HALFPENNIES AND THIRD-PENNIES OF KING ALFRED

By PHILIP GRIERSON

[The majority of the coins referred to below are illustrated on Plate XXVIII, the numbering on which follows that of the Register of Coins on pp. 491-3.]

I

While classifying and listing the coins of King Alfred in the Fitzwilliam Museum for the first fascicule of the *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles*, I was struck by what appeared to be an anomaly in the weights of the so-called “halfpennies” of King Alfred. Three specimens in the collection weighed respectively 6.2 gr., 7.6 gr., and 7.3 gr., while the pennies were usually between 20 g. and 24 g. and normally approached the latter figure. The existence of isolated coins below their proper weight is a common phenomenon, but one would not expect to find a whole series weighing a third or more less than they should. Moreover a fourth coin of Alfred’s time, the unique piece with the legend *Everat me fecit*, weighed 9.4 gr. It was of broader flan and thicker than the others, and gave the impression of being a different denomination. A weight difference of 2-3 gr. may not seem very great, but in coins weighing only about 7 gr. it is quite perceptible. It is a higher percentage of the total weight than is the difference between the modern two-shilling piece and half-crown.

The existence of these light coins had been noted by Brooke, but dismissed with the comment that they were perhaps contemporary imitations. The coins in the Fitzwilliam Museum were of good style, with intelligible legends, and could not easily be relegated to such a class. They were very different in appearance from the occasional pennies of Alfred that are found with weights as low as 14 or 15 gr., the barbarous and imitative character of which is quite clear. It therefore seemed worth exploring the possibility that the “light” halfpennies might in reality be third-pennies.

There is here a certain prejudice in our minds to be broken down. We are so accustomed to dividing pennies into halves and quarters that we find it difficult to imagine anyone attempting to divide them otherwise. But our reluctance to use the third as a fraction is a quite modern phenomenon, and indeed involves abandoning the only advantage which the duodecimal system has over the decimal one, that the unit can be divided into thirds, quarters, and sixths as well as into halves without involving fractions of whole numbers. Our ancestors thought on other lines, and used indifferently either halves and quarters or thirds and sixths, and sometimes both groups of fractions together, as occasion required. If the penny, from the reign of Edward I onwards, was divided into halves and quarters, its typical multiple was not, as with us, the threepenny-piece or quarter of a

shilling, but the groat, the third of the shilling. The noble was the third of the pound, the angelot the third of the salut. Men in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries found no difficulty in using simultaneously the ryal and the angel, the half and third of the pound, just as in late Roman times the fractions of the solidus in normal use had been the semissis and the tremissis. The Byzantines in the early eighth century had experimented with the use of quarter- and sixth-solidi side by side with the normal halves and thirds, and the Arabs likewise sometimes struck half-, quarter-, and third-dinars simultaneously.

There is therefore no theoretical objection to the existence of third-pennies, and there is good documentary evidence in their favour. The Laws of Alfred make no mention of halfpennies—this proves nothing, since they rarely have cause to mention sums below a shilling—but they do twice refer to sums involving thirds of pennies. Chapter 47 lays down that the compensation due for knocking out a man's eye should be 66 shillings, 6 pence, and a third of a penny (driddan dæl pæninges). This figure must be emended to 66 shillings, $\frac{3}{3}$ pennies—the error of $vi$ for $iii$ is common in medieval manuscripts—for it is evidently intended as one-third of the freeman's wergeld of 200 shillings and the West Saxon shilling contained five pence. Such a figure implies either the existence of a coin worth a third of a penny or at least a readiness to cut pennies into thirds if that should be necessary. The same penalty, with the same error regarding the number of pence, occurs in Chapter 71, where it is also made to apply to the loss of a hand or foot.

These two passages from Alfred's Laws were noted some twenty years ago by Mr. W. C. Wells, who suggested that certain peculiarities in ninth-century coin designs and legends might have been intended to facilitate the cutting of pennies into three parts. The tribrachs, particularly the long-voided tribrachs on coins of Cuthred of Kent (798–806), would thus have served the same function as the cross did on later coins, and the threefold division of the king's name in the legend, whether by crosses or by blank spaces, such as occurs on some coins of Alfred, would have been useful in a similar fashion. Mr. Wells illustrated what he believed to be a two-thirds penny of Alfred, with a third cut out from it, which was at that time in his collection. I have not been able to examine the coin, which is now at Reading, but some of those who have seen it have doubted whether the cutting is contemporary in character. What purport to be cut halfpennies or farthings are sometimes only damaged coins which have been trimmed down in modern times with the object of increasing their value. Besides, if one were cutting a coin into thirds one would expect the operation to have been completed, instead of a part of the coin being

left over as a fraction of two-thirds. However, the authenticity of this particular specimen does not affect the general question of whether tribrachs and broken legends were intended to fulfil the function that Mr. Wells ascribed to them, and I myself find his suggestion a very acceptable one.

I would go a good deal further than Mr. Wells, however. If men of Alfred’s time were prepared to deal in fractions of third-pennies, as the documentary evidence shows them to have been, it is worth considering whether they relied simply on cut coins, or whether they had advanced to the stage of striking third-pennies as separate units. I have therefore worked out a table of the weights of all specimens of Alfred’s “halfpennies” which I have been able to trace and tabulated their results.

II

Before looking at these tables, however, it will be as well to say a word regarding the provenance of the coins. It seems probable that all those that are known, with a single exception, can be assigned to one of three hoards, an unrecorded Erith hoard of c. 1840, the Cuerdale hoard of 1840, and the Stamford hoard of 1902.

