COTTON’S ANGLO-SAXON COINS IN THE LIGHT OF THE PEIRESC INVENTORY OF 1606

MARION M. ARCHIBALD

The Anglo-Saxon coins belonging to Sir Robert Bruce Cotton were recorded by Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc when he visited London in 1606. His inventory is preserved among numismatic notes on Cotton’s and other European collections in two bound volumes now in the Rijksmuseum Meermanno-Westreenianum in The Hague, Netherlands. 1 The numismatic importance of this material was first recognised by Gay van der Meer, who planned to publish it in collaboration with Christopher Blunt and Michael Dolley. Some preparatory work was done in 1961, but other demands on the time of all three scholars made it impossible to complete the project. After the deaths of her colleagues, a paper by van der Meer in 1994 discussed the history and context of the manuscripts and made a general and numerical survey of Cotton’s Anglo-Saxon collection based on this and other sources. 2 The publication of the individual coins remained outstanding and she recently invited the writer to undertake this part of the work. This task has been greatly facilitated by van der Meer’s earlier research and a provisional table prepared by Blunt and Dolley in 1961. 3

The data below has, however, been established from scratch, making use of additional manuscript material, information from fascicules of the Sylloge and important studies of specific periods of Anglo-Saxon coinage published during the intervening forty-five years. While the primary object of this paper is thus to make available the detail of the Cotton Anglo-Saxon coins recorded in the Peiresc volumes in The Hague, the opportunity has been taken to collate with it scattered earlier studies now in need of some revision, to produce a corpus of all the Anglo-Saxon coins at present believed to have been in Cotton’s possession. So far as can be determined, the present location of the coins in public collections is given and recent references to them in published sources are cited. This evidence increases Cotton’s known holding in the series from about 160 coins in 1954 to 204. 4

Cotton and Peiresc

There is an extensive literature on both men, so only a brief outline noting the principal bibliographical publications is required here. Both took an active part in the public affairs of
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1 Boezen 1999, 90–1. Mss. 10C 30-31. Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637), Tomus I: De Nummis Graecorum, Romanorum et Judaeorum. Tractatus de Monetis. Catalogi Rerum Antiquarum (paginae 1–716). Tomus II: Nummi Gallici, Gothici, Italici, Britannici, Arabici et Turcici (paginae 156–391). The ozalids of the relevant pages, whose copyright is retained by the Rijksmuseum, have been placed in the library of the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum, where they may be consulted.

2 Van der Meer 1997. This paper was reprinted in van der Meer 1994, from which references in this paper are cited. Dr van der Meer gave a paper on Cotton’s coins at the British Numismatic Society on 18 April 1989. The Peiresc manuscript has been cited in some volumes in the SCBI series after 1961, with the advice of Dr van der Meer and the then editors Christopher Blunt and Michael Dolley.

3 A copy of this table, now out of date in some respects, is also available in the British Museum.

4 The statistics quoted in this paper are based on the Corpus below and differ a little from those given in earlier papers. Van der Meer’s total of 210 coins was based on the Blunt and Dolley table of 1961 which, for example, overlooked the Lactea (no 35) but included coins from the Peiresc “Londres” group here not accepted as Cotton’s (see discussion below and Appendix).
their countries but it is as antiquaries, collectors and conservers of the records of their nations’ past that they are primarily celebrated today. Robert Cotton (1571–1631) was educated at Westminster School, London, where one of his masters was the leading antiquary William Camden (1551–1623), and Jesus College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1586. In celebration of his claimed descent from the Scottish royal family, he adopted the name Bruce around 1603, the year in which he was knighted by James I, the king of the newly united kingdom, and was created a baronet in 1611. He inherited family estates, mainly in Huntingdonshire around his country residence at Comington, and owned a succession of houses in London. When aged only fifteen he was one of the co-founders, with Camden and others, of the short-lived Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and assembled an outstanding library of manuscripts, books, coins and selected antiquities mainly illustrative of England’s history. While he owned coins of the Celtic, Roman and other series, it was his choice Anglo-Saxon cabinet which then as now was regarded as the most significant. He maintained friendly contact with leading contemporary collectors and scholars at home and abroad, generously making his material available to them for study at his houses and on loan. Cotton had intended that his collections should ultimately pass to the nation and after the death of his grandson Sir John Cotton in 1702 these wishes were fulfilled. The public authorities did not immediately ensure their proper curation and after several moves, and some depredation in all areas, including the particularly vulnerable coins, it was decided in 1753 that they should be incorporated with those of Sir Hans Sloane (1660–1753) and others to form the foundation collection of the British Museum. When the Cotton material was inspected prior to its removal to the museum in 1756 the coins were found to be ‘in a most confused state’. The surviving English coins were not counted separately on that occasion but along with others from unspecified series (probably Roman issues for the most part) numbered 352 pieces in a grand total, including seals and other numismatic material, of 549 items.

Among the overseas antiquaries with whom Cotton corresponded was the eminent French scholar Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637). He inherited extensive properties in Provence, but, while generally based at his estate in Belgentier near Aix, he lived mainly in Paris between 1616 and 1623 and travelled widely in his youth, pursuing his many academic interests. Prominent among these was numismatics and between acquiring his first coin at the age of fifteen and his death he had amassed just under 18,000 coins, many of which eventually reached the French national collection. Although the majority of his coins were classical, his unusually extensive holdings in the medieval series were, for his time, particularly noteworthy. He came to London for a month in the summer of 1606 and visited Cotton’s library where he recorded the Anglo-Saxon coins, and the two antiquaries continued to exchange letters, material and gifts until their correspondence ceased in 1622. The major part of Peiresc’s immense surviving archive is housed in the Bibliothèque d’Inguimbert at Carpentras, also near Aix, in volumes of his papers kept by him in packets and bound together shortly after his death. Volume LV in the main series, primarily concerned with coins, became separated from the rest and is represented by the two books (in the bindings of a later owner) now in The Hague, on which the present paper is principally based.
Anglo-Saxon coins in the Peiresc volumes in The Hague

Van der Meer has already discussed the two Peiresc volumes and the entries which relate to Cotton's Anglo-Saxon collection in her 1994 paper, but the evidence to set the corpus in context is presented here with a slightly different emphasis. The Hague volumes record 181 Anglo-Saxon coins in remarkable detail: one in volume I and 180 in volume II. One hundred and sixty-five coins are identified as Cotton's by headings at various points throughout volume II, two more almost certainly belong to him, and there are eleven coins (including the sole coin in volume I) for which no connection with Cotton can be established.\textsuperscript{11} Legends are set out in full although the liberal use of dittoes for obverses in particular can sometimes lead to uncertainties. Letter forms are generally carefully transcribed but the recording of initial crosses and punctuation is not consistent and it is not always clear whether punctuation in the manuscript transcribes stops on the coins or is the writers' way of marking the division between words or the end of a line. Where punctuation is considered to be certainly the latter, it is not reproduced in the Corpus but if there is any doubt it is fully transcribed. The legends are transcribed as nearly as possible as they appear in the manuscript. Spaces are usually, but not always, left between the words of the legends in the manuscript but are set out uniformly with spaces in the Corpus, except in the case of words joined by ligatured letters. The entries display occasional transparent misinterpretations of individual letters and a small number of obvious errors which may be safely discounted without comment, but a few less explicable and possibly more significant ambiguities remain and are noted in the Corpus. The types on both sides are usually briefly described in Latin, supplemented in some cases and replaced in others by stylistically accurate drawings of the main feature of the reverse, and less often obverse, designs. The manuscripts do not identify mints or moneys and weights and findspots (with one exception, no. 15), are not recorded. The coin numbers quoted throughout this commentary refer to those in the Corpus unless stated otherwise.

The great majority of the Cotton Anglo-Saxon coins in Peiresc volume II feature in two lists. The longer on pp. 255–68 in Peiresc's hand is headed by a note stating that the coins listed were made available to him at Cotton's house in London (PI. 26) and, although undated, external evidence establishes that this visit took place in the summer of 1606.\textsuperscript{12} This list (henceforth referred to as the 'Peiresc inventory') describes without running numbers 158 coins under kingdoms and rulers, with marginal comments by Peiresc in Latin and French. The attributions to kings whose names appear only once in the historical record are correct, but in cases where a name occurs more often, or not at all, the entries are less reliable and regnal dates often require correction in line with current thinking. In the Corpus the coins are identified, listed and dated according to modern scholarship and misattributions by Peiresc (other than minor differences in regnal years) are noted.\textsuperscript{13}

The second list is bound into vol. II, pp. 247–50, and has similar Latin descriptions but fewer drawings and occasional marginal remarks in English. It is in a different hand but is headed with a note written by Peiresc saying, in Latin, that it was made by Master Tate from the collection of ancient Anglo-Saxon coins at the London house of Sir Robert Cotton.\textsuperscript{14} No indication is given of when and how Peiresc obtained it. This list (henceforth referred to as the 'Tate list') is in alphabetical order of rulers' names with no attributions made to specific kingdoms and breaks off at his no. 142, in the middle of describing a fourth coin of Harold I. A number of coins without numbers are shoehorned into the list or, like two coins of Plegmund, added in the upper margin. Another version of the Tate list survives among the Cotton papers in the British Library.\textsuperscript{15} It is

\textsuperscript{11} Three coins whose independent existence is doubtful are excluded from the Cotton totals: a Beorhtric and two coins of Edward the Elder which are either dittoes or had apparently left the collection by 1606, possibly disposed of as duplicates (see Appendix, nos VIII–X).

\textsuperscript{12} Sturdy 1983, 225, quoting Carpentarius MSS 1809 ff. 245, 288 and 435. Page 266 of the Peiresc inventory in The Hague, listing coins of Edward the Elder and Athelstan, is illustrated in van der Meer 1994, 229.

\textsuperscript{13} Errors in other early sources are not noted in the Corpus unless they are material to the discussion.

\textsuperscript{14} Francis Tate (1590–1616), barrister and Member of Parliament, was one of Cotton's friends and a co-founder and secretary of the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries (van Norden 1946, 142–50). He was a particularly active scholar, many of whose draft discourses for the Antiquaries survive, including the one given on 27 November 1590 entitled 'The Antiquity of the Word Sterlingorum or Sterling'. The first page of Tate's list with the heading by Peiresc is illustrated in van der Meer 1994, 226.

\textsuperscript{15} Cotton MS Titus B VI, ff. 245r–246v discussed in van der Meer 1994, 227–8.
also in Tate’s hand, but less carefully written, and the contents are closely similar, complete with insertions and unnumbered coins. Both lists break off at the same point, with the numbers continuing (with no details of coins) to 151 in the Cotton manuscript, but only to 145 in the Peiresc manuscript probably because its lower edge has been cut off during the binding process. There are indications, including additional errors, that the Peiresc version is the later of the two. Why the list was not completed is not known.

The Peiresc inventory and the Tate list record substantially the same coins but differing readings and errors, among other details, demonstrate that they are independent of one another, each antiquary reading the coins for himself and not copying some pre-existing descriptions by Cotton. There is no direct evidence for which list came first, but van der Meer argued that the Tate list was probably the earlier and that is accepted here. One hundred and forty coins feature in both, seven appear only in Tate and eighteen only in Peiresc. The excess in Peiresc is inflated because the Tate list is incomplete. Three coins of Harold I Jewel Cross type were the final fully identified coins on Tate’s list, but it is probable that eight other coins of the same reign, which look like a parcel from a hoard and appear only in the Peiresc inventory, were already in Cotton’s collection when Tate was writing. The six coins of Offa present in the Peiresc inventory may also have been owned by Cotton when Tate was compiling his list and broke off before he had reached the letter ‘O’ (but see the discussion of the Carpentras manuscript, p. 176, below). Thus the number of coins added to the collection between the Tate list and the Peiresc inventory is reduced to ten, or possibly just four. The reason why seven coins in Tate were not recorded by Peiresc is unknown, but five of them do not appear again in Cotton’s collection. Apart from the possibility of coins having been stolen, misplaced or out on loan, it is possible that some had been disposed of as duplicates in line with Cotton’s collecting practice.

As the Peiresc inventory is more complete and the detail and transcriptions of legends generally fuller and, as far as can be judged, usually (but not always) more accurate than those of the Tate list, the former is the source from which the legends given in the Corpus have been transcribed unless otherwise stated. Material differences in the legends given in the two lists for what is considered to be the same coin are also noted.

In addition to the two main listings, a number of Anglo-Saxon coins are described elsewhere in The Hague volumes, all undated and without mention of an owner. They are in Peiresc’s hand and the question is whether any of them were when he wrote, or later became, part of Cotton’s collection. On p. 69 of volume II is an unheaded list of three coins, another of Offa with Bishop Eadberht (no. 21), and a penny of Beorhtwulf of Wessex (see at no. 76), none of which feature in the Peiresc or Tate lists. As van der Meer has pointed out, they are almost certainly the three coins mentioned in Peiresc’s letter to Cotton of 4 July 1618 dealing also with Roman coins and casts which he is sending to his English friend as a present. Peiresc writes ‘Les monoyes d’Offa et de Beorhtwulf, je les ay tant demandées qu’enfin …’ but tantalisingly no more of the sentence survives as the page has been damaged. What is probably the first record in Peiresc’s notes of the Offa/Eoba penny, with a drawing of the reverse type, is on p. 101 where it is the lone Anglo-Saxon coin in a list of gold and silver Merovingian and Carolingian coins from an unidentified collection, probably French. It is found for a third time (with a marginal note that it was found near Narbonne) on p. 271 which is headed SAXONICA SIGILLA ad D. Robertum Cottonum. This abnormal third entry on a page of other material sent to Cotton would appear to suggest that Peiresc had arranged for the Offa/Eoba found in France and originally in a French collection to be acquired by Cotton, perhaps, on a favourable interpretation of the ‘enfin’ in the letter, after procrastinated negotiations in 1618. The Offa/Eadbearth (no. 21) is neither noted elsewhere in the Peiresc volumes, nor is such a coin illustrated in Speed, but a coin of the same type in the British Museum is certainly the one illustrated in 1744 in the West collection which included many Cotton coins (see below, p. 182–3). While proof is lacking, there seems to be enough evidence to link these two coins with the Cotton collection so they are included in the Corpus below.

16 See ‘Curation of the collection’ below, pp. 179-80.
17 This page is illustrated in van der Meer 1994, 232.
18 Cotton MS Julius C III, f. 211, van der Meer 1994, 233.
19 Peiresc was sending Cotton reproductions of the impressions of ancient gems attached to spurious charters of Offa and Edgar in the archives of the Abbey of St Denis. Paris; see Birch 1887, 1, nos 1 and 3.
The case of the Beorhtric is particularly difficult to sort out. Peiresc did not note such a coin in the collection in 1606, but Cotton had apparently acquired an example of this exceptionally rare reign, type and moneyer by 1611 for one is illustrated in Speed, whose Anglo-Saxon coin illustrations were sourced from Cotton’s collection.\(^{20}\) The Speed coin, if accurately represented, cannot now be traced. The coin mentioned in the 1618 letter must be a different specimen and the coin Speed published in 1611 does indeed differ in some significant respects from the coin described in Peiresc but, curious as it may seem, no coin precisely matching this second coin either is known today.\(^{21}\) Whether Cotton had two Beorhtrics or just one, and in that case which, is not capable of proof on present evidence. No coin of Beorhtric survived in the collection to be included in the Pegge inventory of 1748. The Speed coin is included in the Corpus (no. 75) where the Peiresc specimen is cross-referenced to its listing at Appendix, viii.

