NOTES ON THE "WOLSEY" COINS OF HENRY VIII

By H. ALEXANDER PARSONS

The editorial note preceding Mr. Lockett's exhibition of coins of Henry VIII, described in vol. xxiv of the Journal (pp. 113 ff.), leads me to present a few impressions of the "Wolsey" coinage which have been in my mind for some very considerable time. These concern (1) the sequence of initial or mint marks at the Tower Mint, including the elaborate cross ends on some of the reverses of the groats; (2) the sequence of these marks at the York Mint and the Wolsey indictment concerning the groats; (3) the general purpose of initial or mint marks.

First it might be well to place on record the mule type of the groats, combining the m.m. lis and arrow both ways, which occur in several collections. A specimen from my cabinet is here shown, Pl. no. 1. No work on the silver currency appears to have mentioned the combination although it helps to determine the position of the m.m. sunburst, and strengthens the view that the m.m. lis was adopted as a m.m. twice in the same coinage. This latter event in the currency is also made more certain by the mule coins combining the rose and lis and pheon and lis, which have already been published, at least by Hawkins in his Silver Coins of England.

In the result, the only Tower m.m. of the groats of this second issue, of which at present we have no recorded examples muled with other marks, is the sunburst, although Brooke in English Coins refers to a sovereign with lis over sunburst, p. 176, and this will be referred to later. As the sunburst has hitherto been placed between the arrow and the second lis, it would be well to review the position of the latter mark. The former is fixed by its association with the first lis.

The second lis I would place at the end of the issue. My reasons for thinking this are, firstly, that it was muled with the full-face groats of the final third issue of 1544 of 9-oz. fine and not with the withdrawn full-face issue of 1542 of 10-oz. fine, and, secondly, that the third issue of 1544 bears only the lis m.m. and is not combined with the m.m. pheon which has hitherto been placed the last of the Wolsey series. It seems to me that the lis m.m. of the circulated third issue of 1544 was merely a continuance of the last of the marks of the second issue, thus following a common practice in overlapping constantly resorted to, and evident even on the same king's first issue and his father's last one. The different obverse of the third issue would make it unnecessary, for fiscal purposes, to change the m.m., and in any case it will be shown later that the initial marks of this issue could not always have been the sole pyx trial marks. If the last mark of the profile second issue had been the pheon, as given by Dr. Brooke, I

1 For evidence of the real third issue being of 1544, and of its being muled with the last issue of the Wolsey coinage, see Num. Chron., 1923, p. 268.
2 English Coins, pp. 176 and 185.
think it would have been continued into the full-face issue of 1544 instead of the lis. Dr. Brooke's view rested on the supposition that the extremely rare profile groats and half-groats with m.m. pheon, and bearing the Irish royal title, were struck in a revived profile issue made between Michaelmas 1543 and March 1544, but he does not say where the commoner pheon coins, without the Irish royal title, should be placed. It would appear that it could only have been prior to May 1542, when the contract for the afterwards withdrawn full-face issue of 10-oz. fine was made, thus forcing the issue of the pheon-marked coins into two widely separated periods, first, before May 1542 for the coins without the Irish royal title and, second, after September 1543 for the coins with the Irish royal title, and this is not convincing.

Let us therefore review the circumstances. In the summer of 1541 Henry was proclaimed in Dublin, by the Irish Parliament, as King of Ireland; on the 23rd of January 1542 the change of style from Dominus to Rex was announced in England, but without parliamentary sanction, and on the 14th of April 1542 Henry ordered the Lord Deputy to alter the seals in Ireland. Although there was no specific instruction to alter the inscription on the Irish coins there seems little doubt, as was assumed by Mr. Henry Symonds, that it would have been inserted on them by, or before, April 1542, and as the English coins were struck alongside those of Ireland in the Tower of London, by the same mint-masters, there seems every probability that some of the dies of the English coins had the Irish royal title inserted on them at the same time, and this also appears to have been the view of Mr. Henry Symonds. In this event all the pheon-marked coins, with and without the Irish royal title would have come naturally together in one issue, instead of two widely separated periods. They were doubtlessly all issued before May 1542, when the coinage of the subsequently withdrawn full-face third issue of 10-oz. fine was contracted for.

