber within a house, even in Nottingham, “the City of Caves,” must at that time have been of rare occurrence. “The Gate”—probably the Bridlesmith Gate where the treasure was found—is mentioned in the 1130 *Pipe*

¹ *Continuatio Chronici Florentii Wigorniensis*, Eng. Hist. Soc., 24, p. 128.

Roll, and Swein, the Moneyer of Nottingham, lived in it. One wonders whether he was not the hero of the story, for he would certainly be one of the first persons the freebooters would seek, and the terms "*subterraneum*," "*cameras*," and "*aulam*," convey more than the description of a private residence of a citizen. The coins, too, which bear his name—and their proportion was considerable—were, unlike many of the others, as fresh as from the die, and all of the latest coinage.

The fire extended and destroyed the whole of the town; and we are told that nearly all the inhabitants either perished in the flames and the tumult, or were carried into captivity; hence it is probable that no subsequent search was made for the money.

THE COLCHESTER, ECCLES AND SUDBOURNE HOARDS.

In July, 1902, at a depth of 5 feet 6 inches below the surface of the premises for the new London and County Bank, in High Street, Colchester, a leaden vessel containing about twelve thousand silver pennies was discovered. The coins, with the exception of about a proportion of three per cent., were of what is now known as the "Short Cross Series," that is, a uniform coinage of silver pennies bearing the legend *Henricus Rex*, which, as the late Mr. Longstaffe first suggested and Sir John Evans finally demonstrated, was the sole currency in England from the later years of the reign of Henry II., throughout the reigns of Richard I., and John, to the year 1248 in the reign of Henry III. [figs. 1-10]. Certain details in their workmanship have, however, enabled us to approximately assign them to the kings under whom they were actually struck.

Mr. Grueber, F.S.A., has published an excellent and exhaustive report upon this find,¹ of which he examined and describes 10,926 coins. Of these, two were of Henry I., one of Stephen, one hundred and sixty were Irish money of John [figs. 15-16], one hundred and fifty-five Scottish *sterlings* of William the Lion [figs. 11-14], and thirteen of his successor, Alexander II., twenty-three were foreign

¹ *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1903, p. 111.



Pl. IV.

TYPES OF COINS FOUND AT COLCHESTER, ECCLES & SUDBOURNE
XI-XIII. CENTURIES

deniers, including specimens of Munster and of the Emperors Otto IV. and Frederic II., and the remainder, namely, ten thousand five hundred and seventy-two, were pennies of the English Short Cross Series [figs. 1-10].

In August, 1864, a precisely similar find, though of approximately only half the quantity, was made at Monks' Hall, formerly a settlement or grange of the Abbey of Whalley at Eccles, near Manchester.¹ The coins which numbered 6,217, were contained in an earthenware bowl, and weighed 21 lbs. avoirdupois. They comprised one hundred and four Irish specimens of John, one hundred and ninety-six Scottish *sterlings* of William the Lion, four foreign *deniers* of Munster and of the Emperors Otto IV. and Frederic II., and the rest, namely, five thousand nine hundred and thirteen, coins of the Short Cross Series.

As evidence of the identity of these two hoards, Mr. Grueber furnishes the following table of the number of coins of the principal English mints which they contained.

Mint.	Eccles, 5,913 English.	Colchester, 10,572 English. ²
Canterbury	2,278	4,122
Exeter	19	48
Ipswich	18	34
Lincoln	58	100
London	2,643	5,096
Oxford	13	21
St. Edmundsbury	212	457
Winchester	142	247
York	96	153

It will be noticed that these proportions almost attain mathematical precision and, whatever the conditions were which accounted for the loss of the Colchester treasure, Mr. Grueber is quite justified in saying, "I am inclined to think that the Eccles hoard was buried under like circumstances." But the only suggestion he offers to account for their loss is "that the coins were stolen whilst the exchange [calling in

¹ *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1865, p. 219.

² This line is an addition to Mr. Grueber's table.

the old money in 1248] was proceeding, concealed and not recovered until unearthed" in modern times. This would, however, account neither for the curious similarity in the proportions of the contents of both hoards, nor for the coincidence of the hiding of two such treasures at the same date, but at two points so widely apart in locality. Moreover at no time would it be so difficult to abstract large sums of money from the exchequer, as when special attention was directed to it at the time of a general exchange; and such exchanges were always held at the mint towns where the new money was coined. Colchester had long ceased to be one of these, and no place was, perhaps, more unlikely or remote for such a purpose than Eccles at that time.

There is yet a third find to record, bearing the same curious proportions. This is described by Mr. L. A. Lawrence in *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1897, pp. 235-244. It was discovered in France, and 574 of its coins were brought to England, and examined by Mr. Lawrence. Of these, two were Scottish *sterlings* of William the Lion, one was a foreign *denier* of Otto IV., and the remainder were of the same series of Short Cross pennies. Mr. Lawrence called attention to the remarkable similarity between the proportions of this hoard and those of the Eccles find.

To demonstrate how closely these proportions apply, we may tabulate the three finds in the following ratio, according to the number of coins they contained, France one, Eccles eleven, and Colchester nineteen, which, omitting fractions, gives us the following table:—

Principal English Mints.	France.		Eccles.		Colchester.	
	Actual.	Ratio.	Actual.	Ratio.	Actual.	Ratio.
Canterbury	215	215	2,278	2,365	4,122	4,085
Exeter	2	2	19	22	48	38
Ipswich	—	1	18	18	34	31
Lincoln	3	3	58	33	100	57

Principal English Mints.	France.		Eccles.		Colchester.	
	Actual.	Ratio.	Actual.	Ratio.	Actual.	Ratio.
London	269	269	2,643	2,959	5,096	5,111
Oxford	1	1	13	11	21	19
St. Edmundsbury ...	29	29	212	299	457	551
Winchester	10	10	142	110	247	190
York	8	8	96	88	153	152

These proportions cannot be accidental. Each of the finds contained nothing but coined money, and this in two, at least, of them was in far too great a quantity to represent any private hoard. The only explanation must be that some rate or contribution had been levied throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland, large sums being taken from London and Canterbury, and smaller sums from the other places, that these payments were made in the money circulating in the respective localities, and that the whole was then carefully mixed together, and finally that these three finds were portions of the same collection. This careful mixing of the whole was an Exchequer custom of the period, and no doubt it equally applied to all cases where large amounts were tested and paid into any official treasury. The *Dialogue of the Exchequer* (temp. Henry II.) describes it thus :—

“When the money is sent to the Exchequer to be counted one of them diligently mixes the whole together, so that the better pieces may not be by themselves and the worse by themselves but mixed in order that they may correspond in weight.”

The presence of the foreign *deniers* and of the large proportion of Scottish coins proves the impossibility of these finds having any relation to the national treasury, for, as the *Dialogue* explains, the greatest care was taken to exclude anything of the kind.

