# ROMAN QUADRANTES FOUND IN BRITAIN, IN LIGHT OF RECENT DISCOVERIES RECORDED WITH THE PORTABLE ANTIQUITIES SCHEME 
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## The quadrans

A copper quadrans was worth a quarter of a copper as in the Roman period, or to put it another way, there were 64 quadrantes to a silver denarius. These coins were minted from the beginning of the Roman cast bronze coinage in the third century bс. After 90 вс, the coinage system changed and they became the least valuable coin in circulation. In the imperial period, they were struck from the reign of Augustus ( 27 bc - ad 14) to that of Antoninus Pius (AD 138-61). Literary sources mention a quadrans as the basic price of entrance to the public baths in Rome. ${ }^{1}$ You could buy wax and a stylus for 1 semis ( 2 quadrantes) or half a litre of wine for 1 as (4 quadrantes). ${ }^{2}$ Petronius sums up their low value in a quotation about someone who was tight with his money: 'He started off with just one as, and was even prepared to use his teeth to extract a quadrans from a dung-heap.'3 Quadrantes rarely bore the emperor's portrait, and whilst many stated the emperor's name, many did not and so can be classified only as anonymous and assigned a wide date range. This short paper considers finds of Roman imperial quadrantes found in Britain in light of recent discoveries recorded with the Portable Antiquities Scheme. ${ }^{4}$ The coins in question cover the period from the reign of Caligula until the reign of Antoninus Pius (AD 37-161). Of the thirty-four coins treated here, nine ${ }^{5}$ are new records made with the PAS.

## Quadrantes on the Continent

Dredging in the River Tiber has produced many quadrantes, 1,098 of which were published by Cathy King in 1975. This assemblage enabled her to re-appraise the production of quadrantes from Augustus to the middle of the second century. ${ }^{6}$ Very few quadrantes are known from sites outside central and south-central Italy. For example, Vindonissa, in modern Switzerland, produced more than 5,000 coins of the period from Augustus to Trajan of which only 50 were quadrantes, of the Rome mint. In contrast Pompeii has 1,827 quadrantes. ${ }^{7}$ Hobley shows that small bronze denominations are most common in Italy from Domitian to Hadrian, but are scarce north of the Alps after Domitian. ${ }^{8}$
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As these coins had such a restricted distribution, any finds outside their expected area is often a cause for enquiry. ${ }^{9}$ For example, the discovery of three Trajanic quadrantes from southern Jordan prompted Julian Bowsher to postulate that they arrived there due to the presence of the military. ${ }^{10}$ This is also the explanation given by Fleur Kemmers for the presence of quadrantes at Nijmegen, since excavations produced 412 quadrantes out of a total of 2,236 coins, an unusually high percentage compared to the rest of the Empire; 96 percent of those attributable to an emperor were issued by Domitian. Kemmers looked at other finds of quadrantes in Germania Inferior, Germania Superior and Gallia Belgica and noted that if a Domitianic quadrans is found, it will nearly always be along the Limes. ${ }^{11}$ Her conclusion from this and other work is that this a shipment of quadrantes was sent to the fort at Nijmegen to act as small change in the absence of other currency and then circulated through the rest of the frontier forts. ${ }^{12}$

## Quadrantes in Britain

The quadrans is a very rare find in Britain and it has generally been assumed the coin did not circulate here in any significant numbers. ${ }^{13}$ The rarity of quadrantes is highlighted at the Sacred Spring of Sulis Minerva at Bath which produced almost 12,595 coins, but not a single quadrans, corroborating the supposition that the coins were not issued for use in the province, but brought over by soldiers in their purses. There are 143,349 Roman coins on PAS database, of which 11,443 fit into Reece periods 1-7 (the periods in which quadrantes were produced; before AD 41-161), and of these only nine are quadrantes, representing $0.0008 \%$ of the coins of those periods. An unpublished PhD thesis by R. Kenyon, which studied Claudian copies of all denominations lists a number of quadrantes. ${ }^{14}$ He looked in all published reports and visited many museums; since he only looked for coins from the Claudian period (AD 41-54), this is not necessarily a complete list of quadrantes from Britain. However, we have searched most of the major coin reports, ${ }^{15}$ as well as the $B N J$ coin register from 1986 to present for this article, and noted no further quadrantes. Nevertheless, Frances McIntosh discovered an unrecognised quadrans while working in Warrington Museum and other museums might likewise hold unrecognised quadrantes. A full list of all known quadrantes from Britain can be found at the end of this article (Table 2).

## Chronological distribution

Table 1 summarises the number of coins from each reign or period. It is immediately clear that the vast majority of Julio-Claudian quadrantes ( 24 out of 25 ) come from excavations of major early sites, such as Richborough and Colchester, whereas for the later periods, from Domitian (AD 81-96) to AD 161, it is the PAS which provides most of the material (8 out of 9 coins). Seven of these coins are new finds; two are older excavated finds from Caerleon and Caerwent which have been incorporated into the PAS database. ${ }^{16}$ If one used only the existing excavation data, one would conclude that barely any quadrantes arrived in Britain after the initial years of the Claudian invasion. The PAS coins show that this is not the case. ${ }^{17}$

[^0]TABLE 1. List of number of quadrantes of each type.

| Period | Number of coins | Pre-PAS records | PAS records |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $37-41 \mathrm{AD}$ | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| $41-54 \mathrm{AD}$ | 24 | 23 | 1 |
| $81-96 \mathrm{AD}$ | 3 | $2^{28}$ | 1 |
| $98-117 \mathrm{AD}$ | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| $81-161 \mathrm{AD}$ | 4 | 0 | $4^{19}$ |
| TOTAL | 34 | 26 | 8 |

## Geographical distribution

Fig. 1 shows the distribution of all known quadrantes from Britain, distinguishing those reported through the Portable Antiquities Scheme and those found on sites during excavation. Although the sample is small, one can probably discern a meaningful pattern to the distribution. None have been found north of York, and most of Wales and the South West show a void. However, there appear to be three loosely formed groups: the South-Eastern (mainly Colchester, Richborough and London); the Western (with Usk, Caerleon, Oxfordshire and Worcestershire); and the North-Western (focussed around Chester).

The chronological range of the coins suggests a possible explanation for the distribution which supports the view that they are to be associated with the presence of soldiers. It has been mentioned previously that it is thought that finds of quadrantes outside of Rome can be attributed to the military. Table 2, which lists quadrantes chronologically, shows that the majority of the Julio-Claudian examples (14 out of 25) were found at the early forts and towns in the South-East, such as Richborough and Colchester (nos. 1, 7-14, 17-21). Given that this is where the Roman army arrived, it is not surprising that a high proportion of quadrantes comes from this region where soldiers disembarked in large numbers. The PAS only provides one new quadrans for this region, a later anonymous issue (no. 32). It is interesting that this is the only post-Claudian piece from the region. Does this merely indicate that most military activity had moved westwards and northwards?

The second group of coins, in the West Country and South Wales, is generally explained as coins lost by soldiers in the early years of the occupation of Britain, five coins being Claudian (nos. 2, 6, 23-5). However, the three westernmost coins in the group, from Caerleon, Caerwent and Worcestershire, are all Domitianic (nos. 26-8), possibly indicating troop movements in the late first and early second centuries AD. Given the evidence from Nijmegen, noted above, one might suggest these pieces came from the Rhineland.

The third group of coins in the North-West is centred upon Chester where three Claudian quadrantes have been found (nos. 3-5); a further Claudian coin comes from Wigan (no. 25). One can only assume that when the Roman army arrived in the region, and founded the legionary fortress at Chester c.AD 70, ${ }^{21}$ there were still Claudian quadrantes in some soldiers' purses. However, there are also two later anonymous quadrantes from the region (nos. 33-4), possibly suggesting some later troop movements. The only quadrans found near York is also an anonymous issue (no. 31) and it is possible that it this coin can be associated with troop movements in the region, possibly the arrival of Legio VI Victrix early in Hadrian's reign.

[^1]

Fig. 1. All known finds of quadrantes in Britain.

## Conclusion

It seems most likely that the quadrantes found in Britain came to Britain through the agency of the army, most likely in the purses of soldiers. The earliest, Julio-Claudian, pieces are generally found in regions where there was campaigning in the initial years after the conquest in AD 43. The Portable Antiquities Scheme data shows that there was also a relatively larger number of later, post-Claudian quadrantes in Britain, suggesting that they arrived with soldiers in the later first and second centuries AD.

| No. | Emperor | Dates | Obv. leg. | Obv. type | Rev. leg. | Rev. type | Wt (g.) | RIC no. | Findspot | Find reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Caligula | 37-41 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Richborough | 22307. Bushe-Fox 1949 |
| 2 | Claudius | 41 | TI CLAVDIVS CAESAR AVG | Modius | PON M TR P IMP COS DES IT | S C | 2.88 | I, 84 | South Oxfordshire | PAS LON-EDEF06 |
| 3 | Claudius | 41-42 | As no. 2. | Modius | PON M TR P IMP COS DES IT or PON M TR P IMP P P COS II | S C |  | I, 84/90 | Chester | Chester Museum; <br> Kenyon 1991, 578 |
| 4 | Claudius | 41-42 | As no. 2. | Modius | As no. 3 . | S C |  | I, 84/90 | Chester | Chester Museum; <br> Kenyon 1991, 578 |
| 5 | Claudius | 41-42 | As no. 2. | Modius | As no. 3. | S C |  | I, 84/90 | Chester | Chester Museum; <br> Kenyon 1991, 578 |
| 6 | Claudius | 41 | As no. 2. | Modius | PON MAX TR POT IMP | S C |  | I, as 86 | Cirencester | Cirencester Museum; <br> Kenyon 1991, 615 |
| 7 | Claudius | 41-42 | As no. 2. | Modius | PON M TR P IMP COS DES IT or PONT MAX TR POT IMP | S C |  | I, 84/86 | Colchester | 184. Sutherland 1947, 148 |
| 8 | Claudius | 41 | As no. 2. | Hand holding scales, inscribed PNR | PON M TR P IMP COS DES IT | S C |  | I, 85 | Colchester | 185. Sutherland 1947, 148 |
| 9 | Claudius | 41-42 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Colchester | Sutherland 1947, 148 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10- \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | Claudius possibly Julio- <br> Claudian | 41-42 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Colchester | Sutherland 1947, 148 |
| 14 | Claudius | 42 | TI CLAVDIVS CAESAR AVG | Modius | PON M TR P IMP P P COS II | S C |  | I, 90 | Harlow | 26. Gobel 1985, 68 |
| 15 | Claudius | 41 | As no. 15. | Hand holding scales, inscribed PNR | PON M TR P IMP COS DES IT | S C |  | I, 85 | 'Nene Valley Sites' | Peterborough Museum; <br> Kenyon 1991, 571 |
| 16 | Claudius | 42 | As no. 15. | Modius | PON M TR P IMP P P COS II | S C |  | I, 90 | 'Nene Valley Sites' | Peterborough Museum; <br> Kenyon 1991, 571 |
| 17 | Claudius | 41 | As no. 15. | Modius | PON M TRP IMP COS DES IT | S C |  | I, 84; Cohen 70 | Richborough | 19364. Bushe-Fox 1932 |
| 18 | Claudius | 41 | As no. 15. | Modius | As no. 17. | S C |  | I, 84; | Richborough Cohen 70 | 22514. Bushe-Fox 1949 |
| 19 | Claudius | 41 | As no. 15. | Modius | As no. 17. | S C |  | I, 84; | Richborough Cohen 70 | 22515. Bushe-Fox 1949 |