The insertion of the Irish royal title on a few of the pheon-marked coins could then be explained on the reasonable hypothesis that some dies were prematurely made and the resultant coins issued at the end of the coinage carrying this m.m., before it was realized that the Irish Proclamation of 1541 granting the title, and the English announcement of it in January 1542, had not been ratified by the English Parliament. The legalizing of the use of the title in England was not effected until the regnal year ended 21 April 1544.

As before mentioned, the Irish and English coins were minted together in the Tower of London, and the die-sinkers, in placing the same title on each type of coin, failed to realize that, although it was legal on the Irish money, as it had been passed by the independent Irish Parliament, it was not proper to the English coins, as it was without English parliamentary sanction.

Doubt has been expressed whether any examples have survived of
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1 The coins were actually struck between July 1542 and March 1543.
3 Ibid.
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the withdrawn full-face issue of July 1542 to March 1543. Dr. Brooke wrote that all were melted down, and that presumably the coinage would have borne the Irish royal title, and the m.m. pheon, but this last suggestion, regarding the m.m., is in contradiction of the subsequent remark in the same article, that if not melted down they are not at present to be distinguished from the remainder of the third issue of 1544, all of which undoubtedly bear the m.m. lis, not pheon. As to whether this tentative third issue was actually melted down after withdrawal, it should be emphasized that although the relative mint accounts from 1542 to 1547 are complete, there is no reference in them to the melting down of the third-issue coins of 1542-3. On the other hand, in Hawkins’s Silver Coins of England, following Ruding, mention is made of full-face coins of “fine” silver, and if this is a loose term for finer silver, as is possible, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the few examples known represent a survival of some of the withdrawn full-face issue of the higher standard of 10-oz. fine. In that case it is certain that all the withdrawn coins bore the m.m. lis, not pheon.

The English announcement of the grant, by the Irish Parliament, of the Irish royal title is dated 23 January 1542, and it is not unreasonable to conclude that the issue of the profile groats, m.m. pheon, with that title, was made between January and May 1542, i.e. immediately before the date of the contract for the subsequently withdrawn full-face issue, and before it was discovered that the title was without English parliamentary sanction, given in the regnal year ended 21 April 1544. It is possible that the withdrawal of the full-face strikings of 1542-3 is to be attributed to the same cause, viz. that the Irish royal title on the coins lacked sanction of the English Parliament, and not, as Dr. Brooke assumes, to the refusal of Parliament to sanction the use of the lower standard of metal, for we do know that the use of the Irish royal title at this time lacked legal sanction.

The fact that these pheon-marked groats with the Irish royal title also bear the Arabic 8 instead of the Roman VIII after the king’s name does not, it is thought, affect their true position in the series. The change was quite possibly dictated by the fact that an additional word, HIB, had to be imported into the legend, besides other alterations, and, to make room, the sprawling Roman numeral VIII was replaced by the compact Arabic numeral 8.

The official parliamentary sanction for the use of the title appears to have been delayed until after September 1543, when the last Wolsey coins commenced to be struck. By this time it would have been realized that the use of the Irish royal title on some late pheon-marked profile groats, and on the withdrawn full-face coins of 1542-3, was premature, and the fresh dies made for the last Wolsey issue would therefore not, in general, bear this title and would, in view of the profile-full-face mules of 9-oz. fine with m.m. lis, issued in 1544, bear the second lis of the Wolsey issue.

