THE PENCE, HALF-PENCE AND FARTHINGS OF RICHARD II, OF THE MINTS OF LONDON, YORK AND DURHAM

FRANK PURVEY

INTRODUCTION

The reign of Richard II is one of the few since the Conquest which has not completely received modern scrutiny.

In the Numismatic Chronicle of 1871 Mr. Neck described some of the more interesting coins in his collection, but it was in the Num. Chron. of 1904 that Mr. F. A. Walters in his series of articles ‘English Coins, 1377–1483’ described and listed all the then known specimens in both gold and silver, and in the Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress, 1936, C. E. Blunt wrote of the links between the late London coins of Richard and the early coins of Henry IV.

This, then, was the total amount of published material available when Mr. W. J. W. Potter and I began to make a more detailed study of the silver coins. The results of Mr. Potter’s work on the London groats and half-groats were published in Vol. xxix (1959) of this Journal and I hope that this article will help to complete the silver series, although a detailed study of the gold coins has yet to be made.

I will make no general reference to the history of this period as a short introduction may be found in Mr. Potter’s article.

The number of minor coins of Richard II which have survived are pathetically small and I should have preferred to make this investigation in the light of a large hoard. The general condition of the coins, too, is very poor, and this has made die-linking extremely arduous.

My investigation deals mainly with the York pence for various reasons, chief among them being that I think a clearer chronological sequence can be seen here than at London and that, due to the many points of similarity which I have noticed between the York pence and the London half-pence, in general, the classification which I shall apply at York will work equally well at London and Durham; this also applies to the suggested dating of the coins, which (without any direct documentary evidence) can only be described as speculative.

There are, however, certain facts which emerge from the numismatic evidence of each of the three mints and these facts will be discussed as they occur in the text with a more general reference to the series as a whole and dating in particular in the ‘Summary’ at the end of the paper.

TABLE OF DATES

Richard II
Ascended 22 June 1377; Deposed 29 September 1399.

Archbishops of York
(1) Alexander Neville, 1374. Translated to St. Andrews 1388.
(2) Thomas Arundel, 3 April 1388. Translated to Canterbury 1296.
(3) Robert Waldby, 5 October 1396. Died 6 January 1398.
(4) Richard le Scrope, 2 June 1398. Died 8 June 1408.
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Bishops of Durham
(1) Thomas Hatfield. 1345. Died 8 May 1381.
(2) John Fordham. 1382. Translated to Ely 1388.
(3) Walter Skirlaw. 3 April 1388. Died 24 March 1405.

Wardens of the Mint
(1) Thomas Hervy (1377).
(2) John Gurmonchester (1377-88).
(3) Guy Roucliff (clerk) (1388-91).
(4) Guy Roucliff and his exors. (1391-2).
(5) Andrew Neuport (1392-9).

Masters of the Mint
(1) Gautron de Bardes (1377-91).
(2) Nicholas Malakin, a Florentine (1395).
(3) John Wildman (?)
(4) Nicholas Malakin (1396).
(5) Geoffrey Mulleken (1396-8).

NOMENCLATURE

In nearly all current references to Richard's coins the terms 'early' and 'late' are used to form a convenient division of the coins. Those coins which have split or fish-tail serifs are called 'late' and all the coins which do not show this characteristic are grouped together as 'early'.

While admitting the correctness of calling the split-serif coins 'late' it is quite inaccurate to call all the remaining coins 'early', although for want of an alternative term I am reluctantly continuing to use it.

It was in fact the Brooke classification of the London half-pence into 'early' and 'late' types which first stimulated my interest in Richard's coins.

From a quantity of half-pence which I separated out into the 'early' types (i.e. those which were closely associated with the Post Treaty coins of Edward III) and the 'late' types with split-serif letters I found that I had more than half the coins left unclassified, and these should really therefore be termed 'intermediate' issues.

Method of classification

To avoid any confusion between the four types described by Mr. Potter in his paper on the groats and half-groats I have also based my classification on four main types, which on the whole conforms to his divisions.

The table which I give below will, I hope, show at a glance my main classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Early' coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I (Cross or lis on breast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Late' coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Pellets by shoulders)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: This table is not made up to any definite time-scale.)

All the York coins bear a quatrefoil in the centre of the reverse cross and thus there are no sede vacante coins which can be so helpful when it comes to dating; indeed, reference to the table of dates earlier will show that there was little time lost in the appointment of a new Archbishop.)
Local dies. It must be admitted that the coins from dies of local manufacture do present enormous difficulties and I do not suggest that my ‘grouping’ of them as opposed to a chronological classification does more than scratch the surface. Also, their exact position in the series is open to dispute, but if the evidence of the mules which are found in this series is taken at its face value, it would seem that the majority of them were struck between my types II and III, in which position I have placed them. A more detailed discussion on these coins will ensue later in the paper.

‘EARY’ TYPES

Type I

This series of coins represents the largest number of dies used. Due to the similarity of the busts and the general poorness of condition, a possible sequence of use can only be obtained by noting the changing style of the letter punches. Fortunately some dies have mixed lettering before a completely new fount is noticeable, and due to a similarity of the punches used for these coins and also for the London half-pence, in several cases I was able to locate mules which I knew should exist on the York coins.

The arabic figures (1–6) which follow my main type IA 1, IA 2, &c., is not a numbering of the dies but a grouping of them into chronological order.

The numbers of obverse and reverse dies examined have as a matter of interest been included, but it must be understood that poor condition makes the counting of dies extremely difficult and my figures may not be accurate. In all cases where I was in some doubt as to the number of dies I have erred on the lower side.

Legend: RICARDVS REX ANGLIE Single or double saltire stops; lis, cross or nothing on breast.

Type IA 1 (PI. VI. 1 and 2). Obv. as above. Rev. EBO/RACI. Early lettering, with serifs curved to follow the inner circle. I1, R1, A1, T1, distinguishes these dies, and the similarity of these letters to those used on the late coins of Edward III places this series as the earliest of the reign. 3 obverse dies, 3 reverse dies.

Type IA 2 (PI. VI. 3, 4, 5). Obv. as above. Rev. EBO/RACI. Mixed lettering. 71 and A1 are virtually the same, but a new A is seen on some dies, A2. The reverse lettering gives way to T2, A3. Two dies have a lis on the breast, 3 have a cross and 1 has nothing. One reverse die has a pellet under the A of RACI. 6 obverse dies, 5 reverse dies.

