I have recently had occasion to check over that part of the series of articles on the heavy coinage of Henry VI by the late Mr. C. A. Whitton which deals with the groats of Calais, London, and York (*B.N.J.* vol. xxiii).

It might be thought difficult to add anything new and of value to this very detailed work, much less to suggest any improvement, and in general I would agree with this view. Nevertheless, I am sure that Mr. Whitton did not desire to claim finality for his work, and there are one or two points concerning the early issues on which I would like to comment.

**Annulet issue.** It is surprising to me that Mr. Whitton should not have mentioned the most obvious division of this coinage, namely the old and young busts, but the fact is that the early coins have the rather stern-looking bust with wide forehead which appeared on the mullet groats of Henry V, while the others have a new young bust with oval, smiling face, and prominent arched eyebrows.

The change apparently took place both at the Tower and at Calais during the currency of the following arrangement:

Cross II both sides, ‘ANGL’, nothing on breast, broken E, as this is found with both busts. The new bust was probably introduced some time in 1425, and was the work of the engraver Gilbert of Brandenburg. The rare York coins, which were struck in the autumn of 1423, naturally have the old bust.

The full classification which I suggest for the Annulet coinage is as follows:

A. Old Bust as Henry V:

1. Cross I b.s., ANGLICE, fleur on breast (RR).
2. Cross II b.s., ,, fleur on breast.
3. ,, ,, ,, fleur on breast, broken R.

1 An illustration of the various crosses appears on p. 308.
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4. Cross II b.s., ANGLIE, nothing on breast, broken R.
5. ,, ,, ANGL', nothing on breast, broken R.
6. ,, ,, ,, nothing on breast, broken R and E.
7. ,, ,, ,, nothing on breast, broken E.

B. Young Bust:
1. Cross II b.s., ANGL', nothing on breast, broken E.
2. ,, ,, ,, nothing on breast, no broken letters.
3. Cross II/\, ,, nothing on breast, trefoils to left of crown and after POSVI, one annulet on reverse.

CALAIS (all types). Annulets beside bust, after POSVI, and in two quarters of reverse.
Saltire stops.
RR Varieties: A2a, A4a, B1a, B2a—No annulets in reverse quarters.
A7a—No annulet after POSVI.
Mules: Annulet B2/Rosette with (R) and without mascle before LA.

LONDON (Types A1–7, B1–2). Annulets after POSVI and in two reverse quarters.
Saltire stops. Bar to copula.
Varieties: None reported.

YORK (Type A2). Lis beside bust, annulets after POSVI and in two quarters of reverse. Saltire stops.

The varieties A7a and B1a of Calais are not mentioned by Mr. Whitton but are in my collection.

As regards the type B3 groats of Calais, with trefoils to left of crown and after POSVI, this was an exceptional issue not in the regular series, as apart from the fact that it was confined to the Calais mint, all mules with the rosette issue have B2 obverses. A mule is known, however, with B2 obverse and B3 reverse.

Rosette issue. There is no sharp division which can be made in these coins as in the annulets, as the young bust is used throughout, but I think that it will help to set out a classification putting in their proper order of importance and appearance the different initial crosses and the various arrangements of obverse stopping which, in Mr. Whitton's list, are all given equal status:

1. Crosses II/\: Obv. Rosette stops, with mascle after REX.
   Rev. Saltires, with rossettes after POSVI and SIE, or DON, and mascle before LA, or LON.

   Varieties of obverse stopping:
   (a) All saltires.
   (b) All saltires, mascle in 2 spandrils of tressure. Known without mascle on reverse.
   (c) Saltires, mascle after HENRIC (ends FRAND').
   (d) Saltires, rossetes either side of REX.
   (e) Saltires, rossettes after HENRIC, mascle after GRA.
   (f) As (e) but rossetes either side of copula (some have HENRIE).
   (g) All rossetes.
   (h) Rosettes, mascle after GRA.
   (i) As (h), but saltires either side of copula.

