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The following Dissertations being in themselves entirely independent of every other Design I may have formed in my own Breast, and at the same time having a mutual and not inobservably Connection one with another, it has been thought proper to bring them together, and to offer them to the Publick. And this I was the rather induced to do, by reason that, thro' the humane Disposition of the Gentlemen concerned, they have been already perused by some of our Antiquaries; and that, at the Request of others, I have been every now and then called upon to give Copies; a Task which, though I have hitherto never declined, yet I should now be glad to be discharged from. And whereas the Purport of the first and third Piece evidently tends to establish a Fact of great Importance to the curious Collectors of our English Antiquities, to wit, that our Saxon Ancestors had amongst them some coined Gold; and this Point, it seems, is not so thoroughly relished by the Literati, as to be thought every way clear and indubitable, but on the contrary to be liable to some Objections, I was willing to appeal to the World upon that Head, and to submit my Observations on this Subject to a more general Examination.
PREFACE.

The Occasion of writing the several Pieces is sufficiently opened in the respective Papers, and there will be no Need for me to repete any thing concerning that matter here; but then, since the Fact above-mentioned of the Saxons coining Gold, as asserted in the first and third Letter, has been publicly oppofed by a Person of some Note in the College of Antiquaries, it will be necessary to take some Notice of what that Gentleman has been pleased to alledge.

The Rev. Mr. George North, at the End of his Remarks on Mr. Clarke's Conjectures concerning a supposed Coin of Richard I. has printed an epiftolary Dissertation, read to the Society of Antiquaries, on some supposed Saxon Gold Coins. What Reception his Dissertation met with from the Gentlemen of the Society I cannot tell, but I am persuaded that upon a mature Discussion of the Reasons there offered, others will incline to believe that the Gold Pennies in Question may possibly be Saxon still.

'Tis presumed that by the Words, The Notion of a late happy Discovery of Gold Saxon Coins, has so much engaged the Attention of the Curious, and so much Pains have been taken in attempting a satisfactory Explication of the Legends on them, &c. Mr. North had an Eye to the first and third of the ensuing Papers, as well as to a Gold Coin of Dr. Ducarel's which he mentions in his last Page: And therefore as I am so directly interested in the Event of this Dispute, wherein he is pleased to diffent from me so totally, his Candor, I hope, will indulge me a few Words in my own Defence.

In the first place, then, Mr. North offers a general Argument, against these two Pieces being Saxon, from
the Singularity of their Types, for, says he, The Coins of all Nations in Gold and Silver bear a Resemblance to each other; and, however the Gold and Silver Coins may differ in Size, Weight, or Value, yet there is a constant Sameness of Manner in denoting and expressing to whom they belong. But this Argument proves a great deal too much; for there is not this Analogy between the Coins either of the Saxons or the English. Our first English Gold Coins differed vastly in their Type from the Silver ones of the Time; and amongst the Saxons, the Copper Sticas varied as much from the Silver Pennies, of those Days; even of the same Kingdom. Were the Gold Coins therefore not English? were the Sticas therefore not Saxon? The intelligent Reader will easily discover how inconclusive this sort of Reasoning is. Now as the Coins varied in one respect, they might vary also in another, and so as to that Particular here mentioned, of expressing the Name of the Person to whom they belonged, 'tis possible that an Omission of that sort might be peculiar to the golden Specie; this, I say, is possible; but there is no occasion to have Recourse to a possible Supposition, because if the Person to whom a Piece belonged was denoted by any other Method equally certain, the Omission of the Name in that Case might be easily dispensed with. Now I apprehend, that the Appropriation of the Piece was sufficiently provided for by the Mintmaster's putting his Name; for as these Masters were then publickly known, and were withal Persons of good Account, it was always notorious by whose Authority the Coin was struck, and consequently to what Prince or Prelate it belonged. Thus for Example, in Sir Andrew Fountaine's ixth Tab. you
have a Coin inscribed on the Obverse, \( \text{σύφνερνέρδ} \) MONETA, and on the Reverse, \( \text{sύφνερνέρδ} \) MONEGH, in the Area DRVR EFIS; from whence it is very clear that the Coin, though the Name of the Proprietor be not mentioned, either belonged to the then sitting Archbishop of Canterbury or the Abbot of St. Augustine, the former of whom had two Mints, and the latter one, at Dorovernia or Canterbury. The Head upon the Obverse must necessarily represent one of these Prelates; and this, I think, is as certain as if the Name of either of these great Ecclesiastics had been expressed in alphabetical Letters. I may add, that it was then very assuredly known, whether it was a Coin of the Archbishop or of the Abbot, because every one knew, or might know if they pleased, whose Servant Swefnerd was, to wit, whether he belonged to the Archbishop or to the Abbot.

So again, as to the next Coin in that Plate, the Obverse is inscribed, \( \text{σύφανίνε} \) MONETA, and the Reverse has in the Area DOROBERNIA LIVITAS; upon which I argue in like manner, that here the Prelate’s Name, by whose Authority the Piece was coined, is not expressed in Letters, but yet every one could know at the Time whose Coin it was, from the Master’s Name and the Place of Coinage.

I shall give a third Instance, and let that suffice, from the Sancti Petri Moneta in the same Plate, none of which exhibit to us the Names of the Archbishops of York, and yet since the Name of the City of York appears upon some of them, and the Name of the Masters upon others, they are groundedly esteemed to be Coins of
the Archbishops of that Province, and no doubt but at the Time it was sufficiently known to what Prelate each Penny appertained (1).

The Case is abundantly clear as to the Earl of Pembroke's Coin, and I think not less so in relation to Mr. Simpson's; for admitting LETO to have been a Workman of King Sibtris's in the Northumbrian Kingdom, the Subjects of that State, on the Sight of any Pennies with his Name, would immediately receive them as the legitimate Coin of their King.

But what becomes of our Author's Observation all this while, that there is a constant Sameness of Manner in denoting and expressing to whom they belong? 'Tis said without Grounds, that the Coins of all Nations in Gold and Silver bear a Resemblance to each other, as I have shewn; and then, as to the Sameness of Manner in denoting and expressing to whom they belong, there is no foundation for an Objection against Saxon Gold Coins from this Topic, because, as we see, the Silver Coins do not always express the Person to whom they belong, that is, they do not always express him in Letters, which is what Mr. North's Words must be interpreted to mean.