The failure of the mint to maintain in circulation the full-face strik-
ings of 1542, whatever may have been the cause, entailed no doubt a
considerable shortage of currency, and the decision to strike, again, a
further supply of profile coins, which was carried out as from Septem-
ber 1543, was probably a hurried one arrived at through the urgency
of the need; for if there had been no real want, there would have been
little point in restarting an issue of what was, in effect, an obsolete
type. This need is illustrated by the continuance in circulation of the
unauthorized issue of some of the 1542 full-face coins of the higher
standard, if it may be taken, as I think it should, that the "fine"
silver coins mentioned by Ruding and Hawkins are of this issue.
Further indication of the urgency of the matter is also to be seen in
the existence, both ways, of the not uncommon mule coins which con-
nect the two last profile m.m.s pheon and lis. These mules were no
doubt struck in the early rush days of this revived profile issue in
September 1543, when the need for working irons was urgent. At the
same time it seems not unlikely that the better preserved dies of the
first lis striking were also pressed into service notwithstanding they
had been long out of use. As it had been decided to mark the new
emergency issue with a lis, the bringing into use again of old suitable
dies would have saved both time and expense. Such a practice is, in
fact, amply proved by the gold coinage.
Examples of similar mule coins, but bearing the Irish royal title,
are also in evidence. These might, however, be attributable to the
end of the issue, which ceased in March 1544. If so, they would show
that, by this time, parliamentary sanction had been given for the use
of the title, so making it now legitimate to utilize the prematurely
made previous dies carrying it. Although the exact date of this
authority is uncertain, it was, as previously mentioned, promulgated
during the regnal year ended 27 April 1544, and the circulated full-face
issue, on which the title appeared, this time legitimately, commenced
at least on the 1st of June 1544.1 Only three examples of this mule
type with the Irish royal title are in evidence; one in the collection of
Mr. E. J. Winstanley (Pl. no. 2), another in my cabinet, and a third
(Pl. no. 3) in that of Mr. L. A. Lawrence. In support of their allocation
to the final workings of the profile issue it should be stressed that the
lis on their new reverses is of a rather different character from that
usually in evidence on the early Wolsey issue. It is of a larger size.
The side petals are more pronounced and the stem is of a more solid
type, similar to the lis on some of the groats and angels of the follow-
ing full-face issue. On workmanship it seems, therefore, that the
reverse dies of these lis marked profile mule coins were made only a
little time prior to those required for the following full-face issue, and
this affords further evidence that the profile second lis was the last
mark of the Wolsey issue.
Apart from this, if the pheon had been the last Tower mark of this
coinage, the muling of the lis marked profile issue with the lis marked
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full-face 9-oz. "fine" issue of 1544 would be inexplicable, at least at this period when muling was, at least on the silver coins, consistently in sequence. On the other hand, if the profile groats bearing the second m.m. lis are of the short period between Michaelmas 1543 and March 1544, just prior to the 9-oz. "fine" full-face issue, the profile full-face mule coins, with m.m. lis, fall into their natural place of being representative of two consecutive issues, and not two divided issues. Further, an explanation of the anomalous use of an identical m.m. twice in the same coinage is then forthcoming, for it is probable that the lis was adopted for the withdrawn full-face premature issue of 1542—certainly so if the surviving "fine" full-face coins are of this issue—and when, subsequently, it was found necessary to make a further issue of the profile second type, what more likely than that the same m.m. lis was continued on it? The different obverses would be adequate for differentiating purposes.

Turning now to the first lis groats of the Wolsey issue it is, as is well known, found muled with the rose and the arrow, so these three marks must have been in sequence. That the rose is the first of the three is made clear by the existence of some rose marked coins with Roman lettering, which Mr. L. A. Lawrence has shown to be contemporary with the issue of the crown of the single rose between August and November 1526, that is, the very first year of the Wolsey coinage. A further and perhaps stronger reason for concluding that these rose marked groats with the Roman letters were the first of the series, and one which does not appear to have been noticed hitherto, exists in the fact that they follow the form of the *dei gratia* inscription consistently (so far as the groats are concerned) found on all previous issues as far back as the time of Edward III. This inscription reads *DI* (or, rarely, *D0l*) *GRAT*, whereas on the groats of Henry VIII's second issue, after the small emission with the same inscription and Roman letters, the reading is *D* (or, rarely, *DI*) *GR* only.

