THE COINAGES OF HENRY VIII AND EDWARD VI
IN HENRY’S NAME

By C. A. WHITTON

PART I. INTRODUCTION

The ensuing papers are intended to supplement Brooke’s account of the coins of this period, leaving the divisions of them save for some necessary changes in the practical form which he devised. The general plan is to show, after a brief historical survey, each metal in each denomination at the several mints as a complete series, except in the case of the Bristol mint which it seemed desirable to treat separately. Thus the papers will consist of four sections:

1. This introduction, mainly historical, together with a synoptic chart of the various mints and mint accounts.

2. Gold of London including Southwark: (a) Sovereigns of each coinage; (b) Half-sovereigns, and the Sovereign and Half-sovereigns of Edward VI’s coinage in Henry’s name; (c) Crowns and Half-crowns of the Double Rose, including those of Edward in Henry’s name; (d) Angels of all three coinages of Henry and George Nobles, and their fractions.

3. Silver: (a) First and Second Coinages of London; (b) Ecclesiastical Coinage; (c) Base Coinage including that of Edward in Henry’s name, including coins of the Tower, Southwark, Durham House, Canterbury, and York.

4. Gold and silver of Bristol.

In both gold and silver some incidental mention will be made of the early coinages in Edward’s name also.

The dates of the coinages are: First Coinage, 1509–26; Second Coinage, 1526–44; Base Coinage, 1544–7; Edward’s so-called First Coinage, chiefly in Henry’s name, 1547–51. Henry’s Base Coinage includes the Third Coinage (1542–4, withdrawn probably save for some coins struck under the indenture of 1526), the Fourth Coinage (1544), the Fifth Coinage (1545), and the Sixth Coinage (1546). Where it seemed useful I have retained these terms, but for general descriptive purposes I have treated the Base Coinage as one continuous series from 1544 to 1551 approximately.

The long reign of Henry VIII figures in English history as a link marking a transition between two ages. This aspect of the reign is reflected in the large and varied coinage it produced. New coins of a new standard were struck, old ones were discarded; new traditions were established and old ones broken; in particular, circumstances and the impetuous character of the king precipitated two remarkable changes in the currency, namely, the abolition of the bishops’ privilege of striking money and the debasement of the coinage. These two events are of especial interest to the numismatist, and to understand
them it will be useful to consider some of the circumstances of Henry's reign.

During the early years of his reign Henry had, through his affinity with Ferdinand the Catholic, the father of his first wife Katherine of Aragon, inevitably been drawn into the intricacies of European politics. The influence of Wolsey, too, was turning the king's mind in the same direction. Within a few years of his accession, by 1513, he had fought the campaigns of Tournay and Flodden, for, as ever, war in Europe was prone to bring trouble also in Scotland. These early successes seem to have gone to Henry's head. The complacency they induced in him found expression in such extravagances as the conference of the Field of Cloth of Gold, and in the triumphant issue of his Tournay groats, the outcome perhaps of youthful dreams, inspired by memories of Agincourt, of a new Anglo-Gallic empire.

But disillusionment was soon to come. By 1520 Henry himself was prepared to admit that his title of King of France was "good for nothing". As his activities increased he became more and more closely involved in the quarrels of the real King of France, as well as in those of the Holy Roman Emperor and of the Pope himself. All these undertakings were exhaustingly expensive, for the soldiery must be paid in hard cash and at a rate much higher than the reward of civil labour. Indeed, more than once in his continental wars Henry suffered the humiliation of seeing his soldiers "come out on strike" for lack of pay, and even give up the campaign and make their way home to England. His own campaigns, however, were not the only expeditions on which Henry's money was lavished. It is to be feared that in his youthful enthusiasm he was sometimes exploited by the older and more experienced rulers on the Continent and induced by specious pleading to contribute to the cost of their private quarrels. When in 1519 the young and formidable Emperor Charles V succeeded Maximilian the cost of such subsidies became an even greater drain on Henry. The danger to England became more real and it was partly through such payments that Wolsey was able to preserve the balance of power between the king's chief rivals, the Emperor Charles and Francis I of France.

With the Pope, Henry was destined to find himself in controversy for another reason. After some twenty years of marriage to Katherine of Aragon, Henry, and the country not less urgently, still lacked the all-important male heir. Katherine's only surviving child was the future Queen Mary, and there was no precedent, save in the doubtful case of Matilda, for the rule of a woman in England. For a medieval monarch a daughter, when an only child, could be doubly embarrassing; not only was her succession likely to be disputed, but if she married a foreigner the very kingdom might be involved with her. On the other hand, the king who had both sons and daughters was doubly blessed; the succession was more secure and his daughters thus became an asset in the marriage market by enabling the king to bargain, however recklessly on a long view, for the alliance of foreign potentates. It was thus indeed that Henry himself had become,
through the schemes of his father, involved in the affairs of Aragon and Castile. And so, alive to his precarious plight and now, moreover, predisposed towards Anne Boleyn, Henry was readily induced to regard the deaths of all Katherine’s sons—she had four in all—as the just punishment of an illegally contracted marriage, illegal at least in the eyes of the Church, since Katherine had first been married to Henry’s elder brother Arthur who had died young.

Any divorce or annulment, however, was not easy and was indeed contrary to the very laws of the Church of Rome. It would be beyond the scope of this paper to follow Henry into the labyrinth of intrigue he traversed during a number of years in pursuit of this purpose. The attitude of Rome remained unyielding, and at last the exasperated king determined to take matters into his own hands. He created himself Head of the Church in his own realm and eventually found in Cranmer the man who was ready to pronounce the divorce. This accomplished (1533), Henry at once married Anne Boleyn, though a secret marriage to her had perhaps already taken place.

The divorce, though unpopular in the country at first, was gradually forgotten if not condoned as the hostility to Rome grew. With the appointment of Thomas Cromwell as the King’s Secretary in May 1534 this hostility took a more active form. The date is important for numismatists because it was probably the prelude to the end of the ecclesiastical coinage in England. The coins too bear out this assumption. There can be little doubt that the bishops’ privilege of coinage ceased in November 1534 with the passing of Cromwell’s famous Act of Supremacy. This instrument, frequently quoted by historians, formally recognized Henry as Supreme Head of the Church, a title, as we have seen already, conceded to him by Convocation in 1531. Its wording is instructive; it annexed to the Crown “all honours, dignities, pre-eminences, jurisdictions, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said Dignity of Supreme Head . . . belonging”. It is difficult to imagine that even the privilege of the bishops can have escaped such an all-embracing claim.

This curtailment of the bishops’ privilege was the beginning of further attacks on the power and wealth of the Church. Such a policy had already been tentatively explored in the dissolution of some of the smaller monasteries. It was soon to be more fully implemented in the suppression of all the religious houses and the confiscation of Church property, the material portion of which was used to serve the king’s immediate needs. Much Church plate was sent to the mint and melted down for recoinage, and much of the money struck after 1536 probably came from such plate. We are told that when anyone lost a coin men said it must have been made from a chalice. For it was not only the power of the Church and the monasteries that the king coveted, it was also their wealth.

The fact is that for some years Henry's financial affairs, as may readily be inferred, had been steadily deteriorating. If in accordance with a promise of Cromwell's Henry became the "richest prince in Christendom" it was for the second time in his life. For there is no doubt that he had inherited from his father a very large sum of hoarded wealth which he speedily contrived to squander. But if he has been censured, and rightly censured, for this extravagance, it is only fair to recall that he was to some extent the victim of circumstances. Although it was not until the reign of Elizabeth that the luxury and beauty of Renaissance work made any wide appeal to the gentry in England, yet even in Henry's time expensive novelties had begun to creep in to tempt the gallantry of one who was essentially the "First Gentleman" of England. Fine clothes and their appurtenances, from jewels, now for the first time skilfully cut to show off their beauty, to trifles like fans and walking-sticks—all these were to Henry and his ladies irresistible and indispensable. And as it happened there was for the king the added lure of seeing himself and his finery immortalized in the attractive paintings of Hans Holbein and his school. The dour and thrifty Henry VII had not been exposed to such temptations as these.

And in addition to the difficulties arising from his own extravagance or from ambitious or unavoidable expenditure abroad, Henry had to contend with the normal troubles of currency. In 1526 there had supervened one of the recurrent crises inevitable in a monetary system where the currency has an intrinsic value; it was a problem which was only solved in modern times when gold was brought under constant scrutiny in the scales of the banks, so that it was never allowed to circulate in a worn condition. In former times the difficulty was temporarily relieved by fixing the weight of the standard coin at the average of that in circulation. Thus in 1526 Wolsey reduced the groat from 48 to 42½ grs., which agrees with the average weight of many surviving groats of Edward IV, Richard III, and Henry VII, which as well as the First Coinage of Henry VIII no doubt still figured largely in the national currency.

At the same time Wolsey began to issue crown gold of 22 ct., a step forced on the king's advisers by the competition of foreign gold here. Its immediate effect was doubtless to drive "underground" much of the existing fine gold. A remarkable instance of this is seen in the St. Albans find of 1886, when there were found hidden within the timber from a dismantled building some 250 gold coins, from ryals of Edward IV to angels and half-angels of Henry VIII's First Coinage, but nothing later and of course no crown gold.¹ There can be little doubt that this was a monastic hoard and had been buried to frustrate one of the visitations of Thomas Cromwell in the 1530's. There was then plenty of crown gold available, but it had been circulated, while the fine gold only was hoarded and hidden. The ryals of Edward IV struck at 10s. were now worth 11s. 3d. in the scales; in twenty-five
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years they were to be worth 15s. each. To those rich enough to save, the passage of time brought an assured bonus on their money. Such hoarding was doubtless widespread and inevitably accentuated the shortage of bullion. The king alone among "rich" men was, by his commitments, debarred from enjoying this bonus. In 1529, we read,¹ he was reduced to searching the country for gold-mines. In 1546 gold was further reduced to 20 ct.

But the mass of the people was concerned not so much with the gold coinage as with the silver. The story of the debasement, first revealed in 1544, needs in the main no historical restatement. It is, perhaps, for the numismatist, best unfolded, with the metal declining gradually to a fineness of 4 oz. in the pound, by the coins themselves. These leave little doubt as to the main facts, but there is some confusion as to the initial stages of the debasement and in particular it seems desirable to re-examine in the light of new evidence Brooke's account of them.

Brooke states² that the first base silver coins, authorized in May 1542 to be of 10 oz. fine, and the corresponding gold coins of 23 ct. were never issued but went back to the melting-pot as their issue awaited proclamation, "which presumably Parliament refused to sanction. As the result of the withdrawal of the coinage the mint was again engaged in coinage of the Wolsey standards [i.e. 11 oz. 2 dwt. silver] between Michaelmas 1543 and March 1544, and to this issue may be assigned the rare groat with Pheon mark on which the Irish title [proclaimed in 1542] is inserted."

Brooke's reasons both for the coinage of the fine groats with i.m. Pheon and for the remelting of the 10-oz. coinage seem open to criticism. To take the latter point first, the view that the 10-oz. coinage was never issued is based on the fact that no 10-oz. coins are known. What are almost certainly the earliest pieces of base silver have proved on assay to be 9 oz. fine, so that it is justifiable to assume, and indeed there is documentary evidence,³ that the first base coins were issued for circulation by the proclamation of May 1544 (not 1542).