The internal evidence of the date of the deposit of these three hoards is also identical, though the result is not so definite as in the previous instances quoted in this paper. All three contain coins

bearing the name *William Ta.* of Canterbury for William the king's tailor, who was appointed a moneyer at Canterbury in the year 1230. The deposit therefore was subsequent to that date, and not later than 1248, when the Short Cross Series ceased to be current. The foreign coins do not help us in this respect, for the latest of them may have been struck at any time between these dates. But the Scottish money does throw light upon the subject. Out of the aggregate of three hundred and sixty-six of these coins, only thirteen bear the name of Alexander II., the contemporary king of Scotland. Alexander had ascended the throne in 1214, therefore these finds tell us that a similar system to that of the Short Cross Series had prevailed in Scotland, for the coinage of William the Lion, Alexander's predecessor, must have been continued to be issued unchanged during the first half of the latter's reign: otherwise the proportions of the money of the two Kings would have been reversed. Alexander died in 1249, and as only one of the three distinct types which are known to have been issued by him appears in these finds, the date of their deposit cannot have been later than 1243, for that date would only allow six years for the remaining two. In Ireland it would appear that the money of John, who died in 1216, like the Short Cross Series, was also still being issued unchanged, therefore no evidence as to the date of deposit is forthcoming in this class. It is a little disappointing that the actual date of the concealment of these hoards cannot (at least, until our National Rolls of this period are printed) be deduced with more accuracy, but allowing some years for the issue of the very large quantities of the coins, present in the hoards, bearing the name of William the Moneyer of Canterbury, we can safely say that it was probably not earlier than 1235, nor later than 1243, which latter date is supported by the fact that the names of one or two moneyers who, we know, were appointed in 1245, are not present in the finds, and finally we may follow Sir John Evans, who, in 1865, deduced that the Eccles treasure was buried about 1240.¹

We will now turn to the places of deposit. Of the French hoard we have no particulars, but those found at Eccles and Colchester

¹ *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1865, p. 294.

again show a similarity in this respect. The former hoard was hidden in the precincts of the old *Monks' Hall* at Eccles, and the latter, as Mr. Rickword has so ably proved,¹ within the curtilage of the ancient "*Stone House*" at Colchester. The Monks' Hall was a religious house or grange under the Abbey of Whalley, but that Abbey was not founded until the year 1296. In 1235, however, John de Lacy had granted the advowson of the Church of Eccles with the lands, liberties and lay rights to the Abbot of Stanlaw. The Abbot held a grange or religious house here, and it is believed by all authorities that the settlement of monks at Monks' Hall was established by him.

The Stone House at Colchester should be compared with the "*Stone House*," mentioned in charters of this period and earlier, as being before the gates and belonging to the Monastery at Norwich, also with similar houses still existing, one of which, for example, is known as the *Jews' House* at Lincoln, another is at Grantham,² and another stands before the Abbey of Glastonbury. These were probably all either religious houses or *hospitia*, in connection with adjacent monasteries, and used for the entertainment of guests and travellers. Such, no doubt, were the Monks' Hall at Eccles, as a settlement of the Abbey of Stanlaw, and the Stone House at Colchester, as a *hospitium* for its Abbey.

To summarize the proposition before us, we have to account for the collection between the years 1235 and 1243, throughout nearly every county of England, and also in Scotland and Ireland, of some general rate or contribution which had evidently been received and mixed upon exchequer principles, but which did not pertain to the English Treasury. For a rate evidently collected³ in large proportions from the districts of London and Canterbury, in medium proportions

¹ *British Numismatic Journal*, I, p. 116.

² Now the "Angel Inn." It was the property of the Knights Templars and "one of those ancient Hostelries, *Hospitia*, where Royal and other travellers were entertained." As such it was visited by King John. *Historical Notes of Grantham*.

³ The argument is not intended to be carried further than that in a payment made in a particular district, the money of the mint or mints of the locality would largely preponderate, and that no ordinary mixing in circulation could account for the same proportions appearing in three finds so widely separated in locality.

from those of St. Edmundsbury, Winchester, York, Norwich, and Lincoln, and in small proportions from Exeter, Ipswich, Oxford, Carlisle, Chichester, Durham, Wilton, and Chester (Rhuddlan).¹ For the hiding of, probably, a large proportion of the whole rate in sections, few of which only as yet have been discovered, but which seem to have been buried within the curtilage of religious houses. Finally, for the large proportion of coins which bear the *cross-pommée* mint mark [figs. 7 and 10]. This mark is clearly evidence that they were issued from the ecclesiastical mints, that is, that they were struck by the moneyers at the various places of coinage, who, by charter of privilege, represented and accounted to certain Bishops and Abbots instead of to the Crown. In most cases several moneyers representing the Crown, or its grantees, also coined at the same mints, hence only a small proportion of the coins could be expected to bear the ecclesiastical symbol. The *cross-pommée* itself no doubt represented the cross which was one of the symbols of investiture.

"Lay down thy cross and staff

Thy myter and thy ring I to thee gaff."²

The following table should prove this theory:—

Mints upon some of the coins of which the <i>cross-pommée</i> appears.	The Bishop or Abbot who is assumed to have issued them.	Reference.
Canterbury	The Archbishop of Canterbury	<i>Henry I.</i> , p. 134.
Chichester	The Bishop of Chichester ...	<i>Ruding</i> , 11., p. 222.
Durham	The Bishop of Durham ...	<i>Henry I.</i> , p. 185.
Exeter	The Bishop of Exeter or the Prior of the Holy Trinity, London.	<i>Henry I.</i> , p. 194.

¹ This mint was established in the reign of William I. and its *Tertius denarius* was subsequently held by the Earl of Chester (see my *Numismatic History of Henry I.*, pp. 147 and 492). Its coins of the Short Cross Series bear the name RULÆ and usually the *cross-pommée* mint mark. The natural inference therefore is that the *Tertius denarius* of the mint had become vested in the Bishop of Chester and Coventry and that the coins bearing that mint mark were issued by him.

² See *Henry I.*, pp. 363-64.

Mints upon some of the coins of which the <i>cross-pommée</i> appears.	The Bishop or Abbot who is assumed to have issued them.	Reference.
Lincoln	The Bishop of Lincoln under a grant of a moneyer at Newark now probably removed here.	<i>Henry I.</i> , pp. 316-18.
London	The Abbot of Reading ...	<i>Henry I.</i> , pp. 371-76.
Norwich	The Bishop of Norwich ...	<i>Ruding</i> , II., p. 200.
Rhuddlan	The Bishop of Chester and Coventry.	See previous note p. 38.
St. Edmundsbury	The Abbot of St. Edmundsbury.	<i>Henry I.</i> , p. 390.
Winchester	The Bishop of Winchester ...	See note below. ¹
York	The Archbishop of York ...	<i>Henry I.</i> , p. 488.

