

# LETTERS OF NUMISMATIC INTEREST ADDRESSED TO JOHN LINDSAY OF CORK

NORMAN SHIEL

A PARCEL of twenty-one letters has recently come to light, which provides much detailed numismatic insight into the preparation of Lindsay's major studies, contemporary evidence concerning the great Cuerdale hoard, and a wealth of general information from the numismatic world of the 1840s. One letter is from Aquilla Smith; all the others from the Rev. Joseph William Martin (1776–1858), rector from 1800 until his death of Keston near Bromley, Kent. Although not known from any published work, Martin was clearly respected by the numismatic fraternity of his day, both for his opinions and for the quality of his collection.

Martin seems to have been a prolific correspondent. As long ago as 1877 some of his letters to Lindsay were being quoted in published work, while as recently as 1979 a newly discovered letter to Aquilla Smith was published in full. I have provided here an annotated text of all the letters save that, in the interests of space, certain sections relating to purely domestic matters have been omitted, and some slight editing has taken place elsewhere.

All but letter nine have been folded in such a way as to leave one surface for the address and obviate the use of an envelope. All the letters bear seals in wax. Letters eleven to thirteen are written on mourning notepaper with seals of black wax. Letter thirteen, presumably because of the value of the enclosures, was registered, at a cost of one shilling. Letter nineteen has a label and annotation such as to suggest something of Lindsay's filing system for his correspondence. From the respective date stamps at Bromley and Cork it is apparent that most of the letters took only two days with that of Smith from Dublin arriving the next day. Martin's is a clear, legible hand and virtually no word is in doubt.

I am most grateful to Christopher Blunt, Ian Stewart, Joan Murray and Robert Carson for their help and advice, but especially to the late Michael Dolley who even in his final months was such an inspiration.

## 1. Keston. 3 March 1841.

(I am not a collector of Heptarchic coins, having long ago sold off my Offa Ceolnoth etc., and commenced business with Ecgbeorht) My object from first to last has been the promotion of a private gentleman's cabinet, and I have always been much disposed to laugh at those who pay exclusive attention to types, mint marks, towns and mint masters, except as curators of museums. The late Dean's object I thought legitimate, because intended for the Irish Academy.<sup>1</sup> . . . In the sole monarchs I can supply an unpublished and unknown portrait penny of Ethelwulf, one if not two portraits of Alfred, a halfpenny of the same, and possibly a still rarer halfpenny with the London monogram and two new and splendid portraits of Edward the Elder.<sup>2</sup> In the Cuerdale hoard, I believe there are only two names of moneyers on the coins of Alfred which are mentioned by Ruding, and those of Edward mostly differ. Mr Cuffe<sup>3</sup> I have no doubt will be able to give you much assistance in the Heptarchic series, his collection is unrivalled and he will prove a formidable competitor for the Regnald Erics and Anlaf which formed part of the late Dean's cabinet. I think there are ten or a dozen Egberts. His Irish coins are not worth £200, and his series of Russian medals have not been paid for, the same may be said for

<sup>1</sup>The very Rev. Henry Richard Dawson, M.A., 1742–1840, on whom see Michael Dolley, 'An Unpublished Letter of Irish Interest', *NCirc* 1979, 447 and Michael Dolley, 'Aspects of George Petrie III. George Petrie and a Century of Irish Numismatics', *Proc. of the Royal Irish Academy* 72 (1972), 165–93, at 168.

<sup>2</sup>Martin Sale. Sotheby. Mon. 23 May, 1859 and four following days, lots 4–7, 11–15, 18, 23–24.

<sup>3</sup>James Dodsley Cuff (1780–1853) to whom Lindsay dedicated his *Coinage of the Heptarchy* (Cork, 1842), and whose coins were sold by Sotheby in June, 1854.

Ramage's patterns for which Cureton, I believe, has a claim of £16. 16s. His English are in general poor, there are a few good Saxon pennies (sole monarchs) but not many with the portrait. . . . In one part of your letter you mention that no coins (Saxon) occur so frequently in Ireland as those of Eadgar, and the Confessor.<sup>4</sup> If you have in your cabinet or can procure me a fine round well struck penny of Eadgar similar to No. 2, 3, 4, 5 of Ruding's plate 20, I will send over a halfpenny of St Edmund good and round.<sup>5</sup> With one exception it is the rarest coin that has been found at Cuerdale, there are several in the British Museum but not one, be assured, will leave it, and three others only have yet appeared. . . . Buy no pence for there are 1700 in the Museum and a very large number must be turned out. The value of the halfpenny above named *is so great* that I will *not accept an inferior coin*. You are fortunate in having procured so many drawings from Dr Smith. Cuffe and I can bear witness to the correctness and beauty with which they are finished, for twenty drawings or more, were obligingly sent over for our inspection. . . . Thank Mr Sainthill for his letter. . . . Since Mr Brummel procured the half florin of Edward III nothing new has turned up. Scarcely anything has been offered for sale either in Preston or Bury except two portrait pence of Eadward at the *low price of £13* not so good my agent tells me as one I was compelled to buy at £4. 4s, the cottagers of Cuerdale are determined on paying the rent this year.<sup>6</sup>

2. Keston. 13 October 1841.

(Contains no numismatic points. He refers to the imminent emigration to Australia of his children, an early case of popular as opposed to penal settlement)

3. Keston. 1 November 1841.

(Family news) Two of the enclosed impressions are from coins called unique. Of No. 1 I have only seen two and no other of No. 2. The first reads Aelfred Rex Saxonum. Reverse  $\frac{3}{4}$  struck at Exeter. There is another with the same obverse but the reverse  $\frac{1}{2}$  struck at Winchester. No. 2 obverse plain Aelfred, reverse London monogram. Tilewine Moneta fine silver and the only one that has appeared with monogram and without the portrait.<sup>7</sup> No. 3 a different head of Aelfred Rex with the monogram of London turned a different way. The first two belong to Mr Kenyon of Preston. . . . The other is in my cabinet. All three are from Cuerdale. . . .

4. Keston. 13 November 1841.

. . . The enclosed are all taken from coins in my little cabinet viz. No. 1 Athelwulf, No. 2 Alfred Oxford penny different from that in Ruding, No. 3 Aelfred halfpenny, No. 4 portrait of Eadward, No. 5 portrait of Eadward bareheaded. I have also another portrait penny of Eadward not figured but it seems unnecessary to encumber your work with three varieties.<sup>8</sup> No. 6 penny of St Edmund *readable* which is more than ninety-nine out of a hundred are. When your engraver commences the plate which is to contain the Exeter penny of Alfred, let him leave a blank of the same size for the Winchester penny. . . . The coin passed through my hands and I have little doubt of being able to obtain a wax impression of it. At present it is the only *whole coin* known, the museum have just half of one, so that it is still rarer than that of Exeter. Pray write . . . to Haigh of Leeds and request him to send you a drawing of an *Alfred with an undecypherable monogram on the reverse*.<sup>9</sup> I have seen

<sup>4</sup> Michael Dolley on the Dunbrody Hoard, *SCBI. The Hiberno-Norse Coins in the British Museum* (1966), pp. 67-68.