As to this Argument then from Analogy, which is thought to lie so strong against me, I would observe, that so far from oppressing me, it really militates very signally on my Side of the Question; for whereas I

(1) See also S. Martin's Penny in Lord Pembroke's Cabinet, Part iv. Tab. 2. and St. Edmund's Money in Sir Andr. Fountaine, Tab. vi. and above all, the Coin marked Eotberebtus in Sir Andrèw's viith Table, for the Coin belongs to Egbert of Wessex, and the Name on the Reverse is the Mintmaster's, and not the King's.
contend that the Coin inscribed VIGMVND appertains to Wulfstan I. Archbishop of York (1), the three prelatical Coins of the Pembrochian Cabinet, Part iv. Tab. 2. do all of them very remarkably resemble it, as does also the Penny of Ceolnoth Archbishop of Canterbury in Sir Andrew Fountaine's third Table; and certainly if a prelatical Coin be like the rest of the same Series, it will amount to a strong Presumption, that it is truly appropriated; wherefore I must insist, that this Gold Coin of my Lord Pembroke's is formed altogether after the Manner and Taste of the Saxon prelatical Specie. And this Observation I desire may extend to Mr. Simpson's Coin, which not only answers to Weight, but the Bust upon it is also sufficiently like King Sibtric, and no one, me-thinks, that knows any thing of the Anglo-Saxon Coins, will object to the Appearance of a Monogram on the Reverse.

It seems to me, that Gentlemen, in judging of these Matters, do not allow enough to the State and Condition of the Mintmasters; the Nature of whose Office and Employment likewise in these early Times ought to be taken into Consideration. The Masters were not Earls, nor perhaps of that high Rank, as Mr. Thwaites, and others, are ready at every Turn to suppose them; but nevertheless they were People of some Consequence; and the very Nature of their Office, considering that there were various Mints then going on in one Kingdom, and even many in one Town, as there were no less than seven in the City of Canterbury, made it necessary for their Names to appear in one Part or other of the Coin;

(1) See the first Dissertation.
because in case of any Irregularity, either as to Weight or the Purity of the Metal, a Complaint could not be made against the proper Person, unless it were known who the Minter was. And for this Reason, as I apprehend, the Moneyers were obliged to put their Names somewhere, and, as far as I remember, there are very few Saxon Coins, if you except the Sanéti Petri Moneta and the rest of that Class, that want the Name of the Master, I dare say there are not above one or two (1). This now may be thought another valid Reason, along with that above given (to wit, that the Master once known, the King or Prelate would also be known) why it might happen that the Master’s Name should occur in a Coin, even without the King’s or the Prelate’s.

But I come now to what Mr. North calls a close and decisive Argument. It runs thus; The only Piece of Gold we meet with in the Saxon Historians is the Mancus or Mancure, if, therefore, it shall be proved, that these new discovered Pieces cannot be the Coin so called, the Question is decided. But the Consequence is here denied; and upon this Foundation; to wit, that most Nations had Denominations in their Accounts different from any Pieces current among them, and that the Mancus or Mark, it is presumed, was of that Kind. The Saxons reckoned by the Pound, the Shilling, and the Mancus (2); but it does not appear they had any current Pieces of the Value of a

(1) N. B. The Name EOTBEREHTVS in the Coin marked Eotber-ebius in Sir Andr. Fountaine’s viii th Table, is the Name of the Mintmaster, and not of the King, as was said above.

(2) Nicholson’s Hist. Libr. p. 44. Edit. 1714. where see the rest, both of the coined Money and their Denominations. Note, They had both Silver, and Gold Marks, the first being four Pennies and the latter thirty.
Shilling, or of a Pound; and therefore one may reasonably suppose, until we have proved to the contrary, they had no coined Piece of the Value of the Mancus, but that it was only a Name in Accompts, just as the English Mark was; the Case, I presume, was the same in respect to the Trimsa. Allowing, therefore, that Mr. North should have established this Point never so clearly, viz. that the Coins, under Consideration, are not Mancus's, it will not serve his Purpose, since the Saxons might have Gold Coin amongst them, though not of the Weight or Value of the Mancus. Whereupon I infer, that all that follows in Mr. North's Dissertation, only proves that Mr. Simpson's, and Dr. Ducarel's Pennies are not Mancus's, which nobody ever supposed they were; but nevertheless they may be Saxon Gold Pennies, and if, upon this Gentleman's Principles, Gold in the Saxon Times was in Proportion to Silver, as Nine to One, the Value of each would be Nine-pence. I know not whether it be worth while to mention it, but I have myself a Gold Penny, which by the Aspect should be Saxon, and weighs twenty Grains, which tallies very well with the Weight both of the Doctor's, and Mr. Simpson's Piece, whereof the former raises Nineteen Grains and a Half, and the other Nineteen; whereupon I cannot avoid remarking, as to Lord Pembroke's Coin, that whether it answers to Weight, or not, and whether I have adjudged it in the Dissertation that follows to the right Owner or no, that is, though it should still remain the Property of Wigmund of Mercia, it will nevertheless be a Saxon, and continue to be a Proof that our Ancestors of that Nation coined some Gold.

But
PREFACE.

But as to my Sentiments concerning the State of the Gold Specie in these remote Times, these I have declared in the following Dissertations, where it is said, "Tho' the Saxons here in England probably had not much coined Gold current amongst them, their Payments in that Metal, when large, being otherwise regulated, yet this hinders not, but a single Gold Piece struck by way of Medal, may have come down to us." And again, "It begins now to appear to me... that the Saxons actually struck some Gold, though perhaps not much. Time, I am greatly in hopes, will clear this Point more fully." This Opinion I see no Cause at present to relinquish; for though the Pieces in Question do not prove to be the Mancus, they may nevertheless, as I have already asserted, be Saxon Coins. Here then I might dismiss Mr. North's Appendix, being directly concerned with it no further than this; however, I shall go so far out of my Way, as to say, that his Positions cannot be admitted. The first is, that the Weight of the Saxon Penny was Twenty-two Grains and an half; this now is generally spoken, but cannot be true, for the Saxon Coins varied, and many that I have weighed actually are a full Penny-weight and more; several of them Twenty-five Grains. Upon which I make no other Reflection at this Time, though it is a Subject that leads to some very important Conclusions, but that the Tower Weight, as it is called, could not prevail when the Coins were so heavy; and consequently that this Author expresses himself too generally, when he says, The Weight of the Saxon Penny... appears to be the same as of our most ancient English Money; and that it cannot be
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I.
A brief Dissertation on a most rare Gold Piece in the Pembrochian Cabinet, Part iv. Tab. 23. wherein it is proved to be a real Anglo-Saxon, and probably a Medal of Wulfstan, Archbishop of York.

