THE ROSE FARTHING TOKENS.

BY THE REV. EDGAR ROGERS, O.B.E., M.A., F.S.A.

Foreword.

HERE is a certain melancholy satisfaction in printing this paper after the death of Surgeon-Captain Weightman, O.B.E., R.N. When it was originally planned, it was meant to be the joint work of Captain Weightman and the actual writer. Both of these had been engaged upon a study of the Rose Farthing Tokens, and when the writer came across Captain Weightman's paper, published in the British Numismatic Journal, he naturally offered to withdraw. Captain Weightman would not hear of it, and when, after a conversation, it was clear that the conclusions at which each had arrived were identical, a compromise was hit upon—the paper was to be a joint-production.

As it happened, the paper was written and read to the Society before Captain Weightman saw it, although it was his wish that it should be so. After the reading, the writer sent the paper to Captain Weightman, and, on his death, Miss Ruth Weightman returned it.

Beyond the fact that Captain Weightman wrote that he agreed generally and had corrected one or two typing-errors, he made no alterations at all. The writer, therefore, must bear on his own shoulders whatever is amiss. Except to add one or two new varieties, which have come into his collection, the paper is exactly as it was written and read.

That it would have been immensely improved if Captain Weightman had had the opportunity to revise it thoroughly, none can doubt, least of all the writer, who would like to be allowed
to use this opportunity, not only to say how much he owes to Captain Weightman’s extraordinary numismatic knowledge, but to pay a tribute to his many kindnesses, and record a deep gratitude for the privilege of a personal acquaintance of one who did all he undertook with thoroughness and insight.

THE ROSE FARTHING TOKENS.

The first expedient to provide a copper currency of small change for England was doomed to failure from the beginning.

The reluctance of Elizabeth, who was properly proud of her success in reforming the coinage which the extravagance of her father had debased, held up the project of a regal copper currency, and it was only the urgent representation of Lord Buckhurst, the Lord Treasurer, of the need of money to pay the army in Ireland, which won from her, among other concessions, permission to issue the pence and halfpence in Ireland which bear the dates 1601 and 1602. Most of these, says Gerard Malynes some twenty years later, were “lost and consumed.”

James I came to the throne already acquainted with the convenience of a small copper coinage in Scotland, but appears to have been as chary as his great predecessor in sanctioning any innovation in England. He refused to entertain the entirely sensible proposals of Sir Robert Cotton in favour of an issue of small copper money, which would prove alike profitable to the King and serviceable to the public.

There was every need for such an issue by authority in the common business of life, which even Elizabeth had recognized by granting permission to the cities of Bristol, Worcester and Oxford to strike farthing tokens. These went current for small things in the cities themselves and within a radius of ten miles.

What the State refused to do in the person of the King, private traders had no scruple in doing to their own advantage and the serious loss of their customers. “Everie chandler, tapster, vintner,
and others," says Malynes, "made tokens of lead and brass for halfpences."

The extent of the evil, and the personal profit to the King in correcting it, were forcibly pointed out by Sir Robert Cotton in his proposals:—

"The benefit to the King," he says, "will easily fall out, if he restrain retailers of victual and small wares from using their own tokens; for, in and about London, there are above three thousand, who, one with another, cast yearly five pounds apiece of leaden tokens, whereof the tenth remaineth not to them at the year's end, and when they renew their store, that amounteth to above 15,000 L and all the rest of this realm cannot be inferior to the city in proportion.

"For the prejudice (since London, that is not the twenty-fourth part in people of the Kingdom, had in it, as found by a late inquiry by order of the late queen, above 800,000) so falleth out to be twopence each person in the entire state; it may be nothing, either of loss, by the first uttering being so easy, nor burthen any with too great a mass at one time, since continual use will disperse so small a quantity into so many hands; but, on the other side, will be of necessary use and benefit to the meaner sort, except the retailers, who made as much advantage formerly of their own tokens as the king shall now; for the buyers hereafter shall not be tied to one seller and his bad commodities, as they are still, when the tokens hereafter made current by authority, shall leave him the choice of any other chapman; and to the poore, in this time of small charity, it will be of much relief, since many are like to give a farthing almes, who will not part with a greater sum."

When neither the economic nor moral reflections of the worthy Sir Robert convinced the King, he gave his approval to a scheme, which promised him a richer return, and the Royal Farthing Tokens were the outcome. As these have been already dealt with exhaustively in the *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. iii, 1908, by Fleet-Surgeon A. E. Weightman, there is no need to dwell upon
them now, except to remark that it sorted ill with the "divine right of kings" for the divinity's features to appear upon the base metal, and therefore the whole series is without the monarch's portrait.

