AN EARLY SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY COLLECTION OF ANGLO-SAXON COINS

By R. H. M. DOLLEY and MRS. J. S. STRUDWICK

One of the less satisfactory features of the British Museum Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Coins is its failure to record provenance, with the result that numismatists have been deprived of the opportunity of utilizing to the full the cumulative evidence of a number of parcels of coins from unpublished finds.¹ Moreover, there are few series where provenance is so relevant to the problem of authenticity, and hence the value of such eighteenth-century collections as have been preserved intact, for it is only with the nineteenth century that modern forgery really becomes dangerous.² As regards the National Collection, the present system of coded tickets was not introduced until the third decade of the nineteenth century, and it is comparatively easy to establish the source of coins acquired since then, by reference to the complete run of more or less standard registers. More recently still it has become the practice to include on the ticket a brief note of the previous possessor’s name and of the hoard provenance, if any. In the case of coins acquired before 1837, however, to discover the pedigree is something of a lottery. Occasionally a note may appear on the otherwise blank tickets that seem to have been introduced after the 1837 reform, but in general one’s only hope is to wade through a number of manuscript lists on the off-chance of coming across a recognizable description. Not all of these manuscript lists have survived, and it is particularly to be regretted that coins from the Sloane collection can now be identified as such only by a not always conclusive process of elimination.

Fortunately there has survived intact an eighteenth-century manuscript catalogue of even earlier material which can claim to be regarded as the first scholarly collection of Anglo-Saxon coins ever to be put together, part of the cabinet of Sir Robert Bruce Cotton, the famous antiquary, and confidant and “cousin” of James I. A careful collation of Speed’s engravings in the 1611 edition of his History establishes that the collection was already of considerable importance by that date—if indeed not substantially complete—but unfortunately we know of no reference that would warrant our describing it as a sixteenth-century collection, though it may well have been begun while Queen Elizabeth I still occupied the throne. The collection, then, is one of the oldest of its kind still to be preserved intact, antedating even the Swedish royal collections, but unfortunately the earliest surviving manuscript catalogue was not made until well over

¹ For example, a recent check of some early registers has revealed that the Museum possesses substantial portions at least of unpublished finds from Rome, Russia, and Ireland, and this check was confined to the tenth and eleventh centuries only.

² The contemporary forgery, of course, is always dangerous—and often more interesting than the issue it imitates.
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By that time Keder had published a catalogue of his private collection, establishing a Swedish primacy in the field of Anglo-Saxon numismatics—at least as regards definitive publication—that has still seriously to be challenged. The Cotton collection, however, was not less fortunate in its eventual cataloguer, the distinguished antiquary Samuel Pegge (1704–96) who was engaged on the task in the autumn of 1747.

Pegge listed and minutely described 128 coins, and of these 112 can be readily identified as coins in the British Museum trays. Nine pieces described by Pegge were found to be missing when Andrew Gifford (1700–84) formally incorporated the Cotton coins into the National Collection after the removal to Montagu House, but on the other hand Gifford was able to record thirteen coins that had escaped Pegge’s notice, either because they had been “borrowed” and subsequently returned, or perhaps because Gifford’s official standing enabled him to make a more thorough search. All these thirteen pieces can be identified, but five more pieces described both by Gifford and by Pegge cannot now be traced. Originally, therefore, the Cotton collection must have comprised at least 141 Anglo-Saxon coins, and there is reason to believe that it may have been even more extensive.

In a postscript to his preface, Pegge complains that he has been able to identify among the coins he included in his catalogue only fifteen out of the thirty-four engraved by Speed. Indeed, the purpose of his catalogue seems to have been to serve as a check upon further depredation. If, then, Pegge was right in his contention that Speed drew on the Cotton cabinet alone for his illustrations, some twenty or so coins must have disappeared from it between 1611 and 1747, including a number of notable rarities. It is unlikely that they were lost in the fire of 1731, for Pegge would surely have welcomed a more charitable explanation of the mystery. Moreover, one or two of them can be identified with reasonable confidence as coins still extant. For our part, we were a little doubtful—despite Walker’s and Ffolkes’s corroboration—whether Pegge was correct in his assertion that Speed drew exclusively upon the Cotton cabinet, but it must be admitted that it is more than probable that the collection had suffered serious losses from pilfering in the course of the hundred years or so that elapsed between Cotton’s death and Pegge’s unofficial “curatorship”. That the Cotton collection of Anglo-Saxon coins originally numbered upwards of 160 pieces can be regarded as virtually certain.