Type IA 3 (PI. VI. 6–9). Rev. EBO/RACI. No new lettering really distinguishes this group of dies as mixed 1 and 2 letters are found, but the I is now a little more regular, I2. On one obverse die only an initial mark is seen similar to that on the London half-groats and was probably used in error (PI. VI. 6). The reverse of this same coin has an extra pellet under EBO and this same die is found with normal IA/3 obverse. On one reverse die there is a quatrefoil after ACT (PI. VI. 7), and some dies exhibit a broken R, R2, and also a ‘nicked’ A, A4 (PI. VI. 8) which I shall discuss later as both these characteristics are found on London coins. At least 7 obverse dies and 8 reverse dies.

Type IA 4 (PI. VI. 10–15). Rev. EBO/RACI. Although one or two of the early letters are still seen on some dies, this group is distinguished by the introduction of new letters, noticeably R3 and A5, and on one obverse die a change in the style of the bust is seen (PI. VI. 12–13). Two coins are known from these dies but the reverses are different. R2 is only found on the reverse of two coins. There may well be mules with the previous die group (PI. VI 10–11). At least 5 obverse dies with 7 reverse dies.

Type IA 5 (PI. VI. 16). Rev. EBO/RACI. There is only one true coin known from this obverse die (with pellets by the shoulders) which is found muled with rev. dies of local manufacture and also with reverses of type IB and which is fully discussed under the section on mules; a new R (R4) is seen. The

1 On only one die in the IA series; it was probably left off by mistake.
OF THE MINTS OF LONDON, YORK AND DURHAM

Of the mints of London, York and Durham reverse die does, I think, belong to the following group of dies as all the IA 4 dies end ACI and those of IA 6 end ACI. 1 obverse die, 1 reverse die, 1 coin.

Type IA 6 (Pl. VI. 17-20). Rev. EBO/RACI. The busts on this group of dies are still very similar, but again a new form of R (R5) with a larger serif to the foot and a less pointed curve to the loop distinguishes this group. Two obverse dies have a lis on the breast and the remainder have a rather poorly stamped cross (possibly a trefoil?) but they are in such poor state that it is impossible to say with certainty. 6 obverse dies, 5 reverse dies.

Type IB (Pl. VI. 21-22). Obv. RICAR DVS REX ANGLIÆ & Z. Rev. CIVI/TAS/EBO/RACI. The distinguishing features of this type are the pellets by the shoulders, the altered ending of the obverse legend and an additional pellet on the reverse under the B of EBO. The cross on the breast is clearly defined. Although the lettering is again mixed (R1, II, A4 are seen), the same R (R4) which is found on the obverse of IA 5 is seen on the reverses of these coins. 1 obverse die, 1 reverse die.

Type II

The dies which make up this type were almost certainly made with a considerable issue in mind. It is possible that time may show that I have been guilty of telescoping these coins into one issue and thus minimizing the length of time during which they were struck. The chief distinguishing feature of these coins is the absence of any marks on the breast and my subdivision of them merely separates those with a breast-line and those without. The lettering is again rather mixed but no really 'early' punches are seen. Again a new R appears (R6) which, although rather more pronounced on some dies than on others is much more dumpy than R3 (which is seen on some dies) and is easily recognizable. It is interesting to note that of the eighteen specimens of this issue which I have traced ten share an identical reverse die (no. 23 on Pl. VI) with five obverse dies.

Type II A (Pl. VI. 23-26). Obv. RICAR DVS REX ANGLIÆ. Rev. CIVI/TAS/EBO/RACI. With line across the breast. Four different styles of bust are known. 4 (possibly 5), obverse dies, 5 reverse dies.

Type II B (Pl. VI. 27, VII. 28-29). Obv. and rev. legend as last. No line across breast. Three different styles of bust are known. 7 obverse dies, 2 reverse dies.

MULES

Having now come to the end of the 'early' series of dies we are now faced with the very large issue of coins from dies of local manufacture, but before proceeding with these coins a word must be said here about mules. The muled coins are possibly the most interesting of the whole series, and although they would appear to connect the last of the 'early' dies and, later, the first of the late dies to the main block of local dies, it is questionable whether any reliance may be placed on the evidence which they appear to give regarding the exact position of the local dies in the series.

A table of all the mules will be given later, and also a more detailed discussion of the local dies and mules.

I listed earlier (type IA 5) a unique obverse die having a pellet at each shoulder, coupled with a reverse of type IA 4.

Until I located this coin (B.A.S. ex Lawrence) I had recorded thirteen other specimens from this obverse die, ten from three different local dies, and three from the one die of type IB.

1 There is only one reverse die known for no. 26 and I am not convinced that the legend ends RACI; it may well be a IA 4 reverse ending ACI, and therefore a mule.
A peculiar feature of this obverse die is the second R in RICHARD (R4) which is only found at York on the reverse of the type Ib coins, although it occurs on London half-pence. There is also a small flaw on the inner circle below and very slightly to the left of the cross on the breast. These features make this die immediately distinguishable, but I have looked in vain for other coins to turn up from this die without the pellets by the shoulders. As, almost without exception, the coins from local dies have pellets it is possible that they were punched into the die at a later date, possibly at York.

However, as seen earlier, the one obverse die of type Ib also has pellets, and as will be seen from the list of mules below, this unique IA 5 obverse is known muled with a Ib reverse.

If in fact the Ib series immediately preceed the local dies (as the obverse mules appear to indicate) my placing of the IIA and IIB dies would seem to be in error, except for the fact that the four coins with local obverses which have ‘early’ reverses are from the IIA and IIB series.

As all the letter punches which were used for the type II coins seem to be completely new, and the busts themselves from new irons, it would seem extraordinary to find an issue following these varied dies exhibiting the characteristics of the preceding dies, as it can be clearly seen from the plates that not only are all the busts of the IA and Ib series similar, but the R and I of Richard on the Ib coins are identical (if not from the same irons) as those on type IA 1. I am therefore convinced that my type II is correctly placed, but not so sure that new mules may not be found indicating that type Ib is more nearly allied to type IA 2 than to type IA 6, as it will be seen from the lists and the plates that these are the only two die series in IA in which the reverse legend ends /RACI. It is a pity that the R on the reverse of type IA 5 (Pl. VI. 16) cannot be identified, for it seems certain that this obverse, and the obverse of Ib, are connected by virtue of the pellets by the shoulders, but their exact position in the ‘early’ series must remain in some doubt, and my somewhat arbitrary division of the ‘early’ dies by the legend endings must stand until more evidence is available.