<sup>5</sup> Christopher Blunt, 'The St. Edmund Memorial Coinage', *Proc. Suffolk Inst. Arch.* 31, part 3 (1969), 234-55. These St Edmund pieces figure prominently in Martin's early letters as he seeks to emphasise the scarcity of the halfpence and the abundance of the pence. Within a year of the discovery at Cuerdale, thirty of the pence had been presented by the Duchy of Lancaster to the Royal Saxon Coin Cabinet at Dresden.

<sup>6</sup> Martin's gentle sarcasm is to be taken with Hawkins's, and is not altogether without parallel in the case of a more recently discovered hoard from South Lancashire. E. Hawkins, 'An Account of Coins and Treasure found in Cuerdale', *NC* 5 (1842-43), 1-48, 53-104.

<sup>7</sup> This coin, bought by the British Museum at the Montagu 1895 sale, lot 535, is confirmed as a Cuerdale piece. It is No. 94 in Lindsay's *Heptarchy*. Despite Martin's clear statement here, no acknowledgement to Kenyon is made, and that collector's name is conspicuous by its absence from Lindsay's work. See Martin's letter 6.

<sup>8</sup> Lindsay gives no acknowledgement in his *Heptarchy*. Only two such pieces were in the Martin sale, lots 23-24. He was at this stage clearly unacquainted with the Edward the Elder halfpenny that he was to acquire at the Cuff sale (lot 491) which is now in the collection of Christopher Blunt.

<sup>9</sup> This piece, attributed at various times to various mints including Castle Rising, Dorchester, Worcester, Swanage, Croydon and Canterbury, is illustrated in *Anglo Saxon Coins* by R. H. M. Dolley (1961) pl. X, No. 5 and classified unequivocally as imitative of the London monogram.

his drawing, and the coin, therefore I am confident there must be two pieces. . . . Pray buckle on your spectacles, and do your best. The leading letter I take to be an R.

Hawkins talked of publishing the Cuerdale coins in the Numismatic Journal, but as the funds of the Society were not particularly flourishing, he hinted that a contribution from the members would be most thankfully accepted towards liquidating the expense incurred.<sup>19</sup>

Young's sale I presume is concluded<sup>19</sup> . . . Young's imprudence and jealousy has ruined collectors and dealers. From the mass thrown into the market our collections are deteriorated one half in value. I read yesterday Mr Haigh's comments on the early coins of Scotland.<sup>12</sup> He seems to play treble to your violin, but . . . neither of you have the slightest knowledge of the *first coinage of William the Lion*.

P.S. This morning came a letter from Mr Sainthill. I have petitioned for a groat flat crown of Henry VII, with me a great desideratum.

---

5. Keston. 29 November 1841.

Friend Cuffe has forwarded wax impressions of Cuthred, Offa and Alfred struck at Winchester the last quite new and from Cuerdale,<sup>13</sup> the former unpublished, . . . you will anticipate Mr Hawkins<sup>14</sup> and having succeeded with Mr Haigh in procuring a drawing of the monogram I mentioned, you will be able to give the world four coins of Alfred of the highest rarity, scarcely known to any collector. I believe that no one has seen . . . them all but myself. Of Mr Haigh's there are two specimens, of the monogram without the head only one. Two of the Exeter penny and one and a half of the Pinc, at present known. As Mr Cuffe's box is not full I have enclosed an Edward bareheaded, unique. . . .

---

6. Keston. 10 December 1841.

. . . . Your book promises important matter to Anglo Saxon numismatists. . . . I hope . . . Mr Haigh has sent you a drawing of Alfred with the curious monogram. . . . I could not satisfy myself with the name of the city but that is no reason why you should not succeed. Mr Sainthill's Aethelred II is very curious and interesting, methinks it will astonish the natives in these parts.<sup>15</sup> I see no reason to doubt the genuineness of the coin, it is one quite in his style, witness his alpha and omega, the hand of providence, the Crux etc. I heard at least six months of a penny of Eohric (East Anglian) of a half penny of same, of No. 9 of Ruding's Alfred coined at Lincoln and the moneyer Heribert converted into a Duke, or some grand official personage, and many other humbugs.<sup>16</sup> Imagination has a very powerful effect on some minds. The two first, the party refused to send me, and the last I returned. . . . I send an impression of an excellent *readable* penny of St Eadmund, one of the best of two thousand, and a halfpenny of same one of the best of nineteen . . . two are presently on sale, one at £7. 10s, the other at £6. 6s. Cupidity or the desire of possessing scarce coins makes many witless fools. Mr Kenyon of No. 7 Butler Street, Preston . . . has a ten guinea coin of Plegmund with Doro in the centre of the reverse. . . . I will not have any further correspondence with him.<sup>17</sup> I have ranked my Scotch penny with the coins of James III and that with the mullets also. I will not admit any coins of James IV, but those that have Q or Qt or Qua or Qdt or numerals either Roman or Arabic. . . . I will send impressions of a

<sup>19</sup> The publication had by this date become the *Numismatic Chronicle*. The President's Address, *NC* 7th ser. 15 (1975), iv-xvi for the early history of the society.

<sup>11</sup> This refers to Matthew Young a coin dealer and original member of the Numismatic Society whose coins were dispersed in a series of Sotheby sales from 1838 onwards. The particular sale referred to here would be the misnamed 'last portion' of 29 Nov. 1841.

<sup>12</sup> Daniel Haigh, 'Remarks on Early Scottish Coins and the arrangement of those bearing the name of Alexander', *NC* 4 (1841), 47-72.

<sup>13</sup> This confirms what has long been supposed, that *BMC* Alfred 156 is a Cuerdale piece.

<sup>14</sup> The race between Hawkins and Lindsay to produce their respective works is emphatically referred to in letter eight. Hawkins won but it was a hollow victory as Lindsay was able to incorporate Cuerdale material not known to his rival. There is a parallel situation almost a century later between Oman and Brooke.

<sup>15</sup> This is the Agnus Dei penny, Lindsay, *Heptarchy*, p. 155. See also E. Hawkins, *English Silver Coins*, third edition (1887), pp. 150-51, Michael Dolley and Tukka Talvio, 'The Twelfth of the Agnus Dei pennies of Aethelred II', *BNJ* 47 (1977), 131-33.

<sup>16</sup> Lindsay (*Heptarchy*, 53 and 59) stated that no coins of Eoric had been found but goes on to include one, p. 131 and No. 139 on the supplemental plate. This is almost certainly the one now at Oslo, bought in a group of seventeen Anglo-Saxon coins in London in 1846, and is very likely to have been a Cuerdale stray. The Alfred penny is in Lindsay, *Heptarchy* No. 94. Hawkins does not list it as a Cuerdale piece but it comes from Kenyon and is accepted as from the hoard by Blunt.