The reader will have anticipated that there was one rate or contribution, and one only, which would meet the conditions of these three finds as above specified, namely, the great levy by Pope Gregory IX. in 1240-1241,² of one-twentieth of the revenues of all the churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland, which caused so much indignation throughout this country. It would be levied upon strict exchequer principles, only the best money would be accepted in payment, and this would be carefully mixed and weighed, so that an official record could be kept, and each officer of the pontifical treasury held accountable for the share placed in his charge. It not only accounts for the absence of clipped money, but also for the presence of the Scottish and Irish contributions, and for the acceptance of the foreign deniers. It also explains the large proportions from the wealthy sees of Canterbury and London, the revenues of which were enormous when compared with those of the lesser diocesan communities. Indeed, Matthew Paris says that one-fifth of their

¹ Henry, Bishop of Winchester, *temp.* Stephen, had a grant of a moneyer at Glastonbury, and it is probable that the privilege had now been removed to Winchester.

² As previously remarked, "about 1240" was the date assigned by Sir John Evans to the deposit of the Eccles hoard.

revenues was claimed, and that Canterbury actually contributed eight hundred marks. Of this levy the following is one of several similar accounts given by contemporary monastic historians.

1240. A friend and relation of the Pope came into England, the Master Peter Rubeus (Le Rouge), who passed rapidly through England, and coming to Scotland, collected with great energy one-twentieth of everything in that country for the use of the Pope. About the same time Master Peter de Supion (Supino), being sent into Ireland diligently to collect the same twentieth in that country, carried off all he could from thence . . . And the booty which he collected is said to have amounted to the number of fifteen hundred marks and more. But the collection of Peter Rubeus, which he extorted from the Scotch territories, is supposed to have reached the double of this sum. And subsequently returning through England, he looked into all the houses of the religious orders with a new spirit, and exacted money for the use of the Pope with exceeding strictness . . . By which conduct he turned aside the hearts of the faithful from any devotion and affection towards the Church of Rome, and wounded them with great anguish.—*Matthew of Westminster, Younge's version.*

We have still to account for the curious hiding of sections of this levy at Eccles, Colchester, and in France (a most unlikely site for a hoard of English coins of this period), also, probably, at many other places on the road between Great Britain and Rome. At this date the Emperor Frederick II., who was excommunicated, and at war with Pope Gregory, remonstrated with his brother-in-law Henry III., for allowing the Pope to levy subsidies in England for the purpose of carrying on the war against him. Henry hesitated between the claims of his powerful brother-in-law on the one hand, and the spiritual influence on the other, but seems to have inclined to a secret policy in sympathy with the former. The King of France openly impounded the whole of the similar levy in his domains, pending the close of the war. The Clergy of England bitterly complained that they were compelled to pay so heavy an assessment, and it was urgently represented to the king, that the country was being impoverished for the purposes of a war the outcome of which was an open question. Therefore, even if all had gone well, it is doubtful whether Le Rouge and Supino would have been allowed to

openly convey their treasure chests out of the kingdom. Matthew Paris, the Monk of St. Albans, who was living at the time, tells us the sequel :—

1241. Peter de Supino, a clerk of the Pope's, had all this time been most assiduously collecting money by extorting the twentieth part of [church] property from all *Ireland*, supported by a warrant from the Pope, and carried away from that country a sum of fifteen hundred marks, besides divers gifts. Master Peter Le Rouge [*Rubeus*], too, who styled himself a familiar [*familiaris* = of the household] and [a] relation of the Pope, was also protected by a papal warrant, and diligently employed himself in amassing fresh heaps of money from the northern parts of England, and by sending messengers throughout *Scotland*. At length with their saddle-bags [*clitellis*] well filled, they proceeded under conduct of the monks of Canterbury to Dover, and suddenly and *secretly* set sail; for they had heard from messengers, sent in haste, that the Pope was still without hopes of recovery; indeed that he was either now dead or would die almost immediately. They therefore took to a *sudden and clandestine flight*, both by land and sea, with their booty, because they were afraid that if the King should gain intelligence of the Pope's death, he would prudently retain all the money they had collected, and consider how to proceed with it on the succession of another Pope. Scarcely had they entered *France*, when lo! Master Walter de Ocra, a messenger of the Emperor's, arrived in all haste, though now too late, bringing letters of credence from the Emperor and also a message to the King, informing him of the state of affairs at the Roman court, and advising him, if any such people were to be found in England, to detain the booty as well as the robbers. But when the messenger learnt that the two had escaped, he blamed the King's indolence, and immediately departed in sorrow and anger at having had his journey in vain: he, however, diligently followed their steps, carefully watching the meanderings of those foxes, in order to tell the Emperor the result of his journey.

The said agents of the Pope being now informed of his death, although the thing was concealed from the people for some days, and knowing that the said Walter was following them on foot, hastened their journey, not sparing their horses. After crossing the Alps, they secretly betook themselves to the cities and houses of their patrons,¹ *stowing away the money with which they had come loaded*

¹ In the original the word is *parentum* which Dr. Giles translates "relatives," but I think that "patrons" is clearly intended. See *Matthæi Parisiensis Chronica Majora*, IV, p. 160, *Rolls Series*.

in secret places, and not making their presence known to all; and as the said Walter could not find either them or the money, except only by whispering reports, he sent word to the Emperor of everything as well as of the fruitlessness of his search. His Imperial Majesty then ordered a strict search to be instituted throughout the whole of the cities of Italy subject to his rule, to discover who these papal messengers and traffickers were, who had, to the subversion of the empire and the common weal, and to excite war, fraudulently collected money throughout various countries, especially England, to bestow it on the Pope . . . He then ordered them to be seized and imprisoned as deadly enemies, to be convened to appear, and their property and houses to be confiscated, as well as those of all their relations . . . Thus these wretched ecclesiastics, who ought to have been protected under the wings of the Pope, were utterly despoiled, and the enemies of the Church more daringly oppressed them.—*Dr. Giles*.¹

The mystery of these three finds is now no longer difficult to understand. At the moment of the news of the aged Pope's mortal illness Le Rouge would be on the borders of Scotland, in all likelihood, staying with the Bishop of Carlisle, whilst he exacted the subsidy from that country, and Supino would be in Ireland, probably at Dublin, similarly occupied. Their instant return to Rome was imperative, and Le Rouge would summon his colleague to meet him at the nearest point *en route*. This would be at the Monks' Hall at Eccles, for Le Rouge would follow the Roman road, already mentioned under the Cuerdale Hoard,² from Carlisle and the north, through the Pass of the Ribble at Walton as far as Wigan where it branches towards Manchester. Supino sailing from Ireland would come up the Mersey as far as Wilderspool near Warrington, and follow the Roman road along the banks of that river and of the Irwell towards Manchester. The actual junction of these two ancient roads, the one from the north, and the other from the Mersey and Ireland, is close to the Monks' Hall at Eccles. Here Le Rouge and Supino would therefore meet and determine their plans. The king was in the west of England preparing for an expedition against the Welsh, and for

¹ I have added the words in the square brackets upon comparison with the original.

