**A SUMMARY OF THE CROMWELL COINAGE**

*By Marvin Lessen*

**Introduction**

A number of written works are in existence regarding the Cromwell coinage. These are in the form of *BNJ* articles, *NC* articles, and even an entire book on the subject by Henfrey. Unfortunately, the details of this literature are not always compatible with each other, and a considerable air of confusion still remains. This is due to the unusual nature of the coinage, with its various forms of originals and copies. Many numismatists apparently consider the subject requires no further study, but it should be realized that the attribution of certain of the coins has been argued about for many years, with the same coins variously being credited to Simon or to Tanner, or to some unknown Dutchman (or men). The present paper is based upon a careful examination of the literature and of the coins themselves, and is intended to assist in clarifying the situation. Basically, this is done by listing all the known varieties, in catalogue form, and by including a flow chart which traces the coinage through the use of die-links and punch-links.

I do not purport to have generated new theories, nor have I discovered new documentation, but I do hope that I have presented these data in a clearer format than now exists, and that the conclusions were reached in a logical manner. I am certain more questions have been proposed than have been answered. However, this could prove constructive by stimulating further studies. The farthing patterns by David Ramage will not be discussed, except for a listing in the general catalogue, since they have been well-covered by Mr. Peck (Ref. 7).

**Historical Review**

Although this paper is concerned only with the coins themselves, a brief sketch of the historical events of the coinage is in order to provide continuity. The subject is best covered by Henfrey (Ref. 1), Hocking (Ref. 3), and Allen (Ref. 4 and 8).

In August and September of 1656*, orders were issued to Peter Blondeau to coin silver bullion in the amount of £2,000 sterling and a small amount of gold. The dies, bearing the Protector's effigy, were to be engraved by Thomas Simon, and the coins struck by Blondeau on his own machinery. An original order of 27 November 1656 contains sketches by Simon of seven coins, and represents official approval of the Simon designs. The design of the bust for the silver coins was altered to its final and presently known form by an order dated 11 December 1656. The seven coins contemplated were the broad, ten-shilling and five-shilling gold pieces, and the silver crown, halfcrown, shilling, and sixpence. Mr. Allen illustrates the two original gold and silver designs and the modified silver design in his first article (Ref. 8). In the middle of 1657, the coins dated 1656 were struck at Drury House in the Strand. These coins were the gold broad (and its pattern, the ‘fifty-shilling’ piece) and the silver halfcrown.

A further series of coins was issued in 1658. This issue was based on an order of 17 November 1657 proposing to increase the coining facilities and capabilities to a weekly output of £10,000.

*Dates used in this paper are based on the old style calendar where the New Year begins on the 25th of March.*
However, the death of Cromwell in September of 1658 apparently brought the coinage to a close, and certainly prevented the issuance of the coins for general circulation. Production probably began very shortly before Cromwell's death, and the coinage consisted of the crown, the halfcrown, the shilling, and a very few sixpences, all basically in silver. Unfortunately, documentation pertaining to this final period of coinage is very sparse, if in existence at all.

A manuscript by Simon, listing his charges for various items from 1650 to July 1657, contains the entry for the cost of stamps, dies, piles, trussells, and irons for seven coins of Cromwell for coining by Blondeau's presses. The implication here is that Simon prepared the equipment for seven different coins. It is not possible to relate these seven coins to the seven referred to in the order of 27 November 1656 since the gold ten- and five-shilling pieces were never prepared. Hocking feels these seven different types were the fifty-shilling piece, the broad, halfbroad, crown, halfcrown, shilling, and sixpence. His contention is incorrect, for the fifty-shilling piece was struck from the normal broad dies and thus cannot be considered as a separate type and, as will be shown later, Simon did not make the halfbroad dies, although he did make a halfbroad punch. It appears that the ten- and five-shilling gold denominations, although normal for the Commonwealth coinage, were deleted from consideration for the Cromwell coinage even though there is no supporting documentation. Only six types may be accounted for as coming from Simon's hand, and these are the broad, crown, halfcrown of both dates, shilling, and sixpence. The meaning of Simon's seven will have to remain undefined, but possibly too much importance should not be placed on that entry. A more important issue is the date of the entry or, more properly, the end date covered of July 1657. If the seven coins do include all his dies, then it would seem that the dies of the coins dated 1658 were engraved in 1657; we know this was very likely so for the crown.