**Mules with ‘early’ obverse dies**

Mule 1 (Pl. VII. 30). Obv. Type IA 5. Rev. Ib.*
Mule 3 (Pl. VII. 32). Obv. As last. Rev. Local (not identified).
Mule 4 (Pl. VII. 33). Obv. As last. Rev. Local; Group B3.

**Mules with local obverse dies**

Mule 5 (Pl. VII. 34). Obv. Local; Group F1.
Mule 6 (Pl. VII. 35). Obv. Local; Group F2.
Mule 7 (Pl. VII. 36). Obv. Local; Group B (B4?)
Mule 8 (Pl. VII. 36A). Obv. Local; Group?

* Since making up the illustrations another mule has come to light, having an obverse of IA 4 and a reverse of Ib.

**LOCAL DIES**

Of all Richard’s coins, those from local dies are, perhaps, the most difficult to classify and die-link. The majority of them look as if they had a very long period of circulation, or the dies were used almost to destruction; perhaps the poor state in which the majority have survived is due to a combination of both factors. However, the few good specimens
which have survived show that, initially at any rate, a fairly faithful attempt was made
to copy coins in circulation, as the Group A coins and to a lesser extent the Group B
coins have a style of lettering whose counterparts can be seen on several of the ‘early’
dies. A similarity in the style of the busts can also be seen.

Whether the corruption of the obverse legend from ANGLIE–ANGLE–ANGILE to ANGILIE
should be ‘significant’ is doubtful, although as there are several dies in each group they
cannot be termed, as Walters terms them, ‘accidental’. It would seem as if a large
quantity of coins were required in a short space of time and the result was similar to a
game of scandal, each die which was copied diverging further from the original.

It may, of course, be possible to see the work of at least two engravers in this series,
the senior engraver being responsible for the work of the Group A dies, and also for
Groups E and F, while Groups B, C, and D were copied by a less-skilled hand. It may
of course be said that there is no parallel for the rendering of HYBERNIA as EB, but anyone
who has read Chaucer would excuse this.

It is interesting to note that on die 3 in Group C the E and B are the wrong way round,
as is the E on die 4.

I must confess that I have not had sufficient patience to identify and die-link all the
reverses of the groups and the following list is merely a grouping of the coins under
their obverse readings.

**GROUP A (ANGIE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Die</th>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ricardvs rex angie*</td>
<td>As Mule 2, pellet before *EBO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Similar, but no saltire after ANGLIE.</td>
<td>As last.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Similar but * (initial nos.) to r. of central fleur.</td>
<td>As last.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Similar to die 1.</td>
<td>*CIVI/TAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>As last.</td>
<td>Similar but no pellet after TAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Similar to die 2.</td>
<td>Similar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUP B (ANGLE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Die</th>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ricardvs rex angle.</td>
<td>As Mule 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>As last.</td>
<td>As Mule 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Similar but * to l. of central fleur.</td>
<td>As last.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Similar.</td>
<td>*EBO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUP C (ANGILE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Die</th>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ricardvs rex angile, * to r. of central fleur.</td>
<td>*CIVI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Similar, but * to l. of central fleur.</td>
<td>CIVI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Die 3 (Pl. VII. 49). **Obv. Similar.**  
Rev. *CIVI/TAS/380/RACI.*

Die 4 (Pl. VII. 50). **Obv. Similar.**  
Rev. [CIVI/TAS/380/RACI, three pellets misplaced under TAS.]

Die 5 (Pl. VII. 51). **Obv. Similar.**  
Rev. Similar, 380, but no misplaced pellets (2 dies known).

**GROUP D (ANGILIE)**

Die 1 (Pl. VII. 52). **Obv. RICARDVS*REX*ANGILIE.**  
Rev. *CIVI/TAS/380/RACI.*

**GROUP E (ANG FRAN)**

Die 1 (Pl. VII. 53–55). **Obv. RICARDVS*REX*ANG*FRAN.**  
I illustrate all 3 known coins from this pair of dies.

Die 2 (Pl. VIII. 56). **Obv. [RICARDVS*RE] X*ANG[FRAN]?**  
Rev. Different to last, no * before CIVI.

**GROUP F (DNS EB)**

Die 1. **Obv. RICARD: REX: ANGL: DNS EB**
Rev. As Mule 14 (Pl. VIII. 69).

Die 2. **Obv. Similar but no stops (see Mule 6, Pl. VII. 35).**  
Correct local reverse unknown.

**MISCELLANEOUS DIES**

Although I have examined more than sixty coins from local dies there are only seven coins which I have been unable to assign to one of my groups due to the poorness of the condition. I illustrate them here in the hope that other coins may help to group them at a later date.

Miscellaneous dies 1–7 (Pl. VIII. 57–63).

**LATE TYPES**

*Type III*

After the large and varied series of coins from dies of local manufacture, it would seem that the London mint was again in a position to supply dies.

These new late coins are, however, strikingly different from any of the preceding issues and are identified immediately by the new letters with split or fish-tail serifs. On both types IIIA and IIIB the obverse legend reads RICARD*REX*ANGIL*S*FRAN and therefore must be considered as a simultaneous issue to the groats and half-groats with fish-tail letters which now emanate from London.

The form of the crown also changes on this type to one smaller and flatter than seen hitherto, and the shortness of the central fleur is most noticeable. My division of this coin is unique in being the only ‘true’ DNS EB coin known (i.e. local obverse and reverse). The obverse die as I have shown is muled with an ‘early’ reverse and the reverse die is muled with a late obverse. It is therefore the only coin which directly connects the ‘early’, local and late dies. I am sorry that I was unable to illustrate this interesting coin.

1 I think that this obverse must end FRAN as there is too much room after the L of ANGL and the last letter looks as if it may be N; the only other ending it might be is DNS EB but I do not really think so.