There seems reason to doubt, however, whether Parliament's presumed refusal to sanction the proclamation of 1542 was the cause of the remelting of the 10-oz. coinage. By 1542 Parliament had long been accustomed to respect the king's wishes. An Elizabethan writer, Sir H. Spelman, records that as early as 1536 when the Commons showed some reluctance to pass Henry's Bill for the suppression of the monasteries the king appeared before them in person. "I hear", he said, "that my Bill will not pass, but I will have it pass or I will have some of your heads."⁴ Now, six years later, Henry's tyrannical rule had become even harsher, and it is evident from the mint records and Mr. Henry Symonds's comments on them⁵ that public affairs whether at the mint or elsewhere were not always conducted on orthodox or con-

¹ Pollard, op. cit., p. 245.
² English Coins, p. 177.
⁴ Maynard Smith, op. cit., p. 79.
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stitutional lines. Henry in fact in contemplating a base coinage was doing so, as Mr. Symonds has suggested, not in order to relieve the shortage of currency among his subjects but to enrich himself, and it may be assumed that if the 10-oz. coinage was remelted it was because the king was now advised that such a standard was an unnecessarily generous one.

New light is brought to bear on the question by a student of economics, Mr. A. E. Feavearyear. His account of the coinage of 1542, citing chiefly the Letters and Papers of Henry VIII, differs in several respects from Brooke's.

In the first place Mr. Feavearyear points out that the terms of the indenture of 16 May 1542, authorizing gold of 23 ct. and silver of 10 oz. fine, and the new price of bullion, were not announced to all and sundry for the good reason that Henry intended, as he ultimately did, to raise the price of bullion still higher and himself take advantage of the rising market before "letting in the general public". Meanwhile money was coined from time to time under this secret indenture and stored in the Jewel Tower in the Palace of Westminster.

Secondly, Mr. Feavearyear states that the silver was not coined according to the strict terms of the indenture but that actually, to make the 22,053 lb. of silver struck in 1542-4, 5,513 lb. of alloy were used, so that the real fineness of the silver was not 10 oz. but only 8·3 oz. in the pound.

It would seem that there is here some confusion in the writer's interpretation of his sources. The figure of 22,053 lb. is certainly that given by the mint accounts for silver struck between July 1542 and March 1543 (10 oz.), but the admixture of alloy seems to suggest that Mr. Feavearyear is considering, whether consciously or not, the bullion after it had been melted down and was being recoined for the 9-oz. standard (or 8·3 oz., a figure to which students need not of course feel tied down).

Thirdly, says Mr. Feavearyear, "so far as the public was concerned, the old indenture still held good, and small quantities of gold and silver were brought in and minted according to the regulations of 1526". This is confirmed (as Brooke was of course aware) by existing mint accounts, and thus the proper explanation of the issue of the Pheon-marked profile groats with the Irish title and the corresponding gold crowns is possibly that they were struck as a token observance of the law simultaneously with the base "whole face" groats, which, as already stated, were not being issued but secretly stored until, as Mr. Feavearyear puts it, "the mine" was ready to be sprung. The "mine" was sprung on 16 May 1544 and the base money brought out and issued to coincide with the proclamation announcing the new and higher prices of bullion.

An important feature of Mr. Feavearyear's account is his emphasis of the element of secrecy in Henry's procedure. Neither Brooke nor

1 The Pound Sterling, Oxford, 1932 (2nd edn.).
2 See also Num. Chron., 1923, pp. 265-6.
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in any way allude to this, yet it is obvious that secrecy was a prerequisite of the king’s schemes. That the truth was bound to be discovered mattered little to the king for the moment. In 1544 he was at war in both France and Scotland and must have money to pay his troops; indeed some of the first base coins were used to pay the soldiers in Scotland. Actually the truth was revealed almost immediately, for in July 1544, only two months after their issue, the merchants of the Low Countries had discovered the baseness of the new groats and were offering a lower price for them. Later, such discovery was even more certain, for the baser coins were often merely plated with silver, traces of which on many of them can still be seen. 

The debasement, it may be supposed, caused widespread distress in the country. Even if the volume of trade was less seriously affected individuals must have suffered considerably, and Latimer in 1548 was doubtless justified in lamenting that “the evilness of money hath made all things dearer”. Yet though it was an unaccustomed evil in England a debased currency had long been general, for instance, throughout France and was indeed an inheritance from more ancient times. “Reprobate silver shall men call them” (the wicked), says the prophet Jeremiah. Somewhat ironically, however, and in obedience to a familiar economic law, an even more notable rise in prices took place later in Elizabeth’s reign when silver of the old standard became, thanks to the influx of new metal from America, once more plentiful in the land. By 1572 the world’s production of silver was six times as great as it had been in 1496. But there seems reason to doubt if even all Elizabeth’s new silver was immediately able to cope with the problem of rising prices. A noticeable feature of the base coins of Henry VIII and Edward VI is their well-worn appearance. It is evident that for some time after Elizabeth’s accession the need for currency was so vital that the base groats remained in circulation, to pass for the official three-halfpence at which they were then rated or indeed for what they would fetch. And within limits, the less their value the greater their circulation.

But Henry’s base coins were destined, even after their disappearance, to have a profound and far-reaching effect on the currency. It was evidently now being realized that base money had a useful part to play. Both Edward VI and Mary tacitly recognized this when, even after the restoration of fine silver, they struck base pennies of their own. And as far back as the reign of Edward III the mint authorities had had a brief if transient glimpse of the practical utility of a base coinage when they struck the farthings of 10-oz. silver in 1335. For one very practical advantage of a base coin is that it is less likely to be clipped, and the evil of clipping can hardly be over-stressed. It was the pence and smaller coins which suffered through wear and tear and by clipping the heaviest percentage of reduction in weight.

3 Ruding, i. 314. 4 Jeremiah vi. 30.
and so in worth, and it is clear from the condition of the mass of surviving pence of all reigns from Edward III to Henry VIII that many thousands of pence can only have had the purchasing power of halfpence. But it was only when the accident of Henry’s greed forced the base coins into circulation in large quantities that immunity from clipping was properly appreciated. However valueless intrinsically, such coins could serve a useful purpose; the shortage of small change was at last being met. The lead tokens of Elizabeth, the copper farthings of James I and Charles I, the Commonwealth tokens, and finally the royal copper coinage itself were all perhaps hastened in their coming by the economic truth brought home by Henry’s base money.

In one other respect did the base groat and the 20-ct. gold contribute to the evolution of English currency. The one brought the fourpenny piece into disuse and so prepared the way for the sixpence and shilling which higher prices were calling for, and the new gold virtually ensured the replacement of the old coin of 6s. 8d. by the more convenient pieces of 10s. and 20s. It was thus a beginning in the beneficial process of identifying the currency with the moneys of account.

MINT RECORDS AND ACCOUNTS

The principal documentary evidence for the coinages of Henry and his son have been set forth in the papers of Henry Symonds. A synoptic summary of it (see folder) showing the several coinages of Henry VIII and the first three coinages of Edward VI was found among Brooke’s papers and is here presented, save for some additions and corrections, as it was compiled by Brooke himself. The figures for the various coinages have been taken from the mint accounts published by Miss Ethel Stokes together with sundry items from Mr. Symonds’s papers quoted above.

The accounts on the whole reflect fairly accurately the comparative frequency of the coins, although there must inevitably be some doubt whether they are complete. In some cases the accounts are entirely missing. The two outstanding examples in the chart concern the Southwark mint and that department at the Tower in charge of Stephen Vaughan, appointed a joint Under-Treasurer in 1544. Research into the affairs of the Southwark mint has been unproductive and the identification of coins struck there must be to some extent conjectural. But one thing is certain: the only series that can convincingly be attributed to Southwark is that which includes the privy marks S, G, and E. Moreover, these are the only coins, other than assured Tower pieces, which are coextensive with the “life” of the Southwark mint, 1545–50. H. Symonds’s objection to this attribution, first made by Evans, that such coins read Civitas London and that Southwark was not within the City boundary may be set aside since, although some of the larger silver coins read Posvi, &c., all the relevant

3 Ibid., 1886, p. 134.  
2 Num. Chron., 1929, p. 27.
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pence and halfpence read Civitas London and some of these must have been struck at Southwark. Brooke's attribution of Martlet coins to the Southwark mint is, since it covers only a short period, quite inadequate and probably wrong. If coins marked S, G, or E were not struck at Southwark, then it seems certain that there are no recognizable Southwark coins. This could only have happened if by some more than usually irregular procedure Southwark had been treated not as an ordinary mint but as a branch of the Tower and received as occasion arose dies bearing several different marks, so that there would be no exclusive Southwark mint mark. This is hardly likely.

The work at the mint of Stephen Vaughan must also be a matter for speculation, but of fairly legitimate speculation. From the evidence of the other activities of Vaughan's career it seems possible that he was appointed at the mint in a supernumerary capacity and that his post was virtually a sinecure. Such an appointment was not unparalleled. Henry Symonds has suggested that Henry VIII was not above appointing among his officials one who should be a sort of watchdog on his colleagues—albeit that the watchdog apparently "sometimes slept".\(^1\) No student of the reign of Henry VIII will be surprised at such a suggestion. Throughout Henry's life few men enjoyed his full confidence. His spies ranged over every field of official life. Stephen Vaughan had in fact been one of them and had been in close association with the king since the death of Wolsey. He was a London Merchant Adventurer who had a useful knowledge of continental affairs. He became head of the English House at Antwerp\(^2\) and had been employed by Henry to explore the possibility of an alliance with the Elector of Saxony. He was also employed in the early 1530's to trace the whereabouts of the "heretic" Tyndale, busy abroad with his translation of the New Testament which was being smuggled into England.\(^3\) In 1536 we hear of his being occupied in spying on the behaviour of the divorced Katherine of Aragon.\(^4\) She died, it will be recalled, in that year under circumstances which suggest that she was poisoned; her body was, by Cromwell's orders, hastily sealed.

In view of these activities it seems not impossible that Vaughan's appointment at the mint was not a normal one. The absence of the accounts may now suggest more strongly that it was a sinecure, that from 1544 to his death in 1549 his connexion with the mint was purely nominal, and that he took no active part in the production of coins.

