THE COINAGE OF IRELAND DURING THE REBELLION,
1641–1652.

BY F. WILLSON YEATES.

The principal authorities upon this subject to whom reference is made in this paper are Simon, 1749; Lindsay, 1839; Ruding, 1840; Dr. Aquilla Smith, 1860; Mr. H. A. Grueber, 1899; and Dr. Philip Nelson, 1906.

In some cases the conclusions arrived at by these writers are satisfactorily supported by documentary evidence, but in other cases there is clearly room for further research.

The following notes may draw fresh attention to the series and lead to a more satisfactory classification of the coins, which are fully described by Dr. Nelson in volume ii of the Journal of this Society.

Before dealing with the coins themselves it is necessary to form some idea of the currency in use in Ireland in 1641 at the time of the outbreak of the rebellion, and also of the parties taking part therein.

Prior to 1558 the silver coinage both in England and Ireland had steadily deteriorated, and was in a deplorable state. In that year Queen Elizabeth attempted to improve the standard in England by re-striking the English base money, which was only 3 ounces

1 Simon's Essay on Irish Coins, 1749, with Snelling's Supplement, 1810.
2 A View of the Coinage of Ireland, by John Lindsay, 1839.
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Fine with 9 ounces alloy for circulation in Ireland. In 1561 the Queen endeavoured to improve the standard in Ireland by issuing the silver coins of the type with three harps on the reverse shield. These coins, which were 11 ounces fine to 1 of alloy, weighed 72 grains.

It was, however, a small issue, and was followed in February, 1600–1, by a large issue of base money. The sterling value of the fine coins issued was only £11,988 as against £278,000 of the base money.¹

James I attempted to improve the coinage in Ireland by his issues of 1603 and 1605 struck in the Tower Mint and shipped to Ireland. The shilling was 9 ounces fine to 3 of alloy and weighed 70½ grains. In 1607 he issued a proclamation that the English shilling should pass for sixteen pence of the new harp money, and that everyone receiving or paying twelve pence Irish should pay or receive one harp shilling of money fine, and not 6½d., as of late had been used.

No issue was made by Charles I for Ireland between 1625 and 1641, but in 1637 a proclamation was made that the title of Irish money or harps should be abolished and that all accounts should be reduced into sterling and made in English money. That this proclamation was not entirely effective is shown by later documents among the Irish state papers, in which such expressions as a pension of "Irish 10/-" and a payment of "£E" are used, thus differentiating between the English and Irish currencies. The standard weight of silver coins struck at the Tower Mint during the reign of Charles I was $\frac{72}{31}$ grains to the penny—equal to $\frac{92}{31}$ grains to the shilling and the fineness was 11 ounces 2 dwts. fine to 18 dwts. alloy. The Irish fine shillings of the 9-ounce standard, being, according to the proclamation of James I, of one-fourth less value than the English shilling, should have weighed considerably over 70 grains, but according to Simon the Irish fine shillings and six-

¹ These particulars are taken from a paper by Mr. Henry Symonds, F.S.A., to the Numismatic Chronicle, 1917.

² Mr. Grueber, p. 106.
pence varied considerably in weight, some specimens weighing only 62 grains and 30 grains respectively.

The copper coinage of the period was also in an unsatisfactory state. Queen Elizabeth in 1601 and 1602 issued pennies and half-pennies for Ireland in copper of little intrinsic value. A considerable part of the mass of copper farthings issued in England under the patents granted to private individuals by James I and Charles I, and of the Rose farthings, found their way into Ireland to the disadvantage of the Irish people.

No mint was established in Ireland for the issues of Elizabeth and James I, but on the 16th of July, 1641, at a meeting of the privy council at Whitehall, which the King attended, the grievances set out in the petition from the Irish Parliament were considered, and to the petition "that a mint should be established in Ireland," the answer was "granted." No steps, however, were taken to establish such a mint. Besides the Irish and English coins, many kinds of foreign gold and silver coins appear to have been in circulation in Ireland, and with coins of such various values and fineness it is difficult to understand how tradesmen were able to carry on their business.

**The Irish Rebellion of 1641.**

The writers dealing with the series of "Irish money of necessity" appear to recognise only two parties, namely, the Royalists and the Rebels. It should, however, be borne in mind that there were at least five opposing parties during the rebellion, which have been described by Carlyle as follows: "There are the Catholics of the Pale demanding freedom of religion under my Lord this and my Lord that. There are the old Irish Catholics under Pope's Nuncios, under Abba O Teage of the excommunications, and Owen Roe O'Nei, demanding not religious freedom only but what we now call Repeal of the Union, and unable to agree with the Catholics of the English Pale. There are the Ormond Royalists of the Episcopalian and mixed creeds, strong for King without Covenant. Ulster and other Presbyterians, strong for
King and Covenant, and lastly Michael Jones and the Commonwealth of England, who want neither King nor covenant."

Viscount Chichester, writing on the 24th of October, 1641, from Belfast to the secretary attending the King in Scotland, reported that he had mobilized the King's forces, but that Sir Phelim O'Neill, "with a huge multitude of Irish soldiers," had seized Charlemont, Newry, and other northern towns. In the following year a number of Scots were landed in Ulster and they were eventually defeated in 1646 by Owen Roe O'Neill.

In the south, on the 23rd of October, 1641, the Catholics nearly succeeded in seizing Dublin, and on the 12th of December, 1641, Sir John Temple wrote to the King from Dublin Castle: "All Ulster is in the hands of the Rebels except where the Scots live. These have no arms. A great deal of Connaught and much of Munster is in their hands. The Lords of the Pale fraternise with the rebels. Besides the 2000 men besieged in Drogheda, we are not able to bring 3000. The city is surrounded by strangers."

On the 6th of November, 1641, the English Houses of Parliament formed a joint committee for Irish affairs to act in the King's absence, and steps were taken to authorise the Lord Lieutenant, then the Earl of Leicester, and the Lords Justices and Council in Ireland to organise an army under the Earl of Ormond.

By April, 1642, the Earl of Ormond had made some progress in this and was thanked by the King. On the 11th of May the King wrote from York to the Lords Justices: "We have referred your suggestions to the Lord Lieutenant and the Committee appointed by us and the Parliament to arrange these matters. You are to take Order for paying the Earl of Ormond and the Officers and men of his troop all arrears that they may be encouraged to follow up their victory of 15th April."

The issues of money dealt with in this paper are attributed to the Catholics of the Pale, who were the English catholics in southern Ireland calling themselves the Confederated Catholics, and whose issues date from 1642; to the Royalists and Parliamentarians, who made issues jointly in 1642–3 and 1643; to the Parliamentarians,
who made issues of their own between 1644 and 1650; and to the Royalists, who also made issues of their own in 1649 and 1650.

No issues can be traced to the northern Catholics under O’Neil or to the Ulstermen or Scots.

**The Money of Necessity.**

The excellent article by Dr. Nelson detailing various issues of the English and Irish money of necessity having already appeared in volume ii of the Society’s Journal, it is unnecessary to give illustrations and details of the general coins which will be found in that volume. It is proposed to deal with the series as follows: 1. The Kilkenny money. 2. The Inchiquin money. 3. The Ormond money. 4. The Cork and City moneys. 5. The Rebel money. 6. The Blacksmith’s money; and 7. The Dublin money.


The Confederated Catholics, in consequence of their successes, formed an assembly which first met at Kilkenny on the 7th of June, 1642, to issue orders for the government of Ireland, but it was not until October and November, 1642, that their orders contained references to coinage.

Their order of the 27th of October, 1642, provided that a seal for the kingdom should be made, and a copy of the commission, dated the 31st of December, 1642, to Captain Oliver to fit out a ship and cruise against His Majesty’s enemies or the enemies of the Catholic cause, which is to be found among the Irish state papers in the Record Office in London, is endorsed with a memorandum dated the 5th of March, 1643, that it was signed by the members named, and: “sealed in yellow wax bearing the mark of the long cross, a Crown on the right side and a Harp on the left with a flaming heart below and a dove above the cross and round about this inscription: ‘Pro Deo Pro Rege Pro Patria Hibernia unanimis’.” Several orders and other documents issued by the Confederated Catholics are preserved among the Irish state papers, but the writer has found only one specimen of what is described as the seal of the
kingdom. This is impressed on the face of a warrant issued by "the Supreme Council of the Confederated Catholicks of Ireland," appointing Colonel Butler to the command of one thousand of the standing forces of the kingdom. The warrant¹ is dated the 20th of March, 1646, and a drawing of the seal is here produced.