It will be convenient to deal first with the exception, a coin at present (1957) in the still unsold portion of the Lockett collection, ex Rashleigh 223. It was published and illustrated by Haigh in 1870, and Haigh’s notes, which dated from the mid-forties, gave its owner as Mr. W. H. Sheppard. It came into the sale-room in 1861, when it was lot 104 in the Rev. J. Lewin Sheppard sale. Despite the fact that Haigh asserted positively that it had been in the Sheppard collection “for many years” before the discovery of the Cuerdale hoard, one is naturally tempted to assume that it was really one of several specimens of this type which Hawkins believed to have formed part of the hoard and to have “by some means disappeared” before it was impounded by the police. Haigh’s assertion, however, is perfectly correct. The Rev. J. Lewin Sheppard had died forty years earlier, in 1821, at the early age of 27, and though his brother

1 A second apparent exception, the coin weighing 12.8 gr. which formed lot 37 at the Pembroke sale (Sotheby, 31.7.1848) and is described in the catalogue as a halfpenny, is not really such, but a penny of abnormally low weight. It is now B.M.C. 362.

2 I should like to acknowledge the kindness and generosity of Mr. Blunt and Mr. Dolley in placing information at my disposal and discussing with me the problems examined in this paper, though they are not to be regarded as concurring entirely with its conclusions. I am also most grateful to Messrs. A. H. Baldwin and Messrs. Spink for allowing me to study coins they had in stock—in particular to Mr. Baldwin for showing me the halfpennies in the still unsold portion of the Lockett collection—and for consulting their records on my behalf. Unfortunately many of Messrs. Spink’s records were destroyed during the war, so that information regarding coins mentioned in their Num. Circular before 1936 is now no longer available.

3 D. H. Haigh, “Coins of Elfred the Great”, Num. Chron. 2, x (1870), pl. iii. 14; cf. p. 28, no. 36 and p. 37. Haigh himself explains that his article was put together from notes collected in the forties for a general work on Anglo-Saxon coins which he subsequently abandoned, and that his information regarding the whereabouts of coins is consequently out of date.

4 Article cited below (p. 481, n. 4), p. 18.
W. H. Sheppard kept the collection till 1861 and allowed scholars like Hawkins and Haigh to study it; he does not appear to have been interested in coins himself or to have added anything to it. The presence of the coin in the collection is therefore sufficient proof that it did not come from Cuerdale.

Let us now turn to the hoards.

1. Hoard I (near Erith, c. 1840)

The coins which can be assigned to Erith are three in number, all varieties of the same type (B.M.C. type VI) with the London monogram; they have the king’s name in full, not blundered in any way, and the design of the bust and the relative size of the bust and the letters of the legend show them to have been modelled on a Frankish tremissis or a contemporary English gold coin of the seventh century. A fourth coin of the same group was found at Cuerdale.

One of the Erith coins was published by Edward Hawkins in 1841, in the first edition of *The Silver Coins of England*. It was the earliest halfpenny of Alfred to be recorded, and its unique character made Hawkins hesitate between regarding it as a halfpenny or as a penny which had lost much of its weight—it weighs 11.0 gr.—by corrosion. It is described as having been “found in gravel dredged up from the Thames”, and in 1841 was in Mr. Thomas Thomas’s collection. At the Thomas sale in 1844 it was bought by Cureton for Edward Wigan, passed from him to Sir John Evans, and finally reached the British Museum in 1915 (B.M.A. 449) through the good offices of Mr. J. P. Morgan.

The second Erith coin has a briefer history. It appeared as lot 39 in the sale of John Brumell’s collection in 1850, where it was described as having been “obtained from the Thames”, and it was bought for the British Museum (B.M.C., no. in).

The third coin was lot 529 in the first Montagu sale in 1895, where it is described as having been “found in the Thames, near Erith”. It reappeared as lot 78 in the first Murdoch sale of 1903, in the catalogue of which it is illustrated. I have failed to trace its history prior to 1895, but no doubt it came from one of the mid-century sales. It is now in the still unsold portion of the Lockett collection.

1 The information on the Sheppard family comes from Burke’s *Landed Gentry* and the notice of J. Lewin Sheppard in John Venn’s *Alumni Cantabrigienses*. The use of the collection by Hawkins and Haigh while it was in W. H. Sheppard’s hands is plain from their writings.

2 This is not true of all the coins in the Lewin Sheppard sale, for the title-page to the catalogue admits the interpolation of a number of coins by the auctioneer. It can be assumed, however, that anything seen by Hawkins or Haigh in the forties was already there before 1821.


4 p. 59 (pl. xiii. 177).

5 Some small discrepancies will be found in the weights given in this paper and those in the sources cited, since I have checked the figures wherever it has been possible to do so.

6 The Wigan collection was bought *en bloc* by the firm of Rollin and Feuardentin in 1872, and the English section sold piecemeal to collectors. Unfortunately no catalogue of it exists.
We have no positive proof that these three coins were found together; Haigh, indeed, stated positively in 1870 that the first and second were found separately.¹ But Haigh's article was based on notes put together between twenty and thirty years earlier, and is not trustworthy on a detail of this nature; the statement probably implies no more than that the records reached him from separate sources. The evidence for their having been found together seems to me strong. All three are of the same type, which was represented at Cuerdale by only a single specimen and was completely absent from Stamford. All three look exactly alike, being black in colour and much corroded by the soil in which they were buried. Two are stated to have been found in gravel dredged from the Thames and the third to have been found near Erith; the very name of the last locality means "gravel harbour", and the export of gravel was one of its most important local industries. One is tempted to equate the hoard with that found at Gravesend in 1838, for locality and date would suit very well, but the contents of the Gravesend hoard are against such an identification.² I believe that we are justified in postulating the finding of a small hoard shortly before 1841 in the vicinity of Erith, and attributing the three halfpennies to it. There were no doubt pennies in it as well, and further research might throw some light on what these were, but with them I am not concerned.³

The good style, correctness of legend, and find-spot of these coins make it reasonably certain that they were official issues of the London mint, and their weights show that they were intended as halfpennies. They weigh 11.0 gr., 8.0 gr., and 9.4 gr. respectively, but all are somewhat corroded and the lightest has lost a section of its rim which must have weighed at least a couple of grains. Their full weights would have been in the region of 11–12 gr., the half of a full penny of 20–24 gr. ¹