2 Walters gives this obverse reading as DNS ED and is obviously copying Neck. The superb Lockett specimen (photo sheet 66) confirms that it is DNS EB. This coin is unique in being the only ‘true’ DNS EB coin known (i.e. local obverse and reverse). The obverse die as I have shown is muled with an ‘early’ reverse and the reverse die is muled with a late obverse. It is therefore the only coin which directly connects the ‘early’, local and late dies. I am sorry that I was unable to illustrate this interesting coin.
group into A and B is due to the two styles of bust which are quite apparent even on comparatively worn coins. The coins of group A I have called ‘coarse bust’, and those of group B ‘fine bust’, and the reasons for this can clearly be seen from the illustrations.

The reverses of all the group III coins now revert to EBOR/ACI and exhibit without exception a most extraordinary ‘mark’ after TAS. This mark has been previously described as a scallop; indeed a scallop does appear on some of the gold coins which may possibly be attributed to the same period, but other marks such as the lion and lis were used which were certainly not used on the York pence. F. A. Walters (NC 1904) admits that on most coins it is rather indistinct, but states that he had in his possession a perfectly struck coin and he seems to be fairly certain that it is a scallop. Walters also states that he could find nothing in the arms of the four archbishops to account for the scallop and says: ‘... I am ... regretfully obliged to confess that it had probably no more meaning than the special mark of a certain die-engraver or mint official.’ I must confess that I have taken a rather different view of this ‘mark’, and although there is only one coin on which it can be seen really well (Ash. Mus.) I am disinclined to continue to call it a scallop. An enlargement is illustrated on Pl. VIII. 76. I cannot of course say from which position it should be viewed but it does appear to have a short stem pointing towards the limb of the cross, and the ‘mark’ itself to consist of three separate parts, cleft in the middle, and is more like a trefoil than a scallop. On some coins which may have been struck later in the life of the die this regular trefoil-like form disintegrates and resembles a flaming sun (e.g. Pl. VIII. 70).

Whatever it is, and whatever its purpose, will probably never be known, and it must be considered as just one of the many things which make the medieval series so very interesting. There is, however, one thing which has occurred to me which may explain its presence, but without any substantive evidence it must remain a theory. If it was intended to be a sun it can possibly be explained in Richard’s new interest in pomp and heraldry during the last year of his reign, when he adopted the rising sun as a personal emblem.

Before proceeding with descriptions of the type III coins I list below the mules which connect this type with the local series.

**Mules with local obverse dies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the reverses are identical and are type III, die 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mules with late obverse dies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both reverses are identical and are from ‘early’ IIIA or IIIB coins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While on the subject of mules, this would seem a good opportunity to qualify my earlier statement that the mule evidence may prove to be misleading.

1 It is a pity that Walters did not illustrate this fine coin.
2 Throughout his reign Richard had been very proud of his white hart badge, eighty different designs of which can be seen in Westminster Hall, the building of which occupied his interest for many years. About Christmas 1398 the rising sun was adopted as a badge and to have this put on his coins is much more likely when considering his grandiose ways, haughty manner, and state of mind at this time than to dismiss the theory by asking why he did not put the white hart emblem on his earlier coins.
When Walters wrote on Richard II he described having seen coins from local dies having the 'mark' described earlier on the reverse. These coins he took to be entirely from local dies. I must confess, however, that it is remarkable that I have been unlucky in not seeing one of these coins, and this fact leads me to think that the coins which Walters saw, although certainly from local obverse dies, had in fact late reverse dies and were mules.

There is little doubt the three mules which I have just listed (Pl. VIII. 64–66) have extremely worn, though definitely recognizable, late reverses.

Why these two reverses appear to have been used when, apparently, in such poor state is inexplicable, as the pure late coins all seem to have been struck from dies which were in fairly good order.

A further point of interest is the fact that one of the late obverse dies is found mule with an 'early' reverse which was obviously used in poor condition. Also noticeable is the crack in the obverse die which runs from the A of RICARD right across the die level with the eyes. This cracked die is not found used with a normal late reverse. As previously stated I have taken the evidence which the mules as a whole seem to offer at their face value, hence my placing of the local dies between the 'early' and late series, and not at the very end of the reign which has been the previously accepted place for them.

A secondary, but equally important, reason for doing this is the fact that no mules are known involving the type IIIB or IV coins, which might have been expected if the local dies occurred at the end of the reign.

Despite the mule evidence it is just possible that the local coins were struck at the very end of the reign from any old dies which the coiner at York could lay his hands on and press into service. If this did in fact happen I do not think that it would greatly affect my sequence of issue of the coins from London made dies, but it would render valueless all the evidence which the mules appear to give, and would necessitate the grouping of all the local dies and their attendant mules immediately following my type IV.

Type IIIA

Type IIIA. Die 1. Obv. ‘Coarse’ bust. Die cracked across level with eyes. RICARD REX ANGLÆZ FRAN

Rev. Only known die is from the ‘early’ IIA or IIB series (vide Mules 12, 13).

Type IIIA. Die 2. Obv. ‘Coarse’ bust as last, but no die crack.

Rev. CIVI/TAS?/EBOR/ACI

Apart from the crack in the die I have been unable to find any points of difference between these dies and have only listed them separately for easy distinction.

Type IIIB

Type IIIB. Die 1. Obv. ‘Fine’ bust RICARD REX ANGLÆZ FRAN

Rev. Die A. CIVI/TAS?/EBOR/ACI

Rev. Die B. Similar, no saltires after ACI.

Rev. Die C. Similar, but i of ACI nearer to limb of cross.

It is just possible that there are two obverse dies because on some coins the shoulders appear to be set at a slight angle to the right giving the impression that the head is not set straight, but I think that this is an illusion caused by the spreading through wear of the right shoulder. There is also a very slight thickening of the inner circle between the

1 ? = The ‘mark’, scallop or trefoil found after TAS on all the type III coins.
A and N of ANGL which occurs on all specimens and which, curiously enough, occurs on the IIIA obverses and which caused me to think at one time that the obverse dies IIIA and IIIB were identical and that the ‘fine’ bust of type IIIB was the result of the die having been retouched or re-engraved.

There is little doubt that the same irons were used to make all the type III dies. Another feature which shows clearly the similarity of these dies is the fact that on all the reverses the top arm of the cross meets the quatrefoil slightly to the right of the lower arm.