² See page 23.

anything they knew to the contrary, had the same information from Rome that they had. Their road, therefore, must lie to the east. To carry their treasure in bulk would court arrest, and in that case all of it would be impounded. But if they hid portions of it in comparatively small sections these could be regained when they returned in less troublous times and so much would be saved. By so dividing it for concealment at the various places at which they stopped *en route*, if one or two deposits were discovered the ultimate loss would be minimised. Matthew Paris heard "whispering reports" that this, in fact, was their system, and his expression that they were "stowing away the money in secret places at the houses of their patrons" proves that they were so hiding it in sections. It is true that he is referring to the latter portion of their journey, but the secret only leaked out there in consequence of the strict inquiries instituted by the Emperor in Northern Italy, but in England no such inquiries were ever made, and there was not the least likelihood that their methods would be known. What was necessary in Italy was equally, if not more, expedient in England.

From Eccles, after crossing the main ford of the Mersey at Stretford, only three miles away, they would make for the east coast, for Henry with his Court was in the west, and their chief supporters in England were in the east. The Bishops of Lincoln and Norwich and Hubert de Burgh of Colchester, the deposed Justiciary, were disaffected towards the King, and, therefore, if Le Rouge and Supino could but safely reach the jurisdiction of any one of those three potentates they would be comparatively safe. Another reason which perhaps influenced them was the fact that the Abbot of St. Edmundsbury and the Monks of Peterborough had been the last to pay their contributions, and it is not unlikely that there were still arrears owing which, if possible, they wished to collect on their way. The route probably chosen would be by the religious houses of Darley, Lenton, Grantham, Peterborough, Ely, St. Edmundsbury and Colchester. Here they would tarry in the vain hope of a ship of some Flemish trader to carry them over the sea, for the passage was no light matter in those days, when even kings with the resources of the Cinque Ports at their

command, were often delayed for weeks ; but they were ultimately compelled to make their way to Canterbury, whence, as Matthew Paris tells us, they proceeded under the conduct of the monks to Dover, from which port they suddenly and secretly set sail for France.

Since the above was written and whilst these pages are in proof, Mr. Frederick A. Crisp, F.S.A., calls attention to a fourth hoard of these coins, which, although discovered twenty-five years ago, seems to have remained unrecorded in any numismatic work. Mr. Crisp and his cousin, Miss G. A. Rope, of Orford, have now kindly instituted enquiries in the locality. The Rev. E. M. Scott, formerly Rector of Sudbourne, has supplied particulars of the find, and Mr. Henry Brindley, who was one of his Churchwardens at the time, has given an account of the discovery as he saw it ; lastly, Mr. Crisp has submitted a selection of the actual coins for inspection. It is, therefore, not too late to place upon record some account of a curious and important find of the Short Cross coinage of Henry II.—III., although any descriptive details must now be lacking.

During the restoration in 1879 of the ancient Church of Sudbourne, in Suffolk, a wooden box containing silver pennies estimated at the number of 2,800, was discovered beneath the flooring of the nave. The box crumbled away when exposed to the atmosphere, but the coins seemed to have been carefully packed within it. They comprised Irish pennies of King John, Scottish *sterlings* of William the Lion, and money of the Short Cross Series, which formed the great bulk of the hoard. In addition there would probably be the usual percentage of foreign coins, which, except to an expert, would pass unnoticed amongst the last series.

It will be observed how closely this description corresponds with those of the lost hoards of Le Rouge and Supino. Again, we have the selection of a site within religious ground. Again, the Irish money of John and the Scottish *sterlings* of William the Lion are in evidence. Again, there is the absence of any valuables save money. Again, the quantity hidden is too great to represent any private fortune in coined money, and again, the date of the latest coins, so far as can be

ascertained from those examined, is contemporary with the events of 1241.

Sudbourne-cum-Orford is on the Suffolk coast, thirty-eight miles from Colchester. Its church, which was standing long before the date of the coins, was the mother church of Orford, and the manor and advowson belonged to the Chapter of Ely. Orford, which was then one of the principal ports on the east coast, supplied ships to the king's navy and carried on an extensive shipping trade with the Continent. So prosperous was it that King Stephen granted it a market and King John a charter of incorporation. Its castle, which is to-day a well-known landmark, was built in Norman times, and was a noted stronghold of the eastern counties. In later days the sea played Orford false, and its harbour became almost silted up; its trade and importance gradually declining in consequence.

Hither, therefore, Le Rouge and Supino would journey from Colchester hoping to take ship for the Continent; for the words of Matthew Paris, "at length with their saddle-bags well filled they proceeded under conduct of the monks of Canterbury to Dover, and suddenly and secretly set sail," rather suggest that Dover was not their first attempt at departure. At Sudbourne, as they tarried in vain, they again lightened their risk, "stowing away the money, with which they had come loaded, in secret places at the houses of their patrons, and not making their presence known to all," and no place could be better chosen there for safety than a church of their patron the Bishop of Ely.

But our probabilities do not end here, for there was a special reason for the selection of Orford as their proposed port of departure. At that time Hubert de Burgh, their patron at Colchester, was also Governor of Orford Castle, hence, not only could they rely upon an escort to the coast, but there was every reasonable expectation of his being able to place a ship at their disposal. We are not told how they came to Canterbury, but it would seem expedient that they should avoid London, and it may be that they went by sea from Orford to Rochester or to Herne, then a port for Canterbury.

This find gives us the third mathematical factor, which though

suggested by the totals of the Eccles and Colchester finds, was lacking because no information was forthcoming of the number of coins found in the French hoard. Now we have the following figures :—

Sudbourne.	Eccles.	Colchester.
About 2,800	6,217	About 12,000

But of these only the total at Eccles claims to be accurate, for the number at Sudbourne was but approximate, and the coins at Colchester were certainly more or less squandered before examination. If, however, the accurate figures at Eccles be accepted as the exponent, and a small percentage allowed to the Sudbourne and Colchester totals to compensate for variation, we have the unit of 3,108 at Sudbourne, the double unit of 6,217 at Eccles, and the quadruple unit of 12,434 at Colchester, and these, it is submitted, were probably the actual numbers, or very nearly the actual numbers, which must have been contained in each hoard—for the following reason. The *Dialogus de Scaccario*, of the time of Henry II., tells us that official payments were then made by weight, “for they thought that, in course of time it might easily come about that money originally good might fall from its condition”—in other words, that it would depreciate by circulation or clipping. At first the difference between number and weight was estimated at six pennies to be added to every cash pound, but this was found not to be sufficient, so later the actual weight of silver only was accepted. The legal weight of the penny of the Short Cross Series was then $22\frac{1}{2}$ grains, but the coins themselves never quite average that standard. It is, therefore, most unfortunate that in the accounts of the Eccles and Colchester hoards no weights whatever are given—a very unusual omission in such numismatic records.