TABLE 2. Quadrantes found in Britain (continued).

| No. | Emperor | Dates | Obv. leg. | Obv. type | Rev. leg. | Rev. type Wt (g.) | RIC no. | Findspot | Find reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | Claudius | 41-42 | As no. 15. | Hand holding scales, inscribed PNR scales | PON M TR P IMP COS DES IT or PON M TR P IMP COS II or PON M TR P IMP P P COS II | SC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, } 85,89 \\ & \text { or } 91 \end{aligned}$ | Richborough | 22516. Bushe-Fox 1949 |
| 21 | Claudius | 41-42 |  |  |  |  |  | 'Southwark, various sites' | Collection of the Southwark and Lambeth Archaeological Excavation Committee; Kenyon 1991, 642 |
| 22 | Claudius | 42 | TI CLAVDIVS CAESAR AVG | Modius | PON M TR P IMP P P COS II | S C | I, 90 | Stanton <br> Low, Bucks. | Bucks. County Museum and Buckingham Archaeology Soc.; Kenyon 1991, 567 |
| 23 | Claudius | 41-42 | As no. 22. | Modius |  | S C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, 84, } \\ & 86-88 \\ & \text { or } 91 \end{aligned}$ | Waddon Hill, Stoke Abbott, Dorset | Proc. of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeology Soc., 101 (1981); Kenyon 1991, 596 |
| 24 | Claudius | 41-42 |  | illegible |  |  |  | Waddon Hill, Stoke Abbott, Dorset | Proc. of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeology Soc., 101 (1981); Kenyon 1991, 596 |
| 25 | Claudius | 41-42 | TI CLAVDIVS CAESAR AVG | Hand holding scales, inscribed PNR scales | PON M TR P IMP COS DES IT or PON M TR P IMP COS II or PON M TR P IMP P P COS II | S C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, } 85, \\ & 89 \text { or } \\ & 91 \end{aligned}$ | Wigan | Wigan Museum Service; Kenyon 1991, 642 |
| 26 | Domitian | 81-96 | IMP DOMIT AVG GERM | Helmeted head or bust of Minerva | SC | wreath | II (2nd ed.) cf. 235-6 | Caerleon, Newport | PAS IARCW63DAE27423 |
| 27 | Domitian | 81-96 | IMP DOMIT AVG GERM |  | SC | Basket of corn ears | $\begin{aligned} & \text { II (2nd } \\ & \text { ed.), } 245 \end{aligned}$ | Caerwent, Monmouths. | PAS IARCW63DAE7D0D |
| 28 | Domitian | 84-5 | [IMP DOMIT AVG GE(RM)] | SC |  | Rhinoceros facing right | II (2nd <br> ed.), 248/9 | Kempsey, Worcs. | PAS WMID2874 <br> (Hobley 1998, 25) |
| 29 | Trajan | 98-117 | IMP CAESAR NERVA TRAIAN AVG | Right facing head | S/C | She wolf right | II, 691 | Blaby, Leics. | PAS LEIC-6910A3 |


| No. | Emperor | Dates | Obv. leg. | Obv. type | Rev. leg. | Rev. type | $W t$ (g. ) | RIC no. | Findspot | Find reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | Trajan | 98-117 | Type not specified |  |  |  |  |  | West Lavington, Wilts. | PAS WILT-33A827 |
| 31 | Anonymous | 81-161 | - | Winged petasus of Mercury | SC | Caduceus |  | II, 32 | Beverley, Yorkshire | PAS YORM-C11BD1 |
| 32 | Anonymous | 81-161 | - | Bust of Mars, helm. and cuir., right | SC | Cuirass |  | II, 19 | Colchester, Essex | PAS ESS-EE5CF3 |
| 33 | Anonymous | 81-161 | - | Winged petasus of Mercury | SC | Caduceus | 2.3 | II, 32 | Goostrey, Cheshire | PAS LVPL-05B7D1 |
| 34 | Anonymous | 81-161 | - | Winged petasus of Mercury | SC | Caduceus | 2.3 | II, 32 | Warrington | Warrington Museum |
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# THE EARLIEST KNOWN TYPE OF EDWARD THE CONFESSOR FROM THE BURY ST EDMUNDS MINT 

## DAVID PALMER

When Robin Eaglen published his book on the Bury St Edmunds mint in 2006 the earliest known coins of the mint were in the Small Flan type ( $B M C$ type ii), which has been given to the years $c .1048-50 .{ }^{1}$ Eaglen recognised the fact that there could be further dies and types remaining to be discovered that would indicate an earlier start date for the mint than the one currently presumed. ${ }^{2}$ The recent discovery of a coin of the Trefoil Quadrilateral type (BMC iii) (Fig. 1) provides evidence for a date for the commencement of minting operations at Bury two years or so earlier, that is, c.1046-48. The coin can be described as follows:


Fig. 1. Trefoil Quadrilateral cut halfpenny of Bury St Edmunds (twice actual size).

[^2]Edward the Confessor BMC type iii, Trefoil Quadrilateral (c. 1046-48)
Obv. +ED[--]RDREX, diademed bust left; in front a sceptre with cross pommée head.
Rev. +MOR[---]EAD:, short cross voided, quadrilateral ornament with three pellets in each angle and one in centre.
Found in 2010 at Bottisham, Cambridgeshire, by John Baxter (EMC 2011.0064).
Weight: 0.58 g .
Die axis $0^{\circ}$.
For clues to the full reverse reading we must turn to those coins that have already been recorded from Bury in the reign of Edward the Confessor (1042-66), which are as shown in Table 1. ${ }^{3}$ We will have to wait until a complete and legible coin is discovered to be certain as to the full reading of the reverse, but the spacing of the lettering and the known readings on other coins of Bury puts the attribution of the coin to Bury beyond doubt.

TABLE 1. Coins of Bury St Edmunds in the reign of Edward the Confessor

| Type | Dates | Reverselremarks | No. of coins |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arm and Sceptre (BMC iiic) | c. 1042 | Unrecorded and unlikely to exist | - |
| Pacx (BMC iv) | c. 1042-44 | Unrecorded but may exist | - |
| Radiate/Small Cross (BMC i) | c. 1044-46 | Unrecorded but may exist |  |
| Trefoil Quadrilateral (BMC iii) | c. 1046-48 | +MOR[------]EAD: | 1 |
| Small Flan (BMC ii) | c. 1048-50 | +HORCEP ON ED | 3 |
| Expanding Cross ( $B M C$ v), heavy issue | c. 1050-53 | +MORCEREE ON EDHVN | 7 |
| Pointed Helmet (BMC vii) | c. 1053-56 | +MORCERE ON EDM | 6 |
| Sovereign/Eagles (BMC ix) | c. 1056-59 | +MORCARE ON EADM: | 1 |
| Hammer Cross (BMC xi) | c. 1059-62 | +MORCRE ON EADMVN (two pairs of dies) | 10 |
| Facing Bust (BMC xiii) | c. 1062-65 | +MARCERE ON EAD: ${ }^{4}$ | 4 |
| Pyramids ( $B M C \mathrm{xv}$ ) | c. 1065-1066 | Unrecorded but may exist | - |

Dr Eaglen, in his book on the Bury mint, gave an in-depth account from several sources of the granting of the eight and a half hundreds to the abbot. After analysing all of these sources, he concluded that it was reasonable to suggest that the grant to the abbot (Ufi) was made by Edward in the years 1043-44. ${ }^{5}$
Eaglen was unable to uncover a grant for minting rights before that of Edward the Confessor to Abbot Baldwin in $1065-66 .{ }^{6}$ However, it is quite obvious from the coins that exist that minting was well established at Bury before this time. Owing to the lack of documentary evidence regarding these rights we only have the coins to fall back on for proof of when the mint was established. A moneyer may well have been granted to the abbot at the same time that the hundreds were.
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[^3]
# STEPHEN BMC TYPE I FROM BURY ST EDMUNDS WITH LEFT-FACING BUST 

R.J. EAGLEN

Mack, in his trail-blazing British Numismatic Journal paper on 'Stephen and the Anarchy' in 1966, recorded and illustrated three obverse dies of Stephen type BMC I (the 'Watford' type) with a left-facing bust. One of the coins bore the reverse legend $+\mathrm{DAGVN}: \mathrm{ON}[]$. The two remaining reverses were largely illegible, but one read $\mathrm{ON}:[\mathrm{V}$, which led Mack to surmise Wilton (PILTV) as the possible mint. ${ }^{1}$ Even when North completed the third edition of his English Hammered Coinage, volume 1, in 1994 he was unable to add to the three coins illustrated by Mack. ${ }^{2}$ Thus the appearance of a fourth specimen, from Bury St Edmunds, more than four decades after Mack is a numismatic event of importance. The coin, illustrated below (Figure 1), may be described as follows:

Obverse: T Slarge and recumbent S$]$ TIEFNE + ; bust of king left, wearing crown ornamented with three fleurs and concave stringers; hair depicted by three parallel curving lines at back of head; collar composed of two shallowly curving concave bands above a row of five pellets, with a single parallel curved band below; sceptre in front of face, topped by a fleur, presumably held in the king's left hand. No circle within legend.
Reverse: $+h V N F R E I$ [apparently over hENRI] ON EDM; inscription around a pelleted border containing a cross moline with a fleur in each angle.
Wt. 1.11 g , die axis $180^{\circ}$. Found to the 'east of Bury', c. $2005 .{ }^{3}$ The coin passed through the hands of Mike Vosper and Spink before being acquired by the present owner.