The reason for the issue of these rose marked coins with Roman lettering has not apparently been elucidated, but I think that they are due to the dies having been made by the workmen who were employed on the new coinage of the crown of the single rose. The crowns followed the module, as well as the weight, of the French crown of the period, on which Roman lettering was used, and such lettering was accordingly copied on the English crown. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the same letters were imported into the dies of the groats and half-groats, being prepared at the same time by the same die-sinkers with, in some cases probably, the same punches as were used for the gold coins. If so, the presence of this lettering on the silver coins was fortuitous, and was largely, though not altogether, restricted to the short period between August and November 1526, when the gold crowns of the single rose were struck. That it was not confined to this period is evidenced by the fact that it appears on a
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few rare gold crowns of the double rose, m.m. rose, which immediately succeeded the coinage of the gold crown of the single rose. Examples of these gold crowns of the double rose with Roman lettering are in various collections, and one with Roman Ms on the obverse only is in my cabinet, Pl. no. 4. The same lettering also appears, though more rarely, on the subsequent lis marked currency in both gold and silver, and comparable lettering was in evidence on some of the second-issue groats of Henry VII, with m.m. scallop.

The sporadic character of this Roman letter feature on the several coinages cited, and the rarity of the coins, precludes, it is thought, the possibility that this lettering was, in conjunction with the initial marks, utilized also as a distinguishing feature for pyx trial purposes, although it is certain that some other feature on the coins, besides the initial mark, was necessary, as is evidenced from the fact that the two first tests of the Wolsey issue were made in June and November 1527, and both came in the earliest period of the m.m. rose.

It should here be mentioned that some of the Wolsey groats with Roman lettering have, in addition, a cross on the reverse of exceptional design with floriated instead of forked ends. One from Mr. Lockett's collection is here shown, Pl. no. 5. But as none of the half-groats with Roman lettering bear this feature, so far as the present writer is aware, and as, also, some of the ordinary groats, with Lombardic lettering, do occur with this exceptional ornamentation, it cannot be considered to represent, in conjunction with the Roman lettering, an officially designed new type of coins. The use of this floriated cross should, it is thought, be regarded as marking an unauthorized variation from the standard on the part of a die-sinker with more individual ideas, and perhaps entrusted only with the preparation of groat dies. Mr. Henry Symonds has drawn attention to the fact that the new Wolsey coinage of 1526 required an increase in the number of working moneyers and, quoting from Miscellaneous Books of the Exchequer, he shows that "coiners" were specially brought from abroad for the work. The artistic standard of foreign workmen at the time was higher than that of the English ones, so it is not unreasonable to regard these coins with floriated ends to the cross as evidence of the individual taste of one of the foreign die-sinkers specially brought to this country to help in the mint. A recrudescence of this form of ornamentation in the forks of the cross is in evidence also in the next reign, on some of Edward's early coins struck with the name and portrait of his father, and inscribed, on the reverse, CIVITAS LONDON. An example from my collection is here shown, Pl. no. 6.

In view of the above special features on the coins, there is no doubt that the rose was the first initial mark of the Wolsey issue and, as it was muled with the lis, the latter mark comes second; whilst the lis and arrow mules show that the arrow comes third. As we have also indicated that the pheon and second lis were the last marks of the issue, in that order, and that all the above named marks are

1 Ibid., vol. x, p. 143.
2 Ibid., p. 141.
interconnected by mule coins, the place of the sunburst is between the arrow and the pheon. Superficially the gold sovereigns appear to militate against this arrangement, but having regard to the unusual feature, as contrasted with the silver coins, of the continuous use of old dies in the periods of other and non-consecutive m.m.s, there is good reason for considering that, in fact, they provide the key to the so far missing mule type connecting the arrow with the sunburst, which would render nearly complete the whole series of second-issue m.m.s, with their connecting mules; for, as Mr. C. A. Whitton has kindly pointed out to me, the obverse m.m. of the obverse lis—reverse arrow mule type sovereign, mentioned by Brooke in *English Coins*, p. 184, is a lis struck over sunburst and possibly, as Dr. Brooke thinks also, over portcullis—see *English Coins*, p. 183. The similarity of dies might justify the existence of this latter under-mark, although it is not, in fact, now evident on the British Museum examples. The portcullis under-mark is, however, distinctly discernible on a British Museum sovereign bearing the m.m. sunburst as the over-mark. We cannot therefore dismiss the possibility that arrow-sunburst muled sovereigns, without the lis over-mark, may yet be discovered.