Ten Anglo-Saxon coins appear in volume II, p. 120, in a list of seventeen miscellaneous medieval coins from the British Isles and one of the Carolingian ruler Pepin of Melle, all bracketed together ‘Londres’. The place-name in itself does not identify the coins as Cotton’s for there were other collectors in London at the time, some of whom were also visited by Peiresc in 1606.\(^{22}\) His explicit acknowledgement of Cotton as the source of coins elsewhere would also tend to support the view that the location ‘Londres’ is an unlikely designation for coins from the latter’s collection. Some of the coins are described in Peiresc’s usual detailed manner, but others are represented by their obverse legends (some not even complete), with reverses denoted merely by lines of dots. The scrappy nature of most of the entries on this page suggests that the coins were probably pieces Peiresc had either seen only briefly, was recording from memory or had just been told about in the hands of other collectors when he visited London, and which he later grouped together in fair copy, transcribing from miscellaneous notes with differing amounts of detail made on the spot. Only six of the Anglo-Saxon coins are described closely enough to be fully identifiable and there is no external evidence associating any of them with Cotton. Several are apparent duplicates of coins already in Cotton’s collection and this, while not conclusive in itself, is another pointer to this group being unlikely as a part of it.

The final Anglo-Saxon coin noted by Peiresc is the only one to appear in volume I, a penny of Offa by the moneyer Aldred (Ethelred) on p. 352. It is entered between coins of Zeno and Tacitus on a page otherwise devoted to Roman and Byzantine issues with no indication of source. It is of Blunt type 48, of which that writer had noted only one example, BMA no. 16, acquired by the British Museum in 1895 from the Montagu sale, whose catalogue records that it had been purchased at the Vicomte de Ponton sale in Paris in 1890. A French source nearly three centuries after Peiresc’s time need not in itself be significant, and a French collector could have chosen to add one of Offa’s attractive pennies to his collection, but the coin is odd-man-out in a sale mainly of Merovingian coins, suggesting that it may represent the survival of another casual French find which had remained there until the nineteenth century. There is no evidence that it ever belonged to Cotton. Equally, there is no evidence that the Ponton specimen was the coin Peiresc noted, for the latter could simply have disappeared, but its context and the fact that it is the only known specimen go some way to supporting the identity.

The Peiresc volumes in The Hague thus include a total of 167 Anglo-Saxon coins which are believed to have been in the Cotton collection and are listed in the Corpus. It is also important that all 181 Anglo-Saxon coins in the Peiresc volumes are published together to put them on record and also to allow students to make their own judgements about the unsourced coins and reconsider their status in the light of any new evidence available in the future. The eleven coins which are not considered to have been part of the Cotton collection are listed in the Appendix, given Roman numbers and cross-referenced at their appropriate chronological place in the Cotton corpus. Three additional entries not included in the totals or statistics because their independent identity is doubtful are also included in the Appendix, and similarly cross-referenced.

\(^{20}\) Speed’s words are somewhat ambiguous in referring to the Cotton collection ‘from whence the chiefest garnishments of this works have been enlarged and brought ...’. Harvey and Harvey 2003, 178 and 186, accept that all the Speed coins come from Cotton; they provide a guide to the complex publication history of early printed books on English numismatics and their illustrations.

\(^{21}\) Blunt 1958. 129–31. See also the discussion at no. 75 in the Corpus.

\(^{22}\) Sturdy 1983. 225.
Growth of the collection

Other manuscript and early printed sources for Cotton’s Anglo-Saxon coins have already been discussed by Dolley and Strudwick, van der Meer and Pagan, and are reviewed here in the context of the growth of the collection. It is not known when Cotton acquired his first Anglo-Saxon coin but his collecting of books and manuscripts began about 1588. He had been a founder member of the Society of Antiquaries in 1586 but no discourse by him is on record before 1598–9. When his former schoolmaster and friend William Camden illustrated coins for the first time in the third edition of his Britannia in 1590, the single plate of British Iron Age coins was sourced not from Cotton but from Robert Aske. In the next edition of 1600 the increased number of plates of Iron Age and Roman coins (the only series illustrated) were said to be taken from coins owned by Cotton. Camden’s comment on that occasion, that Cotton “hath begunne a famous cabinet whence of his singular courtesie he hath often times given me great light in these darksome obscurities”, suggests that his serious collecting of coins had started some time at least before 1600, the date of his influential journey with Camden to Carlisle and the Roman wall. The Peiresc and Tate lists of the fully fledged collection, compiled between about 1600 and 1606, are thus the earliest evidence of Cotton having owned any Anglo-Saxon coins, which by the later date numbered 165 pieces. There is no other known complete inventory of Cotton’s collection during the rest of his life, and indeed none until that of Pegge in 1748. Other information about additions to the collection after 1606 is dependent upon incidental mentions of a few coins and the choices made for illustration in numismatic plates, whose draughtsmanship is notoriously unreliable.

The Carpentras Peiresc manuscript, with accurate drawings by Peiresc’s brother Palamède Fabri de Vallavez, records five Cotton coins (nos 7, 14, 16, 19, 33) seen on his visit to London in 1608. Four (Cuthred, no. 7, and Offa, nos 14, 16, 19) are already in the 1606 inventory, only one (Beornwulf, no. 33) being a more recent addition. The coins may none the less have been drawn to the young man’s attention because Cotton thought that they were important coins that Peiresc may not have seen. There could be several reasons for this belief, but it may have been because they had been acquired not long before that date. The Cuthred is in the Tate list but the three Offas are not. They, and the three other Offas not included in the Carpentras list, could simply have been omitted as has been suggested, but they might have been acquired after the Tate list was compiled, Cotton really having only the Cynethryth from Offa’s reign at that time.

In 1611 Cotton’s collection was the source of Anglo-Saxon coins used to illustrate John Speed’s History of Great Britaine. These woodcuts are of great importance as the first images of the Cotton Anglo-Saxon coins, apart from the Carpentras drawings. Overlooking errors in Speed’s drawings and slips in Peiresc’s and Tate’s transcriptions, it is possible to match the Speed illustrations with coins already recorded in the Peiresc lists, with the exception of four (nos 3, 13, 68, 75) presumably acquired since 1606. None of the four are recorded later by Pegge in 1748, but no. 13 is the Pendraed gold mancus struck during Offa’s reign but misattributed in Speed to the Welsh prince Uter Pendragon, which was certainly Cotton’s. In 1617 Cotton compiled a draft catalogue of selected coins from his collection with cuttings from Speed in places, but it adds no further coins to those recorded before that date. Two coins were probably added to the collection.

---

24 Tite 1984, 28.
26 Little is known of Robert Aske. He was probably the goldsmith who furnished 1561–83 (Heal 1972, 97). Harvey and Harvey 2003, 177, suggested that Cotton had purchased Aske’s collection of British Iron Age coins.
27 Manuscript inventory (now in a bound volume in the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum) prepared by the Rev. Samuel Pegge (1704–96) following his study of the Cotton Anglo-Saxon coins in Westminster School in 1747 and prefaced by a letter to David Casley, then Librarian of the Cotton collection, dated 13 February 1748.
28 Styley 1983, which reproduces the drawings. The spelling ‘Vallavez’ above follows van der Meer (1994); Styley has the form ‘Velavez’.
29 Speed, see n. 20 above.
30 Blunt and Dolley 1968; Tite 1992.
31 This catalogue entitled Nomentumnum Impf. Romanorum Regum Britonis et Anglorum et Iulio Caesaris ad Iacobi Magnum Brundenses gratia in Bibliotheca Cottoniana Extant Exemplaria. 1617 (BL Harleian MS 254) has yet to be edited. It was used by Blunt and Dolley 1968, 152 (see reference), and was outlined and discussed by Tite 1992, 178–80.
with Peiresc’s help in 1618 (nos 15, 21, but see commentary at no. 75 and Appendix, viii). In Speed’s second edition of 1623 the illustrations are the same as before, except that the Æthelwulf of Wessex (no. 79) is omitted and another coin not represented in the Peiresc lists is added, a Ludice of Mercia (no. 35), presumably an acquisition between 1611 and 1623. This coin does not appear in Pegge’s 1748 inventory, but its appearance in West’s collection in 1744 along with many other coins almost certainly from Cotton’s collection strongly supports that provenance. Speed’s plates thus illustrate in aggregate 31 Anglo-Saxon coins from Cotton’s collection and three others which are not proven to have been his but probably were, making 34 in all.32 Between 1606 and 1623 only eight coins are thus known to have been added to the collection, but this is a minimum figure as, in the absence of an inventory, the full increase during those years is unknown. The total of recorded coins by 1623 was therefore 173. There is no contemporary information about any additions made to the collection during the eight remaining years of Cotton’s life. Coins are said to have been among the items added to Cotton’s collection after his death, but it is not known whether they included any Anglo-Saxon pieces.33 This must be kept in mind but, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the assumption is made in what follows that all the coins in the Corpus were acquired in Cotton’s lifetime.

During the next hundred years Cotton’s coins were used as illustrations in a number of publications which provide useful, if not always reliable, images but do not add to the number of coins known from earlier evidence. An early example is the plate of careful woodcut engravings of coins and medals of the British Isles prepared for Sir Simonds D’Ewes in 1649. The sources of the coins are not identified on the plate, but at least nineteen (noted in the Corpus) were Cotton’s.34 The Cotton specimens included among other Anglo-Saxon coins illustrated in Gibson’s 1695 edition of William Camden’s Britannia are simply copied from the plates in Speed. Andrew Fountaine selected Anglo-Saxon coins directly from the Cotton collection for illustration in his Numismata published in 1704, so his engravings provide useful independent, if still inaccurate, visual evidence. He too included coins from elsewhere but, as the owners of the individual coins are not identified, the Cotton coins among them can be distinguished only by matching them with known Cotton coins illustrated or described in other sources. The Fountaine plates cited in the Corpus must therefore be regarded as probable rather than certain identities. Further Cotton coins may have been included but, if so, they cannot be identified, so the Fountaine plates do not provide any additions to the total. None of these early works record the weights of the coins.

The next first-hand evidence for Cotton’s Anglo-Saxon coins appears in 1748 with the inventory made by the Rev. Samuel Pegge.35 Pegge weighed some but not all of the coins. This inventory was probably undertaken because it had become clear that there had been serious losses to the collection by theft. Pegge remarked that fifteen out of the 34 coins illustrated by Speed were missing, a loss of about 44%. After the coins were transferred to the British Museum at Montagu House in 1756, the first curator of the coin collection there, the Rev. Andrew Gifford (1700–84), incorporated the Cotton coins and annotated the Pegge inventory to that effect. He could not trace nine of the 127 coins seen by Pegge, but was able to add a further thirteen Cotton coins to the

32 In each edition of his History Speed includes images of 35 ‘Anglo-Saxon’ coins. Two of the images are of the same coin (Earlred, no 4 in the Corpus below), and one is of a Frisian coin of Audculf (Proc no 1136) excluded from this study as it is not Anglo-Saxon. Thus in each edition of Speed 33 Anglo-Saxon coins are illustrated. However, as he illustrates one coin in the first edition which is replaced by another in subsequent editions, the aggregate figure for Anglo-Saxon coins illustrated in Speed is 34.

33 ‘... and amongst our most Eminently Learned Antiquaries Sir Robert Cotton grandfather to the present Sir John Cotton who...’, the use of the steps of that Illustrious Person, is still augmenting the invaluable Treasure of Medals and Manuscripts obliged the Learned World by his Generous Communication of what has been so long and so improved by him: Evelyn 1697, 345.

34 This plate, pasted into a volume in the National Library of Ireland (MS S39034) which had belonged to the Earls of Wicklow, was discovered by Michael Dolley in 1967. Hogin Pagan discussed it in his Presidential Address, 1987 (Pagan 1987, 176) and I am grateful to him for sending me his photocopy of the plate and notes on its background.

35 See n. 27. This manuscript was the basis of Dolley and Strudwick 1954, which contains a number of errors, for example several coins in BMC identified as Cotton coins are in fact from early nineteenth-century hoards. Some of these misidentifications were corrected by Dolley and Strudwick 1954–5, a paper on the sources of coins in BMC. A number of additions and modifications to the latter appeared in Martin (formerly Strudwick) 1961, 237–40. Further corrections have been made more recently by authors of specialist articles.
1748 inventory. Out of a total of 138 coins recorded by Pegge and Gifford, 107 had already been listed by Peiresc in 1606. The 31 coins known to have been added to the collection between 1606 and Cotton's death in 1631 are, however, just the residue of the acquisitions made during that period after some had been stolen. Accessions appear to have been made from a hoard covering the reigns of Athelstan and Edred. It is not possible to calculate from the post-1606 survivors the total number of coins in the collection with any degree of accuracy because the profile of the later accessions was different from that of the earlier ones. What can be said, even allowing for the likelihood of greater percentage losses among the later accessions (see 'Losses from the collection', below), is that the additions to the collection made during the last 25 years of Cotton's life were not as numerous as they had been in the period before 1606. Recalling that there had been only a small increase between the Tate and Peiresc lists, it is likely that the terminus ante quem for the main acquisitions may be brought back before 1606, probably to a date sometime during the first five years of the seventeenth century. Later published works such as Pegge (1772) and Ruding (1817–40, but incorporating some earlier plates), whose full bibliographical details are given in the Corpus, do not add to the total of the known Cotton coins and so are not quoted systematically there, but they are useful in other ways and are quoted in the commentaries to the entries as required.

Sources of the Cotton collection

The evidence for the sources of the collection is limited and almost entirely internal. As noted above, only one coin likely to have been in Cotton's collection has a finds spot and that was in France (no. 15 and cf. no. 16). Dolley pointed out the presence within the collection of groups of coins which suggested acquisitions from several unrecorded hoards, and van der Meer that these are confirmed by the larger corpus now available. These need only be briefly mentioned here. The large cross-section of Edward the Elder's issues, including a wealth of the pictorial types, suggests a large hoard from north-west Mercia probably extending just into Athelstan's reign, and possibly other finds from the same general period. An important group of ninth-century coins from East Anglia is evidence of a hoard from that area, and the significant group of coins of Harold I suggests a hoard possibly from the east or north-east midlands. The plentiful representatives of the late Saxon types ending abruptly in the Facing Bust/Small Cross type, with coins of Pyramid and Harold II entirely absent, suggest their derivation from a hoard closing before the end of the reign of Edward the Confessor, but whose non-recovery, like the similar find from Sedlescombe (1876), may be associated with the Saxon defeat at Hastings in 1066.

Other less distinct groupings hint at further hoard sources and this aspect of the fuller corpus would repay more detailed analysis. It cannot be assumed, however, that all coins of the reigns represented in these putative hoards originated in them, for isolated finds are no doubt also included and some may be distinguishable by differences in patina even after four centuries. There are virtually no duplicates in the collection, which suggests that Cotton did not acquire or retain all the coins from a hoard and collected essentially on a one-of-each basis. While the profiles of some of the source hoards are clear, mint and/or moneyer representation in his collection are not necessarily that of any given hoard as a whole. The rarer mints will be over-represented compared with the larger or more local mints present in greater numbers, and Cotton's selection will also have depended on what coins were already represented in his collection, thus further distorting the evidence and increasing the difficulties in identifying the locations of the finds from those mixed with coins from other sources in Cotton's collection.

