MISCELLANEA

THREE NEW VARIETIES OF ANCIENT BRITISH COINS

A new inscribed Coritani silver half denomination.

In March 1968, on the Owmby Cliff site in Lincolnshire, was found a small silver coin inscribed VEP BOB. The most interesting feature of this coin is the obverse die, showing a wreath design with beaded circles at either side. This is unrecorded so far in the inscribed silver denomination of the Coritani.

The details of this coin which is now in my collection are as follows:

Obverse. Wreath design down centre, with beaded circle with pellet in the centre on either side.

Reverse. Horse to right with co below.

Weight. 5·1 grains (0·33 grams) (PI. XXI, 1)

An unpublished inscribed silver coin of the Coritani.

In May of 1968 another inscribed coin of the Coritani was found at Owmby Cliff site in Lincolnshire. Though only just over half has survived, it can still be identified as a full silver denomination inscribed, possibly, VEP. This type has only been known for the plated stater illustrated by Commander Mack as number 460 A.

This coin also shows how important it was that it should have been found before it was totally destroyed by the plough.

A new variety of a stater of Addedomaros.

For some time there have been known two varieties of the stater Mack 268, having on the reverse either a wheel or rosette above the horse. In this new variety we find the wheel placed in front of the horse in place of the s shaped ornament.

The details are as follows:

Obverse. Ornament consisting of two solid crescents, back to back, with chevron-shaped compartments in the interior of each crescent. Pellet in angles between crescents.

Reverse. ADDB. Horse to right, tail branched above, a rosette and ring ornament; beneath, a palm branch and ring ornament. In front a wheel and behind an s shaped ornament.

Weight. 82·7 grains (5·36 grams) (PI. XXI, 3)

H. R. MOSSOP.

A MODERN FORGERY OF A SCEAT

A sceat of BMC Type 8 in the Hunterian collection is absolutely identical with BMC 82. Not only are the dies (ostensibly) the same, but their irregular imposition on the flan, the shape of the flan, and the minor defects of striking, are the same. One of the two would seem, therefore, to be a fabrication and, since BMC 82 is an undated (pre-1838) accession, and the Hunterian coin goes back to the eighteenth century, an unusually early fabrication in the sceat series. The Hunterian specimen, which weighs 19·0 gr. (1·23 gm.), was illustrated by Ruding as pl. I, 1 on his two plates of sceattas. We reproduce this very accurate drawing as Fig. 1. The British Museum’s coin weighs 18·9 gr. (1·22 gm.). These figures are in line with those for other examples of Type 8, which maintained a heavy standard. Another specimen, again identical, formed part of the Sir Arthur Evans bequest to the Heberden Coin Room at Oxford in 1941. Its weight is excessive—22·7 gr. (1·47 gm.), but otherwise its general appearance is very convincing.

The type is sufficiently well known from other dies. Dirks illustrated an example in the Hague cabinet, shown here as Fig. 2a, and another, in barbarous style, from Domburg—Fig. 2b. There was one in the Cimiez hoard, weighing 20·1 gr. (1·30 gm.). The bold cross-and-pellets design is derived from the plentiful ‘Frisian Runic’ variety (BMC Type 2c; Rigold R3). The other side of the

1 SCBI Hunterian 52.
2 BNJ 1955-57, 37.
3 Dirks, ‘Les Anglo-Saxons et leurs petits
deniers dita sceattas’, RBN 1870, 81ff.; pl. E. q.
4 Dirks, pl. F, 20.
5 RN 1938, pl. IV, 53.
coin (since it combines two reverses, it is difficult to say which should take priority) is copied from the standard of the 'porcupine' and related issues: the square contains 4 L-shaped symbols, or 3 L's and an I, arranged around an annulet. On the more characteristic specimens the annulet is large and contains a dot.

Dirks also reproduced for purposes of comparison a coin remarkably like the one under consideration, taking his illustration from J Lelewel's Numismatique du moyen âge (Fig. 2c). The similarities are so great that one may assume that the drawing was taken from the same prototype, although it is not quite as faithful as that published in Ruding's work. Dirk's brief comment suggests a possible reason why this particular coin should have attracted interest: he notes that it is 'le seul sceatta que Lelewel attribue à l'Angleterre, et spécialement à Kent.' Lelewel does not say where he took his illustration from, and we have not succeeded in tracing the matter any farther back.

