

particates were linear rods, each six elnes of 37 inches, as one would expect in a burgh. 'There is no historical ground for maintaining the ordinary tradition that this building was the Hotel of the Knights Hospitallers', whose principal place in Scotland was at Torphichen, near Linlithgow. 'It is said to have belonged to the Knights Templars.' That order was abolished in 1312, but the endowments were given to the Hospitallers: the term 'Temple tenements' continued to be used, and was also applied to other endowments of the Hospitallers, which included a toft in every burgh, granted by Malcolm IV. The building in question may have had no stronger connection with the Hospitallers than its site being such a toft, for which the ancient rent was paid to the order. Similarly, John Ker's tenement could have been a Temple one, but only if the term *firma burgalis* could apply to the old fixed rent even when it was not due to the king, as originally, and later to the burgh, by the feu-charter.

While there is no mention of this 'so-called "Mint"' in the *Statistical Account of Scotland*, nor in the mid-nineteenth century one, the writer of the Linlithgow article in the former does refer to the town being a mint. After mentioning the profitable silver mine 'in the southern extremity of the parish', he stated that silver 'from it was also coined here during the residence of the royal family, and some of the great pieces are still in the repositories of the curious'.¹⁸ It was in 1606 that silver ore was found at Hilderston, which was profitably mined for some years, but there may have been an earlier find in James I's reign. It is only for 1427–29 that the exchequer rolls show

payments to a miner, Gerard Frange or France of Frome, who is also called the refiner, but there may have been payments by the treasurer too, and doubtless there was continuing interest in establishing royal mines for precious metals.¹⁹

As Ian Stewart wrote in 1971, 'most of the Linlithgow obverse dies do not link with Edinburgh; many of them are of varieties not represented at Edinburgh, so perhaps minting was temporarily transferred to Linlithgow at this period'.²⁰ Further obverse die-links for Linlithgow, with Edinburgh and with Perth, have come to light since that was written, but they do not invalidate this conclusion of a temporary transfer, which may apply to Perth, too, except for the group II groats with the different head and crescents, die-linked with Stirling. If there was, indeed, a find of silver ore near Linlithgow in the 1430s, the transfer of mint personnel from Edinburgh might have been required for refining this on the spot. (For the Hilderston silver mines, fining and stamping mills were built at Linlithgow loch, in 1608.²¹) It is, admittedly, so natural to postulate a causal relationship between local silver and locally minted groats that it is doubtful whether the local tradition was any more soundly based than this. Nevertheless, it may be thought unlikely that a more satisfactory explanation will be found for the use of Linlithgow as a mint. Before finding the records to date this, I had searched for evidence of pestilence, as a reason for moving the mint from Edinburgh, as in 1585, but the known years of pestilence are 1431 and 1439, neither of which appeared suitable, even without the attested dates.

¹⁸ *The Statistical Account of Scotland*, edited by Sir John Sinclair (1791–99) – vol ii, *The Lothians*, in the 1975 reissue, pp. 768–69.

¹⁹ *ER* iv, pp. 436, 437, 443, 470.

²⁰ 'Scottish Mints', p. 235.

²¹ R.W. Cochran-Patrick, *Records of Mining in Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1878), p. 142.

FURTHER NOTES ON THE YORK MINT OF CHARLES I

EDWARD BESLY

SINCE a study of the York mint of Charles I was published in volume 54 of this Journal,¹ further specimens of its products have been examined, notably a significant private collection containing specimens of most of the recorded die-combinations. Four further Civil War period hoards containing York coins have also come to light and new evidence relating to its organisation has been discovered. This

note updates the facts and conclusions presented in the former article.

Three newly-discovered hoards may be summarised as follows:

i. Breckenbrough, N. Yorks, 1985. 30 AU, 1552 AR, £93. 5. 0d approx. Latest coins: Tower 1s (P) (4)

and specimens detailed here, and to Mark Stoye for drawing my attention to York's mint master.

¹ E. Besly, 'The York Mint of Charles I', *BNJ* 54 (1984), 210–41. I am grateful to Craig Barclay, Donal Bateson, Barrie Cook and Robin Sanders for access to information

/ York 2s 6d (5), 1s (5). York: halfcrowns 1D, 2C, 2G (3); shillings 1B (2), 1E, 2Bb, 2Cc. Also contains 13 Continental coins, mainly ducats and fractions, and two receipts for cheese dated 17 January 1643 O.S.²

ii. Caunton, Notts, 1988. 1571 AR, £62. 14. 9d. Latest coins: Tower 2s 6d (P) (6), 1s (P) (26)/Oxford 1643, York. York: shilling 1B (1). Also contains 31 Continental coins, mainly patagons and fractions.³

iii. Grewelthorpe, N. Yorks, 1991. 296 AR, £16. 7. 6d. Latest coins: Tower 2s 6d (P) (9), 1s (P) (5)/York 2s 6d (7), 1s (2). York: halfcrowns 2C, 2G, 2J, 2J (2), 2L, 3A; shillings 1A, 2Dd.⁴