Three or four other documents issued by "the Council and Committee of Instructions" bear a similar seal by way of a fastening, but such seal is of smaller size and the impressions are too poor to admit of accurate reproduction. It is probable that the description of the seal above quoted is taken from the smaller seal, for the legend on this large seal does not contain the word Pro before either Rege or Pátria.

That on the 15th of November, 1642, the Confederated Catholics assembled at Kilkenny and ordered money to be struck, is referred to by Simon and other writers, but they appear to quote from an epitome of the order of that date as set out in Rymer's Fœdera. Dr. Aquilla Smith, however, found that Mr. Charles Halliday of Dublin was in possession of a full copy of the order, which is printed in volume i of the Proceedings of the Kilkenny Archeological Society and, omitting a few unimportant words, is as follows:—

¹ State Papers, Ireland, vol. 261, No. 117.
THE COINAGE OF IRELAND, A.D. 1641—1652. Plate I.
"By the Lords and Gentry of Ireland assembled in Kilkenny.

WHEREAS we the Confederated Catholickes of this Kingdom of Ireland being enforced to take armes as well for the defence of the free exercise of the Roman Catholique religion throughout this Realme as of his sacred majesties right and prerogatives and the preservacion of the Catholiques and other his Majesties well affected subjects, plotted to be supplanted and destroyed by the malignant party enemies to God his majestie and all his well affected subjects and Kingdome much scarcitie of money and coyne in this Kingdome the same being ingrossed hertofore into the hands of our said enemies by their continued exactions oppressions and extortions whereby much detriment may ensue to our party if not timely prevented.

Wee therefore * * * declare that all money plate and coyne as well silver as gold English and forraine heerafter mentioned shall be * * * raised and enhanced to the just and full value expressed in this Act and that the same shall be according to the said values sett and established by the said Act esteemed taken and received by all and everie person and persons whatsoever of our partie and all such others as doe and shall joyne with us in this Kingdom videlicet: That peeces of 8 be raised to 6s. the peeces of 4 and 2 rateablie, the Portingal testin to 1s. 8d. the Cardique¹ of France to 2s.; the half cardique to 1s. the Pistolet of 14s. to 20s., the quarable and single rateably the Rider of Scotland to 2s., the Jacobus of 22s. to 29s. and 4d. sterling, the 20s. of James and Carolus to 26s. and 8d., the half and quarter ratablie. The Albertus² raised to 13s. and 6d. the half accordingly, the Rose of 4s. 4½d. to 5s. and 6d. All these coines of gold and silver to be due weight the usual allowance to be given according to the proportion anie of them shall not want of their weight.

The 13½d. is to be raised to one shilling 6d. the 1s. sterling to 1s. 4d. the 6d. to 8d. the 9d. to 12d. the 4d. to 5d. the 3d. to

¹ Cardièrè.
² ? Albertin.
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4d. the 4½d. to 6d. the 2d. to 3d. and the dominick groate to 4d. the copper groate to 5d. the white groate of coper to 2d. and that the 9d. of the said severall coynes be henceforth reputed and doe pass for a rs. and half a Crown piece doe pass henceforth for 10 groates. And wee do further Order publish and declare that the plate of this Kingdome be coined with the ordinarie stampe used in the moneys now currant.

Wee do likewise publish and declare that there shall be 4000 L of red copper coyned to farthings and ½ pence with the Harp and Crowne on the one side and to septers on the other and that everie pound of copper be made to the value of 2s. 8d. and that this coine shall be currant before as well payment. No person or persons be compelled to take but rs. in each pound and so ratable in everie severall payment other than that all payments not exceeding 6d. may be made and shall be accepted in the said copper coine. And if the poll of London and Dublin tuch and all plate of equal goodnesse and value shall pass and be accepted at 6d. the oz. sterling * * * * *

All which we doe publish and declare to have been urged into by necessitie for his majesties service * * * * and we do straightlie chardge and command all Generalls and Commanders of our forces all Magistrates or Officers Militarie or Civil to whom it shall or may concerne in all Provinces Citties Countie towns and liberties of our partie through this Kingdome to take Special Notice of this our present Act and with all diligent speed to cause the same to be put in due execution within their severall jurisdictions respectivelie with all and everie of the Confederate Catholiques and their said adherence are particularly to observe and fulfil at their uttermost peril.

DATED at Kilkenny the 15th of gber 1642 and in the 18th yeare of the raigne of our Soveraigne Lo : Charles by the Grace of God King of Greate Britain France and Ireland. God save the King."

Signed by Mountgarrett Plunkett and seven others.

1 ? "6s."
2 ? "which."
There seems to be little doubt that coins were struck under this order. At the trial of Lord MacGuire on the 11th of November, 1644, at Westminster, for organizing the rebellion, Sir Charles Coote, a parliamentary general, said of the Kilkenny Council: "They have made several judges of their own Courts; they print, they coin, they do all in their own names."

The only coins hitherto attributed to this order are the Rebel crown and halfcrown and the Blacksmith's halfcrown, Plate II, 4 and 5, and the Kilkenny halfpenny and farthing, Plate I, 1 and 2. The copper coins must be rightly so attributed. Some of them are countermarked with a castle, the arms of the town of Kilkenny, over the letter K, Plate I, 3, and Dr. Cane states that three pieces in his collection were all found in the town. But the correctness of the attribution of the Blacksmith's halfcrown or the Rebel crown or halfcrown to this order is doubted for the reasons given below.

A silver coin which seems much more likely to have been issued under the order is illustrated by Dr. Nelson on page 317 and may be described as follows:

Obverse: Crowned head of Charles I to left with the numerals XII in the field behind the head; within a plain circle only visible in front of the crown.

Reverse: The royal arms on a square shield garnished; within a grained circle.

Struck on a piece of silver 8 of an inch in diameter, lozenge-, or nearly square shaped: Weight 61 grains. Plate I, 4.

It is natural that the Confederated Catholics should issue their coins according to the Irish standard of weight rather than to the English standard, and this would account for the weight being only 61 grains, which is about 8 grains below the Irish standard. The light weight of the coin may be explained by the fact that some of the Irish regal coins weighed only 62 grains as before mentioned. The weight of the Blacksmith's halfcrown and the Rebel pieces

1 Howell's *State Trials*, vol. iv, p. 654.
2 Kilkenny Archaeological Society's *Journal*, vol. i, p. 442.
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varies considerably, but even the lightest pieces are above what would have been the Irish standard for a halfcrown.

The shilling bears: "the ordinarie stampe used in the monies now currant," as directed by the order of 1642, in that it is copied from the Tower shilling of Francis, type iv c, with mint-mark triangle-in-circle, Plate I, 6, which was also issued in 1642, and a comparison of figures 4 and 6 shows that the one is copied from the other. The omission of the usual legends with the royal titles is significant, notwithstanding the professions by the Confederated Catholics of loyalty to the King. The square shape and incorrectness of weight indicate money of necessity.

The writer's attention was drawn to the last-mentioned coin by reason of a piece in his own cabinet which may be described as follows:

Obverse: Charles I on horseback to the left within a grained circle.

Reverse: The royal arms in an oval shield garnished, within a grained circle.

Struck on a piece of copper .9 of an inch square, which is a little too small to show the whole of the devices in the circles. Weight 140 grains. Plate I, 5.

This piece, as a comparison of figures 5 and 7 on Plate I will show, appears to be copied from the Tower halfcrown of Francis, type iv, with mint-mark triangle-in-circle, Plate I, 7, the weight of which was 231 grains, and it was issued between the 15th of July, 1641, and the 29th of May, 1643. How the Irish piece came to be struck upon a copper blank is a question inviting speculation. It may have been a trial piece.