2. The Cuerdale hoard (1840)

The "halfpennies" found at Cuerdale in 1840 are much more numerous and of a different character. The bulk of the hoard passed to the Crown as treasure trove, and while the pick was retained by the British Museum, the remainder was distributed by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster to museums, learned societies, and collectors of standing. Edward Hawkins, in his first account of the hoard,⁴

¹ Haigh, art. cit., p. 29.
² The Gravesend hoard was predominantly one of Burgred, and must have been buried in the early months of Alfred's reign, well before the "London monogram" type began. The hoard is described by Hawkins in Num. Chron. iii (1841), 14–34.
³ There are in the Fitzwilliam Museum two pennies of Alfred which are exactly similar in colour and corrosion to these halfpennies and which I am disposed to assign to the same source. Both are of the 'London monogram' type, and one is of exceptionally good style. They were lots 2 and 3 in the Thorburn sale of 6 July 1889 (Sotheby).
enumerated 16½ halfpennies of Alfred, besides a large number of Northumbrian and East Anglian origin, but his reckoning was not complete. The steward of Mr. Assheton, on whose estate the coins were found, retained a parcel of them in the interests of his master, and a number of other coins were dispersed by underhand means to other collectors. The coins retained by Assheton’s steward were submitted to the British Museum as soon as Assheton discovered what had happened, so that Hawkins was able to describe them in an appendix (pp. 99–104) to his article; they were not kept by Hawkins for the British Museum, however, and are now in the hands of Lord Clitheroe, the present representative of the Assheton family. They included four halfpennies of Alfred. The others, despite Hawkins’s denunciation of the dispersal of the coins as little better than theft, eluded his notice, and a decent interval had to be allowed to elapse before their owners could be acknowledged and their provenance openly admitted. In a few cases, indeed, this was never done, so we can do no more than register a moral certitude that the source of particular coins was Cuerdale without there being any possibility of producing documentary evidence for this belief.

The great majority of the halfpennies found at Cuerdale and described by Hawkins are now in the British Museum. The only others whose existence I have been able to trace are as follows:

(a) The three halfpennies which were retained for Mr. Assheton by his steward. They are described by Hawkins in his article on pp. 101–3, and two of them, one of the “Orsnaforda” type and the other a blundered copy of this, are illustrated. The third coin, of the “London monogram” type, is illustrated by Haigh in the Numismatic Chronicle for 1870. They are now in the possession of Lord Clitheroe. To these must be added the fourth coin to which allusion is made above.

(b) Two coins of type XIV with the name of the moneyer Cuthbert retrograde and blundered. My attribution of these to Cuerdale is in part conjectural. On pp. 21–22 of his article, as no. 42, Hawkins gives four readings of this type of halfpenny, but says that the hoard contained seven specimens of them. The British Museum catalogue

1 Actually 18, but one of these is the coin (B.M.C. i, p. 203, no. 1) now ascribed to Halfdan, and the other (B.M.C. Alfred, no. 437) is in my judgement a contemporary imitation of a coin of Halfdan, not of one of Alfred.
2 Hawkins, art. cit., p. 104.
3 Hawkins only notes and describes three specimens, but Mr. Blunt, who has examined the coins now in Lord Clitheroe’s possession and kindly supplied me with the photographs used for illustrating them, informs me that there are in fact four. Since this article was already in proof before he saw the coins and this information became available, I have left the numbering of the coins as it stood in my original manuscript and inserted the new coin as no. 14 bis.
4 A good example of this is the way in which the Everat me fecit coin is described by Haigh and illustrated by Lindsay in 1843 without any reference to provenance or ownership, but subsequently (1870) admitted by Haigh to have been in the Kenyon collection and to have come from the Cuerdale hoard.
5 Pl. iii, no. 12; cf. p. 28, no. 33. Hawkins had inadvertently called this coin a farthing. Haigh also reproduced (pl. vi, nos. 3, 6; p. 37, no. 61 and p. 38, no. 71) the other two which had remained in Assheton’s possession.
includes only five specimens (nos. 434, 435, 436, 438, 440), leaving two unaccounted for. Since two of those which are later found in circulation are die-duplicates of no. 436, it seems reasonable to assume that these made up the total and that the Museum authorities sanctioned their disposal to collectors.

One of these coins went to the Rev. J. W. Martin. It is illustrated by John Lindsay in his book on the coinage of the Heptarchy, and was disposed of at the Martin Sale in 1859. It is now in the stock of Messrs. Spink, having been acquired by them as Lockett 495. The other coin is now (1957) in Messrs. Baldwin's stock, being ex Grantley 1026. Lord Granville acquired it privately towards the beginning of the present century from Mr. L. A. Lawrence. It is described in the Grantley sale catalogue as reading ELI - BAD and is identified with B.M.C. 1, but both description and identification are incorrect. The relative illegibility of its legend is to be explained by the fact that the coin is both worn and double-struck, but it is from the same dies as the two others just mentioned. There is no positive pedigree to connect it with Cuerdale, since I have failed to trace it earlier than Lawrence, but from the fact that it completes the gap in Hawkins's enumeration its Cuerdale origin seems scarcely open to question.

(c) A coin with the reading Udbern, blundered from Cuthbert. This coin was already in private hands when Lindsay was writing in 1842. He describes and illustrates it in his book on pl. iv, no. 101, but it is not clear in whose ownership it then was. He gives its weight as 7 g., and since he normally only gives the weight of coins in his collection or in that of his friend Richard Sainthill, it would seem reasonable to assume that it belonged to one or other of these collectors, but it is not in the sale catalogue of Lindsay's collection in 1867 nor in that of Sainthill's in 1870. I have not been able to trace it earlier than the Wigan collection, which was bought en bloc by Rollin and Peuardent in 1872. It was subsequently in the Shepherd, Montagu, Murdoch, Hazlitt, and Fitch collections, and is at present (1957) in the still unsold portion of the Lockett collection.