The original grant passed through the hands of several patentees, until it reached those of Henry Frederick Howard, Lord Maltravers, and Sir Francis Crane, who, by a Proclamation in 1634, were authorized to issue what are known as the "double-ring" farthings.

At the same time, in consequence of the innumerable complaints of the abuses which were attendant upon the use of the Farthing Tokens, the Court of Star Chamber attempted to remedy matters by a decree, which enacted that not more than two pence in farthings should be paid at one time, and that it was unlawful to force the Farthing Tokens upon any poor labourer, or workman, or other persons, in any payments, either in great or small sums. This regulation was aimed at those who bought the Farthing Tokens at low rates—they were normally vended at 21 shillingsworth for one pound—and then paid their labourers a whole week's wages with them at the "par" rate, and so made a handsome profit for themselves.

The Court also declared it illegal to buy or barter any farthings at or for any lesser rate than they were usually vended by His Majesty's patentees, and that the Court was resolved to punish the offenders severely. And it withal held fit and desired that His Majesty should be moved to declare and command the same by his Proclamation to be published throughout the Kingdom, that so the true use of the Farthing Tokens, which were intended for the good of the poor, might be continued and the abuses either prevented or punished.

On September 14th the decree was proclaimed at Dublin by the Lord-Deputy Wentworth and the Council.

Despite these precautions, the wholesale counterfeiting of Farthing Tokens went on, and the patentees added to the general dissatisfaction and to their own profits by repudiating their own previous farthings and issuing the double "rings" in their place.
It is worth while to record, in passing, that the patentees attempted to foist their farthings on the New England colonists, but the opposition was so effectual that on March 4th, 1634–5, the General Court of New Town forbade the use of the brass farthings and, inversely prophetic of one of our war phrases, "bullets were made to pass as farthings." Complaints continued and the Farthing Tokens stood condemned.

The experiment, however, was not to be given up without another effort. To this two causes contributed:

First, the advantage of a copper coinage was in the minds of the King's best advisers on money matters. "The Seauenth proposicion," in a document attributed to Nicolas Briot about this time, entitled "Proposicions made to the King concerning what is necessary and profitable to be done for the good of his Maj" and of his subiects about the ordering of his Coines," discusses at length the advantage of bronze or copper money, not for the paying of great amounts, but for almsgiving, and for the use of the poor, and is illustrated by references to the practice prevailing in France, Holland, and Spain. In this document, Briot considered that a farthing of 11 or 12 grains was good weight and would realize a profit of 33 in the 100 for the King.

It would seem as if the next step taken had been influenced by this suggestion, if attention is paid to the weights of the Rose Farthings. Briot further put his finger upon the real source of the difficulties when he suggested as a remedy the transfer of the control of the irregular issues of these small coins from private traders and speculators to the King.

Secondly, side by side with such theoretical advice was the fact that immense quantities of farthings, both genuine and counterfeit, did actually exist, so that the decrying of them at large would have resulted in considerable loss and hardship.

The effort was made and the reform took place, when on February 18th, 1635–6, a grant was made by the King to Henry,
Lord Maltravers and Sir Francis Crane for a period of twenty-one years to make Farthing Tokens of copper, "with a distinction of brass for the use of subjects in England and Ireland." There was reserved for the King a rent of 100 marks per annum.

On the strength of this, the Rose Farthing Tokens were produced of copper with a splash of brass inlet, in order to avoid counterfeits.

How common counterfeits were may be illustrated from a footnote on p. xlviii of Burn's Descriptive Catalogue of London Traders' Tavern and Coffee-House Tokens. "Counterfeit farthing tokens," he says, "were so generally blended in all payments with those issued under the supposed authority of the patent, that in many instances they were scarcely distinguishable. A bad farthing went as far as an authorised one in charity, and the alms-plate received many. The Churchwardens' accompts of St. Margaret's, Westminster, under the year 1637, notice a disbursement of 1s. 7s. to Mrs. Stone, the wife of John Stone, for bad farthings, which her husband received when he was overseer for the poor' as part of the stock brought in by his predecessors."

Contemporary literature is full of abuse of the Farthing Tokens and has hard names for their makers, as the following passage from Merry Passages and Jests, compiled by Sir Nicholas L'Estrange, shows:—

"The Earl of Arundell, lord marshall, had the sole patent for coining of new farthings, with a distinct mark for their currency, because many were counterfeited before; and when he went ambassador to the emperor, the mint-house, well stored, was locked up till his returne. The sickness being then in London, and poore people wanting their coine, some knave or other, in the night, clapped a redde cross upon the dore, and underwritt it thus: 'Lord have mercy upon us, for this house is full of tokens.'"

The jest, though gruesome, was certainly neither without point nor justification, as the after history abundantly proves.