Fig. 1. Stephen $B M C$ type I penny of Bury St Edmunds with left-facing bust (twice actual size).

The obverse has certain features akin to Stephen's BMC type VI, the Profile/Cross and Piles type: most conspicuously the left-facing bust, a large recumbent $S$ and the lack of an inner circle. However, other examples are to be found in BMC type I where the inner circle is absent or incomplete. ${ }^{4}$ There are also three distinctive differences between $B M C$ types I and VI: the crown of $B M C$ type VI usually has annulets instead of fleurs and the stringers are convex rather than concave; the collar of $B M C$ type VI has a single band rather than a double band above the pellets and the hair is composed of ringlets rather than curved lines. The Bury coin has each of these $B M C$ type I characteristics.

In comparing $B M C$ types I and VI, one coin from Sudbury classified by Mack as $B M C$ type VI, with a conventional Cross and Piles reverse, has an obverse with a large recumbent $\mathbf{S}$ and fleurs to the crown. However, the stringers are convex, the hair appears to be in ringlets and the collar is single-banded. ${ }^{5}$ Therefore, despite certain hybrid features, there is no reason to

[^4]question the classification of the Bury obverse to $B M C$ type I, or the Sudbury obverse to $B M C$ type VI. The re-engraving of hVNFREI over hENRI on the Bury coin was first noticed by Dr Martin Allen when the coin illustrated was shown to him at the Fitzwilliam Museum. Both moneyers were already known at Bury in BMC type I, although each from only one specimen. ${ }^{6}$ Henri was not otherwise represented in the reign at the mint but Hunfrei is known by two coins from the same dies in $B M C$ type II and three coins from the same dies in $B M C$ type VI. ${ }^{7}$ A moneyer named Henri also occurs in the Cross-and Crosslets ('Tealby') coinage of Henry II at Bury. Although the hiatus in the appearance of the name after Stephen's first type could, theoretically, be attributed to the paucity of surviving coins from the reign, the name does not arise again until several years into the well-represented output of Tealby pence at Bury. ${ }^{8}$ His identification with the Henri of Stephen's reign may, therefore, be safely discounted.

Although the altered reverse die of Henri is distinct from the reverse used to strike his only other known coin at Bury, there are grounds to suggest that his tenure as a moneyer was shortlived. Normally, the abbot of Bury was granted one moneyer, who was allowed only one set of dies at a time. However, at uncertain dates early in the reign of Stephen a second and a third die (representing two additional moneyers) was granted to the abbot. ${ }^{9}$ The resultant pattern of moneyers at Bury in the reign (excluding the hENRI/hVNFREI coin ) is shown in Table 1:

TABLE 1. Moneyers active at Bury St Edmunds in BMC types I, II, VI of Stephen ${ }^{10}$

| Moneyer | Type I |  |  |  | Type II | Type VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | REX | RE | R | - |  |  |
| Gilebert | $1^{\text {a }}$ | 2 |  |  | ----1? |  |
| Acelin | 1 | 1 |  |  | _1 | 1 |
| Hunfrei |  |  | $1{ }^{\text {b }}$ |  | 1 | 1 |
| Henri |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Iun(?) |  | ? |  |  |  |  |
| Oddo? |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| [ ]ric |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| No. of moneyers | 2 | $2 ?$ | 3 | 3 ? | 3 ? | 3 |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. Arabic numer <br> b. Obverse title | verse plete. |  |  |  |  |  |

In this table, taken from the author's The Abbey and Mint of Bury St Edmunds, Hunfrei appears before Henri on the hypothesis proposed by Seaman that the royal title was progressively abbreviated from REX until omitted altogether. ${ }^{11}$ Given that the name of Hunfrei was engraved over that of Henri it would seem that Henri's name should precede Hunfrei's in the table. This suggests that Henri operated briefly alongside Gilebert and Acelin, before being replaced by Hunfrei. The precise position of Oddo (if his coin is correctly identified) is unclear, as is the juncture when Gilebert ceased to operate. Whatever the actuality, Seaman's hypothesis clearly begins to unravel at the end of type I.
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# DIES OF HENRI LE RUS 

IAN JONES AND KEITH SUGDEN

## Introduction

William the Lion succeeded to the throne of Scotland in 1165 , on the death of his older brother Malcolm, and died in 1214. His early coins formed a very small disparate issue, and his first major coinage did not take place until around $1174 .{ }^{1}$ This coinage (the Crescent and Pellets coins) was provided by six moneyers (Alibode, William, Adam, Folpolt, Raul and Hue) at four named mints (Edinburgh, Berwick, Perth and Roxburgh), and lasted until 1195, when, according to the Chronica de Mailros, an 'innovation' of William's coins took place. ${ }^{2}$ This is accepted as referring to the commencement of the Short Cross and Stars coinage, which lasted until well after William's death: indeed, coins in William's name were probably struck until the 1230 s , and the final phases of the coinage continued until $1250 .{ }^{3}$

Phase (a) of the Short Cross and Stars coinage was provided by three moneyers at three named mints: Hue at Edinburgh, Raul at Roxburgh and Walter at Perth. ${ }^{4}$ Although there were only two or (perhaps) three moneyers in phase (b), where the mints are not named, the numbers of obverse dies recorded by Stewartby (see Table 1) suggests that phase (b) was a larger issue than either phase (a) or the Crescent and Pellets coinages. ${ }^{5}$

TABLE 1. Obverse dies recorded by Stewartby

| Crescent and Pellets | 55 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Short Cross and Stars, phase (a) | 33 |
| Short Cross and Stars, phase (b) | 72 |
| Short Cross and Stars, phase (c) | 8 |
| Short Cross and Stars, phases (d) and (e) | $>13$ |

It would seem that the two or three moneyers of phase (b) - Hue Walter and Henri le Rus - were either working at one mint for a prolonged period, or at several mints concurrently or consecutively; if consecutively, there would be no need to identify the place of minting, but if several mints were operating together, it would be strange if there were no 'audit trail' to identify poor-quality or fraudulent work. Burns suggested that, analogous with the later 'Sterling' coinage, the number of points to the stars in the reverse design might identify the mint producing the coin, ${ }^{6}$ but Stewartby has commented:

However, although I have noted a considerable number of obverse links between sterlings of these moneyers with different reverse type varieties, I have not included them here since I am very doubtful whether they were designed to indicate separate mints. This is partly because the number of points is indistinct ... but more particularly because of the extensive and haphazard occurrence of links. ... Such density of obverse linking seems more likely to have taken place within than between mints and, though not impossible if these moneyers were in charge of coinage at several mints, goes far beyond the linking observed in connection with the activity of the itinerant moneyers Walter and William under Alexander III. ${ }^{7}$

There is, however, no published study of the dies used in any phase of the Short Cross and Stars coinage, and this brief note aims to record all known obverse and reverse dies used by

[^6]one moneyer, Henri le Rus, in phase (b) of the coinage. It can make no claim to completion, because it excludes an important private collection of Scottish coins, which would certainly have included pieces relevant to this study, but which was stolen before a photographic record of its contents could be made. Nevertheless, the relatively small numbers of coins that are the only known specimen from a die (two coins unique for the obverse die and three for the reverse die) suggest that the study may not be far from completion.

## Results

Using Burns's plates as a template, photographs were assembled from the following sources:
a. The collection of one of the authors (Ian Jones).
b. Major public institutions.
c. Sale catalogues and fixed price lists.
d. Portable Antiquities Scheme and other on-line databases.

Thirteen obverse dies were identified, and twenty reverse dies, all of which are illustrated on Pl. 34. On stylistic grounds the obverse dies fall into three groups: an early group (dies A, B, and C), a middle group (dies D, E, F, G and H) resembling phase (b) class IV pennies, and a later group (dies I, J, K, L and M) of very crude busts. We have used the term 'early' for the first group of obverse dies, since they are linked with a reverse die including the mint signature DEPT (i.e. of Perth), assumed to be carried over from phase (a) pennies which normally carry a mint name; it is also generally accepted that die engraving quality deteriorates during a run of die-sinking, and the crude busts have been labelled 'late'. Reverse die linking was noted within each group (see Appendix and Fig. 1), but no links were seen between early, middle and late groups, perhaps suggesting discrete minting in three phases, separated either temporally or geographically. From the deteriorating quality of die engraving, it is perhaps more likely that minting continued over some years, possibly, but not necessarily, at Perth. There is certainly no support in the pattern of points of the reverse stars to suggest that the number of points has any particular significance; in any case they are often difficult to determine with any confidence.

This study is based on an examination of fifty-six coins, but, in view of the poor state of preservation of many pieces, some dies are difficult to distinguish from each other. Two coins apparently showing obverse die D with unrecorded reverse dies, noted by Burns, could not be located. Unfortunately, the actual chronology remains as obscure as ever.

| Obverse | Reverse | Coins |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A +LEREIWILT | 1 hEUR ILER VSDEPT, $4 \times 6$ | 56B |
|  | 2 hEURILE[ ]V.S, $4 \times 7$ | 57* (obv. and rev. ill.); INJ (cut half) |
| B +LERE[]AME | 1 | 56C* (obv. and rev. ill.) |
|  | 3 hEИR ILERV[ ], $4 \times 6$ | BM |
| C +LEREIWILT | 4 hENRILERWS, $4 \times 5$ | 51B; INJ* (obv. and rev. ill.) |
|  | 3 | 51C* (rev. ill.) |
|  | 5 SUREL:IRИVh:, $3 \times 6,1 \times 5$ | NCirc Feb. 2006, SCO352* (rev. ill.) |
| D LEREIWILA+ | $6 \mathrm{~h}:$ ENRILER[ $]$ S, $3 \times 6,1 \times 5$ | 60B; INJ* (obv. and rev. ill.) |
|  | 7 hNRILER.:V:2, $2 \times 7,2 \times 6$ | 61; FM*(rev. ill.) |
|  | 8 SVRELINEh, $2 \times 7,2 \times 6$ | 61A* (rev. ill.) |
|  | (Not illustrated); $4 \times 5$ |  |
|  | (Not illustrated); $2 \times 6,2 \times 5$ |  |
|  | 9 hENRILERVS, $4 \times 6$ | 60A* (rev. ill.) |
|  | 11 | INJ (cut half) |
| E +LEREIWIL[] | 8 | 61B* (obv. ill.) |