In a LETTER to MARTIN FOLKES, Esq.

S I R,

AFTER I had the Pleasure of inspecting along with you that curious Gold Coin in the late Earl of Pembroke’s Collection, supposed to belong Wigmund King of Mercia, and some Doubts were raised concerning it, I held it adviseable at better Leisure to take it into more mature Consideration: And having now formed what I think a true, at least a settled Judgment upon it, I beg Leave to submit my Sentiments to your candid Disquisition, and by your means to communicate them, if you think proper, to the learned Society of Antiquaries, over which you so worthily preside.

The Coin is undoubtedly exquisite both as to the Type and Size, the Metal and Owner of it; in most of which
which Particulars it is indeed an Unic, greatly enriching that noble Collection of which it is a Part.

Concerning the Owner there is nevertheless some Cause of Doubt. In my Lord's own Plate it is said to be the Coin of Vigmund King of Mercia along with Wiglaf A. D. 830. but this Opinion I propose, in the Sequel, to call into Question, and after that to discover the true and rightful Proprietor of it.

Now in the first place I find nothing that leads to the Opinion of its appertaining to that Mercian, but on the contrary every thing against it.

I make the first Objection to the Form of the Letters, particularly the G, which in the Mercian Specie is always either E, 6, or 3. See Sir Andrew Fountaine's Tables in Wiglaf, Cynethrith, and Coenulf.

The second lies against the Head, which is a full Face, with a peculiar Ornament upon it, both which are entirely repugnant to the Representations given us of the Mercian Princes, either in Sir Andrew Fountaine's Tables or in this Collection.

My next Objection is to the Style, VIGMUND VREP which they interpret Vigmund Merciorum Rex, for I must think the Ligature VR to be Part of some one Word; and consequently that the M, so tied to the R, cannot be separated from it, so as to stand for Merciorum, as Gentlemen suppose, which would be highly unnatural. Neither can I discern in this Legend the Word REX, it being evidently REP.

The last and greatest Exception is, that upon the strictest Enquiry I cannot find there ever was any such King of Mercia as Wigmund. For though both Bromp-
D I S S E R T A T I O N I.

Ton and Higden inform us (1), that Wiglaf had a Son of that Name, yet he never was King, either in Conjunction with his Father or singly by himself; all the Authors that mention him agreeing, that Berthulf immediately succeeded Wiglaf.

And for these Reasons I esteem it absolutely necessary to seek out for some other Proprietor of this Coin, whose Claim may better consist with Appearances. This Proprietor, as I shall now shew, was probably no other than Wulfstan the First, the sixteenth Archbishop of York.

First, I conclude it to be a prelatical Coin, because I observe it in every respect to resemble those Pieces of this Class engraved in this Collection, Part iv. Tab. 2. which are all full faced, with a like Ornament or Mitre on the Head. See also the Heads of the Prelates in Sir Andrew Fountaine, Tab. iii. and ix.

Vigmund or Wigmund I judge to be the Name of the Mintmaster, nothing being more common than to see the Master's Name placed on the Obverse of the Coins, Sir Andrew Fountaine, Tab. i. Ælfred, N° 11. and Tab. ix. Numismata incerta, N° 5, 6. Le Blanc, Traité des Monnoyes de France, p. 57. and the Saxon Gold Penny found at Hull (2), especially where there is no Room for his Name on the Reverse, as happens to be the Case here, and on the Coin last cited (3). MR is therefore the

(2) Gentleman's Magazine 1747, p. 526 and 557.
(3) See also the Pembrochian Collection, Part iv. Tab. 2. the third Penny there.

Abbreviation
DISSERTATION I.

Abbreviation of Monetarius, and the whole of the Legend I interpret, VIGMVND Monetarius Episcopi.

Quere then, who this Vigmund was, and when he lived? For if that Point can be made out, we shall be enabled to conjecture with a tolerable Degree of Probability, whose Effigies it is that the Coin bears. Now there is a Master of this Name on two Coins of Anlaf the Danish King of Northumberland, Sir Andrew Fountaine, Tab. x. which I believe to be the same Person; consequently this Piece must have been struck in the Northumbrian Kingdom and at York, and exhibits to us the Image of some Archbishop of that Province cotemporary with that royal Dane; and, as there is good Grounds for believing, of Archbishop Wulfan, the sixteenth Prelate, who sat in that See from A. D. 941. to A. D. 955. and is known to have taken part with the Danes in that Country against his Liege Sovereigns King Edmund and King Edred (1), and with Anlaf consequently, whose Reign coincides with that Interval of Time. Whereupon it may be proper to remark, that the Workmen of the royal Mints were often employed by the Prelates of those Times; thus Æthelulf, who wrought for Plegmund Archbishop of Canterbury, was a Master of King Ælfred’s, and of Burgred King of Mercia; and Diala, who served Archbishop Ceolnoth, was likewise the Workman, perhaps in a different Part of his Life, of Coenulf King of Mercia.

I esteem it no Objection to our Conjecture that Archbishop Wulfan is here only styled Episcopus, for I find that very commonly done. See Mr. Drake’s Eboracum,

(1) Mr. Drake’s Eboracum, p. 409.
Nor is it any Objection that the Piece is Gold; for though the Saxons here in England probably had not much coined Gold current amongst them, their Payments in that Metal, when large, being otherwise regulated, yet this hinders not, but a single Gold Piece, struck by way of Medal, may have come down to us (2). And if we can be allowed, Sir, to consider this Piece as a Medal, it might possibly be coined on Occasion of the Peace struck up between King Edmund and King Anlaf, A.D. 942. by the Mediation of our Prelate and of Odo Archbishop of Canterbury; but this is offered as a mere Conjecture. However, the Reverse, MVNVS DIVI-NVM, round a Wreath, or Crown, may properly enough denote the Restoration of Peace, the Gift of Heaven, in Allusion to Luke ii. 14. Glory to God in the highest, and on Earth Peace, Good-will towards Men.

I shall only add for a Conclusion, that the above Appropriation of this Coin to the Anglo-Saxon Series, receives great Confirmation and Support from the celebrated Sol d'Or of Ludovicus Pius, of which Mons. Le Blanc, p. 99, has given us both the History and the (1) Cavendish, Life of Card. Wolsey, p. 48 and 155. Godwyn's Hist. of Hen. VIII, p. 71. Brooke's Cat. of Honour, p. 159. So Speed of the Pope, p. 1008. and the Protestants generally call the Pope only Bishop of Rome; so the Popes often style themselves. See also Sparrow's Collection, p. 1 and 4. And the Oath of Allegiance.