We have, however, analysed the metal contents of the Ashmolean Museum's specimen, using X-ray fluorescence spectrometry on a cleaned section, with results which seem to us to be perfectly clear-cut. All the genuine sceattas that have been analysed by this method have been found to contain easily-measurable amounts of trace-elements or minor constituents, particularly lead and gold, and often zinc. In the metal of the suspected forgery, no trace-elements showed up at all. The alloy was in the range 91-93% silver, 7-9% copper— which corresponds with sterling silver! We should add that it is also close to the fineness of genuine specimens of BMC Types 2c and 8, of which we hope to publish four analyses elsewhere. The authenticity of the other two specimens must await proper consideration, but the Evans specimen at least can in our view be dismissed as a modern forgery.

D. M. METCALF and L. K. HAMBLIN

A NOTE ON THE MINT OF HORNCastle

This excessively rare Anglo-Saxon mint, the Horncastro of the Lincolnshire Domesday, was first identified by Mr. Dolley in 1958 from a single unpublished coin of Ethelred II's First Hand type in Stockholm. A second specimen, a coin of Edward the Martyr, came to light in the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in West Berlin and is published by Miss Van der Meer to whom the credit for its discovery there is due. A third specimen, a coin of Ethelred II 'First Small Cross' type, has recently appeared and is recorded by Mr. Purvey in an excellent little article in Seaby's Bulletin. That article, however, does not illustrate the two previously recorded coins and as one is in Stockholm and the other in Berlin it is clearly desirable that all three should be illustrated together. (Figs. 1, 2 and 3 next page)

The two coins which have come to light since 1958 afford most striking corroboration for Mr. Dolley's provisional attribution of the Stockholm coin to a Lincolnshire mint both being from dies which are manifestly typical products of the Lincoln die engraving 'School'.

The coins may be listed as under:—

(1) obv. +EDWARD RE+ ANG
rev. +ADELELN- MOON HOR (The N's reversed).

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, West Berlin.

1 E.g. BMC 80 and 81; SCBI Hunterian 51.
2 Dirks, pl. G, XI.
3 Lelewel, pl. X, 1.
4 P. 316, n. 2 (p.96 in the separate publication).
5 The analysis was done in the Research Laboratory for Archaeology and the History of Art, Oxford.
6 D. M. Metcalf, J. M. Merrick, and L. K. Hamblin, Studies in the Composition of Early Medieval Coins (Minerva Numismatic Handbooks, no. 3), Newcastle, 1968, sections III-V.
7 In the Jaarboek voor Munten en Penningkunde.
8 BNJ XXIX, 1 (1958), pp. 51-54 and block on p. 51.
(2) **obv.** +ÆDELRED RE+ANG  
**rev.** +ÆDELN 0 HR (or 'OH' ligulate)NE (Thr  
N's reversedly barred).
In the writer's collection—without provenance  
but probably a 'stray' from the 1914  
Chester hoard. Note addition of 'E' to  
the mint signature of No. 3.

(3) **obv.** +ÆDELRED REX ANG  
**rev.** +ÆDELGAR M-O HORN  
Royal Coin Cabinet, Stockholm, from an  
unpublished Swedish hoard (SHM Inv.  
7673).