Further comparisons of these two unusual examples of money of necessity may be made with their prototypes, illustrated in this Journal, to Mr. Grant R. Francis's standard work on Silver Coins of the Tower Mint of Charles I, Plate V, Volume XIII, for the halfcrowns, and Plate V, Volume XIV, for the shillings.

2 The same, vol. xiii, pp. 79-80.
There can be little doubt that an issue of these square pieces of two denominations of the value of halfcrown and shilling based upon the Irish standard, was prepared, and the question arises whether this issue was made by the Confederated Catholics under the order of 1642.

The order of 1642, after directing that all money, plate, and coin thereafter mentioned should be raised and enhanced, sets out a list of the current coins. Among these coins is the shilling sterling to be raised to 1s. 4d. and the ninepence to 12d. These coins are presumably the English and Irish regal shillings. The order then directs, 1, that "the 9d. of the said several coynes" should pass for one shilling and the halfcrown for ten groats; and, 2, that the plate be coined with the ordinary stamps used in the moneys then current. The order does not give any direction as to the denominations of the coins to be made from the plate. It is, however, suggested that these coins were the ninepence and halfcrown of the Irish standard directed to pass for one shilling and ten groats respectively. This would be clearer if the direction as to coining the plate had been inserted before the reference to the ninepence and halfcrown, and it may be that after the list of current coins a direction should have been inserted that the plate was to be coined into denominations of ninepence and halfcrown. In this connection it is important to note that the order directs the current coins enumerated to be "raised" in value, but in dealing with the ninepence and halfcrown different language is used. It is ordered that the ninepence "be henceforth reputed and doe pass for a 1s. and half a crown piece doe pass henceforth for 10 groates." The expression: "reputed and doe pass for" is appropriate to a new issue of coin, not familiar to the people; and is distinguished from the direction that the current coins were to be "raised" in value.

Unless the direction as to the ninepence and halfcrown refers to the coins to be made from the plate, there seems to be no reason or necessity for its insertion, because there was no current Irish halfcrown, and the ninepence had already been mentioned among the current coins.
If this view of the order is correct, then the square coins before described seem exactly to answer the description of those to be made from the plate, and no other known coins seem to answer that description.

A search in the principal text-books for pieces of Charles I, of "the ordinary stamp used in the money now current," struck on square or lozenge-shaped flans led to the discovery of only two such pieces, which curiously supply a crown and a sixpence to the halfcrown and shilling. These pieces are both illustrated by Ruding, 1840 edition, but the coins themselves have not been traced, so that little can be said about them with confidence.

The first piece is illustrated on plate XXVI, No. 4, and may be described as follows:—

Obverse: Charles I on horseback to the left, the horse with flowing tail, but no mane shows in front of the neck. The near fore leg stands upon a line for ground. Legend, CAROLUS D G MAG BRI FR ET HI REX: mint-mark a lion.

Reverse: The royal arms on a square shield with scroll above, and below, between the initials C and R. Legend, CHRISTO AUSPICE REGNO: Mint-mark a lion.

Struck on a square blank a little too small to show the whole devices. Weight, 293 grains.

At p. 330, vol. ii of Ruding, the coin is described with the following note:—

"This remarkable piece, by its appearance, seems designed for a halfcrown; but its not having been sized to its just weight makes it difficult to determine whether it was ever current at all, or if it was, for what value it passed. The place of its mintage also is far from being certain: if its having the same mint-mark as the reverse of No. 7 is a just ground for conjecture then it might be struck by some of the York minters after they were dispersed; and possibly Nos. 9, 10, and 11, also, for the same reason. It is in the collection of Peter St. Hill, esq.; and

1 It is obvious that Ruding's "12" is an error for 11.
a lesser piece of the same sort may be seen in the Supplement [A] plate V, No. 8, which is marked EBOB, and in some degree confirms the above conjecture respecting the place where No. 4 was coined."

Of the piece referred to in Supplement [A], plate V, No. 8, only the reverse is illustrated, which may be described as follows:—

Reverse: The royal arms on a square shield quartered by a cross fourchy extending into the legend. Legend: CHRIST|O· AUSP|ICE RE|GNO. Over the shield EBO|OR. Mint-mark a lion. Struck on a square flan. Weight, 31 grains.

The note, volume ii, p. 375, to this coin refers to Plate XXI, No. 9, of the same work, a York threepence with III behind the bust, and weighing only 18 grains, and to the crown previously described, Plate XXVI, No. 4. The note further states: "If this were ever current, probably it was for a groat."

In many cases the obverse or reverse, only, of a coin is illustrated in Ruding's work, and there is no reason to suppose that the obverse of this was blank. It is assumed that the numeral III did not appear on the obverse. If it did, that would prevent the piece being used as an Irish sixpence as suggested. At the same time the remark in the note that it was probably intended for a groat should not have much weight.

The four coins above described weigh 293 grains, 140 grains, 61 grains and 31 grains, making a series all on square flans, of crown, halfcrown, shilling and sixpence, with an approximate standard weight of 61 grains for the shilling, which is the actual weight of the shilling illustrated as Figure 4.

The crown and sixpence would have been prepared at a later date than the halfcrown and shilling, as they are not mentioned in the order of 1642. They have the legend added, and with it a mint-mark, but presumably if the legends had been added to the halfcrown and shilling the Tower mint-marks would also have been copied.

It must be borne in mind that no crowns or halfcrowns of the Irish standard were known, and too much significance must not be
attached to the suggestion that these four coins were of one series. It may be that the shape and comparative weight are merely coincidences. As, however, the halfcrown is connected by obvious similarities with the shilling, why should not the sixpence, which was known as an Irish coin, be added to the series? If the sixpence be added, the crown has as much claim to be included as the sixpence or halfcrown.

It is interesting to note that these four coins bear the devices of the regal money, for in no instance does the authorised money of necessity issued in Ireland, or the siege pieces issued in the towns and castles of England, bear the devices of the regal coins.

A somewhat laborious search in sale catalogues, Messrs. Spink and Son’s *Numismatic Circular* and other publications, for similar pieces has had but poor results. No example of the large York piece, *Ruding*, Plate XXVI, 4, can be traced; but two halfcrowns have been noted which both passed through the Webb, 1894, and Montagu, 1895, collections. The first was Lot 317 in the Montagu sale:

- Tower halfcrown, type 3A, mint-mark triangle, usual type, but struck on a diamond-shaped flan, well preserved . . . . from the Webb collection, Lot 414.

In the Webb sale this piece in Lot 414 is described as struck on a square piece of silver.

The second was Lot 579 in the Montagu sale:


From the Webb collection, Lot 413.

In the Webb sale this piece in Lot 413 is described as diamond-shaped. Both of these coins are now in the collection of Mr. Sidney Webb.
In Messrs. Spink and Son's Numismatic Circular, No. 73293, 1919, p. 293, a coin is described as an Exeter crown, similar to Hawkins, type 2, fig. 479, struck upon a square flan, unusually well preserved, but the weight is not stated.

Two or three specimens of the square or lozenge-shaped shilling have been traced. In the Boyne sale, 1896, Lot 1277 contained one described as struck on a diamond-shaped flan and as a curious and unpublished siege coin.

In the Murdoch sale, 1903, Lot 342 contained a specimen described as a lozenge-shaped coin of rude work but curious, and probably a siege coin: from the York Moore collection, 1879, Lot 336.

Messrs. Spink and Son’s Numismatic Circular, No. 96765, 1903, p. 7173, described a specimen as lozenge-shaped.

In the Hilton Price sale, 1909, Lot 229 contained a specimen described as an uncertain siege shilling struck on a square blank of metal, the design being evidently produced from a pair of Tower-Mint dies, or by the use of Tower punches.

In the Hilton Price sale of 1910, Lot 142, another specimen appeared, described as diamond-shaped and in very fine condition, the dies being evidently prepared from Tower-Mint punches. This coin is now in the collection of Miss Helen Farquhar, who has kindly allowed casts to be made of it for our illustration, Plate I, 4.