(2) This Point, whether the Saxons coined some Gold, is secure, whether this Piece be of Mercia or of Northumberland.
D I S S E R T A T I O N I.

Type. The Reverse has a like Cross within a Wreath, or Crown, with the same Inscription, *Munus Divinum*, which I think never appears on any Silver Coin. *Lewis* died A. D. 840, and his *Sol* weighed 132 Grains, which, if one may judge by the Size of our Type, might probably prove to be the Weight of this Piece, were it tried; but the Superintendant of Lord Pembroke's Tables has unfortunately omitted the Weight of this admirable and truly valuable Anglo-Saxon Remain.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

*Godmersham, June 20, 1751.*

*SAMUEL PEGGE.*

To
Dissertation II.

II.

To Mr. John White.

Sir,

The Day after I sent away my last, I found a little leisure to consider your curious Anglo-Saxon Penny, of which you were pleased to send me a type, and I here send you, with my compliments, the result of a close and very careful inspection. [See Plate, No. 2.]

Whereupon I have to remark, first, that the Name pulston, or Wulston, on the Obverse, cannot be the Mint-master, as was the case in the Gold Coin of Archbishop Wulstan, on which I formerly dissertated, because the Master's Name occurs on the Reverse.

It must, therefore, secondly, be the Name of the Prelate for whom, or by whose authority, the Piece was coined; for Wulston or Wulstan not being the Christian Name of any King of England, and the Device, moreover, not agreeing with those of any of our regal Coins, it ought to be referred, unquestionably, at least in my judgment, to that very imperfect Series, which I would call the Prelatical Series.

And then, thirdly, considering the Form of the Reverse, and the Manner of expressing the Legend there, we ought, I think, by all means, to refer it to the Close of the Reign of Ethelred II, the Father of Edmond Ironside, who died Ann. 1016, and whose Coins present us with the like Legends, and the same Stamp exactly, on that Side. We must, consequently, try what Prelate of that Time it will best suit.

D 2

Now
Now we have no less than three Wulfsons on Record, who may put in their respective Claims. The first is Wulfan I, the sixteenth Archbishop of York, who died A.D. 955, according to Mr. Drake's Eboracum. This is the whole Gold Coin I before endeavoured to illustrate, but cannot be the Prelate to whom this Piece belongs, because he went off the Stage too early, Ethelred not acceding to the Throne till A.D. 978, and it being in his Reign that this Type and Legends of this Form first came into Use.

The second is Wulfan III, Bishop of Worcester, who was consecrated A.D. 1062, towards the End of the Confessor's Reign, and died A.D. 1095, in the Time of William Rufus. But this cannot be the Person, because he is as much too late as the other was too early.

The third is Wulfan II, the Twenty-first Archbishop of York, who succeeded to both the Sees of York and Worcester, A.D. 1002, and died A.D. 1023. These Dates best agree with the Form and Fashion of this Coin; and as Ethelred II. acceded A.D. 978, and died 1016, his Death happened but seven Years before that Prelate's; and moreover, we shall find that the Type of the Obverse, at least as I interpret it, accords perfectly well with the Promotions of this great Ecclesiastic; but of that by and by.

And thus having found the Person to whom this Coin belongs, and he being both Archbishop of York and Bishop of Worcester, there will naturally arise a fourth Question, to wit, whether the Piece was struck for him as Archbishop of York, and consequently was minted in the Diocese of York, or as Bishop of Worcester, and therefore
D I S S E R T A T I O N II.

therefore in some Town of that Jurisdiction. I incline to believe the former, having found no Proof as yet, that the Bishops of Worcester, as such, ever coined any Money, whereas we are sure the Archbishops of York did.

But Quære, fifthly, where then this curious Penny was coined? the Reverse is *EANA ON LVD. from whence it is very obvious to imagine it was struck at Ludlow in Shropshire; but that cannot well be, since Ludlow is neither in the Diocese of York nor Worcester, but in Hereford, where you will find no Bishop of this Appellation. Whereupon I would observe, that there is no Place of this Orthography in the Diocese of Worcester; which amounts to a further Proof, that Wulfstan coined it not as Bishop of Worcester. But then, was there any Place so spelt in the Diocese of York? I answer, I think there was, and I pitch upon the Town of Leedes in Yorkshire, ancienly written Loid or Luyt. [See Mr. Thoresby's Pref. to his Ducatus Leod. p. viii.] For the Vowels are so easily changed, that Loidis, as Leedes is called in venerable Bede, might by others as readily be written Lydis or Ludis. And I myself have a Coin of Ethelred II, with a Reverse minutely in the same Form, and coined at the same Place, as I conjecture, for the Inscription runs, *ÆLFRIL NO LVD. And this, methinks, adds a mighty Confirmation to the Observation above, as to the Age of this Piece, since it shews so clearly, that Money of this Type was actually coined for the Crown, at Leedes, in the Reign of King Ethelred II.

Whereupon I would observe, that whereas that worthy good Man and diligent Antiquary, the late Mr. Ralph Thoresby, who being a Native of Leedes, was very
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folicitous to establish a Mint at that Place, comments upon one of his own Sticas thus:

"EDELRED. REX. Rev. LEOFDES. Moneta. supposing the F redundant, or designed for E, wanting only the Lineola at the Bottom (an easy Error in the bungling Minters of those Ages) and it makes LEODES. Leedes was, without Controversy, a Place much more eminent during the Heptarchy than many Places that occur upon their Monies, witness Bede, the venerable Historian, who lived in this very Century, and writes it likewise with an O." [Thoresby's Musaum, p. 341.]

Whereas, I say, Mr. Thoresby was so desirous of finding a Mint at Leedes, we can now furnish him with one upon very good Grounds, which I doubt were wanting before; for as to the Stica in Question and his Conjecture upon it, he in the first Place misreads the Name, which on the Coin is GEOFDEL. [See the Type in Camden, Tab. v. No. 13. of the Copper Sticas,] or LEOFDEG, which probably was intended for Leofreg (1) or Leofrig, a Name not uncommon amongst the Saxons. [See the Saxon Chronicle passim, and in particular the Name of a Minter of Ethelred II. See Sir Andrew Fountaine's first Table; you have the L in this Form Γ, on the two Sticas of Ethelhelm.] And then, what is worse, he takes the Name of the Mint-master for the Name of the Place, interpreting M. Moneta, whereas it rather signifies Monetarius.