There is, moreover, evidence that the state of affairs just indicated was by no means a novel feature in the personal policy of Henry VIII. It does not need much imagination to suppose, and indeed it can be proved, that the young King in 1509 was not thought to be seriously interested in government either by the astute and experienced courtier or by the more professed politician such as Wolsey himself. Henry's immediate entourage would consist entirely of agreeable flatterers, and even the comparatively minor department of government which

---

\(^1\) Brit. Num. Journ. xi. 141.
\(^2\) D.N.B.
\(^3\) Maynard Smith, op. cit., p. 309.
\(^4\) D.N.B.
## TOWER MINT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Martin Bones</th>
<th>S. Vaughan</th>
<th>Thomas Knight</th>
<th>SOUTHWARK</th>
<th>CANTERBURY</th>
<th>YORK</th>
<th>BRISTOL</th>
<th>DURHAM HOUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. 28 May 1544</td>
<td>Gold of 23 ct. (angel 8s., 80 gr.)</td>
<td>Sov., ½-sov., angel, ½-angel</td>
<td>5,761 lb.</td>
<td>Party to indenture, but no accounts</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver of 9 oz. (penny of 10 gr.)</td>
<td>Testoon to ½d.</td>
<td>68,203 lb.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 27 March 1545</td>
<td>Gold of 22 ct. (sov. 20s., 192 gr.)</td>
<td>Sov., ½-sov., crown, ½-crown</td>
<td>6,869 lb.</td>
<td>Party to indenture, but no accounts</td>
<td>2,310 lb.</td>
<td>No gold</td>
<td>No gold</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver of 6 oz. (penny of 10 gr.)</td>
<td>Testoon to ½d.</td>
<td>73,398 lb.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>27,572 lb.</td>
<td>Silver coinage, but no accounts</td>
<td>21,300 lb. (June to Oct. groat only)</td>
<td>20,200 lb. (June to Oct. groat only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. 1 April 1546</td>
<td>Gold of 20 ct.</td>
<td>Denominations not stated</td>
<td>3,586 lb.</td>
<td>Party to indenture, but no accounts</td>
<td>1,249 lb.</td>
<td>Gold doubtful</td>
<td>No gold</td>
<td>No gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver of 4 oz.</td>
<td>50,100 lb.</td>
<td>30,731 lb.</td>
<td>Silver coined, but no accounts</td>
<td>17,944 lb.</td>
<td>28,736 lb.</td>
<td>16,833 lb.</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD VI (acceded 28 Jan. 1547)</td>
<td>I. 5 April 1547</td>
<td>Gold of 20 ct. (sov. 20s., 192 gr.)</td>
<td>7,984 lb.</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>625 lb.</td>
<td>Indenture for gold and silver (no accounts)</td>
<td>No gold</td>
<td>No gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver of 4 oz. (penny of 10 gr.)</td>
<td>Testoon to ½d.</td>
<td>53,859 lb.</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>8,086 lb.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>5,688 lb.</td>
<td>10,440 lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(as preceding)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>(denominations not known)</td>
<td>6,838 lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 16 Feb. 1548</td>
<td>Gold and silver (no testoon or ½d.)</td>
<td>39,037 lb.</td>
<td>37,576 lb.</td>
<td>22 ct. gold perhaps coined</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>Closed (2 Dec. 1548)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 24 Jan. 1549</td>
<td>Great to penny</td>
<td>15,560 lb.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>Closed (Oct. 1549; moneyers employed at London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. to Mar. 1549:</td>
<td>Silver of 4 oz.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1549:</td>
<td>Shilling (60 gr.), 6d.</td>
<td>1,949 lb.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver of 8 oz.</td>
<td>Shilling (60 gr.)</td>
<td>63,459 lb.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 1549 to Oct. 1550:</td>
<td>Shilling (80 gr.)</td>
<td>27,360 lb.</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Partly conversion of testoons.
2 Conversion of testoons.
3 B.N.J. xi. p. 139; omitted by Brooke.
interests numismatists affords proof of the manner in which official appointments were apt to be made. For instance we know that the post of die-engraver at the mint was repeatedly filled not by persons with any artistic qualifications but by Henry’s friends, mere courtiers and careerists. True, on Henry’s accession in April 1509 the post of engraver was still held by the distinguished Alexander of Bruchsal. But in the following September Alexander was relieved of his office and paid off.¹ He was replaced by one John Sharp, later knighted by Henry. Nothing is known to the discredit of Sharp, but he was presumably a friend of Henry’s placed by him in a lucrative sinecure.² Sharp died in 1519 and was succeeded by Henry Norris, who was also subsequently knighted. Norris retained his post until 1536, when he was executed for his alleged complicity in the infidelities of which Anne Boleyn was accused. Norris was a courtier who clearly owed his appointment entirely to Henry’s friendship and it was not the only one he held.³ After his death the post of engraver was given by Henry to yet another courtier, Thomas Wriothesley, who held it until 1543, when he shortly received yet further advancement, becoming Lord Chancellor in 1544. The character of Wriothesley in so far as it is revealed by his activities at the mint could have had little to recommend it.⁴ As the king grew older his scruples became even fewer. One of his last and most notorious appointments at the mint was, in 1546, that of Sharington at Bristol, whose malpractices eventually brought him within reach of the law.

**MEMORANDA AND BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Notable dates in the life of Henry VIII are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born</td>
<td>28 June 1491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceded</td>
<td>22 April 1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>28 January 1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Katherine of Aragon</td>
<td>11 June 1509; her trial begun 1529; marriage declared null and void 23 May 1533. She died 8 January 1536; her sole surviving child Mary (later Queen Mary) born 18 February 1516.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anne Boleyn</td>
<td>25 January 1533; marriage declared valid 28 May 1533, and invalid 17 May 1536 (the antedating of the marriage by some authorities to 14 November 1532 was probably due to a desire to shield Anne’s character). Anne was executed 19 May 1536, leaving a daughter, the future Queen Elizabeth, born 7 September 1533.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jane Seymour</td>
<td>30 May 1536. She died 24 October 1537, leaving a son Edward (VI) born 12 October 1537.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anne of Cleves</td>
<td>6 January 1540; marriage declared null and void 9 July 1540; no issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Katherine Howard</td>
<td>8 July 1540; she was executed 13 February 1542; no issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Katherine Parr</td>
<td>12 July 1543, who survived Henry; no issue by him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Coinages of Henry VIII and Edward VI
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Details of Henry's first three coinages are as follows; the later coinages are shown on the chart:

Henry VIII, acceded 22 April 1509.

I. 6 Aug. 1509. Tower Mint only.
   Gold of 23 ct. 3½ gr. Sovereign (20s., 240 gr.), Ryal (10s.), Half-ryal, Quarter-ryal, Angel (6s. 6d.), Angelet.
   Silver of 11 oz. 2 dwt. Groat (48 gr.) to Farthing.
   Approximate amounts coined: gold, 23,500 lb.; silver, 44,400 lb.; a gap in both accounts, 1523–6.

22 Aug. 1526. Tower Mint only.

II. 30 Oct. 1526. Tower Mint only.
   Gold of 23 ct. 3½ gr. Sovereign (22s. 6d., 240 gr.), Ryal (11s. 6d.), Half-ryal, Quarter-ryal, Angel (7s. 6d.), Half-angel, George Noble (6s. 8d., 71 0 gr.), Half-George Noble.
   Approximate amounts coined: gold, 12,600 lb. (fine and crown gold not distinguished); silver, 206,600 lb.; a gap in both accounts, 1530–6.

III. May 1542. Tower Mint only (not issued save gold of 22 ct. (and (?) 23 ct. 3½ gr.) and silver of 11 oz. 2 dwt., 1542–4).
   Gold of 23 ct. 3½ gr. Denominations unknown.
   ¹ Not in indenture, presumably struck under a special commission.
Gold of 23 ct. Sovereign (20s., 200 gr.), Half-sovereign, Angel (8s., 80 gr.),
Half-angel, Quarter-angel.
Silver of 11 oz. 2 dwt. Groat (42½ gr.), Half-groat.
Silver of 10 oz. Testoon (120 gr.), Groat (40 gr.) to Farthing.

Approximate amounts coined: gold of 23 ct. 3½ gr., 31 lb.; gold of 23 ct.,
541 lb.; gold of 22 ct., 181 lb.; silver of 11 oz. 2 dwt., 2,408 lb.; silver of 10 oz.,
22,053 lb. plus 72,741 oz. of church plate.

PART 2. THE LONDON GOLD OF HENRY VIII

(a) THE SOVEREIGNS OF THE FIRST AND SECOND COINAGES

It is unusual perhaps to include two consecutive coinages in one discussion. As my paper proceeds, however, I think it will be evident that the continuity of this series is an element of some importance. In itself the First Coinage of sovereigns was small and unremarkable. It began comparatively late, rather as an afterthought, towards the end of the Portcullis period and was soon discontinued. Then after an interval of several years the dies were brought into use once more, to reappear as the Second Coinage. In their new guise they enjoyed a much more considerable vogue, in circumstances which, as it happens, not only help to indicate the sequence of mint marks for this Second Coinage but also throw light on a subject of general numismatic interest, namely, the work and practices of the medieval die-cutter. It will appear that quite unprecedented alterations were made on some of the dies, perhaps because they were the first very large dies from which an extensive coinage was made or contemplated; probably their costliness caused them to be singled out for special attention.

Another reason for considering the First and Second Coinage sovereigns together is that they form a collective and detached whole; they have no fractions or other connexions, and the letter-punches were not used for any contemporary denomination. The falseness of the royal or half-sovereign illustrated (Pl. I, 2) becomes more apparent in this light; if it were genuine one might have looked for the same letters as on the sovereigns or at least as on some other denomination.

The design on both obverse and reverse of the sovereigns is a continuation of that of the last sovereign of Henry VII, with obverse i.m. Lis, reverse Pheon or Crosslet, and certain puncheons for these dies were used also by Henry VIII throughout this series. Thus the king’s face has the same formal appearance and is recognizable on all dies by a defect in the left eye. Presumably these puncheons had been designed by Alexander of Bruchsal, but of subsequent work we know nothing but the names of the officials through whose agency the dies were cut. These men were not craftsmen.

On Henry VIII’s own coinage the artist, whoever he was, introduced a new lettering and a new design for the reverse. Instead of the single tressure of Henry VII he now made a double one, decorated

with alternate lions and lis and saltires in the spandrels. Later, however, on an Arrow reverse he reverted to the single tressure of Henry VII; in fact it has been claimed that the i.m. Arrow is in one case struck over a Pheon on a die of Henry VII, and though there is a slight excrescence from the Arrow on this die (Pl. II, R7) which might lend colour to this view, I do not think it is correct. The lettering on Henry VII's Pheon die is the same as that on the Crosslet die (Pl. I, 1), and quite different from that on either of Henry VIII's Arrow dies (Pl. II, R7, R8).

It will be seen that the Lis/Crosslet (or Lis/Pheon) sovereign of Henry VII introduced a minor change in the design of the king's crown. The decoration along the base of the crown is now an ornamental leaf flanked by two points, contrasting with the former cross patty and two fleurs-de-lis. On Henry VIII's sovereigns this decoration becomes three more elaborate leaves, although in his Third Coinage the design alters materially. The form of the crown in fact on both gold and silver shows much, and sometimes significant, variety throughout the period under review.

I have based my conclusions on these early sovereigns on an examination of seventeen coins, taken from the collections in the British Museum, the Fitzwilliam Museum, and that of Mr. R. C. Lockett, and one coin illustrated in the Heath sale catalogue, lot 12. I think I have taken into consideration every die that has been published. All are here illustrated; the obverses on Plate I, the reverses on Plate II.

The coins were struck from two obverse dies, but one of them is used in four different stages of alteration, making virtually five dies in all. On Plate I I have numbered these as follows:

1st Coinage
O1a (i.m. Portcullis).
2nd Coinage
O1b (i.m. Sunburst over Portcullis).
   ..
   .. O2 (i.m. Lis; a new die used while O1c was being repaired).
   .. O1c (i.m. Lis over Sunburst (i)).
   .. Also O1c which is perhaps O1d altered by tooling.
   .. O1d (i.m. Lis over Sunburst (ii), i.e. O1c after being repaired).