The fourth hoard is a nineteenth-century find:

iv. Fountains Abbey, N. Yorks, 1851. 354 AR, face value not known. Latest coins: Tower, Triangle-in-circle (? – at least one halfcrown)/York (at least two coins). York: halfcrowns 1B and probably 2B, shilling 1A.⁵

While Caunton adds little, the other three hoards, all buried 1643–4, form a useful supplement, and tend to confirm that the sequence of the York issues matches that suggested for the cutting of its die-sets. Apart from the exceptional Pocklington deposit, which contained a significant mint-fresh batch of group 3 halfcrowns, Breckenbrough and Grewelthorpe provide the largest hoard groups for York yet recorded and may perhaps represent a more realistic view of the mint's output, at least as far as the two largest denominations are concerned, and the general abundance of group 2 halfcrowns relative to groups 1 and 3 is confirmed. Both of these hoards are probably 1644 deposits – Breckenbrough, on the basis of the two receipts, certainly so. Grewelthorpe, with its higher proportion of the (P) issue from the Tower (pyxed 15 July 1644) may be the later of the two. The presence of a group 3 halfcrown in Grewelthorpe, poorly produced but not noticeably worn (pl. 11, 292), may therefore confirm its late place in the York sequence. Table 1 summarises the hoard evidence for York as it now stands, down to hoards closing in 1645.

TABLE 1: York coins in Civil War hoards⁶

		York halfcrowns				York shillings		Latest Tower
		1	2A–F	2G–L	3	1	2	
E5	Chesterfield	1	–	–	–	–	–	T-in-C (1641–3)?
E6	Constable Burton	–	–	–	–	–	1	T-in-C
E8	Fountains Abbey	1	1	–	–	1	–	T-in-C?
	Caunton	–	–	–	–	1	–	(P) (1643–4)
E16	St Annes	1	–	–	–	–	–	(P)
E2	Breckenbrough	1	1	3	–	3	2	(P)
	Grewelthorpe	–	1	5	1	1	1	(P)
E13	Pocklington	–	–	–	48+	–	–	(P)
F2	Ashdon	–	–	2	–	–	–	(R) (1644–5)
F13	Penybryn	–	1	–	–	–	–	(R)
G2	'Cotswolds'	–	–	–	1?	–	–	Eye (1645)

The examination of sixty or more 'new' specimens has produced no new dies and no new combinations of dies. The 'machine trial' halfcrown of type 1A illustrated from Folkes has been found, amongst the Charles I patterns in the Hunter Collection (pl. 14, 1), but no further examples of such trials have come to light. One further halfcrown obverse die (2C) proves to show signs that its EBOR signature was recut using larger letters, a feature previously noticed only on 2D; this was observed on the Breckenbrough specimen, an unusually heavy (15.57 grams) and well

struck coin. The heaviest York coin yet noted, excepting the uncut 'trials', is a specimen of 3A in the American Numismatic Society collection, at 15.69g. The additional material also permits an updated weights summary, as follows:

Halfcrowns	1:	14.21g (28 specimens, 94.4% of standard)
	2A–F:	14.08g (44, 93.6%)
	2G–L:	14.23g (39, 94.3%)
	3:	14.61g (63, 97.1%)

² E. Besly, *English Civil War Coin Hoards*, British Museum Occasional Paper No. 51 (1987), pp. 6–16.

³ B.J. Cook, 'Four Seventeenth Century Treasure Troves', *BNJ* 60 (1991), 91–96.

⁴ C.P. Barclay, *pers. comm.*; see this vol., pp. 76–81

⁵ Besly, *Hoards*, p. 51; for the date of finding and size of

hoard: J.R. Walbran, *Memorials of the Abbey of St. Mary of Fountains*, Vol. II, Surtees Society LXVII (1876), at pp. 141–2.

⁶ For summaries and references, see Besly, *Hoards*, pp. 86–93.

Shillings	1:	5.77g (36, 95.8%)
	2:	5.73g (46, 95.2%)
Sixpences		2.93g (20, 97.4%)
Threepences		1.31g (62, 87.0%)

The overall averages are very little changed, even where (in the case of halfcrowns, 2G-L) the sample size has nearly doubled in the interim, increasing one's confidence that these are indeed representative of what was achieved at York.