<sup>17</sup> Hawkins, 'Cuerdale', p. 104. For more details of the events surrounding the discovery and disposal of the hoard see Christopher Blunt, 'The Composition of the Cuerdale Hoard', *BNJ* 53 (1984), 1-6.

half groat and penny of James IV indisputably certain.<sup>18</sup> As you seem to think that Alexander III copied from the English, be consistent and recollect the period when Henry VII commenced with his septimus, septim and VII followed by Henry VIII, whose sister James IV married. . . .

7. Keston. 1 January 1842.

. . . . It is singular enough that one like myself, who has paid little or no attention to Heptarchic and ecclesiastical coins, should be able to recognise in your plate, no less than ten coins, viz. Nos. 4, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24. Your No. 23 is probably taken from Mr Sainthill's cabinet. . . . The engravings appear to show themselves to advantage on the coloured paper, and it is to my mind an improvement. Accuracy and minuteness in detail is of much greater importance to the numismatist. . . . The drawing of the coins is the principal thing, the rest is of easy execution. I heartily wish you . . . success and trust that you have made up your mind to encounter a host of critics and hypercritics. For reasons I can give your plates shall not be shown to any individual.

At present I am not aware that more than twenty halfpence of St Eadmund have appeared. Seventeen of which are in the Museum. Of the whole number only one coin has a perfect legend. It strikes me that in those days the mint and the legend were little considered, and that the monogram alone was sufficient to sanction the circulation of the coin. Of several hundred of pennies I have never met with any one which reads so well as mine. The half penny is in my box but will probably pay a visit to Mr Cuffe ere long who is the great Leviathan of the present day. . . .

I am sorry Mr Haigh did not supply you with a Cuerdalite having an undecyphered Monogram, in my humble opinion a coin of much greater importance than *Herbert Duke of Lincoln*. I find also that . . . he has not met with an Alfred Penny with a curious reverse bearing two swans, or birds of some kind of which I had a rough sketch sent me ten months since. Entertaining very great doubts on the subject, and not placing much confidence in the eye and skill of my agent I suggested it should be sent up for my inspection. But it was refused and the owner a shrewd fellow afterwards said, he had sold it, then that he thought he could find another specimen, in short my man says he is sure that he has not sold it. So he adds, time and patience will be all that is required. I certainly have heard of other extraordinary coins, but seldom believe much of what I hear. About a month since I had a gold Inchiquin sixpence offered to me at £10.<sup>19</sup> It came from *Belfast*, and I believe it to be a forgery. All here have declined it. Mr Long's collection will soon be sold. It contains an Oxford Crown and a petition crown of Simon's work.

8. Keston. 28 January 1842.

I too, in common with others are anxious that your publication should precede that of Mr Hawkins. No doubt whatever that he has much greater opportunities for investigation and research than you have, and that coins drawn by a decent artist from the specimens themselves and engraved, will be superior to those taken, many from wax and plaster impressions, and like mine badly taken, and then lithographed. From your first plate I foresee that there will be an animated controversy, and all that I presume to suggest, is that you should have reasons to advance, for the opinions you publish. Mr Haigh I believe to be an excellent Saxon archaeologist, *but one of the fancy*, and to my mind deals too much in conjecture. Without being a professor of the black art I can easily guess what your comment will be on No. 93 and 94. The whole of plate 4 is to my mind most respectably finished. No. 95 and 97 are certainly too large, and No. 98 too small. *Pray remember that 95 and 97 do not belong to me but to Kenyon of Preston*. No. 94 has paid two visits to Keston and been rejected. I agree with you that the last plate is not so good as it ought to have been, particularly the last fifteen figures. It appears to me too coarse and rough and too deeply cut. With regard to No. 24 there are many opinions afloat. We have halfpence of Alfred, Eadward and Eadgar, and I see no reason why the Confessor should not have coined pieces of that description.<sup>20</sup> I have a coin much about the same weight. No. 23 I never recollect to have seen, and should be happy to say it was in my little collection.<sup>21</sup> Cnut with the hand was booked for a voyage to

<sup>18</sup> J. Lindsay, *A View of the Coinage of Scotland* (Cork, 1845), pl. 7, No. 166 and pl. 8, No. 169 respectively. As lots 443 (13s) and 444 (12s) they fetched little enough in the Martin sale for such rarities.

<sup>19</sup> Presumably a specimen or copy of the so called Inchiquin pistole of 1646. W. A. Seaby and G. Brady, 'The extant Ormonde pistoles and double pistoles of 1646', *BNJ* 43 (1973), 80-95; E. O'Sullivan 'The Only Gold Coins Issued in Ireland', *BNJ* 33 (1964), 141-50; M. Dolley, 'A Note on the Weight and Fineness of the 1646 Ormonde Pistole', *BNJ* 35 (1966), 152-54.

<sup>20</sup> Lindsay, *Heptarchy* No. 136 on pl. 3. Lindsay claimed to own this but no piece came up at his sale. The coin seems to have been a very light example of *BMC* type ii such as *BMC* 842. Stewart Lyon, 'A Round Halpenny of Edward the Confessor', *BNJ* 34 (1965), 42-45.

<sup>21</sup> Lindsay, *Heptarchy* pl. 5, No. 135, *BMC* 1113. C. L. Stainer, *Oxford Silver Pennies* (Oxford, 1904), pp. 48-49. For discussion and reattribution to Theiford see Peter Seaby, 'The Sequence of Anglo-Saxon Coin Types, 1030-1050', *BNJ* 38 (1969), 111-46.

Ireland, but fortunately in turning over Ruding's plates I discovered my coin staring in my face. I have omitted to mention that the reverse of No. 100 is turned upside down.

I was unable to attend the sale last week . . . and I cannot inform you who purchased the Wexford groat. My commission was large but there were three or four competitors, viz. Hawkins, Cuff and Wigan. I had intended it as a present to Dr Smith but not having heard from Tindale the Clerk, conclude that it is buried in the British Museum. It seems to me that these sharks have recently determined not to permit any coin to be purchased by private individuals unless they have a specimen of it in their custody. Recently their commission for Henry VIII portcullis farthing was £20 & they purchased it for £15. 5s. Fortunately for them I had the coin or they would have paid more for it. To me it seems beneath the dignity of a great nation to permit the Curators of its antiquities to send their subs into auction rooms. It is never done at Vienna, Munich or Paris whereas here it is now a confirmed practice.

I observe your letter notices the Alfred reverse swans etc. about a year since I had a drawing of the coin (from recollection) sent me. The owner now offers an impression in wax for 5s. So many curious pieces have turned up from the Cuerdale hoard that I really know not what to think. I mentioned to you last year that an Anglo-Saxon coin had been found in the parcel with the reverse bearing a Grecian temple, and about four months ago I received from the same quarter a small piece of Khosroes II – with the fire altar<sup>22</sup> – the latest coin found was one of Athelstan.