The coins composing the three finds had been in circulation ; therefore a fair average weight to allow for each would be $22\frac{1}{4}$ grains, and this is practically borne out by the test of some 300 specimens

which have been weighed by Mr. Baldwin and the writer for the purposes of this paper. At this weight our unit of 3,108 gives us twelve pounds, troy, even to three halfpence.

We were told by Matthew Paris that Le Rouge and Supino journeyed "with their saddle-bags well filled." Hence, for convenience of transit, we may now assume that they carefully weighed their treasure and divided it into bags, each bag containing twelve pounds in weight. These they would seal and the weight would be convenient for handling and counting in large quantities. At Eccles they buried two bags, at Colchester four bags, and at Sudbourne one bag. By this means they knew that if they subsequently had to send an agent to recover the treasures, they could check his accounts and the searcher could at once ascertain if he had found all. Again, the various receptacles in which the three finds were deposited are explained. At the small religious community at Eccles it was an earthen bowl, deposited mouth uppermost. At Colchester, where they could no doubt obtain whatever they wanted from de Burgh, it was a leaden vessel. At the sea-port town of Sudbourne it was a make-shift wooden box. In every case, we may take it, the money when deposited would still be contained within the sealed bags, but these have long ago perished.

The last we hear of these "wretched ecclesiastics," as Matthew Paris calls them, is that they were languishing in prison, and that, in mediæval times, usually meant the end of worldly affairs. That some of their hidden treasures were not regained is clear, that others still remain undiscovered is more than probable.

THE TUTBURY HOARD.¹

In 1831, in the course of removing a bank in the bed of the river Dove, some thirty yards below the present bridge at Tutbury, a vast quantity of silver pennies, estimated at 20,000,² of the reigns of Edward I. and II., was discovered.

¹ In my search for historical evidence bearing upon this subject, I was assisted by my friend the late Mr. Frederick Spicer, and I think that I am indebted to him for whatever new light is thrown upon it.

² This number has been given as 200,000, but this was, probably, a misprint.

An explanation of the loss of this treasure has already been given by Mr. Hawkins, in a paper read before the Society of Antiquaries, December 15th, 1831, which is as follows:—

After deducing the date of deposit from internal evidence to some time between the years 1321 and 1329, he continues :

“From the very large number of coins discovered, it is not probable that they were the private property of an individual, accumulated for the supply of the ordinary expenses of his establishment; but the treasury of the king or some potent nobleman, collected to defray the charges of some great public undertaking; or to provide the pay and remunerate the services of some large body of retainers; it was probably the military chest of some extensive armament; and this conjecture seems strengthened by the circumstance of the coins being unaccompanied by any other valuables, or articles of domestic use, which would probably have been the case had the treasure been private property, or purposely buried for temporary concealment.

“The probable time, the locality, and the circumstances, all seem to point to Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, as the proprietor of this treasure. After the Barons with this powerful noble at their head, had extorted from Edward II. a sentence of attainder and perpetual banishment against his favourites and ministers, the Spensers, they disbanded their army and separated to their respective castles. Edward soon afterwards assembled his forces to avenge and punish a personal insult to his queen; and, as in this the Barons took no part, the king, having his forces on foot, resolved to take his enemies by surprise and defeat them in detail. In this he was successful; but while he was engaged in these operations in the Marches of Wales, the Earl of Lancaster hastily assembled his vassals, summoned his friends, and marched to Gloucester, whence he proceeded to his castle at Tutbury, in order to effect a junction with a reinforcement he expected from Scotland. Hearing that Edward was rapidly advancing against him, he drew out his forces from Tutbury, and marched to Burton, about four miles distant, and placed his army in position on each side of the bridge to obstruct the King's passage. The river being swollen with late rains ‘there was no means to pass by the fords, whereupon the King was constrained to stay the space of three days,’ at the end of which time the Earl of Surrey was ordered to conduct a small party over a bridge, about three miles from Burton, and fall upon the rear of the Earl of Lancaster's position while his

attention was occupied by an assault upon his front: and at the same time the King, preceded by a strong party under the Earl of Richmond, was to pass a ford at Walton and attack him on the other side.¹ When the Earl found that the King had actually passed the river, his defence of the bridge became of no avail, and he withdrew his troops after setting fire to the town, meaning to give the King battle in the open country: the superiority, however, of the King's forces left the Earl no other resource than a speedy retreat towards the North, and he fled to Boroughbridge, where he was defeated and made prisoner. Though the circumstance is not mentioned by our general historians, yet William de Pakington, who was Clerk and Treasurer of the Black Prince's household in Gascony, and therefore had probably good means of information, expressly states that upon the King having passed the river, the Barons went with the Earl of Lancaster to Tutbury and thence to Pontefract; and with such expedition was all this effected that the latter left behind him at Burton 'all his vittels and other things,' and the King himself came to Tutbury that same evening. At this time, then, in all probability, these coins became deposited; the Earl of Lancaster did not perhaps take his military chest with him to Burton, and his retreat upon Tutbury might have been in some degree influenced by his wish to pick up his treasure as he passed; but it might also be a movement of necessity, for if the King placed force enough to prevent the Earl's immediate passage of the bridge at Burton, he would, as soon as the King had passed the Trent at Walton, be hemmed into an angle formed by the conflux of the Trent and Dove, and the passage of this last river would be his only mode of escape. Voluntarily, then—or involuntarily—his route was across the Dove, about the place where these coins were found; and, as his retreat was conducted with such rapidity as to be rather a flight than a retreat, there would not be time to remedy any disaster that might befall his military chest on its passage through the ford; and a disaster might easily occur, as there was not at that time any bridge over the Dove; the banks were soft and marshy, and the floods, which had delayed the King, had not altogether subsided."

Such was the carefully reasoned argument by which Mr. Hawkins identified the Tutbury treasure with the military chest of the Earl of Lancaster, and it is a pleasant task after seventy-three years to be able to offer direct documentary evidence in support of his theory.

¹ The "turning movement" of modern tactics.

"The King with a strong force pursued the said lords as far as the bridge of Burton-upon-Trent; and the Earl of Lancaster with the aforesaid lords moved from Pontefract towards the King, and came to Tutbury, the first day of March. *And on his way he lost much of his stores through a great flood of water.* And on March 7th, the Tuesday before the feast of Saint Gregory, the said Earl went with the said Lords and with his army against the King, and was defeated at the said Burton Bridge, and fled with his men towards Pontefract. And the King took the castle and town of Tutbury, and Sir Roger de Amory, who was opposed to the King, was killed there, and was buried in the Priory . . . And the King held possession of Tutbury *and whatever treasure he found there.*"¹

This confirms the usually accepted version, that in the initial stages the king was at Coventry, and that the Earl himself, after collecting his forces in Yorkshire, marched south from Doncaster to Tutbury.² Consequently, the Dove at Tutbury would be the only river on his way in which he could have lost "his stores through a great flood of water." Nevertheless, reading the two accounts together, it seems more probable that "the vittels and other things" left behind at Burton, and the stores lost in the flood, relate to the same disaster, and that it actually occurred in the retreat, as Mr. Hawkins has surmised.

