THE PATTERN HALFPENNIES AND FARTHINGS OF ANNE

By C. Wilson Peck

INTRODUCTION

The Anne pattern halfpennies and especially the farthings have always been highly esteemed by collectors, the former, no doubt, because of their unusual reverse designs, and the farthings more probably on account of their simple but very pleasing obverse portrait. All these patterns, except the BELLO • ET • PACE farthing, were struck from dies by John Croker, who had succeeded to the post of Chief Engraver at the Mint in 1705. Some of them bear quite novel reverse types reputedly designed at the suggestion of Dean Swift to commemorate important events in the queen's reign, e.g. most of the halfpennies allude to the Union with Scotland, and the 'Peace in biga' farthing refers to the Peace of Utrecht.

The story, cunningly propagated by various unscrupulous or misguided persons during the first decade of the nineteenth century, that an Anne farthing was worth virtually a small fortune, was readily believed by a considerable section of the population, especially in the country districts, despite its denial by the British Museum and other well-informed persons, among them, William Till. Even as late as 1877, James Henry was constrained to publish a short notice proving the utter falsity of this belief, and it is therefore not improbable that the faint halo which even today still hovers over the Anne farthing can be partly attributed to a lingering link with this idle story.

Considering the popularity of the Anne patterns it is hard to understand why they have never been thoroughly studied and classified: any contention or excuse that their comparative rarity precluded a really comprehensive investigation is quite indefensible, for the writer, without undue trouble, was able in a very short time to discover and record close on 90 Anne halfpennies and more than 250 assorted varieties of the farthing. This latter figure, incidentally, should at least serve to dispel any surviving belief in the old myth that only three farthings were struck!

The first step towards the classification of these pieces is to set them in proper perspective against the background of the Mint's copper coining activities during the previous forty years, i.e. between 1672 and 1712. It is common knowledge that the first English regal copper coinage was issued by Charles II in 1672, but it is not always realized that this coinage involved the Mint in a process which it was actually incapable of carrying out in its entirety from the raw ingot. This was partly because of their inadequate knowledge of the metal at that time: pure copper was insisted upon, yet they knew of no method of assaying it. They also met with serious trouble with the rolling: thinly cast ingots proved unsuitable for coining, and their horse-operated
mills were too weak to roll down thicker ones.¹ Both these major obstacles were surmounted, or rather side-tracked, in this instance by purchasing ready-made blanks from Sweden. All the Mint had to do, therefore, was to strike them.

Passing over the base-metal issues of James II and the first issues of William and Mary, all of which were in tin and have no direct bearing on our problem, we come to the 1694 copper coinage. On 17 April 1694, despite protests from the Cornish mines, the House of Commons passed a resolution against the further issue of tin coins on the grounds that they were wanting in intrinsic value, and were too easily counterfeited. They decided, therefore, on a coinage of English copper—¹ of the intrinsic value', but instead of their giving this work to the Mint, a contract was made with Sir Joseph Herne, Sir Francis Parry, George Clark, Abel Slaney, and Daniel Barton for the coining of halfpennies and farthings to a total of 700 tons spread over seven years, from midsummer 1694. The main conditions of this contract were:

1. The coins should be of 'best English copper, rolled and milled'.
2. They should be struck at the rate of 21d. to the lb. of metal.
3. The blanks should be 'struck at the Mint'.
4. The contractors were to accept up to £200 worth of tin farthings a week in exchange for their new coins, and melt down the tin ones within 14 days.²

Almost exactly six months after the start of this coinage the queen died. The next issue, bearing William III's head only, continued to be produced under the same contract. In January 1695/6 complaints were made that the coins were being made of base copper and that they were light in weight. It was also alleged that the contractors were using cast instead of rolled and cut blanks, and further that they were refusing or tediously delaying the exchange of the tin coins. Early in 1698 a petition from various tradesmen in the Borough of Southwark was read before the House, complaining that the patentees had issued extravagant quantities of copper coin, and requesting that their coining should be stopped. A committee set up to investigate this and other charges, reported that although only 460 tons of the original contract for 700 tons had been coined, there was undoubtedly a glut of copper coin, especially in and around London, and in consequence a stop was put to the striking of any more copper for one year, commencing 24 June 1698.

The coins produced under this contract, especially the William III pieces, are noticeably inferior to those of Charles II, but this was not because of any falling off in the quality of the master dies—the proof pieces confirm this: it was undoubtedly the contractors, using slipshod methods of production, and with maximum profits as their main object, who were really to blame. As Craig points out, they even got their working dies made (very badly) at low rates by the out-of-work moneymen at the Mint, who then struck the blanks as their agents instead of as principals,³ and, despite the stipulation that the blanks should be rolled and cut, many of the coins were struck on cast blanks, which explains the frequently pitted surfaces of so many of the surviving specimens.

At the commencement of Anne's reign it was found that the excessive issues

¹ Craig, The Mint, p. 175.
² Snelling (iii), p. 39.
³ Craig, The Mint, p. 182.
of copper coin between 1695 and 1701 (the year of expiry of the original contract) had amounted to the very considerable sum of £137,200. It was therefore judged that there would be ample copper in circulation for several years: it was not in fact until late in 1712 that a further issue was found necessary.