9. 120 Baggot Street. 1 March 1842.

A. Smith to J. Lindsay.

I am much obliged for your impression of your sixth plate, which contains some very remarkable coins and your artist has acquitted himself very creditably. I perceive he has tinted the letters on a few of the engravings as Fig. 150 etc. If this tint cannot be removed I would suggest that the letters on the other coins should be brought up to the same colour, as those in the first and last lines look paler than the others. When I made the drawings of the coins which you have engraved I did them in a rough but accurate manner to enable you to satisfy yourself as to the moneyers and I am glad to find that they answered so well for your engraver.

The Alfred Fig 93 is very correctly drawn considering the very defective impressions which the coin affords. The monogram is difficult to decypher – there appears to me to be an R at the beginning of it R but I do not venture to give any opinion on the reading.

In the lot of base shillings of William there were five varieties, 1695, 1696 and 1698 besides two dates of the sixpence. It is curious to find so many varieties in one small lot.

The little coin which I sent to Mr Sainthill last week I have had for some time and placed it among my Saxons, it appears to be the same as your Fig. 22 Pl. 1 and you will I am sure excuse me for saying that I cannot discover any evidence from the coin for appropriating it to a Hiberno-Danish prince or king, the place of mintage being so very distinct and seeming to be of York ONE OF ER. I saw Mr Cane today and he told me that the Dean's coins were sent to Sotheby last Saturday.<sup>23</sup> Sotheby is to make out the catalogue himself. Mr Cane gave me a catalogue of Mr Young's coins which Sotheby sent him as a specimen of his style of catalogues and if you have any convenient opportunity of lending me your priced catalogue in the course of a few weeks I would be glad to copy the prices and purchases.

10. Keston. 7 April 1842.

Your kind present reached Keston on Sunday last. Your work professes to be a view of the coinage of the Heptarchy. . . . In early life I doubted the possibility of even forming a tolerable collection of these coins, and having no less than three seniors all of them Grandes Senores before me in the market I withdrew from all competition and sold all my Offa, Cealnoths etc. It has not been in my power to communicate any information on the subject you have selected, nor have I sent either coins or drawings, therefore my name was very properly omitted in your preface. All that relates to the sole monarchs, is merely accessory to your view, and the table of reference was amply sufficient to point out where the coins were to be found. Two mornings have been occupied in examining your work, and as far as an ignorant person may be permitted to give his opinion, I approve of your classification. The Plates, with the exception of No. 5, are most respectably executed, but as you noticed in one of your letters, the artist has certainly figured Nos. 95 and 97 on too large a scale and I think

<sup>22</sup> M. Dolley and N. Shiel, 'A Hitherto Unsuspected oriental element in the 1840 Cuerdale hoard', *NC* 1982, 155–56.

<sup>23</sup> This refers to the Dean Dawson sale, Sotheby June/July

1842. The Hiberno-Norse and Anglo-Irish coins were purchased from the estate privately by friends and presented to the Royal Irish Academy.

No. 98 on one too small. I suspect the first plate will be deemed the best and most accurate. You have advanced our knowledge of Heptarchal coins, but have left many very disputable points. I am afraid the subject may still be said to be involved in much obscurity. Your interpretation of A C R T E N (not of Tic) seems at least feasible, and perhaps the best I have as yet heard.<sup>24</sup> The coins were first sent to me in June 1840<sup>25</sup> and I then considered the letters had reference to the Cross. I believe there is a coin of Alfred in the British Museum with similar reverse and legend. We shall soon hear what Hawkins has to say on the subject.

Page 30, I saw many years since in the hands of Rev. Mr Dymoche of Beauchamp Hatch, Somersetshire, another specimen of Queen Cynethrith, but whether it was deemed a true or false coin I cannot say.

Page 42. I agree entirely with you in considering that specimen which resembles the penny of Alfred recently exploited to be the only certain coin of Ceolulf II. But you have omitted to mention that long before Taylor Combe published Dr Hunter's coin that, or a similar one, had been found in Duane's Plate in Simon's work No. 13.<sup>26</sup> Of Alfred's pence of the same type, there are several besides Cuff's and mine, I venture to say half a dozen at least. Four I can locate in a moment and suspect if you were inclined to give the absurdly extravagant price of six or seven guineas (the last sold for eight) in the course of a fortnight your Saxon ardour might be rewarded with success.<sup>27</sup>

Page 66 & 67. The latter part of the history of Siegfried I had read in the work of that clipping plagiarist Voltaire; the former recently elicited by Mr Haigh, and connecting the parties is extremely interesting and confirmatory of the coins having been struck at York.

Page 79 & 80. I have seen a great many of these pieces. They may be ecclesiastical, but probably foreigners. Do not some of them bear a legend of Civitas Tolosa, Cintas Andergaris, Civis Lemovicus? Mr Haigh's hypothesis does not please me, nor I suspect any one else.

Page 82. Both gold coins have been more than once in my hands.<sup>28</sup> The latter I consider a piece de plaisir, but it is very singular that among the multitude of types of the Confessor, not one should be found in silver exactly similar to it. In 1839 Longperrier and I went through all the trientes in the British Museum. We found several very similar but with different names and towns. I cannot but think the coin is French.

Page 85, Plate 4, No. 93. Dr Smith's coin was offered to me for six guineas and declined, what Mr Haigh (who is not a collector) gave for it I do not know. There may be three coins, the one I examined so long and without any successful result belonged to the Museum. I prefer your solution of the monogram to Mr Haigh's but much doubt its correctness. No. 94 was sent up for my inspection and pronounced an Alfred similar to Ruding Plate 15 No. 9 with the name of a different moneyer. It was Mr Haigh who decided that Herebert was Duke of Lincoln. Most certainly I did not dream of such a thing.

Page 89. Mealdmes for Malmesbury is a happy hit and very satisfactory.

Page 115. Of Alfred's half pence there may have been 13½ in the British Museum and five more are known to me. But you have seriously omitted Alfred's *halfpenny* with portrait of *16 rarity*. One belongs to Mr Thomas and was figured by Hawkins, the other was presented with all his coins to the British Museum by Mr Acheson owner of Cuerdale. There are three halfpence of Edward the Elder known two in the Museum and one at Oxford.<sup>29</sup> ... Some of your decisions I think will be much canvassed and controverted.

11. Keston. 30 April 1842.

I did not consider the French Halfpenny worth your acceptance, much less fitting for publication in a treatise on Heptarchic Coins; therefore never mentioned it, though it has been in my possession with several other foreign pence since June 1840. Finding however that you had given many representations of these coins in your plates, and that mine appeared to differ from all of them, I thought you might possibly wish to see it. I take leave to say it is quite at your service.