The events pertaining to the subsequent wanderings of the Simon dies and puncheons, and the eventual re-coinages, become more muddled, and often impossible to trace. Yet, at various times during the eighty years after the last official coinage by Simon and Blondeau, many more varieties of the Protector's coins were made.

Simon died in August of 1665. His bequest specified that his punches, dies, and engraving tools were to be given to his nephew, William, if said nephew were likewise to become an engraver. If not, then they were to pass to Simon's son, Samuel. Apparently, William did not become an engraver, and Samuel proved to be of insufficient calibre to warrant these items. According to a Vertue note, in 1676 a Mr. Marlow 'bought of the widow of Simons all the tools, stamps, puncheons, wax impressions, etc. that did belong to Mr. Simons'. There had been some confusion over this will in the past, but it has been cleared up by Mr. Whetmore (Ref. 9). None of the original documents mention the Cromwell dies (or other equipment) as such. Thus it is not possible to define what constituted Simon's possessions, and whether or not the Cromwell items were included.

It is generally conceded, often by relatively contemporary sources, that all or some of the aforementioned Simon equipment reached the Low Countries. There, new dies were prepared using the Simon puncheons for the halfbroad, crown, shilling, and sixpence. The new crown was certainly struck there, and the other denominations probably so. These strikings are referred to as the Dutch coins.

In 1700 Isaac Newton, Master of the Mint, purchased, for the Mint, '10 puncheons and 9 dies graven by Mr. Simonds famous graver in the time of Ol. Cromwell for 14 guineas'. Presumably, these were thought to be Simon's originals at the time. Hocking was able to
identify the contents of this purchase and, after a few corrections of misprints in his article, it is revealed that the purchase consisted of the following items:

**Puncheons**
- broad-obverse
- halfbroad-obverse
- crown-obverse
- crown-reverse
- halfcrown-reverse
- shilling-obverse
- shilling-reverse
- sixpence-obverse
- sixpence-reverse
- a medal-obverse (MI 434/84?)

**Dies**
- (Dutch) halfbroad-obverse
- (Dutch) halfbroad-reverse 1658
- (Simon) crown-obverse (a matrix)
- (Simon) crown-reverse (a matrix)
- (Dutch) shilling-reverse (a matrix)
- (Dutch) shilling-obverse
- (Dutch) shilling-reverse
- (Dutch) sixpence-obverse
- (Dutch) sixpence-reverse

It is of great interest to note that all of these puncheons, with the possible exception of the medal puncheon, are considered to be by Simon, but all of the dies are Dutch, with the exception of the crown matrices which are considered to be by Simon. The Simon dies are not now known to exist. Hocking suggests that if the Simon dies had been transferred to the mint, they would probably have been destroyed along with the Commonwealth dies at the Restoration. This assumption is quite logical, but it cannot be shown whether or not the dies were ever transferred to the Mint from Drury House. Hocking was further of the opinion that Simon would have been most likely to keep the dies himself.

The final events occur when Richard Arundell was appointed new Master of the Mint in 1738. He apparently had John Tanner prepare some new dies and strike coins from these new dies. Probably this was done to satisfy certain influential collectors of the time. These new dies were for the crown and a variety of the halfbroad. It is possible that Tanner also made strikings from the existing Dutch halfbroad, shilling, and sixpence dies.

**The Coins**

There is possibly no better way to define the issues involved than a catalogue listing, and such an attempt is made in Table I (opposite p. 172). This listing may also allow the reader to draw his own conclusions. Obviously, the catalogue cannot be complete, and there is no doubt that further additions, and possibly some deletions, will result from its publication. I do feel that the type, or die, groupings, A through S will prove to be complete. I have examined many of the coins, and I have received detailed information on many others in the list. There remains a quantity which are ill-defined and are known primarily through Henfrey. The question of rarity, as usual, must be taken only as a guide. For example, I was familiar with the gold halfcrown I 27, only through Seaby’s ESC (Ref. 6) where it is listed with a rarity of one or two known. I saw one of these coins in 1964 and assumed it to be unique, but Mr. Blunt has recorded the existence of two more, for which I give the weights. In the matter of present collection location, the British Museum is normally used as the master. In Table I, the coins are catalogued by type grouping (actually die grouping, as group A contains two types), and then by an overall sequential numbering system.