Most of what happened in connexion with the proposed copper coinage of Queen Anne was due to Isaac Newton who had been promoted to the post of Master of the Mint in December 1699. Knowing all and doubtless very much more than has been outlined above about the difficulties of coining in copper, Newton set his inquiring mind to improve matters. That, in the end, he completely failed was certainly not through lack of perseverance; the truth is he and the Mint still knew little about assaying copper or testing it for impurities. During Anne's reign the suitability of copper for coinage purposes was decided solely by the 'hammer test', i.e. that the metal when heated red hot and hammered thin should not split. It is but fair to Newton to add that the metalurgy of copper advanced so slowly that this test was still in use at the Mint as late as 1860.¹

Briefly, Newton's plans were, (1) that the new coins should contain their intrinsic value of pure copper less only the cost of making and issuing them, (2) that the entire process of coining should be undertaken by the Mint from ingots of the raw metal, instead of purchasing ready-made blanks as previously, and (3) that in future the quantity of coin issued should be directly related to estimated requirements. By so doing, Newton hoped to provide better quality coins at a lower cost, and also prevent any recurrence of the glut that had been complained of during the previous reign.

Unfortunately these plans came to nothing, for, as Craig explains in considerable detail,² Newton's decision that the copper should be as pure as possible and therefore free from the desirable addition of a trace of tin to facilitate rolling, coupled with the inability of the Mint mills to reduce the castings to the required thickness, defeated all attempts to produce coins which would withstand the hammer test. It may well be asked why these Anne pieces, which are generally acknowledged to be among the most attractive in the copper series, should have been turned down merely because they failed to pass this test. The answer is, of course, that the hammer test was and continued for many years to be the only criterion of purity known to the Mint and to the trade generally. The whole question of purity was inextricably bound up with the false, over-riding insistence on intrinsic value; hence, however fine their appearance, the slightest suspicion that the coins were of impure metal would have been quickly exposed by interested parties in the copper trade, as in fact they were in this instance, for the Treasury invited an outside authority, James Bertie, to inspect some of Newton's latest trial pieces. He at once pronounced them to be of 'coarse copper', and declared that he could make them from pure copper more cheaply. When put to the test Newton's coins did, in fact, crack and all plans for issuing copper for circulation were abandoned.

Many collectors believe that the more-commonly-met-with farthing dated 1714 (Pl. XII, 17) was actually issued for circulation, but Sir John Craig, who

¹ Craig, The Mint, p. 220.
² Id. Newton, pp. 95-98.
had access to the latest relevant records, states emphatically that—"Queen Anne's farthings, at one time priced above rubies by common report, and her double-headed halfpence, were but strays from these experiments. No copper coin was issued in England under Anne."

By April 1717, i.e. nearly three years after Anne's death, the public demand for more copper coin had become too insistent to permit any further delay in experimenting with raw copper, and Newton, no doubt very reluctantly, had to admit defeat and place a contract outside the Mint for a supply of copper fillets, rolled to the required thickness, ready for cutting into blanks on which to strike the first issues of George I.

To sum up: it has been shown that from the very commencement of copper coining in 1672 the Mint was quite unable to cope with all the processes involved in coining from the raw ingot, and that during the period 1694–1701 little or no progress can have been made in this matter, as copper coining was taken away from the Mint and given to second-rate contractors whose main purpose seems to have been profit rather than quality of output. A further span of twelve years following Anne's accession again saw no advance in technique, for although Newton was in office all this time, the excessive issues during the previous reign had left ample copper in circulation, hence the opportunity and incentive for further research were largely lacking until the fresh demand for copper coin arose in 1712.

With this short account of the various factors and events which retarded our first essays in coining copper, we are in a better position to consider two important statements concerning the Anne patterns and also several pertinent facts that have emerged from an examination of a large number of specimens, all of which must be reconciled before any worth-while classification can be drawn up.

1. Craig's authoritative statement that these patterns were merely strays from Newton's experiments to produce satisfactory coins from pure copper.
2. The existence of these patterns—especially the farthings—in metals other than copper, in quantities which seem hardly consistent with the Mint's preoccupation with these experiments.
3. The fact that all the farthings on the medium and small-size flans occur only in copper, and always have the edge plain, whereas all those in gold, silver, and tin occur only on the large-diameter flans, and have the edge either striated or clumsily filed.
4. The occurrence of certain die-pairings of both denominations in copper and silver, and a few (farthings) in gold, all struck from rusted dies.
5. Snelling's statement that the halfpenny dies 'afterwards came into the hands..."
of Mr. Bush of the ordnance office in the Tower, who had several of them struck off, until Mr. Arundel by warrant, ordered the dyes to be destroyed. Snelling gives no authority for this, but as he is usually very reliable on historical matters relating to the coinage, there seems no reason to question it. It is extraordinary, however, that the Anne halfpennies appear never to have been examined in the light of this information. Montagu, it is true, borrowed the story from Snelling, and elaborated a little upon it, but without suggesting how the restrikes might be recognized. As the Hon. Richard Arundell’s tenure of office as Master of the Mint was 1737 to 1745 (not 1733 to 1740, as stated by Montagu, p. 81), the latest possible date for these restrikes is 1745.

**Anne Pattern Halfpennies**

*(a) Trial halfpennies with small bust on both sides (Pl. XI, 1 to 4)*

Although usually listed as patterns, these were obviously experimental pieces and are perhaps better described as trial strikings of a pattern halfpenny obverse for which no reverse die was made. Four different working dies are distinguishable but the same portrait punch was used for all. Their flans often show small fissures in their surfaces and a tendency to split at the edge, which is quite consistent with Craig’s account of the difficulties experienced with the copper at this time.