I hear Combrouse<sup>30</sup> still persists in his opinion, that the Siefrid, Ebraici, Cunnetti and those pieces with

<sup>24</sup> Lindsay, *Heptarchy*, pp. 79–80; Hawkins, 'Cuerdale', pp. 74–75; Lyon and Stewart in *Anglo-Saxon Coins* pp. 96–121, and Lyon and Stewart, *NC* 1964, 281–82.

<sup>25</sup> This shows a prompt dispersal of the hoard, which was discovered on 15 May.

<sup>26</sup> Matthew Duane in J. Simon, *An Essay Towards an Historical Account of Irish Coins and the Currency of Foreign Monies in Ireland* (1749, reprinted with supplement, 1810), *SCBI Hunterian and Coats Collections*, No. 381 for further comment.

<sup>27</sup> Dolley and Blunt in *Anglo Saxon Coins*, pp. 80–81. Hawkins ('Cuerdale', pp. 11–12) records six Cuerdale pieces but by the time of the third edition of his *Silver Coins of*

*England* he recorded that 'eleven specimens, all different, were discovered at Cuerdale' (p. 123).

<sup>28</sup> Lindsay, *Heptarchy*, p. 80. The first appears to be a Merovingian piece, cf. *BMC* vol. 1, pp. XII and XV. The Confessor piece is illustrated in the frontispiece to Michael Dolley, *Anglo-Saxon Pennies* (1964). See also Derek Allen, 'Edward the Confessor's Gold Penny', *BNJ* 25 (1945–48), 259–76, especially p. 261 where Martin is mentioned.

<sup>29</sup> *BMC* 71 and 72, and *SCBI Oxford, Anglo Saxon Pennies* No. 297 which is given as a third penny.

<sup>30</sup> Co-author of *Descriptions des Monnaies de la Deuxième Race du France* (1837).

religious legends are all Saxon coins. Now in my humble opinion they are all French, struck and issued in France, and probably brought over by that body which after the defeat sustained in 892 escaped the slaughter and returned to England.

From the mass of bullion (almost all the wedges from 50 L to 22 grains, distinguished by a particular mark of rings, armlets, chains, etc.) found at Cuerdale I should say that it had been the military chest, and not the property of any individual. Hawkins' date may answer very well, for the coin of Athelstane said to have been found with the other coins, is most probably that of the East Anglian monarch.

I enclose for your acceptance a decent penny of Malcolm IV with my hearty wishes that you would now turn your attention to Scottish coins. A good work on the subject is much wanted, and will be infinitely more satisfactory and acceptable to collectors than a treatise on Arsacidan or Sassanian, where in both instances you will have been anticipated by Stewart and Longperrier.<sup>31</sup>

There can be no doubt that your two publications have been attended with considerable expense and from the liberality of your presents, it is impossible that the sale of a few copies can have reimbursed you. Why not adopt a different mode on the next occasion and make us all pay for our information and amusement. I sent Hawkins such coins as he requested, but paid my guinea for his book. Why should not you do the same. Ce present vous nous traitez en magnifique, vous debites sans salaire. . . .

12. [no address] 7 December 1842.

(Family news)

Yesterday I read your letter, and part of it seems to require an immediate reply. Any information that it may be in my power to give, any drawings of coins that I can procure, any coins that I can send for your inspection shall be most cheerfully and readily furnished, but however flattered by the compliment you wish to pay me, I beg respectfully to decline it. . . . Your letter does not mention, and therefore I presume you have thrown overboard those specimens attributed to Malcolm II. To me they appear very doubtful whether Scottish coins, and perfectly conjectural as to what king to be attributed. My Penny of Malcolm III with two sceptres, similar to the Conqueror and of the same period may pass with a large Q by its side.<sup>32</sup> I am not aware at present that any coins can be distinctly appropriated to Alexander I. Your researches may have been attended with more success. In David I money, you will delight and astonish the Scotch by giving no less than four different heads, and I trust that Messrs. the advocates (i.e. Dogs in the Manger) will take no less than ten copies of your work.<sup>33</sup> Of Malcolm IV or Nencon, I can send one having the first letter of the legend a clear distinct M.<sup>34</sup> The reverses are all similar, and a coin of Stephen might be given with the same reverse, corroborative of their first appropriation.<sup>35</sup> That also I can furnish, and it is unique. I have a beautiful specimen of the first coinage of William the Lion.<sup>36</sup> Head to the left, legend Peris Adam on Ro.

Dorling was always considered as the name of the moneyer and if there be Fl after the name, it may stand for Felius or Fleurs, a castle near Roxbury long since levelled with the dust, and its site now occupied with the mansion of the duke and bearing the same name.<sup>37</sup> With regard to the coins of Alexander II and III I believe you think differently from everyone who has paid attention to the subject.<sup>38</sup> The correct appropriation of these coins you say is one of the grand difficulties. I am not of your opinion. I have already proved to you . . . that Alexander III in the first year of his reign, extended the cross to the extremity of the coin. This is an historical fact and indisputable. No long cross coins whatever therefore can be given to Alexander II. But on coming to the crown at the end of 1249 Alexander III might in the first instance have directed a coinage similar to that of his predecessor. It is possible, but it could not have been large as the long cross coinage took place early in 1250, and certainly the workmanship is very different, but I defy you or anyone else to appropriate these coins. You are also extremely incorrect in stating 'that though Alexander II reigned thirty-six years, there are not

<sup>31</sup> Lindsay took the advice and in 1845 produced his, *View of the Coinage of Scotland*. His work on the Parthian series did not appear until 1852.

<sup>32</sup> Lindsay, *Scotland*, pp. 1 and 4 and pl. 1, No. 5. This was lot 411 in the Martin sale. It is Stewart No. 12 and has been reattributed to Malcolm IV.

<sup>33</sup> Lindsay, *Scotland*, p. VII acknowledges and the help of the Faculty of Advocates. Their collection was bought by the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland in 1873.

<sup>34</sup> This should be Henry, earl of Northumberland. See Lindsay *Scotland*, Nos. 20 and 19 which are Martin sale lots 414-415. See also *BNJ* 35 (1966), pl. XII, Nos. 289 j and l; and Stewart, 'Scottish Mints', in *Mints, Dies and Currency*, (1971) pp. 165-69, especially pp. 195-96.

<sup>35</sup> Lindsay, *Scotland*, pl. 18, sup. No. 21; Martin Sale, lot 69. Stewart sees this as issued at Bamburgh by Earl Henry.

Stewart. *The Scottish Coinage* (1955, revised with supplement 1967) p. 7 and Stewart, 'Scottish Mints', p. 195.

<sup>36</sup> Lindsay, (*Scotland*, p. 8) repeats Martin's error. The short cross coinage may be shown to have been the last struck in the name of William the Lion, produced posthumously about 1230.

<sup>37</sup> See Stewart, *Scottish Coinage*, p. 12 and Stewart, 'Scottish Mints', p. 199, for die links.