All these type III coins have a cross on the breast, although on some coins it more resembles what is often referred to as a slipped trefoil.

Type IV

This last issue of coins at York is immediately recognizable by the hair which appears to puff out at either side of the head.

The lettering too is from different punches from those used for the previous issues and for the last time the obverse and reverse legends change. The crown also is rather more spread out than that seen on the type III coins. I have only been able to trace four of these extremely rare coins, and they appear to be the product of three obverse and three reverse dies.

Although I cannot read with certainty the obverse legend of the British Museum specimen (Pl. VIII. 79) it is certainly from a different die to the other three coins. There are no marks on the breast.

These coins are interesting from many points of view. In the first place they would appear to be related to the issue of late London groats and half-groats which have a crescent on the breast, as the style of lettering, bust, and the position of the hair is similar.

Furthermore, the first i in RICARD on die 1 can be clearly seen to have a break on the bottom right-hand foot, and this identical punch was used on the crescent half-groat. This broken i punch is also used on the late London pence reading RICARD*REX*ANGLIE (vide BNJ xxix, pl. xx), and also on the reverse of the unique Henry IV light penny of London with pellet and annulet by the bust which I published in vol. xxx of this Journal.

Type IV (Pl. VIII. 77), Obv. Die 1. RICARD*REX*ANGLIE
Rev. Die A. CIVI/TAS/EBO/RACI

Type IV (Pl. VIII. 78), Obv. Die 1. As last.
Rev. Die B. CIVI/TAS/EBO/RACI

Type IV (Pl. VIII. 79), Obv. Die 2. Similar.
Rev. Die C. Similar.

Type IV (Pl. VIII. 80), Obv. Die 3. RICARDVS*REX*ANGL*Z*F*
Rev. of Die A.

1 Since writing this two specimens have turned up, one, R. C. Lockett coll., uncatalogued, which is a die duplicate to that in the collection of Mr. C. E. Blunt, two, a specimen in the BM erroneously ticketed and placed under Henry IV.

2 The half-groat with the crescent on the breast was unknown to Mr. Potter when he wrote his paper.

3 Although not suggested at the time, I thought that the reverse of this coin may have been one of Richard’s; this evidence of the broken i punch makes me even more sure that it is, especially as I have also seen it on a recently examined late type half-noble of Richard II.
TYPE CHART SHOWING MAJOR MULE COMBINATIONS AND NUMBER OF COINS EXAMINED OF EACH TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. obv. dies</th>
<th>No. rev. dies</th>
<th>No. examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 1.

79 OBV. DIES AND 77 REV. DIES = 181 COINS EXAMINED

Early types 42 obv. dies; 41 rev. dies = 71 coins
Local dies 30 obv. dies; 28 rev. dies = 72 coins
Late types 7 obv. dies; 8 rev. dies = 38 coins

| 79 | 77 | 181 |

FIG. 2.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pl. VI</th>
<th>Number of coins examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Early Type IA 1</td>
<td>C. E. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. &quot; IA 2</td>
<td>B. A. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &quot; IA 2</td>
<td>Dr. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &quot; IA 2</td>
<td>Bel. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. &quot; IA 2</td>
<td>C. E. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. VI.</td>
<td>6. Early Type IA 3. Note i.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>IA 3. Note quatrefoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>IA 3. Note R and A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>IA 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Mule IA 4/IA 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Mule IA 4/IA 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>IA 4. Note the bust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>IA 4. Note the bust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>IA 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>IA 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>IA 5. Rev. IA 6?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>IA 6. Lis on breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>IA 6. Lis on breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>IA 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>IA 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>IB. Note new legend ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>IB. Note new legend ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>IIA. Bust 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>IIA. Bust 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>IIA. Bust 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>IIA. Bust 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>IIb. Bust 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. VII.</td>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>IIb. Bust 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Mule 1. Obv. IA 1. Rev. IB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Mule 2. Obv. IA 1. Rev. Local, Group A 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Male 3. Obv. IA 1. Rev. Local (unidentified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Mule 4. Obv. IA 1. Rev. Local, Group A 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Mule 5. Obv. Local, Group F 1. Rev. From Early Type II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Mule 6. Obv. Local, Group F 2. Rev. From Early Type II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Mule 7. Obv. Local, Group B die. Rev. From Early Type II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36A.</td>
<td>Mule 8. Obv. Local, Group A. die. Rev. From Early Type II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Local Dies. Group A, die 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Group A, die 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Group A, die 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Group A, die 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Group A, die 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Group A, die 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Group B, die 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Group B, die 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Group B, die 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Group B, die 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Group C, die 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Group C, die 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Group C, die 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Group C, die 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Group C, die 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Group D, die 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Group E, die 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Group E, die 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. VIII.</td>
<td>55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Group E, die 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pl. VIII. 57. Local. Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of coins examined</th>
<th>YM 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>YM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>BM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>BM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>BM 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Dr. B. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>B. A. S. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. Mule 9. Obv. Local, Group B. Rev. From Type III C. E. B. 1
65. Mule 10. Obv. Local, Group F 1. Rev. From Type III C. E. B. 1
66. Mule 11. Obv. Local (unidentified) Rev. From Type III BM 1
67. Mule 12. Obv. Type IIIA die 1. Rev. From Early Type II C. E. B. 1
68. Mule 13. Obv. Type IIIA die 1. Rev. From Early Type II R. C. B. 1
69. Mule 14. Obv. Type IIIA die 1. Rev. Local, Group F die I C. E. B. 1
70. Late Type IIIA die 2 obv. E. J. W. 1
71. IIIA die 2 obv. B. A. S. 1
72. IIIA die 2 obv. Ash. M.
74. IIIa. Obv. Die 1. Rev. Die B YM 1
76. Enlargement of 'mark' on no. 72.
77. IV. Obv. Die 1. Rev. Die A E. J. W. 1
78. IV. Obv. Die 1. Rev. Die B C. E. B. 1
79. IV. Obv. Die 2. Rev. Die C BM 1
80. IV. Obv. Die 3. Rev. Die A YM 1

**Minimum no. of coins examined**

| 181 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>= C. E. Blunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>= British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B.</td>
<td>= Dr. E. Burstal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. C. B.</td>
<td>= R. Carlyon-Britton (dec'd.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. V. D.</td>
<td>= G. V. Doubleday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. M.</td>
<td>= D. Mangakis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A. S.</td>
<td>= B. A. Seaby Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. J. W.</td>
<td>= E. J. Winstanley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YM</td>
<td>= Yorkshire Museum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART II. LONDON AND DURHAM—SUMMARY

#### LONDON HALF-PENCE

As I have dealt with the York dies in some detail it will be unnecessary to treat the London half-pence similarly as the two are parallel issues, and with the exception of the York dies IB and the local dies which have no parallel at London all the half-pence can be grouped chronologically by referring to the illustrated York coins and to the lettering chart.¹

Before making specific reference to the main types, two points of interest deserve mention. The first is the occurrence of 'broken' letters.