On March 1st following, a Proclamation was made to the effect that no Farthing Tokens should be paid or received, except such as
had been made, or should thereafter be made, by the late King or his present Majesty. Penalties were attached to the making and uttering of counterfeits or the introduction of copper coin made in Scotland or abroad, and it was made illegal to compel any to take the farthings against his will. The Proclamation authorized the tokens to pass current in England, Ireland and Wales as farthings for payments in small sums to those who were willing to accept them, and, finally, that all authorized farthings should be, from time to time, rechanged for current money.

Neither the reform of the Farthing Tokens nor the terms of the Proclamation did much beside increase the unpopularity of the tokens and the profits of the vendors.

For the moment the story of the Farthing Tokens fades before the tremendous issues which were gathering for the conflict in England, but it is obvious that the old abuses connected with them must have continued and resulted in serious financial difficulties; for while the King raised his standard at Nottingham on August 22nd, 1642, a month later, on September 24th, a Petition was presented to the House of Commons with reference to the Tokens, which was read and referred to a Committee for Propositions, in order that the whole bad business might be thoroughly sifted.

On February 15th following (1642-3) a further step was taken, when the sequestering of the rents and profits of the Farthing-token Office, and the calling the officers thereof to account for arrears, were referred to the Committee for the Advance of Monies at the Haberdashers’ Hall.

It is, perhaps, worth while to remark here that the mint-house or Token Office for the issue and rechange of the farthings was situated on the north side of Lothbury, and the name still survives to-day in Tokenhouse Yard.

The Committee set to work and deputed the investigation of the Office to Mr. James East, who was to examine the patent in the Rolls Office and make a report. Although this report was on April 14th ordered to be presented on the morrow, it does not appear to have been presented, or, if it was, the record is lost.
On April 12th, 1643, the House of Commons ordered Mr. Playter, who was apparently responsible for the issue of the farthings, to cease striking, and the Committee at the Haberdashers’ Hall was ordered to seize all the farthings which had been made and were in the possession of Mr. James East, also apparently a responsible person at the Office, together with all the plant for their production. But after the seizure on April 17th all the farthings in the Office were ordered to be placed to the account of Mr. East, and he was to continue making the farthings, pay the workmen, and render a strict account of the weekly profits, while Mr. Playter was to render an account of the transactions of the Office since the previous July; and, lastly, on April 21st, Mr. Harrington and Mr. Peter Hasard were appointed with Mr. East to be overseers of the accounts of the Office.

A further order was issued on May 9th, adding Mr. William Harrington, a merchant, to the number of the overseers, and it was directed that all profits were to be paid over to Mr. William Strickland, M.P., who was to hold them for the benefit of the Prince Elector Palatine, who had the right to them, until such time as they might be handed over to the Prince, who was the son of the King’s sister Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia.

The efforts of the Committee do not appear to have been singularly successful, for another Petition was presented to the House of Commons concerning the grievance by the inhabitants of London and Westminster, and referred in true official style to the Committee, who were further to have the assistance of the knights and burgesses of Middlesex, Surrey, London, and Westminster to help them to solve the problem.

This galaxy of wisdom and business acumen fared no better than its predecessors, and on December 16th, 1643, a new Committee was appointed to deal with the pressing problems of better striking, the preventing of counterfeits, and of the importation of false farthings from abroad; and also how to use the Office to the best advantage of the State.

Six months or so later the matter cropped up again, despite the
fact that the Civil War was then at its height. This time the petitioners to the House of Commons were no less than the Lord Mayor of London and the Common Council, which is sufficient proof that the farthing scandal was causing a serious inconvenience to trade and a real financial loss. The Petition preferred on the third of August was as usual passed on to the Committee, to aid whom were added the members for Westminster, for the City itself, and for the borough of Southwark.

A further Petition was presented by the citizens and the poor on September 7th, 1644, not without good reason. The transference of the Royal authority from the Token Office to the Parliamentary Committee at the Haberdashers’ Hall had resulted in a total cessation of the exchange function of the original Office, and these last petitioners complained that there was no rechange for their farthings, which was resulting in sheer loss or complete ruin.

Following the usual custom, a Committee of members of the House was appointed to report to the Common Council how the House had debated the question, and to ask their opinion how the inconvenience might best be removed and the least hardship inflicted upon them.

The Common Council replied on September 10th with commendable modesty, to the effect that they conceived it to be a thing of such consequence that it was above them to present a remedy. They pointed out their dilemma, that the inconvenience would be equally great if the tokens were suddenly decried or if they were continued. They, however, offered certain considerations to the House. That patentees had formerly proclamations for decrying of them without rechange; that traders were more willing to have them decried than continued; and that there was a sum of £1,500 in the hands of the patentees in farthings which might be melted down. If this were done, and the estates of the patentees distrained upon, it would go a long way to satisfy the poor, who were in great strait not knowing to whom to trust.