Fig. 1. Obverse and reverse die links.

| Obverse | Reverse | Coins |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F +LEREIWILT | 7 | AM |
|  | 8 | NMS* (obv. ill.) |
|  | 9 | BM |
|  | 10 SVRELINEh, $2 \times 5,2 \times 6$ | NMS* (rev. ill.) |
| G +LEREIWILT | 11 hENRILERV2, $4 \times 6$ | INJ* (rev. ill.) |
|  | 12 SVRELINEh:, $4 \times 6$ | INJ $\times 2$; INJ (cut half) $\times 2$; NMS* (obv. and rev. ill.) |
| H +LE[ ] M | 13 hE.URILERVS, $4 \times 6$ | INJ* (obv. and rev. ill.); PAS: SURF3CF84 (cut half) |
| I +LEREIWILAM | 14 hENRILERVS, $4 \times 6$ | INJ* (obv. and rev. ill.); NMS |
| J +LEREIWILAM | 15 hENRILERV $\sim 4,4 \times 6$ | 51; INJ* (obv. ill.); BM* (rev. ill.) |
| K +LEAMLER | 15 | BM |
|  | 16 hENRILIRV:, $2 \times 6,2 \times 5$ | 51 A ; INJ×2* (obv. and rev. ill.); NCirc Feb. 2008, SCO664 |


| L +W[]AMR | 16 | BM; DNW sale 78, lot 513 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 17 hENRI:RWS (from 2 o'clock), $1 \times 6,3 \times 5$ | INJ* (obv. and rev. ill.); BM×2 |
|  | 18 hENR ILER V[], $4 \times 6$ | Spink sale 57, lot 61* (rev. ill.); BM |
|  | 19 hE [ ]ERVS, $4 \times 5$ | BM* (rev. ill.) |
| M +LERIIRWM | 20 hENRILERVS, $4 \times 5$ | INJ* (obv. and rev. ill.) |

Notes:
(a) Numerals given for reverses are number of points to stars.
(b) Numbered coins refer to illustrations in Burns 1887.
(c) Coins illustrated on $\mathbf{P l} \mathbf{3 4}$ are indicated by an asterisk.

Abbreviations
AM Ashmolean Museum
BM British Museum
DNW Dix Noonan Webb
FM Fitzwilliam Museum
INJ Collection of Ian Jones
NMS National Museums of Scotland
PAS Portable Antiquities Scheme
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## SOME SMALL MEDIEVAL HOARDS FROM SCOTLAND

## N.M.M ${ }^{C}$ Q. HOLMES

The years 2009 and 2010 have seen the recovery of a number of very small and individually rather insignificant hoards from Scottish soil, but they are recorded here in order to place their existence in the public domain and to ensure that they take their place in the overall picture.

## Cruggleton Farm, Garlieston, Wigtownshire (2009)

A hoard of twenty-five English pennies of Edward I was discovered by Mr John Senior with the aid of a metal-detector. They have been claimed as Treasure Trove and allocated to Stranraer Museum.

A terminus post quem of $c .1306$ for the concealment of the coins is provided by the latest of them, which belong to type 10cf2. Although this may be somewhat inconclusive in the case of such a small hoard, it is notable that almost half of the coins (eleven) are of types 10 ab or $10 \mathrm{cf} 1-2$, issued between 1300 and $c .1307$, and that the later issues of 10 cf which are unrepresented are just as common overall as the earlier ones.

## LIST OF COINS

|  |  | Wt (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Canterbury |  |
| 1 | 3g3; S3, stops? | 1.16 |
| 2 | 4 d | 1.33 |
| 3 | 10ab3a; top-tilted S | 1.35 |
| 4 | 10cf1 | 1.29 |
| 5 | 10cf2a; A2, E?, h2, N1 | 1.32 |


|  |  | Wt (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Durham |  |
| 6 | 3 g 2 ; S3, stops 1; slightly chipped | 1.27 |
|  | London |  |
| 7 | 3b; bifoliate crown | 1.24 |
| 8 | 3c; h1, S1, R1 / S2; face 2a | 1.26 |
| 9 | 4 a 1 | 1.24 |
| 10 | 4b | 1.33 |
| 11 | 4b; broken hair | 1.16 |
| 12 | 4c | 1.34 |
| 13 | 4 d | 1.30 |
| 14 | 4e | 1.29 |
| 15 | 8c; large face; unbarred Ns on rev. | 1.29 |
| 16 | 8c; small face; chipped | 1.28 |
| 17 | 9a2; straight letters; star on breast | 1.34 |
| 18 | 10ab5; earlier R | 1.33 |
| 19 | 10ab5 (late) | 1.36 |
| 20 | 10ab5 (late); late R | 1.34 |
| 21 | 10ab5 (late); late crown and lettering | 1.28 |
| 22 | 10ab6?; + [ ]R XIIGLDIIShYB; IIG punched over other letters; serpentine $S$ on rev.; much poor striking | 1.31 |
| 23 | 10cf1; serpentine S; angular G | 1.37 |
| 24 | $10 \mathrm{cf1}$; serpentine S ; broken | 1.23 |
| 25 | 10cf2(a or b); obv. poorly struck | 1.32 |

## Belladrum, Kiltarlity, Beauly, Inverness-shire (2009)

Eight Scottish coins of David II and Robert II were found by Mr Eric Soane with the aid of a metal-detector. They have been claimed as Treasure Trove and have been allocated to Inverness Museum.

In the absence of any published classification of the coins of Robert II, the terminus post quem for concealment can only be said to be 1371, the year of Robert's accession to the throne. Hoards closing with coins of Robert II usually also contain issues of David II but no earlier or non-Scottish issues, ${ }^{1}$ so this small group conforms to the general pattern.

## LIST OF COINS

|  | David II <br> penny, first coinage, group II, same dies as Burns 8 (not ill.), same obv. die as Burns 9, | Wt $(\mathrm{g})$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Fig. 234. <br> groat / fragment, second coinage, type C or D | 0.93 |
| 2 | Robert II | 1.85 |
| 3 | groat, Edinburgh | 4.05 |
| 4 | another | 3.78 |
| 5 | another; same obv. die as Burns 3 (not ill.) | 3.74 |
| 6 | groat, Perth; same dies as Richardson 7 | 3.89 |
| 7 | another | 3.75 |
| 8 | penny, Edinburgh; badly chipped | 0.82 |

## Roberton, Hawick, Roxburghshire (2010)

Three separate little 'purse' hoards were recovered within a small geographical area by Mr Raymond Barr, using a metal-detector. All have been claimed as Treasure Trove and have been allocated to the National Museum of Scotland (registration nos. K.2011.44-45, 46-49 and 50-52 respectively).

[^7]
## Hoard 1

This comprised two Edinburgh groats of David II's third (light) coinage of 1367-71, the first weighing 3.79 g , and the second (chipped, broken and stuck together) 3.55 g .

## Hoard 2

This contained four groats of Robert II, two of Edinburgh (3.69g, 3.65g) and two of Perth ( $3.66 \mathrm{~g}, 3.65 \mathrm{~g}$ ).

Numismatically, all these six coins could have been part of a single hoard, but the finder has stated that the two groups were separate and discrete deposits.

## Hoard 3

This comprised three later fifteenth-century copper 'Crux Pellit' coins, corroded and fused together. One can be identified as belonging to type IR, ${ }^{2}$ but the others are completely unidentifiable.
Although 'Crux Pellit' coins are frequent as single finds, hoards have so far been notable by their absence, with the obvious exception of the problematic assemblage from Crossraguel Abbey. ${ }^{3}$
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## THE COINAGE OF JOHN BALIOL: AN ADDENDUM

## PHILIP HIGGINSON

In volume 80 of this journal, in an article entitled 'The Coinage of John Baliol', ${ }^{1}$ the authors listed a hitherto unrecorded first coinage halfpenny of St Andrews (catalogue no. 346). As the coin was known only from images posted on a dealer's website, the authors could not be certain if the reverse had mullets or stars, or the exact number of points. Now a second example in the author's collection (Fig. 1), although having parts of the legend illegible, is apparently from the same pair of dies, i.e. $\mathrm{SH} 1 / \mathrm{SHb}$.


Fig. 1. Second example of halfpenny of St Andrews of John Baliol's first coinage, Holmes and Stewartby 2010, no. 346, Image © P. Higginson.

[^8]Acknowledgements. I wish to express my thanks to Nick Holmes for his assistance with this note.
${ }^{1}$ Holmes and Stewartby 2010.

The reverse reads CIVI / TKS / SNN / [DRG]. There is no evidence of piercing on the symbols, so they are stars not mullets in the first and third angles of the cross, the other angles being blank. The star in the first angle has six points and that in the third has five, but has been double-punched.
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# GOLD COINS FROM TWO SIXTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH HOARDS: BISHAM ABBEY AND HOUGHTON-CUM-WYTON 

MARTIN ALLEN AND MARK BLACKBURN

This note records two groups of gold coins that derive from hoards deposited during the reign of Elizabeth I and found in the 1870s. In each case the coins had been mounted in the nineteenth century to be worn as jewellery, and it appears that they may not have been included in the original hoard reports.

## Bisham Abbey hoard

In 1878 Charles Francis Keary (1848-1917), who was then a member of the staff of the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum, published a short note on a sixteenthcentury hoard of gold coins found at Bisham Abbey. ${ }^{1}$ Keary stated that this was 'a hoard of 218 gold coins found at Bisham Abbey, Berkshire, the property of George Vansittart, Esq.', but he provided no further information about the circumstances of the find or the disposal of the coins in it. Keary's summary listing of the find is, however, admirably informative, showing that it contained a Henry VI Annulet issue noble (attributed by Keary to Henry V), six Edward IV ryals, an angel and half-angel of Henry VII, seventy-one coins of Henry VIII, 117 coins of Edward VI, twelve coins of Elizabeth I and nine foreign gold coins (from Spain, Portugal and Venice). The latest English coin was an Elizabeth I half pound with privy mark Rose (1565-65/6), which might suggest that the hoard was deposited in or shortly after 1565/6. Twenty-seven ( $12.9 \%$ ) of the 209 English coins listed by Keary had been issued before the beginning of Henry VIII's open debasement of the coinage in 1544. This evidence for the survival of pre-debasement gold coins in circulation in the early years of Elizabeth I is confirmed by the St Albans hoard (tpq 1560), which had three such coins in total of twenty-nine. ${ }^{2}$ The presence of nine foreign gold coins in an English hoard of this period need occasion no surprise because there is an increasing amount of hoard and single-find evidence for the circulation of foreign gold coinage in sixteenth-century England, confirming the evidence of royal proclamations regulating its use and literary sources. ${ }^{3}$

Twelve coins from the Bisham Abbey hoard were presented by George Vansittart to Rev. Thomas Edward Powell (d. 1901), vicar of All Saints' Church, Bisham from 1848 until 1899,

[^9]and they were made into a necklace, probably as a gift for Rev. Powell's wife, Emma. Mr Vansittart was the patron of the living of All Saints', and the church had been extensively renovated and enlarged during the 1840s and 1850s, funded jointly by him and Rev. Powell. The coins were subsequently dismounted from the necklace, and in the 1980s they were divided up, two each, among six surviving great-grandchildren. Three of these great-grandchildren (Jane Powell, Belinda Powell and Benjamin Powell) deposited their six coins at the Fitzwilliam Museum, while the remaining six are thought to have been sold and no record of them is known. ${ }^{4}$ The coins brought to the Fitzwilliam, which are listed below and illustrated in Figs. 1-3, have four


Fig. 1. Bisham Abbey hoard, nos. 1 and 2.