2. Crosses IIIa/\: As 1.

   Variety: (a) Mascle after GRA instead of REX.
3. Crosses IIIb/V: As i. (One die has HENRI.)
Calais: All types as above. Mules: Rosette 2/Pinecone.
London: Type i, and variety (f),
   Type 2 and varieties (b) Mascle after LON,
   (c) Mascle instead of rosette after DON,
   (d) Mascle before TAS instead of before LON.

Mules: Rosette 2/Pinecone.

As in the annulet classification, I have followed Mr. Whitton in calling the London groats with all saltire stops and copula with bar on the obverse, mules of the annulet/rosette coinages, as he rightly points out that in the Calais coins, where the annulet issue is distinguished from the rosette by the annulets beside the bust, all the latter coins have copula without bar. Nevertheless, it is very curious that these so-called mules are, in fact, the least scarce of all the London rosette groats. Of the nine in the British Museum no less than five are of the mule type, but even this is, I think, less than the normal average.

Pinecone issue. This is a simpler issue than the two previous coinages as there are few varieties other than the two initial crosses, and many of these, in view of their scarcity, are probably ordinary die-sinking errors. During the currency of the issue, Gilbert of Brandenburg gave place to Orewell as graver, and this change is no doubt responsible for the deterioration in the engraving of the bust punches and their placing, which is apparent in the later coins.

Here is the suggested classification:

Calais: Obv. Pinecones after HENRIC, DI, GRA, mascle after REX, saltires either side of copula.
   Rev. Saltires, pinecones after POSVI and DON, mascle before LA.
   1. Crosses IIIa/V. Varieties (a) No pinecone after POSVI.
      (b) No pinecone after SIE.
      (c) King’s name HENIC.
   2. Crosses IIIb/V. Varieties (a) Town spelt VIV/LA.
      (b) King’s name HENRC.
      (c) King’s name HENIC.

Mules: Pinecone 1/Annulet B2 or Rosette.
   Pinecone 2/Leaf-Mascle, nothing after POSVI.
   Pinecone 2/Leaf-Trefoil, reverses 1, 2. | See the respective classifications,
   Pinecone 2/Trefoil, reverses 2, 4. | Calais.

London: As Calais, with pinecone after DON, mascle before LON.
   1. Crosses IIIa/V. Varieties (a) Mascle after TAS instead of before LON.
      (b) TOS for TAS in normal legend.
   2. Crosses IIIb/V. Varieties (a) Mascle before TAS instead of LON.
      (b) TOS for TAS in normal legend.
      (c) No mascle in reverse legend.
      (d) No mint-mark on reverse.

Mules: Pinecone 1/rosette normal.

A curious point regarding the mules between these three coinages is that there are no rosette/annulets known either of London or Calais, whereas there are quite a few pinecone/annulets of Calais. I
will not attempt an explanation of this, but it could scarcely have been an error on the part of the coiners, and certainly not a chance happening, as more than one reverse die is concerned. In fact, the four British Museum specimens are from four different reverse dies.

**Dates of issue and totals of bullion coined.** Mr. Whitton does not mention the corroborating evidence for his dates of the various issues which is to be found in the tables of bullion coined at the Tower which he reproduces from the figures published by Miss E. Stokes in *Num. Chron.* 1929. Between 1422 and 1436 there are four final dates other than Michaelmas, the normal end of the mint year, namely, 20.4.1427, which might well mark the end of the annulet coinage, 31.3.1430 for the rosettes, 26.6.1434 for the pinecones, and 24.6.1435 for the leaf-mascle. Later dates do not coincide with those chosen by Mr. Whitton, but this is possibly due to the fact that the divisions that have been made for convenience of identification do not all correspond with those made by the mintmasters for accounting purposes.