They recommended that, if the farthings were decried, steps might be taken to coin new farthings, according to their intrinsic
The Rose Farthing Tokens.

value, and that small monies, pennies, twopennies, and such like, might be coined at the Tower.

This, of course, was the obvious remedy, and two copper patterns of "Farthing Toakens," one especially for the "Cittie of London," of this year exist, which lend colour to the opinion that the recommendation was seriously entertained. But, in fact, it came to nothing, and it is worth noting that until the current issue of the farthings of Charles II in 1672, the only Farthing Token intrinsically worth a farthing is one issued by Edward Nourse, "Next the Bvll in Bishop Gate Street 1666" (cf. Burn, No. 173).

Parliament replied to the Common Council on September 14th by passing a resolution to raise five thousand pounds from the estates of the patentees, etc., and required the Lord Mayor to call a Court of Aldermen to see how that sum might be raised and best applied to the relief of the poor in the Cities of London and Westminster and the lines of communication in order to stop the clamour of the poor upon the rumour of decrying the Farthing Tokens.

The City Authorities pursued the usual course of masterly inactivity, and the whole matter fizzled out in an undignified manner, after a riot, largely composed of old women from the City, at the Houses of Parliament, on September 26th, when the House ordered a servant to be appointed to the Serjeant-at-Arms to take the names and addresses of the women who came to the House to complain of the tokens, and note what they desired.

Certainly leaden tokens dated 1644 exist, and presumably the House suppressed their issue, for nothing more is heard of them after 1644, and the contemporary published arguments for and against them are dated the same year.

Although they have been quoted at length before, they may perhaps bear re-quoting, because they sum up the opinion of the time, and summarize the history of the whole matter in the crispest way.

A pamphlet, entitled A Remedy against the Losse of the subject by Farthing Tokens, says:

"Our projectors soon found the advantage that accrued to a private tradesman by his farthings being sometimes lost
and under pretence of the good of the subject and of the poor, obtained a patent to make thousands of pounds worth; and amongst other ways to get rid of them, some merchants would sell unvendible commodities for tokens, and then would press them upon their workmen whom they dealt with, and by that means, even chandlers, bakers and victuallers had their hands full. Their profit was exorbitant, as out of 1 oz of copper, which cost them one penny, they made 20 pence in tokens. This could not hold long, but others more eminent persons, must have a share, and so the first makers were dismissed, and their patent dissanulled, and all the tokens left on the subjects' hands, who were to sell them to the braziers at 10 or 12 pence a pound, for they had a patent to make and distribute them, but the poor subjects had no patent to force the makers to take them again.

"The next token makers, we all know who they were, the public farthing token offices in London do witness it, and this was done with a more large profit to the makers; they had their officers to attend the sale of them daily, and had a pretty way to vent them, by giving one shilling over in twenty to those that came to buy them, which occasioned many to fetch them, and force 5, 10, yea 20 shillings at a time away; so that in a short time there was an infinite quantity dispersed abroad, to the excessive profit of the makers, but the excessive loss of the takers, as shortly after did appear, as it inticed many that had no patent to become farthing makers; but the City of London, and the adjacent counties of Kent, Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk are so loaded with them, that there was scarce even any silver or gold left, but all was farthing tokens. But when farthings began to come in faster than they went out, the patentees did not like it, but soon found out a device; that is that none was theirs but double ringed; a pretty device, for very few were double rings, most single, and not theirs; and who could prove the contrary? and so upon a sudden, all farthings were left upon the subjects' hands. This was the second cheat, and a grievous one it was; many poor persons lost all they had;
for they who got their living by selling fruit, herbs, fish and other commodities, had all their stock in farthings, some 6, 8, 10 to 20 shillings; which was all lost to their utter undoing. Tradesmen of a higher degree had at that time 10, 20, 40, yea 60 L worth of farthing tokens in their hands; which almost all proved clear loss or single rings. It was conceived that there was at least 100,000 L dispersed throughout the kingdom, which was all lost, and no remedy could be had against the farthing makers. And this was the lamentable issue of making farthing tokens for the good of the subject.