In these circumstances it has been thought desirable to append a list of the nineteen coins engraved by Speed which Pegge claimed had

---

1 For the early history of the Department of Coins and Medals of the British Museum see the notable paper by Dr. John Walker, *B.M.Q.* xviii (1953), pp. 76–80.

2 In the light of English neglect of Nordman’s classic work on the Finnish hoards, it is not surprising that still less attention has been paid to works of Brenner and Keder that even antedated Fouquet.

3 Speed’s only positive claim was to have drawn on the Cotton cabinet for all his “British” coins. However, it will not fail to be noticed that the geographical pattern of the missing nineteen Speed coins is precisely that of the Cotton collection as listed by Pegge—only three pieces are from mints south of the Thames. This argument may seem decisive.
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once been part of the Cotton collection, and an attempt has also been made to establish whether or not the coins in question have since found their way into the National Collection. In the case of one or two outstanding rarities—for example *B.M.C.*, East Anglia, 404—it is reasonably certain that the wanderer has returned to the fold, but in the case of others—for example the Ecghard of Beorhtric which cannot well be other than the Hunter coin—it would seem that the pieces have strayed irrevocably. In view of the outstanding rarity of so many of these coins, it is indeed satisfactory that the losses have been made good in the majority of cases by the subsequent acquisition of die-duplicates. 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.

Pegge’s manuscript catalogue is spread over, but by no means fills twenty-five near quarto leaves written on one side only, and is penned in a small, neat, and eminently legible hand. The brief descriptions of the types are in every case adequate, and are sometimes curiously “macaronic”, a good example being afforded by the entry corresponding to *B.M.C.*, Edward the Confessor, 349: “EDPARDXAGLORO Rex sedet coronatus, sinistra mundum, dextra sceptrum tenens. R: the Martlets with Feet, & two annulets +IOKETELONEOE.” Pegge and Linnaeus were contemporaries, but Pegge can perhaps be pardoned for ignoring the niceties of the species “Delichon”. Even so, it is a little surprising that a scholar of his ability did not essay a respectable compromise with a formula such as “hirundines pediferae duobus cum anulis”. Where weights are given, which is surprisingly often, they are generally accurate within a grain. In a few places, notably in the case of the so-called “rare” types of Edward the Elder, the descriptions are curtailed or even omitted and replaced by charming sketches which are also remarkably accurate.

We have thought it worth while to instance Pegge’s misattributions—and also those of Speed—not from any feeling of superiority but in order to indicate the state of numismatic knowledge in the early seventeenth century and about the middle of the eighteenth. It may seem to some collectors of trifling import that Pegge should have been unable to distinguish the coins of *Æ*Ethelstan of East Anglia from those of *Æ*Ethelstan of All England, but it is something always to be borne in mind by the student trying to establish the identity of coins described with tantalizing brevity in the works or papers of other early antiquaries. Pegge, incidentally, misattributes only 12 out of 112 coins, which marks a most significant advance upon Speed’s total of 13 wrong out of 34. Still more remarkable is Taylor Combe’s achievement, which surely entitles him to rank as the “father” of English numismatists, at least as regards the Saxon series. All the Cotton coins were correctly attributed by him with only one or two exceptions, notably the controversial Beorhtric of Wessex about which the last word has perhaps still to be said. It is not perhaps generally appreciated how much Ruding owed to Taylor Combe, and it is to be
hoped that members of this society will take full advantage of Dr. E. C. Linton’s most generous gift to its Library of Bryer’s manuscript transcript of Taylor Combe’s notes for an unpublished corpus of Ancient British and Anglo-Saxon coins.¹