One Word now upon the Device on the Obverse, and then I have done. One of the Figures is apparently a

(1) Dr. Wetton (that is, Mr. Thwaite, for Mr. Thoresby mistakes the Person) read it LEOFREG. See the Notes on that Table in Camden.
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Woman, as is clear from her Breasts, and I take it for granted, it was intended to represent the Virgin Mary. The other Figure, which is a Man, is in no Posture of Adoration, as one would expect from the received Notions of those Times, and moreover is placed on the Right Hand, consequently must be at least equal, or perhaps superior to her in the present Case. From whence I conceive, that Wulfian being both Archbishop of York and Bishop of Worcester, and the former of these Cathedrals being dedicated to St. Peter, and the other to St. Mary; these two Figures mean to represent St. Peter and St. Mary; and in this Case York, being the principal See, St. Peter would necessarily have the Right Hand. The Device, thus interpreted, affords us this Sense, Wulfian Bishop of St. Peter's and St. Mary's, and at the same Time appropriates the Coin, irrefragably, to Wulfian II, the Twenty-first Archbishop of York, as was asserted above, since there was no other Wulfian but him that enjoyed both the Sees.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient,

Whittington, Sept.
8, 1755.

S a m u e l  P e g g e.
Sir,

The Gold Coin, of which you were pleased to send me a Drawing (1), is very curious in regard both of the Metal and the Type. It is undoubtedly an Anglo-Saxon, of the Northumbrian Kingdom, being struck at York, in the Beginning of the tenth Century; and perhaps is a Coin, but this I speak with Diffidence, of the Danish King Sihtric. These Points I shall endeavour to establish and illustrate, as follows:

The Inscription on the Head Side is LETO MON. that is Leto Monetarius; for it is very customary to have the Mint-Master’s Name on an Obverse. Of this you will find many Examples in Mons. Le Blanc’s Traité des Monnoyes de France, p. 57, seq. But this Point I have fully clearly in a Dissertatio on the famous Gold Piece of my Lord Pembroke’s, Part iv. Tab. 23. and therefore need say no more here than only to observe, that sometimes the King’s or the Prelate’s Name is expressed in the Reverse, and sometimes not, as in this Case. And that, where it is not, it must needs be, generally speaking, exceeding difficult, and sometimes absolutely impracticable, to say, whose the Piece is.

(1) See Plate, Numb. 3. N. B. This curious Gold Penny is the Property, or lately was so, of Mr. Thomas Simpson of Lincoln. See Gent. Magaz. 1747, p. 526 and 557.
DISSERTATION III.

The Letters in the Cypher on the Reverse $\text{EiE}$, are only $\text{EiE}$, for the Twist in the Middle is nothing but an Ornament or Ligature to tie the $\text{E}$ and $\text{I}$ together. These Letters, Sir, I interpret, Civitas Eboraci; for I have seen the Place of Coinage very often expressed in such Monograms; witness that incomparable Coin of King Alfred with his Head, in Sir Andrew Fountaine's first Table, and Mons. Le Blanc, p. 88, et alibi. And indeed where the Master's Name is on the Obverse, as here, the Place of Coinage generally occupies the Reverse in some Shape or other. Sir Andrew Fountaine, Tab. ix. Numismata incerta, No. 6. Le Blanc, p. 57.

This Cypher, together with the Place where the Piece was found, to wit, at Hull in the County of York, induces me to refer it to the Northumbrian Kingdom, where only, so far as yet appears, the Anglo-Saxons coined Gold.

And I refer it to the beginning of the tenth Century; because I think it might be about that Time, if one may judge from the Gold Coin of Archbishop Wulfstan, that the Saxons began to stamp Gold. The Weight, methinks, which is nineteen Grains, agrees perfectly with this Period, for the Silver Money of King Edmund and King Edred, in Mr. Thoresby's Museo, and the Cotton Library (1), run thereabouts; and I must believe that the Gold Money was adjusted exactly to the Silver,

(1) I was favoured with the Weights of Mr. Thoresby's Coins by his Son, and those in the Cotton Library I weighed myself, with the Permission of the late Mr. Gasley.
as to Weight, whatever Difference there was, as to the Value of the two Metals (1).

I should imagine, lastly, that about this Time, the Mint-masters began in England to despit from putting their own Names only, without the King's, on the Specie; for I do not recollect any Example of it later than the Middle of this Century. If this be so, then I think this may possibly be a Coin of Sibtric, King of Northumberland, who began his Reign, according to Mr. Drake, A. D. 914, and the Drawing certainly agrees sufficiently with the Head of Sibtric in Sir Andrew Fountaine's Tab. ix.

I have been the more exact in the Consideration of this Piece, because it begins now to appear to me, from this Penny, and my Lord Pembroke's Piece above-mentioned, that the Saxons actually struck some Gold, tho' perhaps not much. Time, I am greatly in hopes, will clear this Point more fully. In the mean while,

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient,

Godmersham, July 31, 1751.

Samuel Pegge.

(1) Dr. Ducarel's Gold Penny weighs Nineteen Grains and a Half, mine Twenty Grains.

IV. A Differ-
A Dissertation on an ancient Jewel of the Anglo Saxons *, now in the Bodleian Library.

There is a well known and curious Piece of Gold now in the Bodleian Library, of which I propose here to take some Notice, though it be not properly a Coin. It has been no less than four Times engraved, first by Dr. Plot, in his Natural History of Oxfordshire; then in Camden's Britannia; after that by Sir Andrew Fountaine, in the Epistolary Dissertation prefixed to his Tables; and lastly by Mr. Wife, in the xvii th Table of his Catalogue; and all the Gentlemen concerned; to whom I may add Mr. Thwaites in his Notes on the Anglo-Saxon Coins, have respectively given their Opinion of it, but are so discordant amongst themselves, that there is indeed great Room and great Occasion for a Moderator to compose Differences between them, and, if one may be so happy, to give the true Explication of it. The Method I shall take will be in the first Place to give you the several Authors Words; then to add some Remarks upon them; and lastly, but with all due Deference to the great Names herein to be produced, to subjoin my own Opinion.

Dr. Plot, in his Nat. Hist. of Oxfordshire, p. 352.