“But these pretenders, who do all for the good of the subject, would by no means forsake their excessive profit, but contrived another sort of tokens, that none should be able to counterfeit, as they pretended; and that was, with a little yellow spot in the copper; a good mark to know their own, but a better mark to make another cheat of 100,000 L more upon the poor subject, but all for their good, as is pretended. This hath gone on certain years; but at first, because that great loss did lie so heavy upon many, and so fresh in the memory of all, they could not vent so many as they expected. In the mean time, this now sitting parliament began, and presently all patents were put down, because they were illegal and pressing to the subject. But (to the great admiration of many) this, so illegal and pressing a patent, did stand upright in its full power. When they perceived they were not questioned, they went on cheerfully, and began to use several means to vent their tokens, and, amongst other devices, they used many poor women as their factors to go about the city and suburbs and all other places where any resort of people was, and there would by entreaty and importunate begging, get and persuade many to change them sixpence in tokens for silver, which of late hath dispersed an infinite quantity of tokens; by which means they are become so plenty, that every retailing tradesman is so pestered therewith that almost half of what they receive is farthing tokens; and all adjacent counties are become so full
of them, nay more than ever they were before; so that of necessity these tokens must go down again, which will prove a greater loss than those formerly, except the authority of this honourable parliament doth compel the token-makers to attend to their office, with ready money, to take in and exchange to the subject all the tokens for good current money, as in conscience and equity the token-makers ought to do, or else it will prove a very great loss to the subject.

"It is very true that farthings are useful and necessary, both for rich and poor, we cannot well be without them, and in silver they are so small, that many cannot feel them between their fingers; therefore, we ought to have farthings, either in copper or some metal mixed with copper, and they ought to be so much in value as may be worth a farthing; all copper without any mixture is likely to be best, to prevent counterfeiting of them; for it is certain, if it be so big and so weighty, as with the coining and other charges, they cost a farthing, we are sure none shall be counterfeited, nor brought in from foreign parts; for it was the great profit that made the increase. Therefore we ought to make our farthings worth a farthing, that the subject may be no more deceived with unlawful tokens. These farthings will be very beneficial to all tradesmen, especially retailers, and very comfortable to the poor people."

An answer to this pamphlet appears in a Petition addressed "to both the high and honourable houses of parliament, 4to, printed in the yeare 1644." It runs:

"The humble petition and remonstrance of some hundreds of retailers, who have sparkes of charity and reason in them; and of country chap-men in the associated counties, and of thousands of poore people besides, for the restoring of the farthing tokens, who are extremely damnified, and are like to perish by the suppression of them."

The Petitioners are very frank in dealing with their opponents, and do not scruple to impute personal motives to the opposition
to the patentees, and say "That this very point is the gulph of their conceptions, and the mystery of their gripping iniquity, mixt with vaine-glory, viz., to suppress these farthing tokens, that so they may advance their owne tokens, stamps, seals, names, signes and superscriptions, if not images, as now appeares, though they be far inferior to Caesar's." And there the story may well end.

When, however, so much has been said, and the actual coins—the so-called Rose Farthings—are examined, there is a very strong temptation to think all this much ado about nothing, such insignificant examples of numismatic art do they appear.

The whole bygone scandal serves to illustrate an aspect of human nature, which, unhappily, is not unknown to-day; it proves how easily unscrupulous profit-seekers did, and may still, exploit a long-suffering public, and how difficult it is for those in authority to do more than give a crying abuse a careful consideration, and, no doubt, forms a venerable precedent for that policy of "wait and see," which remains a cardinal doctrine of imperial politics.

Authorities.

The authorities consulted for the above sketch are the State Papers, Snelling, and Ruding, and, lastly, J. H. Burn, whose account, with the exception of certain valuable footnotes, appears to be almost a verbatim transcript of Ruding, to say the least quite inadequately acknowledged.

The Name.

The Farthing Tokens under consideration are conveniently known as Rose Farthings to distinguish them from the earlier Royal Farthing Tokens, by reason of the design, which they all bear upon their reverse. This design, a rose, takes several forms.

Upon the earlier pieces it is a double rose, of which there are two varieties: the ordinary heraldic rose; and a second, with more numerous petals, infolding upon the centre, which may be, called the botanical rose. Upon the later pieces the rose is single with a large seeded centre; but in some cases—presumably from
careless or inefficient workmanship—the centre presents the appearance of a large pellet.

Weight, Size and Fabric.

The average weight of the Rose Farthing pieces is about 13 grains, ranging from 9½ grains to 17 or 18. Exceptionally heavy pieces occur and are known to weigh 21, 25 and 26 grains.

The size of the Farthing Tokens is very uniform and is generally about .55 inch.

The fabric is considerably thicker than is the case with the Royal Farthing Tokens, and in some pieces the edges have been hammered.

Mint-Marks.

Unlike the Royal Farthing Tokens, which are distinguished by a lavish profusion of mint-marks, the Rose Farthing Tokens show but few.

Six in all have been recorded, viz., cross patee,1 martlet, lys, crescent, mullet, and mullet pierced. Of these the first two and the last are exceedingly rare, and marks other than these should be received with care, either as appearing upon forgeries, which are unhappily only too common, or being but crude examples of the above six. Both the cross patee and the martlet seem to occur only on early currency experimental pieces, and Fleet-Surgeon Weightman makes the ingenious suggestion that possibly "martlet" was misread for "mullet" in some written instruction to the die-makers. The lys, crescent, and mullet only appear in the tokens issued for general circulation. They are used either singly or in combination.