Gifford’s annotations on Pegge’s manuscript are in a coarser hand, and are often a little ambiguous. For example, it is not always clear whether he is amplifying, correcting, or even substituting—at one stage he seems to have been more interested in checking the totals than the pieces themselves, the reign of Edward the Elder being a case in point. As far as can be judged, however, Gifford records 124 coins as having been “brought to, and put into ye Museum”, this total including one or two pieces which he claimed to be missing but which had certainly found their way to the Museum by the end of the century. As we have seen, 119 of these coins can be readily identified as in the British Museum trays, and these pieces have now been given tickets to the effect that they are ex Cotton. There remain five coins, described by Pegge and endorsed by Gifford as “brought to ye Museum”, which cannot now be traced, and which would appear prima facie to have been abstracted from the National Collection after the removal to Montagu House. It is here that the Taylor Combe manuscript comes into its own. Two of the missing coins are notable rarities, a Brooke 5 of Ecgbeorht by the moneyer D Cormod and a Brooke 10 of Æthelwulf by the moneyer Osmund. Neither appears in the Taylor Combe corpus, though he would scarcely have overlooked the former in particular, a coin of a type so rare that he knew only one example, the Hunter Sigestef. It can be assumed, then, that the losses occurred before 1803 when Taylor Combe assumed the charge of the National Collection.

Principally the reconstituted Cotton collection will be regarded as a canon of authenticity, in this respect surpassing even the Hunter as regards antiquity, though not, alas, rivalling it in range. It can safely be said of the earlier seventeenth century that there was nobody with the numismatic knowledge and technical equipment necessary to produce a Saxon forgery capable of deceiving even for one minute the modern expert, and consequently the Cotton coins must command the same respect as if they were to turn up tomorrow in a hoard. This is a matter of some moment when one considers its high proportion of great rarities, especially in the Mercian, East Anglian, and Northumbrian series—under the heading of Mercia being included the tenth-century pence of the north-western area. It is perhaps not generally realized that it is to Cotton’s diligent enthusiasm that the National Collection owes thirteen of the twenty coins of Edward the Elder’s “rare” types recorded in the 1893 Catalogue, and, these apart, the Cotton collection would still be memorable as the provenance of the styca of Eadberht and Ecgberht, the St. Martin penny of Lincoln, and the Eric Bloodaxe penny of York. It is not without interest—

¹ The original manuscript which Bryer copied was preserved in the British Museum, but appears to have perished in the destruction of the Coin Room in 1941.
nor indeed significance—that the collection should prove not to contain a single Northumbrian penny of the ninth century and only a single copper styca. Indeed, the Cotton cabinet is almost as interesting for what it lacked as for what it comprised. Especially is this the case as regards the eleventh century, where the Swedish finds have completely altered our concepts of relevant type frequency. To take but one example, quatrefoil of Cnut is nearly twice as common as short cross and more than seven times as common as arm-and-sceptre, while pointed helmet is very nearly as common as quatrefoil. Yet the Cotton collection can boast one short cross coin and one arm-and-sceptre but not one piece of the types that are now considered common.

It has been claimed that the Cotton coins have virtually the same authority as if they were to turn up tomorrow in a hoard, and in fact it would seem that the Cotton cabinet drew heavily upon three unpublished finds. Most obvious is the superb run of pence of Edward the Elder accounting for nearly a third of the whole collection. As will be shown in a paper elsewhere, these coins form a remarkably homogeneous group, almost all being products of the Chester-Derby-Shrewsbury triangle and struck in the latter part of Edward's reign. Less spectacular are the important group of East Anglian pence of the ninth century, and the curious run of pence of Harold I from Danelaw mints. The Cotton family estates were primarily in the north Midlands—Sir Robert's own seat being at Conington near Peterborough—and the impression given by the whole collection, and not by these three “hoards” alone, is very much that the Cotton cabinet has been built up in the main from local finds.

This impression is borne out by an analysis of the fifty-odd pence of the tenth and eleventh centuries that have an unambiguous mint signature. As is argued elsewhere in the Journal, it would appear that roughly half of the late Saxon coinage was struck north of the Thames, and half on or to the south of the river. Of the Cotton coins in question, however, less than twenty per cent. are struck on or south of the Thames, a phenomenon which not only suggests that the coins had mainly, if not, indeed, exclusively, been found north of the river but which prompts some interesting reflections. For example, there would seem little doubt but that Wells was right in giving some at least of the “Hamtun” coins to Northampton instead of Southampton.²

1 Of the so-called “rare” types of Edward the Elder, only Brooke 1 and 2 are to be associated with “Wessex”. The remainder are purely “Mercian”. Similarly the “ordinary” types can be broken down into at least eight well-defined groupings, geographical as well as chronological. Of the 38 Cotton coins of this reign, only 5 would seem to have been struck on or south of the Thames, and all these are late. Another 5, also late, were probably struck in Danish Mercia, while the remaining 28 are late coins from Western Mercia, the great majority from mints that had not struck for Alfred. It is not surprising that Cotton's coins of Æthelstan repeat this geographical pattern. Of 7 coins, 2 are from Chester, 1 from Derby, 2 from York, and 1 each from Norwich and London.