I consider the flow chart of Figure 1 (opposite p. 166) to be the heart of this discussion, as it was really the means by which somewhat of a breakthrough was accomplished in the matter of presentation. Certainly, it and the catalogue complement each other. The chart is a most convenient method of relating the different dies used in this very confusing series. Unlike the usual die-link charts, it became necessary to include the puncheons and known matrices. All the known puncheons, matrices, and dies in the Royal Mint are shown, and the obvious missing
dies and puncheons have been added to provide a complete picture. The various theories regarding the puncheons, that is, that they belonged to Simon, and probably were or possibly were not used to strike the specific issues, were taken solely from the observations of Hocking. Except for a few definite cases which he mentions, it does not appear possible to be entirely certain that a specific puncheon produced a specific die. I have no reason to challenge his most basic contention that the puncheons were all by Simon, but I do feel they might be a somewhat random sampling of his work, possibly including some rejected items. In other words, the Mint purchase of 1700 does not necessarily represent the sum total of Simon's puncheons and, in fact, some basic puncheons were not even present. When considering whether or not all the dies of the same denomination (Simon, Dutch, and Tanner dies) were produced from the same puncheon, it should be realized that no two dies would be expected to appear absolutely identical when hand-sunk from the same master puncheon. Also, it is possible that retouching was done on the die itself after the sinking. Certain portions of the design, such as harp strings, were probably engraved directly on the die. Thus, the solid and dashed connecting lines of Figure 1 must be taken in the light of the above comments. I have not had the opportunity to examine the dies and puncheons themselves. As an example illustrating this problem, the Cromwell medal, referred to as the imitation inauguration medal, possibly by Dassier (MI 410/46), has a bust which might appear to the untrained eye to be made from the same puncheon which Simon used on his Lord General Medal (MI 388/7). Similarly, the bust puncheon of the smaller of the two Dutch imitation funeral medals (MI 434/84) could have been the same one which made the Dutch shilling. This puncheon is in the Mint and formed part of the 1700 purchase. Possibly it was a rejected Simon puncheon. However, the Simon and Dutch shillings appear to be from the same bust puncheon.

Cast forgeries are known to exist, in the halfcrown and shilling series, at least. These all appear to be copies of the Simon coins. Definite forgeries are avoided in the catalogue listing, although some coins which are listed, such as the E 14 and E 15 crowns, might be in the same dubious category.

From these preliminary remarks, the coins themselves will be discussed, based upon the catalogue and the flow chart.

The fifty-shilling gold piece (A 1), so-called because of its weight being 2-5 times that of the broad, is in existence to a greater degree than is normally supposed; in fact, to a degree whereby they might conceivably be considered to be presentation pieces more than patterns or proofs of the dies. Since the order specified a gold coin with the lettered edge reading as does the fifty-shilling piece, the original purpose of this magnificent striking may safely be considered as such an attempt. It will thus be defined here as a pattern for the broad. Yet, the coins themselves would have to have been made after Simon and Blondeau were well aware that the lettered edge was impractical for a twenty-shilling piece because of the increased thickness required. Hocking thought these coins to be from separate dies from the broad because of the indented or bifurcated bases in the lettering on one, but not the other. However, this bifurcation appears to be a function of the striking process, and is possibly related to the density and/or thickness of the metal used. In the few instances where it is possible to compare gold and silver strikings from the same die, or the same metal of different thicknesses from the same die, variations may be noted*. The fifty-shilling and broad dies are obviously one and the same, and the broads are thus categorized under the same grouping, A.