It is pertinent to wonder why, when the Mint was apparently somewhat harassed by their continual failure to produce pieces which would pass the hammer test, they should have gone out of their way to edge some of these pieces with the **DECVS • ET • TVTAMEN** inscription, so badly put on that the lettering usually overlaps at two points. This overlapping was doubtless due to their having used the half-crown Castaing edging machine which would be too long for the smaller diameter of the copper coin by about seven or eight letter spaces. This slipshod method of edging and the fact that the **DECVS** inscription was never intended for the copper issues seem rather suspicious and suggest the possibility that this edge might have been put on later during the restriking period, say in 1739, the 12th regnal year of George II. As, however, no George II DVODECIMO half-crowns appear to occur with crosses in their edge reading as they do for Anne, it is practically certain that these halfpennies were officially edged during Anne’s reign with the 1713 half-crown inscription, **DECVS • ET • TVTAMEN • ANNO • REGNI • DVODECIMO • * • * •**, but it is odd that no specimen showing even a trace of the final O of **DVODECIMO** has yet been found. It would appear from the specimens examined that the flan was sometimes rolled one complete revolution in the machine and then removed, with the result that the last few letters and the crosses were omitted. In other cases, the rolling must have been interrupted once or twice, the flan being loosened and turned back a little each time, thus causing an overlap of some of the letters, but enabling the tail end of the legend and crosses to appear. It is extremely unlikely, therefore, that any two of these edge-readings will be identical, and obviously no specimen bearing the complete inscription can possibly exist.

1 Snelling, (iii), p. 42.
The following double obverse halfpenny trial pieces occur:

1. **Obv. ANNA • DEI • GRATIA** • Bust to left, in rather high relief, the hair bound on top of the head with a string of pearls, the two ends of which hang from the bun behind. Toothed border (often defective).
   
   ‘Rev.’ As the *obv.*, but the legend is differently spaced, e.g. ANNA and DEI are farther apart.
   
   **Dia.**: about 28.5 mm.
   
   **Edge.** DECVS • ET • TVTAMEN • ANNO • REGNI • DVODECIMO • • (Inscription never complete, and always bungled; some words overlap adjacent ones, and one or both crosses are often missing).

2. **Obv. ANNA • DEI • GRATIA** • (stops weak). Similar to *obv.* and ‘rev.’ of 1 but from a different die from either, the I of DEI being much closer to the head.
   
   ‘Rev.’ Similar to the *obv.*, and to the *obv.* and ‘rev.’ of 1, but differing from all three in that the legend starts below the tip of the drapery.
   
   **Dia.**: 29 to 29.5 mm.
   
   **Edge.** DECVS • ET • TVTAMEN, &c. as before, and the same remarks apply.

3. **Obv.** and ‘rev.’ Bust as before on both sides; no legends.
   
   **Edge.** plain. ‘Rev.’ ↓

4. **Obv. ANNA • AVGVSTA** • Bust as before.
   
   ‘Rev.’ As the *obv.*, but the lettering differently spaced.

---

(b) **Pattern halfpennies with large bust (Pl. XI, 5 to 12)**

Three *obvs.* are distinguishable, each with the bust from the same master punch. The portrait, although much larger than the previous one, is in much lower relief, resembling that on the silver coins. It faces to left, with the hair in wavy curls, but is unornamented except for two short ends of riband projecting high up behind the head.
Obv. 1. **ANNA D G MAG BR FR ET HIB REG** (very faint traces of punctuation marks are sometimes discernible). Details as follows:

1. The N's each have a serif at the base of the right limb.
2. The tail of the R in BR is partly covered by the hair.
3. The letters FR ET are usually weakly struck up and most of the other letters are rather ragged.  

* (Pl. XI, 5)

Obv. 1*. From the die of Obv. 1 after it had become rusted. Numerous rust spots occur in the field in front of the face, and especially on and in front of the breast. Another patch occurs below THI.  

* (Pl. XI, 12)

Obv. 2. **ANNA • D : G • MAG : BR • FR : ET • HIB : REG :** From a new die:

1. The N's have no serif at the base of the right limb.
2. The tail of the R in BR is almost clear of the hair.
3. The legend is differently spaced, the ends being slightly closer to the drapery. All the letters are perfect and well struck up, as also are the stops, except the last two colons which are often weak.
4. There is no trace of rust-marks.  

* (Pl. XI, 8)

The following halfpenny revs. occur, all without legend or date:

* Rev. A. Britannia seated to left on a globe; a crown above. The figure is draped in long, flowing robes, but the right leg is bare. In her extended right hand she holds a *rose and thistle* united on a single stem. In her left hand which rests on an ornamented oval shield bearing the combined crosses of St. George and St. Andrew, she clasps a spear. Quadruple exergue line; toothed border.  

* (Pl. XI, 5)

* Rev. B. A rose with 4 leaves and a thistle with 2 leaves, united on a single stem. A crown above. Toothed border.  

* (Pl. XI, 6)

* Rev. C. Britannia seated; a crown above, exactly as Rev. A except that she now holds a *spray of olive leaves*.  

* (Pl. XI, 7)

* Rev. D. A rose with 8 leaves and a thistle with 2 leaves, united on a single stem. No crown above. Toothed border.  

* (Pl. XI, 7)

These four revs. also occur struck from the same dies after they had become slightly rusted, as follows:

* Rev. A*. From a rusted die of Rev. A. Rust patches are visible:

1. In the left half of the field, especially around the rose and thistle.
2. To right of the spear head.
3. In the right hand corner of the exergue.  