With regard to the amounts of bullion coined at Calais as given by Ruding and Walters to which Mr. Whitton refers, I agree that there is no need to take the limiting dates as being those of the annulet, rosette, and pinecone coinages at that mint, as these were probably more or less the same as those at the Tower, except for the date of opening of the mint, which is unknown. I do think, however, that the first two pairs of totals given, namely:

- **Silver:** 25.2.1424 to 31.1.1428, 67,745 lb.
- 20.2.1428 to 3.8.1431, 89,660 lb.
- **Gold:** 24.1.1424 to 24.12.1427, 2,834 lb.
- 20.5.1428 to 2.8.1431, 361 lb.

might well be those of the annulet and rosette coinages at Calais, in spite of the two points Mr. Whitton makes against this view. Summarized, these are: the annulet coinage at Calais must have started before January or February 1424, as we know that the London coinage, which was much smaller, started early in 1423 (indenture of 16.2.1423 with Bartholomew Goldbeter). Further, the silver total must have been much more than 67,745 lb. seeing that the surviving annulet coins are at least four times as common as the rosettes.

To answer these points before explaining my reasons for the suggestion I have advanced, I would say firstly that Walters gives the commencing date for the first amount as 1423, but in any case we do not know the date of the opening of the Calais mint, though it would appear to have been shortly after that of the Tower, to judge by the varieties of each coinage known. Secondly, the comparative plenty of surviving specimens of the annulet and rosette coinages really has nothing to do with the amounts originally circulated, but is due mostly to the chance composition of several large hoards of these coins which have come to light.

My reason for thinking that these amounts may represent the annulet and rosette coinages of Calais is based upon a point which
appears to have been hitherto overlooked. In the Tables of Bullion Coined, already referred to, we find the following entries in the Remarks column under the London gold of Henry VI:

Mich. 4 Hen. VI (1426) to Easter, 5 Hen. VI (1427)—Payment to Brandeburgh for engraving 2713 dies for gold and silver coinage at Calais.

Mich. 7 Hen. VI (1429) to 31 Mar. 8 Hen. VI (1430)—ditto for 1405 dies for the silver coinage at Calais.

31 Mar. 8 Hen. VI (1430) to Mich. 10 Hen. VI (1432)—ditto for 2187 dies for the silver coinage of Calais.

On the assumption that the first number of dies, i.e. 2,713, were for the annulet coinage, which was brought to an end in April 1427, we have 3,592 dies for the rosette coinage. Taking this number first, as being the less controversial of the two, and also as applying solely to the silver coinage, we divide it into obverse and reverse dies on the normal basis of one obverse to three reverse, giving us 898 obverse and 2,694 reverse dies. 898 obverse dies for 89,660 lb. of silver, gives the very convenient figure of almost exactly 100 lb. per obverse die. Perhaps it is significant that this is the amount stated in the indentures from which 2s. value was to be set aside for the Pyx trials.

It is not possible to say exactly how many coins were produced from this weight of silver, as half-groats and smaller pieces were included, as well as groats, but an average figure of 12,000 would probably be near the mark. This figure should be of value to students for many calculations.

We can now turn our attention to the amounts which I have suggested might well be those of the annulet coinage, i.e. 67,745 lb. of silver and 2,834 lb. of gold. Taking first the silver, if we apply the figure of 100 lb. per obverse die, we find that 678 obverse and 2,034 reverse dies would have been required, or a total of 2,712. Although the dies paid for apparently included those for the gold, or perhaps 60 dies on the basis of one per 12,000 pieces, it can scarcely be a coincidence that the number quoted, i.e. 2,713, is almost exactly that of the calculation, and I do think that the result goes far to prove the validity of the figures for the dies, and the identity of the totals of bullion coined at Calais.

Privy marking. Mr. Whitton follows Dr. Lawrence, Dr. Brooke, and others in assuming that the mintmasters put a distinctive mark on each three-monthly batch of their production so that the money could be recognized at the Pyx trials, and that they did this in accordance with the instructions contained in their indentures. Apart, however, from the many practical difficulties with the dies which such procedure would entail, I do not think that the indentures specify any such thing. The mintmaster is certainly enjoined to "make a privy mark on all moneys he shall make of gold and silver", and in the earliest published indenture containing this injunction (20 June 1361 with Robert de Porche) we are given the purpose: "so that another time if need be he may know which are his work among other like moneys and which are not". There is no mention that such a mark is
to be changed every three months, nor are the instructions linked
directly with the three-monthly assay which was ordered. The
identification of coins at the Pyx trials depends on samples of the
production being placed in a fixed proportion in a box with 2 keys
and 2 seals, and this box being opened "once every 3 months before
the Council or their deputy, and before the wardens and masters".
When the Pyx trials were delayed, as happened, for instance, at the
beginning of the reign of Edward IV, the contents of the box were
regularly transferred to sealed and labelled bags,¹ so that there was
still no question of any difficulty in identifying the master responsible.