36 Dolley 1954, 76 and 78, suggested that some of the restored coins were stolen pieces which had found their way to other collections, but most if not all were probably among the 'confused' Cotton material delivered to the museum. Gifford notes p. 20 'the above 8 [Pegge entries] are in y Mus, with which came the following [Gifford entries]' and p. 24, 'The first [of two Pegge entries] brought to & put into y Museum and just below 'The second was found'. It is possible that others remained from those days among the early unregistered material in the museum whose provenance could not be established.

37 Dolley 1954, 78; Van der Meer 1994, 225.

38 As none of the coins of Edward the Elder were in 'frames' (see 'Coin containers' section below), any coins of Athelstan from this find (if they have survived) are likely to be among the coins in the Corpus which have been weighed.
It was noted by Dolley and Strudwick that the collection is biased in favour of coins struck on or north of the Thames, and they suggested that this showed that the collection had been built up in the main from local finds around Cotton’s family seat in Huntingdonshire. The question of bias is too complex to be debated here, but the predominance of hoards from north of the Thames, which contributes so strongly to the content of the Cotton collection, is a matter of chance – within a relatively short time-span the incidence of hoards need not conform to any perceived norm. It may be accepted that Cotton, like most collectors, acquired some local finds, but the Peiresc evidence now shows that the bulk of the collection is unlikely to have been built up in this way. Cotton’s acquisitions were not made evenly throughout his life, as such a method of acquisition could be expected to reflect. A large part of it had been secured by 1606, and most of it a few years before that. Even postulating an early start, it seems unlikely that Cotton could have built up so large and representative a collection based principally on local finds. The acquisition profile would, however, be explicable if Cotton, like other early collectors, had purchased one or more cabinets of previous antiquaries and then added individual coins or parcels from hoards whenever they appeared locally or on the open market. Cotton had acquired the manuscripts and notebooks of some of his friends after their deaths and it is likely that he made additions to his coin collection in the same way. Even some of the hoard coins could derive from these earlier cabinets. Relatively little is known about English collections in the sixteenth century, and even less about the detail of their content, so it is not possible at the moment to establish any earlier pedigree for Cotton’s Anglo-Saxon coins. It seems probable that Cotton acquired Aske’s collection of British Iron Age coins. As has been seen, he acquired coins from Peiresc and he employed agents to seek out coins for him. None of the Cotton coins examined are pecked, so it is unlikely that he acquired coins from the Viking area and this conclusion is supported by the presence in his collection of just one coin of Cnut. This also confirms that the small groups of coins of Cnut’s sons and the coins of Æthelred II were also English single or multiple finds.

Curation of the collection

It is known that Cotton concerned himself personally with the running of his library and maintained a record of loans, crossing items off when they were returned. An undated note in Cotton’s hand describes the internal arrangements of the double-fronted cabinet in which coins and other small items were kept. It had eight leaves and two drawing boxes with the third leaf on the first (left?) side ‘contayning Coyns of the Saxon kings som in silver som in gold’. A few coins were housed in drawers dispersed among the book presses, but may not have included any Anglo-Saxon ones. Nothing further is recorded about how they were arranged and labelled, if at all, and this need not have remained the same throughout Cotton’s lifetime. Some clues are provided by the Peiresc lists.

It may be asked which of the two lists, Tate’s alphabetical or Peiresc’s geographical and chronological, represented Cotton’s arrangement of his collection? At first sight, Peiresc’s would seem to be more in keeping with Cotton’s emphasis on the history of his country, and that is how he arranged his draft catalogue in 1617. Tate’s list, with its inserting of omitted coins, might suggest that he had been converting another arrangement into an alphabetical one, but the curious inclusion of coins in the regular sequence numbered ‘00’ without numbers prompts a different and probably better interpretation. He could have been listing a collection which had been numbered but to which some coins had been added at their alphabetical places later, but no re-numbering had been done: the marginal additions were recent acquisitions which had not yet
been put into their alphabetical positions because of the bother of shifting around the existing coins. Looking again at Peiresc’s list does suggest that he could be re-arranging the position of some of the coins in his fair copy, although the disadvantages of the traditional alphabetical system for his main historical purpose may have caused Cotton to change the arrangement of his coin collection then or later. The readings of coin legends in the two lists not infrequently differ which suggests that Tate and Peiresc were deciphering the readings for themselves, not copying from a list or labels written by Cotton.

What of the kingdom and reign attributions – were they Cotton’s or Peiresc’s? The marginal notes made by Peiresc suggest that he was basically transcribing Cotton’s reign attributions, but occasionally and perceptively querying them in cases he thought doubtful. Cotton is said to have supervised the selection of plates for Speed in 1611 and virtually acted as its editor, but in his draft catalogue he makes a number of pertinent comments which shows he has formed independent views of his own, for example querying Speed’s attribution of the Enred of Northumbria (no. 4) to Redwald of the East Angles. The selection of the coins in his collection implies considerable numismatic knowledge and expertise on Cotton’s part, although if he had acquired the cabinets of earlier collectors some of the credit may initially be due to them. To choose one coin of each reign, type, mint and moneyer requires that the legends were read and broadly understood and this is confirmed in the cases where there are near duplicates. Careful examination shows that they have both been retained because there is some difference between them in spelling or other details. Just as elsewhere in his collection Cotton enjoyed curiosities and kept a surprising number of blistered coins also simply because they were different. Peiresc’s reign attributions do generally reflect Cotton’s, although he sometimes queries them, and these errors are fully discussed by van der Meer and noted throughout the Corpus.

Coin containers

Evidence for the housing of individual coins is found in Pegge’s letter to David Casley, the curator of the Cotton collection, which precedes his 1748 inventory. He writes ‘All [the coins] that were not in Frames have their weight annex’d’. If Pegge was careful to weigh all the others, which there is no reason to doubt, the absence of weights may be taken as an indication that these coins were in frames. As it stands this statement might be understood to imply picture frames containing groups of coins, but Pegge mentions a frame in the inventory itself on p. 4 in connection with the East Anglian coin of Beornwulf of Mercia (no. 33) which describes ‘Head very rude, upon ye Ivory frame it is call’d ‘Conulf Rex’, and to that Prince [Coenwulf of Mercia, 796–821] I therefore here refer it, but q’.

It would be reasonable to assume that the other unweighed coins were also contained in similar individual ivory frames, possibly with the appropriate king’s name inscribed on the rim, although the frames may not have been of uniform material or design. Whether any additional details also appeared it is impossible to say, although space would have been limited. These frames recall the ivory and wooden cases used to contain small precious objects such as relics and early sixteenth-century portrait miniatures. As Pegge gives details of both sides of the coins, these frames were such as to permit both sides of the coin to be seen and recorded. No glazing is mentioned.

Frames of this type are also found as coin containers in other contemporary collections. Abraham van der Doort in his inventory of Charles I’s collection c.1640 notes that the king had shown him 27 gold coins in ‘black turned hoops’ (i.e. ebony ring-mounts) which had been the

46 See Peiresc’s comment on p. 244 under the heading ‘Nummi Saxonici’ above coins of the East Anglian kings, Athelstan and Edmund (nos 49–54, 56–8 and 65), that although their older, larger, lettering does not allow them to be attributed to the kings of England with those names, it is not easy to place them.
47 Tate 1992, 179 (n. 8).
48 See, for example, Corpus nos 50–1, 53–4 and 60–2 of the East Anglian kings.
49 Van der Meer 1994.
50 Broken coins were almost certainly not in frames even though they were not weighed. The sceat (no. 1) was also probably not framed. It was normal practice (for example in BMC) not to give the weights of damaged coins. They are excluded from the list of framed coins.
51 Foskett 1963, 37, 45 and pl. 4 (the miniature by Hans Holbein of Anne of Cleves).
property of his older brother Henry, Prince of Wales (1594-1612), probably from the magnificent ebony and ivory cabinet containing classical coins belonging originally to Abraham Gorlaeus (1549-1609) of Delft which he had purchased in 1612.\textsuperscript{52} It would seem that the ‘frames’ which contained some of the Cotton coins are likely to have been similar ring-mounts with broad enough borders to have identifications written on them. As Pegge did not remove them they had probably been fixed closed and did not have screw fittings as some of their latter-day plastic successors. It seems likely that they were removed soon after the coins reached the British Museum and either then, or later, when the connection of the scraps of broken ivory frames with one of the foundation collections had been forgotten, were not thought worthy of preservation. Today there is no trace of them in the Departments of Coins and Medals or Prehistoric and Later Europe. The diagnostic frames are likely to have been removed by the thieves before selling any stolen Cotton coins so none appear to have survived.

The coins likely to have been in frames in 1747 are: Coenwulf (no. 25), Beornwulf (no. 33), Burgred (nos 37, 39, 41, 44), Athelstan I of East Anglia (nos 55, 56), Edmund of East Anglia (nos 65, 66), St Edmund (no. 67), St Martin of Lincoln (no. 69), St Peter of York (no. 70), Ecgbereht (no. 78), Æthelwulf (no. 80), Athelstan (nos 127, 130), Eadwig (no. 140), Æthelred II (nos 153, 155), Harthacnut (nos 161, 175, 176), Harold I (nos 167, 168, 169), Edward the Confessor (nos 181, 184, 193). Both coins listed in 1606 and others apparently acquired later were still framed in 1747, indicating that they do not represent coins obtained from a particular earlier source. It is clear from the list that, as they stood in 1747, the frames did not contain a representative cross-section of the coins or the most rare and choice specimens among them. It is notable that none of the numerous coins from the Edward the Elder hoard group were in frames while the issues of Cnut’s sons are well represented. There might have been more than one kind of frame and some of the coins could have been removed from their frames for various purposes long before Pegge saw them. Some of the frames may have been removed when coins were drawn for inclusion in numismatic books, but some of the coins illustrated in Speed were in frames. Whatever the reasons for framing and deframing the coins, it seems to have been Cotton’s own practice, perhaps influenced by an earlier collector whose cabinet he had acquired, or what he had seen elsewhere in antiquarian circles.

Losses from the collection

In theory, coins recorded in Cotton’s collection earlier in his life need not necessarily have been retained by him until his death, and some could have been lost in the Ashburnham House fire of 1731, although that has never been established. Most of the losses seem to have been the result of theft. Of the 165 Cotton coins noted in the Peirsic and Tate lists up to 1606, sixty did not survive in the collection to be incorporated into the museum by Gifford in 1756, an overall loss of about 36%. Taking account only of the coins of the eighth and ninth centuries (including with them the few coins of Viking Northumbria of the early tenth century) the losses rise to the startling figure of about 68%. The loss of manuscripts during Cotton’s lifetime is estimated at 10%.\textsuperscript{53}

For the period between 1606 and 1631 we have much poorer evidence, knowing of only a small proportion of the acquisitions and the total number of survivors after the losses by theft. As far as the evidence of the survivors goes, the profile of the later acquisitions does not replicate that of the collection before 1606. There is no sign of hoards on the scale evident in the pre-1606 collection and there is a larger proportion than before of coins of the eighth and ninth centuries compared to those of the tenth and eleventh. It is likely that the different rate of losses between the pre- and post-900 series was similar among the later acquisitions, so that coins from the two earlier centuries are likely to have been a greater proportion of the overall acquisitions after 1606 than they had been before that date. Given the bias in thefts towards the earlier coins, the overall loss from the post-1606 acquisitions was probably greater than the 36% it had been from the pre-1606

\textsuperscript{52} Strong 1986, 198–9. Cotton knew Prince Henry well and probably influenced him to begin making a coin collection c.1611, and thus is likely to have known the ebony hoops and ivory tables containing the Gorlaeus coins.

\textsuperscript{53} Tite 1997, 285.
collection. Because of the different profile of the post-1606 collection (see end of the ‘Growth of the collection’ section above), it is not possible to calculate the number and percentage losses from the number of survivors of the later additions with any degree of certainty, and thus to arrive at the size of the complete scale of losses from the collection overall.

The absence of any inventories of the collection between 1606 and 1748 means that it is only from the appearance of probable Cotton coins in other collections that a terminus ante quem can be set to their theft. It is clear from the fate of the Pendraed that even during Cotton’s own lifetime items borrowed were not always returned and no doubt there were other losses, but they only begin to be traceable in the early eighteenth century. While this horizon is to a large extent the result of the necessary detail then becoming easier to obtain, it is also inherently likely that thefts from the collection became a more serious problem after the death in 1702 of Sir John Cotton, who had taken a personal interest in the coin collection. There is some contemporary evidence, but much of it is available because several of the large collections formed in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were either donated to public institutions, where they still survive, or were not dispersed until a century later, when sale catalogues are more explicit, allowing coins in modern collections to be traced with greater certainty. Pegge’s inventory of 1748 may even have been prompted by a recognition that there had been recent serious thefts rather than a realisation of the cumulative effect of steady attrition over the years. The postscript to his introductory letter is less than clear on this point, remarking that he feared that Cotton’s collection ‘had been plundered of part of its Treasure some time since he liv’d’, drawing particular attention to the fact that fifteen of the 34 Cotton coins illustrated by Speed were missing. Although a few additional pieces disappeared between 1748 and 1756, the bulk of the thefts possibly occurred between 1702 and 1747. The greater losses among the rarer coins of the eighth and ninth centuries, and the abstraction of choice rarities like the coin of Launceston (no. 147) among the later ones, indicate that the thefts were not the work of opportunist thieves, but that the collection was selectively targeted by persons with expert knowledge. As the Cotton collection was never easy of access, this suggests that they were also known and trusted.

Even before the Peiresc material became available it was recognised that Cotton coins were probably represented in some of the great eighteenth-century collections, particularly that of William Hunter (1718–83). Since he had begun to collect seriously only in 1770, after the date when the remnants of the Cotton collection were already in the British Museum, he must have acquired the probable Cotton coins through some intermediate collection(s). A number of Hunter’s sources are known but they were not identified for individual Anglo-Saxon coins in SCBI 2 (Glasgow). Coins were certainly purchased for him at the sale of coins from the collection of James West (1704–72), one-time President of the Royal Society, at Langfords in 1773. In the sale catalogue most of the coins are listed only by reign and nothing more, but West had compiled dated manuscript lists of his collection in 1744, now among the Banks papers in the Royal Mint. The coins are listed there in somewhat greater detail, though not always fully enough for comparison, but 25 of the eighth- to early tenth-century coins are accompanied by impressions of one or both sides. Although these impressions have some imperfections and West has touched up details with pen and ink, they approach the usefulness of photographs and allow coins to be identified with certainty in other collections, many of them in Hunter’s. In one case the transmission from Cotton through a drawing in the Carpentras manuscript via West to Hunter can be proved absolutely, adding weight to other cases where the link from West to Cotton cannot be demonstrated for certain (Cuthred of Kent, no. 7, Pl. 14, 1–4 respectively).