(d) In his original description of the hoard, Hawkins mentioned (p. 21) a single halfpenny with the moneyer's name Buee. A second specimen of this turned up later, and Mr. Blunt informs me that the duchy records show it to have been disposed of to Mr. J. D. Cuff, of the Bank of England, whose collection of English coins was generally reckoned as second only to that of the British Museum. The coin appeared as no. 470 at the Cuff sale in 1854 and since that date has passed through many of the major English collections. It last appeared in the sale room in 1952, when it was no. 725 at the Ryan sale. It is now in the possession of Messrs. Baldwin.

(e) A halfpenny of Ludig also figures as no. 471 at the Cuff sale.

1 A View of the Coinage of the Heptarchy (Cork, 1842), pl. iv, no. 100; the ownership is stated on p. 129, no. 100.
2 Both Lindsay and Sainthill were presented with Cuerdale coins by the Chancellor; see p. 124, note * of Lindsay's book.
No specimen of this coin was described by Hawkins and it is not represented in the British Museum. Nor, as far as I can discover, is there any record of Cuff having received it officially. There are two possibilities regarding its provenance. One is that the coin is not from Cuerdale at all, but was found independently some time between 1840 and 1854. This seems to me unlikely, since if it had been a recent discovery the fact would probably have been noted in the Cuff catalogue. The other is that it is a stray from the hoard, and represents one of those coins whose loss so distressed Hawkins. The statement in the preface to the catalogue of the Cuff sale, that Mr. Cuff "never omitted an opportunity of procuring the best specimens that presented themselves", may perhaps have been more true than its writer supposed.

(f) The unique coin with the legend *Everat me fecit* was first illustrated by Lindsay in 1842, presumably from a drawing sent him by his friend Haigh, who published a description of it the same year and whose assistance in the compilation of his book he repeatedly acknowledged. No indication was given regarding the whereabouts of the coin, but when Haigh came to work over his notes again in 1870, he declared that it was in the possession of Mr. J. Kenyon. The coin subsequently passed through the Wigan, Whitbourn, Rashleigh, Carlyon-Britton, and Young collections and is now in the Fitzwilliam Museum.

Finally, there are two forgeries to be noted. One of these, struck from false dies, is copied from the "Orsnaforda" coin belonging to Assheton, as published by Hawkins in 1842, but with slight modifications of detail. Its early history is unknown to me, but it was in L. A. Lawrence's possession in 1906, when he published it as a forgery, and it is now amongst the forgeries in the British Museum (Lawrence gift, 1917). The second, of similar type, is a cast made either from the blundered "Orsnaforda" derivative in Assheton's possession or from a replica of this based on the design of it published by Hawkins. It is now (1957) in the unsold portion of the Lockett collection, and has a distinguished pedigree, being from the Murdoch, Montagu, and Maynard collections. This last sale takes us back to 1885, but we know that Assheton's coins were available to scholars in the early 1840's, and it is to be presumed that some untraced forger seized the opportunity of copying these somewhere around the middle of the century.

3. The Stamford hoard (1902)

The third find, more important for the study of Alfred's halfpennies than either of the others, was made at Stamford on 25 August

---

1 *Coinage of the Heptarchy*, pl. iii, no. 82.
3 Haigh, *Coins of Alfred the Great*, p. 38, no. 72. I have failed to discover any particulars of the Kenyon collection, or when the coin was acquired by Wigan.
4 *British Num. Journ.* iii (1906–7), pl. i facing p. 281, no. 12. Lawrence is mistaken in assuming that it was based on the blundered version of this type in the British Museum.
5 I owe to Mr. Fred Baldwin the information that the coin is a cast.
1902. Some workmen engaged in digging a trench unearthed a small hoard of pennies and halfpennies of Alfred's reign. These were adjudged to be treasure trove, and fourteen coins, including an imitation obole of the French king Charles the Bald, were sent to the British Museum. H. A. Grueber published in the following year an entirely inadequate account of this important hoard. He estimated the coins which were missing at six or seven pennies and three or four halfpennies. The account of these given to the police was that they had been "lost" by their holder on his journey to London from Stamford, and Grueber said plainly that he believed them to have been "lost" in such a manner as would make their ultimate recovery possible by the "loser".

It was unfortunate that the find occurred at the precise moment that it did. A number of distinguished collectors and numismatists were at odds with the staff of the British Museum Coin Room and the management of the Numismatic Chronicle, and the movement was already under way which was to lead to their secession from the Numismatic Society and the foundation of the British Numismatic Society in 1903. One of the points at issue was the treatment of treasure trove by the Museum authorities. Grueber had stated what he believed to be the law, both in theory and practice, in an article in the Chronicle; Major P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton, the first president of the British Numismatic Society, seized the occasion of his Presidential Address in 1904 to make a rejoinder. The rewards paid to finders were entirely inadequate, and the authorities had only themselves to thank if hoards failed to reach the Treasury intact. Andrew, writing of the Stamford coins, had the effrontery to twit Grueber publicly and in print on seeming "to attach an exaggerated importance to the fact that the Museum did not get all the hoard".

Grueber was perfectly correct in his conjecture that the "lost" Stamford coins would in due course be recovered, but he was hopelessly astray in his estimate of their number and importance. For ten years no coins—or at least no halfpennies—that can be ascribed to the Stamford hoard appeared on the market. In the decade 1913-23 no fewer than 30 "halfpennies" of Alfred changed hands at public auctions or appeared in dealers' lists. Nine of them were coins already known in the nineteenth century; the remaining 21 were completely new, and no provenance was for the moment assigned to them. A number were of types found at Stamford for the first time; all were much alike in external appearance; and their Stamford origin cannot be doubted. By the thirties all reticence was thrown aside, and when they appeared in the sale-room their Stamford origin was freely admitted. Almost without exception they are known to have passed

1 "A find of coins of Alfred the Great at Stamford", Num. Chron. iii (1903), 347-55. It was the subject of contemptuous comment by W. J. Andrew in Brit. Num. Journ. i (1904), 367-71.
through the hands of Major Carlyon-Britton—13 were included in his
three sales of 1913, 1916, and 1918—and it seems to me probable
that at some time or other, and apparently as early as 1904, he had
acquired the “lost” portion of the Stamford hoard and that those not
included in his sales were disposed of privately. Certainly two of the
“Stamford” halfpennies which, when they first appeared in the
Numismatic Circular in 1919 and 1920, had no provenance attached
to them, were described as “ex Carlyon-Britton” when they re-
appeared in 1927.