* (Pl. XI, 8)

* Rev. B*. From a rusted die of Rev. B. Rust patches are visible in the field, mainly:

1. Below the larger thistle leaf.
2. Near the tip of the upper thistle leaf.
3. Between the rose and the middle leaf below it.  

* (Pl. XI, 9)
Rev. C*. From a rusted die of Rev. C. Faint rust marks are visible in the field, especially:
1. Between the spear and the crown.
2. To left of the crown.
3. To right of the shield.
4. To the extreme left of the olive spray. (Pl. XI, 10)

Rev. C**. From the die of Rev. C* after most of the rust had been polished away. The little that remains can be faintly discerned:
1. Close to the three lowest olive leaves on the right of the spray.
2. Just above the outstretched arm and in front of the face. (Pl. XI, 12)

Rev. D*. From a rusted die of Rev. D. Rust spots are visible chiefly:
1. Between the lower rose leaves and the main stem of the rose.
2. Near the border, below the point of the stem.
3. Above both the rose and the thistle, near the border. (Pl. XI, 11)

In arranging the various die-pairings it is first necessary to decide which of the pieces were the early, original strikings, i.e. products of Newton's experiments. By analogy with the farthings of group 1 it is fairly certain that these comprise only the rustless, plain-edge copper pieces combining Obv. 1 with Revs. A and B (i.e. 5 and 6).

Obviously no classification can be accepted which fails to account for the pieces struck from rusted dies and for the restrikes mentioned by Snelling. At first it seemed not unreasonable to explain both these by linking them together and concluding that all the halfpennies struck from rusted dies were restrikes, on the grounds that any Anne dies re-used in the middle of George II's reign would, by that time, almost certainly have become rusted. But this explanation does not fit all the facts, for despite their slightly rusted revs., the pieces in question (8 to 11) are the finest in appearance of all the Anne half-pennies, with obvs. from the same rustless and obviously little-used die which, it is very important to note, never occurs paired with any other than the four revs. A*, B*, C*, and D*.

It follows that if these pieces are to be accepted as restrikes, this obv. die must either (1) have been made during Anne's reign and remained in the Mint practically unused and in almost pristine condition until Bush got hold of it some twenty-five to thirty years later or (2) it must have been specially made for Bush from the master portrait punch, with new lettering added in extremely close imitation of the original. The first alternative is highly improbable; the second is quite unthinkable, for this restriking by Bush was an illicit undertaking, doubtless carried out in great secrecy with the help of inexperienced Mint underlings, quite incapable of making such a splendid die even had the master punch been accessible to them.

It is much more probable that these pieces were struck during the last year of Anne's reign or possibly very early in George I's reign, and that they constitute an official set of pièces de plaisir analogous to the group of farthings, 19 to 21. The correspondence between the two sets is certainly remarkable: both occur in silver and copper only; both sets were struck from specially prepared obv. dies for which a slightly different style of lettering was used—
note the N’s without serif at the base of the right limb. Lastly, all have the finely striated edges characteristic of Mint proofs. All this is far too convincing to be disregarded on the grounds that the use of rusted dies would not have been allowed for striking specimen pieces, for actually most of the rust marks are so slight that they detract very little from the fine overall appearance of these revs.

The fact that of the four original rev. dies only Revs. A and B were used for Newton’s tests suggests that they proved unsuitable and were soon discarded—hence the early rusting. It looks very much as if most of Newton’s trials were made with the small bust dies. Whether dies C and D were made at the same time as A and B, or a little later, it is impossible to say, but they certainly have not yet been found paired with Obv. 1, hence neither was used for the copper-striking experiments. The occurrence, however, of revs. C and D paired together in silver and copper (group 2) is understandable, for they were no doubt made as specimen strikings of these two hitherto unused, alternative revs. before the dies were set aside, also as unsuitable, and left to rust.

There now remains only one piece to account for, viz. 12, with the obv. from a rusted die of Obv. 1 (i.e. Obv. 1*) paired with the rusted and repolished Rev. C**. Considering the rusted state of the obv. and the poor quality of these pieces, it is practically certain that these were the restrikes made by Bush, but in view of Snelling’s remarks it is strange that no other restruck halfpennies appear to exist. However, his statement is not very explicit; it does not necessarily follow that because the halfpenny dies ‘afterwards came into the hands of Mr. Bush’, they were all in usable condition, and the expression that ‘several of them’ were struck off might well mean that several halfpennies from only one pair of dies were actually made. As there are at present no other pieces known which seem likely to be restrikes, it is futile to speculate further as to the precise meaning of Snelling’s words.

The following ‘large head’ Anne pattern halfpennies occur. All are on 28.5 mm. flans and have the rev. ↓, except 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1. Comprising the original strikings, presumably products of Newton’s experiments. These, as would be expected, are from rust-free dies, rather poorly struck, and have plain edges.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2. Comprising the only known contemporary strikings of Revs. C and D from rustless dies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Hunterian Collection; probably unique. Obviously a proof, used perhaps as a control during the trials.
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This is Montagu 8 = Christmas 17. No trace or even a record of any of the halfpenny reverse mules listed by Montagu (7, 9, and 10) has been found, and it now seems that if they ever existed they have long since been lost or destroyed. Montagu listed them without having seen any specimens, and, doubting their existence, he quoted Christmas, who in turn appears to have copied Snelling. None appeared in the Christmas sale and it is significant that none occurs in the Hunterian collection.