*A sufficient sampling has not been examined for definite conclusions to be reached.
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THE PUNCHES, DIES, AND COINS.
The broad (A 2, 3, and 4), or twenty-shilling gold piece, presents no particular problem as one set of dies was used to strike this coin, and these dies were by Simon. A few strikings, identical to the gold, are known in silver with grained edges. One thick striking is known with a plain edge, and this is in the Hunter collection. The dies are those which also produced the fifty-shilling piece and, like all the Simon dies, are now missing. The obverse puncheon is in the Royal Mint and was part of the 1700 purchase; the reverse puncheon has never been accounted for. The silver broads appear to have more bifurcation at the bases of the letters than do the gold strikings. A weight ratio of the standard gold broad to an average silver broad is 1:46:1. There were no Dutch or Tanner re-makes of this coin. This was also the case for the halfcrown, and the significance may lie in the fact that in each instance one of the required puncheons is missing. The implication here is that those puncheons were not part of the lot which reached the Low Countries, and thus new dies could not be sunk. An inconsistency occurs when the halfbroads are considered since there never was a reverse puncheon (all reverse dies were made from the sixpence arms), and yet new dies and coins were made. This may be rationalized in that no halfbroads were in existence, so the ‘Dutch’ had a reason to account for a coin for which they had but one obverse puncheon. This idea was then carried further by Tanner.

The halfbroads (Groups B, C, and D), or ten-shilling gold pieces, formerly presented some of the most perplexing problems of the entire series, but Mr. Allen correctly defined the issues (Ref. 4), presumably based on Hocking’s observations. Simon made the bust puncheon for the halfbroad, and possibly even one for the arms, although there is no trace of the latter. It is most unlikely that dies were sunk, for then it would be inconceivable that no proof or trial strikings survived. Since the halfbroad was originally ordered, and since this was a contemporary denomination, I must assume that an order, now missing, cancelled the need for the gold ten-shilling coin and indeed for the gold five-shilling piece as well. There are three distinct issues of the halfbroad, constituting die groups B, C, and D, and the sequence may easily be defined both by the degree of die faulting noticeable in the coins and by the die-links. In all instances, Simon’s bust puncheon for the proposed halfbroad and Simon’s reverse arms puncheon for the sixpence were used. A total of two obverse dies and two reverse dies were used to strike the three coins; two of the dies were Dutch and two were sunk by Tanner. Both puncheons and the four dies are in the Royal Mint, all but Tanner’s two dies forming part of the purchase of 1700. As previously mentioned, the probable reason for producing these false dies and coins was that the puncheon was in existence but not the coins, and thus for completeness the coins were made.

Group B dies were Dutch and therefore the first of the series. They are dated 1658 and are known in both gold and copper, with plain or grained edges. If the Dutch connotation is not sufficient to define these as the initial issue, the degree of obverse die cracks does place these coins before group D which came after group C. It has not been possible to determine whether or not any of this issue was re-struck at the Mint in 1738. A thorough examination of all existing specimens might provide the answer by comparing die flaws and searching for rust marks. In this paper the strikings will be considered as Dutch.

The second sequential issue was made from die group C, which dies were by Tanner. The coins are in gold, with both plain and grained edges, and dated 1656. Tanner apparently made these new dies in preference to using the Dutch dies of group B, perhaps in order to provide consistency with the original Simon issues. That is, Tanner’s new obverse die has
the correct inscription with the ‘&’ in the legend, and his reverse die has the 1656 date which may be considered consistent with the only original gold issue, the broad.

When all this was done, Tanner now lost consistency by muling the Dutch obverse of group B with his own reverse of group C. He thus produced group D. At least I must assume these coins were by Tanner since they were definitely a Mint output. Here, plain edge coins, in gold and silver, were made with the 1656 date. The sequence is again obvious because this final group was made from obverse and reverse dies which show the very latest stages of die flaws. The reason for Tanner’s group C is clear; the reason for the muled group, D, was possibly because Tanner’s obverse die became unusable and he had further coins remaining to be produced. An examination of the flow chart should clear up any confusion on the die-links which might still remain with the reader.

The crowns (Groups E, F, G, and Ga), or five-shilling silver pieces, constitute a rather involved series, yet a generally well-defined one. The crowns consist of the originals by Simon and the Dutch and Tanner copies. The Royal Mint has a Simon obverse punchon and a Simon reverse punchon, and both an obverse and reverse matrix, considered by Hocking to be Simon’s work. All of these were a portion of the 1700 purchase. Additionally, the Mint now has the final Tanner obverse and reverse dies as well as three of his unfinished dies. As usual, the Simon dies are missing, and the Dutch dies, alone of the Dutch series, are also missing (they were not in the 1700 purchase). The edges of all the different issues of the crown are lettered with the exception of a few of the copies which have plain edges.