It will be apparent from a glance at the readings  
that it is most unlikely that the 'new' coin (Fig. 2)  
could ever have been attributed to Horncastle  
without knowledge of the Berlin coin (Fig. 1).  
Similarly, too, it is doubtful whether a firm attribution  
would have been possible for the latter without  
knowledge of the coin in Stockholm (Fig. 3). All  
three coins, each seemingly unique, are of consecutive types but as to whether the mint opened  
up under Edgar, time alone will show. This must be  
both possibility but I have not included the  'Two Line' type coin of that reign (B.M.C. No. 63)  
of the moneyer Adelgar which Mr. Dolley thought  
might be associated with this mint because, as he  
himself points out, this is incapable of proof in the  
present state of our knowledge of these 'no mint  
signature' coins. A 'Second Hand' type of  Æthelred II is hardly likely to appear as the mint  
of Lincoln, which must have been the die-engraving  
centre for the small Lincolnshire mints, is unknown  
in that type. Mr. Dolley points out, though, that  
a Second Hand coin of Torksey is known (SCBI,  
Copenhagen II, 1251), which could suggest the  
possibility of dies being sent to Horncastle from a  
centre further south. Since one has not as yet turned  
up in the vast Danegold hoards, it is probable that  
Horncastle did not survive to strike the succeeding  
('Crux') type of Æthelred II. The name of the  
moneyer of Nos. 1 and 2, or at any rate its spelling  
on the coins (ÆDELN and ÆDELN) is very unusual  
and is only paralleled by the unique coin of  Edward the Martyr in the B.M. (B.M.C. No. 20)  
with an enigmatic mint signature and reading  +ÆDELN M-O LVVLE. In B.M.C. the name is  equated, with a query, as being ÆDELM. That coin  (B.M.C. No. 20) is of 'Southern England' style  which must rule out the likelihood of there being  
any connection between the two moneyers of this  
seemingly very uncommon name. The characteristics  
of the Lincoln 'School' of die-engraving apparent  
on Nos. 1 and 2 are quite unmistakable but those  
on No. 3 are far more subtle and it is indeed Remark-  
able that Mr. Dolley should have identified Horncas-  
tle as 'A possible sixth Anglo-Saxon mint in  
Lincolnshire' on the evidence of that one coin alone.  
The purpose of this note is to summarise the fresh  
evidence which has turned that possibility into a  
virtual certainty.

F. BLMORE JONES.

A PENNY OF HARTHACNUT FOR WILTON

Dr. A. S. DeShazo has kindly permitted me to  
publish an 'Arm and Sceptre' penny of the Wilton  
mint which is now in his collection. The only other  
known coin of this mint for Harthacnut is Hild.  
198, a cut halfpenny, which does not show the  
moneyer's name. Mrs. Ulla Westermark, Assistant  
Keeper of Coins, Statens Historiska Museum, has  
kindly sent photographs of that coin. It is illustrated  
below with the coin which is the subject of this note.

Of the three moneyers striking for Harold I at  
Wilton, only Aelfstan is known to have struck coins  
for Cnut and Edward as well. Lifinc struck for
Harold I and Edward but not Cnut, and Golsig is known solely for Harold I. The moneyer Aelfwine struck for Cnut and Edward, but coins from his dies are not known for Harold I or Harthacnut. Thus we have expected discovery of coins from Wilton in the name of Harthacnut, especially considering the existence of Hild. 198. The circumstances surrounding the find of the new coin are not known.

I purchased it from a dealer in 1967, and apparently it had lain in a box with other Anglo-Saxon coins for some years before that. Those ‘typically Scandinavian test-marks’ might indicate a non-English find site.

The two coins known for Harthacnut of the Wilton mint are illustrated below, and read as follows:

1. ♣ HÅRDNYTREX ♣ ALFSTANGNÝLLVE
2. ♣ HÅR . . . . IVTR: ♣ ... . . . . . . ONPILTV

A HALFGROAT VARIETY OF RICHARD II

In BNJ XXIX (pp. 345-6) Mr. Potter discusses and records the varieties of Richard II halfgroats known to him. None are recorded equivalent to the earliest groats, type I, which have letters and bust as on late coins of Edward III. But there are five obverse dies of type II, with the old bust but new letters and reversed Z for æ. The obverse of a new specimen is from Potter die no. 1, and its reverse is the unusual one, Potter IIb, reading ADIVTORE and with a saltire in place of initial cross. This reverse is otherwise known only with the obverse Potter no. 2. The number of similar reverses found with both dies no. 1 and 2, together with this die-link, suggest that they may have been in use more or less concurrently, and that Mr. Potter was right in making them adjacent in his series. The new halfgroat came to me in a wrapping inscribed ‘Found at Lancing, 1861’. Its dies are illustrated in vol. XXIX, plate XX, no. 1 (obv.) and no. 2 (rev.).

IAN STEWART.