"Before they [the Kings of England] touch for this Distemper [the King's Evil] they have always Prayers read suitable to the Occasion, both which, when performed, the King forthwith bestows on every Patient a

* See Plate, No 4.
Piece of Angel-Gold purposely coined, and put upon a White Ribbon to be hung about the Neck; which as long as worn preserves the Virtue of the Touch. . . . However it be, that this was the Custom ab initio I take to be plain from that Piece of Gold of King Edward the Confessor, Tab. xvi. Fig. 5. found in St. Giles's Field in the Suburbs of Oxon, having the initial Letters of his Name over the hinder Part of his Head, and two small Holes through it, as if designed to be hung on a Ribbon for the Purpose above-mentioned, the Holes being strengthened with Gold Wire fastened round them, and to the Piece itself, much after the Fashion of the Eye of a Man's Doublet, as exactly described in the Figure, ut supra; which Piece was lent me by that courteous Gentleman Sir John Holeman, Bart. in whose Possession it now remains at his House near Northampton.”

Mr. Obadiah Walker, in Camden’s Britannia,
Tab. iv. No. 40.

“The fortieth is taken out of Dr. Plot's History of Oxfordshire; it was found in digging the Works (1) at Oxford, and is, or not long since was, in the Possession of Sir John Holman. It is supposed to be the Gold given by St. Edward the Confessor at his curing the Scrophulae, or the King's Evil. It is worth noting, that it hath upon it the Figure of a Woman veiled (not unlike a Nun) whether of the blessed Virgin, or some other holy Woman, I cannot determine. But it seems much more proper for that Function, than that now used of an Angel; which was taken from the French.”

(1) In St. Giles’s Field. Dr. Plot.
Mr. Thoresby in Camden, ibidem.

"That Edward the Confessor was the first of our Kings who cured the Struma, is acknowledged by all, and that it was called the King's Evil upon that Account is probable enough: But that he and the succeeding Kings gave Pieces of Gold in this Form, may, I think, be justly scrupled, and can never be proved from E C, the supposed Initials of his Name, who is never styled Confessor upon any Moneys or Medals of undoubted Antiquity. And if Gold had been coined and distributed upon this, or any other Occasion, in those Ages, a greater Number of them, no doubt, would have been found in the Cabinets of the Curious, as well as their current Moneys; whereas, nothing of that Metal appears till Edward the Third's Time; and that, perhaps, no other, than the current Silver Money of each Prince, except gilded for Distinction. Such an one, with a Hole for the Ribbon to be hung about the Neck, was amongst the Curiosities in the old Lord Fairfax's Museum, and is yet preserved in this. It has the full Face (as he is represented upon his Great Seal in Speed's History) with the arched Crown, and may possibly be one of the same numerical Pieces given upon that Occasion. As for the Curiosity described by the ingenious Dr. Plot, in his History of Oxfordshire, and from him transmitted to Number Forty in this Table, I look upon it as a Sort of Amulet (for which those darker superstitious Ages had an extraordinary Veneration) like that noble one of King Alfred, described by the learned Dr. Hickes (1); and do

(1) In his Thesaurus Ling. vet. Septentr. p. 142.
conclude, with Dr. Wotton, that those Pieces inscribed
St. Edmond, were of the like Nature."

Sir Andrew Fountaine, Dissert. Epift. ad Comit. Pem-
brochiae præfix. Tab. Nummorum Anglo-Sax. &c.

"At vero mihi haud diffitendum est, ne unum quidem
[numnum aureum] aut a me unquam fuiisse visum, aut
inter legendum mihi occurrisse, nisi in Dissertacione illa
Walkeriana et Historia Naturali comitatus Oxoniensis a
Doctore Plot conscripta. Hic quidem scriptor, eumque
secutus Walkerus, numnum 40" in tabula octava
(quam videre est in prædicta editione Britanniae Camde-
nianæ) autumat esse Saxonium, et qualem ad curandam
Scrophulam Edvardus cognomento Confessor hominibus
morbo illo laborantibus elargiri solitus est. Sed ratio-
ciniis adeo insirmis innixa est hæc opinio, ut in
tabulis nostris monetae Saxonicæ nummus iste nullum
obtinuerit locum. Veruntamen iconem ejus infra appo-
nere visum est, ut inde judices, Hon. Comes, quam valido
argumento contendat Walkerus numnum hominibus
scrophulæ affectis elargiendum, monachæ quam Angeli
(uti nunc dierum in more positum est) imagine rectius esse
signandum."

Mr. Thwaites.

"In the 16th Page of Sir Andrew Fountaine's Epistolary
Dissertation, a Coin (or Piece of Money) represents, if I am
not mistaken, the Head of Jesus Christ, with these Letters,
C. A. ≤. Ω. that is, Christus Alpha et Omega; Christ,
Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and Ending, or first and
last. This Head is adorned with a triple Crown. The little
Character ≤ (&, and) is to be seen now in ancient Coins,
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struck in the same Manner. It is taken from the Anglo-Saxon " or 'I (&, or and.)"

Mr. W i s e, Numism. Bodl. Catalog, p. 232.


So far the Gentlemen Commentators: Now as to Dr. Plot's and Mr. Walker's Notion, of this being one of those Pieces distributed by Edward the Confessor amongst the Patients touched by him for the King's Evil, the later Antiquaries, Sir Andrew Fountaine, Mr. Thoresby, and Mr. W i s e, all agree to reject it, and, I think, very justly.
DiSserTATIoN IV.
justly. In the first Place, Dr. Plot builds his Opinion upon the C, which he thought he discerned upon it, and which he imagined might denote Confessor; but that Letter is not a C but a G. Secondly, I esteem this Piece of Gold to be older than that Prince. Thirdly, I do not take it to be a Coin. Fourthly, The Head does not represent a Woman veiled, consequently neither the blessed Virgin, nor any other holy Woman, as Walker thought, but a Person of a higher Order, as will be seen below. To all which you may add, fifthly, the plausible Objections raised by Mr. Thoresby.

Mr. Thoresby very rightly judges it to be an Amulet, but he has contributed little to the Explanation of it, since he adds nothing either concerning the Effigies or the Letters upon it, but leaves us still entirely in the Dark as to them.

Sir Andrew, in Effect, says little upon it, contenting himself with alledging it to be no Coin, and exposing Mr. Walker’s, and Dr. Plot’s Notion, of its being a Touch Piece.

Mr. Thwaites, who follows next, has come nearest the Truth; but as on one hand he takes it for a Coin, which it is not, so on the other, he still persists in the old Track of taking the G for a C, and likewise has overlooked two other Letters. Moreover, his Interpretation has been so coldly received, so slighted by Mr. Wife, who seems entirely to dissent from him, and even to doubt whether there be any Inscription or not, that it may be thought necessary, to do Justice to Mr. Thwaites in certain Particulars.
Mr. Wifé very rightly holds it to be a Jewel, and not a Coin; but then, I think, he mistakes its Use, and even doubts, as I said, whether there be any Legend upon it; which I cannot but admire, since that is so evident in his own Type.