The reverse dies are eight in number, but as one shows three stages of alteration there are in reality ten different dies in all, numbered on Plate II:

1st Coinage
R1 (i.m. Portcullis).
   .. R2 (i.m. Portcullis, another die).
   .. R3a (i.m. Portcullis, a third die).
2nd Coinage
R3b (i.m. Sunburst over Portcullis on die R3a).
   .. R3c (i.m. Lis over Sunburst on R3b).
   .. R4 (i.m. Lis, new die A).
   .. R5 (i.m. Lis, a second new die B).
   .. R6 (i.m. Lis, a third new die C).
   .. R7 (i.m. Arrow A).
   .. R8 (i.m. Arrow, another die B).

I append a brief description of these seventeen coins below; there are three pairs of duplicates (5 and 6, 10 and 11, 15 and 16) and one set of triplicates (12, 13, 14):
The following coins are all illustrated in well-known works of reference; all are believed to be different coins:

Portcullis both sides; \( \text{Oi} \times \text{R1} \); Bliss 253.

Lis over Sunburst (i), rev. New Lis die (B); \( \text{Oi} \times \text{R5} \); Cassal 237, now B.M.

Lis over Sunburst (ii), rev. Arrow (B, single tressure); \( \text{Oi} \times \text{R7} \); Heath 12.

The known combinations of dies therefore are as follows:

Possible but unknown combinations of dies are:

The unusual feature of the series is the alteration which some dies underwent. The coins show that not only was the same die used during successive periods with the initial mark changed, but that at least in one instance work undertaken presumably to repair worn portions of the die ended in extensive changes in the detail of the design.

Some of the alterations are already familiar. Brooke has shown that
one obverse die reveals three distinct initial marks, the Portcullis (Oia), the Sunburst struck over the Portcullis (Orb), and the Lis struck over the Sunburst (Oic and Oid). He did not, however, add that the same treatment was applied to one reverse die, which shows the same three initial marks in turn, Portcullis (R3a), Sunburst (R3b), and Lis over Sunburst (R3c). Each successive change of initial mark involved some minor alteration on both obverse and reverse, usually in portions of the die, chiefly letters, adjacent to the initial mark. But it will be noticed that the obverse Lis over Sunburst shows two stages, Oic and Oid; the repairs which effected this transformation were much more considerable.

The more notable features of the five successive stages of the obverse dies all shown on Plate I follows:

Oia; i.m. Portcullis; the original die, showing all e’s broken. A reverse, but not an obverse die, is known with the e’s unbroken.

Orb; i.m. Sunburst over Portcullis (traces of which are visible); the broken e’s have been repaired, save in the word Rex; a portion of the inner circle has been redrawn, partly obliterating the top-most of the vertical row of saltires forming the right-hand border of the back of the throne. Only one coin is known from this die.

Oic; i.m. Lis over Sunburst (i). The H of Henricus has been restruck from a new puncheon. This is the only additional alteration; the die was little used in this stage and was evidently soon put aside for repair, for coins with this obverse are very rare.

O2; i.m. Lis, the new Lis die, i.e. not struck over Sunburst, and used probably while Oic was being repaired. The design of the king’s crown is new, the base being now adorned with three more elaborate leaves and the arch above decorated with small crosses instead of the plain bosses on the old die. The left-hand chain of the portcullis at the king’s feet is differently arranged and the ornamental border shows fleurs, contrasted with the previous pellets, below each chain; below the portcullis are three saltires; the legend shows the error Frane for Franc.

Oid; i.m. Lis over Sunburst (ii). This is the old die Oic transformed. No change has been made in the initial mark, but elsewhere the die has undergone such extensive repairs as virtually to constitute a new die. The repairs may be summarized under the following four headings: 1. Legend; 2. The fretted back of the throne; 3. Ornamental border of the inner circle; 4. The king’s face and crown.

1. Legend. This has been almost entirely, if not entirely, removed and replaced from chiefly new puncheons. The letters have in general been replaced with a quite remarkable precision. In some cases the saltire stops have been left in situ, in others they have been put back in slightly different positions. These changes are revealed from the composite evidence of all the coins available; naturally no coin shows every letter or stop perfectly struck.
Edward VI in Henry’s Name

In general the new letter-punches closely resemble the old, but certain key letters, for instance C, T, and I, show unmistakable changes, and there is a new e in Rex previously left unrepaired. In the saltire stops changes were made before or after Dei Gracia, Anglie, and Et, but otherwise they seem to have been left unaltered.

2. Back of the throne. The fretted detail has been entirely reconstructed and a new design of the pellet and lozenge pattern superimposed on the old. This part of the work is not so successful, and the right-hand border of the back of the throne is not quite straight.

3. Ornamental border. The fleurs have been recut or elaborated here and there. The general design has now been extended also to the space between the chains of the portcullis at the king’s feet and the inner circle.

4. The king’s face and crown. Some hair has been removed to emphasize the outline of the king’s face. The design of the crown is quite new and incorporates the new features already noted in O2, showing a more pronounced picotee edging to the leaves at its base, and on the arch small crosses instead of the plain bosses of Oic. The cross and orb surmounting the crown have been reimpreso, but the work has been bungled on the die and all coins struck from it, save one, show this cross with a double-struck appearance. The exception is a coin at the British Museum which shows the faulty cross at the apex of the arch entirely redesigned in the form of a tiny square. As this specimen appears to be unique I think this may have been done by tooling on the coin itself. If not, it constitutes a new stage of the die O1e (Pl. I) which is otherwise identical with O1d.

The ten reverse dies, all shown on Plate II, are as follows:

R1 and R2; i.m. Portcullis, both reading Tranciens. The earlier is presumably R1 since it shows the e unbroken; on R2 all e’s are broken as on the corresponding obverse. Neither R1 or R2 was used again later.

R3a; i.m. Portcullis, reading Transiens. This die, which in this stage is absent from the British Museum collection, was to be used again by overstriking with first Sunburst and later Lis.

R3b; i.m. Sunburst over Portcullis (traces of which are visible). No repairs have been made, even to the broken e’s. Only one striking is known.

R3c; i.m. Lis over Sunburst. The letters adjacent to the initial mark, the t of Ibat, and the Ih of Ihesus have been restruck from new punches. Coins from this die are very rare.

R4, R5, R6; i.m. Lis. All three are new Lis dies, i.e. not overstruck. They differ in minor respects. The general design is unaltered, but R4 (New Lis A) is perhaps the earliest since the saltires in the spandrels are of normal size; on R5 (New Lis B) they are very much smaller and on R6 (New Lis C) they appear to have been erased from the die. In fact it may be that R6 is an altered form of R5, which is moreover known from one coin only, almost the
only noticeable difference being in the position of the small lions and lis in the tressures. The die R4 differs conspicuously from R5 and R6 in having two saltires after *Ibat*.

R7; i.m. Arrow (A); this die has a double tressure with lions and lis, but no saltires in the spandrels.

R8; i.m. Arrow (B); this die has a single tressure and no lions nor lis, and again no saltires, in the spandrels. The stops about the Arrow are a conspicuous feature.

Reviewing these dies an obvious comment is that during the Second Coinage no sovereign was apparently struck until the period of the Sunburst, for which the old Portcullis dies were brought into use once more. But two marks, the Rose and the Lis, it is generally agreed, were in force before the Sunburst, and though it is easy to believe that no Rose-marked sovereigns were struck, since none are known, some doubt must at first sight appear in the case of the Lis, since Lis-marked sovereigns, not struck over Sunburst, exist. In enumerating the obverse dies above I have placed these new Lis coins (O2) between the two stages (OiC and O1d) of the old Lis coins. This is because existing combinations of obverse and reverse dies render this order highly probable, and the letter-punches confirm it. The alternative possibility is that the new Lis dies, and even the Arrow dies, were used before the old Portcullis die was re-employed. For economic reasons this is very unlikely, and in the case of the Arrow coins it can be shown to be almost impossible. Moreover, if they or the new Lis dies had been used before the Portcullis dies, one or other of them would probably be found to-day muled with the Portcullis, but they are not. More particular evidence is as follows:

1. The obverse die Lis over Sunburst, stage i (OiC), is found combined with two reverse dies: first, its fellow reverse Lis over Sunburst, a very rarely used die and presumably soon scrapped; secondly, with one of the new Lis reverse dies. Thus it is clear that the new Lis dies were in operation before OiC was transformed into O1d, i.e. into stage ii of obverse Lis over Sunburst. We have already seen that the detail in the new Lis obverse die (O2) was probably the source of inspiration for some of the changes made in the course of this transformation.

2. The obverse die Lis over Sunburst, stage i (OiC), is never found combined with reverse i.m. Arrow. This is almost certainly because, by the time Arrow came into use, OiC had disappeared, transformed into O1d.

Two more facts emerge, viz. that the new Lis obverse die (O2) did not prove so serviceable as the rejuvenated Lis over Sunburst die (O1d), for coins with the latter mark are much commoner than with the former; and also that the repairs on the rejuvenated die were so effective that, throughout the Arrow period, no Arrow obverse dies were apparently thought necessary for none are known, most of the not uncommon Lis/Arrow coins being struck from this reconstructed die.
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Prima facie, therefore, the possibility that any Lis or Arrow dies were made before the Sunburst period is remote, and in point of fact a complete catena of letter-punches exists which confirms that the order of the dies was as follows:

**Obverse:** Sunburst (Oi\textsuperscript{b})
- Lis over Sunburst (i) (Oi\textsuperscript{c})
- New Lis (O2)
- Lis over Sunburst (ii) (Oi\textsuperscript{a})

**Reverse:** Sunburst (R3\textsuperscript{b})
- Lis over Sunburst (R3\textsuperscript{c})
- New Lis (R4, R5, R6)
- Arrow (R7, R8)

Thus though Brooke lists the order of these sovereigns correctly, viz. Sunburst; Lis; *obv.* Lis, *rev.* Arrow, he is inconsistent elsewhere (*English Coins*, p. 176) in placing Arrow before Sunburst. This question will receive further consideration when the silver is discussed.

The letter-punches in question show different forms of A, E, and V forming links as follows:

1. Between the old Lis dies in their altered form (Ai, Ei, and Vi) and the new Lis dies (Ai, Ei, Vi, and V2).
2. Between the new Lis dies (Ai, Ei, V2) and the Arrow dies (Ai and A2, Ei and E2, V2 and V3).
3. Most conclusively, between the latest Arrow die and the earliest die (i.m. Lis) of the next coinage of 1544 (A2, E2, V3 on both).

I have made below drawings of these letters. The chief difference between the A's lies in the lower serifs. Both show one half of the top serif absent, a space-saving device to enable the letter following to be placed closer to it. The dotted line in A2 shows the completed A found on the obverse of the first sovereign of the Third Coinage (Pl. III, A and a) where the graver experimented by adding a serif to the original puncheon; on the reverse, however, he reverted to the original form of the letter. E2 is a broken letter. V2 is conspicuous by the nick at the base; V3 has different serifs from Vi and V2 and is slightly smaller.