Group 3. Halfpennies combining Obv. 2 with the four rusted revs. A* to D*. These are specimen pieces, analogous to the farthings of Group 2, struck from a new obv. die with the lettering and stops much more sharply rendered, and with the N's without any serif at the base of the right limb.

8

Obv. 2±Rev. A*. Edge, striated.
S
C

The last two colons are usually weak.

9

Obv. 2±Rev. B*. Edge, striated.
S
C

The last two colons are usually well struck up. Copper specimens bronzed over at a later date have been seen.

10

Obv. 2±Rev. C*. Edge, striated.
S
C

The last two colons are usually weak.

11

Obv. 2±Rev. D*. Edge, striated.
S
C

The last two colons are usually weak.

Group 4. Comprising a single die-pairing, with rusted obv. This is probably a restrike made by Bush sometime between 1737 and 1745.

12

Obv. 1*±Rev. C**. Edge, plain.
C

Anne pattern farthings

The queen's portrait on the farthings very closely resembles, on a smaller scale, that on the double-headed halfpennies, with the hair bound on top with a string of pearls, the two ends of which hang from the bun behind. The bust, with the legend around, is enclosed within a broad outer toothed border,¹

¹ This is only complete on the large-size flans.
immediately within which there is usually a raised linear circle. Two slightly different busts occur, but both were obviously derived from the same master portrait punch.\(^1\) The two varieties of bust are distinguishable by a slight difference in the shape of the pointed end of drapery farthest from the first A of ANNA. Bust A (Pl. XII, 13, and 18 to 24) occurs only on Obvs. 1, 3, and 4; Bust B (Pl. XII, 14 to 17, and 25) occurs only on Obvs. 2 and 5.

The following obverses occur:\(^2\)

**Obv. 1 (Bust A). ANNA • DEI • GRATIA •**

1. No linear circle between toothed border and legend.
2. The G is disproportionately large and has a slight backward tilt.
3. The N's each have a curved serif at the base of the right limb.\(^3\) *(Pl. XII, 13)*

**Obv. 2 (Bust B). ANNA • DEI • GRATIA •**

As Obv. 1, but:

1. With linear circle between toothed border and legend.
2. The G is normal in size and position.
3. The letters AT are quite separate (cf. Obv. 4). *(Pl. XII, 14)*

**Obv. 3 (Bust A). ANNA • REGINA •**

1. With linear circle between toothed border and legend.
2. The N's have serif, as before.
3. The G is usually weak or broken at the top. *(Pl. XII, 18)*

**Obv. 4 (Bust A). ANNA • DEI • GRATIA •**

As Obv. 2, except that:

1. The N's have no serif at the base of the right limb.
2. The letters AT are joined by their base serifs.
3. The tiny wisp of hair immediately above the brow is almost worn away. *(Pl. XII, 19)*

**Obv. 4*. From the die of Obv. 4, after it had become rusted across the throat and chin. These rust marks appear as a faint, irregular, raised pattern. *(Pl. XII, 22)*

**Obv. 5 (Bust B). ANNA AVGVSTA (no stops)**

No linear circle between toothed border and legend. *(Pl. XII, 25)*

The following reverses occur:

**Rev. A. BRITANNIA • 1713 •**

Britannia in flowing robes, seated to left on a globe, her right leg bare. By her left side is an ornamented oval shield bearing the combined crosses of St. George and St. Andrew. In her raised right hand she holds a spray of olive leaves. Her left arm, resting on the shield, supports a long spear, the blade of

\(^1\) When these differences were first noticed, it seemed likely that they might provide some important clue to the elucidation of these pieces, but this has not proved to be the case. They are mentioned here merely as observed facts.

\(^2\) Excluding the BELLO • ET • PACE • piece, which is described separately later.

\(^3\) This serif could perhaps be more accurately described as a curved extension to the cross-bar of the N, which is of rather unusual style.
which intrudes slightly between I and A. Exergue line, double. Legend, followed by the date, around. All within a plain, raised, linear circle and an outer toothed border. (Pl. XII, 13)

Rev. B. BRITANNIA • 1713 •

Identical with Rev. A, except that the linear circle is slightly thicker, so that it now touches the tops of several of the letters. When paired with Obv. 4*, this rev. sometimes has a flaw on the toothed border, opposite AN. (Pl. XII, 14, 19)

Rev. C. BRITANNIA • 1713 • Similar to Rev. A, but:
1. The linear circle is ornamented on the inside with square teeth.
2. There are two tassels attached to the spear, just below the blade.
3. The exergue line is triple.
4. The legend is in smaller letters. (Pl. XII, 15)

Rev. D. BRITANNIA.

Britannia as on Rev. A, but seated within a portico or niche, the whole resting on a single exergue line. The date, 1713, below. Legend around, interrupted between the N's by the top of the portico. All within a plain, raised, linear circle and an outer toothed border.

All the thirty specimens examined with this rev. had a large raised flaw fouling the stop, and a smaller flaw near the base of the right pillar. When paired with Obv. 4*, this rev. usually has another flaw on the toothed border, above the portico. (Pl. XII, 16, 20)

Rev. E. BRITANNIA.