Simon’s crown is characterized by three very distinct traits. The first is the well-known flaw running across Cromwell’s neck which was due to a cracked die. No crown has definitely been recorded in which some evidence of this flaw was not present, albeit occasionally minute. The flaw became massive by the end of the series as the crack in the die widened. The second trait is the protrusion from the upper right of the numeral 8 in the date. A careful examination under a sixty-power microscope leaves little room for doubt that the 8 was re-cut over a 7. The final identifying characteristic of the Simon striking is that the top leaf of the laurel wreath points to the left part of the right foot of the letter A in ANG. This is useful in differentiating the coin from the other crowns. These points are all well known and I have simply repeated them here. There are two gold strikings of the crown known to exist. At least one of these shows a moderate state of the die flaw and, if I may, I will assume that the other is similar. Probably some presentation pieces were required during the striking of the regular coinage, and thus the cracked die was all that was available for use. They cannot be thought of as proofs of the die. I have listed two other crowns of the Simon type, E 14 and E 15, one in pewter and the other in some base metal, silver plated. I consider these as casts and therefore not original works of Simon. E 15 has been examined under a thirty-power microscope, and a granularity and roughness of the surface is very evident. However, this could be a function of the base metal and the plating. A date sometime just after the Restoration, when Pepys (1662) comments on their upswing in price, would be my guess as to the time and the reason for the castings. With this surmise one would expect to find more in existence, and very likely there are. They are included in the catalogue because of the uncertainty of their status. The weight ratio of a standard crown to the plated crown (E 15) is 1·37:1, and of the two gold crowns to the standard silver crown, 1·54:1 and 1·63:1.

1 The Fitzwilliam specimen (758·4 gr.) is illustrated in the Montagu catalogue (third portion, Nov. 1896, Sotheby) as lot 720 and the Wakley catalogue (Dec. 1909, Sotheby) as lot 113. The other specimen (716 gr.) presently in the United States, is illustrated as lot 456 in the Murdoch catalogue (second portion, June 1903, Sotheby). They do appear to be similar.
Hocking illustrates a wax (?) impression from the Simon matrices, which were in the 1700 purchase, as no. 4 in Plate IV (Ref. 3). Unfortunately, I am unable to discern any differences between this impression and a normal Simon striking, at least nothing which could not be explained by the condition of the steel. Hocking mentioned the lack of bifurcated letters but, being a function of the striking, the matrices would not be expected to illustrate this peculiarity, and a wax impression would also lack it. I find this confusing only in the great degree of sameness between the matrices and the coins, especially so for a hand-made item.

The Dutch crowns were possibly struck prior to 1690, and the dies were presumably sunk from Simon's puncheons. This coin is characterized by an inverted and reversed letter N in the obverse and edge legends, by the bust being poorly centered, and by the top leaf of the laurel wreath pointing to the first leg of the letter N in ANG. The coins are known in various metals, but not gold, and the edge is lettered normally. I assume that all the listed coins were struck. The dies for this coin have never been accounted for. Perhaps it is significant to note that the Dutch crown differs from all other Dutch coins in that the letter N is always inverted and reversed, the & is present in the obverse legend, and the dies are missing. Additionally it is the poorest instance of bust centering. Certain opinions in the past have been expressed to the effect that Simon's puncheons were not used to sink the Dutch crown dies. Possibly this crown has no relation to any of the other Dutch coins, but was concocted independently to satisfy some unknown demand.

The Tanner crowns were struck circa 1738 from new dies made with the Simon puncheons purchased in 1700. The coins are all in silver and have either a plain or lettered edge. The top leaf of the laurel wreath on this coin points between the A and N of ANG, and it is a reasonably good copy of Simon's work. These crowns were apparently made for certain collectors of the day, but I would not hazard a guess as to the reason. Certainly the purpose was not to satisfy a demand for Cromwell crowns, since the few made by Tanner would not have supplied a general market and the Simon crown was not so rare. A curious striking exists (Ga 24) which mules the Tanner reverse with the Simon obverse matrix. This coin is mentioned in the Linecar & Stone article (Ref. 5) and by Hocking. It was probably made expressly for Mr. Hunter as a curiosity.