III

So much, then, for the finds of Alfred’s “halfpennies”. Our material
evidence regarding the denomination of the coins consists of 50
specimens, the weights of 49 of which are known. This evidence is
set out in summary form in Tables I–II. The grouping under
provenances has been preserved, since it is relevant to the discus-
sion that follows, and the types are described according to the
classification of the B.M.C., slightly refined and modified. This may
be summarized as follows:

Type VI. Bust; London monogram.
(a) Correct and full legend.
(b) Short blundered legend.
(c) Similar, but bust I.

Type XIV. Small cross; moneyer’s name in field.
— As XIV, but moneyer’s name divided by alpha-omega.
— As XIV, but moneyer’s name divided by “Lincoln” monogram.

Type XVII (“Canterbury”). As XIV, but DORO in obverse legend.

Type XVIII–XIX (“Orsnaforda”). 3-line legend on obverse; 2 lines on reverse,
separated by pellets, crosses, or long cross.
— “Everat me fecit” (variety of type XIX).

The three coins nos. 1–4 need not detain us long. No. 1, obviously
an imitation, weighs 10 gr., and the three “Erith” coins, which are
assignable to Alfred and the mint of London, weigh 8·0+, 11·0, and
9·4 gr. respectively. All are halfpennies; they are too heavy to be
anything else. What of the others?

1 The Bruun collection, now in the Royal Cabinet at Copenhagen, contains a coin of
Halfdan of the moneyer Tilwine which on grounds of general appearance and fabric can be
attributed to the Stamford hoard (L. E. Brunn, Mønt- og Medaillesamling, Part II.
Mønter fra Northumberland, Østangel og Irland (Copenhagen, 1928), no. 116). This coin
was acquired by Bruun at the first Carlyon-Britton sale, lot 245. As part of a plate of coins,
under the innocuous title “Types of coins found at Cuerdale”, it had been used to illustrate

2 Mr. Blunt has since informed me, on the authority of Major Carlyon-Britton’s son,
that a fourth portion of the Carlyon-Britton collection was in fact sold privately to
Messrs. Spink.

3 B.M.C. type XXIII (“Bath”) can be suppressed. Brooke pointed out that B.M.C. I
really belongs to type XIV. He read the moneyer’s name as Eillath (?), but this is to look
at it upside down; the correct reading is CVD-EIT, i.e. CVDBERHT blundered.

4 This is Brooke’s “Guthrum” class, so called because it is that normally used by
Guthrum and Brooke believed that he originated it. This seems to me very doubtful, so
I prefer to avoid what would otherwise be a very convenient term.
The evidence of the Stamford hoard must be considered first. It is earlier in date than Cuerdale, and since it contains no coins of the "Orsnaforda" or "Canterbury" types, it must have been buried some years at least before the end of Alfred's reign. Its testimony regarding denominations seems to me quite clear. The majority of the coins weigh between 7 and 8 gr., averaging about 7.5 gr. They cannot possibly be regarded as halves of a penny that weighed round about 22 gr., but must be thirds. Some of the coins are contemporary.

### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Wt. (grains)</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown Provenance</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>RCL</td>
<td>Rashleigh 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type VI (b)</td>
<td>8.0+</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;ERITH&quot; (?), c. 1840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Type VI (a)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.A. 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Unbroken legend</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>RCL</td>
<td>Murdoch 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2) Leg. broken by cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3) &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuerdale, 1840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Type VI (a). Good style</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Clitheroe</td>
<td>N.C. 1870, pl. iii. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Leg. broken by cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b). Blundered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Type XIV</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuthbert (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (2)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (3) dies</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>(Spink) R.C.L. 495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (4)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>(Baldwin) Grantley 1026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (5)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (6)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>RCL</td>
<td>Hazlitt 1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Birnwald (?)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Eadwald (1)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Same (2)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Clitheroe</td>
<td>B.M.C. 439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 bis</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (3) dies</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ludwig</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Dresser Ryan 729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wynberht</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Type XVII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Brunheard (?), blundered</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Buee (1)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (3)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>(Baldwin) Ryan 725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Edcull</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Type XVIII—XIX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>(1) Bernwald</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>Clitheroe</td>
<td>N.C. 1843, p. 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>(2) Bernwald, blundered</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.C. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>(3) &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Clitheroe</td>
<td>N.C. 1843, p. 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Everat me fecit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>C.B. 358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forgeries exist of no. 23 (B.M. forgeries; see B.N.J. iii, pl. facing p. 281, no. 12) and no. 24 (Lockett, ex Murdoch 92, &c.).

BM = British Museum (Catalogue or Acquisitions); CB = Carlyon-Britton sales; FW = Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge; RCL = R. C. Lockett (unsold portion of the collection where no number follows).
imitations with blundered legends, produced for the most part in that part of Mercia which was at that date subject to Guthrum and other Danish rulers. But a large group, notably those of the moneyer Tilwine, are unquestionably the product of an official mint, and show that the third-penny was a subdivision regularly issued under Alfred’s rule.