Fig. 2. Bisham Abbey hoard, no. 3.

[^10]ring mounts soldered to their edges, and they still have chains attached to them. On two of the coins (nos. 1 and 3, Figs. 1 and 2), two chains are attached to a catch-plate. The coins comprise a crown and a half sovereign of Henry VIII's third coinage and four half sovereigns of Edward VI's second and third period coinages. Coin 5 (Fig. 3, centre) is an exceptionally rare half sovereign of 1549 from the Durham House mint with a half-length crowned bust of Edward VI. Only one other specimen of this type is known, which is from the same pair of dies and was formerly in the A.H.F. Baldwin collection. ${ }^{5}$ Keary did not list any Edward VI half sovereigns with the Bow privy mark of Durham House, which suggests that the twelve coins presented to the Rev. Powell were not among the 218 shown to Keary.


Fig. 3. Bisham Abbey hoard, nos. 4-6.

Gold coins from the Bisham Abbey hoard deposited for study at the Fitzwilliam Museum
(All weights include mounts and attachments.)
1 Henry VIII (1509-47), 3rd coinage (1544-47), crown, Bristol, privy mark WS (1546-47), North 1836, 5.79 g. (Fig. 1, left.)
2 Henry VIII, 3rd coinage, half sovereign, Tower, privy mark Pellet in Annulet (1544-47), North 1827, 7.16 g. (Fig. 1, right.)
3 Edward VI (1547-53), 2nd period (1549-50), half sovereign, Tower, privy mark Arrow (1549), North 1908, 8.23 g. (Fig. 2.)

4 Edward VI, 2nd period, half sovereign, Tower, privy mark Swan (1549-50), North 1911, 5.54 g. (Fig. 3, left.)
5 Edward VI, 2nd period, half sovereign, Durham House, privy mark Bow (1549), North -, 5.71. (Fig. 3, centre.)
6 Edward VI, 3rd period (1550-53), half sovereign, Tower, privy mark Y (1550-51), North 1928, 5.75 g. (Fig. 3, right.)

[^11]
## Houghton-cum-Wyton hoard

In 1877 Keary published a note on a find containing at least twenty-five gold coins and 288 silver coins ( $t p q$ 1579) from Houghton-cum-Wyton in Cambridgeshire. ${ }^{6}$ Keary quotes a letter from a Mr J.D. Robertson of St Mary's Passage, Cambridge, which stated that:

It appears that a labouring man named Holmes, living at Houghton, near St. Ives, was digging a hole for an ash-pit in his garden. About fifteen inches below the surface he found a common earthenware jar, the upper part of which was wanting, in which were contained nearly three hundred coins of Henry VIII., Edward VI. and Mary. Mr. Bateman Brown managed to recover all or nearly all of these coins, and communicated the fact of their discovery to the Treasury, to whom he has handed them over. ${ }^{7}$
Keary's summary listing of the hoard is less informative than his publication of the Bisham Abbey hoard, and it omits many coins on the grounds that they were 'utterly defaced'. Only fourteen of the twenty-five gold coins referred to by Keary are listed. Thus it is particularly fortunate that Mrs E.B. Tarring of Weybridge in Surrey bequeathed two items of jewellery containing twenty of the hoard's gold coins to the Fitzwilliam Museum in 1953 (Figs. 4-5). ${ }^{8}$ There is a small gold chain of five coins (clearly intended to be worn as a bracelet) and a larger chain of fifteen coins (a necklace), all contained within a box with the inscription 'WASSELL \& HALFORD GOLDSMITHS JEWELLERS AND WATCHSMITHS 43 FENCHURCH S ${ }^{\text { }}$ inside the lid. This London firm traded until 1879, when the partnership of C.F. Wassell and R.H. Halford was dissolved, and presumably the coins were converted into jewellery by them soon after the hoard's discovery. ${ }^{9}$ In both the bracelet and the necklace the coins are connected by two sets of gold links attached to ring mounts soldered to the edges of the coins, broadly comparable with the mounts and chains attached to the Bisham Abbey coins. A note made at the time of the bequest by Harold Shrubbs, then the Fitzwilliam Museum's Coin Room


Fig. 4. Houghton-cum-Wyton hoard, bracelet.

[^12]

Fig. 5. Houghton-cum-Wyton hoard, necklace.
Assistant, lists eleven silver coins from the hoard that were examined at the Museum in 1947 but not included in the bequest. ${ }^{10}$

A comparison between the fourteen gold coins from the Houghton-cum-Wyton hoard listed by Keary and the twenty coins acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum (see Table 1) shows that three coins in Keary's list cannot be matched in the bracelet or the necklace, and that nine of the Fitzwilliam Museum's coins are not listed by Keary. This is a total discrepancy of twelve coins, but it is worth noting that Keary refers to a total of twenty-five gold coins in the hoard, which is eleven more than he lists. Thus it is possible that at least some of the Fitzwilliam Museum's coins were in the unlisted part of the parcel of 313 gold and silver coins surrendered to the Treasury by Bateman Brown, who was presumably the owner of the property on which the hoard was found. It is also possible that none of the coins in the Fitzwilliam Museum's acquisition was in the parcel surrendered to the authorities.

[^13]TABLE 1. Gold coins from the Houghton-cum-Wyton hoard

| Reign | Coinage | Denomination | Privy mark | Keary | Fitzwilliam <br> Museum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Edward IV | 2nd reign | angel | Cinquefoil | 1 | 1 |
| Henry VII |  | angel | Crosslet | 1 | - |
|  |  |  | Pheon | 1 | 1 |
| Henry VIII | 1st coinage | angel | Castle | - | 1 |
|  |  |  | Portcullis | 2 | 2 |
|  | 2nd coinage | angel | Sunburst | 1 | - |
|  |  | crown | Rose | 5 | 4 |
|  |  |  | Arrow | - | 4 |
|  |  |  | Pheon | - | 1 |
|  | 3rd coinage | half sovereign | Pellet in Annulet | 1 | 1 |
| Edward VI | Henry VIII posthumous | half sovereign | Arrow | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  | E (Southwark) | - | 1 |
|  | 2nd period | sovereign |  | 1 | , |
| Elizabeth I | 1st issue | half pound | Cross Crosslet | - | , |
| Louis XII of |  | écu d'or au |  | - | 1 |
| France |  | soleil |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | 14 | 20 |

Investigation through online searches of Census returns and birth, marriage and death records has revealed a direct relationship between Mrs Elizabeth Blake Tarring, who bequeathed the coins to the Fitzwilliam, and Bateman Brown. ${ }^{11}$ Mrs Tarring's husband, Bateman Brown Tarring (1873-1953), was the son of Eliza Tarring (née Brown, b. 1850), and a grandson of Bateman Brown (b. 1824). Although by the time of the 1881 Census Bateman Brown, JP, was living at 'The Hall', Hemmingford Abbots, Cambridgeshire, the family had had close connections with Houghton, for he, his daughter Eliza and his grandson Bateman Brown Tarring were all born in Houghton, and no doubt he retained family property there. It is reasonable to assume that this rather splendid gold coin necklace and bracelet were commissioned by Bateman Brown, either for his wife Susanna or for his daughter Eliza, and that they were passed down through the family to Mrs E.B. Tarring. It was appropriate that on her death they should return to Cambridgeshire and to the Fitzwilliam Museum.

## Coins from the Houghton-cum-Wyton hoard

Gold coins acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum in 1953
(Coins are listed in the order of their appearance on the bracelet and necklace.)

## Bracelet

1 Henry VIII, 2nd coinage, crown, privy mark Pheon (1541-42), North 1792.
2 Henry VIII, 2nd coinage, crown, privy mark Arrow, North 1790 (Henry and Jane Seymour), 1536-37.
3 Henry VIII, 2nd coinage, crown, privy mark Arrow, North 1788 (Henry and Katherine of Aragon), 1532-33.
4-5 Henry VIII, 2nd coinage, crown, privy mark Rose (1526-29), North 1788 (Henry and Katherine of Aragon).

## Necklace

1-2 Henry VIII, 2nd coinage, crown, privy mark Rose (1526-29), North 1788 (Henry and Katherine of Aragon).
3 Henry VIII, 1st coinage (1509-26), angel, privy mark Castle, North 1760.
4 Henry VIII, 1st coinage, angel, privy mark Portcullis, North 1760.
5 Edward IV, 2nd reign (1471-83), angel, Blunt and Whitton type XXI, privy mark Cinquefoil (c. 1475-1482), ${ }^{13}$ North 1626
6 Elizabeth I (1558-1603), 1st issue (1558-61), half pound, privy mark Cross Crosslet (1560-61), North 1982.