The silver halfcrowns (Groups H and I) are a straightforward issue, although they are the only original Simon coins represented by two different dates, that is, 1656 and 1658. The coins themselves are noticeably different from each other in the general appearance of the bust, the arrangement of the reverse crown, and the reading of the obverse legend (1656 reads III whereas 1658 reads IIB). However, it is usually agreed that the puncheons were the same for both coins. The obverse halfcrown puncheon and all four Simon dies are missing, but the reverse puncheon was included in the Mint purchase of 1700. The 1656 halfcrown is known only in silver and with a lettered edge. It is normally found in a circulated condition and is quite scarce. It is likely that these coins of 1656 were circulated in the sense that they were distributed on a high social level (Parliament?), possibly as an experiment for general circulation, but with a result that they became souvenirs or pocket pieces. The halfcrowns of 1658 are known in silver and gold and again all have their edges lettered. The weight ratios of the gold halfcrowns to the standard silver halfcrowns are 1.76:1 and 1.78:1 for two of the three known to me. In a fashion similar to the gold crowns, these gold pieces were probably struck for presentation purposes during the manufacture of the normal silver issue.

The silver shillings (Groups J and K), are represented by the Simon and Dutch issues, but there are none by Tanner unless he made some re-strikes from the Dutch dies. The Mint
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has both Simon puncheons, the pair of Dutch dies, and an unfinished Dutch reverse matrix. Hocking was somewhat doubtful that the existing reverse puncheon was actually the one used to sink the Simon and Dutch dies. The Simon dies have not been accounted for, as usual.

All of the original Simon silver coins show the effects of certain die flaws, and these are described in the catalogue listing. A unique striking in the British Museum is in silver on an octagonal flan, undoubtedly a proof of the dies. The silver coins are of uniform quality, but the base shillings are an unknown factor. These base issues, in pewter, copper, and lead, are mentioned in sale catalogues according to Henfrey, but details and present locations are not known to me and I have my doubts as to their genuineness. Other than the pewter sixpence, supposedly by Simon, there are no Simon strikings in other than silver and gold, the pewter and base crowns presumably being casts. Until they can be thoroughly examined, they must remain as anomalies. One of the most mysterious coins is a gold shilling from the Simon dies, but lacking the die flaws. It must not be assumed that the die pits causing the flaws were repaired by Simon or Blondeau to make special presentation shillings compatible with the gold crowns and haflerrows, because the quality of the coin is not that of a Blondeau striking. The quality is the most important characteristic of the coin—the coin is properly centered, but the bust, arms, and legends are not in sharp focus although the beading and graining are. The polish and frosting are not good, yet none of these faults can be readily attributed to a weak striking. The question of the coin being a cast naturally arises, but it has been studied and measured under sixty power and does not appear to be a casting. The measurements show that the coin diameter and the lettering dimensions are identical to three standard silver shillings which were examined for comparison. That is, there is no discernible shrinkage of the gold coin as would normally be expected of a cast. The weight ratio of the gold shilling to a standard silver shilling is 1:24:1, which implies a highly alloyed coin. A cast coin would have reproduced the die flaws since the original model would have been flawed, and it is not likely that the flaws would have been ground off the gold coin. Thus, all indications point to a struck coin, possibly from rusty dies, and probably not by Blondeau. Certain characteristics, such as weak harpstrings and unsharp outlines could be attributed to rusty dies. There is also a very faint tendency toward reverse double striking although this is not evident to the naked eye. Mr. Allen (Ref. 4) mentions a gold shilling in the Murdoch sale (said to be cast in the catalogue) and the Wertheimer sale. I do not know if these coins are one and the same nor if they are the same as the one I list. I have purposely detailed this particular coin because, if the conclusion that the coin was struck is accepted, then a very important relationship is developed between this coin and the disappearance of the Simon dies. The tendency is to consider the coin as a later re-strike, later especially if the dies actually were rusty. Unfortunately, I am unable to develop this trend any further. If other gold shillings exist, it would be most interesting to examine them. Similarly, it would be interesting to see if the base shillings illustrate the same peculiarities as the gold coin. Sometime in the past some individual may have had a full set of Simon coins in gold, with the exception of the sixpence!