No specimen of the smaller piece figured in Ruding's Supplement can be traced, but in the Webb sale, 1894, Lot 550, appeared a York threepence with lion mint-mark struck on an octagonal flan, and described as very well preserved. This coin was in the Murdoch sale, 1903, Lot 281, and is described as reading AUSPCE on the reverse. In the Numismatic Circular for 1905, p. 8679, No. 20650, the foregoing octagonal threepence is presumed to be unique, and again in 1907, p. 9689, No. 37063, it is described as reading MA·BR·F·E·H.

Enquiry at the British Museum has failed to disclose any similar specimens struck upon square or lozenge-shaped flans. If any of the diamond or square-shaped coins were in fact issued by the Confederated Catholics it may be asked why are they not more
plentiful? The writer can only conjecture that for some reason, such as the fineness of the metal, they were melted down again into bullion. Even then isolated specimens ought to be found from time to time in Ireland, but of such finds, no records at present exist. On the other hand, specimens of the Rebel crown and half-crown, of the Cork shilling and sixpence, and of the Dublin crown and halfcrown are very rarely met with.

2. The Inchiquin Money.

The coins known as the Inchiquin money were struck on plain flans of irregular shape with a small circular counter stamp. The coins of the first issue were stamped with the weight on both sides, Plate I, 8; those of the second issue gave the weight on one side and the value on the other, and those of what is now treated as the third issue, Plate I, 10, gave the value only on both sides.

Among the Ormond Letters published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission are a series of letters written by the Lords Justices and Council of Ireland, principally to the Earl of Leicester, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and to Lenthall, the Speaker of the House of Commons. These letters detail the progress of the rebellion, and generally end with an appeal for money for the troops. In their letter to the Speaker of the 20th of January, 1642–3, the Lord Justices, after describing the straits in which the Army was for the want of pay, wrote: "We directed that in present, to render some subsistence to the Officers until treasure arrive hence, every man in this City shall bring in half his plate to be paid for it when treasure arrives * * * but alas so inconsiderable is the quantity of plate left here as it cannot amount to any considerable sum nor hold out for many days unless supply of treasure come from thence"; and in a further letter of 20th February, 1642–3, they wrote: "The plate brought in by persons of all sorts, among whom there are but three papists that brought in any, though we used all possible endeavour to advance it by calling many of them to this Board and otherwise, amounts to not £1200, a sum so mean and inconsiderable
as can in no degree give any contentment to the Officers of the Army towards their great arrears, which shows as well the extreme poverty of this place and all men here as the high necessity of hastening the supply of treasure."

An earlier letter of the Lords Justices of the 2nd of August, 1642, shows that upon the death of Sir William St. Leger, the Lord President of the Province of Munster, they entrusted the Civil Government of Munster to the Earl of Barrymore and the Lord Baron of Inchiquin as Commissioners with the Council there, and entrusted Lord Inchiquin with the command of the forces in Munster.

The proclamation of the Lords Justices and Council referred to in their letter of the 20th of January is dated the 14th January of 1642–3, and is set out by Simon in his Appendix as document XLVI. The proclamation shows that it was issued in pursuance of an act or order of the Council of the 5th of January. The quotation from the act given by Dr. Aquilla Smith does not refer to Lord Inchiquin or to the issue of silver coins, and he states that Lord Inchiquin was not in any way connected with the coinage of this money. This view is also taken by Mr. Grueber.

Dr. Nelson gives no authority for his statement that by the Act of the 5th of January, Lord Inchiquin, Vice-President of Munster, was empowered to issue silver coins of various denominations.

The documents show that the issue was made by the Lords Justices and Council of Ireland on behalf of the English King and Parliament.

It is important to note that the weights stamped on the coins, and in fact approximately used, were of the English Tower-Mint Standard.

Mention should here be made of what may have been a fourth type of the Inchiquin issue. The piece used to be known as "the Lathom House shilling," and may be described as a piece of silver cut in irregular shape from a plate or dish, showing part of the rim, with a circular countermark on the obverse, \( \frac{4}{2} \) inch in diameter,

\[1\text{ p. 116.} \quad 2\text{ p. II.} \quad 3\text{ p. 235.} \quad 4\text{ p. 333.}\]
showing "C R" in a circle of dots and another smaller oblong countermark of the value XII, set II over X, in Roman numerals. The reverse is plain and the weight 125.9 grains, Plate I, 9.

Dr. Nelson, on p. 318, tentatively describes and illustrates the piece under Lathom House, Lancashire, but fails to give any good reason for attributing the coin to that house.

Mr. Andrew, in his paper on English Obsidional Money, in vol. xi of this Journal, was of opinion that the coin was certainly Irish and of Inchiquin character.

Assuming that the third type of the Inchiquin money was the crown and halfcrown bearing the value in Roman numerals on both sides—see Plate I, figure 10, which illustrates the halfcrown—this "Lathom-House" piece would follow as a coin of lesser denomination with the value in Roman numerals, but with a new countermark bearing the initials of the King. Such a type would form a connecting link between the Inchiquin issue commenced in January, 1643, and the Ormond issue authorised in May, 1643. It would also prove the growth of the royalist influence in Ireland in the spring of 1643, by the introduction by the Lords Justices upon their coins of necessity of, first, the royal initials and, afterwards, a royal crown over such initials. It will be found that the official correspondence as to the Inchiquin issue was with the Lord Lieutenant and the Speaker, while that relating to the Ormond issue was with the King direct.

There are, however, difficulties in the way of attributing the piece to the Inchiquin issue, of which the principal is the weight, 125.9 grains. The coins of both the Inchiquin and Ormond issues conformed fairly strictly with the standard of the Tower Mint of about 92 grains to the shilling. No doubt this was facilitated by the plate usually being melted down and formed into flans of correct weight. The "Lathom-House" shilling is cut direct from the plate, which may account for some error, but an error of over 35 per cent. is hardly likely to have been passed in the Dublin issues.

1 Dr. Nelson, on p. 353, illustrates a copper coin countermarked with C R beneath a crown in a circular indent of similar size to that on the Inchiquin half crowns.
Another difficulty is that in the Inchiquin issues the two countermarks do not both appear upon the same side of the coin, nor are the countermarks other than circular in shape. On the other hand, the type of the “Lathom-House” shilling is unlike that of any other known English siege piece and is like that of the Inchiquin series. In the absence of more definite information about the coin, it is suggested that it may more properly be treated as a fourth type of the Inchiquin issues.

3. The Ormond Money.

This issue—of which our illustration, Plate II, 1, represents a halfcrown—was also by the Lords Justices and Council of Ireland. It was made under the authority of a letter from the King, dated the 25th of May, 1643, the draft of which was prepared by the Lords Justices and sent to the King for signature, with the following letter:

1643 May 15 Letter Lord Justices and Council to Sir Edward Nicholas, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State.

Although the quantity of plate here is very little and no bullion at all that we know of, yet in our necessities here, which are indeed grievous and unspeakable, we find it necessary to offer to His Majesty’s princely consideration this enclosed draft for warranting the melting down and coining the little plate left here and bullion if any may be gotten. And if His Majesty in his Royal judgment shall approve thereof, we desire to take care that it be returned to us under His Majesty’s Royal signature and Privy Signet with all convenient speed.

The text of the King’s letter of the 25th of May, 1643, is as follows:


The King to the Lords Justices and Council for coining plate into small pieces.

Our subjects in Ireland are so reduced by the Rebellion that they are anxious to coin a little money out of their own

plate as a last remedy for their support. This sum is so small that it is not worth while to set up a Mint for the purpose in Ireland and this would take too much time. You shall therefore authorise such persons as you think fit by commission to melt down their plate and make it into five shillings half-crowns twelvepences and sixpences. You shall receive these coins and stamp them with C R and a crown on one side and their value on the other. They shall be of the same value and alloy as the current money in England. You shall give what allowances you think fit to the coiners, and take security against fraud from them.

On the 20th of September, 1643, the Lords Justices wrote to Sir Edward Nicholas:—¹

According to His Majesty's Royal pleasure signified unto us by his letter of 25th May last, we caused a commission to issue to certain persons here for melting down plate coin bullion or silver into small pieces as His Majesty's said letters directed and have issued a Proclamation for making such pieces current here as His Majesty by his said letters commanded. And in regard His Majesty by his said letters hath declared his gracious intention to make the same current in England and for that it will not otherwise pass here but with much loss, we therefore have sent the said Proclamation here enclosed humbly beseeching His Majesty that by his Royal Commandment the said pieces be made current in England and that a public notification thereof be sent hither as speedily as conveniently may be.