Whatever may have been the case in previous reigns, and a good
case has been made out for some form of regular privy marking under
Edward III and Henry V, I am not convinced that Mr. Whitton has
proved that a similar system obtained with the coins of Henry VI.
There are plenty of privy marks to be found, but I do not think that
we know the purpose of them.

I think it will be agreed that the annulet, rosette, and pinecone
coinages, with their ample and continuous output, and the corre-
sponding survival of specimens today, make an admirable "corpus"
for the study of privy marks, and therefore if any three-monthly
system was used during this reign, it will be apparent in these issues.
What I propose to do, therefore, is to take Mr. Whitton's suggested
systems for these three coinages and apply them to an analysis of a
typical lot of these groats to see whether this will show a reasonable
grouping of specimens such as would occur if we are dealing with
three-monthly production periods.

I was recently able to examine a lot of approximately 500 of these
groats, and while no such lot could be called typical unless propor-
tionately selected from all known surviving coins, I do think that any
discrepancies would not be sufficiently great to affect the result.
Here is the analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annulets</th>
<th>Calais:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Br</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annulets</th>
<th>London:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosettes</th>
<th>Calais:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross II</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Var.)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross IIIa</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Var.)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross IIIb</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosettes</th>
<th>London:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the annulet coinage Mr. Whitton has taken the privy marking to be a combination of the initial cross, presence or absence of fleur on the breast, the spelling of ANGLIE, and the broken letters, as set out in the table. This produces 10 varieties, and a reference to the analysis shows that 283 groats are of 2 of the varieties, and 38 of the remaining 8. However, at least 16 varieties are required, and these Mr. Whitton supplies by dividing my type A1 into four with his N1, N2, N3, and N4, and my type B2 into three with F1, F2, and the normal and tapering-topped A’s. Apart from the fact that I doubt whether these microscopical differences in shapes (when there were no microscopes!) would constitute practical privy-marks, the first-mentioned division at least would only accentuate the disproportion, as none of these rare varieties occurred in my lot of 500. I did not sort the lot for the F’s and A’s.

In the rosette coinage the situation is even more absurd, for here the privy marking suggested is the varieties in obverse stopping, presumably combined with the three initial crosses, of which we have 13 combinations, or one more than required for the three years from 20.4.1427 to 31.3.1430. Referring once more to the analysis we find 119 specimens from 2 of the varieties, which are, in fact, 2 of the initial crosses with the “normal” obverse stopping, and 5 only from the other 11. Need I add that only one of these latter has as yet been found on a London groat?

In the pinecone coinage we have a rather different problem. It is obvious from the classification table that no varieties of the type suggested for the annulet and rosette coinages occur on the pinecone groats, and recognizing this Mr. Whitton has put forward for the privy marking of this issue nine different forms of pinecone which he has discovered. Apart from the fact that 13 varieties are required to cover the Pyx periods from 31.3.1430 to 26.6.1434, once more I cannot believe that such minute and easily obscured differences could have met the assumed needs of identification, and Mr. Whitton himself has recognized this fact when he characterizes this system as “a poor one”.

In the later coinages we find a very complicated system in operation involving both obverse and reverse stopping, as well as, at first, two different reverse crosses or none at all. Here there is no lack of varieties, and the total corresponds more or less to the hundred or so required for three-monthly privy marking, though a division on this basis would not give the same dates for the issues as those suggested by Mr. Whitton. I have no doubt that this correspondence is only a coincidence.
What conclusions are to be drawn from all this is difficult to say. Many systems of privy marking were in operation during this reign, but I do not think it can be demonstrated that they had anything to do with the regular three-monthly Pyx periods, owing to the great disparity which exists between the numbers of surviving specimens of the various varieties. Making every allowance for the possibility that the surviving coins do not properly represent the original issues, I would say that the rosette coinage at any rate shows no recognizable three-monthly system, and I suggest that if such a system cannot be found in so ample and continuous a coinage then it is impossible to say why it should have been suspended for this one issue but used in the others.