The Dutch shillings are generally of good quality and closely resemble the Simon shillings, although the ‘&’ is missing from the obverse legend. Except for a very few known in bronze, a microscope.

1 A specimen has been reported without the usual flaw under the letter P, but I have not examined this coin.

2 An extremely faint trace of a portion of the flaw under the letter P has been noticed with the aid of a microscope.

3 However, the thickness of the gold shilling is only about 80% of that of a silver shilling. This could account for the weight discrepancy as compared to the gold and silver broads.
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The coins are in silver, with grained or plain edges, and struck on thick or normal flans. I have listed the normal and thick coins separately, not because the thick issues have been traditionally known as two-shilling pieces, but simply because there are two distinct weight groupings. According to Hocking, the thick flans were necessary due to the quality of the Dutch dies. I have little doubt that most of the strikings were done in the Low Countries. This is based on the quality of the strikings and the lack of traces of rust on those coins I have examined. If struck in 1738, the dies would have been very old, and therefore rust on the steel dies would be expected.

The silver sixpence coinage (Groups L and M) is represented, in a similar fashion to the shillings, only by the Simon and Dutch issues. The Royal Mint has both the Simon puncheons and the pair of Dutch dies. The Simon dies are, of course, missing. This denomination is the smallest, except for the Ramage farthings, and will be the final coin to be discussed here.

The Simon coin is an exceedingly rare one, and surprisingly so. The majority of specimens reported by Henfrey are only in fair condition. The coins are all in silver and have their edges grained with the exception of a plain-edged pewter striking in the British Museum. The primary difference between the Simon and Dutch sixpence is that the former has the proper legend with the ‘&’ but the Dutch, as on the shilling and halfbroad, omits it. The inconsistencies arise when it is considered that the sixpence was a very natural denomination to produce, and yet it is the rarest of Simon coins; the condition of most of the existing specimens is not equal to other remaining Simon rarities; and the pewter striking is possibly the only Simon coin struck in something other than gold or silver (taking the previous comments on the other base coins into account). When I began this paper, I had expected to be able to disprove the connection between Simon and the ‘&’ sixpence. However, this I have been unable to do, so unless new data come to the fore, this denomination will remain as a part of the original Simon coinage. Possibly they are trial pieces with the rarity due to Cromwell’s death before full production could be begun. Or possibly the dies were prepared by Simon, but only a pewter trial struck. In that case someone else would have had to strike the coins at a later date. Under this premise, the question of the history of the Simon dies again becomes important. Certainly the dies are not Dutch and, had they been by Tanner, they would probably still exist. Tanner had the Dutch dies, and therefore would have had no reason to make new ones. Everything points to the dies being by Simon, but not necessarily the strikings.

The Dutch sixpences are relatively common, and are found only in silver, with either grained or plain edges. I have avoided the traditional ninepence nomenclature for the thick-flan strikings, but instead I have listed only two types, based upon the type of edge. The coins vary greatly in weight, and not in distinct groupings of light and heavy, or thick and thin. Again, I would suspect that most of the strikings are Dutch.

Conclusions

From an examination of the presented data, it will be noted that none of Simon’s original dies are known to exist, with the possible exception of the crown matrices which are not truly dies. Conversely, all of the dies known to exist (in the Royal Mint) are either Dutch or by Tanner, except for the matrices. All the Dutch dies, with the exception of the Dutch crown, were purchased in 1700 by the Mint. It is not really conceivable that the Simon dies may yet come to light, but it is to be hoped that documentation will. Since these dies were a part of an official English coinage, of a sort, it is entirely logical to assume they were officially
destroyed at or by the Mint after Cromwell's death. Then the gold shilling, possibly the base shillings, possibly the silver sixpences, and possibly some of the other Simon coins would have to have been made by some unscrupulous mint worker between the time of Cromwell's death and the destruction of the dies. In that case, Simon and Blondeau would have had to transfer the dies to the Mint from Drury House, necessitating some form of documentation. If the Mint were officially aware that the dies had been destroyed, it is strange that those purchased in 1700 were thought to be originals, unless the change in personnel over the years would account for the discrepancy.