At least fifteen coins in West’s collection match missing Cotton coins and are now in the Hunter and other collections, as detailed in the Corpus. In other cases where the descriptions are

54 Tite 1992, 181.
55 For the purposes of this paper it is assumed that the Anglo-Saxon coins in these collections were acquired by the original collector.
56 Pagan 2003, 158.
57 Dolley and Strudwick 1954, 311, noted a number of Cotton coins in the Hunter collection.
58 Macdonald 1899, xvi and xlviii, noted that Hunter’s instructions for purchases at the West sale survived in the Glasgow archives, but these were not available to Dr Robinson when writing SCBI 2.
inadequate and there are no impressions a connection cannot be proved, but more Cotton coins are likely to be among them and purchased at his 1773 sale. It should be emphasised, however, that not all of West's Anglo-Saxon coins can be matched in the current Cotton corpus. Some could be Cotton coins acquired after 1606 which did not survive in the collection until 1748, but others are more likely to have been acquired from elsewhere. As shown in the Corpus other Cotton coins passed via the West collection to other collections such as Southgate and Tyssen, several ending up in the British Museum. West also donated a number of Anglo-Saxon coins to the Bodleian Library in 1733. It is possible that no. 26, in the Ashmolean Museum, is one of these coins. Even if this were so, it is not possible to establish whether the other Cotton coins in West's list of 1744 were acquired before or after 1733.

West was not the only collector to acquire stolen Cotton coins, as is shown in Table 1. A number reached other prominent early collections such as those of the 2nd Duke of Devonshire (1672–1729) and the 8th Earl of Pembroke (c.1656–1733), as well as those of other scholar collectors. In these cases the numbers are small, but other Cotton coins may be unrecognisable or be unknown because they were among the acquisitions of Cotton's later years. The person or person stealing Cotton coins to sell is unknown, and until there is further evidence it would be unfair to speculate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Cotton coins in eighteenth-century collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire 1729, 1: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne Willis 1731, 1: 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke 1733, 1: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West 1744, 15: 7, 9, 24, 35, 40, 15, 16, 21, 28, 30, 32, 36, 45(?) , 51, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise 1750 (book), 1: 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyre 1764, 1: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter 1783, 6: 2, 9, 24, 35, 40, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne 1791, 1: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodson 1794, 1: 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate 1795, 4: 16, 21, 28, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyssen 1802, 8: 3, 7, 16, 30, 45, 51, 61, 156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven Cotton coins that Gifford transferred into the British Museum after 1756 (nos 37, 39, 77, 80, 99, 126, 153) do not appear in the Anglo-Saxon catalogues of 1887 and 1893. The only recorded coin of the Edward the Elder's Hand type of Fugel (no. 99) must have been stolen and has never been seen again. The rest of the missing coins were almost certainly not stolen but, having lost their identity shortly after their arrival, as explained above, were probably among the coins disposed of in exchanges or sales of museum 'duplicates' in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Identifications in modern collections

It is only in the case of the coins transferred to the British Museum in 1756 that there is direct transmission from Cotton's collection into a surviving one. In all other cases the establishment of a Cotton pedigree is a matter of deduction. As coins are mass-produced objects, it is in only a limited number of cases that identifications between coins in Cotton's collection and those in modern sources can be established with absolute certainty in the absence of true images and weights. The accuracy of legends and stopping given in both the early written and pictorial sources cannot be relied upon, especially if they went through one or more transcriptions or stages of copying. In comparing the available data with extant coins it would be possible in some cases to reject a true identity because certain details do not match or to dismiss differences as errors and propose an identity where none exists. Decisions in such cases are rarely clear-cut and are a matter

59 SCBI 9, xiii.
of individual judgement. Coins from later hoards and provenanced finds are obviously non-starters, but an early pedigree is not sufficient in itself to establish a Cotton provenance. Coins from the hoards which were the sources of some of the Cotton coins may have been acquired by other contemporary collectors and so passed down into later cabinets, creating problems in identifying the Cotton specimen among several similar coins or even die-duplicates with equally venerable pedigrees. Neither can coins with apparently only short modern histories be ruled out, as the Pendraed demonstrates.

To avoid lengthy discussion of each coin in the Corpus, four categories have been adopted to indicate the degree of likelihood of an identification. In the first category it is said that the Cotton coin is the named coin in a modern collection or publication. This category is narrowly defined and includes only those pieces transferred directly to the British Museum from the Cotton collection in 1756 and those coins of which realistic drawings exist or whose descriptions or drawn physical characteristics are specimen-unique, for example those with holes or illegible areas in the same position. In the second category it is said that the Cotton coin is probably the named coin. These are coins where the descriptions fit acceptably, they are the only known eligible coin and almost always have an early pedigree, often in a collection in which other Cotton coins are known to have been found. In the third category it is said that the Cotton coin is possibly the one named, where one candidate is more likely, but the evidence is not so strong or there are greater problems in reconciling readings. In the final category Cotton coins are described as ‘not traced’ when there is more than one, sometimes many, possible candidates or none at all. In some cases in this category an identity may be suggested in the commentary where there is insufficient evidence for it to be placed in the main entry or where one of two candidates is probably the Cotton coin but it is not possible to say which. Eligible coins with no claim for consideration beyond correct readings are not cited. There are grey areas between all of these categories and where the line is drawn is often a subjective decision, but it is hoped that enough detail is given in the Corpus to allow readers to reach their own conclusions.

It is currently possible to identify 166 out of the 204 Cotton coins known. One hundred and fifty-nine in public collections, mentioned in the main entries of the Corpus, are listed in Table 2. Less secure candidates discussed in the commentaries below each entry are not included. In some of the latter cases the choice is almost certainly between coins in just two public collections, but these are not listed in the table.

### Table 2. Cotton coins in public collections

| Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 4: | 12, 26, 29, 71 |
| Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, 1: | 10 |
| Hunterian Museum, Glasgow, 8: | 2, 9, 24, 35, 40, 48, 82, 105 |
| Leeds University, 1: | 19 |
| Berlin, State Museum, 1: | 22 |

### Conclusions

With the discovery of the Peiresc manuscripts in The Hague, the evidence now available for Cotton’s collection of Anglo-Saxon coins is exceptionally extensive and detailed. A total of 204 coins can be listed and classified according to modern scholarship with a fair degree of certainty. The size of the collection before serious losses by theft is still uncertain. Identifying the coins in modern collections and publications is more problematic, but 166 coins can now be traced either certainly or at least possibly. Many questions about the collection discussed above and in the Corpus have not been fully resolved and much work remains to be done on all aspects of the Cotton collection of Anglo-Saxon coins.
Notes on the compilation and order of information given in the Corpus

The coins are silver or base-silver pennies except for the gold mancus of Pendrad (no. 13); nos 1–3 and no. 5 are sceattas (pennies on small, thick, silver or base silver flans) and no. 4 is a styca (similar on a base-metal flan with little or no silver). They are listed according to modern attributions and classifications followed by North number and references to other standard works. Dating follows North. The inscriptions are then transcribed as they appear in the more detailed Peiresc list (vol. II, pp. 255–68) unless otherwise stated. The shapes of individual letters are usually carefully delineated in the manuscript and have been taken into account in establishing the identity of the coins in modern collections, but cannot be reproduced here. Contraction marks have not normally been shown. Runic letters are not always correctly transcribed. Any significant differences in the Tate list (Peiresc vol. II, pp. 247–50) are mentioned in the comments below each entry. Ligatured letters are denoted by underlining. The legends of coins which appear only in the Pegge 1748 inventory or other sources are transcribed from them in the same way. The presence or absence of initial marks and punctuation follow the manuscripts, where their inclusion is inconsistent. The complexity of the punctuation (e.g. under Offa) and its positioning cannot be fully reproduced although it is taken into consideration in matching coins in modern collections. No weights are recorded in Peiresc, but where weights are given in Pegge 1748 they are noted; weights of coins in modern collections are not quoted in the commentary unless they are material to the discussion. The legends are followed by citations in selected early manuscript and printed sources in chronological order of writing or publication, and then by the identification of the coin in modern collections under the categories of likelihood discussed above. The commentary below each entry includes regal attributions in the Peiresc manuscript different from those currently accepted and possible, but less secure, identifications with coins in modern collections.

Principal manuscript and early printed sources with abbreviations

References are made systematically in the Corpus to the various Peiresc manuscripts, the Pegge manuscript of 1748, Speed 1611 and Fountaine 1704 (where probable). Other sources are mentioned in the commentary below each entry as necessary.


CC Charles Combe’s manuscript notebook compiled c.1774–82, with a few later additions, in the library of the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum (see M under ‘Modern publications’ below).

TC Robert Bryer’s manuscript copy made in 1812 of Taylor Combe’s annotated plates, the property of the British Numismatic Society, deposited in the library of the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum.

D’E Plate prepared for Sir Simonds D’Ewes in 1649, National Library of Ireland MS 8390(4). (See Pagan 1987, 176. Citations are made from a photocopy of the plate kindly made available by Hugh Pagan.)


P Pegge manuscript in the library of the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum, 1748 (followed by page/number on the page if given, see D&S 1 below).


PC Peiresc manuscript in Carpentras, 1608 (see Sturdy 1983).

PC(G) Coins in the Pegge manuscript added by Rev. Andrew Gifford after 1756.

PH Peiresc manuscript in The Hague, 1606. All the references are to vol. II, except for no. iv in Appendix 2, which is from vol. I; entries are cited by page/number on the page if given (see D&S 1 below).


RN Notebook of Rev. Rogers Ruding, British Library Additional MS 18093, recording coins in the British Museum and Southgate’s collection before 1795. (I owe this reference and details to Hugh Pagan.)


W Loose unnumbered sheets listing Anglo-Saxon coins in the collection of James West (1704–72), compiled by him and dated 29 August and 10 September 1744, among the Sarah Sophia Banks papers in the library of the Royal Mint. Citations below are to the later version.


Early undocumented and unprovenanced acquisitions by the British Museum are noted as before 1782 (present in the Charles Combe manuscript), before 1812 (in the Taylor Combe manuscript) or before 1838 (present in the collection before systematic registration began in 1838 and, as they are not included in Taylor Combe, almost certainly between 1812 and 1838).
References to pedigrees and sales

Generally, references are confined to the most recent owner and, following 'from', other early collections or sales through which the coin is known to have passed. The first day of the sale only is mentioned. Lot numbers are given if these are known, but in some cases the sale of origin may be recorded but many lots are not described in sufficient detail for individual coins to be identified. Complete pedigrees have not been attempted.

Bird. 1974  Glendining. 20 November
Bergne. 1873  Sotheby. 20 May
Boyne. 1843  Sotheby. 19 July
Boyne 1. 1896  Sotheby. 21 January
Brownie. 1791  Sotheby. 16 March
Cuff, 1854  Sotheby. 8 and 26 June
Carlyon-Britton 3, 1918  Sotheby. 11 November
Dimsdale. 1824  Sotheby. 6 July
Lockett 1 and 7, 1955/1958  Glendining. 6 June/4 November
Montagu. 1895  Sotheby. 18 November
Murdoch. 1903  Sotheby. 31 March
Ryan 2, 1952  Glendining. 22 January
Southgate, 1795  Leigh and Sotheby sale catalogue without date, collection sold before sale to Samuel Tyssen. The British Museum acquired a number of his coins directly.
Warne. 1889  Sotheby. 24 May
West, 1773  Langford. 19 January. Few coins can be identified individually in the sale so coins are cited from his 1744 manuscript inventory (see W above).

Principal modern publications cited and abbreviations

(See also ‘References’, below, p. 202.)
Publications are cited by their author and year or abbreviation.

B  C.E. Blunt, ‘The coinage of Offa’, in R.H.M. Dolley (ed.), Anglo-Saxon Coinage (London. 1961), 39–62. Coins are cited by the number in his list, which can refer to more than one coin. Although this paper is not a corpus, Blunt notes how many coins of each type he has seen.
Bl Blunt 1958.
Bo 2 J. Booth, ‘Monetary alliance or technical co-operation? The coinage of Berhtwulf of Mercia (840–52)’, in M.A.S Blackburn and D. Dumville (eds), Kings, Currency and Alliances (Woodbridge, 1998), 63–103.
D&S 1 Dolley and Stradwick 1954.
D&S 2 Dolley and Stradwick 1955–7 [with C.E.Blunt(f)] and F.E(imore) J(ones)]. Emendations and additions are given in the ‘Appendix’ to Martin 1961 but it should be noted that more are now required.
M Martin 1961.
St Sturdy 1983.
SCBI Sylloge of the Coins of the British Isles, followed by the volume number, short collection identification and coin number.
SCEATTAS, late 7th to early 8th centuries

1. Uncertain Series. P 25/2. This coin is stated in P to have no inscription and a standing figure holding two crosses; the type on the other side is not described. British Museum, not identified.

No weight is given in Pegge 1748. Gilford did not annotate P 25 headed Nummi incerti with his usual note that the three coins on it had, or had not, been transferred to the British Museum, but the other two coins are present in its trays. It is therefore likely that this coin, the only Southumbrian sceat certainly in Cotton's collection, is one of the five unprovenanced pre-1838 acquisitions of various Secondary series with this type, but no inscription (BMC nos 89, 99, 108, 111, 172).

Uncertain series. See Appendix, i.

NORTHUMBRIA

EADBERHT, 737–58

2. No moneyer. N 177, Bo class A (i). EADBERHTVF. PH 255. This coin is possibly SCBl 2 (Glasgow), no. 134, almost certainly ex Hunter 1783, Bo 11.

The coin is attributed in PH to Kent and dated 726 (as for Eadberht, 725-C.748). There are several eligible coins of which the above is the most likely.

3. No moneyer. N 178, Bo class B (ii). EOTBEREDTVS. S 329, F VIII, 1. This coin is possibly BMC no. 5, ex Tyssen 1802, Bo 17.

The spelling of the king's name on the coin in the Speed illustration means that it cannot be identified with PH 255 (no. 2).

ÆTHELRED I, Second reign, 789–96

Ceolbald. See Appendix, ii.

EANRED, c.810–40 or c.830 or earlier–c.854

4. Edwine. N 186, +EANRED REX / +EADWINI. PH 250/106 and 256. Possibly S 305 & 332, F VIII, 1. This coin is possibly BMC no. 92, acquired before 1812.

The reverse type is drawn only on PH 256, a cross patee with rays in the angles. The coin is described in PH 250 as 'gold' and in PH 256 as 'a gold coin of a king unknown to me if it is not possible to read it as KEANREDVS, the king of the Mercians of that name who died in AD 704' (i.e. Cenred, 704-C.709). D&S 1 suggested that the Speed coin was possibly BMC no. 92. This identification is likely as both have pellets in the reverse cross angles, the Speed obverse legend ending RE is explicable as the X of REX on BMC no. 92 is only partially visible and the latter's obverse cross with pelleted arms could well be represented by the second curious version shown in Speed. For this coin to be equated with the Peiresc entry requires the rays in the latter to be accepted as a misrepresentation of the pellets. This, on balance, seems just preferable to postulating either another coin (possible) or a gold forgery (unlikely).

ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

ECGBERHT, 732/4–58

5. Under King Eadberht. N 192, Bo class v, 20. EOTBEREDTV / ECGBERH. P 8/3 (wt 18 gr), F VIII, 4. This coin is BMC no. 4.

F misreads the obverse as -VIBEREHTV, and P has R for A on the reverse.

Under King Eadberht. See Appendix, iii.

KENT

CUTHRED, 798–807


This coin is attributed in PH to Cuthred of Kent (740–56). It is described by Pegge in 1748 as 'a broken coin' (an expression often meaning a fragmentary one). D'E shows that some damage had already occurred by 1649.


The HE is ligatured (correctly) on PH 255 but not on PH 248.

ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY

CEOLNOTH, 833–70

Pegge (PA 1772, 14–5) annotates his illustration, copied from Fountaine. “This penny now extant in the cabinet of the Hon. James West Esq . . . weights 20gr” and notes that another example is in the Duke of Devonshire’s cabinet (weight not quoted). The impressions in West’s 1744 manuscript show that his coin is certainly the specimen now in the Hunterian, whose weight is recorded in both Ruding pl. 13, 2 and in SCBI as 19.8 gr. The Devonshire specimen (via Cuff 1854, 396, where no weight is given) is BMC no. 39, whose weight is recorded in the catalogue as 20.5 gr. The incomparable weights are almost certainly to be explained as an error by Pegge in 1772 in giving the weight of the Devonshire to the West specimen. Pegge also notes that the West specimen was that engraved by Speed and Fountaine, confirming that the Cotton coin is the West/Hunter specimen rather than BMC no. 39. The curious formula “now extant” suggests that Pegge knew or suspected that this coin had been Cotton’s.


PLEGMUND, 890–923


No description or drawing of the types is given in PH 247, but the moneyer is so far known for Plemmund only in N 256. Apart from a fragment in poor condition, Bird 1974, 50 (probably a recent find), the only relevant coin in CTCE is SCBI 50 (St Petersburg), no. 125, ex Reichel 1858. Reichel acquired coins in western Europe, but no earlier provenance of this coin is recorded in SCBI. While the G on the obverse of this specimen might easily be mistaken for an E, the reverse clearly reads BER. The form BIER ... recorded in PH 247 is in fact known among the Vatican hoard coins of the same type, so it would be unsafe simply to dismiss the reading as an error in transcription in PH. While allowing that an identity with the Reichel specimen is possible, the Cotton coin could be another missing specimen of this or even (although less likely) another type.


Peiresc comments, correctly, on PH 245 that this coin belongs to the period of Edward the Elder. Pegge (PA, p. 17) says that his illustration (based on Fountaine) shows “one of Sir Robert Cotton’s coins but is now lost, as many of his coins are, and consequently does not appear in the British Museum” (a formula copied by Ruding, pl. 13, 2). The only eligible coin in CTCE which reads MO is the Oxford coin. The engraving in F omits the R in the archbishop’s title (also copied by Ruding), which PH shows to be an error, and the differences in punctuation may probably be safely disregarded, but it remains possible that the Oxford coin could be a different specimen and the Cotton coin is still missing.

MERCIA

OFFA, 757–96


This coin is BM 1962, ex Christie, 30. v. 1961, 16 (purchased by C.E. Blunt for presentation to the museum).

Reading above from Speed, the Ds being a hybrid Roman D with a gap between the upright and long upper serif. Pegge notes in 1772 (PA p. 45), ‘The piece was formerly a part of the Cotton cabinet but is now secreted’ and remained so until the 1961 sale (Blunt and Dolley 1968, Tite 1992 and discussion on p. 176 above).


Ealhred. See Appendix, iv.

Eadberht. See Offa with Eadberht, Bishop of London, no. 21 below.

15. Eoba. N 306, B 52. EOB A / OFFA REX. PH 69, 101 and 271. F IX, 7, D’E. This coin is probably BMA no. 20, ex Evans 1915, ex Bergne 1873, 50 (wt 1.22 g, 18.9 gr), from Reichel d. 1803 (Ruding 4.14, wt. 19 gr), from West (1744, impressions).

The legend above follows PH 101; the other two entries omit the trefoil before EOBA and PH 69 has a quatrefoil of pellets between B and A. This coin is stated in PH 271 to have been found in the Narbonne region of France (date not given) and probably passed to Cotton from a French collection (see discussion on p. 174 above).

16. Ethelnoth. N. 326, B 96, St 5. +OFFA / REX / M / EL / NOD. PH 257, PC 118. This coin is BMC no. 48 (pierced and plugged), ex Tyssen 1802, ex Southgate 1795, from West (1744, impressions).

The hole in the coin shown in the PC drawing was still open in 1744 as it features as a blank in the same position in the West impressions of 1744, but it had been plugged before it reached the British Museum. D&M 1957 showed that BMC no. 48 is the coin illustrated in Britannia 1789 (vol. i, cxiv, pl. xvii) where Gough is discussing the discovery of an Offa penny at St Albans. Their statement that “From the hands of the actual finder the penny passed to the cabinet of James West, who was MP for St Albans” is, in the light of the Peiresc evidence, no longer tenable. The St Albans provenance could theoretically have been passed down from Cotton’s time to 1789, but such a transmission would be unique among his coins and must be regarded as unlikely. It seems more probable that Gough did not illustrate the actual coin found at
St Albans but, as was not uncommon practice among early antiquaries, used an engraving of a similar coin (the Cotton/West specimen, then in other hands). The Offa coin found at St Albans is thus almost certainly not the Cotton specimen, 

**BMC** no. 45, but is probably one of the three others of this type known to Blunt in 1961.

17. Ethelnoth. N 321, B 97. +O(3 pellets vertically) FFA / REX / m / E^EL / NOJd. PH 257, R 5, 23. This coin is possibly British Museum, ex Carlyon-Britton 1604, from Rebello (d. 1803). The British Museum coin was the only one of its type known to Blunt in 1961, but the stopping does not exactly match.

In 1961, there were three other coins of the same type known to Blunt: the Offa coin found at St Albans, and two others from the same property sold on the same day (Sotheby 8 April 1880, p. 36 lot 490). The earliest provenance given in the Carter-Britton sale catalogue is the Major Hyc collection, but in fact the coin came from an anonymous property sold on the same day (Sotheby 8 April 1880, p. 36 lot 490). Just before the start of the Major's lots on p. 37, the lot described as coming from an anonymous property sold on the same day (Sotheby 8 April 1880, p. 36 lot 490) just before the start of the Major's lots on p. 37.

18. Ibba. N 301, B 64. +OFFA REX / +IBBA / PH 257, P 3/2 (wt 18 gr). S 344, F VIII, 3. This coin is 

**BMC** no. 20.

19. Lul. N 337, B 114. St 4. +OFFA / REX / m / +HUL. PH 257, PC 118, F IX, 8, D'E. This coin is 

**SCBI** 21 (Leeds), no. 954 (pierced), ex Winchester collection 1954, from Eyre 1764. Study 1983 suggested that this coin was possibly **BMC** no. 52 but that coin is intact whereas the Leeds coin has a hole in exactly the same position as the coin drawn in **PC** 118. The collection of William Eyre (1698-1764), a Winchester lawyer, was formed in the early eighteenth century (**SCBI** 21, xxvi). D'E shows the hole not detailed in F.

20. Lulla. N 311, B 66. +OFFA / REX / +CULÉA. PH 255. P 3/3 (wt 20 gr), S 301, F VIII, 4. This coin is 

**BMC** no. 22 (two holes towards the edge diametrically).

**OFFA with EADBEARHT**, Bishop of London, d. c. 787-9

21. Bishop Eadberht. N 278, B 34. OFFM / EADBEARHT / PH 69. This coin is probably 

**BMC** no. 41, ex Southgate 1795, from Browne 1791, 22, from West (1744, impressions). PH lists this as another coin of Offa, but the attribution of the reverse to the bishop rather than a normal moneyer is now generally accepted.

**CYNETHRYTH**, wife of Offa

22. Ethelnoth. N 339, B 118. +EOBA / +CFNEARFREGIN. PH 250/108 and 258, S 345. This coin is probably 

**SCBI** 36 (Berlin), no. 71, ex Murdoch 1903, 22, ex Boyne 1896, 1118. PH 258/108 has Ys in the queen's name. This was the only coin of the type known to Blunt. The Speed coin is not as D&S 1954 stated, "almost certainly the Pembroke coin lot 16" as that coin, later Lockett 1 360, is of B 117.

**COENWULF**, 796-821

23. Biornferth. Canterbury, Group II A. N 347, BLS 35 or 36, +COENVWLF REX m / +BIORNFRED' MONETA. PH 247/25 and 258. This coin is possibly 

**BMC** no. 62 (BLS 36), acquired before 1838. On the usually less accurate PH 247 the moneyer's name is spelt with E not I, but both spellings are recorded on extant coins. The arrangement of the obverse legend, which distinguishes between the varieties BLS 35 and 36, is not detailed in PH. A coin with the BIORN- spelling is listed in the West 1744 inventory without descriptions of the types or impressions. **BMC** no. 62 (BLS 36) has the earliest known pedigree, but there are other candidates.

24. Ceolbald. London. N 355, BLS 94. +COENVWLF REX m / +CEOLBEALD. PH 247/19 and 258. This coin is probably 

**SCBI** 2 (Glasgow), no. 343, ex Hunter 1803, from West (1744, impressions). The inverted Ls in the moneyer's name distinguish the reverse of this coin from the only other known coin of the moneyer in the type for Coenwulf. A also inverted.

25. Deala. Canterbury, Group IVC. N 356, BLS 52. +COENVWLF REX m / DEAULA MONETA. PH 247/20 and 258, P 4/2. This coin is 

**BMC** no. 66. PH 247 has a pellet before the last L of the moneyer's name.

26. Diormod. Canterbury. Group III D. N 358. BLS 57(6). +COENVWLF REX m / +DIORMOD MONETA. PH 247/18 and 258. This coin is probably 

**SCBI** 9 (Oxford), no. 18, ex Bodleian (Wise 1750, pl. xvii, 2). (pl. 27, 6-7) The Oxford coin is the only eligible coin of the moneyer in the type listed in BLS. Thompson remarks in the introduction to **SCBI** 9 (Oxford), viii, that some of the coins in the Wise catalogue may have been those given by James West in 1733. There is no list of the West gift so an identity cannot be proved in the case of any particular coin, but this coin may well be one of the many Cotton coins which probably passed through his hands.

27. Eanmund. London. Group IB. N 342, BLS 19. CONVWLF REX / EANMVND. PH 247/25 and P 4/1 (wt 20 gr). This coin is 

**BMC** no. 95 (pierced). The error of the omission of the F in the king's name is perpetuated by ditto marks from PH 247/25-27.

28. Eoba. Canterbury. Group IB. N 342, BLS 9. CONVWLF REX / EOBA PH 247/27. This coin is probably 

**BMC** no. 96, ex Southgate 1795, from West (1744, impressions). For the misspelling of the king's name see previous coin.

29. Ethelnoth. Canterbury, Group IB. N 342, BLS 10. CONVWLF REX / EHLMOD. PH 247/26. This coin is possibly 

**SCBI** 9 (Oxford), no. 16, ex Browne Willis, 1742-6 or possibly to 1760. For the misspelling of the king's name see no. 27. The Oxford coin is the most likely of several possibilities. It appears in the Browne Willis notebook of 1731.

30. Lul. East Anglia. Early group. N 362, BLS 97. +COENVWLF REX m / +LUL. PH 247/22 and 258, S 347. F IV, 1. This coin is probably 

**BMC** no. 73, ex Tyssen 1802, ex Southgate 1795, from West (1744, impressions). The small differences in the details of the cross ends of PH compared with the BM/West coin are probably a matter of interpretation.
31. Tidheorht. Canterbury, Group IIIA. N 347, BLS 38. +COENVVLF REX M / +TIDBEARHT/MONETA. PH 247/23 and 258. This coin is possibly BMC no. 81, acquired before 1838, probably from West (1744, no impressions).

PH 247 omits the R in the moneyer’s name. There are two candidates in BLS: the Assheton specimen, ex Devonshire 1844 (1729), 22, and BMC no. 81. The coin in West 1744 (no impressions) was transcribed, probably in error. TIDBEARHT.

32. Wihtred. East Anglia. N 364, cf. BLS 108. +COENVVLF REX M / +EPIRA [PH. PH 247/21 and 258. This coin is probably the one in West (1744, impressions), not traced since.

The reading above follows PH 247. PH 258 has EPIRA. The West coin is a different specimen from the only coin of this moneyer in the type in BLS, BM ex Barnett 1935, ultimately from Rashleigh 1909 (1811), 46.

BEORNWULF, 823–5

33. Eadgar. East Anglia Type III. N 396, BLS 5. St 2. NULF REX D ES / +EAD / GAS. PC 118 and P 4/3. This coin is probably BMC no. 104.

The letters on P are merely adumbrated above; the S after DE is over a small 0. This coin was wrongly attributed to Ceolwulf I in PH, P (with a query), BMC and D&S 1954, but correctly in BLS and later. P notes “upon ye Ivory frame it is called “Conulf Rex”, and to that Prince I therefore here refer it, but q.” (see discussion of frames on pp. 180–181 above).


The legends above follow PH 247. PH 258 has EPIR. This coin is possibly the one in West (1744, impressions), not traced since.


This coin is probably BMC no. 133 with cross-and-pellets reverse which is the Dorking coin (with which its patina is compatible) and BMC no. 134 a darker coin with cross-and-annulets reverse which is the earlier acquisition.

BERHTWULF, 840–52


PH 247/14 has ZIGHEAH where this coin appears between the coins numbered 6 and 7 in the Tate list. It can be shown, from evidence too complex to rehearse here, that at some stage between the British Museum’s acquisition of coins from the Dorking 1817 hoard and the preparation of BMC, published in 1887, a cross-and-pellets coin from the hoard had changed places with the cross-and-annulets coin, an earlier acquisition illustrated on Ruding plate 7, 5, originally dated January 1803. It is therefore BMC no. 133 with cross-and-pellets reverse which is the Dorking coin (with which its patina is compatible) and BMC no. 134 a darker coin with cross-and-annulets reverse which is the earlier acquisition.

BURGRED, 852–74

PH 247 does not record sub-types and PH 259–60 does not differentiate between c) and d). PH 247 records all reverse legends without indication of line-breaks. The evidence of Pegge is accepted on these points. Fountaine is not cited for his reign because he says (p. 166) that the coins of Burgred (not individually identified) are mostly derived from the collection of Rev. George Hickes (1642–1715). The sources of these Hickes coins – a parcel from a hoard (?) or mixed, including Cotton coins (?) – are unknown.


Although P 5/1 was transferred into the BM by Gifford in 1756, it does not appear in BMC. There is no eligible coin of this moneyer in the British Museum with a trefoil of pellets before ETA.

38. Berlm (Burghelm?). Lunettes (a). N 423. BVRGRED REX / BERLM / MON / ETA. PH 247/8 and 260, and probably P 5/7 (wt 20 gr). This coin is BMC no. 169.

PH 247/8 has L for L. P 5/7 has six pellets after BERLM not recorded in either of the PH entries or on BMC no. 169 and so would appear prima facie to be a different coin, but see note at no. 41 for why this identity is accepted. BMC records the weight as 20.5 gr, as now.


The legends above follow PH 247. PH 259 and P 5/4 (with central hooked lines only) read incorrectly +BERHM for F before MON. P 5/4 apparently of type (d) is not BMC no. 189 as stated in D&S 1954 for that coin, as correctly stated in D&S 1955–7, as ex Bank of England, 1877. Cotton’s coin of Ciallaf was said by Gifford to have been put into the museum, but the only eligible coin in BMC is BMC no. 191 type (c), ex Tyssen 1802. There are a number of possible explanations, of which the most likely appears to be that the Cotton coin was disposed of as a ‘duplicate’ at some stage between the acquisition of the Tyssen coin and 1887, and is the pierced coin of type (d) weighing 21 ½ gr illustrated in RN before 1795.