Discussion of the minting technique and the illustration in *BNJ* 54 of clear examples from each die might seem to indicate an output of uniform excellence, though the poor control of weights hints otherwise. At their best, York coins are unsurpassed by those of any contemporary English mint (pl. 14, 2), but while their rotary coining method, by eliminating the double striking which marred so many 'hammered' coins, ensured a clear image, other faults combined to produce a far from uniform coinage. The design was not always fully impressed, perhaps because of poor adjustment of the coining machine, while some specimens are unevenly impressed across the width of the design, as a result of uneven adjustment of the cylinders forming the die set. (pl. 14, 3; pl. 11, 288, 292). Signs of die clashing, another feature of early mechanised coining, are also to be found, on most of the halfcrown set 2A-F. These too confirm poor adjustment, taking the form of incuse letters of part of the obverse legends ...] OLVS.D.G:MAG[. . (i.e., the right hand portion, as struck), visible on the left of the reverses of some specimens of varieties 2A, B, D, E and F (pl. 14, 4). Poor preparation of the silver strip-ingots also left its mark. They were not necessarily trimmed before coining, for instance, as may be seen from pl. 14, 5, a group 2 halfcrown seemingly cut from the very end of a strip. Insufficient annealing of the strip at any stage of production might result in cracked coins or weak images (pl. 14, 6). A very few York halfcrowns are oval in shape, a phenomenon noted mainly in group 2G-L (pl. 14, 7). Though one explanation might be the distortion of round blanks fed singly into the coining machine, this is more likely to result from a distortion of the cutter punch, since two unclipped oval specimens (2I and 2L) from Grewelthorpe have the characteristic raised burred edges of specimens cut out after coining (pl. 11, 288, 291). A new punch was used for the group 3 halfcrowns.

One recantation is necessary, regarding the date of the 'base' halfcrowns discussed in Appendix 4.⁷ I argued that there was no convincing evidence for an early date for halfcrowns of 'York' and 'Tower' types, of common origin, similar low weights and highly

debased metal, illustrated on pl. 8, nos 6-9. An example of the 'Tower' type, with privy-mark Star, in Breckenbrough (no. 1575) now shows conclusively that these are indeed contemporary, and presumably local, creations. (Another, p.m. Triangle, said to have been found in north-eastern England, was shown at the BM in November 1984.) Their very baseness and light weights nevertheless condemn them as counterfeits, albeit skilful ones. The arsenic detected in the three that have been analysed (two 'York' and the Breckenbrough specimen) was a standard ingredient of the counterfeiter's recipes of the time.⁸

Another northern counterfeiting operation, which copied York shillings, is also of interest here for its technical competence. A shilling from Breckenbrough (no. 1582) is closely related to two in the BM, sharing some of the punches used to create their dies (pl. 14, 8-10). From their clearly-impressed images, these would appear to have been made using a rotary press, while their metal is apparently good silver. The profit to their creator lay in low weights: 4.27g, 4.01g and 3.81g respectively, the Breckenbrough shilling thus having an intrinsic value of around 8d. Such coins will have circulated without difficulty in the north of England, because of the clipping prevalent in the area, evidenced by the Wyke (Bradford), Breckenbrough and latterly Grewelthorpe hoards.⁹

One important reference regarding the York mint's establishment in 1642 was not encountered in time for the article in *BNJ* 54. In her memoir of her husband, the Duchess of Newcastle refers to his receiving various commissions from the King as General of all forces 'Trent-North', etc., including the power to coin money.¹⁰ The date is not given, but the context places these commissions in the autumn of 1642, and that for coining presumably refers to York. From this it would appear that, for reasons previously suggested, the royal warrant of 15 July 1642 was a dead letter.¹¹ In the aftermath of Edgehill, as an extended struggle became reality, the King seems to have issued a series of commissions regularising aspects of the war effort. A similar sheaf of commissions sent to the royalists isolated in Cornwall included one dated 14 November 1642 to Sir Richard Vyvyan which, empowering him to 'coyne or cause to be coyned at such place or places as you shall think fitting . . .', established the Truro mint.¹² Newcastle was no doubt similarly empowered to delegate his minting and it appears that the identity of his mintmaster has now been discovered. On 23 May 1650, information was laid before the Committee for Advance of Money that William Martin, attorney, of York 'had correspondency with the Earles of Cumberland and Newcastle and was in arms with

⁷ Besly, 'York Mint', pp. 232-3.

⁸ A. Macfarlane, *The Justice and the Mare's Ale* (Oxford, 1981), Appendix C ('The method of counterfeiting coins'), pp. 215-16; see also the analyses of counterfeits from the Breckenbrough and Ashdon hoards: Besly, *Hoards*, pp. 8, 17.