The repetition of history in the above theories to account for the treasures at Cuerdale and Tutbury is curious. Both were the treasure chests of an army, and, allowing for the depreciation in the value, and consequent increase in the quantity of current money during the intervening four centuries, both were of equal value. In each case an army, raised in Lancashire and Yorkshire, whilst attempting to defend the crossing of a river against an English King Edward, was cut off from the Roman road at a ford named *Walton*, and lost its treasure chest in crossing, or attempting to cross, a river in its retreat towards York. In each case also, the English king was successful, and the chiefs of the defeated force slain or subsequently executed.

¹ *Livre de Reis de Brittanie, etc.*, Rolls Series, p. 341.

² *Battles and Battlefields in England*, p. 58.

KING JOHN'S ARMY CHEST.

There is still a vast army chest lying but a few feet below English soil, compared to which all these discoveries pale into insignificance. This is the entire treasury of King John, including the ancient regalia of England, the jewels of the Normans, and perhaps even the crown of Alfred. We know that it was lost in a quicksand, where the old road from Lynn to Swineshead crosses the "Wellestrem," and that a gold coronet was discovered in the sinking of a well in that neighbourhood. Then the district was half land and half water, but now the retrocession of the sea and the drainage of the Fens ought to have rendered possible a recovery which was once hopeless. That it will be recovered is but the repetition of history; but that no attempt should be made to locate and recover a treasure which apart from its intrinsic value, would be of priceless worth to the nation and to the whole archæological world, is incomprehensible. Surely the antiquary and the historian, guided by the discovery of the coronet and the records and traditions of the locality, can ascertain the vicinity, and the geologist locate the probable site of the ancient quicksand.¹

DESCRIPTION OF THE PLATES.²

PLATE I.—TYPES OF COINS FOUND AT CUERDALE. IX–X CENTURIES.

Alfred the Great.

Fig. 1. *Obverse*.—+ . . . ÆLFRE D . REX; bust to right, diademed.

Reverse.—+BVRGNOD, in angles of cross-crosslet, with lozenge-shaped centre, enclosing cross with pellet in each angle, each limb extending to outer circle, and terminating in a fleur. Pellet outside each side of lozenge.

Numismatic Chronicle, N.S., Vol. X, Pl. II, 12, engraved from this coin.

¹ My notes on the subject of buried treasure contain materials for the possible explanation of the loss of other hoards, which I trust to similarly treat upon some future occasion.

² The whole of the coins illustrated have been selected from the collection of Mr. P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton, F.S.A., President of this Society.

From the Cuerdale find; and the Kenyon, Norris, Whitbourn, "A Lady in the North," Brice, Montagu (lot 559), and Murdoch (lot 81) collections.

Fig. 2. *Obverse*.—ÆLFRE D REX SXX; similar to fig. 1.

Reverse.—HEAHTAN MONETAN; similar to fig. 1, except that the limbs of the cross-crosslet are not fleured, and there are no pellets in the angles of the small central cross.

From the Cuerdale find, and the Kenyon, Huxtable, Murchison, Bergne, Young and Brown, collections.

Fig. 3. *Obverse*.—ÆLFRE D REX; similar to figs. 1 and 2.

Reverse.—HEREFERÐ; similar to fig. 2, except that there are groups of three pellets outside each face of the lozenge.

Numismatic Chronicle, Vol. V, Pl. I, 4, engraved from this coin.

From the Cuerdale find, and the Wigan, Marsham (lot 155), Montagu (lot 557), and Murdoch (lot 82) collections.

Fig. 4. *Obverse*.—+EE FR ED RE, in four groups of letters, around a small cross pattée within inner circle.

Reverse.—CENE forward, FERÐ, retrograde, in two lines, divided by three pellets, one pellet and one pellet; below, one pellet.

Fig. 5. *Obverse*.—ÆEL FRE DREX, in three groups of letters, otherwise similar to fig. 4.

Reverse.—+AÐELVLF MO, in two lines, divided by three crosses pattée; above and below single pellet.

Fig. 6. *Obverse*.—EL FR ED REX, in four groups of letters, annulet after L and R of the king's name; large plain cross within inner circle.

Reverse.—+SCLAMVIM; crescent after M; large M surmounted by crescent, within inner circle.

Types of St. Edmund Memorial coinage, cf. *British Museum Catalogue*, Vol. I, p. 116, coin No. 386, where the obverse legend is read as that of the name of a moneyer "Elofroed?" cf. also Vol. II, p. 38, coin No. 2.

Fig. 7. *Obverse*.—ÆLFR ED REX; bust to right, diademed.

Reverse.—Large monogram of *Londonia*; cross above and below.

Fig. 8. *Obverse*.—ÆLFR ED REX; similar bust, drapery varied.


Reverse.—Similar, ornaments in field varied.

Fig. 9. *Obverse*.—+EGER ED RE; similar bust, drapery varied.

Reverse.—Variety of figs. 7 and 8.

Fig. 10. *Obverse*.—ÆLFR ED REX; similar bust, drapery varied.

Reverse.—Variety of figs. 7, 8 and 9.

- Fig. 11. *Obverse*.—ELFR ED RE ; similar bust, drapery varied.
Reverse.—Variety of figs. 7, 8, 9 and 10.
- Fig. 12. *Obverse*.—ÆLFR ED REX ; similar bust, drapery varied.
Reverse.—Small monogram of *Londonia*, between TILEVINEMON in two lines, ornaments in field.
- Fig. 13. *Obverse*.—+ELFRED REX D<>R-<> (for *Dorobernia*, Canterbury).
 Small cross pattée within inner circle.
Reverse.—DIA RV LDM-, in two lines, separated by three single pellets, above and below, pellet.
- Fig. 14. *Obverse*.—+ELFRED+ in centre line, above and below OPRSNÆF OPRDÆ (for Oxford), in two lines.
Reverse.—BERIIVÆLRDMO, in two lines, divided by three crosses pattée ; above and below, a group of four pellets.

Edward the Elder.

- Fig. 15. *Obverse*.—+EADVVEARD REX ; bust to left, diademed.
Reverse.—VVLF+REDMO, in two lines, ornaments in field.
- Fig. 16. *Obverse*.—+EADAMÆARD REX ; similar to fig. 15, but of rougher work.
Reverse.—IIEICIOH (? the last letter), in upper line, II EIOIB>, in lower line, divided by three crosses pattée, above and below, cross and pellets.

St. Edmund, Memorial Coinage.