It may now be asked what the varieties and marks found signify if they did not indicate the Pyx periods. The answer to this must be, firstly, that the identifying symbols of the issues, namely, the annulet, rosettes, pinecones, leaves, trefoils, &c. were the mintmasters' privy marks as prescribed in their indentures, which in later reigns were simplified into the mint-mark system. As to the significance of the other marks, i.e. all the complex varieties of obverse and reverse stopping, it is doubtful whether we shall ever know their purpose. We can only hazard a guess that they could have been designed to indicate:

1. Different accounting periods.
2. The produce of different mint establishments or workshops.
3. The work of different die-sinkers or other mint personnel.

Later issues. I have only minor criticisms to make regarding Mr. Whitton's listings of the later issues, but I think that a comprehensive classification based on his lists of obverse and reverse legends would be of assistance to collectors, and would also help students to get a clearer picture of these complex coinages. I would like to emphasize, however, that the divisions made are only the obvious and convenient ones, and though they are generally arranged in chronological order, as demonstrated by the lettering differences noted, there was undoubted overlapping, and probably some of the sub-classes were in concurrent issue. A comparison of the reverses will make this clear and also show why it is often impossible to say what were the normal issues and what mules, and Mr. Whitton has wisely refrained from attempting to separate them.

For these issues I propose to give the Calais coins separately, as there was greater difference from the London issues than with the earlier coinages and in any case only three more classes of Calais groats appeared, all now rare, before the mint was closed.

CALAIS GROATS OF HENRY VI

IV. Leaf-Mascle Issue

Leaf in spandrel below bust.

1. Crosses IV/V: Obv. Saltires, mascle after REX (one die, FRANC).
   Rev. Saltires, mascle before LA, leaf below last M of MEVM.
   (RR. variety—Leaf after POSVI.)
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2. Crosses V/V: Obv. and Rev. as 1 (two dies, FRAN, FRANC).

(RR. varieties (a) Saltire after POSVI.
(b) No leaf below MEVM.)

V. Leaf-Trefoil Issue

Leaf on breast.

Crosses IIIb/IIIb: Obv. Double saltires (one die).

Rev. 1. Double saltires only (CAL1 struck over SIV1).
2. Ditto with trefoil after LA (Mule with Trefoil reverse 3).

VI. Trefoil Issue

Trefoils by neck, leaf on breast.

1. Crosses IIIb/IIIb: Obv. Saltires, trefoils after DI, REX, FRAN.

Rev. 1, 2, 3, 4.
2. " " " Obv. Saltires, trefoils after DI, REX.
   Rev. 5.
3. " " " Obv. Saltires, trefoils after DI, GRA.
   Rev. 1, 2a, 3, 4, 5.

Reverses: 1. Trefoils after ADIVTORE and SIE, before LA.
2. Trefoils before LA and SIE.
3. Trefoil after LA.
4. Ditto, no E in ADIVTORE.
5. Saltires only.

LONDON GROATS OF HENRY VI

IV. Leaf-Mascle (leaf in spandrel below bust)

Crosses IV/V: Obv. Saltires, mascle after REX (one die).

Rev. Saltires in o/circle, mascle before DON for LON, TAS over LON, leaf below last M of MEVM. (This die originally had CIVI/LON/ODON/—.)

Mules with Leaf-Trefoil A reverses A1, 2, 4, 5.

V. Leaf-Trefoil A

Leaf on breast, usually leaves and/or trefoils in legend.

Obv. 1. Saltires, leaves after DI, GRA. Rev. A1, 2, 3, 4, also mule with Pinecone normal.
4. Leaves after HENRIC, DI, GRA, trefoil after REX, saltires by copula. Rev. A5, 6, 8, 11.

Leaf-Trefoil B

Nothing on breast, and leaves and trefoils in legend.