⁹ Wyke: Besly, *Hoards*, pp. 33-42.

¹⁰ Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle*, edited by C.H. Firth (1886), pp. 23-4.

¹¹ Besly, 'York Mint', pp. 222-3.

¹² Vyvyan MSS, Cornwall Record Office V/BO/18.



1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



BESLY: YORK MINT OF CHARLES I

them in Yorke against the Parliamt and was Mint Master under theire comand from the beginning of theis troubles until Yorke was reduced to the obedience of Parliamt'.¹³ The following day, order was sent to the county commissioners to 'take examinations against him and send them up'.¹⁴ The county committee's reply leaves us in little doubt that Martin was indeed York's mint master:¹⁵

Gentlemen

We send you herinclosed certaine depositions of witnesses taken under oath before us by vertue of yr pticular order of the 24th day of May last an[en]t Mr. Will Martin whereby it appeares he acted much for the Lord Newcastles Army against the p[ar]liament both by coyneing money for their maintenance and alsoe for making of pistolls for them, we crave yo[ur] further Orders herein for direction how to proceed and soe rest

Yo[ur] most humble servants
John Geldart
Tho: Bouchier
Ro Rymere

Yorke 22 Octob 1650

Martin was admitted to composition for delinquency,

¹³ PRO, SP 19/140 (168): 'Articles exhibited unto the Hono: the Committee for Advance of money, by the right worth: S^r Thomas Mauleverer Knight and Baronett . . . against William Martin an Attorney of Yorke, and a notorious delinquent'. (This reference to Martin was discovered by Mark Stoye.) Mauleverer was MP for Boroughbridge, 1640–53, and a regicide; he died in 1655. See *DNB* xiii, p. 89. The previous week, on 15 May 1650, one John Clifton

having been 'in Yorke when it was a garrison for the late King', on 27 September and on 15 October his fine, of one-third of his goods and personal estate, was set at £83.¹⁶ Like Vyvyan, Martin was a local man of some standing – 'gent & Attorney' – with no previous experience of minting and who served the King in more than one capacity. Unlike Vyvyan, he failed to make his peace promptly, and was in due course found out and fined heavily in proportion to his personal estate.

KEY TO PLATE

1. Half crown, 1A no. 8; trial piece. 18.83g, 0°. *Hunterian*.
2. Shilling, 2Dd no. 6. 5.60g. *NMW*.
3. Half crown, 2H no. 2. 14.70g. (Wyke hoard). *Bradford Museums*.
4. Half crown, 2B no. 5. 14.46g (detail of rev.). *NMW*.
5. Half crown, 2E. 14.21g. *Private collection*.
6. Half crown, 3A no. 4. 14.79g. *NMW*.
7. Half crown, 2K. 14.73g. *Private collection*.
8. Shilling, counterfeit. 4.27g. (Breckenbrough hoard). *Yorkshire Museum*.
9. Shilling, counterfeit. 4.01g. *BM*
10. Shilling, counterfeit. 3.81g. *BM*.

had laid 'an Information or charge of delinquency' under bond against Martin before the same committee (bond: SP 19/140 (169)).

¹⁴ *Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Advance of Money*, edited by M.E. Green (1888), III, p. 1232.

¹⁵ SP 19/140 (170).

¹⁶ SP 23/220 (133, 136).

JOHN BAYOCE AT YE BLACK DOG: AN UNPUBLISHED SEVENTEENTH CENTURY TOKEN FROM YORK

MELINDA R. MAYS

This token, which is not recorded by Williamson or Dickinson,¹ is in the collection of the York Castle Museum.

Obv. *JOHN BAYOCE AT Y^e BLACK[E?]- Dog
Rev. *IN PETERGATE IN YORKE 1667 – HIS/HALFE/
PENY* (pl. 13)

Acknowledgements I am most grateful to Arthur Benson and Richard Stansfield (both from the York Castle Museum) for their help and cooperation, and to David Scott for commenting on an earlier draft of this note.

The surname 'Bayoce' is spelled in a variety of ways in contemporary documents, but usually incorporates the letter k (e.g. Bayocke and Bayock, Baocke and Baoek). An innkeeper's bond signed by John Bayocke in 1663, and witnessed by John Brice and John Buckle, is recorded in the parish of St Michael le Belfrey.² Here the name is spelled 'Bayake'.

¹ G.C. Williamson *Trade tokens issued in the seventeenth century* (1889, 1891), and M. Dickinson (*Seventeenth century tokens of the British Isles and their values* (1986)).

² The innkeeper's bond is preserved at the York City Archives (K 68–11).