[^14]Edward VI, coinage in the name of Henry VIII (1547-51), half sovereign, Tower, privy mark Arrow (1547-49), North 1865.
8 Edward VI, 2nd period, sovereign, Tower, privy mark Y (1550), North 1906.
9 Edward VI, coinage in the name of Henry VIII, half sovereign, Southwark, privy mark E (1547-49) on reverse only, North 1806.
10 Henry VIII, 3rd coinage, half sovereign, Tower, privy mark Pellet in Annulet (1544-47), North 1827).
11
12
Henry VIII, 1st coinage, angel, privy mark Portcullis (1509-26), North 1760.
Henry VII, angel, type V, privy mark Pheon on both sides (1507-09), North 1692/2.
France, Louis XII (1498-1515), écu d'or au soleil, Tours, privy marks stop under 6th letter and Tower followed by triple colon (1498-1509), Lafaurie 592.
14-15 Henry VIII, 2nd coinage, crown, privy mark Arrow, North 1790 (Henry and Jane Seymour), 1536-37.
Silver coins listed but not acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum
Henry VIII, 2nd coinage, groat, privy mark Arrow (1532-42), North 1792.
-5 Henry VIII, 2nd or 3rd coinage, groat, privy mark Lis (1529-32, 1538-41, 1544-47).
Edward VI, fine coinage, shilling, privy mark Tun (1551-53), North 1937.
Mary (1553-54), groat, privy mark Pomegranate, North 1960.
Philip and Mary (1554-58), groat, privy mark Lis, North 1973.
Elizabeth I, 2nd issue, sixpence, 1569, privy mark Coronet, North 1997.
Elizabeth I, 2nd issue, threepence, 1575, privy mark Eglantine, North 1998.
Elizabeth I, 2nd issue, penny, privy mark Coronet (1567-70), North 2001.

## REFERENCES

Brown, I.D. and Dolley, M., 1971. A Bibliography of Coin Hoards of Great Britain and Ireland 1500-1967, RNS Special Publication 6 (London).
Challis, C.E., 1978. The Tudor Coinage (Manchester).
Culme, J., 1987. Directory of Gold and Silversmiths, Jewellers and Allied Trades 1837-1914, 2 vols (London).
Evans, J., 1872. 'On a hoard of English gold coins found at St. Alban's', NC 12, 186-98.
Keary, C.F., 1877. 'Treasure-trove. 1. Houghton find', $N C^{2}$ 17, 163-4.
Keary, C.F., 1878. 'Bisham treasure-trove', $N C^{2} 18,304-6$.
Kelleher, R., 2007. 'Gold is the strength, the sinnewes of the world: Continental gold and Tudor England', BNJ 77, 210-25.
Kent, J.P.C., 1985. 'The circulation of Portuguese coins in Great Britain', in Actas do Congresso Nacional de Numismatica (Lisbon), 389-405.
Kent, J., 2005. Coinage and Currency in London from the London and Middlesex Records and other Sources: from Roman Times to the Victorians (London).
Stewartby, Lord, 2009. English Coins 1180-1551 (London).
Whitton, C.A., 1941-44. 'The "Edward Royal" of Edward VI', BNJ 24, 190.
Winstanley, 1941-44. 'An exhibition of coins of Henry VIII', BNJ 24, 113-17.
Woodhead, P. 1996. The Herbert Schneider Collection Part 1: English Gold Coins and their Imitations, SCBI 47 (London).

## THE SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY TOKEN OF WILLIAM MASON OF ROTHWELL: NORTHAMPTONSHIRE OR YORKSHIRE?

P.D.S. WADDELL

THE token illustrated in Fig. 1 was first published and attributed in a paper published in $B N J$ in $1951,{ }^{1}$ referring to a number of seventeenth-century tokens not listed in Williamson's catalogue of traders' tokens, ${ }^{2}$ or in the later book by W.C. Wells on Seventeenth-Century Tokens of Northamptonshire, ${ }^{3}$ but held in the Browne-Willis cabinet at the Ashmolean Museum in

[^15]

Fig. 1. Token of William Mason, Rothwell, Ashmolean Museum, ex Browne-Willis collection (Dickinson 2004, 145A). Photograph © Ashmolean Museum; line drawing from Milne 1951.

Oxford. Michael Dickinson lists this as a new token for Rothwell and gives it the number 145 A in the Northamptonshire series. ${ }^{4}$
Just recently the author was able to acquire an example of the above seventeenth-century token from a London dealer. He was able to confirm the reading of the token as * WILLIAM MASON $\cdot$ around $\cdot \mathbf{M} \cdot|\mathbf{W} \cdot \mathbf{A}| \mathbf{1 6 6 6}$ on the obverse, and $*$ IN $\cdot$ RODWELL $\cdots$ around HIS | HALF I PENY on the reverse. However, the author's research suggests that a reattribution of the token from Northamptonshire to Yorkshire is necessary.
Four other seventeenth-century token issuers are known for Rothwell, Northamptonshire, three of which spell the town name ROELL on their tokens, with ROWELL on the fourth. A local history article states that the town is sited on a Danish settlement known as RODEWELL, but by the early middle ages it was called ROTHWELL or ROWELL as it is known locally. ${ }^{5}$
The Northamptonshire County Records Office at Wooton Hall on the outskirts of Northampton holds a number of records relating to the parish of Rothwell, including the register book of Rothwell for 1614-1707, ${ }^{6}$ which was searched for a William Mason of Rothwell who might be married to a wife with the initial 'A'. The only Mason found in the register book was John Mason of Kimbolton who married Francis Ginne of the parish in November 1705. A son of this John Mason was buried in 1706. The hundred of Rothwell Taxation Index of 1697 also shows a John Mason at Draughton in the hundred of Rothwell married to a Sarah with five children. ${ }^{7}$ No mention of a William Mason was found in any documentation relating to Rothwell in the mid-seventeenth century, including the wills index, nor of any William Marson or William Mawson.
The search was widened by considering other towns called Rothwell in England. These were Rothwell, Lincolnshire, and Rothwell near Leeds in West Yorkshire. A request to Lincolnshire Archives Office about a William Mason found no entry under that name in Rothwell marriage register 1640-1720. This register also included births and deaths. ${ }^{8}$
Prior to my contacting the West Yorkshire Archive Service in Wakefield, R.H. Thompson pointed out that in the 1672 Hearth Tax assessment a Willm Mason was chargeable for one hearth in Rothwell, Yorkshire. ${ }^{9}$ The West Yorkshire Archive Service confirmed that they held parish records for Rothwell and that the marriage of William Mason to Alice Blitheman was recorded for 1654 . William had at least four children, one of whom was also called William. The Wakefield office did not hold any wills of the period, and an on-line internet search of the National Archives did not turn up a will for a William Mason at an appropriate location. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{~A}$ search at the Borthwick Institute attached to the University of York for a will of William Mason in the Prerogative and Exchequer Courts of York for the late seventeenth century yielded no will, but an entry for an administration, dated 2 May 1676, was found under William

[^16]Mason of Rothwell, meaning that he died intestate. ${ }^{11}$ The entry relates to Beatrix Mason, William's widow, appearing before the Exchequer court as the administrator of William's goods. This implied that William had remarried, and a request to the Wakefield office for a document search for Alice Mason's death and family details in the parish registers confirmed the following: ${ }^{12}$

28 June 1654 William Mason and Alice Blitheman both of the parish of Rothwell were married.
15 July 1655 Anne the daughter of the above was christened.
20 January 1659 William child of above was buried.
20 June 1661 Susanna the child of above was christened.
January 1665 Maria daughter of above died.
March 1666 Alice wife of William Mason died.
November 1666 William child of William Mason of Rothwell was christened. ${ }^{13}$
This evidence suggested that if the token was from Rothwell it was more likely to belong to Rothwell, Yorkshire rather than Northamptonshire. However, as seventeenth-century tokens often contain many variations on the spelling of town names a search was made for William Mason in the following towns:

Radwell occasionally called Rodwell in parish of Felmersham Bedfordshire. The county archivist replied to the effect that all the records examined showed no record of a William Mason. ${ }^{14}$

Radwell, Hertfordshire, is in the Odsey hundred and part of the diocese of Rochester. ${ }^{15}$ No William Mason was found on marriage records and hearth tax records by Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies Centre. ${ }^{16}$

Rodmell is a parish town in East Sussex. The East Sussex Record Office searched the marriage registers for a William Mason of Rodmell in the seventeenth century and drew a blank; they also checked their records and could find no entry to such a person in the period. ${ }^{17}$

No town was noted with the name Redwell in England.
It is concluded on the present evidence that the seventeenth-century token of William Mason of Rodwell belongs to Rothwell, Yorkshire, rather than Northamptonshire.
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# MULED TOKENS OF JOHN SALMON OF CHESTER AND OVERSTRIKES UPON THEM 

## M.J. DICKINSON

The writer purchased the token illustrated as Fig. 1 (below) from Spink \& Son Ltd in 2001. With it is a Spink ticket dating back fifty years or more, and perhaps before World War II; it is written in the same hand as many of the annotations in the Spink house copy of Williamson, ${ }^{1}$ and as a number of the tickets accompanying tokens in the Norweb collection that came from Ralph Nott (d. 1960). ${ }^{2}$ The token is identified on the ticket as 'Dorset 69|Dorchester|Two others struck|over it'. Although overstriking is indeed evident on both sides, Williamson's description of his Dorset no. 69 does not fit either striking.
In 2007 Robert Thompson showed the writer a group of tokens found near Shudy Camps, Cambridgeshire, that had been sent to him for identification, and which he was writing up for publication in BNJ 78. ${ }^{3}$ One of them, overstruck by another token, was reminiscent of the piece described above, and a comparison of the two pieces proved the link between them. The decision was made to write up these overstrikes, the present note being the result. ${ }^{4}$ The Shudy Camps overstrike appears in Thompson's paper as token no. 6 under the sub-heading Associated finds, and is described as follows:
$O b v \cdot \mathbf{W I L L} \cdot \mathbf{G I V E} \cdot \mathbf{F O R} \cdot \mathbf{T H I S} \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{P E N Y} \cdot \mathbf{I 6 7 0}$ around arms
Rev. $\mathbf{H I S} \cdot \mathbf{H A L F E} \cdot \mathbf{P E N N Y} \cdot \mathbf{I 6 6 7}$ around merchant's mark. Overstruck by the dies of Williamson, Shropshire 5, $=$ Norweb iv.3879. ${ }^{5}$
1.97 g (corroded).

The overstrike is a halfpenny of Edward Wollaston of Bishop's Castle dated 1670. Its reverse is clearly enough from the same die as Norweb 3879. ${ }^{6}$ Probably the obverse is also, as the arms

[^18]are identical, but because very little of its legend is visible one cannot be absolutely certain. The die axis is $180^{\circ}$, whereas that of the Norweb specimen is $0^{\circ}$. Unfortunately the specimen is not in a condition good enough to be usefully illustrated.