### TABLE II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Wt. (grains)</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Type VI (b)</td>
<td>6.5+</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>C.B. 351; R.C.L. 507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5.8+</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Barnett (1935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7.1+</td>
<td>(Baldwin)</td>
<td>C.B. 1654; Ryan 716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Type VI (c)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>C.B. 934; R.C.L. 508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tilwine (1)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.A. 489 (1902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>C.B. 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>RCL</td>
<td>C.B. 944; Drabble 843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Circ. 1916, no. 39381, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ricof (“Leicester”)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>C.B. 353; Drabble 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ralfig</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>C.B. 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I.N.L.C.E</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.A. 490 (1902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>IOID-URH</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>(Lockett)</td>
<td>C.B. 1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>EDH-IRHL (? Cudberht)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>(Baldwin)</td>
<td>C.B. 1656; R.C.L. 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>EDI-HRL (? Cudberht)</td>
<td>7.0+</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>C.B. 1657; Drabble 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>CDII-HCP</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>RCL</td>
<td>Circ. 1919, no. 74799, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Tidheia (?)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>RCL</td>
<td>Circ. 1920, no. 77825, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>PER-IRNL</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>C.B. 943; Barnett 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Type —. Tilwine, alpha-omega</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.A. 491 (1902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>B.M.A. 492 (1902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>C.B. 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Bruun 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>7.0+</td>
<td>Ashmolean</td>
<td>R.C.L. 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>C.B. 352; R.C.L. 502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hoard also reveals, however, a tendency to strike a class of coin somewhat higher in weight, for two, one of them an imitation, attain weights of over 8 gr. Here we must see the influence of the Viking coinage, and the “halfpennies” of the Cuerdale hoard must be taken into account. Here all but three of the coins are 8 gr. or over, four of them being 10–11 gr., and must be regarded as halfpennies. They are almost without exception blundered—the chief moneyer is Cuthbert instead of Tilwine, but all except one of his coins must be regarded as imitations—and the lighter Alfredian coin is almost completely absent. The predominance of the halfpenny over the third-penny can also be ascribed to Viking influence. Halfpence of the “Cunnetti”, “Siefried”, “St. Edmund memorial” and related coinages, weighing 8.5–9.5 g., occurred in considerable numbers in the
Cuerdale hoard\(^1\) and prove that in Northumbria and East Anglia, and presumably in the area of the Danelaw between them, it was found a convenient unit of currency and struck in considerable quantity.

On the other hand, I am reluctant to accept the argument that it was the Vikings who invented—or at least first struck—the halfpenny in this country.\(^2\) This claim is based on the existence of a halfpenny (9-1 gr.: much worn) bearing the names of *Alfdene R(e)x* and the moneyer *Rainoald\(^3\) and another in *Alfdene*’s name and that of *Tilwine* (9-4 gr.).\(^4\) Since Halfdan, son of Ragnar Lodbrok, was expelled from Northumbria in 877, it is assumed that the coin is to be attributed to him and to have been struck before this year; some scholars have thought it goes back to his occupation of London in 872.\(^5\) I find it impossible to date the coin as early as this. Halfdan was a common Danish name, and there are no good reasons for assuming that the *Alfdene* of the coins is identical with the king who was expelled from Northumbria in 877. There must have been many local coinages in the 880’s and 890’s in the great area of Danish Mercia which lay east of Watling Street. Moneyers working for individual military chieftains, for the armies encamped at such places as Leicester or Stamford or Nottingham, would have been free to pick their designs as they pleased and to coin in their own name—*Everat me fecit*—or in their employer’s according to the directions they received. It is dangerous to rely too heavily on the testimony of a single hoard. The Delgany find does not prove that the coinage of Co. Wicklow in the early ninth century consisted of Kentish pennies, and despite the fact that the smallest denominations are those least likely to circulate far from their place of origin we cannot be certain that the coins found at Stamford do in fact represent the ordinary coinage of Danish Mercia. Nevertheless I am inclined to attribute to this area and date the imitative coins which formed part of the Stamford hoard, and to include amongst them the Halfdan coins now in the British Museum and at Copenhagen. Guthrum’s coinage was also, I believe, imitated

\(^{1}\) The weights of the B.M. specimens within these limits are 8-5 (5 spec.), 8-6 (1), 8-8 (5), 8-9 (1), 9-0 (6), 9-1 (1), 9-2 (1), 9-3 (2), 9-4 (1). Below it are 1 of 7-8 gr. and 2 each of 7-9 gr. and 8-0 gr.; above it are 2 of 8-6 gr., 2 of 8-8 gr., 1 of 9-0 gr., and 1 of 12-5 gr. The weight of the pennies is usually 18-22 gr.

\(^{2}\) Cf. Brooke, op. cit., p. 46: “The type [B.M.C. type XIV] is copied from the Viking coinages, and from the same source the round halfpenny is now introduced.” See further below, p. 32, n. 4.

\(^{3}\) B.M.C. i, p. 203, no. 869. It is from Cuerdale. W. J. Andrew (in *Brit. Num. Journ.* i. 19-26) argued that the Halfdan in question was a later king who was killed in 911, but this view, though reinforced by a number of highly ingenious conjectures on the nature and date of the Cuerdale hoard, has not found supporters and is certainly incorrect.

\(^{4}\) See above, p. 486, n. 1. B.M.C. 437 of Alfred, which is from Cuerdale, appears to me to be a blundered coin of Halfdan (9-0 gr.).

\(^{5}\) This is the implication of B.M.C. i, p. 203, note *, and it is definitely asserted by Brooke, p. 34: “The halfpennies of Halfdene are closely allied in style to the pennies of Guthrum–Æthelstan and Alfred; on one of them is the name of the moneyer Tilwine who struck pennies for Alfred with the London monogram. The whole of Halfdene’s coinage may therefore be ascribed to the London mint and was issued within the years 872–5; his halfpennies are the earliest in the coinage of England, and his use of the London monogram precedes its use on coins bearing the name of Alfred.”
from that of Alfred, and not vice versa. But on the chronology of Alfred's issues we must await publication of their paper by Mr. Blunt and Mr. Dolley.