As to the lis over-mark on the known coins, the present writer has little doubt that the long interval between the portcullis under-mark and the sunburst over-mark of the British Museum sovereign above referred to was repeated by a further long interval between the arrow and the final lis over sunburst of the Wolsey second issue in 1543-4, notwithstanding that on both occasions other marks intervened; for it can no more be argued, on the evidence of these sovereigns, that the lis immediately followed the sunburst than that it could be laid down that the sunburst immediately succeeded the portcullis, which we know definitely not to have been the case. This solution of the lis over-mark is supported by the clearer and more consistent evidence of the silver currency. It no doubt was, in the known urgency of this last temporary emergency issue, inadvertently omitted on the reverse. Whether these lis overstruck coins were, in fact, actually struck from old dies, or were the missing arrow-sunburst mules recalled and overstruck, cannot now be determined.

The execution of Henry's second silver issue was so consistent, apart from the unusual features above mentioned, that there does not seem to be much scope for separating definitely the coins of the first lis from those of the second, except in such cases where examples from similar dies can be identified against the mule pieces. In other words, lis coins which are identical with rose-lis and lis-arrow mules, of course on the lis side, would undoubtedly be of the first lis issue, as also lis coins with Roman lettering. Whilst such lis coins as are identical, on the lis side, with pheon-lis and second-third issue mules would also, beyond question, be of the second lis issue; as will any coins marked with a lis of the character of that on the pheon-lis mules with the Irish royal title. As mentioned previously, there is also the possibility of well-preserved dies of the first lis issue being, in the emergency,
brought into use again a second time, and it would be impossible to differentiate between early and late strikings of such coins. In any case, if the suggestion made above that the second lis was used only on the small revived profile issue of 1543–4 is correct, I doubt if many have survived. In other words, the great bulk of the Wolsey lis groats in existence probably belong to the strikings of the early part of the coinage.

It will have been observed that the above remarks relate only to the Tower mint of the Wolsey issue, but some reference to the mint of York might be made, more especially as two apparently unpublished major varieties of the groats of that city are in evidence. One is without the initials T. W., on the reverse, although it bears the Cardinal's hat below the shield as on the ordinary Wolsey coins, and the other is a mule type with the m.m. acorn on one side and the voided cross on the other. An example of the latter, from my collection, is illustrated, Pl. no. 9. One of the former, in the possession of Mr. L. A. Lawrence, is shown in Pl. no. 7, and another belonging to Mr. E. J. Winstanley is illustrated by Pl. no. 8. Only the m.m.s acorn and voided cross are known on the groats of York of this issue so, although the above mule type indicates that the two marks were in sequence, it does not show their precise order. A clue to this, however, is preserved in the halfpennies of the same issue and mint, for both those of the Wolsey issue with his initials on them, and those of the sede vacante issue, which immediately followed, and still formed part of the second coinage, bear the m.m. voided cross. The cross on my specimen of this sede vacante halfpenny, Pl. no. 10, is, for this small coin, very large, about the size of the cross on the groats. It seems, therefore, not unlikely that the punches no longer required for the Wolsey groats, after Wolsey's indictment, were utilized for the following sede vacante halfpence, which were doubtlessly struck in the archiepiscopal mint, as the king's mint at York was not opened until 1545.1 The evidence of this continuation in the same coinage, and apparently with the same punches, is considered to be stronger for the sequence acorn, voided cross, than that for the contrary order based on the presence of the m.m. cross voided on the entirely separate coinage of the preceding issue, apart from the fact that there were other marks on this latter issue the sequence of which has not been determined.