Obv. As Leaf-Trefoil A No. 4. Rev. A5, 8, 9, 10, B2, C1.

VI. Trefoil A

Trefoils by neck and in legend, leaf on breast.

Trefoil B
Trefoils by neck, leaf on breast, fleurs in spandrels.
2. Saltires only, no fleurs at shoulders. Rev. C4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, Di, 2, 3.

Trefoil C
Trefoils at shoulder cusps, leaf on breast.
Obv. 1. Saltires, trefoil after REX, ends FRANE, no stops after HENRIC, Di.
Rev. C9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, Di, 2, 3, 4.
2. Saltires, trefoil after REX, ends FRAN. Special reverse: Double saltires after DEVME, trefoil after DON (unique).

VII. Trefoil-Pellet
Trefoils by neck, pellets by crown, leaf on breast.
Obv. Saltires, trefoil after REX. Rev. C10, 11, 12, 16, Di, 2, 3, 4, also E2—Mule with Leaf-Pellet B.

VIII. Leaf-Pellet A
Pellets by crown, leaf on breast, letter Di—ANGL.

Leaf-Pellet B
Pellets by crown, leaf on breast, letter D2—ANGLI.
Obv. 1. Saltires, trefoil after ANGLI, fleur on breast.
2. As 1, no fleur. Rev. Ei.
3. Saltires only, fleur on breast (one die has HENIC).

Leaf-Pellet C
Pellets by crown, leaf on neck, fleur on breast, letter D2.
Obv. 1. Saltires only. Rev. Ei (one has DIVI for CIVI), E2, 3. Also Fi—Mule with Cross-Pellet B.
2. Saltires, leaf after FRANC. Rev. E2. (Unique.)

Leaf-Pellet D
As Leaf-Pellet C but 4 pellets, 2 by crown and 2 by hair, letter D2. Rev. E2. (Unique.)

IX. Unmarked
No marks on obverse, letter D2.
Obv. (1 die) Saltires. Rev. E2, and two special reverses:
(a) Cross V, saltires in o/circle, pellets in two quarters, letters D2/M3.
(b) No mm., no stops, pellets in 4 quarters, D2/M3.

X. Cross-Pellet A
Saltires by neck, pellets by crown, leaf and fleur on breast, letter D2.
Obv. (1 die) Saltires, ANGLI.Z.FRANC. Rev. E2. (2 coins.)

Cross-Pellet B
Saltite on neck, pellets by crown, fleur usually on breast, letter D2.
Obv. 1. No mullets. (a) No stops, no fleur. Rev. Fi.
(b) Double saltires after ANGLI. Rev. Fi.
3. Mullet after FRANC only.  (a) Fleur.  Rev. F1, 3, 4a, 5.  
   (b) No fleur.  Rev. E2, F1, 3, 5.
4. Mullet after HENRIC only:
   (a) ANGL(I).FRANC(Z).  Rev. E2, F1, 5.
   (b) ANGLI.FRANC, no fleur.  Rev. E2, F1, 2.
   (c) ANLI.FRANC.  Rev. E2, F1.
   (d) ANGLI.FRANC with letter D3.  Rev. E2, 3.

Cross-Pellet C
As B with mascles instead of mullets in legend.

2. Mascles after HENRIC, GRA, pellet after ANGLI.  Rev. E2, F1. (One has pellets by hair instead of by crown.)
3. Mascle after HENRIC only (letter D3).  Rev. E2, F1, 4a, 6, also F4—no pellets.