The undertype of the piece illustrated as Fig. 1 is struck from the same dies as the Shudy Camps find and in the same axis, $180^{\circ}$. It has been overstruck with the dies of the halfpenny of Otteweell Robotham of Doncaster, dated 1669 (Williamson, Yorkshire 83; Norweb 5848), ${ }^{7}$ which itself is illustrated here as Fig. 3 for comparison. In Fig. 1 it can be seen that the arms, denomination and date in the central areas of the Robotham overstrike are clear, but the surrounding legends of the mule host are largely the more legible. Yet where traces of the legends of the overstrike are visible, they are all in higher relief than those of the host token. The piece is perhaps a unique numismatic item in that it bears three different dates of issue and two different denominations.


Figs 1-2. 1. Halfpenny token of Otteweell Robotham of Doncaster, Yorkshire W.R., dated 1669; overstruck on a mule of the reverse of a penny of John Salmon of Chester, 1670, and the reverse of a halfpenny of an unidentified issuer, 1667 (approx. $1 \frac{1}{2}: 1$; actual diameter $22 \mathrm{~mm} ; 2.90 \mathrm{~g}$ ). 2. Double reverse mule as the undertype of Fig. 1, apparently not overstruck (approx. $11 / 2: 1 ; 2.05 \mathrm{~g}$ (slightly corroded)).


Fig. 3. Halfpenny token of Otteweell Robotham of Doncaster, as Fig. 1 but struck on a virgin flan, ex Norweb Collection (5848) (approx. 1½:1; 2.19 g ).

The undertype of both pieces is evidently a mule of the reverses of a penny dated 1670 and a halfpenny dated 1667. The legend on the 1670 -dated 'obverse' is as that on the second known token issue of John Salmon of Chester (Dickinson, Cheshire 33A). ${ }^{8}$ The description for this was taken from the original recording by Heywood, ${ }^{9}$ but with the spelling of the denomination corrected from PENNY thanks to a specimen that passed through the writer's hands at B.A. Seaby Ltd in 1984 and which was purchased by Nigel Clark.

Many years ago, the writer had been notified by Nigel Clark of a mule in his collection, which was apparently the same as the two examples of the undertype discussed above. It seemed a good idea if possible to examine these three pieces together. Nigel Clark made his

[^19]mule specimen available for study, and at the same time his examples of both the 1667 and the normal 1670 issue of John Salmon's pennies for further comparison purposes. Clark's mule is Fig. 2 here; his example of Salmon's 1667 penny (Williamson, Cheshire 33; ex Fildes collection ${ }^{10}$ ) is Fig. 4; and his example of Salmon's 1670 penny is Fig. 5.


Figs 4-5. 4. Penny token of John Salmon of Chester, 1667 (approx. 11⁄:1; 2.33 g). 5. Penny token of John Salmon of Chester, 1670 (approx. 1½:1; 1.06 g (considerably corroded)).

The Clark example of the mule (Fig. 2) proved to be the same in all respects as the undertypes above, but is interesting in that it has apparently not been overstruck. We cannot be quite sure of this, however, as it is possible to imagine there being parts of letters above A•PENY (on the 1670-dated 'obverse'), but corrosion or slight double-striking may be the cause of this impression. Nevertheless, despite the corrosion on this piece, we have a good view of the 'reverse', especially of the device - a merchant's mark incorporating an anchor, with the letter S on its shaft. Unfortunately, despite a thorough trawl through Dickinson, and illustrations and descriptions of tokens published subsequently, the writer has as yet been unable to identify an obverse for this 1667 halfpenny token.
No such problem exists with the 'obverse' of the mule. It is from the same die as used for the reverse of the penny of that year of John Salmon of Chester, a specimen of which (Fig. 5) has been affected by corrosion in an unusual way, the raised areas having apparently become incuse in relation to the field. Robert Thompson has an example from the same dies ( 2.48 g ) but, although much less corroded, it is not as useful for photographic purposes; nevertheless it does have the merit of confirming the spelling of the place name CHESTER, incomplete in Fig. 5. The die axis of both these tokens is $0^{\circ}$. In the entry for this type in Dickinson (Cheshire 33A) Heywood's description of the reverse - Haberdashers' Arms - was followed. ${ }^{11}$ The arms on the specimens illustrated for the present article, however, are:

On a shield three fishes hauriant impaling the arms of the Worshipful Company of Weavers of the City of London, i.e. on a chevron between three leopards' heads each holding in the mouth a shuttle, three roses.

It now seems likely that Heywood was making an assumption in describing the arms on the reverse of Salmon's 1670 penny as being the same as those on his 1667 issue (Fig. 4, from the same dies and in the same axis as Norweb $510,{ }^{12}$ but a much better example), especially if the specimen he saw or had had reported to him was unclear. The description for Cheshire 33A in Dickinson therefore needs correcting. It is worth noting that the three fishes on the reverse, no

[^20]doubt intended to represent pseudo-Salmon family arms, do not have the crescent for difference above them as they do on the obverse. (The crescent here is in heraldic usage as a mark of cadency indicating the second son in a family). It can be seen that the arms on the obverse are as those on Salmon's 1667 token, described at Norweb classification 5.14.21, ${ }^{13}$ though not from the same die. The entry for Norweb 510 notes Sir William Dugdale's statement that the obverse arms 'disclayme' the issuer, i.e. declare him not entitled to bear arms. ${ }^{14}$

## How did these mules and the overstrikes upon them come to exist?

It seems unlikely that the mules were produced deliberately as samples to help obtain business from potential issuers of tokens. By 1670 the large majority of traders in most parts of England, Wales and Ireland would surely have been aware of the existence of tokens, if not many different examples of them. Besides, if a token manufacturer wished to use a sample to help attract custom, one combining an obverse with a reverse would be more appropriate for such a purpose; and the secondary usage of the reverse mules discussed in this article as if they were blank flans seems to rule out this possibility.
Assuming that they were struck unintentionally, why then was one reverse dated three years before the other? The likeliest reason would be that the issuer of the 1667 halfpenny had sought a further supply of tokens three years later. With the reverse die, and perhaps the obverse, being still in good condition, it would be a sensible idea for the issuer to make use again of a resource that had cost good money originally - a pair of dies made for the Corporation of Henley on Thames's farthing of 1669 cost ten shillings, for example. ${ }^{15}$ Presumably John Salmon's 1670 pennies were due to be produced at about the same time as Mr or Mrs X's repeat order of 1667-dated halfpennies, and the reverse dies of both issues were accidentally used together to strike tokens. The moneyer concerned, mindful of his profit margin or simply not wanting to waste good metal, could have mixed some of the resulting unwanted mules in with his stock of blank flans for use as hosts for the tokens of further issuers, evidently including Edward Wollaston of Bishop's Castle, Shropshire, and Otteweell Robotham of Doncaster, Yorkshire. Robotham may have been another issuer ordering a further quantity of tokens in 1670, some months after their original manufacture in their dated year, 1669, although of course the first usage of the Robotham and the 1670 Salmon dies could have been virtually concurrent at about the time the year changed.
The topic of where seventeenth-century token dies were kept after their original use has been discussed by Thompson. ${ }^{16}$ It is a pity we do not know (yet) where the 1667 halfpenny issuer lived and traded. If this location was in the Chester area, or conceivably on a route that agents of the moneyers would take between there (or beyond) and London where the tokens were manufactured, it could suggest that he or she had been the keeper of the dies after the original tokens were struck from them, and had returned them to London by means of an agent who on the same business trip had secured the order of a new issue for John Salmon and perhaps other traders also. On the other hand the die(s) of the 1667 halfpenny issuer could have been resting on a shelf or in a box at the mint since the time tokens had been originally struck from them.
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## GEORGE JOBSON'S HALFPENNY

## D.W. DYKES



Fig. 1. George Jobson's halfpenny. ( $D \& H$ : Northants 1 ).

One of the more enigmatic of eighteenth-century tokens is that supposedly issued by George Jobson, Banker, dated 1794, and with a reverse inscription that suggests a connection with Northampton. Although Pye expressed no reservations about the token's authenticity in either edition of his seminal catalogue of provincial coins its genuineness has plagued numismatists down the years. ${ }^{1}$ No one has been able to establish Jobson's identity; he is not known as a banker in any part of England or Wales nor has he been readily pinpointed as a Northamptonshire inhabitant while Thomas Sharp, who was the first to question the token's legitimacy, tells us that circulation of the token 'was not attempted' in Northampton. ${ }^{2}$ The token's reverse, too, serves only to consolidate one's suspicions. Though boasting the inscription MAY NORTHAMPTON FLOURISH, it portrays, as R.T. Samuel pointed out in one of his anonymous articles in the Bazaar, The Exchange and Mart in the 1880s, the triple-towered castle and 'passant guardant' lion of the arms of Norwich and is a close copy of Thomas

[^21]

Fig. 2. The obverse of Nathaniel Bolingbroke's Norwich halfpenny. ( $D \& H$ : Norfolk 14).

Wyon's obverse of the 1792 halfpenny of the Norwich haberdasher Nathaniel Bolingbroke made by Kempson. ${ }^{3}$

One might, of course, be tempted to explain away the 'Jobson' reverse as a die-sinker's error since the arms of Northampton do contain representations of a castle and supporting lions but this would smack too much of an exercise in special pleading. Samuel concluded that were it not for Pye he would have regarded the token as one made for sale. And, in fairness to Pye, as Waters pointed out, the token has every appearance of being genuine. ${ }^{4}$ The dies are well engraved and the portrayal of 'Jobson' is particularly fine, capturing, as Samuel puts it, the 'speaking' likeness of someone who, it might be readily assumed from the image presented, is a tradesman of integrity, perhaps the honest Quaker that his dress suggests.

Although Pye listed - and illustrated - only a plain-edged halfpenny in his catalogues, Birchall, Denton and Prattent, and Conder recorded a variety with the edge legend PAYABLE
IN LANCASTER, LONDON OR BRISTOL. ${ }^{5}$ They, however, made no mention of the plainedged version and it was left to Sharp in 1834 to itemize both varieties of the token. He gave primacy to the inscribed-edge variant, the pattern of listing followed by all subsequent commentators culminating with Dalton and Hamer whose enumeration has become that accepted as standard today. ${ }^{6}$ Thus $D \& H$ : Northants 1 is listed as the inscribed-edge variety and $D \& H$ : Northants 1a as the plain-edge one.
$D \& H$ : Northants 1 is quite a prolific piece in average condition. It is struck with a die axis of 12 h and to a weight standard approaching 50 to the $\mathrm{lb} .( \pm 9.18 \mathrm{~g})$. The incuse edge legend is bogus and is used on at least fifty blanks emanating from the Lutwyche coinery for forgeries, fabrications and mules. ${ }^{7}$
$D \& H$ : Northants 1a, on the other hand, is particularly scarce, probably rarer than many modern students realise. ${ }^{8}$ It is struck with a die axis of 6 h and to a weight standard of 34 to the lb. $( \pm 13.04 \mathrm{~g})$.