As the voided cross mark seems clearly to be the final one, the above groats so marked, and without the letters T. W., might be regarded as coming very late in the issue, when proceedings were being formulated against the archbishop, and as reflecting a doubt of his right to the profits of such a coin as the groat, for the presence of the initials indicates that the profits went into the archbishop's coffers. Wolsey himself no doubt realized that he may have strained his coining privileges, although there was no specific law against his coining of groats,2 and those without the initials might therefore be survivors of an attempt to forestall awkward comment, and to prove that the mint
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was being worked, at least partly, for the king's profit, the hat, closely woven into the design, being left to show only that the machinery of the archbishop's mint was being used; for, as above stated, there was no royal mint in York at this period. The idea that the omission of the initials was intentional is strengthened by the fact that the examples of the groats above illustrated, Pl. nos. 7 and 8, are from essentially different dies.

The above explanation of this omission of the letters T. W. constitutes a not unreasonable solution to the otherwise debatable clause No. 40, relating to the coinage, in the Wolsey indictment, which did not state, as numismatists have read into the wording, that the cardinal had unwarrantably taken the profits of the groat coinage, but that he had presumed to imprint his cardinal's hat under the royal arms. By the time of the indictment the profits of the mint had, most likely on the evidence of the coins without T. W., been diverted to the King's Treasury. The indictment says that Wolsey's presumption was the placing of the hat under the king's arms on the king's groats. The exact wording, as addressed to the king, is "under your arms in your coin of groats". One implication of this phrasing is that the king, at the time, was receiving the profits of the coinage. The presumption read by the cardinal's accusers into the use of the hat was, therefore, the only concrete point left to make a charge about, trivial as it was. After all, why should we read into this legal document something that was not there, simply because there appeared to be little point in what was there, thus implying also that the compilers of the indictment were incapable of correctly expressing what they meant? The nearly contemporary Shakespeare was in no such doubt for, in his play of Henry VIII, Act III, Scene 2, he wrote: "That, out of mere ambition, you have caused your holy hat to be stampt on the King's coin." Here is no suggestion that it was really the striking of groats that constituted the crime, but only that the cardinal's hat was inserted under the royal arms, as specifically stated in the indictment. Further, it is on record that the king had no fault to find with Wolsey's administration of the Tower mint, as a warrant issued in 1530, after the cardinal's disgrace in the previous year, ratified all he had done.  

Although this document relates only to the Tower mint, it does form something of a certificate of rectitude, and it is suggested that we must accept the York mint indictment strictly as it is worded, and not read into it something which is not there. If, as the present writer thinks, the omission of the letters T. W. on the coins shows that the king was given, although belatedly, the profits, it would be just another illustration of Wolsey's desperate attempt to placate the king and forestall trouble, which is evidenced also, and on a larger scale, by his apparently voluntary surrender to the king of his great palace of Hampton Court, which rivalled, or surpassed in magnificence, Henry's own palaces.

There is the alternative that the absence of the letters was fortuitous,

but it is significant that a similar omission is well known, and more extensive, amongst the York half-groats of the first issue. The coincidence of two entirely different series of coins being without the initials, whilst retaining the cardinal’s hat, seems, however, to rule out the idea of accident and to imply that the omissions served a purpose, and I suggest that on both occasions the profits of the issue of these uninitialled coins went to the king, although the machinery of the archiepiscopal mint was, in the absence of a royal mint, used for striking them. This explanation would also settle the question of the sponsor of the first issue York half-groats bearing the hat but no initials, which Dr. Brooke left an open one.¹

A list of the m.m.s and mule types of the Tower and York groats of Henry’s second issue, in their sequence as above proposed, is as follows:

**Tower.** Rose, Rose–Lis, Lis, Lis–Arrow, Arrow, Sunburst, Pheon, Pheon–Lis, Lis, 2nd issue Lis–3rd issue Lis.

The gold sovereigns provide the connecting mule type arrow–sunburst, although the sunburst is over-marked with the second lis.