What I propose, therefore, to do in the last Place, in regard to this Dissonance of Opinions, is, first, to discover and explain the Letters. Secondly, to shew whose the Head is. Thirdly, to add a Word of the Age of the Jewel. And fourthly, of the Use for which it was originally designed.

First then, this Jewel is chased and repaired; for that Side which is placed for the Reverse in Mr. Wifé’s Type (which I make Use of here, as esteeming it to be the most accurate) is the Intaglia, or concave Side, and the Obverse is the Convex. But the Workman very thoughtlessly (a Fault too frequent in those rude and early Times) wrought the Letters of his Draught or Pattern the right End upwards on the Concave Side, by which Means all of them but one, namely, the G, are inverted on the other. The Margin, which consists only of Ornaments, seems to be entirely embossed, or the Work of the Chiffel, there being no Appearance of it on the other Side. The Letters, then, on the Convex Side, where they are the fairest, are EGOVSU, all which, except the G, being, as I said, inverted, when they are made to stand upright, are EGOΛΩΩ, which I interpret Ego Alpha et Omega, the Λ wanting the cross Stroke, as is very common on the Coins, and the reversed S (? being an usual Abbreviation of et. Mr. Thwaites calls this the little Character ⼰, but I do not know why,
since it is of the Size of the Letters. This Character he deduces from the Anglo-Saxon ז or י, which is certainly very unnatural, if it is to stand that Way he gives it; but if it be reversed, as is alleged above, then it may possibly be that Anglo-Saxon Character rounded at the Corners, or rather that other Mark E, which he gives us, Page 182, so rounded; and it is certain, that upon the English Coins, both Gold and Silver, from Edward III. to Edward VI. inclusive, the < or et generally stands that Way. Mr. Thwaites also overlooks two of the Letters, the first and third, and takes the G for a C; but it is evidently a G in Mr. Wise’s Plate, and the other Letters, E, G, O, are very conspicuous upon the Jewel on the Obverse or convex Side; and I cannot but wonder he should miss them; and much more that Mr. Wise should dispute the Existence both of them and the rest of the Letters, which I think must be undoubtedly to every body else. These, now, are all the Letters and Characters I can perceive, the Strokes or right Lines, that precede the E, being intended for another Purpose, as will appear hereafter.

The Head, therefore, in the second Place, is not an Angel’s, or the Blessed Virgin’s, or other holy Woman’s, as has been supposed, but our blessed Saviour’s. The Legend plainly alludes to Rev. i. 8. Ego sum α et ω (1); and you may observe the Cross placed before his Face, and Rays of Glory (which at first Sight some might take

(1) I think it very probable, that the Word sum was wanting in that Copy of the Latin Vulgate which the Designer of this Jewel made Use of. But at present I have no Opportunity of examining how the several Copies of that Version stand, in Relation to this Text.
for Letters) issuing from the Dress or Ornament of his Head; for what Mr. Thwaites above calls a triple Crown, is nothing else but an antique Head-dress, something like what we have on the Coins of Burgred King of Mercia, in whose Territory the Jewel was found. See Sir Andr. Fountaine's Tab. iii. Burgred, No 17—23.

I would willingly, therefore, thirdly, refer the Piece to the Mercian Kingdom, the G being of a Form sometimes used in that Country, [See the foregoing Dissertation on the Coin of Archbishop Wulfstan] and to the Reign of King Burgred, who was living when King Ælfred came to the Crown, and flourished in the Middle of the Ninth Century. But if any Gentleman, on Account of the Inscription ΑΩΩ, would chuse to place it an Hundred Years later, when the Allusion to that apocalyptical Description of our Saviour was much in Vogue, namely, in the Reign of Ethelred II, as appears from his Money in Sir Andr. Fountaine's first Plate, I will not greatly contest it with him. In either Case, the Jewel will be older than Edward the Confessor, and can have no Relation to him, or his pretended Cures. However, it should be remembered, on the other Side, that in the Franco-Gallic Series, the Α and Ω appears sooner than the Time of Kenred King of Northumberland(1). It is observble, that there are certain Holes in it for a Silken String or small Ribban to pass through; and therefore I think it highly probable, in the last Place, that it was intended to be worn about the Neck, either by way of Ornament, or perhaps as an Amulet, or Charm, according to the Conjecture of Mr. Thoreby.

And this, I think, much more likely than the Notion of Mr. Wife (who fancies it might be intended for the Boss or Ornament of a Book, or some other Piece of household Furniture) by Reason that the said Holes are placed near together, and not opposite to one another in different Parts of the Margin or Border, which surely they would have been, had the Jewel been intended to have been fastened to any other Substance.

Quære, Whether this be not the oldest Piece of chased Work at this Day any where extant.
V.

Second Thoughts on Lord Pembroke's Coin;

In a Letter to Mr. Joseph Ames.

Sir,

You remember that in the Year 1751 I wrote a Letter to Mr. Folkes, concerning a curious Gold Penny of Lord Pembroke's, which I perceive has been perused by many others of my Brother Antiquaries, as well as yourself. But since then, and indeed since the preceding Dissertations, with the Preface prefixed, were dispatched to London for the Press, I have had the Pleasure of inspecting, by the Favour of our common Friend, Mr. White, a Couple of Sticas, which have occasioned me to alter my Sentiments on that Coin. This, Sir, I am never ashamed to do upon valid and sufficient Reasons; and what the Reasons are that have induced me to do it in this Case, I here beg Leave to declare in what follows. And this Method I take of giving the World my second Thoughts, rather than to suppress or interpolate the Letter; because, as I observed, it has been seen by so many; and that though I shall now appropriate the Coin to a different Prelate, the Letter, in the most material Parts, will not be affected, and wherever it is, I propose to specify below.

Now, Sir, one of Mr. White's Sticas is in most exquisite Preservation; and this still remains in the Custody of that Gentleman, who has permitted it to be engraved.*

* See the Plate, No. 5.
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The other, which now by his Bounty enobles my slender Cabinet, is in good Order in every other Respect but the Prelate’s Title, which unhappily is but too much defaced.

The Inscription of the first, which singly is sufficient for our present Purpose, is, + VIGMVND ARΣP; Reverse, + LoENRED. The Legend on the other Coin is the same on both Sides, only, as I said, the Σ-P are somewhat obliterated; for that the third Letter in the Style is a Σ, and not an E, will appear evidently to any one that compares it with the two E’s on the Reverse.