In response to a question in the Gentleman's Magazine from a correspondent 'R.Y.' (almost certainly the barrister-collector and later clergyman W.R. Hay) in 1796, Pye made it clear that that the plain-edged $D \& H$ : 1a, illustrated on plate 21 of his 1795 catalogue, was the substantive striking of the 'Jobson' token which he declared he had 'received from the manufacturer'. ${ }^{9}$ Pye made no comment in his letter on $D \& H$ : 1 (which was the version that ' $\mathrm{R} . \mathrm{Y}$.' had in his cabinet) but while struck from the same dies, it is obviously a subsequent light-weight copy produced for general currency and presumably by Lutwyche. Pye's original engraving of $D \& H$ : 1a had been published on 1 March 1795 and both Hammond and Spence in the various manifestations of their catalogues put out in the spring and summer of that year refer only to

[^22]this version. ${ }^{10}$ This would suggest that $D \& H$ : 1 was not produced until the autumn of 1795 at the earliest. It eventually appeared, as we have already noted, as the sole striking of the token in Samuel Birchall's Descriptive List in early 1796 (Birchall's preface is dated 30 January 1796) and subsequently ( 28 March 1796) as an engraving on plate 75 of Denton and Prattent's Virtuoso's Companion (Fig. 3). It is reasonable, therefore, to assume that there must have been a gap of nine months or more between the substantive striking and the production of the lighter-weight inscribed-edge variety.


Fig. 3. Detail from pl. 75 of Denton and Prattent's Virtuoso's Companion, 28 March 1796.

When Pye originally published the plain-edged $D \& H$ : 1a in 1795 he stated that its die-sinker was 'Wyon' - perhaps with a backward glance at Thomas Wyon's Norwich reverse for Nathaniel Bolingbroke - but he presumably revised his opinion for in his subsequent 1801 catalogue he made no mention of any die-sinker for this piece. ${ }^{11}$ Hay's manuscript annotations to his copy of Pye's 1795 plates reiterated the name 'Wyon' but one imagines that he was simply copying Pye's initial verdict from the latter's 'Index' for ease of reference. What is of more import, however, is that Hay noted that the token's 'proprietor' or issuer was 'Morgan a Button maker'. There can be no doubt that Hay's gloss is contemporaneous with his other jottings in Pye's 1795 edition and, since manufacturers' and frequently issuers' names were not published by Pye until 1801, Hay must have obtained his information from some other source. We know that he was in Birmingham in September 1796 and talked to Pye, Jorden and other luminaries of the local token-making scene and it is likely that he ferreted out this information then. ${ }^{12}$

Who then was Morgan? In the 'Index' to his 1801 edition Pye tells us that he was 'R.B. Morgan' but as with another singleton token maker, 'Simmons' $[D \& H$ : Staffordshire 26], he omits the name from his prefatory list of 'Die Sinkers and Manufacturers'. Pye does include Morgan in his Birmingham Directory of 1791 where he is shown as a button maker of 'St Paul's-square, corner of Caroline-street'. ${ }^{13}$ But this was his sole legitimate directory entry and as with so many of his fellow tradesmen Morgan is lost among the shadowy throng of eighteenthcentury Birmingham button makers. From time to time some tantalisingly meagre glimpses of him can be caught but what seems to emerge is someone singularly unsuccessful, probably undercapitalised, and an all too typical example of a tradesman perpetually haunted by the spectre of debt in a society dependent on credit. ${ }^{14}$

[^23]Robert Brickdale Morgan was born in Newport, Shropshire in 1756 or 1757. ${ }^{15}$ Nothing thereafter is known about him until 1785 when he was trading as a mercer and draper in Stafford in partnership with a William Pace. In the November of that year the partnership was dissolved and before very long Morgan had moved to Birmingham where he entered into a new partnership in a linen-drapery business with one Benjamin Dugard Webb. This venture could not have been very successful since both partners were declared bankrupt in June 1788. ${ }^{16}$ Then in January 1789 Morgan is recorded as marrying Elizabeth Ashton, the daughter of a Birmingham brass-founder, partner in the firm of Ashton and Goddington, ${ }^{17}$ and it is presumably this connection that brought Morgan into the button-making industry. ${ }^{18}$ It is otherwise difficult to explain the transition from linen-draper to button-maker despite the reputation that Birmingham tradesmen had for taking risks and turning their hands to anything as events dictated; 'jacks-of-all-trades', guyed in a local broadside where such a 'jolly roving blade' is portrayed as exhausting seventy-three distinct trades from porter, through pastry cook, coffin maker, hatter, die-sinker, glover and pawnbroker before ending up making awl blades. ${ }^{19}$

It is likely that Elizabeth Ashton herself or through her father brought some much-needed financial back-up to Morgan but she died suddenly in April 1792 and, less than eighteen months' later, in September 1793, he was gazetted for a second time. ${ }^{20}$ His earlier debts had not yet been settled and the creditors in both his bankruptcies were still seeking redress years later. The causes of Morgan's dual downfall are not known but both 1788 and 1793 were years of recession following boom periods, the first affecting the textile trade especially (Morgan was then still a linen-draper), the second more general. Underlying both slumps was a shrinkage of credit exacerbated particularly in 1793 by an over-enthusiastic issue of private banknotes.

Morgan must have been in dire straits when he made his one apparent excursion into token making. Whether it was a venture of his own initiative or perhaps a crumb cast to him by an established manufacturer it seems clear that it was intended as an exercise in deception inspired by the desire to make a profit out of the emergent collector's market. $D \& H$ : 1a is even more substantial [34:1b.] than most of the legitimate tokens put out in 1791 and 1792 - those of Worswick (Lancaster), Clarke (Liverpool), Kershaw (Rochdale) and Shearer (Glasgow) for example - and it is inconceivable that Morgan would have issued a token of this weight standard in 1794 as a legitimate commercial venture when copper prices had risen by something approaching 20 percent and most tokens were averaging no more than about 46 to the lb . (or under 10 g .).

While his token must have been a sham one must wonder whether Morgan's choice of the name 'George Jobson' for his pseudo banker was based on anything more substantial than his own imagination. As it happens, there is a strangely direct precedent for the use of the name and one in an avowed banking context. This is a bogus 'banknote' (Fig. 4) purporting to have been issued by the 'Northampton Bank' and, from those specimens known to the writer, variously dated to June and July 1793, the year before the declared date of Morgan's token. The note, obviously an early example of the 'skit' productions that proliferated in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, gives the impression that it is connected with the lacemaking industry which was a feature of south Northamptonshire and the adjoining northern parts of Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire. ${ }^{21}$ It has a small, somewhat crude vignette of a woman making bobbin lace ${ }^{22}$ with the legends Lace from three pence pr yd to Five Guines [sic]

[^24]and I Promise to Pay at the Lace Box to Mr Laceman or Bearer on Demand the sum of five pence Value received. And then, below the date, For Laceman, Edgman, Threadman, Buyer, Seller, Ready Money and Self. What is of especial interest is that the note also has images of a castle and a lion as on the 'Jobson' token - although the lion is walking to the right - and it is signed George Jobson.


Fig. 4. Pseudo banknote of the 'Northampton' Bank', 4 July 1793. $183 \times 112 \mathrm{~mm}$ (Outing, 2010, -). (C) The Trustees of the British Museum).
'Jobson', as I have indicated, is unknown as a Northampton banker. The town in fact boasted only one bank in 1793, the 'Northampton and Northamptonshire Bank' of John Lacy (d. 1795) and his son Charles. John Lacy was a prominent figure in the town, a local alderman and, until he sold the business in 1792, a bookseller and stationer. There is no evidence of the Lacy's bank having been set up before 1792 and its foundation probably coincided with the sale of the bookselling business. ${ }^{23}$ It must have been one of the many local banks that sprung up in the boom years of the early 1790 s, some without the capital that The Times, echoing Dunning's famous Commons motion, deemed essential: 'The Country Banks have enormously encreased, are encreasing and ought to be diminished. At all events a law should be made, that none do exercise the trade of a Banker, who is not qualified by the unencumbered possession of so much landed or personal property'. ${ }^{24}$

John Lacy, although a local landowner and accepted as a 'gentleman', was not in this category and in April 1793 the bank failed, one of sixteen local banking firms that were bankrupted that year. ${ }^{25}$ In part Lacy's bank had been brought down by the collapse of one of its London agents (Harrison and Co. of Mansion House Street) and the threatened failure of the other (Sir James Sanderson and Co. of Southwark - the 'Lord Mayor's Bank ${ }^{36}$ ) but a contributory cause was also almost certainly an over-issue of Lacy banknotes (Fig. 5) unsupported by sufficient liquidity to withstand a run.

My first reaction to the 'Jobson' note was that it was some kind of satirical squib directed at low putting-out payments to cottage-based lace-makers and that 'Jobson' might have been a much-execrated middleman or factor. It is much more likely though that while the note

[^25]

Fig. 5. A five guinea banknote of Lacy and Son, 13 November 1792. $191 \times 119 \mathrm{~mm}$ (Outing, 2010, 1572a ${ }^{27}$ ). (C The Trustees of the British Museum).
was a satirical squib, it was directed at the Lacys - its heavy stress on 'lace' being a play on their name - and the level of dividend payable by the bankrupted partners. The failure of Northampton's first and only bank was still very much a live issue in the summer of $1793^{28}$ and must have had serious consequences for many people in the town. But this does not explain the adoption of the name 'George Jobson' on the 'skit'. Whether the name possessed some particular inwardness in the demise of the Lacy's bank or on the other hand derived from some banking cant may one day be established by further research. Why Morgan should also have used the name on his halfpenny is at present an equally unsolvable riddle. It can hardly have direct relevance to Morgan's own bankruptcy or to the Lacys' failure; it may simply have been a name clutched from the air or seen fortuitously on a specimen of the bogus note. But, whatever the source of the name and the circumstances of the token's issue, Pye and his collaborators, despite the care they professed to have taken to exclude specious provincial coins bearing the name of a 'pretended proprietor' from their catalogue, ${ }^{29}$ had clearly been hoodwinked by Mr Robert Brickdale Morgan.
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