THE NEWARK MEDAL OF ANTHONY ASCHAM: SOME REMARKS

Miss M. P. Bellamy has discussed this presumed medal in BNJ 1966 and printed some very interesting documentary evidence concerning it. I am conscious that I am not well qualified to take up the discussion of this subject since I am neither as a historian nor as a numismatist concerned with the 17th century, but there are, I think, things that should be said about this medal which have not been
said and I hope that my saying these things will at least stimulate others better qualified to take one side or another in the argument.

Briefly, the situation is this. Anthony Ascham, nominated Resident for the English Parliament at Madrid, arrived at Madrid on June 5th 1650 and was murdered there by exiled English Royalists on the 6th. On his body was discovered something that was either a Newark siege-piece of the shilling denomination (partially tooled?) or a medal with a design derived from a Newark siege-piece of that value. Its singularity lies in the fact that the two drawings of it that exist show that the crown that appears on the obverse of the Newark siege-pieces is in this case transfixed by a dagger. Since it is very probable that Ascham was one of those who sat in judgement on Charles I and certain that he was an intertemperate Republican, there is a prima facie case for associating the design with Charles's execution. Whether it was a talisman personal to Ascham or a medal worn promiscuously by Parliamentary zealots Miss Bellamy is not prepared to decide but she is confident, at least, that the design reflects the elation of a Parliamentarian at the downfall of the monarchy and she regrets that no object answering the description is now known. So notable a numismatic reflection of republican feeling would certainly be a great prize.

I want, however, to offer a very different interpretation of the evidence. I shall argue that it is much more likely that the object discovered on Ascham's body owed its presence there to some Royalist agency, and I shall also argue that it is by no means clear that this object was other than a quite ordinary unaltered shilling Newark siege-piece; that is to say, that the 'Ascham Medal' may not have been Ascham's and may not have been a medal.

First, the design. Of this we have two illustrations and one contradictory verbal description. A contemporary pamphlet, the Madrid News Sheet, dated July 1st 1650, contains an engraving of a single-sided oval object which has on it the essential features of both sides of a Newark siege-piece: the denomination XII, the date 1646, the inscription OBS NEWAREE, and, above, the transfixed crown. Very much the same object is portrayed in a drawing accompanying a letter written ten days earlier (June 21st 1650) by the Royalist ambassadors in Spain, Lord Cottington and Edward Hyde, to the exiled Charles II: there are some minor discrepancies which lead Miss Bellamy to conclude that the drawings are independent of each other. On the other hand, the Spanish report of the inquest held by the authorities after the murder says that Ascham had a two-sided medal with NEBARI on one side, XII and OBSTRICT on the other, and although an English translation of this report, with preface dated May 8th 1651, brings this more into line with the illustrations by adding that the object carried a crown and poniard, this is, as Miss Bellamy says, an interpolation based on the News Sheet, and there is really no reason to doubt that the item involved had designs on both sides and hence was not in fact a medal but a Newark siege-piece more or less altered.

Why, then, do the illustrations show a one-sided object? To explain this we must look at the problem as a whole and examine our sources more closely. Miss Bellamy's position is that she regards, albeit with some reservations, the News Sheet and the letter as independent of each other, and partly as a consequence of this she appears to believe that the facts of the case are as reported in these documents and that the surmises they—particularly the News Sheet—offer are serious contributions to understanding the problem. Such a view I regard as naive.

The first point to be made is that the Madrid News Sheet is a Royalist production. In its title Ascham is described as 'agent . . . for the rebels of England'. Now it and the letter from Cottington and Hyde have strong verbal similarities, as Miss Bellamy allows; she finds it difficult to see how those responsible for the Madrid News Sheet could have had access to a letter addressed to Charles II, but once recognized as a Royalist production the difficulty disappears, for at this date a Royalist pamphlet is likely to have been produced on the Continent and probably in the Low Countries, and it seems very likely that Charles or his advisers would decode Cottington and Hyde's letter and pass a transcription to a printer for propaganda purposes. It could even have been produced at Madrid, something perhaps suggested by the short interval that elapsed between the date on the letter and the printed date on the News Sheet; if so, Cottington and Hyde themselves passed a copy to the printer. In any case, the title of the News Sheet refers to its compilation from 'letters written out of Spain' and in its text the epistolary 'we', suitable to the fact that there were two ambassadors in Spain, is retained, so at whatever remove Cottington and Hyde's letter is the foundation of the News Sheet. The two sources independent of the inquest report reduce to one, and the minor discrepancies between engraving and drawing are readily explicable by the bare fact that one is an engraving and the other a drawing.