<sup>38</sup> Martin seems to have won Lindsay over to his way of thinking. It is interesting that Martin's correspondence is quoted in this very context by Cochran Patrick, 'Remarks on the Coinage of Alexander II', *Proc. of the Soc. of Antiq. of Scotland* 12 (1877), 283-84. Martin later realised he was a bit mixed up (letter 13). See Stewart, *Scottish Coinage*, p. 16 and chapter III and Stewart, 'Scottish Mints', pp. 202 following.

perhaps a dozen of his coins to be found in all the cabinets of Europe.' They certainly are not so abundant as those of his successor. I have six or eight and I guess Cuff may have twenty at least, that cannot possibly be given to Alexander III owing to their inferior workmanship, their small size, their double short cross, their spur rowels and curiously formed letter A. Of Robert Bruce there are two or more coinages, one much lighter than the other. In fact all coins struck in the provinces are lighter than those coined at Edingbay (*sic.*). I think with you that the arrangement of the coins of the four first James is a matter of no small difficulty, and fear you will break down in attempting a correct appropriation. The Fleur de Lys groat as certainly belong to James I as the crown groat and naked bust to James II; the difficulty is whether other coins of lighter weight now given to James III may not belong to his predecessor, in the same way as the coins of Henry IV after his thirteenth year – of James III at present I say nothing. . . . On coming to James IV I again stand *on sure ground* – none but those with Q. Qrt. Qdr. Quart. 4 or IIII belong to him. Those with three-quarter face whatever the legend are also his because we know profile coins were not struck in Europe till the reign of Henry VII and Jamie married his daughter. The two pieces of James V puzzle me more than any others in the series. There must indeed have been a great deficiency of silver to cause pieces of 36 grains to pass for a groat. I wish you may be able to unravel the mystery. I hope to send you a drawing of another gold piece, and then *that series will be complete*. . . .

---

13. Keston. 19 December 1842.

. . . . If by short cross Mr Haigh would be understood to intend those only where the cross does not reach beyond the inner circle I certainly agree with you, and take leave to retract that sentence in my last which has reference to my own or Cuff's cabinet. No doubt such coins with the legend of Alexander and similar to the reverses of William the Lion are very rare, so rare that I have never seen more than one, and that in a very bad state. I may have overlooked such a coinage of late years but certainly not when twenty years younger. That point of history which refers to Alexander III is well established and a Rubicon that you cannot pass. What then is to be done with these coins bearing the name of Alexander, of small size, very inferior workmanship to those struck in 1250, with the A singularly formed, of various types, with heads to the right, to the left, with crowns and without crowns, with and without sceptres etc. with the names of moneyers and the towns of Annan<sup>39</sup> and Berwick, those of Alexander III bearing Rex Scotorum whether pence, half pence or farthings. Admitting that William coined a vast deal of money (a case not proven) and that little could be required during the reign of his successor, another false conclusion, I repeat your observations, because I feel persuaded that you are right, and Master Haigh wrong, to what king but Alexander II can the coins above mentioned be appropriated at all. For if Alexander III came to the crown at the end of 1249 and coined money particularly described in 1250 it is quite impossible that such numerous coins, which have not the long cross can have been struck within a few months. They are almost as common as those of Alexander III rex scotorum. These last were probably coined by French moneyers (one reads Rex Escossiae) of superior workmanship, and no doubt these men on their return to France were paid in their own money for the coins are common in Western and Eastern France and Western Germany at this present time.<sup>40</sup> I have found them in the Pyrenees. . . . Cardonnels' figure No. 19 with Jonas on An may have been struck immediately on his coming to the crown, but I have never seen it.<sup>41</sup> I had expected it would have been in my power to have enclosed two or three drawings, but none have as yet reached me from Findlay. Perhaps the wax impression may be new to you.

---

14. Keston. 29 December 1842.

My patience is exhausted and I am again disappointed in not being able to enclose a drawing of another gold coin, the quarter lion sejant of James VI unknown to all numismatists and collectors. As I take a great interest in your forthcoming work on Scottish coins and could wish that it should be as complete as possible, I venture to propose to you engraving another gold coin from my little Cabinet. With these six of mine, omitted by Cardonnel, and his sixty (three of which are medals or trial pieces) I am persuaded the whole of the gold coinage of Scotland will be fairly represented. Much about the time that Cardonnel published his *Numismata Scotiae*, Pinkerton's work appeared. It contains the only figure I believe of the noble of David II.<sup>42</sup> Three

<sup>39</sup> A misreading for Ander or An which are abbreviations for the mint of St Andrews.

<sup>40</sup> Stewart, 'Scottish Mnts', p. 223. The greatest example of Scottish coins turning up in Europe was to come some sixty years after this letter with the discovery of the Brussels hoard.

<sup>41</sup> This is a mistaken reading of Tomas.

<sup>42</sup> Lindsay, *Scotland*, fig. 2; Martin sale, lot 422. In an unpublished letter in the possession of the descendants of R. W. Cochran-Patrick, Martin in characteristic vein writes 'I am astonished that the sharks of Russel Street did not snap at my coin, which passed through their jaws'. There are now four specimens of this coin known to exist.

specimens of the coin are known, all differing in some very minute particulars; one in the British Museum, another in the Hunter Collection at Glasgow and mine. Now whatsay you to engraving the piece? The coin must not pass the water, but if you approve of my proposal I will take care Findlay shall furnish a correct drawing. Favour me with your fiat.

As Miss Lindsay's drawings are correct and satisfactory I beg leave to engage her attention in figuring the enclosed specimens. The first is a penny of Malcom IV which will perhaps interest you more than the others previously sent.<sup>43</sup> No. 2 a coin of Stephen, obverse and reverse the same as No. 1 except the name and town, corroborative of the date when the other was coined. One of William the Lion, face to left, legend Peris Adam on Ro. I intended to forward, but find you have already received a Drawing of it from Dr Smith. No. 3 called in Scotland the penny of Alexander I, but with all due submission to young Mr Haigh's acquaintance with Scottish coins and his ex Cathedra decision, what I deem a penny of Alexander II. I purchased it some years since of Mr Cuff, who is the last man in the world to part with his best coin, and therefore conclude his specimen is superior. Possibly it may be found in your list. No. 4 is unknown, and having a large Q in the obverse legend I appropriate it to James IV. It may be Cardonnel No. 7 Plate 6, but he has omitted the Q. . . .

A half groat of one of the James' with an I in the centre of the cross on the reverse I have overlooked. Possessing a perfect specimen of Cardonnel No. 8 Plate 5 in billon, I strongly suspected that what he copied was not silver. I wrote to Edinburgh requesting a friend would examine the coin in the Advocates Library. He answered by acquainting me that every single piece was wrapped in paper and the box containing the coins stood in a vaulted chamber without light, and that it would occupy his time more than a week to find it. In this state the Collection has remained since the middle of the last century. For such folk are you wasting your oil to midnight. I call the advocates Dogs in the Manger. At Glasgow the personal attendance of three professors is necessary to view the coins, and when last there they were all in their original wrappers of paper.