It is pertinent, finally, to inquire whether the third-penny ended with Alfred's reign. I do not think it did. "Halfpennies" of Edward the Elder (899–925) weigh between 8 and 9.5 gr.,¹ and since his pennies weigh between 24 and 28 gr. they can reasonably be regarded as thirds. No fractions of the penny are known for Athelstan, and the only one of Eadmund (940–6) is a unique piece in the British Museum weighing 9.1 gr.² Since his pennies are usually 20–24 gr., it is difficult here to decide whether we have a light halfpenny or a heavy third-penny; I suspect the former. There were two fractions of pennies of Eadred (946–55) in the Chester hoard,³ one a "halfpenny" of 8.6 gr. and the other a "halfpenny" cut as a farthing of 3.8 gr.; if these were really halfpennies, the corresponding pennies would be 17.4 gr. and 15.2 gr. respectively, and since his pennies in fact weigh between 19 and 24 gr., it seems to me that we may still be dealing with thirds.

The only known "halfpenny" of Eadwig (955–9), also from the Chester hoard, weighs 9.7 gr.,⁴ and is surely a full halfpenny, since his pennies weigh from 18 to 24 gr. Finally, under Eadgar (959–75) we have clear evidence of the two denominations. Both are represented in the Chester hoard, and are of quite different types. One, of thin flat fabric corresponding to his pennies, weighs 7 gr., and is a third-penny of a unit which weighs 19–23 g. The other piece weighs 10.8 gr., and in design, as well as in denomination, must be regarded as a conscious revival of the halfpenny of Alfred.⁵

With that the denomination of a struck halfpenny, as distinct from the cut one, vanishes from English coinage for a century and a half, only to be again revived, and that temporarily, under Henry I. Two reasons can be suggested to account for the disappearance of these fractional coins. One is the difficulty that there would be of distinguishing between halves and thirds at a time when the weight of the penny was being altered substantially from issue to issue; under such circumstances it would be impossible to keep the fractions separate. The other is the greater cost of making the fractions as separate coins. The striking of £1 in halfpennies would involve twice as much labour as the striking of the same sum in pennies, or indeed rather more, for the lighter coins would be more awkward to handle and slower to work, so that the profits of the moneyer would be proportionately reduced. It was cheaper and less trouble to strike pennies and cut them into halfpennies and farthings, even if the cut coins were the

---

¹ B.M.C. ii, p. 94, no. 71 (9.3 gr.); Ashmolean (8 gr.); Ryan, lot 736 (9 gr.).
² B.M.A. 545.
³ C. E. Blunt and R. H. M. Dolley, "The Chester (1950) hoard", Brit. Num. Journ. xxvii (1952–4), p. 149, nos. 260, 261; cf. also p. 130. The only other published specimen of a "halfpenny" of Eadred is Carlyon-Britton (I) 426, weighing 8.7 gr., but Mr. Blunt informs me that Messrs. Baldwin have another specimen (wt. 8.9 gr.). There was also a fragment in Montagu (I) 604.
⁴ Ibid., no. 374.
⁵ Ibid., nos. 514, 515; see the discussion of the last on pp. 135–6.
more easily pared and chipped in circulation. Not till the reign of Edward I was a fraction of the penny, struck as such, brought effectively into existence, and then and for the future it was to be the halfpenny and not the third-penny.

REGISTER OF COINS

Sale Catalogues and Collectors


Bergne J. B. Bergne. Sotheby 20.5.1873.

Brumell J. Brumell. Sotheby 19.4.1850.

Brunn L. E. Bruun. Sotheby 18.5.1925.

Carlyon-Britton P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton. Three sales, all Sotheby. (I) 17.11.1913. (II) 20.11.1916. (III) 11.11.1918. Part of the collection was also disposed of privately to Messrs. Spink.

Crompton-Roberts C. M. Crompton-Roberts. Collection now dispersed.

Cuff J. D. Cuff. Sotheby 8.6.1854.


Grantley (III) Lord Grantley. Part III. Glendining 22.3.1944.

Hazlitt W. C. Hazlitt. Sotheby 5.7.1909.

Lewin Sheppard See Sheppard.

Lockett (I) R. C. Lockett. Part I. Glendining 6.6.1955. ("Lockett", not followed by a number, indicates that the coin, at the time of writing, had not yet been sold.)


Martin J. W. Martin. Sotheby 23.5.1859.


Shepherd E. J. Shepherd. Sotheby 22.7.1885.


Whitbourn R. Whitbourn. Sotheby 2.2.1869.

Wigan E. Wigan. Collection bought by Messrs. Rollin and Feuardent, 1872.

Young A. W. Young. Collection left to the Fitzwilliam Museum in 1935.

Circ. = Spink's Numismatic Circular.

1. 11-0 gr. Lockett (1957), ex Watters 53, ex Rashleigh 223, ex Sheppard 104. Found before 1821.


4. 9-4 gr. Lockett (1957), from Spink (Circ. 1906, no. 24369), ex Murdoch (I) 78, ex Montagu (I) 529. Found in the Thames at Erith.

5. 7-0 gr. Lord Clitheroe, from Cuerdale. Illus. N.C. 1870, pl. iii. 12.

6. 10-7 gr. B.M.C. 112, from Cuerdale.

7. 9-5 gr. B.M.C. 435, from Cuerdale.

8. 7-4 gr. B.M.C. 436, from Cuerdale.

9. 10-0 gr. Spink (1957), ex Lockett (I) 495, ex Watters 52, ex Rashleigh 232, ex Bergne 171, ex Murchison 213, ex Martin 18, from Cuerdale.
10. 8.4 gr. (worn). Baldwin (1957), ex Grantley (III) 1026, ex L. A. Lawrence (privately, not in a sale) . . . from Cuerdale.