The Arrow is the last mark found on a fine sovereign of Henry VIII. Indeed a surviving pyx trial record\footnote{Brit. Num. Journ. x. 147.} shows that between March 1533 and October 1534 no fine gold was coined at all. Nor does fine gold appear in any later trial. This may perhaps imply that the coinage of fine gold and therefore of Second Coinage sovereigns had ceased before March 1533, when, moreover, the Arrow period was not very old. Yet the mint accounts show that a very small amount of fine gold, less than 60 lb. in all, was coined in 1536–7 (still the Arrow period, as witness the crowns with Jane Seymour's initial which have i.m. Arrow) and in 1540–1 (perhaps the Pheon period). This gold was presumably struck into either sovereigns or angels, though no angel is known with Arrow, and neither denomination with Pheon of this time.
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There was one other piece of fine gold which in the indenture is closely linked with the sovereign, namely, the ryal. The sole existing specimen, accepted and illustrated by Grueber (Handbook, 394), was rightly, I think, condemned by Brooke. I illustrate it again (Pl. I, 2) for general convenience, and because of its persistent occurrence in the indentures. The piece shown may have been copied from a genuine coin. Though plausible in its ensemble and weight, its detail is unconvincing. It shows, for instance, the king wearing the now obsolete open crown, and both the lettering and the form of the i.m. Portcullis differ materially from those seen on any other piece of Henry VIII. Yet there is some evidence that ryals were actually struck. At the Record Office exists an undated fragment of a pyx trial which mentions together ryals and George nobles. From this we may conjecture that a ryal may turn up, but of the Second Coinage, and that as a contemporary of the George noble it might bear the i.m. Rose.

The indenture of the First Coinage mentions half-ryals and quarter-ryals also, but none are known to exist. Both they and the ryals were repeated in the indenture of 1526, but a pyx trial record of 1527 includes no ryals. This indenture also mentions a "demi-sovereign" of the same value (11s. 3d.) as the "royall". The coin is unknown. In the indenture of 1533 the half- and quarter-ryals were omitted, and though the ryal is still mentioned, the mint accounts render it unlikely that any were struck.

London Sovereigns, Base Coinage 1544-7

I have followed Brooke in placing the commencing date of this coinage in 1544, but strictly speaking, as I have already explained, the Base Coinage began to be struck in 1542, and in particular the sovereigns and half-sovereigns of 23 ct. were perhaps struck from an amount of gold known to have been coined between July 1542 and March 1543 but not issued until the winter of 1543-4.

Brooke's description of the sovereigns is not quite accurate. He divides them (English Coins, pp. 185-6) into: I. Coins of 200 gr. and 23 ct. (Fourth Coinage), large module; II. Coins of 192 gr. and 22 ct. (Fifth Coinage) or 20 ct. (Sixth Coinage), small module. He overlooks the fact that some sovereigns of small module, with i.m. Lis, also weigh 200 gr. and are presumably also of 23 ct. He also disregards the possibility of Southwark coins. I therefore propose to recast his classification as follows:

Tower I. Coins of large module: 200 gr., 23 ct.; straight-sided throne; i.m. Lis (large).

II (a). Coins of small module; wt. 200 gr., 23 ct.; curved-sided throne; i.m. Lis (Small).

II (b). Coins of small module; wt. 192 gr., 22 or 20 ct.; curved-sided throne; i.m.s Lis, Annulet-with-pellet (rev. Lis).

Southwark II (b). Similar to Tower coins; i.m.s S; obv. S, rev. G (G below shield); obv. G, rev. S.

2 Ibid., 134-5.
3 Ibid., p. 140.
4 Ibid., p. 143.
5 Ibid., p. 146.
The last coin was unknown to Brooke. The Southwark gold was perhaps all of 20 ct., for none was authorized under the indenture of 1545. Tower coins of II (a) and II (b) with i.m. Lis can only be distinguished by their weight.

Brooke cited also other sovereigns with i.m. Lis. The Lis on these coins is peculiar in having two stamens projecting from the central petal of the lily, and has been called "Lis with feelers". These coins (there are two in the British Museum) have Roman letters and rosette stops, and I propose to transfer them to where Brooke himself placed the similarly marked Bristol sovereigns, namely, in the First Coinage of Edward VI. They will be described later (Pl. VI, 1–3).

The following is a list of fourteen London sovereigns of types I and II, all from the British Museum save nos. 2, 8, and 14. No. 2 is in the collection of Dr. E. C. Carter, no. 8 is in the Ashmolean Museum, both showing reverse dies absent from the National Collection, while no. 14, a recent discovery with obverse i.m. ι, reverse S (also two new dies), formed lot 77 in the Shand sale (Glendining, March 1949), where it was misdescribed in the catalogue. The obverse dies are described by capital letters A, B, C, D, E, and F, and the reverse dies by small letters a, aa, b, c, d, e, ee, f, ff, and g. All the dies in the British Museum are illustrated on Plate III; reverse ee and obverse F are shown below; reverses aa and ff are not illustrated.

1. Large module (I); wt. 196.4 gr.; i.m. Lis; saltire stops; Tranciens, Illorv' (Pl. III, A×a).
2. Large module (I); wt. unknown; same obverse die as no. 1, reverse similar but reads Illorum (A×aa; E. C. Carter).
3. Small module (II (a)); wt. 199 gr.; i.m. Lis; trefoil stops; Trnsiens [sc] (Pl. III, B×b).
4. Small module (II (b)); wt. 188.4 gr.; i.m. Lis; trefoil stop; same obverse die as no. 3 (Pl. III, B×c).
5. Small module (II (b)); wt. 189.2 gr.; i.m. Lis; stops, obv. sleeves, rev. trefoils; same reverse die as no. 4 (Pl. III, C×c).
6. Small module (II (b)); wt. 188.9 gr.; i.m. Lis; stops, obv. sleeves, rev. trefoils; same obverse die as no. 5; Tranciens (Pl. III, C×d).
7. Small module (II (b)); wt. 190.6 gr.; i.m. Lis; stops, sleeves both sides; same obverse die as nos. 5 and 6 (Pl. III, C×e).
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8. Small module (II (b)); wt. 189-8 gr.; i.m. Lis; stops, sleeves both sides; same obverse die as nos. 5, 6, and 7; reverse has two stops after Ibat (C\times\text{ee}; Ashmolean Museum).

9. Small module (II (b)); wt. 189-8 gr.; i.m. obv. Annulet-with-pellet, rev. Lis; stops, trefoils both sides; Tranciens; same reverse die as no. 6 (Pl. III, D\times d).

10, 11, and 12. Small module (II (b)); three coins from the same two dies; wts. 189-8, 193-7, and 190-5 gr.; i.m. S; trefoil stops (Pl. III, E\times f).

13. Small module (II (b)); wt. 187 gr.; i.m. obv. S, rev. G (G below shield); stops, obv. trefoils, rev. sleeves; same obverse die as nos. 10, 11, and 12 (Pl. III, E\times g).

14. Small module (II (b)); wt. 188-5 gr.; i.m. obv. G, rev. S; stops, obv. sleeves, rev. trefoils; two new dies (F\times ff, Shand 77).

The dies are, in detail, as follows, the lettering being normally Lombardic:

\textbf{Obv.} 
A: i.m. Lis, saltire stops (\textit{Anglie}).
B: i.m. Lis, similar letters to the A, but trefoil stops (\textit{Angl}).
C: i.m. Lis, new Lombardic letters (Roman R), sleeve stops.
D: i.m. Annulet-with-pellet, similar letters to die B but Roman E and R, trefoil stops (\textit{Agl}).
E: i.m. S, similar letters and stops to die D (Agl).
F: i.m. G, similar letters to die C (Agl).

\textbf{Rev.} 
a: i.m. Lis, Lombardic letters (Roman M), saltire stops.
aa: i.m. Lis; as die a but \textit{Ilorvm}.
b: i.m. Lis, similar letters to die a but trefoil stops (\textit{Trnsiens}).
c: i.m. Lis, similar to die b in all respects but reads \textit{Transiens} (the trefoil stops have stems and resemble saltires).
d: i.m. Lis, Roman M, E, and R, trefoil stops (\textit{Tranciens}); similar letters, &c., to obverse D.
e: i.m. Lis, new Lombardic letters (Roman R); sleeve stops, similar letters, &c., to obverse C.
ee: i.m. Lis, similar to die e but reads \textit{Ilorv} and has two stops after Ibat.
f: i.m. S, Roman M, E, and R, trefoil stops (\textit{Transiens}, no stop after \textit{Per}); similar letters, &c., to obverses E or D.
ff: i.m. S, similar to f but with trefoil stops after the i.m. and \textit{Per}.
g: i.m. G, new Lombardic lettering (Roman R), sleeve stops (\textit{Transiens}); similar letters, &c., to reverses e and ee or obverse C.

\textit{I.m.s. Lis and Annulet-with-pellet.} Reviewing these coins, no. 1, of large module (i.m. Large Lis), is a well-known rarity and the few specimens extant were apparently struck from one obverse and two reverse dies. Others known to me are in the Ashmolean and Fitzwilliam Museums and four more are in private collections. The dies show the workmanship of the earlier sovereigns and were perhaps cut by the same artist now attempting a portrait. The unflattering result (Pl. III, a) may account for the coin's rarity and the artist was presumably superseded by the designer of the small module. I have alluded elsewhere to the different A's on obverse and reverse. The reverse shows the original puncheon used previously on the last Arrow die of the Second Coinage; the obverse shows a new serif added at the right-hand side of the apex. This patchwork experiment was not repeated.

The new portrait on the coins of small module was certainly more successful (it was even better on the half-sovereigns), but the standard of workmanship gradually deteriorated and the low relief of the detail makes a poor coin seem even worse in illustration. As the letter-
punches became worn they were replaced by less artistic ones, often clumsily inserted on the die. Thus a very crude Roman M replaces its predecessor and a Roman E or R intrudes on the original Lombardic fount (PI. III, D and d). With the change from trefoil to sleeve stops during the run of i.m. Lis a new and rather rough Lombardic fount (save for Roman R) was devised (PI. III, C and e). This fount alone seems to have been used with sleeve stops, for the two appear together also on the reverse of the sovereigns with i.m. ə (PI. III, g) and on other coins. Another peculiarity is that the abbreviation mark after the king's name changes with these stops from the query-shaped object to a comma (PI. III, C).

As regards nos. 3 and 4 in my list of sovereigns, struck from the same obverse die (PI. III, B), both are equally fine but differ by some 10 grains in weight (199 and 188.4 gr.). The reduction in weight, therefore, from 200 to 192 grains evidently took place during the period of their privy mark, Lis. Other specimens are recorded of the heavier weight, e.g. Bruun 552 (198½ gr.) and Montagu v. 235 (197½ gr.). The coin with obverse i.m. Annulet-with-pellet, reverse Lis (PI. III, D and d) is rare; some two or three other specimens are known, e.g. Bruun 553.