2 The recent “discovery” of a coin of Æthelraed II’s first type, reading ÆIZZECOE M-O HAMTVN, renders untenable any arrangement which seeks to allocate all Hamtun coins to Southampton on the one hand or Northampton on the other. As might have been expected, the coins now have to be divided between the two mints, and here arguments based on style, epigraphy, prosopography, and provenance come into their own.
One wonders, too, whether Brooke was right to transfer the coins of Beorhtric from East Anglia to Wessex. Though not at all impossible, Egghard is by no means characteristically a West Saxon form of the name, and his other coin, found at Sunbury, lacks an obviously West Saxon provenance.\(^1\) If the Cotton coin could be proved to come from East Anglia—and the run of pence from Æthelstan to Eadmund supplies a natural context—one wonders whether the Wessex attribution would ever have been suggested. As it is, it is curious that Speed should have given the coin to an obscure king of East Anglia instead of to a scion of the royal house of Wessex.

The Cotton collection, then, has an interest that is not purely antiquarian. Its creator is shown to be a man of unusually wide and discriminating interests and no mean scholar into the bargain. It is only too easy to dismiss the seventeenth-century antiquaries as credulous and unscientific, but at least they were not guilty of all the gaffes that have been laid at their door. As, it is hoped, has been demonstrated elsewhere, Cotton’s gold coin of “King Lucius” was not the complete fantasy it has been made out to be. Though naturally misattributed, it was not a forgery as alleged by Haddan and Stubbs, who could not be troubled to ferret out the coin they so roundly condemned.\(^2\) Moreover, Pegge’s introduction to the manuscript catalogue has at least one message for the numismatist of today. Written in simple, direct English it runs as follows:

Dear Sir,

I fear it will be necessary for me to make some Apology for my being so long in sending you a Copy of the Catalogue of ye. Anglo-Saxon Coins in the Cotton Library, wch. under your Favour I made the last year. My Time has been so taken up of late with an Affair quite forreign to these Kind of studies, that it was indeed impofsible for me to give you this. Token of my Respect much sooner; I hope you will pardon an unavoidable Delay.

As to ye. Catalogue itself, wth. wch. I here present you, the Coins I trust have been describ’d with sufficient Accuracy; All that were not in Frames have their weight annex’d, to half a Grain; But there is one Thing I must take some Notice of more particularly, which is, that I differ sometimes from Sr. Andrew Fountaine, Mr. Thoresby, Mr. Walker, Mr. Speed & other Antiquarians, in appropriating the Coins to their respective Kings. This is indeed a material Point, but I have my Reasons for what I have done, wch. at this Time I can’t be permitted to enter into, (for it wd. make this Epistle run out into too great a Length) but posibly I may find some future occasion to deduce them at large. In ye. Interim I shall only say, that as the Gentlemen above named seldom afsign any Reasons for their opinions, we certainly may be at Liberty to difsent from them, and yt. I am, Sir, with great Respect,

your most obedient,

humble Servant,

Samuel Pegge.

Godmersham
Feb. 13. 1748.

P.S. You will observe in perusing the Catalogue yt. Mr. Speed has engrav’d Some of these Coins. But whereas yt. Author has exhibited many that are not in this Collection
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'tis to be fear’d yt. ye. Cotton Library has been plunder’d of part of its Treasure Some Time Since he liv’d, You have only 15 out of the 34 exemplified by him.¹

Space does not permit the citation of all the quaint touches to be found in the text of the catalogue proper, but at least Pegge’s preface has hinted at them. Perhaps one day there will be found a Maecenas to sponsor the publication of a facsimile edition which would do justice to Pegge’s penmanship and to his skill as an artist. Such an edition need not be very costly, and ideally would illustrate the actual coins as well.² The substance of the commentary is incorporated in the notes that follow. We apologize for their aridity, but think that they may yet be serviceable, both to possessors of the British Museum Catalogue who may wish to mark up the provenance of some of the more interesting coins, and to those students of Anglo-Saxon numismatics who believe that there is much that can be salvaged from admittedly imperfect recording in the past. That the Pegge manuscript survived the devastation of the last war must be regarded as fortunate in the extreme, and possibly publication of the essential content may seem a wise precaution in an age when destruction has become more and more dramatically sudden and when safety seems to lie only in dispersal.³