You will be sensible, Sir, that ARCH-P can stand for nothing but Archiepiscopus, of which Word those Letters are a natural Abbreviation; especially if it be considered, that the third Letter with the short Line or Dot after it, and placed just in the Middle of it, was intended both for a Σ and for an E, as was common in these Times. And whereas we now, according to the Truth of the Etymology, do insert an H and an I in this Latin Name, that was not the Custom anciently; for you have upon the Coins AREEPIΣ for Archiepiscopus. See Sir Andr. Fountaine’s Tab. iii. Ceolnoth, No. 2. As in the Saxon Chronicle, anceb. for the English Word, Archbishop.

These Sticas, then, must belong to Wigmund, the twelfth Archbishop of York, who sat in that See from the Year 831 to A. D. 854. For though both Matthew of Westminster (1), and William of Malmesbury (2), agree in calling him Wimund, yet I presume it is by Accom-

(2) Gul. Malmesb. p. 269.

modation
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modation to the Pronunciation of their own Times, and that otherwise the true and ancient Orthography was Wigmund, or Vigmund, a Name not infrequent among the Saxons (3). Whereupon I would observe, that Malm- bury, in another Place, to wit, p. 291. writes the Name Guimund, still more conformably to the Norman Manner, for that Guimund, and Wimund, and Vigmund, are the same Name, there remains no Doubt with me. However, for the Sake of others, I will proceed so far as to remark, that the Mercian King, Wiglaf, a Cotemporary of our Prelate’s, and whose Name is so given both on the Coins (4), and in the Saxon Chronicle (5), as likewise in Florence of Worcefer (6), and Ralph Higden (7), is called by Matthew of Westminister (8), and William of Malmbury (9), and Henry of Huntingdon (10), Wilaf; inomuch that it seems to have been the constant Method of these later Historians to soften these old Names by leaving out the rough Letter G. But the Name is clearly written Vigmund, on two Sticas in Sir Andrew Fountaine’s xth Table, and there given to Anlaf, the Danish King of Northumberland. For, Sir, I must be of Opinion, that those two Sticas do both of them appertain to this Prelate, the Obverses there being put for the

(3) Wilkins’s Councils, Tom. i. p. 179. 175. 167, 168.
(4) Sir A. Fountaine, Tab. ix.
(6) Florentius Vigorn. passim.

Reverses
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Reverses, and, vice versa, and Hunlaf, the Name of the Mint-master, being taken for the Name of the Prince. All this, Sir, I take to be very plain from the Legend of the first of these Coins, * VIGMVND \R, where the two last Letters (the last Stroke of A coalescing with the upright Stroke of the R) stand for Archiepiscopus; for if this first of those two Sticas be rightly interpreted, as I dare say you will think it is, there will be no Doubt of the other; and then all the Difference between these, and our Sticas, will be, that they were struck by two different Masters.

Supposing then, that these four Sticas, or, if you will, our two Sticas only, are the Property of Archbishop Wigmund, is it not probable that Lord Pembroke’s Gold Penny belongs to the same Prelate? The Letters are certainly sufficiently similar. And more than this, have we not some Reason to suspect, that the Letters on my Lord’s Coin, NVREP, have been misread for AREP? But this, Sir, I can only put as a Query, of which I must leave the Decision to those who hereafter may have an Opportunity of viewing the Coin more accurately.

And now, Sir, let us see what Effect this new Appropriation of my Lord’s Coin will have upon the Letter formerly written about it to Mr. Folkes. And this truly in the main will be very little or nothing. For first, the Coin still remains adjudicated from the Mercian Prince. Secondly, it still proves to be a Coin of the Northumbrian Kingdom, as also of the Prelatical Series. Thirdly, it was still coined probably in Imitation of the Sol d’Or of Ludovicus Pius, who was Cotemporary with Archbishop
bishops Wigmund, though not on that Occasion conjectured in the Letter. And fourthly, and lastly, it still continues to be a strong Proof, that the Anglo-Saxons had amongst them some coined Gold. But in relation to this Particular, it may be proper for me to note, that whereas I have insinuated, in the third of the foregoing Dissertations, that it might be in the Tenth Century that the Saxons began to stamp Gold, it appears now that they began in the Ninth.

In the Letter to Mr. Folkes, I have also said, "that my "Lord's Coin was exquisite both as to the Type and "Size, the Metal and Owner of it: In most of which "Particulars it is indeed an Unic;" and this was truly the Case at that Time; but it seems it is no longer such either in respect of the Metal or the Owner, since Mr. Simpson's Gold Penny, and, in my Opinion, others, will rank with it in Point of Metal; and then as to the Owner, it has been found now, at length, that we have two, if not four Sticas of the same Prelate. But, how widely do the Sticas and the Gold Penny differ? which shews what little Foundation there is for our Friend Mr. North's Remark, "That the Coins of all Nations "in Gold and Silver bear a Resemblance to each other." For certainly there is as much Reason for Gold and Copper to be alike, as Gold and Silver, and yet nothing can well be more dissimilar, as to the Type in general, than my Lord's Piece and the Sticas.

I will only trouble you with one Particular more; I have said, in the foregoing Preface, that there are very few Saxon Coins that want the Name of the Mint-master; but if Wigmund be the Name of the Prelate, as is here supposed,
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supposed, this Coin of my Lord's will be another Instance. But then, Sir, the Observation will not be greatly invalidated by that, since there are so few Examples of it, even with this Coin of my Lord's included.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient,

Humble Servant,

Whittington, Oct.
15, 1755.

Samuel Pegge.

FINIS.

Lately published, by J. Whiston and B. White,
In one Volume, Royal Quarto,
(Price Eighteen Shillings neatly bound)

I. TABLES of Ancient COINS, WEIGHTS, and MEASURES, explained and exemplified in several Dissertations. By John Arbuthnot, M. D. Fellow of the Royal Society and of the College of Physicians. To which is added, An Appendix, containing Observations on Dr. Arbuthnot's Dissertations on Coins, Weights, and Measures. By Benjamin Langwith, D. D.

II. A DISSERTATION upon ORIUNA, said to be Empress, or Queen of England, the supposed Wife of CARAUSIUS, Monarch and Emperor of Britain, who reigned in the Time of Diocletian, the great Persecutor of Christians; whom he was at War with for many Years, until received as Colleague with him in the Roman Empire. Illustrated with the Coin of ORIUNA, and several others most remarkable of CARAUSIUS, hitherto not made public; this Coin of her's being lately sent to France to his Most Christian Majesty. Price 2s. 6d. few'd.