Type I (of the present classification) shows lys and mullet, either separately or together.

Type II presents crescent and mullet, either separately or together.

Type III presents mullet only.

1 It is possible, and, in my own opinion, certain, that the alleged cross patee is only a badly formed mullet.
It should be observed that the Farthing Tokens were a private speculation. Although under a Royal Patent, and as has been seen, with the King personally interested, they were not produced by the Royal Mint. The marks upon them are not therefore mint-marks in the same sense as similar marks upon the gold and silver coinage of the day and, of course, did not go through the pyx. It seems, however, better to retain a name which is generally understood for these privy marks than to strain after a pedantic accuracy.

Classification.

The Rose Farthing Tokens fall naturally into three main types, which are most readily distinguished as follows:—

I.—Imperial crowns on either side: double rose on reverse.

II.—Monarchical crown on either side: single rose on reverse.

III.—Monarchical crown on obverse: above sceptres in saltire, and not passing through as in I and II; monarchical crown and single rose on reverse.

The order of the types probably represent the order of issue, which may, perhaps, be further determined by the sequence of mint-marks.

As this classification is diametrically opposite to that usually accepted on the authority of Montagu, it requires that the grounds for its adoption should be clearly set out.

The Rose Farthing Token, it is agreed, followed upon the "double ring" or Maltravers Farthing Token, and was obviously intended to be an improvement upon it.

A comparison with a Maltravers Farthing of any of the three types of Rose Farthing Tokens, either as they are set out in Montagu or as it is proposed to set them out here, suggests at once the similarity of type I, which Montagu puts last of all, to the Maltravers.

The following particulars may be singled out:—

The legends are identical.

Obverse.—CAROLVS D G MAG BRIT.

Reverse.—FRAN ET HIB REX.
This obverse legend never occurs upon either types II or III, on which BRI or even BR is always used instead of BRIT; while the commonest form of reverse legend is FRA ET HI REX. Unfortunately Montagu makes a confusion of this by recording together all the variations of legend, as if they were used indiscriminately.

The Maltravers Farthing Token exhibits an imperial crown upon obverse and reverse. So does type I of the Rose Farthing Tokens and no other. Types II and III always show the monarchical, and mules exist which seem to mark the progress of the change.

The Rose, which appears as a mint-mark upon one variety of Maltravers Farthing, is identical with the double Rose upon type I of the Rose Farthing. The single Rose on types II and III is quite a new form and is to be found nowhere else upon English coinage.

And, lastly, while the sceptres on the obverse of the Maltravers Farthing Tokens are wholly within the inner circles, there exist Rose Farthing Tokens of type I (mint-mark, lys, or martlet, or cross pattée) with the same characteristics, and others whereon the sceptres barely cut the inner circle; but in type II the sceptres invariably reach to the edge of the coin, and in type III are disposed in an entirely different fashion.

Such a classification covers the facts more naturally than the opposite one. The substitution of the monarchical crown for the imperial, the single rose for the double, and the marked contraction of the legend point to more slip-shod, and possibly fraudulent, work than could be expected in a new type, which was meant to correct the deficiencies of its predecessors. It is difficult to believe that the Rose Farthing Tokens began with the almost "barbarous" work of type III, and gradually improved until the best work of type I was reached, when, year by year, the times became more troublous and the complaints against the tokens increased. That the whole
Four quite exceptional pieces, and probably unique, from the cabinet of Captain Weightman deserve special notice.

No. 1 is of the ordinary type, but the reverse legend reads FRAN ET HIBER REX. The mint-mark is a lys on both sides.

No. 2 is also of the ordinary type, but the reverse legend reads FRAN ET HIBE REX. This legend should be compared with the silver Briot pattern, described by Montagu, p. 24, No. II; where HIBER should be read HIBE. There is a stop between the E and the following R. The special interest of this coin lies in the possibility it suggests, that Briot had a hand in designing the Farthing Tokens. The Farthing Token has a lys on the reverse and no mint-mark on the obverse. (Pl., 8.)

No. 3.—Obverse.—CARO–LV S D G M–AG BR
Reverse.—FRAN ET. HIBER. REX

No mint-mark on either side. The sceptres are longer above the crown than usual, extending beyond the inner linear circle. In this variety there is a different arrangement of the legend, which begins in the centre above instead of to the right above. The sceptres are so long that they break the legend, and the letters CARO are between the sceptres. The handle of one of the sceptres breaks the word MAG—a distance existing between M and AG. Instead of BRIT there is only BR, and on the reverse HIBER instead of the usual HIB.