A. Cotton Coins in the British Museum and of which B.M.C. Number is Known

COINS MARKED (S) ENGRAVED BY SPEED

COINS MARKED (G) ADDED TO PEGGE MS. BY GIFFORD

Mercia

B.M.C. 11, 20, 22—the last given by Speed to Offa of Essex.

B.M.C. 66, 95.

B.M.C. 104—attributed by Pegge to Cœnwulf.

Burgred. Br. normal varieties, Berhea, Berlm, Ciallaf, Diga, Dudecil, Dudwine.
B.M.C. 158, 169, 189, 228, 250, 260.

Kent

Cuthred. Br. 2, Werheard: Br. 1, Eaba (S).
B.M.C. 9, 12—the latter given by Speed to Cuthred of Wessex.

East Anglia

Æthelstan I. Br. normal varieties, Eadgar, Eadnoth, idem, Erhnwer, Orhthelm, sine nomine.
B.M.C. 6, 7, 9, 15, 18, 20—all attributed by Pegge to Æthelstan of All England.

¹ Mr. David Casley was the effective head of the King’s and Cotton libraries before the foundation of the British Museum proper after Sloane’s death in 1753. For the greater part of his career he was subject to a nominal superior, but towards the end was himself compelled by infirmity to exercise his functions through a deputy. At least as regards numismatics he seems to have been a conscientious “Keeper”—the Department of Coins and Medals possesses in addition to the Pegge MS. a similar catalogue of the Norman, Plantagenet, and Tudor coins drawn up at Casley’s request by Martin Ffolkes (1670–1754).
² For an illustration of one page of the Pegge MS. see R. H. M. Dolley, B.M.Q. xix (1954), pp. 75–81, and Pls. xxx and xxxi.
³ It is hoped to publish in a forthcoming number of the Journal the whole text of the Martin Ffolkes catalogue, which is very differently arranged and which lists many fewer coins—a significant commentary on Cotton’s Saxon interests.
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Æthelweard. Br. normal varieties, Eadmund (S), idem.
  B.M.C. 28, 29—both attributed by Pegge to Æthelweard of Wessex, the former by Speed also.

Eadmund. Br. normal varieties, Eadmund (S), Eadwald.
  B.M.C. 59, 61—both attributed by Pegge to Eadmund of All England, the former by Speed also.

St. Edmund. Br. normal type, Elismus.
  B.M.C. 385.

St. Martin. B.M.C. 698.

Northumbria

  B.M.C. 4—attributed by Pegge to Ecgberht of Wessex.

  B.M.C. 1111.

St. Peter. Br. 4 (without sword).
  B.M.C. 1125 (G).

Wessex

  B.M.C. II.

All England

Alfred. Br. 6, Goda.
  B.M.C. 325.

Edward the Elder. Br. 13, Abba, Megenfred, Æthelstan, Beahstan, Beornere, Beornwolde (G), Beore, Burhelm, Eadered, Iva, Ragewulf, Vvalem, Vvarner, Vvefred:
  Br. 12, Eahlstan, Framvis, Grimwold (G), blundered, Heremod (S), blundered, idem bis [B.M.C. 92 (G)]: Br. 4, Athulf:
  Br. 7, Boiga, Buga, Br. 6, Heremod, Ioffermund:
  Br. 7, Osulf:
  Br. 9, Ahlstan, Athulf (G), Deormod:
  Br. 11, Eadmund, Urfara (G):
  Br. 3, Wulfgar:
  Br. 2, Eicmund.
  B.M.C. 2, 3, 5, 6, 17, 18, 20, 23, 25, 34, 47, 52, 57, 58, 68, 78, 79, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 92, 94, 99, 100, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112—no. 84 given by Speed to Edward the Martyr.

Æthelstan. Br. 3, York, Regnald:
  Br. 4 var., York, Regnald:
  Br. 6, Chester, Frard:
  Br. 6/5, Chester, Eadmund:
  Br. 4, London, Biorneard (S); Norwich, Manticen.
  B.M.C. 6, 13, 48, 58, 65, 76.