So the ambassadors' letter is primary. What do they say? They say that 'a plate of silver' was found
on the body of the dead man on his left side 'next his skin and nearest his heart' and that it passed into the possession of the King of Spain. They then say that they are sending a model (a drawing) of it to Charles, and add 'We here take it to be some symbol not of Parliamentary success but defiant Royalist resistance. Only if tooled would they be something that Ascham could proudly carry, and indeed the drawing indicates that this was a tooled coin. Here however is a difficulty. The tooling consists of a poniard through the obverse crown, and it is extremely improbable that this is other than a reference to the execution of the king in March 1649; yet Newark fell to Parliament as early as May 1646. Why should Ascham have had a Newark siege-piece in his possession untooled nearly three years after the fall of Newark and (6) have thought that putting a poniard through the crown of such a siege piece made any very effective pro-republican statement as late as 1649?

Much better to suppose that the crown and the poniard in Cottington and Hyde's drawing refer not to the fate of the king but to the fate of Ascham; a poniard has been added by them to the design that the siege-piece actually carried to indicate that Ascham has been killed because he was a regicide or extreme republican. I am fortified in this supposition by what is said in the letter about the design: they call it a Hieroglyphic—which could mean that it is not purely representational—and suggest that it will be understood near England. Note that they do not say in England. The reference is to Charles II's court. Miss Bellamy thinks that Cottington and Hyde call it a hieroglyphic because they were unaware what the design meant; but if they expected to discover from 'near England' what the design meant why on earth do they run together obverse and reverse? Clearly their remarks are disingenuous. Nor is there very much to be said for the other element in their remarks that does not appear in the inquest report. The statement that the object was carried 'next his skin and nearest his heart' could easily be a dramatization of the fact that it was found on the body. The nearer the heart, this emblem of regicide revenged appeared the more pointed Cottington and Hyde's hieroglyphic becomes.

There remains the undeniable fact that a siege-piece was found on the body. I have already argued that a Newark siege-piece untooled would be a Royalist token and the introduction of the poniard a Royalist idea. It remains more likely that a Royalist would own an untooled siege-piece at the time of Charles I's execution and later tool it to mark Ascham's corpse as that of a regicide rather than that Ascham would own one and wear it as a symbol of republican triumph.

H. R. PAGAN.
A FURTHER NOTE ON THE GOLD MEDAL ALLEGEDLY AWARDED TO MAJOR ROGERS FOR VALOROUS SERVICES IN 1690

Oliver Cresswell in *BNJ XXXI* (1962), pp. 138-151, makes a most convincing case for dating the Major Rogers medal to c. 1790 rather than 1690 as so often hazarded from the date under the bust on the obverse and the date on the legend on the rim.

This is not the first time the use of vital dates, from King William's career, in legends on medals has misled commentators. In the Belfast Municipal Art Gallery and Museum’s *Quarterly Notes*, no. XXII (December, 1912) p. 5, a medal by John Craig Parkes is said to have been ‘made in 1688’ by ‘John E. Parkes’ (sic). The date 1688 on the reverse was taken as the date of striking of this Orange medal, though Parkes lived from 1821 until 1901.

Mr. Cresswell suggests as provenance for the ‘Rogers’ medal ‘some pre-Orange, Loyal Association, in Enniskillen’. Might I suggest as possible claimants to the title of issuing the medal either one of the Volunteer Units in the town or the later Yeomanry corps.

The town had two volunteer units and they appear under the following names: Enniskillen Volunteers, Enniskillen First Company, Old or First Enniskillen Company, Enniskillen Company, Enniskillen Independents and Independent Enniskilleners. References to these occur between 1779 and 1784.

A much more likely source for the issue of such a medal is the yeomanry unit embodied in the town in 1796 and appearing on the published lists of yeomanry corps in 1797, 1798, 1803, 1804, 1805, 1807, 1829 and 1825. Occasionally referred to as Enniskillen Yeomen Infantry or Enniskillen Infantry the title under which they are normally listed is simply Enniskilleners. They are mentioned by Mr. Cresswell (loc. cit., p. 145).