- Fig. 17. *Obverse*.—+ſCEADN, followed by small crescent. Large A within inner circle.
Reverse.—+CVLCREO, followed by small crescent. Large cross pattée within inner circle.
- Fig. 18. *Obverse*.—+SCEADMONDI RE ; similar to fig. 17, pellets in field.
Reverse.—+ADRADV2MOT ; similar to fig. 17, but plain cross.
- Fig. 19. *Obverse*.—+CDRENIDANÆ ; similar, pellets differently arranged.
Reverse.—+ER ſALT MON ; similar.
- Fig. 20. *Obverse*.—+ſCFÆI ; A within inner circle.
Reverse.—+CREREI ; similar to fig. 17. A halfpenny.

Cnut of Northumbria.

- Fig. 21. *Obverse*.—··CNVTR··E··+, plain cross.
Reverse.—+EB··IAI··CEC··IVI (for *Eboraci civitas*, York). Small cross pattée, with pellet in each angle, within inner circle.
- Fig. 22. *Obverse*.—··CIVT RE+ ; even-limbed cross with pellet in each angle.
Reverse.—+BRAICE CIVIT ; similar, but without the pellets. York.

- Fig. 23. *Obverse*.—CNVT, at extremities of even-limbed cross, pellet in each angle.
Reverse.—+EBI|I|CCCIIF; similar. York. A halfpenny.
- Fig. 24. *Obverse*.—· · CN · · VTR · · E · · +; patriarchal cross inverted, pellet in each of four lower angles.
Reverse.—+EB · · |AI · · ICE · · S · ·; small cross pattée within inner circle, pellet in second and third angles. York.

PLATE II.—TYPES OF COINS FOUND AT CUERDALE.
 IX-X CENTURIES—*continued*.

- Fig. 25. *Obverse*.—· · CNVT REX; similar to fig. 24, but upper limb of cross terminates in an R or crozier.
Reverse.—+EB · · |AI · · CEC · · IV · ·; similar to fig. 24. York.
- Fig. 26. *Obverse*.—· · CNVT R · E+; similar to fig. 24.
Reverse.—+EB · · |AI · · CEC · · IV; large plain cross, a pellet in first and fourth quarters. York. A halfpenny.
- Fig. 27. *Obverse*.—Similar, but patriarchal cross to left.
Reverse.—+E · · B · ID · · C · · EC · Λ ·; small cross pattée with a pellet in each angle. York. A halfpenny.
- Fig. 28. *Obverse*.—· · CNVT R · · E+; similar to fig. 26.
Reverse.—+EB · · |AI · · CI · · VI; monogram of "Karolus" within inner circle. York. A halfpenny.
- Fig. 29. *Obverse*.—CRFEN=CNT RE, cross crosslet having a pellet in each central angle, and one in each outer angle.
Reverse.—+EB · · |AI · · CEC · IV · ·; within inner circle, small cross pattée. York.
- Fig. 30. *Obverse*.—· · CNVT R · · E+; plain cross.
Reverse.—+CVN · · NET · · TI · ·; within inner circle, small cross pattée, a pellet in first and fourth angles.
- Fig. 31. *Obverse*.—· · CNVT R · · E+; patriarchal cross inverted, a pellet in each of the four lower angles.
Reverse.—+CVN · · NET · · TI · ·; similar to fig. 30.
- Fig. 32. *Obverse*.—· · CNVT R · · E+; similar, but small cross pattée in each of the two upper angles of the cross.
Reverse.—+CVN · · NEFI · ·; similar, no pellets in angles of cross.
- Fig. 33. *Obverse*.—OV+NIH+ (for CNVT RNX), irregularly disposed about patriarchal cross inverted; no pellets in angles.
Reverse.—+E+IDIVQ, retrograde (for CVNDITE), cross pattée, no pellets in angles, within inner circle.
- Fig. 34. *Obverse*.—· · CNVT RE+; upper limb of cross terminates in Я or a crozier.
Reverse.—+CVN · · NET · TI · ·; small cross pattée, pellets in first and fourth angles.

Fig. 35. *Obverse*.—CN ··· VT R ··· E+, patriarchal cross inverted, a pellet in each of the four lower angles.

Reverse.—+CVN ··· NET ··· TI ···; within inner circle, small cross pattée, a pellet in second and fourth angles of cross. A halfpenny.

Fig. 36. *Obverse*.—O ··· NVTR ··· E+, at ends of, and between limbs of cross; upper and lower limbs crosslet; pellets in four lower angles.

Reverse.—+CVN ··· ICL ··· LI ···, retrograde; within inner circle, small cross pattée, a pellet in first and fourth angles.

Fig. 37. *Obverse*.—··· CN ··· VTR ··· E+; similar to fig. 35.

Reverse.—+ · CVN ··· NET ··· TI ···; within inner circle, monogram of Karolus. A halfpenny.

Fig. 38. *Obverse*.—+HURLAENAI; small cross pattée, having each limb prolonged, and a pellet in each angle.

Reverse.—+JVENTOIVICI; small cross pattée. Quentovic, near Étapes, France.

Cnut and Siefred.

Fig. 39. *Obverse*.—··· CHVT R ··· E ··· +, patriarchal cross inverted as fig. 24.

Reverse.—+SI EF RED VS, in four groups of letters; within inner circle large plain cross, a pellet in first and fourth angles. This coin is a "mule" connecting the coinages of Cnut and Siefred.

Siefred.

Fig. 40. *Obverse*.—+SIEF RED VS, in three groups of letters; within inner circle plain cross, a pellet in first and fourth angles.

Reverse.—+REX, opposite ends of plain cross.

Fig. 41. *Obverse*.—+SI EF RED VS, in four groups of letters; within inner circle small cross pattée with two pellets opposite each angle.

Reverse.—+REX, opposite ends of cross crosslet, ··· between each letter.

Fig. 42. *Obverse*.—+SIEFREDVS REX, around cross crosslet.

Reverse.—+EB IAI CEC IVI, in four groups of letters; within inner circle small cross pattée with groups of three pellets opposite each angle. York.

Fig. 43. *Obverse*.—+SIE ··· FRE ··· DVS ··· REX ···, around cross crosslet.

Reverse.—Similar to fig. 42. York.

Fig. 44. *Obverse*.—ISRTVEIE (for SIEVIERT), between limbs of long cross crosslet having a group of three pellets in each angle.

Reverse.—Similar to figs. 42 and 43. York.

Fig. 45. *Obverse*.—+SI EU ERT REX ·, in four groups of letters, around patriarchal cross with a pellet in each of the four upper angles.

Reverse.—+D · NS DS · REX · (for *Dominus Deus Rex*); within inner circle small cross pattée with pellet in second and third angles.

Fig. 46. *Obverse.*—+E BR AI CEC, around patriarchal cross nearly to left.

Reverse.—+MIRABILIA FC (*fecit*); within inner circle cross pattée with a pellet in first and fourth angles. York.

Fig. 47. *Obverse.*—+NDIDNIAI FLOTT; within inner circle cross pattée with a pellet in second and third angles.

Reverse.—DN2 D2 -<->- REX, in two lines divided by central cross pattée.

Alwald.

Fig. 48. *Obverse.*—+ALVALD · DVS, within inner circle cross pattée with a pellet in second and third angles.