40. Diarulf. Lunettes (c). N 426. BVRGRED REX / DIARVL / MONE / ETA. PH 247/13 and 259. This coin is possibly SCBI 2 (Glasgow), no. 373, ex Hunter 1783, from West 1774 (rev. drawing).

West 1744 has a drawing of the reverse only (no impressions), but reproduces only the central hooked lines of the type and has a pellet after ETA. The Hunter coin has no pellet after ETA, but there is a tiny pimple in the field which could have been mistaken for one and the hook-ends in West seems to reproduce weaknesses visible on this coin.
41. Diga. Lunettes (a). N 423. BVRGRED REX / +DIGA (6 pellets) / MON / ETA. PH 260 and probably P 5/5. This coin
is BMC no. 228. P 5/5 lacks the six pellets after the moneyer's name present on PH 260 and BMC no. 228 which
prima facie would indicate that it is a different coin. It appears, however, to be more likely that Pegge attached the six-pellet motif to the
wrong coin: P 5/7 of 'Berlm' (no. 38 above) has it, but BMC no. 169 does not, while P 5/5 of Diga lacks the motif, but
BMC no. 228 has it. It may be suggested that Pegge had made the mistake in transcribing rough notes he made in 1747
into the next version of them that he sent to Caseley on 13 February 1748.

Diga. See Appendix, v.

has a trefoil of pellets before and after ETA, but normal punctuation is not being recorded at this point in PH. Gifford
notes in 1756 that the coin recorded by Pegge in 1748 is missing.

This coin is BMC no. 250.

44. Dudwine. Lunettes (a). N 423. +BVRGRED REX - m / DVDPINE / MON / ETA. PH 247/15 and 259. P 5/6. This coin is
BMC no. 260. P 5/6 has a trefoil of pellets after ETA.

45. Eanired. Lunettes (a). N 423. +BVRGRED REX - / EANRED (inverted and retrograde) / MON / ETA. PH 247/16 and
260. This coin is probably West 1744 (impression of obverse only), but not traced later. PH 247 gives no indication of orientation. West 1744 sets out the reverse inscription showing the moneyer's name inverted and retrograde. There is no matching coin in Hunter. On both BMC no. 286, ex Tyssen 1802, and also SCBl 9 (Oxford), no. 29, illustrated Wise 1750, pl. XVII, 3, the moneyer's name is retrograde but not inverted, and neither matches the obverse impression in West (if that is from the Eanred coin and not one of the others from the group it serves to illustrate).

46. Hyssa. Lunettes (c) or (d). N 423. +BVRGRED REX - m / HYTTA / MON / ETA. N 423. PH 247/12 and 260. Not traced. The
above reverse reading is from PH 247, here, unusually, better than PH 260 which has +MLKTA. Fountaine (F III,
23) is type (d) but is probably not a Cotton coin.

47. Tata. Lunettes (c) or (d). N 426. +BVRGRED REX m / +TATA / MON / ETA. PH 247/9 and 259. Not traced. Fountaine (F III, 4) is type (c), but is probably not a Cotton coin. The Fountaine coin has a colon before MON, absent in PH, but this is not necessarily diagnostic as PH does not record normal punctuation here.

48. Wine. Lunettes (c). N 425. +BVRGRED REX m / VVHNE / MON / ETA. PH 247/11 and 259. S 308. This coin is
possibly SCBl 2 (Glasgow), no. 377, ex Hunter 1783.

Reading above follows PH 247; PH 259 dittoes m (in error) after REX. Speed (S 308) has + instead of m after REX, but
this has been overlooked rather than postulate that Cotton had a second specimen. There is no coin of Wine in
PH, but this is not necessarily diagnostic as PH does not record normal punctuation here.

EAST ANGLIA

In PH the second letter of the kings' name is transcribed variously as a D, a letter closer to thorn or, more usually, a rounded or pointed P; here the Roman letters D or P are used throughout. The Ns are sometimes retrograde or H, but all
appear here as normal Ns or H. Sometimes it is possible only to adumbrate the legends as transcribed in the manuscripts.

ATHELSTAN, c.825-45


50. Rernher (Regenhere). Pa II. N 444. +EPESLSTNI A / +HERNNPER. PH 244 and 250/128. P 13/1 (wt 22 gr). This coin
is BMC no. 15.

51. Rernher (Regenhere). N 444. Pa I. 1. +EPESLNI / +RERNNER. PH 244 and 250/127. This coin is probably BMC no.
14, ex Tyssen 1802, from West (1744, impressions).

In BMC no. 14 and West the second N of the moneyer's name is retrograde, but in both PH entries it is normal, probably in error.


The third letter of the reverse is transcribed as a sort of M with a bar across the base of the right-hand upright. The only coin of
the moneyer and type recorded by Pagan 1982, 58, is BMC no. 4, ex Tyssen 1802, which is in rough style, but has FELTTAH RG with the letters normally orientated. The Cotton coin appears to be missing.


PH 244, described by Peiresc as crassissime sculpta, has the I, T, A and R in the king's name inverted and PH 250 has the
complete obverse legend retrograde but no letters inverted and omits the G on the reverse. The only coin of this
moneyer and type recorded by Pagan 1982, 58, is BMC no. 4, ex Tyssen 1802, which is in rough style, but has FELTTAH RG with the letters normally orientated. The Cotton coin appears to be missing.

BMC no. 6.

PH 250 has REX, both PH have a bar through the forward limb of the N.
55. Eadnoth. N 440. Pa III, 1. +EDELSTANI / EADNOED MD. P 13/5. This coin is BMC no. 9. Pegge shows the first four letters of the king’s name individually reversed, whereas the complete legend is retrograde on BMC no. 9. This coin may be represented by F II, 22, which shows the reverse rather than the obverse legend retrograde, a form not recorded on any coin in Pagan 1982, 58–9.

56. Eadnoth. N 446/1. Pa I, 1. +EDELSTANI / +EADHOD MON. PH 244 and 250/130. P 13/4. This coin is BMC no. 7.

57. Thorthelm. N 440. Possibly Pa VI, 1 or II, 1. +EDELSTANI / +TORHTELM. PH 244 and 250/129. This coin is possibly BMC no. 16 or 17.

The PH transcriptions include no punctuation, but this cannot be relied upon as it is usually omitted in this series of entries. If the Cotton coin did in fact lack punctuation then BMC no. 16, ex Tyssen 1802, is a possibility, but if it did have punctuation BMC no. 17, ex Bank of England 1877, ex Robert Austen (d.1797), from West (1744, impressions) is likely. Other Cotton coins reached both these collections.

58. Thorthelm. N 440. Pa I, 1. EDELSTANI / ORTHELM. PH 244 and 250/126. P 13/6 (wt 21½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 18.

ÆTHELWEARD. c.845–55

The coins of this East Anglian king, unknown from the historical records, are attributed by Peiresc in PH 256, with reservations, to Æthelward (recte Æthelwald) Moll of Northumbria and in PH 257, again with reservations, to a king of Mercia (perhaps intending Æthelred d.716)?


PH has AEDELNOEL M. Depending on the form of punctuation, if any, there are several candidates, but none with a pedigree before the mid-nineteenth century except Ruding pl. 26, 1 (no weight), shown with an unbarred A in the king’s name, from the collection of Isaac Rebbello (d.1803). BMC no. 23 (with punctuation) ought to be ruled out because it sits on a ticket sourcing it to the Gravesend heard of 1838, and its details conform to those given in the accession registers for one of the coins from that find, but no weight is given. It does, however, lack the silvery appearance of Gravesend coins generally, having a uniformly black patina usually indicative of Cotton coins (although not exclusively). The Gravesend coin was probably disposed of as a duplicate.


PH 250 omits the V in the moneyer’s name and mistranscribes the runic O as Roman N.

61. Eadmund. N 450. Pa I, 1. AEBELVVEABD REX / EADMVND MN. PH 250/135. F II, 2, D’E. This coin is probably BMC no. 28 (chipped). ex Tyssen 1802, from West (1744 impression of rev. only).

PH 250/135 does not transcribe the legends, but just dittoes the previous coin (including the mistakes noted) and, as is normal practice in this list, includes no punctuation, so the absence of the trefoil of pellets after the MO does not rule out BMC no. 28. Pagan 1982, 69 mistranscribes the West specimen as having a single pellet after the MO and therefore does not equate it with BMC no. 28, but the West coin does have a trefoil of pellets and is chipped at the same place.


The contraction R is not recorded in Pagan 1982 for this reign, but there is no reason to reject Pegge’s transcription. The square C is a misinterpretation of the initial cross-on-step motif. D&S 1954 identified P 7/1 with BMC no. 28, but the obverse legend of the latter reads REX and its weight is recorded in BMC as 19.3 gr (see also at no. 61). Although Gifford noted that he had transferred into the British Museum this coin as well as the other by the same moneyer listed by Pegge (no. 60), no coin with this obverse reading was included in BMC in 1887. It had possibly been disposed of as a ‘duplicate’. Pagan 1982 does not list this second Cotton/Pegge coin individually, but it may be one of those in sales where full details for comparison are lacking.

63. Raegenhere. N 450. Pa I, 1. AEBELVVEABD REX / RAEXENEBE m (runic G). PH 250/136 and 257. F II, 1. This coin is probably BMC no. 34, acquired before 1812.

PH 257 attributes this coin with reservations to Mercia and PH 250 reads ENNEBEM RAEX. The end of the obverse legend was read in Pagan 1982 as RD, but can be interpreted as REX as in PH and BMC.

64. Twiega. N 454. Pa III, 1. AEBELVVEARD REX / TPICCÂ MON. PH 250/133 and 257. This coin is probably Ryan 1952, 655, from Devonshire 1844 (1729), 8.

Attributed in PH 257 with reservations to Mercia. The pellet before the A of the moneyer’s name identifies it as the Ryan coin.

EDMUND, 855–69


On PH 244 this coin appears in a short section headed Nummi Saxonicie and Peiresc comments that, although their older, much larger, lettering does not allow this coin and those of Athelstan (nos 49–54 and 56–8 above) to be attributed to Edmund and Athelstan of England (reigning in the tenth century), it is not easy to place them.


ST EDMUND, c.895–c.910

67. Elisimus. N 483. +SCEADYNE / +ELISMYSAAO. P 24/2. This coin is BMC no. 385.

Pegge comments ‘ye last E in the obverse may be an R’.

68. Eura. N 483. +SYCFRDN11 / EVVRAM HO. S 301. This coin is BMC no. 404, acquired before 1838.
VIKING INVADERS

ST MARTIN OF LINCOLN, c.925

ST PETER OF YORK, period c.905-c.910
70. Early issue. N 551. S-CPE /TRI MO quatrefoil of pellets above and below / +EBORACI CIV-. P(G) 24/3. This coin is BMC no. 1125.
71. Early issue. N 551. +1/SC1 PET/R / +EBORACI CI-. PH 245. This coin is probably SCBI (Oxford) 9, no. 228, ex Bodleian, but not in Wise 1750.
The drawing of the full obverse in PH and the trefoil of pellets at the end of the reverse legend identify the Cotton coin with Oxford no. 228 (Ruding pl. 29, 27, Appendix) and not no. 227 as stated in SCBI 9. (PL 27, 10-12)

ANLAF SIHTRICSSON, 941-5
PH 245 omits the M in the moneyer's name in error; it is included as H in PH 247. U denotes a squared-cornered motif occupying only the upper half of the height of the letters. F III, 2 is probably BMC no. 1091 despite the omission of the gamma-like motif at the end of the obverse legend.

73. Rathulf. N 542. ANLA (inverted) F CANAC / EA-BVF MONETA. PH 245 and 247/5. This coin is probably BMC no. 1097 / BMS no. 1256, acquired before 1783.

ERIC BLOODAXE, 952-4
This coin is probably F VIII, 2 despite a minor difference in stopping.

WESSEX

BEORHTRIC. 787-802
The Speed woodcuts appear to show punctuation as above, but it is uncertain. Two coins of the reign with a cross type reverse are now known: BMC East Anglia, no. 36 which can be ruled out as a later provenanced coin, and SCBI 2 (Glasgow), no. 528, ex Hunter, which has a single pellet in each angle (as North 558), while S 299 and D'E show three. West 1744 does not include such a coin. Fountaine read the coin as Speed did, but makes a mistake in the moneyer's name with F for E in HEARD. D&S 1954 considered that the differences could be overlooked and identified S 299 with the Hunter coin, but Blunt 1958, 129-131, considered them too material and preferred to conclude that the Speed/Cotton coin was now missing, and this is accepted here.

Ecghard. See Appendix, viii.

ECGBERHT, 802-39
The Canterbury monogram in the centre of the reverse is identified in PH 263 as Ecgbeorht's. Speed omits the I on the reverse in error. D&S 1954 suggest with a query that the museum coin was probably that illustrated by Speed and presented to the British Museum by Taylor Combe's widow. He did not mention it in his lists. The coin has the typically black patina of coins from the Cotton collection. It is very fragile and had probably deteriorated between Speed seeing it and the decision to exclude it from BMC in 1893.

This coin was transferred into the museum by Gifford in 1756, but does not appear in BMC. D&S 1954 quote C.E. Blunt's suggestion that this coin was the one drawn by Dymock, but in his later paper on the coinage of Ecgbearht in BM 28 (1958) at p. 468 he mentions the coin in the Dymock manuscript but gives its weight as '?' and does not mention any connection with Cotton. In SCBI 2 (Glasgow), published in 1961, C.E. Blunt is the source of the suggestion that no. 529 is 'probably one of the missing Cotton coins', but the Glasgow specimen (acquired in 1877 from the Wigan collection, essentially formed before 1869) is an intact coin weighing only 20.7 gr, so the identification is unlikely unless Pegge's usually reliable weighing was here at fault.

78. Tidbearht. N 573. +ECGBEARHT E / TIMBEARHT. P 8/2 (wt 18 gr). This coin is BMC no. 11 (chipped).
Pegge notes 'rudy & base mettle'.

ÆTHELWULF. 839-58
The Æthelwulf included in Speed's first edition was omitted from the next in 1623 and a Ludica (no. 35) not present in 1611 added. The Hunter coin SCB 2 (Glasgow), no. 547 was the only one of the type known to Taylor Combe in 1812, but it reads RE not REX and there are other illegible coins known.
80. Osmund. Canterbury. N 596. ÆD+ELVLF REX / OSMVND MONETA. PH 250/138 and 264. P 9/1. Not traced. PH 250/138 does not read the moneyer's name, but says it is the same type as the previous entry, which identifies it with PH 264. P 9/1 reads +E ELVLF REX / ... MOSM ... 'base mettle and broken'; Gifford annotates 'OSMVND. in ye centre SAXONVM'. Put into ye museum. The descriptions and lack of one suggest that this was a badly chipped or fragmentary coin. It does not appear in BMC and is not in the museum now, so it had probably been disposed of as a duplicate. RN records but does not illustrate or give a weight of a coin in the BM reading OSMVNDMO[ ] which is almost certainly the Cotton coin.

ALFRED, 871–99

There are several candidates.

82. Cuthberht. Two-line. N 637. /EL FR ED RE X / CVDB/ERNT. PH 247/3 and 264. F I, 1. This coin is probably SCBI 2 (Glasgow), no. 565, ex Hunter 1783, from West (1744, impressions).