**York.** Acorn, Acorn–Voided Cross, Voided Cross.

The lesser denominations follow suit, although they are not so complete.

The question now arises whether these initial marks were pyx trial marks as well as guides to the commencement of the inscriptions. If they were inserted only for the latter purpose, the reason for changing them five times on the Tower coins of the Wolsey issue is not apparent. One mark alone would have sufficed, as in the case of the cross used from ancient times to the reign of Edward IV, with the exception that Edward III, for a short period, introduced a crown as an initial mark. We know from documentary evidence that, by the time of Elizabeth, the initial marks were also specifically used as the differentiating symbols for the trials of the pyx and were then the sole marks used for the purpose, with perhaps a few exceptions. But this is by no means certainly the case in the time of Edward IV when the initial marks first became so varied, and the Wolsey issue furnishes evidence that they were not the sole pyx marks in the time of Henry VIII. Mr. Henry Symonds has quoted records of eight pyx trials, made at irregular intervals, during the period of this Wolsey issue, but these trials relate only to the period 1527 to 1540.² The records of them are often in an unfinished or mutilated condition, and none indicate the marks used for separating the coins struck between the trials. The last two m.m.s of the Wolsey issue, i.e. the pheon and the second lis, were, there is little doubt, used after 1540, so we are left with only four initial marks, viz. rose, first lis, arrow, and sunburst, for the eight trials known to have been made, and it is quite possible, indeed probable, that there were other trials in the period the records of which have not survived, for in the indenture relating to the withdrawn full-face coinage of 1542 it was laid down that the pyx was to be opened

¹ *English Coins*, p. 175 and pp. 183–4.
every three months.\textsuperscript{1} This entry no doubt followed precedent, but it is doubtful whether it was acted upon strictly. Clearly, therefore, the initial marks were not the sole pyx trial guides in this reign. Judging also by the fact that some coins of Edward VI and Philip and Mary, as well as of Henry VIII, are without initial marks, such marks were also not, in all cases, the pyx trial guides in those reigns, except possibly for the first trial after a change in the initial mark. For a subsequent test between the initial marks, some other feature on the coins, perhaps used in conjunction with the initial mark, must have been utilized.

The reasonable conclusion seems to be that, from Anglo-Saxon times to the reign of Edward IV, the initial mark was used solely as a guide to the punching in of the legends on the dies, that there was a transitional period from the latter reign to that of Elizabeth, during which it was also utilized for pyx trial purposes, although sometimes in conjunction with other features on the coins, and that from the Elizabethan period to the introduction of universal dating of coins, in the reign of Charles II, the initial mark was, with certain exceptions, the sole pyx trial guide. That it was then practically the sole guide is proved by the record of the pyx trials in the Commonwealth period for only the sun m.m. appears on the coins from 1649 to 1657, and there was, in fact, only one pyx trial for that long period. It was made on the 3rd of December 1657, of coins struck in the Tower between 9 November 1649 and the day of trial.\textsuperscript{2} The new mark of the anchor appeared on coins of the following year, 1658.

On the general question of nomenclature, the terms mint mark and initial mark have been used more or less indifferently. As the marks were made in the mint they can all be properly called mint marks, as was formerly the practice. Nevertheless, the term initial mark is a more useful one when dealing solely with the inscriptions. It was for that reason that it was introduced into my article on "The Regnal Divisions of the Short Cross Coinage", when the work of the Rhuddlan die-sinkers was being discussed\textsuperscript{3} and, to the best of my belief, this was its first introduction into numismatic literature, contrary to the statement in the \textit{Num. Chron.} 1941, p. 136, which implied that the earliest reference to the term initial mark was in 1926.

\textsuperscript{1} Brit. Num. Journ., vol. x, p. 151.
\textsuperscript{2} Num. Chron., 1915, p. 345.
\textsuperscript{3} Numismatic Circular, July-Aug. 1923.