

compared with 10.49 for pure, and 10.35 for 925 silver. If all the impurities were present as copper, this density would correspond to a fineness of about 680, an alloy which would show a large amount of lamellar Ag-Cu eutectic. No eutectic whatsoever was seen on the section examined. It seems improbable that silver which might have been used for a modern counterfeit would contain diluents, other than copper, to the extent that this coin does.

Having no standards with which to compare the coin, it is not possible to establish whether it is genuine or not, but it is certainly not cast.

The photomicrograph reproduced here seems even to the non-scientist decisively to endorse Mr. Dunning's verdict, while the numismatic evidence already adduced seems conclusive that the coin is not merely "not cast" but authentic. On the other hand it would be idle to pretend that the coin in question does not have a thoroughly cast appearance—and especially about the obverse. It is my belief that this is to be explained partly by overstriking, and partly by "scrubbing" when the coin was first discovered in the eighteenth century.

R. H. M. DOLLEY

AN UNPUBLISHED PENNY OF EDMUND FROM THE COTTON COLLECTION

IN the spring of 1956 I purchased a penny of Edmund of the Norwich mint by the moneyer Eadgar. I knew Eadgar was an unrecorded moneyer for Norwich for this reign.

I showed the coin to Mr. Dolley who identified it immediately as a hitherto missing coin from the Cotton collection and referred me to his article in *B.N.J.* vol. xxvii where he had written (p. 304) referring to losses that had occurred from the Cotton collection, probably in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries—"Even so, the National Collection is the poorer for lacking the Pembroke Cynethrith (now in Lockett), not to mention the unpublished moneyer of Norwich for Eadmund."

Sir Robert Cotton, the famous antiquary and contemporary of James I, formed what was probably one of the earliest collections of Anglo-Saxon coins. It eventually passed to the British Museum and was catalogued by Samuel Pegge in the middle of the eighteenth century. It is probable that the collection suffered losses from pilfering after Cotton's death, the Edmund penny of Norwich being one of the coins stolen, for it is amongst the nineteen coins engraved by Speed which Pegge claimed to have once been part of the Cotton collection (see *B.N.J.* vol. xxvii, pp. 303 and 312) but which are now missing from the B.M. trays.

The coin, which on the obverse reads +EADMVND REX and on the reverse +EADGAR Mō NORÐPT (Pl. XXV, 15), is of Brooke type 4 with crowned bust to the right and small cross on reverse. It is illustrated on page 381 of Speed's *Historie of Great Britaine* (1611) and on plate VI opposite p. cxxxix of Gibson's edition (1695) of Camden's *Britannia*.

It would be interesting to know the circumstances under which it came to be missing from the Cotton collection and in whose hands it has been all the intervening years, but these details are not forthcoming. It is only to be hoped that most of the missing Cotton coins will eventually come to light and perhaps one day return to their rightful place in the British Museum.

R. P. MACK

AN ALLEGED *AGNUS DEI* PENNY OF THE WAREHAM MINT

RECENTLY the writer's attention has been drawn to a passage in Charles Warne's *Ancient Dorset* which seemed to provide good evidence for the existence of an *Agnus Dei* penny of the Wareham mint. The relevant passage occurs on p. 328 under the general heading "Anglo Saxon and Danish Coins struck by Dorset Mints and now in the following Foreign Collections. ADDITIONAL". It runs as follows:

LUNDEN

Ædelred II, A.D. 978-1016

✠ALFGAR MO FER Hildebrand, Type G.

On p. 320 we are told that information concerning the coins at Lund had been furnished by a Professor Thorberg of that University.

Warne's *Ancient Dorset* was published in 1872, and there is internal evidence that the correspondence with Professor Thorberg is to be dated to that year. Consequently the reference to a Hildebrand classification must allude either to the 1846 edition of *Anglosachsiska Mynt*, or to the same author's comparatively youthful disquisition on the Anglo-Saxon coins belonging to Lund University which was published in three successive fascicules in 1829. The latter possibility, however, seems precluded by the fact that the alphabetical type sequence there proposed does not extend beyond the letter "F". The reference must, therefore, be to the 1846 Stockholm Catalogue, where the classification adopted is the same as that followed in the 1881 edition. Consequently there is a strong *prima facie* case that we are here confronted with an unpublished coin of the celebrated *Agnus Dei* issue, a type so rare that fewer than a dozen specimens are known to the numismatist.

The existence or non-existence of this coin is critical for the serious student of the late Saxon series for the simple reason that it would be the first penny of this type to be associated with a mint from Wessex proper. The late W. C. Wells seems to have been the first to recognize the peculiarly "Mercian" flavour of the issue, but unfortunately had to resort quite unnecessarily to some very specious but not very convincing special pleading in order to include the two coins of Malmesbury. There is absolutely no need for the numismatist to speculate on whether this or that county came within Eadric's ealdormany, and certainly there are few numismatists today who would care to be