83. Goda. Two Line. N 637. EL FR ED RE X / GOD/A M. PH 247/2 and 264. P 9/1 (wt 23½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 325.

EDWARD THE ELDER, 899–924
84. Ealhstan. N 651, CTCE no. 18. +EADVVEARD REX / EALHS/TAN MO. PH 248/44 and 266. P 10/1 (wt 25 gr). This coin is BMC no. 78.
86. Grimwald. N 651, cf. CTCE no. 26. +EADVVEARD REX / GRIMV/ALD MO. PH 248/46 and 266, P(G) 10/1 (wt 24½ gr). S 373. This coin is BMC no. 82.

PH 248 has GRIMEALD. The CTCE listing (not a corpus) omits BMC no. 82.
87. Heremod. N 651, CTCE no. 28. +EADVVEARD REX / HERE/MOD M. PH 248/43 and 265, P 10/3 (wt 24 gr). S 373, F VII, 55, D' E. This coin is BMC no. 84.
88. Blundered. N 651 (East Anglian). +EADVVEARD REX / TEREIEP/TEREIO. PH 248/49 and 266, P 10/5 (wt 25 gr). This coin is BMC no. 83.
89. Blundered. N 651 (East Anglian). +EADVVEART / NIEICO/NIOICE, Ns retrograde. PH 248/47 and 265, P 10/4 (wt 22½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 86.
90. Blundered. N 651 (East Anglian). +EADVVEARD REX / NEIOR/OIIEICI. PH 248/48 and 265, P 10/6 (wt 22 gr). This coin is BMC no. 87.
91. Blundered. N 651 (East Anglian). +EADVREXRDEOX, retrograde / TEREIEP/TEREIO. P 10/7 (wt 19 gr). This coin is BMC no. 92.

Another coin of Wulfgar follows at PH 248/54 (also in the other version of the Tate list in the British Library), but only one appears in PH 265. Various possibilities were considered; simple dittography is unlikely here and the most straightforward is that Cotton had two coins when Tate listed them, but disposed of one of them before Peiresc's visit. To retain a near duplicate would be at variance with Cotton's normal practice, as shown by his one-of-each selection across several hoards of this period and other sources from which the coins in his collection apparently derive (CTCE, 41–2).

Wulfgar. See Appendix, ix.

Building types
92. Cuthberht. N 665, CTCE no. 317. +EADVVEARD REX / CVDBERHT. PH 248/56 and 265, F VII, 58. Not traced. PH 248 has CVDBERHT. There are two equally likely candidates, die-duplicates (without A in the moneyer's name) in the corpus in CTCE: British Museum, ex Lockett 1, 526, ultimately Bootle (ms list in British Museum) 1802 (formed by Captain Robert Bootle, 1693–1758), and SCBI 2 (Glasgow), no 591, ex Coats 1924, possibly Dimsdale 1824, 611 (CTCE notes that the obverses of nos 591 and 592 are transposed in the plate). Both coins could have originated in the early Edward the Elder hoard from which many of Cotton's coins derive and one of them is likely to have been the Peiresc coin.

93. Eadmund. N 666, CTCE no. 320. +EADVVEARD REX / EADVWMN. PH 248/55 and 265, P 12/31 (wt 26 gr, corrected by Gifford to 25½ gr). F VII, 57. This coin is BMC no. 109.

PH 248 has EADVWN.
94. Irfara. N 666, CTCE no. 322. +EADVVEARD REX / IREFARA MO. PH 248/57 and 265, P(G) 11/25 (wt 24½ gr), corrected by Gifford to 18 gr). This coin is BMC no. 110.

Another coin of Wulfgar follows at PH 248/54 (also in the other version of the Tate list in the British Library), but only one appears in PH 265. Various possibilities were considered; simple dittography is unlikely here and the most straightforward is that Cotton had two coins when Tate listed them, but disposed of one of them before Peiresc's visit. To retain a near duplicate would be at variance with Cotton's normal practice, as shown by his one-of-each selection across several hoards of this period and other sources from which the coins in his collection apparently derive (CTCE, 41–2).

Wulfgar. See Appendix, ix.

Hand types
97. Athulf. N 663, CTCE no. 344. +EADVVEARD REX / AV-DVF M. PH 248/51 and 265, P(G) 10/14b (wt 24½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 107.

D retrograde in PH 265. PH 248 has MEL-BVV.
98. Deormod. N 664, CTCE no. 345. +EADVVEARD REX / DEORMOD M. PH 248/52 and 265, P 10/12 (wt 24 gr). This coin is BMC no. 108.


This 'unique' coin was said to have been incorporated into the British Museum in 1756 by Gifford, but is not in BMC 1893. It is likely to have been stolen, but has not been noted anywhere from sight since 1756. This coin is not listed in RN and, as Hugh Pagan remarks (pers. comm.), Ruding would certainly have mentioned it if it had been in the BM c.1795.

Floral types


101. Buga. N 660, CTCE no. 327. +EADVVEARD REX / BVGA. PH 248/59 and 266, P 12/32 (wt 24½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 100.


103. lofermund. N 658, CTCE no. 339. +EADVVEARD REX / IOFERMND. PH 248/62 and 266, P 11/24 (wt 25 gr). This coin is BMC no. 104.

104. Osulf. N 659, CTCE no. 329. +EADVVEARD REX / OZVLF. PH 248/58 and 266, P 11/28 (wt 25 gr, corrected by Gifford to 24½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 105.

Star (rosette) type

105. Brec. N 657, CTCE no. 325. +EADVVEARD REX / BRE • CEX. PH 249/74 and 266. This coin is probably SCBl 2 (Glasgow), no. 585, ex Hunter. The pellet read in the moneyer's name in both PH 249 and 266 suggests the Glasgow coin, where the other pellets forming a central cross are less clear than on BMC no. 97, ex Devonshire 1844 (1729), 174, which is the only other known coin which is eligible.

Rose type

106. Elcmund. N 655, CTCE no. 314. +EADVVEARD REX / EICM / VND MON. PH 249/85 and 266, P 12/35 (wt 25 gr). This coin is BMC no. 112.

One-line type

107. Athulf. N 656, CTCE no. 336. +EADVVEARD REX / AEDELFL M. PH 249/77 and 266, P 12/34. (wt 25½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 94.

In PH 266 the moneyer's name shown between two plain straight lines.


The readings above are from PH 266 and show the letters of the moneyer's name in a single line, without defining lines, with a cross above and below. PH 249 has EDELARD. The moneyer's name is not listed in CTCE for Edward the Elder, but the form 'Ethelgar' is known from Athelstan onwards. This coin now appears to be lost.

Two-line type

109. Abba. N 649, CTCE no. 49. +EADVVEARD REX / ABBA / MON. PH 249/80 and 266, P 11/27 (wt 25½ gr, corrected by Gifford to 25 gr). This coin is BMC no. 2.

110. Æthelstan. N 649, CTCE no. 59. +EADVVEARD REX / AEDEL / TAN MO. PH 249/82 and 266. P 10/9 (wt 24 gr). This coin is BMC no. 5.

Only this coin appears in the Peiresc inventory, but the Tate list includes a second coin of this moneyer PH 249/65 spelt ÆDELSTAN and with the contraction mark over the MO absent. These are differences which would normally be overlooked and these two coins are separated in the list. This may therefore be a case of ditography, but it seems safer to treat the second coin like the Wulfgar (at no. 95) as possibly a duplicate or near-duplicate coin disposed of by Cotton between the compilation of the Tate and Peiresc lists.

Æthelstan. See Appendix, x.

111. Æthelwine. N 649, CTCE no. 61. +EADVVEARD REX / AEDELV / VINE MO. PH 249/67 and 266, P 11/30 (wt 23½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 6.

112. Æthelwulf. N 649, CTCE no. 62. +EADVVEARD REX / AEDEL / VVLF MO. PH 249/73 and 266. This coin is probably BMC no. 9, acquired before 1838.

PH 249 has A and alone has a contraction mark over the O. BMC no. 9 was the only coin of this moneyer known to CTCE.


PH 249 has (correctly) H for N.


115. Beornwald. N 649, CTCE no. 103. EADVVEARD REX / BEORNV / VALD MO. PH 249/63 and 266 P(G) 10/8b (wt 25 gr). F VII, 68. This coin is BMC no. 20.


Gifford does not specifically note that this coin is absent, but he inserts another coin alongside to re-use its number, which he does in other cases where he notes that the original coin is missing.

119. Eadred. N 649. CTCE no. 166. (+EADVVEARD REX) / EADE / RED IO. PH 249/68 and 266, P 11/22 (wt 20½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 34.

120. Iva. N 649, cf. CTCE no. 220. (+EADVVEARD REX) / IVA MO / ETA+. PH 249/64 and 266, P 11/29 (wt 24 gr, corrected by Gifford to 23 gr). This coin is BMC no. 47.

121. Megenfreth. N 649, CTCE no. 234. (+EADVVEARD REX) / 1LEIF / RED IO. PH 249/70 and 266, P 11/23 (wt 24½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 3.


125. Wulfred. N 649, CTCE no. 306. (+EADVVEARD REX) / VVER / RED MO. PH 249/75 and 266, P 11/16 (wt 20 gr). This coin is BMC no. 68 (chipped).

PH 249 has E for AL.

126. Blundered. N 649, CTCE. +EVEARD REX / ER(inverted)LDO / ARE PH 244 and 249/84, P 10/8. Not traced. P 10/8 agrees with the PH 244 reading above except for RE+, but PH 249 reads the reverse as E-BLDO / ARE. This coin was incorporated into the British Museum by Gifford in 1756, but is not in BMC.

ALL ENGLAND

ATHELSTAN, 924/5–39

Portrait type


PH 250 reads mint signature as LOND C'.

128. Norwich. Manticen. N 675. +ÆBELSTAN REX / + MANTICEN. MON.ORVII. PH 250/124 and 266, P 13/12 (wt 22½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 76/BMS no. 146 (chipped).

PH 250 reads the reverse as HANTILEH.MOMO.

Building type


PH 250 shows trefol of wedges after REX.

Circumscription Cross


131. Megenfreth. N 671. EDELSTAN RE+ A+ORV / +MERENFREB MOT (first R inverted). P 13/13 (wt 22½ gr). Not traced. This coin was weighed despite being described as 'broken', so was probably only slightly chipped. It was missing by 1756. This is not SCBI 2 (Glasgow), no. 623, where the moneyer's name is in the genitive.

Circumscription rosette/cross

132. Chester. Eadmund. N 682. ÆBELSTAN REX TO BR / +EADMND MON LEGEC. P 13/10 (wt 24½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 58/BMS no. 179.

The omission of the V in the moneyer's name is an error by Pegge.

Circumscription rosette

133. Chester. Efrard. N 680. ÆBELSTAN REX TO BR / +RARD MO LEIGECE. P 13/7 (wt 24½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 48/BMS no. 186.

EADMUND, 939–46

Portrait


R. P. Mack, BNJ 28 (1956), 411–12, identified a recent purchase from Spink with no previous recorded pedigree as the Cotton specimen, but in 1973 in SCBI 20 (Mack collection), xi, in a note to no. 786, he records a second example from the Fred Baldwin collection. Either could be the Cotton specimen. It may be added that these two coins are possibly those attributed in Britannia 1695 (pl. VI) to the Cotton collection and William Charleton (also known as Courten,
The latter bequeathed his coins to Sir Hans Sloane, whose material was among the foundation collections of the British Museum in 1753, but there are no inventories to document any transmissions. The Cotton coin had gone from his collection before 1748 and there is no evidence that the Charleton coin even got to Sloane. Neither reached the British Museum.

**EADRED, 946–55**

*Portrait*


Two line


The obverse is irregular.


This coin is probably a CC/HR 4 mule and is the only example known to *CTCE*.


The obverse is irregular.

139. Gifford annotated P 15/6 but not P 25/3 (certainly *BMC* no. 79) as transferred into the museum. Pegge seems to have entered the same coin twice, once under Æthelred with no details and no weight and again under *Nummi incerti* with the blundered inscription and weight.

**EADWIG, 955–9**

Two line


Described in 2 as ‘base metal & broken’. The coin shown in 3 has some differences, but Pegge notes that it is the same coin.

**EADGAR, 959–75**

Circumscription rosette


Reform


**ÆTHELRED II, 978–1016**

The legends follow the Peiresc inventory as usual; the Tate list normally has Æ-DELREd but other differences in the diphthongs in the king’s name in the Tate list are not normally detailed.

First Hand

146. Ipswich. Leofric. N 766. +Æ-DELRED REX ANGLOR / ÆLEOFRIC MO GIPIES. PH 250/120 and 262. Not traced. PH 250 has GIPES.


The British Museum coin is the only known example. This coin was identified as Lancastrian mint in the Warne sale.


The legends are the same on PH 250, except the king’s name ends RÆD. No coin of this moneyer and type combination was known to Short, NC 1948, 189–97.

150. Winchester. Frythemund. N 766. +Æ-DELRED REX ANGLOR / +FAY-BMVND MO PIN. PH 250/121 and 262. This coin is probably *BMC* no. 358, acquired before 1795.

PH 250 has +FAY-BMVND MO PIN with a pellet following the PIN like *BMC* 358. RN records, but does not illustrate, a coin in the BM of this description weighing 25 gr which must be *BMC* 358 as its weight is the same.
151. York. Oda. N 766. +ÆELRED REX ANGLOR / +ODA MONETA EPERRIC. PH 250/117 and 262, P 18/6 (wt 22½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 77. PH 250 has EPERRIC.

Second Hand
152. Norwich. Swyrtinc. N 768. +ÆELRED REX ANGLOR / +SPRTINC MO NOR-D. PH 250/115 and 262, P 18/5 (wt 21 gr). This coin is BMC no. 292. PH 250 has EPERPIC.

Crux
153. London. Ealhstan. N 770. +ÆELRED REX ANGLOR / +EALNITAN MO LVN. PH 250/113 and 262, P 18/4 (wt 23 gr). Not traced. PH 250 has RÆ and EALHSTAN; Pegge has EALHSTAN. This coin is noted as being put into the museum by Gifford, but is not in BMC. RN records, but does not illustrate, a coin of this type in the BM weighing 23½ gr which could be the Cotton coin.

154. London Lifing. N 770. +ÆELRED REX ANGLOR / +LIFINING MO LVND. PH 250/112 and 262, P 18/7 (wt 24 gr). This coin is BMC no. 226. PH 250 has LIFING.


Long Cross
156. London. Leofric. N 774. +ÆELRED REX ANGLOR / +LEOFRIC MO LVND. PH 250/114 and 262. This coin is possibly BMC no. 248, ex Tyssen 1802, ex Hodsoll 1794.

Helmet
157. York. Outhgrim. N 775. +ÆELRED REX ANGLOR / +ODGRIM MO EOFR. PH 250/111 and 262. P 18/3 (wt 23 gr). Not traced. PH 250 has OÆERVM MO EOFR and P has OÆGRIM MO E. This was one of the coins in Pegge found to be missing by Gifford in 1756.


Last Small Cross
159. London. Wulfwine. N 802. +ÆELRED REX ANGLOR / +PVLFVINE MO ON LVNDE. PH 250/109 and 262. P 18/2 (wt 17½ gr). Not traced. PH 250 has [ ] LVNDE, suggesting the moneyer’s name is not fully visible. This was one of the coins in Pegge found to be missing by Gifford in 1756.