¹ I have not drawn letters found on types III and IV as they are quite distinctive and are clearly seen on the photographs.
The letter R (R2) will clearly be seen to have a break, or V nick almost at the top of the upright, and the letter A (A4) is 'nicked' nearly at the bottom of the left-hand leg.

That these are privy marks is indicated by the fact that no effort appears to have been made to mend the punches which would have been the case with a broken punch, furthermore, it would seem that these 'nicked' punches were used for a succession of similar dies over a fairly short period. Their exact purpose, however, can only be speculative if they are not privy marks, but it may be significant that these letters only occur on dies in the groups IA 2 and IA 3, principally the latter, which together account for more than a third of the surviving specimens.

The nicked R is found on all other denominations of the above-mentioned die groups with the exception of the farthing. Although I have not made any real attempt to die-link the half-pence it is plain that the intermediate issues covering types IA 2–IA 6 were struck from a large number of dies in a comparatively short space of time.

The second point touches the question of mules.

The recorded mules of the London half-pence show a structure not dissimilar to the York pence, where, at first, it was most surprising to find mules connecting the early coins of type I with the very much later issues of type III. London mules, however, go one better as types I and IV are found muled.

As the Tower mint was responsible for the manufacture of all the dies this curious muling of the early and late issues would not seem to indicate a shortage of silver (which there most certainly was between 1391 and 1396) but a shortage of dies, brought about possibly by the input of silver to the mint jumping from just under £200 to nearly £1,200 within a single year (1396), and catching the engravers unawares. Hence the necessity of finding any old die that could be pressed into service. This certainly strengthens the assumption that types III and IV can be dated to the final years of the reign, but other implications regarding dating will be found in the summary at the end.

Early and Intermediate types (types I and II)

Early Type. Obv. RICARD REX ANGL. Rev. CIVITAS LONDON. (Pl. IX. 1)

The N's are reversely barred and there is a contraction mark over the last N. The stops are double saltires. This is the only type of half-pence on which a breast decoration is found and may be either an annulet or a saltire. The lettering on this type conforms to type IA 1.

Intermediate Type. Obv. RICARD REX ANGL. Rev. CIVITAS LONDON. (Lombardic N's.)

Roman N's correctly barred are found on one small group (a specimen illustrated, Pl. IX. 2). With this single exception the remainder of the Intermediate dies, covering Types IA 2 to IA 6 and type II have Lombardic N's on the reverse. The stops are either single or double saltires, single or double pellets or wedge and saltires.

As mentioned earlier, from this group of dies the largest surviving number of specimens is found, all of which bear the lettering of their York counterparts, although at London the lettering is rather more intermixed making the individual die grouping which was easy at York a little more difficult, hence my grouping of the dies into a single 'Intermediate' type.

Pl. IX. 3, 4, 5 illustrate typical examples of the die groups IA 2 and 3 showing the broken R which typify this group; the nicked A which is clearly seen is also found in later groups. It will be noticed that the obverses of nos. 4 and 5 (particularly the latter) appear to have been struck from rusty dies.
Pl. IX. 6 and 7 illustrate examples of type IA 4 and IA 6 (separated at York chiefly on account of the altered ending of the reverse inscription), and Pl. IX. 8 is the London counterpart of the unique (York) type IA 5 die with pellets by the shoulders, which do not, of course, occur here. But the strange tail of the R (R4, which is best seen on the mules, Pl. VII. 30, 31) make this die immediately recognizable. It will be recalled that the die group IB (obv. ends ANGL Z) is not represented at London, but as this particular R is found on the reverse of these coins it may be fairly argued that type IA 5 and IB are represented by the halfpenny I have illustrated.

Pl. IX. 9, representing types II A and B (separated at York only by some dies showing a breast line and some not) bring this series of intermediate dies to an end.

As the London mules involve the type IV coins they will be listed later.

Late Types (types III and IV)
Type III. Series 1 (Pl. IX. 10, 11, 12). Obv. RICARD REX ANGL. Rev. CIVITAS LONDON. Stops are either double saltires, or wedge and saltire.
Series 2 (Pl. IX. 13, 14, 15, 16). Obv. RICARD REX ANGL F. Rev. As last.

The most distinguishing feature of the London half-pence corresponding to type III is the use of tall thin lettering with split, or 'fish-tail' serifs. Only minute differences in the style of the busts are noticed as opposed to the York coins which have strikingly different features which enabled me to sub-group them into A and B.

Type IV. Series 1. Obv. RICARD REX ANGLI (Pl. IX. 17). Rev. As last.
Series 2. Obv. RICARD REX ANGL (Pl. IX. 18, 19, 20). Rev. As last.

This is the last of the London half-pence, and perhaps the most interesting. The chief distinguishing features of this type are the somewhat thicker and dumpier lettering and a taller and thinner bust with realistic hair curling away from the face. These coins are exactly similar in style to the very rare York pence of this class and also the London groats and half-groats with a crescent on the breast.

They have too the 'nicked' letter I (clearly seen on the York pence) to which I have referred earlier in respect of this class, a feature by itself which must surely prove that all the type IV dies were made more or less together, and terminate the product of the Mint under Richard II.

Mules. The following are the mules I have recorded although doubtless more exist; as mentioned earlier, no mules are to be expected of type IB and the local dies which are peculiar to York.