Eadred. Br. 1, Bese, Elfordulf, Elfres, Frothric, Tyleadrex?, Thodmar:
  Br. 5, Unbein (S).
  B.M.C. 21, 34, 37, 46, 79, 96, 119—no. 37 without regal attribution by Pegge, who placed it under “nummi incerti”.

Eadwig. Br. 1, Heriger.
  B.M.C. 27.

Eadgar. Br. 6, Hamtun, Cyilm, Leofsig (S):
  Br. 4, Thurmod.
  B.M.C. 15, 16, 203.

Æthelred II. Br. 2, York, Oda:
  Br. 4, York, Wulfsgge:
  Br. 3, London, Lifinc:
  Br. 2, Norwich, Folceard (S), Swyrtinc: Sudbury, Godwine.

Cnut. Br. 5, Cambridge, Godwine (S):
  Br. 4, Shrewsbury, Wulfmaer.
  B.M.C. 234, 507.

Interregnum of 1035/6
  Br. Cnut 6, London, Brunman:
  Br. Harthacnut 1, Winchester, Ælfwine (S).
  B.M.C. Cnut 467; Harthacnut 23.
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Harold I. Br. 2, York, Scula; Cambridge, Ælfwig: Br. 1, Lincoln, Swafa (S & G): Br. 2, Lincoln, Swartinc: Br. 1, London, Leofwine; Norwich, Ælfwald (G): Br. 2, Norwich, Manna (G); Stamford, Godric; Thetford, Ælfwine (S).

B.M.C. 33, 39, 50, 53, 60, 82, 85, 92, 107—no. 50 given by Speed to Harold II.

Harthacnut. Br. 2, Hereford, Lefenooth (P); London, Lefstan.

B.M.C. 6, 15.


B.M.C. 229, 256, 299, 321, 349, 354, 47, 615, 622, 626, 630, 641, 654, 666, 1186, 1291, 1426, 156—no. 299 given by Speed to Edward the Elder.

B. Cotton Coins Described by Pegge But Missing by 1757

Merica

Burhred. Br. normal type (B.M.C. d), Duda.

As B.M.C. 242 but trefoils flanking ETA.

All England

Edward the Elder

Br. 13 (B.M.C. ii), uncertain moneyer.

Obv. +EVEARD RE+, Rev. • | EBLDO | +++ | ••••ARE | •

Br. 13 (B.M.C. ii), Eadmund.

As B.M.C. 35 but M for N in first line and crosses in place of trefoils.

Br. 9 (B.M.C. xi), Fugel.

Apparently an unpublished moneyer for type—a careful sketch in Pegge MS. seems to preclude possibility that it is misread Athulf.

Æthelstan. Br. 5 (B.M.C. v), Megenfreth Mot.

Æthelred II.

Br. 1 (B.M.C. i), London, Wulfwine.

Rev. reading M"O LVNDEI—not in Hildebrandy.

Br. 4 (B.M.C. vii), York, Æthgrim.

Rev. reading M"O E—not in Hildebrand.

Harold I. Br. 2 (B.M.C. v), Norwich, uncertain moneyer.

Alleged to read +ATVPIONNoRØ

Edward the Confessor

Br. 6 (B.M.C. vii), uncertain mint, Leofwine.

Mint alleged to read NE or HE

C. Cotton Coins Described by Pegge and Endorsed by Gifford as “Brought to Ye Museum” But Which Cannot Now Be Traced

Wessex


Mr. Blunt suggests that this is the coin drawn by Dymock (vide B.N.J. 1953, p. 135). It cannot be the Lockett coin which is from the Dorset Find (cf. N.C. 1915, pl. XVII, 4).

Æthelwulf. Br. 10 (B.M.C. v), Osmund.

All England

Eadred. Br. i (B.M.C. i), barbarous.

Described by Pegge as “imperfect, inverted and illegible”.
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Æthelred II
Br. 2 (B.M.C. ii var. d?), London, Eahlstan.
As B.M.C. 204, which is, however, from an 1843 Irish parcel.

Harold I. Br. 2 (B.M.C. v), Thetford, Ælfwine.
As Carson 19 but obverse legend ends REC.