I.m. S. The coins with i.m. S are a little more abundant, but all the coins or illustrations I have seen show the same pair of dies, and all have trefoil stops (PI. III, E and f). The reverse dies show no letter below the shield, whereas the majority of the corresponding half-sovereigns with i.m. S have Lombardic ə below the shield. A sovereign reverse die, therefore, with i.m. S and ə in that position may yet turn up.

I.m. ə. The coin with the same obverse die (i.m. S) as those just mentioned and reverse i.m. ə may be unique (PI. III, E and g). It was presented to the British Museum through the National Art Collections Fund (ex H. Oppenheimer sale and Murdoch i. 412). The complementary mule with obverse ə, reverse S is also perhaps unique. Various speculative views, none quite convincing, have been advanced of the significance of the letters S and ə (e.g. Southwark, Edward Seymour, Egerton, Eglonby, &c.).

The deterioration in the later sovereigns and the simplicity of the series are in notable contrast with the careful and complex treatment accorded to the dies of the first two coinages. The early dies were cut in high relief with the meticulous care traditionally lavished on gold from 1344 onwards when dies were made to last. But the economy practised in 1544 was on different lines; the dies were cut in low relief and soon became flattened; they were not repaired and few coins show the detail of the design in clear relief. It is evident that quantity of output was of more importance than quality.

Judging by the lettering and stops it becomes apparent that i.m. Lis was struck in greater variety than any other mark. A possible inference is that this mark persisted throughout the coinage, and that at a certain stage it was accompanied or succeeded, in one department,
by i.m. Annulet-with-pellet and also, perhaps in another department, probably the Southwark mint, by i.m. S, which in turn was succeeded by i.m. Θ. As regards the Tower mint, we know that during this period it was reorganized and divided into at first two and later three departments. However, neither in silver nor gold does it seem easy to identify any departmental characteristics and it seems simpler to classify the Tower coins as one series.

The dies of the two mints show the following characteristics (Lombardic letters save Roman as shown):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tower</th>
<th>Southwark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fount 1</td>
<td>I.m. Lis, saltire stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fount 2</td>
<td>I.m. Lis, trefoil stops (Roman E, R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fount 3</td>
<td>I.m. Lis, sleeve stops (Roman R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The apparent interruption of i.m. Lis by Annulet-with-pellet is curious but does not perhaps imply that the use of Lis was suspended. The affinity between these two marks is noticeable in all denominations, and on the half-sovereigns, for instance, it is the Annulet-with-pellet, not the Lis, which persists throughout the coinage, while on the crowns and half-crowns the Annulet-with-pellet seems to replace the Lis, which does not occur.

The Bristol sovereigns, described later, show a similar portrait and type to the London coins of small module; one type has the lettering of fount 2 in the above table, but Lombardic Μ; the other, perhaps struck under Edward VI, shows all Roman letters. The earlier Bristol sovereign with the lettering of fount 2 throws an interesting and important light on the London and in particular the Southwark sovereigns from the same fount. Since the Bristol mint opened with the Sixth Coinage in 1546 when gold was reduced to 20 ct., it is likely that the Southwark gold is also of 20 ct. This accords with the terms of the indenture of 1545 (with gold of 22 ct.), which as I have said did not authorize gold to be struck at Southwark. Actually the first written authority for gold at Southwark dates from April 1547, but gold was clearly struck there in Henry’s lifetime, and, as Henry Symonds points out, the necessary authority may well have been included in the missing indenture of 1546 for Henry’s last coinage.

LISTS

FIRST COINAGE (1509−26). Wt. 240 gr.; 23 ct. 3½ gr.; value 20s.

Obv. King seated on a straight-sided Gothic throne with diapered back, a portcullis at his feet; a candlestick on each pillar; a tressure of alternate leaves and pellets.

1 Brooke, English Coins, p. 179.  
Edward VI in Henry's Name

Rev. Shield on a large Tudor rose, double treasure enclosing alternate lions and lis, saltires in the spandrels.

Obv. Henricus Dei Gracia Rex Anglie et Franc Dns Hib.

Rev. Ihesus Avtem Transiens (Transiens) Per Medium Illorvm Ibat.

Lombardic lettering save Roman M.

I.m. Portcullis (1 obverse, 3 reverse dies); saltire stops (Pl. I, O1a; Pl. II, R1, R2, and (Mr. R. C. Lockett) R3a).

SECOND COINAGE (1526–44)

Similar to First Coinage, but value 22s. (August 1526), later (October 1526) 22s. 6d.

1. I.m. Sunburst (over Portcullis both sides, Pl. I, O1b; Pl. II, R3b).

2. I.m. Lis (over Sunburst, stage (i), both sides (Pl. I, O1c; Pl. II, R3c) or rev. of new Lis die (Pl. I, R5)).

3. I.m. Lis (new dies, 1 obv. (Pl. I, O2), 2 rev. dies (Pl. I, R4, R6)). N.B. The combination of this obv. die O2 with rev. R5 (new Lis B) is not recorded.

4. I.m. Lis (over Sunburst, stage (ii), obv. only (Pl. I, O1d), rev. new Lis die (Pl. II, R4 or R6)).

5. I.m. obv. Lis (over Sunburst, stage (ii), rev. Arrow (2 dies, double or single treasure, Pl. I, R7, R8)).

6. I.m. obv. Lis (new die), rev. Arrow (R7, double treasure, e.g. Heath 12). N.B. The combination of this obv. die O2 with rev. i.m. Arrow (R8, single treasure) is not recorded.

BASE COINAGE (1544–7)

Sovereigns (all valued at 20s.); Lombardic letters except as shown.

Tower I. Large module; wt. 200 gr.; 23 ct.

Obv. Elderly, bearded, rather vacant portrait of the king on a straight-sided throne, a candlestick on each pillar, a rose at the king's feet.

Henric 8 Di Gra Anglie Francie Et Hiber(n) Rex.

Ihesvs Avtem Tranciens Per Medium Illorvm Ibat.

Rev. Crowned shield with supporters (lion and dragon), HR monogram below.

I.m. Lis (large); saltire stops; Roman M (Pl. III, Aa).

Tower II (a). Small module; wt. 200 gr.; 23 ct.

Obv. Elderly, bearded, more dignified portrait of the king on a curved-sided throne, a bird with wings outspread on each pillar, a rose at the King's feet.

Henric 8 Di Gra A(n)gl Francie Z Hiber(n) Rex.

Ihs Avtem Tranciens (Tranciens) Per Medium Illorvm(m) (Illor) Ibat.

Rev. Crowned shield with supporters (lion and dragon), HR monogram below.

I.m. Lis (small); trefoil stops; Roman M; one reverse die reads Tranciens (Pl. III, Bb).

Tower II (b). Small module; wt. 192 gr.; 22 or 20 ct.; similar to II (a).

1. I.m. Lis, from the same dies as class II (a); trefoil stops; also with Roman E, R, and M on reverse (Pl. III, Bb, Bd).

2. I.m. Lis; sleeve stops, new Lombardic letters (Roman R) on both sides; sometimes muled with reverse dies with trefoil stops and varied lettering (Pl. III, Ce).

3. Mule; i.m. obv. Annulet-with-pellet, rev. Lis; trefoil stops both sides, Roman E, R, and M (Pl. III, Dd).

Southwark. As Tower II (b). 20 ct.

1. I.m. S; trefoil stops both sides, Roman E, R, and M; on true coins one pair of dies only (Pl. III, Ef).

2. Mule; i.m. obv. S, rev. G, with G below shield; obv. trefoil stops (same die as true coins with i.m. S), rev. sleeve stops and new Lombardic lettering (Roman R), same fount as coins with i.m. Lis with sleeve stops (Pl. III, Eg).

3. Mule; i.m. obv. G, rev. S; stops, obv. sleeves, rev. trefoils, converse lettering to last (a new rev. die, Mr. H. Hird, ex Shand sale 77).
The following sale catalogues illustrate some of the above:

Group I. I.m. Lis, large module; Murdoch, i. 409; Roth, i. 245.
   „ II (a). I.m. Lis, small module (198 gr.); Bruun 552.
   „ II (b). I.m. obv. Annulet-with-pellet, rev. Lis; Bruun 553.
   I.m. S; Rashleigh 781; Huth 36; Hamilton Smith (1927) 4; Clarke-Thornhill 49; Heath 13; Fletcher 51.

(b) HENRY VIII, HALF-SOVEREIGNS; EDWARD VI, FIRST SOVEREIGN AND HALF-SOVEREIGNS

The coins here to be considered are:

The half-sovereigns struck in Henry’s reign with Henry’s name and portrait.

The half-sovereigns struck in Edward’s reign with Henry’s name but Edward’s portrait, and a sovereign with Henry’s name and portrait probably contemporary with these half-sovereigns.

These coins will involve some consideration also of two series of coins in Edward’s name which were contemporary with them.

The half-sovereigns, a new denomination, are abundant and usually of poor execution. If there was need for haste in striking the sover- reigns, much greater haste was used in coining the halves. Possibly the practical usefulness of the denomination became more apparent as the coinage progressed, and as the demand increased so the workmanship deteriorated. The coins remained current for many years side by side even with gold of better quality. Of the 218 gold coins in the Bisham Abbey hoard, buried probably soon after Elizabeth’s accession,¹ 134 were half-sovereigns in the name of Henry VIII (81 with the young portrait), as against 38 profile half-sovereigns, 28 of which were of Edward VI and 10 of Elizabeth.

Half-sovereigns struck in the reign of Henry VIII
(Pl. IV; Pl. V, 1–9)

Not all Henry’s half-sovereigns are contemptible. Like most new issues they began well. All coins show an admirable portrait and the earliest are often well struck. A noticeable feature of these early pieces is their neat Roman lettering, particularly H with its ornamental bar, a detail occasionally echoed on contemporary wood-carving. Equally remarkable are the very small saltire stops. But this high standard was not maintained; the small neat initial mark (©) becomes ill-shaped and larger, the stops become normal saltires or trefoils, and the neat letters are gradually replaced by coarser ones, now Roman, now Lombardic; on some coins the lettering is entirely Lombardic. Before the end of the reign it becomes Roman once more, and so remains on this series in Edward’s reign.

Brooke omits an important coin which necessarily modifies his classification and brings it, in fact, into line with the sovereigns. The coin has i.m. Lis and shows the same design as the sovereigns of small

Edward VI in Henry’s Name

module. It weighs 99\frac{1}{2} gr. and is doubtless the half of a sovereign of small module of 200 gr. It is presumably of 23 ct. and belongs to class II (a); it shows the small, neat Roman lettering. The coin here illustrated, which is extremely rare, came from the Montagu sale (ii. 710),\(^1\) and is now in the Fitzwilliam Museum (Pl. IV, 1).

The half-sovereigns of Henry’s lifetime, therefore, may be reclassified showing also the Southwark coins, on the same lines as the sovereigns, except that no half-sovereign is known of large module, i.e. of class I:

**Tower II (a).** Coins of small module; wt. 100 gr.; 23 ct.; curved-sided throne; i.m. Lis.

\[\ldots\]

**Southwark II (b) as Tower II (b); i.m. s with, save on early coins, \& below shield; obv. S, rev. \&; obv. \&, rev. S; \& with \& below shield.**

It is noticeable that i.m. E is not recorded on half-sovereigns of Henry’s lifetime though it occurs on crowns. But some with i.m. \& are Edward’s.