Britannia in clinging drapery, seated to left on a globe. The date, 1714, in the exergue. All within a plain, raised, linear circle, and an outer toothed border. This rev. differs considerably in the treatment of the figure, as compared with Rev. A, e.g.:
1. The figure is more slender and more gracefully draped: the right leg is now covered.
2. The scroll ornamentation on the shield is less elaborate.
3. The right forearm is held out almost horizontally, and the spray contains more leaves.
4. The left hand is now raised, and grasps the spear close to the blade, the tip of which touches the linear circle.
5. The date is now in the exergue.
6. The legend is widely separated between the N's by the head and the spear arm. (Pl. XII, 17)

Rev. F. BRITANNIA.

Similar to Rev. E, but differing from it as follows:
1. The lettering is more slender, and the N's have no serif at the base of the right limb.
2. The fold of drapery to right of the upper scroll on the shield extends farther into the field, its upper edge lying roughly parallel to the exergue line.

3. The first figure of the date—1714—slopes slightly forward, and there is more space between it and the 7.

This rev. seems to have been made specially for striking the specimen pieces of group 2, as it only occurs with Obvs. 4 and 4*. When paired with the latter it shows a flaw on the border opposite BRI, and traces of rust marks are discernible on the shield and globe. (Pl. XII, 21)

Rev. G. PAX • MISSA • PER • ORBEM

Peace standing in a two-horsed chariot or biga, driving at a gallop to right. In her right hand she holds an olive branch, and in her left the reins and a spear. The date, 1713, below a double exergue line. All within a broad toothed border. The three stops are usually rather weak, especially the middle one. (Pl. XII, 25)

It has already been explained that the Mint, in their efforts to produce satisfactory coins, used copper blanks of varying thickness and diameter. This is especially evident in the case of the farthings, which show a variation in diameter from 21.5 to 24.5 mm., and in edge thickness from about 1 to 2 mm. It was soon realized that the classification of the farthings was to a considerable degree dependent on the recognition of three main ranges of flan diameter. Rather surprisingly, their weights also show much variation, ranging from about 63 to 95 gr., or even more. Bearing in mind that the object of the trials was to produce coins suitable for circulation, presumably at about 21d. to the lb. (i.e. 83.3 gr.), it is strange that the weight was allowed to deviate so widely from the standard.

The majority of the farthings fall quite easily into an arrangement comparable with the halfpennies. Thus all those which occur only in copper with plain edge and nearly always on the medium and small size flans (group 1) are almost certainly the experimental pieces corresponding to the group 1 halfpennies.

Next come three pièces de plaisir (group 2), struck only on the large-size flans with striated edges, in silver and copper from a new obv. die on which the N's have no serif at the base of the right limb, exactly comparable with the halfpennies of group 3. The next three die-pairings (group 3) each occur in gold, silver, and copper, all on the large-size flans, and have their edges or rims usually coarsely filed. These three constitute a set which duplicates the specimen set (group 2), except for two important differences: (1) they are all struck from a rusted Obv. 4 die (i.e. Obv. 4*), and (2) their revs. are usually flawed and/or slightly rusted. This is strong presumptive evidence for believing they are restrikes, and—despite Snelling's implication that only the half-pennies were restra—were very probably made by Bush. There now remain only the PAX MISSA farthings: these constitute group 4 and are fully discussed under that heading.

The following Anne pattern farthings occur, many of them on two and sometimes three different sizes of flan:
Small (21.5 to 22.5 mm.); medium (23 mm.); large (23.5 to 24.5 mm.). Flan thickness is recorded as:

-Thin, if under 1.25 mm., or thick, if over 1.75 mm.

Group 1. Farthings combining Obvs. 1, 2, and 3 with Revs. A to E.

These occur only in copper with plain, unfiled edges, and are almost invariably on the small- or medium-size flans. The small wisp of hair immediately above the brow is well struck up, but the stops in the obv. legends are usually weak or virtually missing, apparently because they were too small and not sunk sufficiently deep in the dies to yield good impressions. These relatively unspectacular plain-edge copper pieces are almost certainly the genuine experimental strikings, but the following arrangement does not pretend to list them in the exact order in which they were produced. To do this would be difficult, if not impossible, for little can be deduced from the dates, and still less from the obvs., as dies bearing busts A and B were both used for both years, hence all three obvs. were probably used and re-used indiscriminately.

Obv. 1+Rev. A (1713)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Copper—small flan BM, P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Copper—medium flan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Copper—large flan P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Copper — (2.25 mm. thick)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forgeries cast in silver, brass, and copper occur on small and medium flans. No genuine silver or brass pieces are believed to exist.

Obv. 2+Rev. B (1713)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Copper—small flan A, P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obv. 2+Rev. C (1713)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Copper—small flan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Copper—medium flan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Brass— &quot; P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obv. 2+Rev. D (1713)

Four specimens examined; all were rather poorly struck

Obv. 2+Rev. E (1714)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Copper—small flan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Copper—large flan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cast copper forgeries on both sizes of flan are very common. Rather deceptive small flan silver casts also occur.

1 Patterns 13 c, 13 d, and 17 b provide the inevitable exceptions, which in no way invalidate the main conclusions. As already stated, 17 was most probably the die pairing intended for circulation, hence specimens were also struck on the large flans for comparison (17 b). No. 13 d (author's specimen, 121.7 gr.) is obviously abnormal. The two strikings in brass, 15 c and 18 b, were doubtless connected in some way with the experiments.

2 From the writer's experience of over 140 specimens of this group, it is practically certain that no genuine varieties occur struck from dies bearing no stops.
Group 2. Farthings combining Obv. 4 with Revs. B, D, and F.