Simon, in his appendix, document XLVII, sets out the proclamation of the Lords Justices and Council dated the 8th of July, 1643, for the issue of these coins. This proclamation gives "the tenor" of the letter from the King, but omits the direction that the Lords Justices were to receive the coins and stamp them. The proclamation suggests that the three Commissioners appointed to melt the plate also stamped the coins, but it seems more likely

that officials were employed in Dublin Castle to prepare the dies and stamp the flans as directed by the King.

The Lords Justices' request that the coins should be made current in England appears to have been granted, for on the 11th of December, 1643, they write to Sir Edward Nicholas that "His Majesty's Proclamation touching the Irish coin we have received and caused it to be reprinted and published here," but the writer has been unable to trace any such publication either in England or Ireland.

Simon states that plate to about £120,000 was coined at this time, but Dr. Cane explains that £1200 only was coined from plate, the remainder of the £120,000 issued being made up of remelted coins and contributions from England.

It should be noted that the weight of the coins of this issue is approximately that of the standard of the English Tower Mint.

Although this is called the Ormond money, it does not appear that Lord Ormond had anything to do with its issue. He was from the commencement of the rebellion the Lieutenant-General of the King's armies in Ireland, but it was not until the 21st of January, 1643-4, that he assumed the active duties of Lord-Lieutenant. The documents show that the money was required primarily for general circulation, and not necessarily for the soldiers' pay; therefore it is suggested that the issue should more properly be called "The Lords Justices' Second Issue."

The power of the Lords Justices and Council to issue money is further shown by a letter, also dated the 25th of May, 1643, written by the King to "the Lords Justices and Council for issuing monies in Ireland," as follows:

The power given to our late Justices to issue money is determined with their tenure of office. We therefore empower you and your successors for the future at any time to give orders to the Vice Treasurer and Treasurer for Wars for issuing money sent to them from England as occasion shall serve.

2 P. 47.
4 Calendar of State Papers, Irish, vol. 260, p. 381.
A number of the Ormond crowns have been found to have a copper centre, and it seems likely that whenever the supply of silver plate or bullion ran short, the Dublin Castle officials resorted to this expedient to make good the deficiency.

4. **Town Pieces of Cork, Youghal, Kinsale, and Bandon.**

The four Munster towns of Cork, Youghal, Kinsale, and Bandon, held out from the commencement of the rebellion against the Confederated Catholics, whose headquarters were at the neighbouring town of Kilkenny. Each town struck coins of its own, while garrisoned by the Parliamentary forces, and such coins usually bore a circular device and were struck on a square or irregular flan.

Simon¹ says that in the years 1645 and 1646 another kind of money was struck at Cork, namely, shillings and sixpenny pieces of silver; that these have on one side the word CORK, and under it the year 1645 or 1646, and on the other side the value, XIId and VID. He illustrates the sixpence as Plate VII, No. 143, and the shilling is illustrated in Snelling’s Supplement, Plate I, No. 30, and both are dated 1647. Lindsay² points out that the Cork shilling and sixpence are dated 1647 and not 1645 or 1646. He also illustrates brass coins of Cork on square flans, one of which is dated 1646. Farthings of Cork and Youghal are here illustrated, Plate II, 2 and 3.

Ruding makes no mention of the pieces in vol. i, but the shilling and sixpence are illustrated in Plate XXVIII, 11 and 12. The note to them in vol. ii, p. 332, merely points out Simon’s error in date and states that the coins were struck at Cork.

Dr. Aquilla Smith, in section VIII of his paper, p. 137, refers to the brass coins described by Lindsay and mentions that within a few years³ many of the same class had been discovered. He describes pieces of all the four towns. These latter coins, he points out, had all the arms or part of the arms of the town upon them. He illustrates two of Kinsale, one of Bandon, one of Cork, the seal of Youghal, with the device of the galley, and seven coins of that town. He quotes the statement in Smith’s *History of Cork* that in

¹ p. 48.  
² p. 56.  
³ of 1860.
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1642, except these four towns, every town in Munster was then in possession of the rebels, and the assertion in a report to the English Parliament on the state of Ireland, dated the 10th of December, 1646, that in Munster the Parliament had these four towns, and in them 4000 foot and 300 horse.

Dr. Aquilla Smith, in sec. 9, p. 141, describes the Cork shilling and sixpence of 1647, adding:

"I have already stated my reasons for dissenting from the common belief that the pieces of silver stamped with only their value expressed in pennyweights and grains were coined by Lord Inchiquin, but I do not altogether reject the tradition that money was coined by order of His Lordship during the period he was in authority as President of Munster. In May, 1647, he took Dungarvan and he then intended to besiege Clonmel, but the want of provisions and other necessaries for his troops compelled him to retire to Cork—Cox, History of Ireland, vol. ii, p. 196. The date of these pieces, which corresponds with the fact of Lord Inchiquin being compelled to retire to Cork in 1647 in some degree supports the tradition that money was coined by order of His Lordship, and if the name of 'Inchiquin money' is to be retained, it may with more probability be applied to the Cork shilling and sixpence than to any other money issued during the Civil War in Ireland."

Mr. Grueber states that it is not improbable that the Cork money—shillings and sixpences in silver, and pennies in copper—was struck by order of Lord Inchiquin during his short sojourn in that city in May, 1647, and that this attribution somewhat supports the tradition that money was coined there by his order. As to the pieces of the other three towns, Mr. Grueber suggests that they were probably intended to pass as pennies, and may have been issued by the rebels in 1646, as all those places were in their hands at that time. This statement, however, seems to be entirely contrary to those of other authors.

1 p. 2.  
2 p. 237.
Dr. Nelson\(^1\) states that during the years 1646–1647 the four towns were defended for the King by his adherents in Munster, and that coins were issued at all these strongholds, and he proceeds to describe the coins, adding several varieties not before mentioned. He adopts the view that the shilling and sixpence of Cork were struck during Lord Inchiquin's stay there in May, 1647.

After Dr. Aquilla Smith's paper was written the Rev. S. Hayman prepared a paper, also published by the Kilkenny Society.\(^2\) He describes eight varieties of the Youghal pieces found when removing the pews in the church there, and states that Mr. Croker, then engaged on a "Life of Lord Broghill"—which was never published—attributed the coins of all the four towns to him, the towns being under his command or influence. Lord Inchiquin was appointed President of Munster on the 14th of January, 1644–5. Lord Broghill was Vice-President and in command of the Parliamentary forces in Munster.

This attribution to Lord Broghill has been strikingly confirmed by a further paper from the Rev. S. Hayman, published by the successors of the Kilkenny Society,\(^3\) where he sets out the following order, dated the 20th of March, 1645–6, by the Vice-President and Council of Munster, which is to be found among the British Museum Additional Manuscripts, No. 25287:

WHEREAS it has been generally observed that the most part of the monies and coins now current in the Army and amongst the inhabitants and rest of the English Garrisons are pieces of eight Rix dollars and other large foreign coins very difficult to be exchanged for want of which the soldier is hindered providing himself victual befitting his condition which the markets might furnish if there were small monies which might pass current. It is therefore thought fit that certain small pieces of copper and mixed metal be coined and stamped by Nicholas Stowte Gent. and Marmaduke Deverox in manner following, namely: every such piece to be in value a farthing and pass in all exchanges within the English quarters and

\(^1\) p. 349. \(^2\) Vol. ii, N.S., p. 195. \(^3\) Vol. v, Series 4, p. 36.
weight one quarter of an ounce or with 12 ounces in each pound weight to be formed and cut square, having a ship stamped on one side and Y T on the other charging all his majesty's subjects within the town of Youghall to receive the said pieces so stamped. PROVIDED ALWAYS that Nicholas Stowte shall not coin or issue above the value of forty pounds sterling in copper farthings until he be further authorised and that the aforesaid Nicholas Stowte shall pay unto any that shall demand for everie twenty two shillings in farthings twenty shillings current English money and so for greater or lesser sums. PROVIDED that in common exchange in the market or within the English Garrisons in the exchange of twelve pence there shall not be above one penny in farthings and it shall be lawful for any person to refuse more of said copper coin than one penny in the shilling.