The following table shows the parallel changes at the two mints of the Tower and Southwark in lettering and stops. Some Southwark dies were presumably used first at the Tower since they show i.m. S struck occasionally over Annulet-with-pellet. The Southwark half-+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tower</th>
<th>Southwark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.m. Lis</strong></td>
<td><strong>I.m. Annulet-with-pellet</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Roman, small saltire stops(^2) (Pl. IV, 1)</td>
<td>Small Roman, small saltire stops (Pl. IV, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Small Roman, trefoil stops (Pl. IV, 5, rev.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Large Roman, trefoil stops (Pl. IV, 2, rev.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Large Roman, saltire stops (Pl. IV, 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Mixed letters, trefoil stops (Pl. IV, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Lombardic letters, trefoil stops (Pl. IV, 9, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Lombardic letters, sleeve stops (Pl. IV, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Lombardic letters, trefoil stops (Pl. IV, 9, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Lombardic letters, sleeve stops (Pl. IV, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Roman letters, lozenge stops (Pl. V, 9, obv. Edw. VI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Another is recorded in the Durrant sale, lot 5 (Sotheby, 1 May 1919).

\(^2\) These very small stops when worn resemble square pellets.
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sovereign with i.m. £ and lozenge stops was probably struck under Edward VI.

The large Roman fount often includes one or two Lombardic letters. The abbreviation mark after the king's name varies considerably; it is sometimes a comma, sometimes the query-shaped symbol, and sometimes omitted.

The Bristol half-sovereigns, discussed elsewhere, show Lombardic letters of London style with trefoil stops. The distinctive Bristol lettering is not known on a half-sovereign.

I.m. Lis. The weight of the only fully recorded specimen (99 1/4 gr. for 100) show it to be the earliest coin. It seems likely, however, that some coins with i.m. Lis were struck at 96 gr. as halves of the sovereigns of 192 gr. with i.m. Lis. A noticeable feature of the legend is the reading Et in full.

I.m. Annulet-with-pellet. The earliest coins are, save for the weight which is always 96 gr. or nearly, identical with those with i.m. Lis and read Et (Pl. IV, 2). The copula soon became denoted, however, by the letter Z. The changes in lettering and stops have been noticed. On some late coins an Annulet is placed on the inner circle, no doubt an adaptation of the “point secret” so common on contemporary French coins (Pl. IV, 9 obv.). A mule occurs with obverse i.m. Arrow and the young portrait of Edward VI (Pl. VI, 4).

I.m. S. The coins reveal, as I have shown, approximately the same sequence of lettering and stops as those with i.m. Annulet-with-pellet. The earliest pieces resemble the sovereigns in showing no mark below the shield (Pl. V, 1-3); the later association with £ is indicated by £ placed below the shield. If we may anticipate for a moment, the coins with S alone probably correspond to the groats with £ in the forks, and those with the additional £ to groats with £ and S in the forks.

One obverse die with i.m. S omits the king's sceptre as, perhaps oddly, do also some half-sovereigns of Edward's reign. A mule occurs having reverse i.m. S and on obverse the young portrait of Edward and no i.m. but which by deduction must belong to the series with i.m. £.

I.m. £. These pieces are muled both ways as in other denominations with i.m. S. Reverse dies always have £ below the shield like the sovereign. The sequence of lettering and stops has been noted. The coin with Roman letters and lozenge stops was most likely struck early in Edward's reign. A mule occurs with a reverse of Edward VI showing i.m. £ (over Arrow, Pl. V, 10).

Coins struck in the reign of Edward VI

Sovereign (Pl. VI, 1-3). Brooke lists no London sovereign of Edward struck in Henry's name, though he refers to one both in the text of English Coins (p. 177, inadvertently in his first edition, giving its weight as 120 instead of 192 gr.) and in the chart shown facing p. 64. This gap may appropriately be filled by the sovereigns with i.m. “Lis with feelers”, Roman letters, and rosette stops. The p-
trait, however, is anomalous; it still shows the elderly face of King Henry when the half-sovereigns show the features of his son. The two specimens of this sovereign in the British Museum are from the same obverse die and weigh respectively 187.9 and 188 gr., and so were obviously struck at 192 gr. (Pl. VI, 1-3). Both read on the reverse Tranciens (possibly a privy mark since on one die the C is struck over S). An additional reason for placing the coins here is their similarity to the Bristol sovereigns with Roman letters with which they are clearly contemporary and which Brooke himself apparently assigns to this coinage; indeed he thought from the similarity of fabric that these Lis-marked sovereigns too might be of Bristol, and even perhaps counterfeit pieces such as Sharington is known to have struck. However, I feel no doubt not only of their genuineness but that this is their proper position in the series. The student may notice the similarity between certain letters on these coins and some Arrow-marked half-sovereigns of the period (e.g. T, M, and I, see Pl. VI, 2 and 5). These sovereigns should probably not be associated with the young portrait half-sovereigns with i.m. Lis which are late coins and come right at the end of the series.

There is moreover on these sovereigns with Roman letters, both of London and Bristol, another mark, small but distinctive, which in my opinion suggests that they were not struck by Henry VIII. It is the lis puncheon in the coat of arms on the reverse. This is the new puncheon without a band round the stem which did not appear until the reign of Edward VI. All fleurs-de-lis used in Henry’s lifetime whether as initial mark or in the coat of arms have a band round the stem.

Half-sovereigns with the portrait and mint-marks of Edward VI (Pl. V, 10-12; Pls. VI and VII). If we consider them solely in their relation to the reign of Henry VIII, the half-sovereigns bearing Henry’s name but the young face of Edward are important chiefly as providing the clue, as Evans pointed out, to the distinction between Henry’s initial marks and Edward’s. They thus enable the silver coins to be classified which bear the same marks but Henry’s portrait. But the half-sovereigns with Edward’s portrait have a wider significance. These coins of 20 ct. include two marks, Arrow and E, one of the Tower and the other of Southwark which are much commoner than the others, and it seems likely that by the variety of their stops these two marks were continued for some time side by side with other marks (K, Grapple, Martlet, Lis). Indeed, Arrow (also Grapple and Martlet) persisted on the new profile portrait half-sovereigns of 22 ct. and shillings in Edward’s name coined after January 1549.

Moreover, among the 20-ct. half-sovereigns with i.m. Arrow and E

---

1 English Coins, p. 181. The weight and appearance of the coins are satisfactory; their quality must remain uncertain. One of the Bristol sovereigns is illustrated in Grueber’s Handbook (431) and another in Brit. Num. Journ. xxiv. 116, Pl. 11, 22. The coin will also be illustrated later.
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are a few rare coins which bear Edward’s own name as well as the youthful seated portrait. These coins deserve special consideration here since they are made from the same reverse dies as coins with Arrow and E bearing Henry’s name. Indeed, die links are known between the two kings (Pl. V, 11, 12; Pl. VII, 1, 2). From their detail, too, the coins in Edward’s name (including the corresponding rare crowns and half-crowns of the Double Rose and profile groats and lesser coins) seems to have been struck early in the period of these marks, Arrow and E, for all bear the lozenge stops which are early. I think this issue was probably limited to a few months in 1547–8. Brooke, it will be remembered, extended the date until January 1549.¹

We do not know the reason for this synchronized dual issue in each king’s name, nor why the coinage in Edward’s name suddenly ceased, but it is apparent that the mints now concentrated exclusively on the issue of coins in Henry’s name. It was perhaps to legalize the obvious anomaly of this practice that Edward issued the proclamation of February 1550 ordering old testoons to be melted down and struck into groats and lesser coins bearing the “hole face and inscription of our most dear late father”.² This extraordinary command, though primarily concerning the silver, affects also the half-sovereigns in Henry’s name. Since the groats struck under it must include some of the later of those bearing the well-known marks Arrow, K, Grapple, Martlet, Lis, and E, it is legitimate to infer that gold coins of 20 ct. bearing the same marks and Henry’s name were also struck after February 1550 (the date of the proclamation), i.e. simultaneously with the coinage of 22-ct. gold profile pieces in Edward’s name, begun in January 1549, which, as I have said, included three of the same marks, viz. Arrow, Grapple, and Martlet. We do not know how long this coinage of groats and 20-ct. gold lasted, but it was probably until 1551, a date found on shillings with i.m. Lis which is probably the latest mark on groats and half-sovereigns. But groats were presumably not struck after July 1551 when they were devalued, at first to threepence, and in the next month to twopence each.³

It will perhaps help to visualize the several contemporary series of coins if they are seen in tabular form. I have shown both the coins in Henry’s name and those in Edward’s. In Edward’s profile shillings—the term testoon is here used only for the full-face coins with Henry’s name and portrait—I have made one change from Brooke who seems to me inconsistent in listing the Durham House Shilling of 1548 as a different issue from the Durham House Half-sovereign of 1548. I have therefore placed them together under the coinage of 1548 as “old style”, for they were both struck between December 1548 and March 1549, when 1548 “old style” ended.

¹ English Coins, p. 188. They seem to have remained in circulation until demonetized by Elizabeth in 1561.
² Brit. Num. Journ. xi. 140. This directive was addressed primarily to Southwark, but doubtless applied to all mints.
³ Ibid., p. 847.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Henry</strong></td>
<td><strong>Name of Edward</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1547 to Jan. 1549</td>
<td>20-ct. sovereign, Tower (i.m. &quot;Lis with feelers&quot;), ¼-sov. (Edward's portrait), crown, ½-crown, Tower, Southwark, Bristol (sovereign with Roman letters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1549 to April 1550 (1551?)</td>
<td>The above coinage continued, but no sovereigns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reverting to the half-sovereigns, the coins, including those in Edward's name, may be divided into two classes:

I. Coins with i.m. Arrow, K, Grapple, Martlet, and Lis.

II. Coins with i.m. E.

The parallels between the two series become more obvious if their principal features are tabulated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tower</th>
<th>Southwark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.m. Arrow, lozenge stops, some with Edward's name.</td>
<td>I.m. E, lozenge stops, some with Edward's name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.m. Arrow, pierced cross stops, Angl, E monogram for Z.</td>
<td>I.m. E, pierced cross stops, Angl, E monogram for Z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.m. K, lozenge stops, Dei Gra.</td>
<td>I.m. E, lozenge stops, some with Dei Gra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.m. Grapple, pellet stops, Dei Gra.</td>
<td>I.m. E, pellet stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.m. Martlet, saltire or pellet stops, some read Dei Gra.</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;, &quot;&quot;, &quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.m. Lis, pellet stops.</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;, &quot;&quot;, &quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have not seen an Arrow-marked half-sovereign with pellet stops, although pellets occur on Arrow-marked crowns, half-crowns, and groats. The issue of Arrow-marked half-sovereigns may have been interrupted during the run of K, Grapple, Lis, and Martlet, but we have seen that it was resumed in January 1549 on the 22-ct. profile gold.