These occur only in silver and copper and always on the large-size flans with striated edge. The wisp of hair above the brow is almost worn away, hence these pieces must have been struck after group 1. They are all flawless and rustless and usually well struck from a new obv. die, for which a slightly different style of lettering was used; note the N’s without serif at the base of the right limb, and the well marked, larger stops. These are pièces de plaisir corresponding to the halfpennies of group 3. The large blanks were doubtless used to give full effect to the broad toothed borders on the dies.

Group 3. Farthings combining Obv. 4* with Revs. B, D, and F, usually in a flawed or slightly rusted condition. They occur in gold, silver, and copper, but only on the large-size flans, with their edges or rims usually coarsely filed. It is practically certain that these are restrikes made by Bush.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. 3 + Rev. E (1714)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copper—small flan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass—*, P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper—medium flan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pl. XII, 18)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. 4 + Rev. B (1713)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver—large, thin flan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pl. XII, 19)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. 4 + Rev. D (1713)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver—large, thin flan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper—large flan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pl. XII, 20)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. 4 + Rev. F (1714)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver—large, thin flan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper—large flan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pl. XII, 21)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. 4* + Rev. B (1713)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold—large, thin flan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver—*, BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper—*,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pl. XII, 22)

A flaw, which in its later stages is very conspicuous, sometimes occurs across the toothed border of the rev., opposite AN. Other specimens show no trace of this flaw, probably because it only developed on the die after a number of these restrikes had been made. However, flaw or no flaw, the rusted obv. is fairly conclusive proof of restriking.

---

1 That is to say, the portrait punch had become weakened at this point by the time it came to be used for making the Obv. 4 working die.
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Obv. 4* + Rev. D (1713)

a Gold—large, thin flan BM (two specimens) (Pl. XII, 23)
b Silver—
c Copper—

The revs. almost invariably have a flaw on the toothed border above the portico. This first becomes noticeable as a thin raised line, which ultimately develops into a long and very conspicuous raised lump across the border. The heavier of the two gold specimens in the British Museum and the recorded copper piece both have this flaw in its later stage. Only one specimen (in silver, Hunter coll.) has yet been found without this flaw, which probably developed quite rapidly, causing the die to break after only a few restrikes had been made—hence the rarity of these pieces in all metals.

Obv. 4* + Rev. F (1714)

a Gold—large, thin flan BM, HM (Pl. XII, 24)
b Silver—
c Silver—large flan BM
d Copper—

These revs. show minute rust patterns on the globe and in the sunken border round the left side of the shield. Also, on the outer edge of the toothed border, opposite BRI, there is a long flaw which on some specimens has been filed down, giving the rim a flattened appearance at this point.

Group 4. Farthings combining Obv. 5 (AVGVSTA) with Rev. G (PAX MISSA). These exist in gold, silver, copper, and tin, and, like those of group 3, are restricted to the large-size flans, with the edge and/or rims often coarsely filed. The wisp of hair is well struck up, possibly because of retouching, as it is not quite identical with that on the portraits of group 1.

According to Montagu,¹ this farthing ‘was indisputably struck in several metals from Croker’s dies in the reign of George II’, and although he quotes no authority for this statement, it may well be correct, or at any rate partly so, for there are several puzzling facts which tend to isolate these pieces from all the others, e.g.

1. No specimens have yet been found on the medium or small size, plain-edge copper flans which characterize the experimental strikings of group 1.
2. Neither dies appear to have been muled with any of the other farthing dies.

¹ See ‘Queen Anne’s so-called “Bello et Pace” Farthing’, Num. Chron. 1887, p. 154.
3. Although both dies are rust-free and of excellent workmanship, many of the thirty-seven specimens examined were very carelessly struck¹ and sometimes double-struck, probably with heavily burred edges, judging by the rough filing marks which disfigure some of their rims. Specimens on thick and thin flans, as recorded below, are readily distinguishable as such, but others occur which are difficult to classify, as their thickness varies appreciably along different sections of the circumference.

4. The use of the title Augusta and the omission of DEI GRATIA must not escape notice, especially the latter, as this occurs on all the other farthings, and in view of the decidedly unorthodox rev. design, which is generally associated with the Peace of Utrecht, the possibility cannot be ruled out that these pieces are just medalets commemorating that event, in which case the date (1713) does not necessarily indicate the year in which they were struck.

These facts and uncertainties are alone sufficient to show that the PAX MISSA pieces are somewhat suspect, both as regards their purpose and their time of origin, but it is doubtful if a strong enough case can be made out for completely dissociating them from the other farthings, especially as they have one definite link with those of group 1: it will be found that those letters on the obv. of group 1, which also occur in the obv. and rev. legends of the PAX MISSA pieces, viz. A, N, G, T, I, E, R, are all from the same punches, the curiously shaped G in particular being unmistakable.

It seems impossible, at present, to make any definite statement as to the true status of these pieces, but in view of the poor quality of many of the specimens it is highly probable—whatever they are—that the dies were used for restriking along with the others, with which they are obviously linked. Judging by the pieces examined, the thick-flan silver and tin pieces are probably originals, whereas the BM gold specimen and many of the badly struck examples on the thin silver and copper flans may well be restrikes.

25 Obv. 5+Rev. G (1713)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Gold—large, thin flan BM (Pl. XII, 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Silver—&quot; thick &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Silver—&quot; thin &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Copper—&quot; thick &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Copper—&quot; thin &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Tin—&quot; thick &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 The Bello et Pace farthing, 1713.