The Governor of the town to proclaim this.

Dated at Corke BROGHILL
XX March 1645. W. FENTON."

This order sets at rest any doubt as to the authority for the issue of the coins of Youghal, and the direction that they were to pass current within the English Garrisons, the word being in the plural, leads to the natural inference that the similar copper coins issued in the other three towns were also struck under orders from the Council of Munster, which some day may be found. The similarity of the Cork shilling and sixpence and their date also point to a like origin for these coins.

Dr. Aquilla Smith's suggestion that Lord Inchiquin was concerned in the issue of the Cork shilling and sixpence may be correct, for as president of the Council of Munster he would no doubt, when available, have signed the proclamations.

In January, 1645-6, he was in London, successfully defending himself before Parliament against a charge of adhering to the King's cause.

On the 11th of June, 1646, when Lord Inchiquin appears still

1 See Plate II, 3.
to have been in London, the English Joint Committee ordered the Treasurer for Wars, from time to time, to pay out sums remitted to Ireland for the Irish service on the order of Lord Broghill, Vice-President of Munster, pending the arrival of Lord Inchiquin "without looking back upon any occasion or service past of what kind so ever."

Dr. Nelson\(^2\) gives the weight of the Cork shilling as 69 grains, and that of the Cork sixpence as 34 grains, whilst Mr. Grueber\(^3\) gives the weights as 67•4 grains and 31•7. These weights show that the issue was to be current according to the Irish standard of about 70 grains to the shilling, which was a departure from the standard ordered to be used for the issues of the Lords Justices.

5. The Rebel Money.

Of this money—see Plate II, 4, for the halfcrown—Simon, after describing the Ormond money of 1643 at p. 47 says:

There was another sort of money coined in this Kingdom without inscription, having on one side a plain cross and on the other side the value \(V\), for five shillings and perhaps smaller pieces. This is supposed to have been struck during the siege of Dublin in 1641,\(^4\) but from the cross imprinted on it I should rather think that it was coined in imitation of and opposition to the last mentioned, and much about the same time, by the Chiefs of the Rebels, who pretended to act under the King's authority, as appears by several of their petitions to the King in Carte's *Life of the Duke of Ormond*.\(^5\)

He then quotes the Kilkenny proclamation of 1642 and continues: "It seems, therefore, more probable that this coin was struck by the rebels by virtue of this act of their Assembly."

Simon does not illustrate the crown, but on Plate 8, No. 173, he illustrates the halfcrown, which is not mentioned in the text. An illustration of the crown appears on Plate I of the Supplement, No. 31.

\(^2\) pp. 353–4.  
\(^3\) pp. 237–8.  
\(^4\) *Irish Historical Library*, p. 170.  
\(^5\) *Ormond Letters*, pp. 47, 99, and 110; and *Life of Ormond*, vol. i, p. 380.
Ruding, in note 9 to p. 398, after quoting Simon's Essay, referring to the Kilkenny order of 1642, says:—

The date of this order for coinage does not agree with Simon's conjecture that the pieces above mentioned were struck in imitation of, and in opposition to, those coined in Dublin by virtue of the commission dated upon the 25th May, 1643, as it is not probable that the rebels would so long delay the coinage which they had announced. I have therefore referred these coins to the year 1642.

He illustrates a crown and halfcrown on Plate XXVIII, Nos. 1 and 2.

Lindsay, on p. 56, says that the coins, usually called the rebels' crown and halfcrown, were probably, as Simon supposes, struck in pursuance of the act of the assembly at Kilkenny in 1642, but as Ruding justly observes, it is probable that they were struck before, and not in imitation of, the Ormond money. The crown and halfcrown are extremely rare.

Dr. Aquilla Smith describes the coins in section VII, p. 136, of his paper and continues:—

Bishop Nicholson, speaking of the crown-piece, says:—

Whether this was coined at the siege of Dublin in 1641, Mr. Thoresby, who has one of the pieces, cannot surely inform us, but it is certain that soon after the rebellion there were some coined of a different stamp from those that afterwards had C·R· under a crown.₁ Harris says there is another Irish crown supposed to be minted about the same time as the Ormond money. It has on one side a plain cross and on the other V.²

After quoting Simon's Essay, Dr. Aquilla Smith points out that the peculiar form of the letter S over the V on one of the crowns is almost identical with the letter S on one of the varieties of the Ormond crown, and that the numerals on the reverse of the halfcrowns, figures 3 and 4 of plate VI, are of the same size as those

₁ Irish Historical Library, 1724, p. 170.
² Harris's Ware, fol. 1745, vol. ii, p. 279.
of the Ormond halfcrown, figure 3 on a plate in an earlier article, whilst the inequality in the size of the numerals on the halfcrown published by Simon may be noticed also on the Ormond halfcrows, figures 4 and 5, and the halfcrown, figure 7 of plate III.

That the rebel money was coined in imitation of the Ormond money is, Dr. Aquilla Smith continues, not only probable from the resemblance of type already noticed, but derives further confirmation from the substitution of the cross for the crown and letters C:R:, which implies that the King's enemies were no longer disposed to coin money "with the ordinarie stampe" as on the Blacksmith's halfcrowns, described in section V of his paper, or of the standard weight of the coins made current by proclamation issued from the Castle of Dublin in 1643 under royal authority.

Mr. Grueber¹ describes the crown and halfcrown, and adds that "from its type it is evident that this money, which consists only of crowns and halfcrowns, is imitated from the Ormond money. On account of the substitution on the obverse of a cross for the royal initials and crown, it is supposed to have emanated from the rebels."

Dr. Nelson² adopts the view that the coins were struck by the Confederated Catholics during 1643, but previously to September the 15th, when peace was declared.

The main reasons given by these authors for attributing these coins to the Confederated Catholics are:—

1. That they ordered money to be struck.
2. That an issue different from the Ormond money was struck in 1643; and
3. That the Ormond money was imitated, substituting a cross for the crown over C:R:

It is suggested that these reasons are not sufficient to satisfactorily account for the issue. In the first place the type of these coins is not of "the ordinary stamp now current," and a type of coin of such ordinary stamp issued by the Confederated Catholics under the Proclamation of 1642 has been suggested earlier in this paper.

¹ p. 237.
² p. 348.
In the second place Mr. Thoresby, in referring to another issue different from the Ormond money, was no doubt referring to the Inchiquin crown and halfcrown with $V$ and $\text{II} \ VI$ respectively on both sides, which Dr. Aquilla Smith treats as a fraudulent issue made between the 5th of January, 1642, and the 25th of May, 1643, but Dr. Nelson describes as the third type of the Inchiquin money. If the latter is correct, there is no occasion to place the coins with the cross to the year 1643.

Lastly it seems improbable that, after the Ormond money was in circulation and the negotiations for peace were in progress, the Catholics would abandon the direction to make their money of the ordinary stamp and imitate the Ormond money. Nor is there any reason why, when imitating the Ormond money, they should have omitted the royal emblems.

The similarity between this money and the Ormond, and the Inchiquin money of type 3, pointed out by Dr. Aquilla Smith is so great that it is suggested that it also came from the same source, namely, Dublin Castle, and that it was struck at some date after the appointment of Colonel Michael Jones as Deputy Governor of the Castle by the English Parliament on the 18th of March, 1646-7.

It has already been shown that the parliamentary representatives in Munster allowed the issue of money of necessity in 1646 and 1647, and it is not improbable that Colonel Michael Jones caused or allowed an issue to be made in Dublin Castle with the tools used for the Ormond money. It seems likely that the issue was made before 1650, for, as shown later, Lord Ormond appears to have struck what is called the Dublin Money of Charles II after November, 1649; and to have used the tools with which the Ormond money was made for the purpose.

Lord Ormond had some dispute as to what royal property he should take with him from the Castle. He claimed, but apparently was not allowed to take, the ensigns of royalty, including the sword of state. The mint tools are not mentioned. If he did use them in 1650, it is probable that he took them when he left the Castle in
July, 1647. In that case the issue by Colonel Michael Jones must have been made before that date.