Reverse.—DNS DS REX, in two lines divided by central pellet.

Halfdan II.

Fig. 49. *Obverse.*—+ΛΓF DE NE RX; within inner circle a small cross.

Reverse.—TIIVVINE, in two lines divided by group of three pellets to left, and a central pellet. A halfpenny.

PLATE III.—TYPES OF COINS OF WILLIAM I, FOUND AT BEAWORTH. XI CENTURY.

Fig. 1. *Obverse.*—+PILLEM REX ANG; within inner circle, crowned full-faced bust between two stars.

Reverse.—+LIOFRED ON ERIC+; within inner circle, springing from central annulet a cross with limbs terminating in group of three pellets surmounted by a quadrilateral compartment, with single pellet at each angle. Cricklade. Type V (1077–1080).¹

∴ Overstruck on Type IV. The final cross in the legend is from the earlier die.

Fig. 2. *Obverse.*—+PILLELMRE; crowned full-faced bust holding sword in right hand, resting on right shoulder, inner circle springing from the shoulders.

Reverse.—+GODSBRAND ON SCL; within inner circle, cross ornamented by quadrilateral compartment with each angle terminating in a fleur of three leaves. Type VI (1080–1083).

¹ The references to the types of this reign are from Mr. Carlyon-Britton's "Coins of William I. and II.," *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1902.

Fig. 3. *Obverse*.—+PILLIELMREX; crowned bust in profile to right, in front, sceptre in the king's right hand, inner circle springing from the king's shoulders.

Reverse.—+IEGLRIC ON PERH; within inner circle, cross with central annulet, in each angle fleur of three leaves springing from inner circle. Wareham. Type VII (1083-1086).

Fig. 4. *Obverse*.—+PILLELM REX; same type as fig. 3.

Reverse.—+LIFOLD ON PINC; same type as fig. 5. Winchester.

"Mule" connecting Types VII and VIII.

Fig. 5. *Obverse*.—+PILLELM REX; full-faced crowned bust, sceptre to right in king's right hand terminating in cross, and resting on his left shoulder, annulet on his right shoulder, inner circle divided by bust.

Reverse.—+IELFPINE ON CRIC; within inner circle, plain cross with annulet in each angle containing the letters PAXS. Cricklade. Type VIII (1086-1087).

Fig. 6. *Obverse*.—+PILLELM REIX; similar type, group of three pellets on king's right shoulder.

Reverse.—+TVRRI ON DEVITVN; similar type.

Fig. 7. *Obverse*.—+PILLELM REX; similar type, but no ornaments on king's left shoulder.

Reverse.—+SEMIER ON IEXEC, similar type. Exeter.

Fig. 8. *Obverse*.—+PILLELMREX; similar type, annulet on left shoulder.

Reverse.—+SILAC ON GLPEC, similar type. Gloucester.

Fig. 9. *Obverse*.—+PILLELMREX, similar to fig. 5.

Reverse.—+GODRIC ON STFANI, similar type.

Fig. 10. *Obverse*.—+PILLELM REX; similar type, pellet (as is usual) on king's left shoulder.

Reverse.—+IELFEN ON SANDP, similar type. Sandwich.

Fig. 11. *Obverse*.—+PILLELM REX; similar type.

Reverse.—+IELNOÐ ON SCIEFT; similar type. Shaftesbury.

Fig. 12. *Obverse*.—+PILLEIM REIX; similar type, but four pellets on king's right shoulder, and large annulet intersecting arches of crown.

Reverse.—+O-ODESBRAND ON SI; similar type.

∴ Mr. Carlyon-Britton has another coin from this remarkable obverse die, but with reverse very similar to fig. 6.

Fig. 13. *Obverse*.—+PILLELM REX, similar type to fig. 11, but no ornament on either shoulder.

Reverse.—+SEFMROI ON PITI, similar type. Wilton.

Fig. 14. *Obverse and Reverse*.—Similar types, but of rough work and legends blundered, cf. figs. 6 and 12.

PLATE IV.—TYPES OF COINS FOUND AT COLCHESTER, ECCLES AND
SUDBOURNE. XII–XIII CENTURIES.

- Fig. 1. *Obverse*.—**HENRICVS • R • E***; within inner circle, head, full-faced, crowned with a row of pearls surmounted by a cross, sceptre to left.
Reverse.—***FILIP • ON • NORHT**; within inner circle, cross pommée, voided with small cross pommée in each angle. Northampton. Class I, 1180–1189.¹
- Fig. 2. *Obverse*.—Similar.
Reverse.—***RAVL • ON • NORHT**. Northampton. Class I.
- Fig. 3. *Obverse*.—Similar.
Reverse.—***h[ERN]AVD • ON • I**. Ilchester. Class II, 1189–1208.
- Fig. 4. *Obverse*.—Similar.
Reverse.—***IVE • ON • SÆLOP**. Shrewsbury. Class II.
- Fig. 5. *Obverse*.—**HENRICVS R E***.
Reverse.—***HENRI ON EANT**. Canterbury. Class III.
- Fig. 6. *Obverse*.—**HENRICVS R E***.
Reverse.—***PIÆRES • ON • DVR**. Durham. Class III, 1208–1216.
- Fig. 7. *Obverse*.—**HENRICVS R E***.
Reverse.—***SÆMVE • L • ON • CÆ**. Canterbury. Mint mark cross pommée. Class III–IV.
- Fig. 8. *Obverse*.—**HENRICVS R E***.
Reverse.—***NICOLA • ON • LÆN**. Lynn. Class III.
- Fig. 9. *Obverse*.—**HENRICVS R E***.
Reverse.—***RAVF ON LVNDÆ**. London. Class V, 1222–1248.
- Fig. 10. *Obverse*.—**HENRICVS R E***.
Reverse.—***TOMAS • ON • RVLÆ**. Rhuddlan. Mint mark cross pommée. Class II, 1189–1208.

William the Lion of Scotland.

- Fig. 11. *Obverse*.—***LEREI WILM**; bust to left; before a sceptre.
Reverse.—***hVE WALTER**; within inner circle a cross voided; in each angle a star.
- Fig. 12. *Obverse*.—Similar type, but with inner circle.
Reverse.—Similar type.
- Fig. 13. *Obverse*.—Similar type.
Reverse.—Similar type.
- Fig. 14. *Obverse*.—***hVE WAL RO**.
Reverse.—Same legend. Roxburgh.

¹ The classes and dates are according to the arrangement by Sir John Evans.

John. Irish Coinage.

Fig. 15. *Obverse*.—**IOHANNES RE** ✱; crowned full-faced bust within triangle, sceptre to left, and quatrefoil to right.

Reverse.—**ROBERT ON DIV** ☾; crescent and large star between three small stars, all within a triangle terminating in a cross pattée at each angle. Dublin.

Fig. 16. *Obverse*.—Similar.

Reverse.—**WILLM ON LI** •; similar. Limerick.