Obv. ANNA : DEI • GRATIA • (incuse)

Draped bust to left within an oval marked by double lines, and surrounded by a broad, slightly raised rim, bearing the legend and an ornamental scroll below. Toothed border.

¹ Including the gold piece in the British Museum.
Britannia, helmeted, standing facing, within an oval marked by double lines. In her right hand she holds an olive branch, and in her left, a spear with the butt resting on the exergue line. The date, 1713, below. The whole surrounded by a raised rim bearing the legend. Toothed border.

*Edge*—plain. *Dia.*: 24 mm.

_Copper_ (Pl. XII, 26)

This piece, only four specimens of which are known, has long been a subject of controversy for it is considered by some authorities to be a pattern for a farthing, and by others to be merely a medalet or jetton.

Montagu listed it in the first (1885) edition of his book as a pattern (M. 16), but in 1887, doubting the correctness of this, he investigated the matter more thoroughly and published his reasons for believing it was nothing more than a privately issued medalet commemorating the Peace of Utrecht. His revised opinion was based mainly on the following arguments:

1. That these pieces were struck from such carelessly engraved and somewhat worn dies that it was quite impossible to associate them with the work of Croker.
2. That the issue of a piece 'of so worthless a design and of such base metal' by the Mint was highly improbable in view of the relative perfection of the rest of Anne's coins in all metals.
3. That the submission of such 'a wretched production', even as a private pattern, could only have invited its instant rejection.
4. That neither Martin-Leake (1745) nor Snelling (1766) mentioned these pieces, and William Till, noting their inferior execution, expressed his doubts that they could have emanated from the Mint.
5. That no question of their being anything other than medalets or jettons would ever have arisen but for the fact that they happen to be of about the size and weight of a farthing, and that the *obv.* bears the inscription _ANNA DEI GRATIA_, as on most of the official patterns.
6. Montagu then pointed out that certain medals of artistic value, particularly coronation medals, are not uncommon, but badly executed medalets or jettons, evidently cheap copies of these and contemporaneously issued for sale in the streets, are more or less rare. He considered this *Bello et Pace* piece to be one of these and that its rarity 'was caused entirely by its common and worthless character, which had the effect of its not being thought worthy of preservation and of being handed down to posterity, as was the case with the more artistic medals'. He then pressed this argument still further by drawing attention to several medals issued in 1713, commemorating the Peace of Utrecht. One of these is as follows:

*Obv.* Bust of the queen (by Croker)

*Rev.* Britannia, helmeted, standing facing and holding an olive branch

---

1 BM., HM., F. Brooks, and P.  
and spear. On one side of her are ships; on the other, men ploughing and sowing. Legend: **BELLO • ET • PACE** • and in the exergue **ANNO • MDCCXIII • PAX • RESTITVTA** • (by Samuel Bull).

The similarity of this rev. to that of the farthing is admittedly too evident to be ignored, for as Montagu observed—'Here we have the very device and the very inscription of our own piece; and what is more natural than that a third variety of still smaller size should have been struck, particularly having regard to the tendency of the times before referred to in connection with the issue of inferior copies of interesting medals for sale in the streets?' He then concludes—'On the whole, therefore, it appears to me to be certain that our piece, considered to be our rarest Queen Anne's farthing, must yield its place under that head and must be relegated to the more ordinary class of medalets or jettons'.

His conclusion that it was not an official pattern is, in the writer's opinion, correct, but it is hard to believe that it is only a medalet. It is practically certain that the standing figure of Britannia was copied from the medal, but it does not necessarily follow, because of this, that the small pieces are also medals. It is conceivable that a private die-sinker may have considered that a change from the customary seated figure might prove more acceptable as the design for the farthing; after all, Pingo tried the same idea in 1788, and a similar design was actually used for the florins of Edward VII.

There are reasonable grounds, therefore, for believing that the Bello et Pace piece may have been a privately produced pattern; in fact, one of Montagu's own arguments (3) brought him nearer to this same conclusion than he seems to have realized. The mere fact that its poor workmanship would probably 'have invited its instant rejection' is irrelevant, for numerous private patterns had proved unacceptable in the past, and many more were to be refused in later years, but we do not in consequence dub them medalets.

Locations have only been given for the rarest pieces: one location = the only specimen known to the writer; two locations = the only two known. No reference indicates that at least three (usually more) specimens have been examined. Pedigree records of five more farthings in gold have been found, but as the actual pieces have not been traced it is obviously impossible to include them in this paper, although the writer feels confident in predicting that when these pieces eventually turn up, they will be found to duplicate the gold die-pairings already recorded.

I am indebted to the British Museum, the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow, J. M. Ashby, Esq., and Dr. E. A. Johnstone for allowing me to examine and quote coins in their collections. The following code has been used: **BM** = British Museum; **HM** = Hunterian Museum; **A** = J. M. Ashby; **J** = Dr. E. A. Johnstone; **P** = C. W. Peck; **Pa** = H. A. Parsons.

The two plates illustrate every known die-pairing of both denominations. All the pieces reproduced on Pl. XI are in copper, except nos. 3 and 4, and all are BM specimens, except nos. 1, 2, and the rev. of 5, which are in the
writer's collection. Of the farthings on Pl. XII no. 13 (in copper) and nos. 22 to 25 (in gold) are from specimens in the BM; the remainder, nos. 14 to 21, and 26 are in the writer's collection, 19 to 21 being in silver and the rest in copper.
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