11. 8.0 gr. Lockett (1957), from Spink (Circ. 1918, no. 67294 = 1921, no. 90908 = 1922, no. 11980 = 1923, no. 25274 = 1926, no. 5112 = 1927, no. 67028 = 1928, no. 72232 = 1928, no. 80243 = 1929, no. 88149), ex Pitch, ex Hazlitt 1934, ex Murdoch (I) 594, ex Montagu (I) 570, ex Shepherd 79, ex Wigan, from Cuerdale.

12. 8.5 gr. B.M.C. 1, from Cuerdale.

13. 10.0 gr. B.M.C. 434, from Cuerdale.

14. 7.7 gr. B.M.C. 438, from Cuerdale.

14 bis. 7.5 gr. Lord Clitheroe, from Cuerdale.

15. 7.0 gr. B.M.C. 439, from Cuerdale.

16. ? J. L. Dresser, ex Ryan (II) 729, from Spink (Circ. 1920, no. 81347), ex Crompton-Roberts, ex Montagu (I) 569, ex Marshall 154, ex Wigan, ex Cuff 471, from Cuerdale (?).

17. 8.6 gr. B.M.C. 440, from Cuerdale.

18. 9.0 gr. B.M.C. 75, from Cuerdale.

19. 8.6 gr. B.M.C. 76, from Cuerdale.

20. 8.2 gr. B.M.C. 77, from Cuerdale.

21. 8.6 gr. Baldwin (1957), ex Ryan (II) 725, ex Grantley (III) 1025, ex Murdoch (I) 93, ex Montagu (I) 516, ex Shepherd 76, ex Murchison 215, ex Cuff 470, from Cuerdale.

22. 8.3 gr. B.M.C. 78, from Cuerdale.

23. 11.0 gr. Lord Clitheroe, from Cuerdale. Illus. N.C. 1870, pl. vi. 3.


24. 9.7 gr. B.M.C. 153, from Cuerdale.

25. 8.0 gr. Lord Clitheroe, from Cuerdale.

25 a. ? Forgery of no. 25. Lockett (1957), from Spink (Circ. 1906, no. 24370), ex Murdoch (I) 92, ex Montagu (I) 543, ex Maynard 5, allegedly from Cuerdale.


27. 6.5 gr. (chipped). B.M., ex Lockett (I) 507, ex Carlyon-Britton (I) 351, ex Stamford.

28. 5.8 gr. (chipped). B.M., ex Barnett (1935), from Spink (Circ. 1919, no. 76236 = 1921, no. 90906 = 1923, no. 25272 = 1925, no. 38449 = 1926, no. 54068), ex Carlyon-Britton (?), from Stamford.

29. 7.1 gr. (chipped). Baldwin (1957), ex Ryan (I) 716, ex Drabble (I) 392, from Spink (Circ. 1919, no. 70761 = 1921, no. 90907), ex Carlyon-Britton (III) 1654, from Stamford.

30. 5.9 gr. B.M., ex Lockett (I) 508, from Spink (Circ. 1917, no. 48815), ex Carlyon-Britton (II) 934, from Stamford.

31. 8.5 gr. B.M.A. 489, from Stamford.

32. 7.3 gr. Fitzwilliam Museum, ex A. W. Young (1935), ex Carlyon-Britton (I) 355, from Stamford.

33. 7.2 gr. C. E. Blunt, ex Drabble (I) 843, ex Carlyon-Britton (II) 944, from Stamford.

34. 7.2 gr. Lockett (1957), from Spink (Circ. 1916, no. 39381 = 1920, no. 77826 = 1924, no. 27257 = 1926, no. 54069 = 1927, no. 67029 = 1928, no. 83276 = 1930, no. 94061), ex Carlyon-Britton (?), from Stamford. (It is possible that some of the Circ. references given here refer really to no. 33.)

35. 7.6 gr. C. E. Blunt, ex Drabble (I) 391, from Spink (Circ. 1914, no. 42538 = 1919, no. 76237 = 1921, no. 90905 = 1922, no. 1197 = 1923, no. 25273 = 1926, no. 51122 = 1928, no. 76233), from Carlyon-Britton (?), from Stamford.
36. 6·2 gr.  Fitzwilliam Museum, ex A. W. Young (1935), ex Carlyon-Britton (I) 356, from Stamford.
37. 8·9 gr.  B.M.A. 490, from Stamford.
38. 6·7 gr.  Lockett (1957), ex Carlyon-Britton (III) 1655, from Stamford.
39. 7·7 gr.  Baldwin (1957), ex Lockett (I) 496, ex Drabble (I) 390, ex Carlyon-Britton (III) 1656, from Stamford.
40. 7·0 gr. (chipped). C. E. Blunt, ex Drabble (I) 390, ex Carlyon-Britton (III) 1657, from Stamford.
41. 6·6 gr.  Lockett (1957), from Spink (Circ. 1919, no. 74709 = 1922, no. 11987 = 1927, no. 67031), ex Carlyon-Britton, from Stamford.
42. 8·0 gr.  Lockett (1957), from Spink (Circ. 1920, no. 77825 = 1922, no. 11979 = 1925, no. 38450 = 1927, no. 67031 = 1928, no. 83277), ex Carlyon-Britton, from Stamford.
43. 7·6 gr.  B.M., ex Barnett (1935), ex Carlyon-Britton (II) 943, from Stamford.
44. 7·7 gr.  B.M.A. 491, from Stamford.
45. 6·8 gr. (chipped). B.M.A. 492, from Stamford.
46. 7·6 gr.  Fitzwilliam Museum, ex A. W. Young (1935), ex Carlyon-Britton (I) 354, from Stamford.
47. 7·7 gr.  B.M., ex Barnett (1935), ex Bruun 71 . . . from Stamford.
48. 7·0 gr. (chipped). Ashmolean Museum, ex Lockett (I) 512 . . . from Stamford.
49. 7·4 gr.  J. W. F. Hill, ex Lockett (I) 502, from Spink (Circ. 1914, no. 24539), ex Carlyon-Britton (I) 352, from Stamford.
HALF AND ONE THIRD PENNIES OF ALFRED