About this time, 1647, Ormond was negotiating for the King with the Parliamentarians, and it would be natural for the Parliamentarians on any issue of money to abandon the type of the royal crown over C·R, substituting therefor the English sign, the cross of St. George. This cross became the main feature of the English Commonwealth money which was directed to be struck by an Act of Parliament dated the 17th July, 1649.1

This cross on the Irish coins bears no resemblance to the cross on the seal of the Confederated Catholics, p. 190, and may well have been intended for the English cross, especially if the coins were issued before any of the Commonwealth money reached Dublin. That the cross from the Commonwealth money was soon adopted in Ireland is shown by that on a shield on the tokens of Cork illustrated by Lindsay, plate 7, numbers 152 and 153, and by Mr. Grueber as plate LXII, number 98; and by the cross on two small tokens figured in Snelling's first additional plate to Simon, numbers 38 and 39, one reading KER, which is supposed to stand for Kerry. Heraldically the form may be inaccurate, but so late as in 1654 the Commonwealth cross appears on an English token as fourchée.2

The light weight of the money with the cross—Dr. Nelson gives the weight of a crown as 376 grains, of a halfcrown as 188 grains—rather points to an unauthorised issue, but it may have been necessitated by a scarcity of silver.

In the Talbot Ready Sale Catalogue, 1920, lot 851, a note to the Rebel halfcrown there described says, "From two chisel cuts on the reverse it can be seen that this piece has a copper centre," which fact confirms the suggestion that the so-called Rebel money was issued by the Dublin Castle officials, because, as already explained, they were in the habit of issuing coins of the Ormond type with copper centres.

1 Ruding, p. 410.  
2 Montagu, p. 31.
6. The Blacksmith’s Halfcrown.

These coins, Plate II, fig. 5, are not attributed to Ireland by Simon or Lindsay. Snelling,¹ in his account of the coins from unknown mints in the reign of Charles I, observes that:—

Amongst the very great variety of this King’s money, although we meet with many very rude and of bad workmanship, yet we think none of them comes up to the halfcrown No. 13, the barbarous work of which was certainly that of a smith and not of an engraver.

Ruding, in plate XXVI, number 5, reproduces Folkes’s illustration, and in volume ii, p. 330, says, in a note:—

Very poor workmanship . . . . No account has yet occurred of its place of mintage. It is called the Blacksmith’s halfcrown from its rude workmanship. Mr. Willett has a halfcrown of the Exurgat money the workmanship of which is equally rude.

Hawkins described three varieties, but does not attribute the issue to Ireland. Dr. Aquilla Smith² was the first to suggest this attribution. The grounds upon which he based his conclusion were: 1. The statements in the Confederated Catholics’ proclamation of 1642, that “a halfcrown piece do pass henceforth for 10 groats,” no mention being made of a crown, and that the plate was to be coined “with the ordinarie stamp used in the monies now currant.” 2. That the cross mint-mark was similar to the cross on the rebel crown and halfcrown. 3. That the harp mint-mark was similar to the harp mint-mark on some of the Confederated copper halfpennies; and 4. That the harp in the arms resembled that on the halfpennies. He also points out that the letters have been cut with a graving tool like the copper coins, and not made with punches as was the case in the English coinage.

Mr. Grueber³ places the Blacksmith’s halfcrown among the Irish coins of 1642, and says:—

The date of the issue of these halfcrowns is somewhat uncertain, but it is possible that they were struck in conformity

¹ Silver coins, 1762, p. 42. ² p. 135. ³ p. 236.
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to the order of the Confederated Catholics of the 15th of November, 1642, which directed that the plate of this kingdom be coined with the ordinarie stamp used in the monies now current. They have of late times received the appellation of 'Blacksmith' halfcrown on account of their very rude workmanship. No other denominations are known of this coinage.

Dr. Nelson¹ says:—

By the excellent researches of Dr. Aquilla Smith we are now satisfactorily enabled also to assign to Kilkenny those silver pieces which from their rudeness of execution are known as "Blacksmith's halfcrows." They were struck at Kilkenny to the amount of £4000 under the ordinance of . . . . . . . . 1642.

Dr. Nelson has overlooked the terms of the order, namely, that the coins to be struck to the amount of £4000 were not silver coins, but the red copper halfpennies and farthings. This does not appear in the inaccurate summary of the order which he sets out from Rymer. See our p. 192.

Should the attribution of the square shilling to the coins struck under the proclamation of 1642 be correct, the chief argument of Dr. Aquilla Smith falls to the ground.

On the 8th of August, 1649, the Marquis of Ormond issued the following warrant from Kilkenny:—²

ORMONDE—

WE DO HEREBY authorise you, our well beloved Thomas Reade, to erect His Ma's Mint in the City of Kilkenny or elsewhere as you shall see or find convenient for the coyning of gould and silver according to the way manner and form formerly used in England and we desire the Mayor and Aldermen of the said City of Kilkenny, or the Mayor and Aldermen of any other citiy or place where you shall come, to furnish and afford you a place convenient to erect his ma's mint in, and all other theire assistants wth fitting and necessary accomodacons.

Kilkenny 8th August 1649.

² Carte papers, vol. clxii, p. 12, at the Bodleian.
This document was referred to at a meeting, in 1873, of the Kilkenny Society, and is reported in vol. i of the third series of the Proceedings of the Historical and Archæological Society of Ireland by Mr. Graves, who stated that as Cromwell took Kilkenny in March, 1650, it was probable that the contemplated mint was never set up.

It is possible that we have here the explanation of the Blacksmith’s halfcrows. The dies must have been made under difficulties, but nevertheless the coin is, so far as was possible, “according to the way manner and form formerly used in England.” It is to be noted that the order does not direct the use of any new legend referring to the succession of Charles II. The weight conforms well with the English standard of the Tower mint of 231 grains. The short time at Reade’s disposal would account for the issue of money of only one denomination, although he appears to have had to make several dies. It may be that Reade was the man who made the dies for the Kilkenny copper halfpennies and farthings, and thus the similarity in style referred to by Dr. Aquilla Smith would be accounted for.

The harp was a natural mint-mark to adopt, but the cross as a mint-mark would seem to have no particular significance. It will be seen that a similar mark appears at the end of the legend on the seal of the Confederated Catholics.

For these reasons it is suggested that the Blacksmith’s halfcrown should henceforth be regarded as having been made for the Royalists by Reade at Kilkenny in 1649.

7. The “Dublin” Crown and Halfcrown—Charles II.

The halfcrown is illustrated as Plate II, 6.

In Snelling’s supplement to Simon he states that the halfcrown there engraved as Plate I, 36, and the crown of Charles II, Plate I, 37 :

were first published by Mr. Folkes . . . . but he could never learn where or upon what occasion they were struck, neither have we [writes Snelling] been able to gain any intelligence relating to them. However, we think from the manner of the pieces, that they were struck in Ireland, and in the interval between his [Charles II’s] father’s death and his own restoration.
Ruding, under date 1660,\(^1\) considers it probable that they were struck in Ireland by the Marquis of Ormond, who proclaimed Charles II as King in all places which owned his authority within about a fortnight after his father’s death, for in type they were exactly similar to the money coined in Dublin by the authority of Charles I in 1643.

Lindsay,\(^2\) upon the authority of Snelling, merely supposes that the pieces were struck by this King between his father’s death and his own restoration.

Dr. Aquilla Smith does not refer to these coins at all and Mr. Grueber adds nothing to Ruding’s suggestion.

Dr. Nelson’s statement\(^3\) is that:

Subsequently to the execution of Charles I, money of necessity was issued in Ireland, though at what date and whence no information now exists. Two pieces occur, namely, crown and halfcrown, which are believed to have been struck at Dublin in 1649 by James, Marquis of Ormond, who proclaimed Charles II as King in Ireland.