XI. Lis-Pellet
Lis on neck, pellets by crown, fleur on breast, letter D3.

Obv. 1. Mascle after HENRIC, saltire after REX. Special reverses:
   (a) No mm., double saltires after DON letters D3/M3, pellets in 2 quarters.
   (b) Cross V, no stops letters D3/M3, pellets in 2 quarters.
2. Double saltires after GRA. Special reverses:
   (a) As 1a
   (b) No mm., no stops
   (c) Lis, no stops
   (d) Lis, saltire before MEVM

Reverses
Type A — Letters AI/MI
A1. Cross IIIb, saltires in outer circle, or outer and inner circle.
   2. ,, saltires in outer and inner circles, trefoil after DEV, SIVI for CIVI.
   3. ,, saltires in outer and inner circles, trefoil after TAS.
   4. ,, saltires in inner circle, trefoils after MEVM and TAS, no E in ADIVTORE.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  A1 & M1 & D1 \\
  A2 & M2 & D2 \\
  A3 & M3 & D3 \\
  A4 & M4 & D4 \\
\end{array}
\]

5. Cross V, saltires in o/circle or outer and i/circle.
6. ,, trefoil after DON, no other stops.
7. ,, saltires in outer circle, trefoil after DON.
8. ,, saltires in outer circle, leaf before LON, trefoil after DON.
9. Cross V, saltires in outer circle, leaf before LON, trefoil after DON, masle before TAS.
10. " " saltires in outer circle, trefoils after MEVM and LON.
11. No mm., saltires in outer circle.

**Type B—Letters A1/M2**

B1. Cross V, saltires in outer circle, leaf before LON, trefoil after DON.

B2. No mm., saltires in outer circle, trefoils after POSVI, CIVI, DON.

**Type C—Letters A2/D1/M2**

C1. No mm., double saltires in outer and i/circle, trefoil after LON.

C2. Cross V, trefoil after DON.

C3. " " saltires in o/circle or outer and i/circle.

C4. " " double saltires after DEVVM, trefoils after MEVM, LON.

C5. " " saltire after TAS.

C6. " " no stops.

C7. " " saltires in outer circle, leaf before LON, trefoil after DON.

C8. No mm., saltires after TAS.

C9. " " saltires in outer and inner circle.

C10. " " pellet after DIVTOR/E, saltire before DON.

C11. " " pellet after DIVTOR/E, double saltires before MEVM.

C12. " " trefoil before DON.

C13. " " double pellets after POSVI, saltire before DON.

C14. " " no stops.

C15. " " saltires in o/circle or outer and i/circle, pellets in 2 quarters.

**Type D—Letters D1/M2**

D1. No mm., saltires in outer circle

D2. " " saltires in inner circle

D3. " " saltires in outer and i/circle

D4. " " no stops.

**Type E—Letters D2/M3**

E1. No mm., saltires in outer and/or i/circle

E2. " " no stops

E3. " " no stops, no pellets.

**Type F—Letters, D2 or D3/M3**

F1. No mm., mullet after POSVI, D2

F2. " " saltire after CIVI, D2

F3. " " saltire after POSVI, D2

F4. " " no stops, D3

F5. " " no stops, D3 only in DEVVM

F6. " " saltire before MEVM, D3

F7. " " saltire after MEVM, D3

Pellets in 2 quarters or on inner circle.

**Notes on the Classification**

*Reverses.* I have not specified exactly the stopping with saltires only, as this would make the classification too complicated.

*Leaf-Masle.* This issue undoubtedly formed part of a larger coinage, and if this lasted only a year, as Mr. Whitton thinks, i.e. 26.6.1434–24.6.1435, it would still require more than one obverse die to deal with the 667 lb. of silver struck at the Tower during this period. Probably some of the Leaf-Trefoil A issue, such as the obverse types 1 and 2, which have no trefoils in the legend, were used. This is borne out by the Calais coins, where there were more Leaf-Masle dies, but only one Leaf-Trefoil, which
also appears without trefoils in either legend. Incidentally, the solitary London die was originally struck—CIVI/LON/DON/—, and then corrected by striking TAS over LON, and L over the D of DON. There is no question of it reading NON as stated by Mr. Whitton.

Trefoil B. Obverse I is another example of the curious intermixture of these Leaf and Trefoil coinages, as it is found only with one of the earliest reverses made for the Leaf-Mascle/Leaf-Trefoil issue.

Leaf-Pellet D. The single coin constituting this group is a freak die of Leaf-Pellet Ci, under which it should be included.

Unmarked issue. This curious issue from one obverse die, without any special marks, is made more curious by the fact that the two reverse dies used with it are not found used on any other coinage.