No. 4.—This piece presents a similar condition of things, but only CAR is between the sceptres and MAG is not broken. The reverse is the usual FRAN ET HIB REX, and there are no mint-marks upon either obverse or reverse.

It is difficult to account for such pieces. They may have been experiments on the part of the Token House Mint or they may have been some of those forgeries of the day, which were so skilfully made as to succeed now, as then, in their sinister purpose.
D.

Exactly similar to A, B, and C, except that the ends of the sceptres nearly reach the outer circle, and BRI is used instead of BRIT in the obverse legend.

The mint-marks are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lys.</td>
<td>Mullet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullet.</td>
<td>Lys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullet.</td>
<td>Mullet. (Pl., 5.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In one case in my collection the mullet, in the mullet-lys type, is pierced, and the work is generally finer.

All Farthing Tokens of type I are rare and some are excessively so. It would seem that their time of issue was comparatively short, and that they soon gave way to type II, which is distinguished by the single rose.

There is no direct evidence as to when the change was made, but it appears to have been made deliberately, because the British Museum has a finely executed silver pattern of type II, and copper proofs also exist.

It is tempting to conjecture that perhaps a change was made soon after the death of Sir Francis Crane, which took place in Paris on June 26th, 1636. This would give type I about six months of issue, which would sufficiently account for the rarity.

Mules of Types I and II.

Before going on to describe type II, notice should be taken of certain transitional pieces, of which I am able to classify the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obverse.—Type I.</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>Reverse.—Type II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mint-mark.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mint-mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullet (in one case pierced).</td>
<td>Lys.</td>
<td>Mullet (in one case pierced).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lys.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crescent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crescent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mullet. (Pl., 10.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all these cases the obverse reads CAROLVS D G MAG BRI, and the reverse FRAN ET HIB REX.
The Rose Farthing Tokens.

Obverse.—Type I.  D.  
Mullet.

Reverse.—Type II.  
Crescent.

While the obverse legend remains as the previous, the reverse reads FRA ET HI REX.

Obverse.—Type II.  
Crescent.

Reverse.—Type I.  D.  
Mullet.

The legend on the obverse of the former reads CAROLVS D G MAG BRI; the latter, which I only know in my own specimen, CAROLV

Type II.

Obverse.—CAROLVS (or CAROLV) D.G. MAG (or MA) BRI.

A single monarchical crown, through which pass two lys-headed sceptres in saltire with ornamented handles, which reach to the edge of the coin. The legend is between an inner linear circle and an outer circle of dots.

Reverse.—FRAN (or FRA) ET HIB (or HI) REX.

A single rose surmounted by a single monarchical crown.

Legend between linear inner circle and outer circle of dots.

The jewels in the crowns are oblong on the obverse and square on the reverse.

The varieties of legend are disposed in the following six groups:—

1. Obverse.—CAROLVS D G MAG BRI  
Reverse.—FRAN ET HIB REX

2. Obverse.—CAROLV D G MA BRI  
Reverse.—FRAN ET HIB REX

3. Obverse.—CAROLVS D G MAG BRI  
Reverse.—FRA ET HIB REX

4. Obverse.—CAROLV D G MA BRI  
Reverse.—FRA ET HIB REX
The Rose Farthing Tokens.

5. Obverse.—CAROLVS D G MAG BRI
   Reverse.—FRA ET HI REX

6. Obverse.—CAROLVS D G MA BRI
   Reverse.—FRA ET HI REX

The British Museum silver pattern is No. 1, and would appear to be the standard. It weighs 12 grains, and has the lys mint-mark on both obverse and reverse. (Pl., 4A.)

There are copper proofs of No. 2 (a beautifully executed piece, weighing 27·8 grains), and of No. 6, weighing 21·8 grains; in each case with mint-mark crescent on both sides.

No. 6 is by far the commonest of the whole series, and must have been struck in enormous quantities. The die varieties are innumerable, and there is every variety of punctuation. One example of this exists with the mint-mark upon the obverse only. The work is coarse and in high-relief.

Two very exceptional pieces read respectively: CAROLV D G MAG BRI and CAROLVS D G MAG BRI on the obverse and FRA ET HIB REX on the reverse—mint-marks, crescent on both obverse and reverse.

The mint-marks are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crescent</td>
<td>Crescent. (Pl., 4, II.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent</td>
<td>Mullet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullet.</td>
<td>Crescent. (Pl., 3.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullet.</td>
<td>Mullet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the mint-mark crescent on both sides shows all six varieties of legend, the remainder have only the last legend.

Two interesting pieces worth noting: the first has a double crescent upon the obverse with crescent upon the reverse; the other has a mullet overstruck upon a crescent on the obverse and a crescent upon the reverse.