1. (Pl. IX. 21.) Obv. Type IA 1. Rev. Type IA 2. Note the annulet on the breast.
2. (Pl. IX. 22.) Obv. Type IA 1. Rev. Type IV. Note the annulet on the breast; ? the same die as last. The reverse clearly shows the typical dump lettering of type IV and the last i of civi has the familiar 'nick' in the bottom right-hand serif.
3. (Pl. IX. 23.) Obv. Type IA 3. Rev. Type IV. The obverse is a typical die of this group showing the 'nicked' A in RICARD; note how rustily the die appears.
4. (Pl. IX. 24.) Obv. Type IA 6. Rev. Type IV.
5. (Pl. IX. 25.) Obv. Type II. Rev. Type IV. Identification of the obverse die is made certain by the clear striking of the second r in RICARD — R6.
Also recorded but not illustrated are mules connecting the following types.

7. *Obv.* Type II. *Rev.* Type IA 3.
8. *Obv.* Type IA 3. *Rev.* Type III.
9. *Obv.* Type IV. *Rev.* Type IA series; exact die group uncertain.

This last mule is interesting as the obverse is known with a normal type IV reverse.

On the whole the mules of the half-pence are quite rare, only about a dozen or so being recorded to date.

It may be opportune to say here that no indication of rarity should be inferred from the numbers of coins which I have chosen to illustrate my types; I have chosen coins which together best serve to illustrate a particular die group.

It may be interesting to note that the half-pence of type IV are twice as rare as those of type III, and of the type III coins only about 1 in 3 have the obverse legend ending ANGL F. Types III and IV together account for about one-third of the surviving specimens.

**LONDON PENCE**

London pence are the second rarest of all Richard's surviving coins. I have been unable to locate any London pence corresponding to types II and III. The chief characteristics of the pence of type I and IV are as follows.

1. (Pl. IX. 26.) Type IA 2. *Obv.* RICARDVS REX ANGLIE
   *Rev.* CIVITAS LONDON. (Reversely barred N's.)
2. (Pl. IX. 27.) Type IA 4. *Obv.* RICARD (VS?) REX ANGL Z FRAC [sic]
   *Rev.* As last.
   Note the typical 'nicked' A on the obverse; there is also a lis on the breast. Note also the D of DON on the reverse, this is from the same punch with the 'hole' or flaw in the centre of the curve which is found on the Durham and York pence mentioned earlier.
3. Another specimen (not illustrated here) very similar to the last is illustrated in *BNJ* vol. xxix, pl. xx. 27, and appears to be from a slightly later series of obverse irons. It reads RICARD REX ANGL Z FRANC. The reverse is similar to last.
5. (Pl. IX. 29.) Type IV. *Obv.* RICARD REX ANGLIE. *Rev.* CIVITAS LONDON. (Lombardic N's.)
   The lettering on these type IV coins corresponds in every detail to the other coins which I have attributed to this final type. The coin illustrated here also depicts the 'nicked' i.

In the *Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress, 1936*, C. E. Blunt publishes a mule of this type with the name RICARD mutilated on the coin; the reverse is a die of the heavy coinage of Henry IV. This coin is interesting as the obverse is also known with a regular type IV reverse. A coin which I published in *BNJ* vol. xxx as a unique penny of the light coinage of Henry IV having a pellet to the left and an annulet to the right of the head, is, I am certain, a mule, the reverse being of Richard II type IV, chiefly by virtue of the 'nicked' i punch. These two coins would appear to be the only links known between the pence of Richard II and Henry IV.

**DURHAM PENCE**

The known pence of Durham, the rarest of all the coins of Richard II, can almost be counted on the fingers of both hands.
They appear to be the product of one obverse and two reverse dies.

1. *Obv.* ricardvs rex anglie (a) civitas dvno1m (Pl. IX. 30).
   (b) civitas dvno1m (Pl. IX. 31).

These coins correspond exactly to type IA 4, the D with the flaw in the curve being clearly seen on the York pence of the same type (Pl. IX. 10, 11, 12) as well as on the London pence (Pl. IX. 27) and on the groats and half-groats of the same type.

**LONDON FARTHINGS**

These tiny coins, only fractionally commoner than the Durham pence, all seem to have been struck from dies made at roughly the same time, that is, if one can accept the fact that the change in the style of lettering from early to the late fish-tail lettering would have been apparent on the farthings. All the coins I have examined, including the exceptionally rare variety with roses instead of the usual three pellets in the angles of the reverse cross, would seem to have flat serifs and conform to the early styles of types I and II; the similarity in the style of the busts and crowns would also seem to confirm this.

**Series 1.** (Pl. IX. 32.)
*Obv.* ricardvs rex angl. *Rev.* civitas london

**Series 2.** (Pl. IX. 33, 34, 35.)

**Series 3.** (Pl. IX. 36.)
*Obv.* ricard rex angl. *Rev.* as last, but roses in the angles of the cross.

*Note.* J. J. North in *English Hammered Coinage*, vol. 2, quotes a specimen with rose after rex.

The stops on all the coins would seem to be double pellets, a feature common to the half-penny dies which occur towards the end of the IA series. Failing the location of new coins one cannot be more precise.

In order to facilitate examination of the farthings I have illustrated them twice natural size.

**SUMMARY**

From the purely practical point of view, I hope that the information in the preceding pages will assist students and collectors in classifying and arranging their coins in the order of issue.

The object of this summary is to examine the documentary evidence to see if a satisfactory answer can be given to the question of dating the coins.

**The Documentary Evidence**

1. London. *(a)* The silver bullion figures as published by Miss E. Stokes in the *Numismatic Chronicle* for 1929, and which I reproduce here in diagrammatic form. (Fig. 3.)
   *(b)* The various Petitions to Parliament regarding the need for small silver; published in the *Annals of the Coinage* by the Rev. Rogers Ruding, whose chief sources were the Rolls of Parliament and Rymer’s *Foedera*.

2. Durham. *(a)* In 1384, two years after the accession of Bishop John Fordham ‘the Barons of the Exchequer were commanded to receive from Bishop John the old dies which Thomas (Hatfield) his predecessor had for coining money within the Royal liberty of Durham and to deliver him new dies, i.e. three standards and six trussels’.
(b) Ratification of the privileges of coining in respect of Bishop Skirlaw in 1392, i.e. four years after his consecration.