Dr. Aquilla Smith states, in his articles on the Ormond money,\(^4\) that the Marquis was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland on the 17th of November, 1643, and was sworn in on the 21st of January, 1643–4. On the 19th of June, 1647, he delivered up the government to the Parliamentary Commissioners but resumed office on the 27th of September, 1648, and continued to be Chief Governor of Ireland until the arrival of Oliver Cromwell on the 17th of February, 1648–9. Colonel Jones had been recommended by the English Joint Parliamentary Committee on the 13th of March, 1647, for appointment as Deputy Governor of Dublin Castle and of all the forces in the garrisons in Ireland. On the 23rd of May, 1648, ships were ordered to take money to Dublin to Colonel Jones.

It does not seem likely, therefore, that the Marquis of Ormond, after proclaiming the accession of Charles II, would have been able to issue these coins from Dublin. The explanation of the issue is

---

\(^1\) Vol. ii, p. 1.  
\(^2\) p. 58.  
\(^3\) p. 355.  
\(^4\) *Kilkenny Society*, ser. i, vol. iii, p. 16.
to be found in the following interesting letter in the State Papers, Ireland, volume 282, number 16, from Charles II to the Marquis of Ormond, dated the 13th of November, 1649:—

To our right Trusty and Right well beloved Cosen and Councellor the Marquis of Ormond, our Lieutenant of our Kindome of Ireland.

CHARLES R.¹

Right Trusty and Right welbeloved cosen and councellor, we greete you, well understanding that it many times happens that our shipps employed at sea against the rebells do mee te with Prizes wherein there is bullion and forraigne coyne of which they cannot make such use and advantage for paying of seamen, or supplying our said ships with victualls and other necessary provisions, as if the same were turned into money of our stamp and standard. AND WHEREAS there may be many occasions for reinforcing or supplying our ships and Fleeete with seamen and marriners: we have therefore thought it necessary by these our Letters to desire you to take present order that when our dear cousin Prince Rupert (admirall of all our ships now at sea) shall desire it, that such Officers of our Mint in that our Kingdome, together with all requisite utensills stamps and Instruments for Coyning, may be sent to such Port or place in that our Kingdome as shall be requisite for coyning of such Bullion and forraigne coyne as he shall bring to be there put into money. And we likewise further desire you presently to give order to all Officers in any our Ports and creekes in that our Kingdome, to give all possible and ready assistance to such persons as our said dear Cosen shall employe for the pressing of such seamen and Marriners as according to his instructions he shall from time to time thinke fitt. For all which these our letters shall be your sufficient warrant.

Given at our Court at Castle Elizabeth in our Isle of Jersey this 13th of November in the first year of our Reigne. Anno Domini 1649.

¹ Sign-manual.
The reference in the letter to the royal mint in Ireland, evidently is to that in Dublin Castle, and it is suggested that the coins were made with the tools formerly in use there.

It is interesting to note that the height of the first I in II·VI of this issue is the same as that of the last I on the Ormond II·VI, while the height of the last I in II·VI in this issue is the same as that of the last I in II·VI of the so-called Rebel issue.

It is hardly likely that the King would have so specifically referred to the tools unless he had been previously informed that they were under Lord Ormond's control.

At any rate the letter shows that Lord Ormond had authority from Charles II to make the issue, and naturally he adopted the type of the previous Irish royal issue, adding, however, the legends to show the succession of Charles II. The English standard of weight was well maintained.

Another coin which may perhaps have been issued by the Royalists or the Confederated Catholics soon after the succession of Charles II, has been brought to the writer's notice by Mr. L. L. Fletcher. It is in his collection, and may be described as follows:—

Obverse: CAROLVS II·DG·MAG·BRIT. An imperial crown; the whole within a circle of dots.

Reverse: FRA·ET·HIB REX. A smaller imperial crown; the whole within a circle of dots. In the field below the crown a circular countermark enclosing a crown. Copper: .90 of an inch; weight 77 grains. Plate II, 7.

A similar but evidently badly struck coin is illustrated by Lindsay, 1839, supplemental Plate IV, No. 90, and described in the table on p. 100. The weight of that specimen is given as only 38½ grains.

This coin bears some resemblance to the countermarked Kilkenny halfpennies. The absence of the harp on the reverse makes it unlikely that the coin was issued by the Confederated Catholics, while the King's letter to Lord Ormond only refers to the coinage of bullion, so that perhaps the Rev. H. Christmas, 1862, and Dr. Nelson, 1904 and 1905, were right in not referring to it in their papers on Irish coins.
ST. PATRICK’S MONEY.

Before concluding it is necessary to refer to the halfpennies and farthings known as St. Patrick’s money. Both denominations have upon the obverse a king kneeling with a harp before him, with the legend “Floreat Rex,” and upon the reverse the figure of St. Patrick with the legend on the larger piece of “Ecce grex,” and on the smaller of “Quiescat plebs.” They are illustrated as figures 12, 13 and 14 of plate II to Dr. Nelson’s paper in the first volume of this journal.

Evelyn, in 1697, and Thoresby, in 1715, placed these coins among those of Charles II. Bishop Nicholson, in 1724, and Leake, in 1726, placed them among those of Charles I, the latter suggesting that they were struck by the Confederated Catholics. Simon, in 1749, agreed with this, and suggested that the specimens in silver were struck under the order of 1642 as shillings.

Dr. Robert Cane suggested that they were minted upon the Continent, and brought over by the Nuncio Rinuccini for the use of the Confederate Assembly.

Mr. W. Frazer, in 1895, suggested that the coins were struck by Briot and Ramage under the order of Charles I when the mint was at Oxford, and were taken to Ireland by the Earl of Glamorgan for the payment of the troops he was sent to raise there in 1643, from the ranks of the Confederated Catholics for service in England. That, as his mission failed, the coins were not used, and in 1681 were taken by Mark Newby to New Jersey.

Dr. Aquilla Smith, after dealing with the earlier suggestions, came to the conclusion that the coins were issued as private tokens in Dublin at some time between 1673 and 1680, when royal copper halfpennies were coined for Ireland.

Dr. Nelson, in 1905, considered that they were struck in Dublin in 1678, and pointed out that their circulation was prohibited in the Isle of Man in 1679.

1 Kilkenny Arch. Soc, vol. i, p. 442.
2 Ibid., series v, vol. v, p. 338.
3 Ibid., 1854, vol. iii, p. 67.
Mr. W. S. Ogden, in 1907, agrees with Dr. Nelson that the pieces were issued in 1678, and suggests that they were struck for political purposes by the Catholic party, with a view to the approaching restoration of the Catholic Church.

There can be little doubt that the St. Patrick’s money had no connection with the Irish rebellion, and that it is now rightly dated about 1678. Apart from other arguments, it does not seem likely that such heavy copper pieces would have been put into circulation before the issue of the regal halfpenny of Charles II in 1672.

The suggestion of Mr. Frazer that the coins were connected with the English royal mint in 1643 must be discarded, but it is curious to note that pieces of brass were used in making the copper rose-farthing issued in London from 1635, and that pieces of brass were used to draw attention to the King’s Crown on the St. Patrick’s money.

**SUMMARY.**

It will be difficult to alter the description by which the coins of the Rebellion have become so well known, but it is suggested that in future the following new terms should be substituted for those now in use:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old description</th>
<th>New description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Inchiquin Money</td>
<td>The Lords Justices’ First Issue, 1642.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Town pieces</td>
<td>The Parliamentary Munster issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rebel crown and halfcrown</td>
<td>The Parliamentary Dublin issue, 1648.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dublin crown and halfcrown</td>
<td>The Royalist Charles II issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*British Numismatic Journal*, vol. iii, p. 219.
The writer does not pretend that the subject is by any means exhausted, and it is hoped that other members with more knowledge of the history and coinage of the period will discover further material which will put the classification of the various issues beyond doubt.

**Description of the Plates.**

**Plate I.**

2. " halfpenny "
3. " countermarked halfpenny, 1642.
4. " shilling, 1642.
5. " halfcrown, 1642.
7. " halfcrown "
8. Lords Justices' first issue, 1642. Type I. "Inchiquin."

**Plate II.**

1. Lords Justices' second issue, 1643. "Ormond."
2. Parliamentary Munster issue, Cork farthing.
3. " Youghal farthing.
7. Uncertain Charles II farthing.