Too much stress ought not to be laid upon such varieties.
Careless workmanship or unusually skilful forgeries probably account for them.¹

Full-stops, colons, and the apostrophe occur, and sometimes a combination of two or three different sorts of stops. Probably pieces on which no stops occur at all are contemporary forgeries.

The mint-mark is sometimes modified by a stop or pellet before or after or both, but the explanation suggests itself that this was due to the idiosyncrasy of different die-makers, who chose to fill up blank spaces in their legends in this way.

A typical illustration will be found in Appendix II to this paper.

Type III.

Obverse.—CAROLV D G MAG (or MA) BR (or BRI)

A single monarchical crown above two sceptres, placed horizontally in saltire. Inner linear circle, through which the sceptres pass and reach an outer circle of dots.

Reverse.—FRA (or FR) ET HIB REX

A single rose surmounted by a single monarchical crown.

Legend between plain inner circle and outer circle of dots.

The mint-mark on both sides in all cases is a mullet. The punctuation of the legends is so erratic that no classification is possible. Apparently, however, only a colon or full-stop is used. There is no inlet of brass, as is the case with the other types.

There are two varieties in which the handles of the sceptres are either ornamented or plain.

(a) Ornamented handles to sceptres. There is no variation in legend, which is always:—

Obverse.—CAROLV D G MAG BRI
Reverse.—FRA ET HIB REX

¹ I have a specimen of the mullet-mullet type, which has no inner linear circle on the obverse.
(b) Plain handles to sceptre. The variations in the legend are as follows:—

Obverse.—CAROL V D G MAG BR  
Reverse.—FRA ET HIB REX

Obverse.—CAROL V D G MAG BR  
Reverse.—FR ET HIB REX

Obverse.—CAROL V D G MA BRI  
Reverse.—FRA ET HIB REX

Obverse.—CAROL V D G MA BRI  
Reverse.—FR ET HIB REX

In sub-type (b), with legends CAROL V D G MAG BR and FR ET HIB REX, a variety presents an orb only, instead of the usual cross on orb above the crown of the obverse.

The design and workmanship of this type are both miserably poor, while the fabric is irregular and the metal sometimes so short that it has worn completely through in parts in the striking.

It has already been suggested that this type was in the nature of money of necessity, especially coined for the purposes of Army pay at the instance of the King—which might well account for the variation in design.

A quotation from the newspaper called *The Diary*, of September 13th, 1644, with reference to the proceedings of the House of Commons on the previous Friday (September 6th), runs:—

"The business of Farthing Tokens was again taken into consideration; and it was declared how great a damage the Kingdom sustained by their increase, some of them being made and minted beyond the seas, the brasse no way countervailing the worth of the farthing; which, as it was a hindrance to our kingdom, was a great benefit to strangers. It was also declared, that His Majesty payed his army for the most part with farthing tokens which were minted at Bristol; and, being cunningly and secretly conveyed by sea to London, they oftentimes received silver for them."
Captain A. E. Weightman had a small hoard of thirteen farthings of this type, practically in mint condition, just as they were issued, which were found in the pocket of a soldier who was buried in Somerset. This evidence would seem to point to the year 1644 as the time of issue and Bristol as the place of minting.

**APPENDIX I.**

*Table to Illustrate the Sequence of Mint-marks.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type I—</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>⭐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⭐️</td>
<td>⭐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⭐️</td>
<td>⭐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b), (c)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>⭐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>⭐️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

{Mules of type I (d).}

Muled types I and II—

| ⭐️      | ⭐️      |

Type II—

{Mules of type II.}

Type III  ⭐️  ⭐️
**APPENDIX II.**

*Table to Illustrate Punctuation and Modification of Mint-marks by the Presence or Absence of Stoops or Pellets.*

In the following table, only one type is set out at length, viz. type II (a) (4), which is the commonest. This will serve to illustrate all the rest, though in no other type are so many variations to be found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obverse.</th>
<th>Reverse.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAROLV D: G MA: BRI:</td>
<td>FRA: ET: HI: REX:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CAROLV D: G MA: BRI:</td>
<td>FRA: ET: HI: REX:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CAROLV D: G MA: BRI:</td>
<td>FRA: ET: HI: REX:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CAROLV D' G MA' BRI'</td>
<td>FRA: ET: HI: REX:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CAROLV D: G MA: BRI:</td>
<td>FRA: ET: HI: REX:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CAROLV D: G MA: BRI:</td>
<td>FRA: ET: HI: REX:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CAROLV D: G MA: BRI:</td>
<td>FRA: ET: HI: REX:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CAROLV D: G MA: BRI:</td>
<td>FRA: ET: HI: REX:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CAROLV D: G MA: BRI:</td>
<td>FRA: ET: HI: REX:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>