3. York. (a) Dies were ordered for Archbishop Neville in 1375 (the year following his consecration) and again in the first year of the reign of Richard II.

Although the surviving evidence of the individual mints is meagre, taken as a whole I think the various pieces of the jig-saw can be made to fit together, and I must here emphasize again that mention of individual types refer to issues from similar dies at all three mints.

That the coins of types IA 2 and 3 represent the first big issue of the reign is undeniable and while it is tempting to ascribe them to the huge issues of 1389–91 there are insufficient coins from earlier dies to account for the £9,697 worth of silver coined during the first ten years. An earlier date must therefore be looked for.

The bullion figures for the individual years 1377–87 are not known and the chart merely indicates the yearly average, approximately £1,000 per year for the first seven years and just under £900 per year for the next three.

In view of the Petitions made to Parliament it is more than likely that half-pence in quantity were not made earlier than 1382. There is no real reason to suppose that the striking of these coins took place straight away, as half-pence had not been coined at the Tower mint since 1369, and there would presumably have been no dies immediately available which could be altered to serve as a stop-gap.

The Petition of 1378/9 stated that silver and gold was not being brought to the mint and that the country needed half-pence and farthings. The reply received stated that they would be made as soon as the king had bullion for the purpose.
Another Petition dated 1380 again echoed the lack of half-pence and farthings and suggested that of every pound weight three-quarters should be made into half-pence and farthings.

The reply to this Petition stated that a certain quantity should be made for the ease of the people and with the advice of the Council.

Another Petition in 1381 represented the kingdom as being in a state of wretched want. No answer to this was received and another Petition later the same year was presented by the officers of the Mint in the Tower of London. This stated that no money, either gold or silver, was made in the Tower, to the damage of the king and the people. The first Petition of 1381 was renewed on the 13th of December when a favourable reply was received; no doubt influenced by the document presented by the officers of the Mint.

Petitions now cease until 1393 when half-pence and farthings were again needed and the king replied that they should be made.

It would therefore appear that virtually no coins were struck until 1382 (and the rarity of type IA 1 testifies to this) and this would have the effect on the bullion chart of doubling the amount shown for the years 1382–7.

The peak issues shown for the years 1389–91 on the chart would now appear less significant.

I therefore suggest that the IA 2–3 dies initiated the coinage period 1382–7 and the remainder of the IA dies followed.

I think that the bulk of the bullion coined in the 'peak' years 1389–91 was made into groats and half-groats and not into half-pence for two reasons.

1. The largest number of surviving groats and half-groats correspond to the last of my type IA dies.

2. If the 'peak' of 1389–91 consisted of half-pence there should have been no need for the Petition of 1393.

I think that the bulk of any half-pence struck during 1389–91 were made from old dies and this would account for the fact that approximately one-sixth of the IA 2–3 coins appear to have been struck from rusty dies, and many of the later coins in the IA group show damage not entirely accounted for by wear.

During the period 1391–6 only about £1,000 worth of coins was struck altogether and to this period I would ascribe the coins of type II which are very rare at both London and York.

The coins of types III and IV can safely be assigned to the final years 1396–9, a period during which £2,320 worth of coins were struck. As far as the half-pence are concerned these last two types probably followed closely upon each other as both types are intimately muled with the IA dies. If the foregoing is correct the following facts emerge regarding the ecclesiastical mints.

1. Durham. The surviving coins correspond exactly to type IA 4; the D with the flaw in the centre of the curve, mentioned earlier, being clearly seen on the York and London coins of the same type, all of which die-link into the IA 3 dies which I date to the first two years or so of the period 1382–7. The fact that dies were ordered for Bishop John Fordham in 1384 would seem to indicate his being responsible for these coins. Although ratification of the right to coin was granted to Bishop Skirlaw in 1392 no coins other than
those of type IA 4 are known, and I should confidently expect any new coins which may come to light to correspond either to types II, III, or IV, preferably the first named.

2. York. To Archbishop Neville can be ascribed all the type IA and In coins. The tenancy of York between 1388–96 was held by Thomas Arundel, and it is during this period that I have given the coins of type II.

It was probably during the lean years at London (1391–6) that suspension of the manufacture of dies for York occurred, or alternatively it was necessary greatly to supplement the amount of coins which could be struck from the dies supplied by the Tower. The very large issues from dies of local manufacture are the result. One may speculate if the need for a large number of coins during this period has any relation to the fact that Archbishop Arundel contributed £1,000 towards Richard’s Irish campaign of 1394; it is significant that some of the coins have the Irish title DNS EB (see Pl. II. 34, 35).

To Archbishops Waldby (5 Oct. 1396–6 Jan. 1398) and Scrope (2 June 1398–6 June 1408) can be ascribed the coins of types III and IV although it seems unlikely that, due to the unsettled state of the country during the final months, Richard le Scrope would have received dies of his own. If he was responsible for striking any coins he probably continued to use the dies of his predecessor.

In conclusion may I express my pleasure in being able to provide a new classification and to record hitherto unpublished types of a reign in the medieval series whose kings have received the attention of such notable numismatists as the Fox brothers, L. A. Lawrence, C. E. Blunt, and C. A. Whitton. I should also like to record my grateful thanks to all those who assisted me both in supplying coins and casts and in proffering advice. In particular I should like to mention the names of C. E. Blunt and Dr. E. J. Harris.
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I trust I shall be forgiven for not mentioning the ownership of individual specimens as they are described in the text. The following, however, are the chief contributors to whom I am indeed grateful: C. E. Blunt, The British Museum, E. J. Harris, B. A. Seaby Ltd., E. J. Winstanley.
RICHARD II, YORK, EARLY DIES, MULES AND LOCAL DIES
PLATE VIII

55 (Die 1) 56 (Die 2) 57 (Die 1) 58 (Die 2) 59 (Die 3) 60 (Die 4) 61 (Die 5) 62 (Die 6) 63 (Die 7) 64 (Mule 9) 65 (Mule 10) 66 (Mule 11) 67 (Mule 12) 68 (Mule 13) 69 (Mule 14) 70 (IIIA) 71 (IIIA) 72 (IIIA) 73 (IIIB) 74 (IIIB) 75 (IIIB) 76 77 (IV) 78 (IV) 79 (IV) 80 (IV)

Group 'E' Miscellaneous Local Dies