---

15. Keston. 2 January 1844.

(Comments on the Atholl collection)

John the 3rd duke was the collector, but principally of medals, and I have heard, used to come into the city to old Matthew Young's shop on Ludgate Hill as early as seven in the morning, two or three times in the week whilst resident in London. . . . The duke possessed some very scarce and curious medals, but I suspect not much in the coin way. . . .

Unless you have very valid reasons I would not disturb the arrangement of the gold of Robert II and III. I conceive that James II on coming to the crown coined first St Andrews and half St Andrews similar to those of his predecessors. Desirous of a change he might possibly direct his Cunzier to produce something new, then came No. 10 of Cardonnel. That specimen not being satisfactory another attempt was made, and then we have No. 11 and 12. I feel persuaded that James III first struck unicorns and no other gold money,<sup>44</sup> that James IV in three instances copied his predecessors and invariably inserted his numerals. With regard to David's noble, I decline at present saying anything, except that I am so bad a taker of impressions that I will not do anything of the kind. Dr Smith very recently gave me an account of Mr Sainthill's work. He spoke in high terms of it, and I find, has furnished many of the drawings. . . . Mr Butler has been making many acquisitions and many others have been picking up little curiosities. . . . What Thomas sale may produce no one can conjecture. I understood they, the cabinets, had been offered at £12,000 to the British Museum.<sup>45</sup>

---

16. Keston. 13 June 1844.

It has been more than six months since I gave directions to Findley to draw David II noble in tric, but from bad health, and the superintendence of two works mentioned in my last, I was not furnished with the drawing till Monday evening. I have most carefully compared it with the original, and will warrant its correctness. It would have pleased me more had the drawing been darker. I thought the same of Dr Smith's engravings. My eyes are I suppose in fault. You are quite at liberty to use the Museum engraving which differs from mine, or that in Pinkerton so as you give us one of the three, nor should you be restrained, whether you consider the piece as a medal, a fancy piece, or a coin.

With authorities for your guidance or information can you be quite certain that my smaller St Andrew of

<sup>43</sup> Martin here correctly attributes the coin yet it appeared as Lindsay, *Scotland*, p. 69, No. 5 and pl. 1 No. 5 and appendix No. 2, p. 205, as well as Martin sale lot 411 as Malcolm III.

<sup>44</sup> James III struck riders as well as unicorns but Lindsay follows Martin's view.

<sup>45</sup> The Thomas sale, Sotheby 1844 realised the then vast sum of £19,882.

Robert III is not or may not be the actual St Andrew of Robert II? I think differently with regard to the coins with Nencon, and can not conceive what right an *earl*, a *prince* or *baron* can have to bear a crown and sceptre on his coins. Nor yet why King Stephen's moneyers should copy as they have done both obverse and reverse the coins of a petty prince. The Parliamentary document of Jan. 26, 1489 I should say entitles you to place the eywin coins of James IV first in the list, but why that monarch should afterwards return to the old unmeaning full face requires some explanation.<sup>46</sup> The profile was intended as an improvement, and was followed by his successor. Did his contemporary Henry VII after striking his profile coins revert to the full face. I have never seen nor heard of any gold piece bearing the legend of Jacobus Quartus.<sup>47</sup> Probably the lions sejant of James VI were coined instead of those you mention with Hactenus Invicta. All that I said with regard to the P.L. and Raul Derlig was entirely conjectural and might stand for filius. The Greeks and Romans are mustering their forces for the attack on Thomas collection, no doubt by far the finest ever offered for sale, whether here or on the continent. Burgon has made quite a catalogue raisonnee of the Greek. Friend Rollin from Paris is coming over and swears he will buy everything. Unfortunately at this present time, there is not one collector of much eminence, who possesses also a superabundance of cash. The British Museum refused the purchase of the whole collection at £12,000 and I presume intend to compete lustily with the foreigners. But their wants are said not to be extensive. Hawkins purchased but little at the duke's sale, and may have reserved himself for future operations. Mons. Duprez will I have no doubt run him hard. For the Carausius and Allectus in gold he is said to have paid Rollin 8000 francs and they were purchased for £177.<sup>48</sup> Dealers you know must live. But such an advance appears unreasonable. . . .

---

17. Keston. 9 August 1844.

I really do not recollect having ever mentioned to you, except when the coin was sent, my penny of David I. It was found on the field of battle where Stephen was defeated by the barons and passed into my hands about twenty-five years since.<sup>49</sup> . . .

I am firmly persuaded that my penny of David I is as genuine a specimen as any you have in your collection. . . . In my humble opinion, you have entirely mistaken the art and tact of a falsifier, which in modern times is to imitate the rarest coins and not to originate new types.

My coin was of base metal and much corroded with rust when it came into my hands. I cleaned it with vinegar and salt, and sent it to Ireland. The coin shown me at the Devonshire Sale belonged to an undergraduate at Oxford. Hawkins also sent a similar one for my inspection in 1841, and I daresay that if people would give themselves the trouble of searching, they would find plenty more of the same description. I always smile when unique coins of common currency are shown to me.

I have not been able to attend the late sales and cannot give you any account of what has taken place. Friend Rollins came over determined to run all lengths and what with their purchases at the Sussex library, and Thomas' sale the British Museum, i.e. John Bull, will have disbursed a large sum of money. The late Thomas would have wished that his collection should have remained entire and therefore directed that it should be offered to the British Museum at 12000. Hawkins and Birch, however, on careful inspection found that their wants would not be very numerous, so decided on going into the market. . . .

---

18. Keston. 15 March 1845.

Many thanks to you for the first plate of the Scottish gold coins. Your artist has not succeeded so well as I could wish; with the exception of three coins the whole plate seems feebly executed. It may have been the most difficult of all, and therefore required more attention.

The Museum noble is respectably finished and I have always considered it (not indeed the best) but the most valuable of the three known, from having on the reverse St Andrew Cross. My coin has not been fairly treated and you have my consent to rap his knuckles, or to give him a kick. Where did you procure your drawing or impression of James I half St Andrew? I am acquainted only with two specimens, one not come-at-able, and the

<sup>46</sup> The document given by Lindsay (*Scotland* pp. 228-29) was dated 1488. Eyewin means full face and not three-quarter as here. The three quarter portrait groats are of James III though they were not current very long before his death and James IV had more reason to break with the practice of his predecessor than had Henry VIII in England.

<sup>47</sup> The only exception is the half unicorn with 1 in the centre, in the Bute collection; misread previously as

SCOTORUM but given correctly in Stewart, 'Scottish Coinage', Fig. 299 as SCOTORV QR.

<sup>48</sup> Both are now in the British Museum to which they were presented in 1864 by Wigan, Norman Shiel, 'The Episode of Carausius and Allectus', *British Archaeological Reports* no. 40, 1977, pp. 147 and 156 and plates A no. 8 and C no. 5.