The Dutch coins were probably made to satisfy some unknown request, and someone quite knowledgeable in the types of Cromwell coins seems to have been involved in the enterprise. A search through Dutch archives in reference to some of the known medalists of the day might prove enlightening. Tanner's coins, if indeed he was the culprit, were probably a result of the influence of some collector of the period, but the philosophy behind the re-makes will probably never be understood.

Clearly, we are still plagued with many unanswered questions, other than that of the disappearance of the Simon dies. These questions include the reasons why certain denominations were never made; how and why the Simon puncheons (at least) reached the Low Countries, and exactly what constituted this package; and how this parcel of Simon puncheons and Dutch dies arrived back at the Mint to be purchased there in 1700. I present these opinions and comments, for that is only what they are, in the hope that future studies will be initiated.

It has not proved possible to include quality illustrations of the coins, but most are illustrated by castings in one book or another and, where known, these are noted in the catalogue listing.

It remains for me to express my appreciation for the generous assistance extended me by H. W. A. Linecar and W. Slayter. For the extensive correspondence and details of the most important collections I wish to thank R. E. Ockenden, R. A. G. Carson of the British Museum, G. Pollard of the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge, Dr. C. H. V. Sutherland and J. D. A. Thompson of the Heberden Coin Room at Oxford, and Dr. Anne Robertson of the Hunter Coin Cabinet at Glasgow. I would also like to thank D. G. Liddell for supplying many of the coins, and H. E. Manville for corrections and comments.

Since the preparation of this paper it has been decided that the E 15 crown is a silver-plated cast. The F 21 crown has had its edge-lettering erased and thus the type does not really exist.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATALOGUE NUMBER</th>
<th>DENOMINATION</th>
<th>METAL</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EDGE</th>
<th>DIE ENGRAVER</th>
<th>CATALOGUE NUMBER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ILLUSTRATION REFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>WEIGHT (Grams)</th>
<th>COPPER</th>
<th>SILVER</th>
<th>GOLD</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>&quot;FIFTY SHILLINGS&quot;</td>
<td>GOLD</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>LETTERED</td>
<td>SIMON</td>
<td>BM 11</td>
<td>A 551.25</td>
<td>A 11</td>
<td>PROBABLY A MISTAKE FOR THE ROD. ON A THICK PLAIN WITH EDGE READING &quot;PROCTOR LONDON LONDON LONDON, SHOP, BAY, BAY, BAY, BAY.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>&quot;FIFTY SHILLINGS&quot;</td>
<td>GOLD</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>GRANCHED</td>
<td>SIMON</td>
<td>BM 11</td>
<td>A 551.25</td>
<td>A 11</td>
<td>PROBABLY A MISTAKE FOR THE ROD. ON A THICK PLAIN WITH EDGE READING &quot;PROCTOR LONDON LONDON LONDON, SHOP, BAY, BAY, BAY, BAY.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 3</td>
<td>&quot;FIFTY SHILLINGS&quot;</td>
<td>SILVER</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>GRANCHED</td>
<td>SIMON</td>
<td>BM 11</td>
<td>A 551.25</td>
<td>A 11</td>
<td>PROBABLY A MISTAKE FOR THE ROD. ON A THICK PLAIN WITH EDGE READING &quot;PROCTOR LONDON LONDON LONDON, SHOP, BAY, BAY, BAY, BAY.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 4</td>
<td>&quot;FIFTY SHILLINGS&quot;</td>
<td>SILVER</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>GRANCHED</td>
<td>SIMON</td>
<td>BM 11</td>
<td>A 551.25</td>
<td>A 11</td>
<td>PROBABLY A MISTAKE FOR THE ROD. ON A THICK PLAIN WITH EDGE READING &quot;PROCTOR LONDON LONDON LONDON, SHOP, BAY, BAY, BAY, BAY.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1 - A CATALOGUE LISTING OF THE CROMWELL COINAGE**