CNUT. 1016–35

Quatrefoil

Uncertain Cnut. See Appendix, xi.

HAROLD I AND HARTHACNUT, JOINT REIGN, 1035–7

HARTHACNUT

Jewel Cross
161. London. Brunman. N 808. +CNVT - RECX / +HRVNHAH ON - LVN. PH 248/33 and 267, P 19/1. This coin is BMC Cnut no. 467.

162. Winchester. Elfwine. N 808. +HAR-DACNVT REX / +ELFPINE ON -DICE. PH 248/- and 267, P(G) 19/2b and P 21/2 (wt 17½ gr). S 396, F VIII, 3. This coin is BMC Harthacnut no. 23. PH 248 has PICE. David Symons (pers. comm.) does not accept that this coin could be of Worcester.

HAROLD I. 1037–40

The coin of Harold without a reverse reading at PH 250/142 is likely to be one of the following quoted just from the Peiresc inventory.

Jewel Cross
163. Lincoln. Swafa. N 802. +HAROLD REX / +SWAFA ON - LINCOLN. PH 250/141 and 267. P(G) 20/9 (wt 18 gr) S 402, F VIII, 10. This coin is BMC no. 50. P 20/6b is a Gifford dittography of P 20/9. Speed attributes this coin to Harold II, but PH 267 places it with coins of ‘Harold’ between Cnut and Harthacnut, showing that Peiresc identified it correctly.

164. London. Leofwine. N 802. +HAROLD REX / +LEOFPINE ON -LVNDE(3 pellets upright). PH 250/140 and 267, P 20/7 (wt 17½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 60. BMC no. 60 has a colon after LVNDE.

165. Lydford (?). Vikn (Viking). N 802. +HAROLD REX / +VIKNC ON DIDASC. PH 267. Not traced. The moneyer is known at Lydford and Worcester, but the mint signature suggests a misreading of LYDAFO. David Symons (pers. comm.) would not accept this as a Worcester coin.
COTTON’S ANGLO-SAXON COINS

166. Norwich. Ælfwold. N 802. +HAROLD REX / +ÆLFPARD • ON NOR. PH 250/139 and 267, P(G) 20/1b. This coin is BMC no. 82. PH 267 has colon after NOR; BMC no. 82 has a single pellet and FFP in the moneyer’s name.

Fleur-de-lys
PH 267 (in error) dittos the REX reading of a Jewel Cross coin for all others of Harold I.

167. Cambridge. Ælfwig. N 810. +HAROLD REX / +ÆLFWIN ON PAN. PH 267, P 20/4. This coin is BMC no. 39. P 20 has RECA and LVPIN • ON CRAN; BMC has ÆLFWIG ON CRAN.

168. Lincoln. Swartinc. N 810. +HAROLD REX / +SWARTINC ONIC. PH 267, P 20/2. This coin is BMC no. 53. P 20 has OLINC.

169. Norwich. ‘Atuwil. N 810. +HAROLD RCX / +ATUU • ON NOR-B. P 20/1a. Not traced. This coin was missing on transfer to the British Museum in 1756.

170. Norwich. Manna. N 810. +HAROLD REX / +MANN • ON NOR-B. PH 267, P 20/10. This coin is BMC no. 85.

171. Stamford. Godric. N 810. +HAROLD REX / +GODRIC ON IPC ON ST-. PH 267, P 20/6a (wt 18 gr). This coin is BMC no. 92. Legends above follow P20/3; P 20/5 has HAROLD REC / +ELFPINE ON BEO-B; PH 267 dittoes a previous legend HAROLD REX; BMC no. 107 is as above except D for the final -B and weighs 18.2 gr. Pegge apparently records two coins of this moneyer, but Gifford, noting no coin missing, says ‘The 3d & 5th are alike’ and counts only one coin of Ælfwine in his total. Pegge was thus probably guilty of dittography during the process of ordering his notes. Cotton had probably owned just one coin.

172. Thetford. Ælfwine. N 810. +HAROLD REC •/ +ÆLFWINE ON DEO-D. PH 267, P 20/3 (not weighed) and 20/5 (wt 18½ gr). S 394, F VIII, 11. This coin is BMC no. 107.


174. York. Scula. N 810. +HAROLD REX / +SEULHOFER. PH 267, P 20/8 (wt 18½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 33. HARTHACNUT, 1042–66

1042–66

All the coins of this king on PH 261 are listed there under Edward the Martyr, perhaps following Cotton’s attribution, but Peiresc adds a marginal note that there is little doubt concerning these and it would be preferable to attribute them to Edward the Confessor. Coins on PH 268 are correctly attributed. In both lists in Peiresc many obverses are dittoed from earlier coins and are less reliable; Pegge entries for probably the same coins show up errors in the earlier listings.

175. Cambridge. Godwine. N 811. +CNVT • RECX / GODPINE ON GRAT. PH 248/31 and 267, P 19/2a. S 390, F IV, 16. This coin is BMC Cnut no. 234. PH attributes this coin to Cnut.

176. Hereford. Leofnoth. N 811. HAR-DCNVT RE+/ +LEOFNOH ON BEO-D. PH 267, P(G) 23/3 (wt 15 gr). This coin is BMC no. 6. Inscriptions above from P(G); PH 267 dittoes a Harold obverse / +H -AHOO-BONDIE. PH 249/97 and 261, P 23/17 (wt 18½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 15.

177. London. Leofstan. N 811. +HAR-DCNVT R / +LEFSTAN ON LVND. PH 248/- and 267, P 21/1 (wt 18½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 57. PH attributes this coin to Cnut.

178. Shrewsbury. Wulfmier. N 811. +CNVT RECX / PVLTMER ON NGCR. PH 248/32 and 267, P 19/3 (wt 17 gr). This coin is BMC Cnut no. 597.

Uncertain coin of Hælkan. See Appendix. xii.

179. York. Onolf. N 816. +EDPERD REX / VNLOF ON EOFERP. PH 249/97 and 261, P(G) 23/3 (wt 15 gr). This coin is BMC no. 256. PH 261 has final P only dotted in; PH 249 has EOFERP; as BMC no. 256, PH 249 agrees REX only, but P(G) 23 has REX A as BMC no. 256.

Radiate Small Cross

180. Chester. Wryan. N 818. +EDPERD REX / IR IN ON LICE. PH 249/100 and 261, P 23/17 (wt 15½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 639 (pierced). PH 249 has a row of dots instead of the moneyer’s name. This is one of the pieces of evidence that shows that the Peiresc inventory cannot have been copied from the Tate list and is an independent compilation. P 23 asks ‘was it coin’d for an half peny?’


Expanding Cross

183. York, Leofnoth. N 823. +EDPERD REX / LEOFENO-D ON EOE. PH 249/88 and 262. This coin is possibly BMC no. 306, acquired before 1838.

Pointed Helmet

184. Chester, Bruninc. N 825. EDPARD RE / +BRYNNA ON LEI. P 22/5. This coin is BMC no. 641.

185. Leicester, Godric. N 825. EDPARD REX / +GODRIC ON LENFR. PH 249/93 and 268. This coin is probably BMC no. 614, ex Southgate 1795.

P 249 has EDPERD REX (dittoed from a coin earlier in the list).

186. Leicester Wulnoth. N 825. EDPARD REX / +DVLINMOB ON LEI. PH 249/91 and 268, P(G) 23/2. This coin is BMC no. 615.

PH 268 obverse legend is dittoed from above. P(G) has E..PEDRE and PH 249 has the same reverse reading.


PH 249 has PIN as Pegge and BMC no. 1426, P 23 has +EDP-REI.

188. York, Arnctel. N 825. EDPARD REX / +ARNETEL ON EOFE. PH 249/89 and 268, P 22/7 (wt 21 gr). This coin is BMC no. 321.

The obverse legend of P 22/7 and BMC no. 321 ends R not REX, but the obverses at P 249/89 and 268 are dittoed from a previous entry and so less reliable. The identity is accepted with a query, but the Peiresc coin may be a different example.


See previous. Taylor Combe noted a coin of this description in the British Museum in 1812, but it was not listed by Pegge or Gifford and is not in BMC. D&S 1954 suggested that the Cotton coin may have been disposed of when a better specimen was acquired from the Bishophill (1882) hoard.


P 22 has EDPER D REX / LEOFINE ON HE. Gifford found this coin to be missing in 1756.

Uncertain mint and moneyer. See Appendix, xiii.

Sovereign


Legends above from PH 249. PH 268 reads MDL. Swetric is a moneyer at Milborne Port for Cnut and at Wilton for Edward, Hammer Cross.

193. York, Ioketel. N 827. EDPARD REX ANGLOR / IOKETEL ON EOFE. PH 249/104 and 268, P 22/4. This coin is BMC no. 349.

This coin and the next do not appear in the Tate list in Peiresc because they have been cut off the bottom of the page in the binding, but are supplied by the closely similar list among the Cotton papers (see discussion on pp. 173–4 above). (PH 249) has ORETEL ON EOFER.


See previous. Taylor Combe noted a coin of this description in the British Museum in 1812, but it was not listed by Pegge or Gifford and is not in BMC. D&S 1954 suggested that the Cotton coin may have been disposed of when a better specimen was acquired from the Bishophill (1882) hoard.


PH 249 reads EOFRPC; P(G), -BOR.

Hammer Cross

196. Chester, Ælfisi. N 828. +EADPARRD RE / +ELFSI O EGECS. P 23/13 (wt 21½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 654.

197. Exeter, Lifinc. N 828. +EADPARRD • RE / +LIFING • ON • EXECEST. PH 249/95 and 268, P 22/3 (wt 20 gr). This coin is BMC no. 229.


This coin was found to be missing by Gifford in 1756.

199. Leicester, Ælric. N 828. EADPARRD RE / +ÆLRIC ON LEHPE ... PH 249/96 and 268, P 22/8 (wt 20 gr). This coin is BMC no. 622.

PH 249 has LEH • • • •; P 22, LEHR; BMC, LEHRECE. Pegge had recorded this coin as 16 gr, but this was corrected by Gifford to 20 gr, which is the weight of BMC no. 622.


BMC has RE and SCOBE, but the weight agrees, 20.6 gr.

Hammer Cross / Small Cross

201. Leicester, Ægelric. N 828.830. +EADPARRD • REX / +AGLINC ON LEHO. PH 249/99 and 268, P 23/14 (wt 17½ gr). This coin is probably BMC no. 625.

PH 249 has AGERIC ON LEHR, acceptable for BMC, but there the weight is 16.6 gr.

Facing Small Cross

202. Leicester, Ægelric. N 830. +EADPARRD • REX / +AGLRIC ON LEHR. P 23/16 (wt 15 gr, corrected to by Gifford 17½ gr). This coin is BMC no. 626.

BMC has +EADPARRD, a pellet after LEHR and weighs 16.7 gr.

BMC and D'E have REXA followed by a trefoil of pellets and BMC weighs a closely similar 16.5 gr.


Uncertain mint and moneyer. See Appendix, xiv.

APPENDIX

Other Anglo-Saxon coins in the Peiresc volumes in The Hague

The coins fall into three categories:
(a) duplicate coins listed by Tate which apparently left the collection before Peiresc's visit in 1606 (nos ix and x);
(b) one coin which may have passed through Cotton's hands, but was probably not retained (no. viii);
(c) coins which are unlikely to have been in Cotton's collection (nos i-vii and xi-xiv)

SCEAT, late 7th or early 8th centuries

i. Uncertain series. OOVTH radiate head/standard with TTOII (d). PH 120. This coin probably did not belong to Cotton (see p. 175). Not traced.

The substantive series which associate a radiate head with a standard type reverse are Primary Series A and C, and Secondary Series R. The neatness of the letters inside the standard as drawn in PH is found more systematically in Series A and C, although it also occurs occasionally in series R, but there is insufficient detail for classification. Pegge (1748) does not include a sceat of these types and, if the pseudo-inscription is correctly transcribed, none of the relevant coins in the British Museum with a standard reverse is a likely match.

ÆTHELRED I OF NORTHUMBRIA, Second reign, 789-96

ii. Ceolbald. N 185. +AEDILRED rosette / +CEOLBALD rosette. PH 120. This coin probably did not belong to Cotton (see p. 175). Not traced.

BMC no. 284 (under Æthelred II in D & S 1955-7), acquired before 1838, is possible, but there are other candidates.

ARCHBISHOP ECGBERHT OF YORK, 732/4-58

iii. Under King Eadberht. EOTBEREhTV / ELGBERRT. PH 120. This coin probably did not belong to Cotton (see p. 175). Not traced.

OFFA OF MERCIA, 757-96


BURGRED OF MERCIA, 852-73

v. Diga. Lunettes (a). N 423. +BVRGRED REX / D1GA MON ETA. PH 120. This coin probably did not belong to Cotton (see p. 175). Not traced.

vi. Dudecil. Lunettes (a). N 423. BVRGRED REX / DVDEL HMO NETA. PH 120. This coin probably did not belong to Cotton (see p. 175). Not traced.

The drawing on PH 120 shows no hooks on the central lines normally designating type (a) so, if correctly drawn, this cannot be BMC no. 253, ex Tyssen, otherwise a candidate, which is of type (c).

vii. Dudeman. Lunettes (a). N 423. BVRGRED REX / DVDEMA HMO NETA. PH 120. This coin probably did not belong to Cotton (see p. 175). Not traced.

BEORHTRIC OF WESSEX, 787-802


This coin is listed with nos 15 and 21 above in PH 69 and, with them, in the letter of Peiresc to Cotton of 1618, so it cannot be the coin illustrated in Speed 1611, but it seems unlikely that Cotton had two coins of this rare type (see p. 175).

EDWARD THE ELDER, 899-924


This coin was probably disposed of by Cotton between Tate compiling his list and Peiresc's visit of 1606 (see no. 95 in the Corpus). There are several candidates, some probably deriving from the same hoards from which Cotton acquired coins (see CTCE, 41-2 and 79). One is Pembroke 1848 (1733), 39, which Rashleigh 1908 (1811), 241, says 'has been in fire'. None of the surviving Cotton coins shows signs of burning and the coin collection is not believed to have suffered in the Ashburnham House fire of 1731. The comment in Rashleigh may have been a deduction from the black patina displayed by many (but not all) Cotton coins but, if there were no other evidence, it does not connect the coin with Cotton as fires are commonplace.


While dittography cannot be ruled out, this is a probably a similar case to no. ix, where a duplicate coin was disposed of between Tate compiling his list and Peiresc's visit in 1606. (See no. 110 in the Corpus.)
COTTON'S ANGLO-SAXON COINS

Section: Unrecorded mint and moneyer

xi. Unrecorded mint and moneyer. North 790, CNVT REX diadem bust / rev. legend not given. PH 120. This coin probably did not belong to Cotton (see p. 175). Not traced.

xi. HARTHACNUT, uncertain period

xii. Unrecorded mint and moneyer. North number uncertain. +HARD CNVT R / rev. legend not given. PH 120. This coin probably did not belong to Cotton (see p. 175). Not traced.

xiii. Unrecorded mint and moneyer. North 825. +EDPERD REX / rev. legend not given. PH 120. This coin probably did not belong to Cotton (see p. 175). Not traced.

xiv. Unrecorded mint and moneyer. North 830, EALRARD REX / rev. legend not given. PH 120. This coin probably did not belong to Cotton (see p. 175). Not traced.
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