<sup>49</sup> S. Till, *An Essay on the Roman Denarius and the English Silver Penny* (1837), p. 72.

other obtained with great difficulty.<sup>50</sup> Messrs. the Scots seem to me to care very little about numismatics. It is quite impossible but that the half St Andrew must have often turned up, but I am afraid the crucible has been much employed by them. With regard to No. 16 of Mary, all I can say is that I have never heard of or seen the coin in any collection to which Cardonnel is supposed to have had access.<sup>51</sup> . . .

In April we are to have a sale where you will find no less than 960 Irish pence of King John, plenty of half pence of both kinds I believe and one triangle farthing besides coins of Henry III, Edward I groats of Waterford Drogheda etc. etc. and I cannot recollect what besides.

Among the pence of John the name of one new moneyer occurs. I send an impression of David's farthing *Moneta regis D/reverse/Avid Scotorum*. Mine is a perfect specimen.

In the silver coins of James IV you have omitted the groat with beard. You may not have known where to place it, or you may possibly reserve it for the Supplemental Plate, or you may do with the coins as the Jews were directed to do with their Olives and Vines and leave a little of the fruit for the gleaner. I have not a specimen of David II Edinburgh halfpenny, at least I cannot find one. It is a very common coin, and many of your correspondents must have it.<sup>52</sup> I am not aware that you collect English gold coins. If such be the case and a nice round well struck half angel of Philip and Mary should fall in your way, pray buy it for me, never mind the money. My specimen is very indifferent and one other in the British Museum are all that are known. . . .

---

19. Keston. 25 June 1845.

Your packet arrived safely, and I find in the Plate which has been kindly forwarded, no less than two coins figured with which I am unacquainted. The half Atkinson of James VI No. 45, and the half plack No. 54. Some years ago I gave such attention to the Scottish billon money, and really thought with one exception (*sit nomen Domini benedictum*) all had found a place in my cabinet in accordance with my mode of collecting.<sup>53</sup> In your last letter you seemed to fear that the third plate of gold would be deficient and that certain promises made you would not now be fulfilled. The Plate must necessarily be deficient for you have already figured four coins of James V, and cannot furnish twelve including the remaining specimens of James V and Mary for the third plate. In case difficulties occur, it may be as well for me to say that I have a good specimen of all the Bonnets of James, and all of Mary's gold but No. 16. The coin is not mentioned in my list of the gold monies in the Advocates Library, not in that of the Society of Antiquaries. I do not think that it belongs to the Athol Collection, because the duke did not turn his attention to coins till after 1786, but it may possibly be found in Fraser's cabinet of which no one seems to know anything, as to where it is or in whose hands. . . .

Nothing as far as I am acquainted has transpired relative to the purchase of the Pembroke Collection. The price was to be eight thousand pounds or guineas. The collection is well known to contain many false coins, and it seems a large sum to raise by public auction. If it does take place few of the scarcer Greek and Roman will remain in this country.

---

20. Keston. 11 January 1849.

(Family news)

You have done wonders; yet it is a matter of doubt with me whether more than half a dozen individuals in Scotland are able to appreciate your work. It provokes me to think that your countrymen take so little interest in their antiquities. There is Dr Hunter's Museum, that of the Advocates Library, they might as well be buried. They are not to be examined without incurring great obligations, and no small share of trouble.

In the way of collecting I have been very quiet for some years, and can scarcely be said to be known in the market. Living very retired in the country, I have little chance of procuring any thing but what has been refused by the London cognoscenti. So as fortune favours the young I leave the field to more active and enterprising men. But their time will come, and they too will find that all their desiderata cannot be obtained. For nearly fifty years, I have spared neither time, money nor pains to procure a complete series of our Queen Mary's current coins English and Irish and want two now. In siege pieces struck at Scarborough and Beeston Castle though I have many more than any other collector and two that our Museum have not, yet am I very deficient.

From your account there does not appear to be much stirring in the coin way in Ireland. Here the Pembroke

<sup>50</sup> Lindsay, (*Scotland*, appendix 2, p. 213) records his sources as Advocates and Cuff. These are, in any case, coins of James II.

<sup>51</sup> This is probably Lindsay, *Scotland*, No. 116, which is Cardonnel, pl. 2, No. 16. No such piece is known to exist.

<sup>52</sup> This was not known to Burns, and Stewart knows of only one example.

<sup>53</sup> This refers to Cardonnel, billon and copper, pl. 1, No. 19 which is a French jetton and not a hawbee.

Cabinets caused some sensation. The Roman gold I thought very fine, and the collection on the whole sold well, but it was much inferior to the Devonshire. There were so many false coins. . . .

I hope things are improving in your neighbourhood. You have had a severe trial. May the worst have already past. I have several (Plates) of Sessanian or Arsacidian or for anything I know to the contrary Parthian coins. If likely to be of any use to you all are at your service. They were given to me by Nichols the printer.

---

21. Keston. 5 July 1849.

(Thanks for latest book)

One part of your letter has given me great satisfaction, which acquaints me that you contemplate an additional plate to your Numismata Scotia. It is singular but I have always had a predilection for Scotch coins and have paid much attention to them. Neither labour nor expense has been spared. Though by many years the first in the market, and my acquisitions, I dare say so numerous and as good, as those of any other collector, what has been the result but a miserable mass of defaced, clipped, ill-struck, base metal coins of the realm, incomplete both in gold and silver without the least probability of rendering it more complete.

I owe much to William Ferguson of Edinburgh who died in March last. . . . His collection has probably been disposed of by public long ere this. He had a few rare pieces, of the earlier series particularly a half groat of James II better than mine, but by no means good, and I believe a complete series of Mary testoons with some extraordinary dates.<sup>54</sup> He was a writer to the Signet but I am afraid with very little practice, and though he possessed a good knowledge of Scottish coins, and was an ardent collector, yet from his deficiency of means, he was unable to cope with two or three others, who ignorant of what they purchased bore off in triumph what he valued because possessed of a heavier purse. Such is often the case and few things more galling to a judicious collector. Little has passed in the coin way worthy of notice, since the Pembroke sale; nor will there be any more sales till the end of the year. Sotheby told me that on the preceding sales of coins, more than £1200 had not yet been paid: and that he was afraid to advertise another. The only acquisition I have made of any consequence is the Irish penny (good silver) of Mary, with a fine head and good reverse, but some witless person has drilled a small hole in the legend. For the Devonshire penny I bid £17 but gave it up to Hawkins to induce him to withhold his opposition to another coin. These two are all that I am *acquainted with*. Have you any in Ireland? I should be glad to know.

I trust that in your country, famine and trouble have ceased. You have had a fearful struggle.

<sup>54</sup> His collection was not sold until 1851. He had a portrait testoon of Mary dated 1565, one of two known and several other varieties. Cuff's notes in his copy of Cardonnel show that he too owed much to Ferguson.