Two sceattas are described by Pegge in terms so vague that their identification is not possible. One would seem Merovingian, and the other to belong to the group represented by B.M.C. xv-xxi.

D. Coins engraved by Speed and supposed by Pegge also to be ex Cotton

Mercia

Cynethrith, Brooke, type a, Eoba.
Almost certainly the Pembroke coin (lot 16).

Coenwulf, Brooke, Group I, type c, Lul.
Perhaps B.M.C. 73, acquired in 1802 (ex Tyssen).

Beornwulf, Brooke, Group B, type b, Monna.
Approximately as B.M.Acq. 126 (ex Delgany find), and the “Rashleigh” coin of Taylor Combe’s notes, but Mr. Blunt believes it to be different from these and the other two recorded specimens.

Berhtwulf, Brooke “cross and anulet” rev. Sigeheah.
As B.M.C. 134 (ex Dorking find), the original not known to Taylor Combe. Probably not the Lockett coin, which has a pedigree back to Wigan.

Burgred, Brooke normal type, Wine.
Approximately as B.M.C. 388 (ex Gravesend find), but ligulation ΗΝΕ suggests it is in fact the Hunter coin.

Canterbury

Archbishop Ceolnoth, Brooke, Group II, type 4, Diala.
Possibly the same coin as B.M.C. 39 (Cuff, lot 396), but more probably the Hunter coin.

St. Edmund Memorial (attributed by Speed to “Sigherd of Essex”).
Brooke, normal type, Eura.
Almost certainly B.M.C. 404, acquired after 1812 and before 1830.

Northumbria.

Eadberht, Brooke, normal type, without name of moneyer (attributed by Speed to Æthelberht of Kent).
Possibly B.M.C. 5, acquired in 1802 (ex Tyssen).

Eanred, Brooke, normal type, Eadwine.
Possibly B.M.C. 92, acquired before 1812.

Anlaf, Brooke, type r, Farman.
Possibly B.M.C. 1091, acquired before 1812—not the Tyssen coin illustrated by Taylor Combe, which is from different dies (B.M.C. 1090).

Wessex?

Beorhtric, Brooke, type r, Ecghard (attributed by Speed to Berhtric of East Anglia).
Almost certainly the Hunter coin—B.M.C., East Anglia, 36 (a find from Sunbury), not acquired until 1865.

Ecgeaeorht, Brooke, Group I, type r, Deibus.
As B.M.Acq. 353 (ex Dartford find)—it is curious that Taylor Combe should have omitted the moneyer’s name from his lists, for a fragment of a second coin (?) that engraved by Speed) was presented to the museum by his widow, but unaccountably omitted from B.M.C. though clearly reading ..DEIB...
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Æthelwulf, Brooke, type 11 (Winchester).
As B.M.C. 32 (ex Dorking find)—probably the Hunter specimen, apparently the only one known to Taylor Combe. Mr. Blunt points out that the type is, however, fairly common, perhaps because of a more recent find or finds.

All England

Alfred, London, Brooke, type 1 (plain monogram).
As B.M.C. 94?—possibly that coin which was acquired in 1838 (provenance not stated) and since exchanged for a superior die-duplicate.

Eadmund, Brooke, type 4, Norwich, Eadgar (attributed by Speed to Eadmund Ironside).
Apparently unpublished—doubtfully a misread Hrodgar. Taylor Combe knew Manticen only for this reign and mint.

Eadwig, Brooke, type 1, Heriger.
Apparenty a die-duplicate of a B.M. coin from the Tetney hoard (N.C. 1945, p. 86, no. 66).

Edward the Confessor, Brooke, type 7, York, Othgrim.
Superficially the same coin as B.M.C. 350, but according to Taylor Combe was in the B.M. in 1812 whereas B.M.C. 350 was acquired in 1883 (ex Bishopshill find). It is possible that the Speed coin was exchanged or sold as a duplicate at the time of the accession of the parcel from Bishopshill.

Frisia (attributed by Speed to Aldulf of East Anglia).

Aldulf, Prou, 615.
Alleged to be silver but otherwise corresponds in every way to a gold tremissis in B.M. (ex George III).

Uncertain (attributed by Speed to "Utherpendragon").
Probably a barbarous solidus of Virtus type (? Suevic), but no exactly comparable piece can be traced in B.M.