**Tower**

_**I.m. Arrow.**_ The initial mark is normally on both sides, but occasionally on obverse only. There is neither mark nor letter below the shield. The stops are usually lozenges or pierced crosses ("incurved mascles") sometimes combined with saltires. Those with pierced

---

1 Brooke says that some of these groats with i.m. E have S in the forks, but the only profile groats with S in the forks which I have seen either in the British Museum or elsewhere have no i.m., not E. *(Brit. Num. Journ. xii, Pl. v, 6.)*
The Coinages of Henry VIII and

crosses read Angl and have the E monogram for Z (Pl. VI, 6, 7). One
puncheon for the letter E is minus the centre bar so that it resembles a
square C. Three mules are known, the one already mentioned with
reverse i.m. Annulet-with-pellet of Henry VIII (Pl. VI, 4), one with
reverse i.m. Lis, and another with obverse i.m. Lis.

The coins with Edward’s name are rare and are probably early.
They have lozenge stops. The reverses do not differ from those of
coins struck in Henry’s name and die links between the two have been
established (Pl. V, 11 and 12).

I.m. K. The initial mark, a rare one, is found on the reverse only
or is omitted altogether, but since K is also placed below the shield
(Pl. VI, 7, 8) the attribution is never in doubt. The coins read Dei Gra
instead of the usual D G. The stops are lozenges, but saltires are found
on a reverse die showing Grapple over K. The coins with i.m. K show
improved workmanship. The practice of omitting the initial mark on
one side or the other was probably part of a deliberate policy, for such
a die would obviously serve for more than one period, and in point of
fact at least one unmarked obverse die was combined with a reverse
showing first K and later Grapple below the shield (Pl. VI, 8 and 9).
It is likely that such die links could be multiplied, especially among
the groats where the initial mark is often omitted on one side.

A mule is recorded (Bruun 588) with obverse i.m. E, reverse no i.m.
but K below shield. If K is the mark of Thomas Knight it is useful to
remember that this name appears in the indenture of April 1547 but
is missing from that of February 1548, in which year he died.¹

I.m. Grapple. The initial mark, quite scarce, appears on both sides
or on either or is omitted altogether, but a Grapple is always placed
below the shield. The stops are round pellets, and the coin shown on
Pl. VI, 9 since it has lozenge stops on obverse may be regarded as a
mule K/Grapple. One reverse die shows saltire stops but has i.m.
Grapple struck over K and also over K below shield. Although saltire
stops are not found on a half-sovereign with i.m. K,² they are not
impossible. The affinity of Grapple with i.m. K is further denoted by
the legend which again reads Dei Gra.

I.m. Martlet. The initial mark, again a scarce one, is placed on both
sides (Pl. VI, 11) and there is no mark or letter below the shield.
The stops are round pellets, or rarely saltires. The mule with i.m. Lis (Pl.
VI, 12) is the only one recorded. Some dies read Dei Gra as on the two
preceding marks.

I.m. Lis. This scarce mark is found on both sides (Pl. VI, 13); there
is again no mark or letter below the shield, and the stops are round
pellets. The mules have already been mentioned and have either
reverse Arrow or obverse Martlet.

Southwark

I.m. E. This is rather a large class, somewhat naturally so if it was

² The overstriking makes the letter sometimes difficult to read.
Edward VI in Henry's Name

issued throughout the period of the five Tower marks (Pl. VII). The initial mark is placed sometimes on both sides but usually on the reverse only, where it is sometimes struck over the Arrow. A Roman E rarely a Lombardic Ε (Pl. VII, 3) is placed below the shield, except on some of the dies showing an overstruck initial mark when it may be omitted, as it had been on the original Arrow dies. The Roman E below the shield is sometimes reversed, perhaps intentionally, since it so appears on different dies (Pl. VII, 6); sometimes it appears as a broken letter, with the centre bar missing, when it may also form the initial mark (Pl. VII, 5). The three mules have already been mentioned: one with obverse i.m. Ε of Henry VIII; one, omitting an obverse i.m., with reverse i.m. S of Henry VIII; and the other with a reverse showing K below the shield. The stops in this series range from lozenges, saltires, and pierced crosses to pellets.

Like the Tower coins with i.m. Arrow the rare coins with Edward's name have lozenge stops and are probably early. All show i.m. E over Arrow on obverse and once more they use reverse dies of coins struck in Henry's name (Pl. VII, 1 and 2). All have the monogram HR below the shield, but this is often illegible.

LISTS

HALF-SOVEREIGNS. Wt., II (a), 100 gr.; 23 ct.: the remainder, 96 gr.; 22 or 20 ct.

Henry VIII. Bearded portrait of king upon a throne with diapered back, extending to the inner circle; reverse, shield with supporters, HR below. The legends in Roman, Lombardic, or mixed letters vary widely, but show substantially: Henric 8 D G Agl Franci Z Hib Rex and Ihs Avtem Transiens Per Medivm Illorvm Ibat, the larger Roman letters in particular involving much abbreviation. The early coins read Et for Z.

Tower, Henry VIII. II (a). I.m. Lis; small Roman letters (Di Gra, Et Hiber) with ornamental H; small saltire stops (Pl. IV, 1; 99½ gr.; Fitzwilliam Museum).

Tower, Henry VIII. II (b). I.m. Annulet-with-pellet; variants:
1. Small Roman letters (Et or Z); small saltire stops (Pl. IV, 2–4).
2. Similar letters to no. 1; Z from now on; trefoil stops (Pl. IV, 5 rev., 6).
3. Large Roman or mixed letters; trefoil or saltire stops (Pl. IV, 2 rev., 7, 8 obv.).
4. Similar to no. 3, but with Annulet on inner circle.
5. Lombardic letters; trefoil stops; some dies show i.m. Annulet-with-pellet struck over S.
6. Lombardic letters; trefoil stops; Annulet on inner circle (Pl. IV, 9, 10).
7. Lombardic letters; sleeve (hook) stops (Pl. IV, 11).

SOVEREIGNS. Wt. 192 gr.; 20 ct.

Edward VI. Coins of the same size and design as the small module, class II of Henry VIII, the portrait, throne, and reverse on both are the same, but with Roman letters, rosette stops (Pl. VI, 1–3).

I.m. Lis with curved stalks from the centre petal (“Lis with feelers”).

Henric 8 D Gra Agl Franc Z Hib Rex.
Ihs Avte Tranciens Per Mediv Illorv Ibat.

HALF-SOVEREIGNS, Edward VI, 1547–51

Wt. 96 gr.; 20 ct.; legends as on Henry's coins, rarely with Edward's name; youthful portrait of king upon throne with plain, rounded back; reverse, shield with supporters, HR below. The legends, always in large Roman letters, are similar to but usually more abbreviated than those on Henry's coins.
The Coinages of Henry VIII and

Tower


I.m. Arrow (both sides, rarely on obverse only); no mark below shield; stops, lozenges or pierced crosses, sometimes combined with saltires; some have broken E. Variants:

1. Coins in Edward's name, lozenge stops; reverse dies are those of coins in Henry's name (Pl. V, 11 and 12; same rev. die).
2. Lozenge stops (Pl. VI, 4, 5 with broken E, cf. i.m. E, variant 7).
3. Saltire stops (Pl. VI, 6, rev., combined with pierced crosses).
4. Angl., with E monogram and pierced cross stops (Pl. VI, 6).
5. Sceptre omitted (Pl. VI, 4, cf. i.m. E, variant 13). For Mules see i.m. Lis.

I.m. K (on reverse only or absent); K below shield, Dei Gra; lozenge stops (Pl. VI, 7, 8).

Saltire stops are also possible.

Mule: (K/Grapple); Obv. no i.m., but of K period, Dei Gra, lozenge stops; rev. no i.m., Grapple below shield, pellet stops (Pl. VI, 9 same obv. die as Pl. VI, 8).

For mule with obv. i.m. E and K below shield, see Southwark.

I.m. Grapple (both sides or either or absent); Grapple below shield, Dei Gra; stops, round pellets (Pl. VI, 10) or saltires, on a reverse die showing Grapple over i.m. K and over K below shield. I.m. Martlet both sides; no mark below shield, Dei Gra or D G; pellet stops or, on reverse, saltires (Pl. VI, 11, His for Ihs, a reading found also with i.m. E).

2. Obv. Lis, rev. Arrow; no mark below shield; stops, obv. pellets, rev. pierced crosses.
3. Obv. Martlet, rev. Lis; pellet stops (Pl. VI, 12, Fitzwilliam Museum).

(Southwark

Henry VIII. II (b). I.m. S. (a) No mark below shield; variants:

1. Small Roman letters, trefoil stops (Pl. V, 1).
2. Large Roman or mixed letters, trefoil stops (Pl. V, 2, 3).
3. Lombardic letters, trefoil stops.

(b) A below shield; variants:

1. Large Roman or mixed letters, trefoil or saltire stops (Pl. V, 4, 5 obv.).
2. Sceptre omitted (Pl. V, 4).
3. Lombardic letters, trefoil stops (Pl. V, 6).


I.m. A, with A below shield; variants:

1. Lombardic letters, trefoil or sleeve stops (Pl. V, 8).
2. (Edward VI) Roman letters, large lozenge stops (Pl. V, 9 obv.).

Southwark

Edward VI

2. Obv. no i.m., rev. S (Henry VIII); see Messrs. Seaby's list, March 1938, ex P. Carlyon-Britton collection; the legend, D G, &c., with lozenge stops shows the obverse to be of this period, though i.m. absent.
3. Obv. E, rev. no i.m., K below shield (Tower die, Bruun 588).

I.m. E (both sides or on reverse only), E usually below shield; stops, lozenges, pierced crosses, sometimes combined with saltires, or round pellets; variants:

1. Coins in Edward's name; i.m. E over Arrow on obv. and sometimes on rev.; lozenge stops with either E, broken E, E reversed, A, or no mark below shield;
SOVEREIGNS OF HENRY VII; OF HENRY VIII (EARLY OBVERSES)
FALSE RYAL OF HENRY VIII

Plate I
LATER SOVEREIGNS OF HENRY VIII, 1544-7

Plate III
HALF-SOVEREIGNS OF HENRY VIII, 1544-7
(i) I.M. Lis and Annulet-with-pellet
HALF-SOVEREIGNS (ii), HENRY VIII AND EDWARD VI
SOVEREIGN, HALF-SOVEREIGNS (iii), EDWARD VI

Plate VI
reverse dies are those of coins in Henry’s name (Pl. VII, 1 and 2, same rev. die).

2. I.m. E on rev. only, lozenge stops (e.g. Pl. VII, 3, 4, 7, and 10).
3. I.m. E on both sides (Pl. VII, 6, 8, and 9).
4. I.m. E over Arrow (Pl. V, 10, rev.; Pl. VII, 1, 2, 7, and 8).
5. Normal E below shield (e.g. Pl. VII, 10).
6. E reversed below shield (Pl. VII, 6).
7. Broken E for i.m. E and below shield (Pl. VII, 5).
8. Lombardic G below shield (Pl. VII, 3).
9. No E below shield (Pl. VII, 1, 2, and 8).
10. Angl, and monogram E with pierced cross stops (Pl. VII, 7).
11. Dei Gra, lozenge stops (Pl. VII, 6).
12. Pellet stops (Pl. VII, 9; obv. 9 and 10).
13. Sceptre omitted (Pl. VII, 10).

(To be continued)