Mr. Cresswell has pointed out the importance of the spelling, of the name of the town, for the purposes of dating the alleged 1690 medal. The coincidence of the title of the yeomanry unit of 1796-1825 with the legend on the reverse of the medal is probably of significance in establishing the date and provenance of the medal.

Oliver Snoddy.

A HITHERTO UNCONFIRMED CLASS OF IRISH PETTY PAPER-MONEY

Recently there was shown at the Ulster Museum a specimen of a class of Irish emergency paper-money, from the period of the monetary crisis of 1803/1804, which until then was known to have existed only from incidental denunciations which stud the pages of the 1804 British House of Commons and House of Lords Parliamentary Report of the Committee on the Circulating Paper, the Specie, and the Current Coin of Ireland, and of quite a number of contemporary pamphlets. The ‘note’ is illustrated here from an enlarged direct photograph—the back is completely blank:

The ‘note’ itself measures $2\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$ inches, and is executed in black on white handmade paper without watermark, except for the issuer’s initials ‘w s’—a cancellation?—which are overprinted or stamped in red. The different elements of the both printed and handwritten text may be analysed as follows:

**Graddam.** This is the name of a rural townland in Crosserlough parish a few miles to the south of Cavan Town. The official spelling is Graddum. As we shall see, typographical corroboration of this identification comes from the circumstance that an Ireland was the Cavan printer at the material time.

**W. Stafford.** This is the name of the issuer, a farmer in Graddum townland and an ancestor in the direct line of the ‘note’s present owner. The addition of the name quite literally in copper plate engraving is of interest because it suggests that other individuals in Graddum townland may have been issuing these ‘notes’ on a standard printed form—it should perhaps be explained for the benefit of non-Irish readers that a townland is a subdivision of the Irish civil parish which last is usually quite appreciably larger than the run of its English counterparts.

**I O U.** It is in this formula that the uniqueness of the present ‘note’ consists. The ‘silver notes’ proper, banknotes for less than £1 redeemable in silver, used the same standard promissory wording as notes of the larger denominations, and the great majority were issued by recognized banks. In the National Museum of Ireland there are some two dozen specimens of this petty paper money for sums of less than 10s., and three-quarters of these come within the above category. The exceptions either are more or less modelled on banknotes but put out by institutions other than banks, for example, a brewery and a canal company, or employ quite other formulae and emanate from private individuals, a Cahir printer, a Cork grocer, a Killarney saddler and a nameless person at Kinsale. The promissory formulae used include ‘due to bearer’, ‘for convenience of change’ and ‘I will give you’, but never
These other notes, though, well merit a separate study, and particularly since the Institute of Bankers in London actually holds in one case an original printing-plate, a stitched book of printed blanks, and a pair of moulds for a parallel token. It is perhaps worth remarking, too, that Ulster as a whole was singularly free from the abuses of paper-money with which the 1804 Committee was concerned, and it even comes as something of a surprise that the new 'note' should be from as far north as Cavan.

One shilling and one penny. The 'note' is for a shilling Irish of 13d., the normal medium of small change before 20 December 1825/6 January 1826, and hence 'silver notes' for such sums as 7s. 7d., 3s. 9½d., 1s. 7¾d., the third, sixth and fourteenth of the English guinea. It may be noted that the National Museum of Ireland has only eight specimens, including duplicates, of 'notes' for less than two shillings. The dates run from 17 March († a jest) 1797 to 5 August 1804, and it is interesting that the dates of the true 'silver notes' seem all to fall within the same bracket. What killed the small paper, in fact, was not so much the legislation of 17 May 1805 outlawing private banknotes for less than £1, but the Bank of Ireland dollar which began to come into circulation in quantity in the latter part of 1804, and the smaller denominations which were first put out in 1805.

II. This is apparently intended to express in numbers the one shilling and one penny of the text.

July 11 (handwritten) 1804 (printed). We have here the date when the 'note' was put in issue; and it was normal practice for private banknotes to be individually signed if not dated even as late as the early years of this century. On many of the 'silver notes', only the first two or three digits of the year of issue are printed, e.g. 18- or 180-, the day, month
and exact year having to be filled in by hand, and the new 'note' from Graddum is in fact a little unusual in having all four digits of the year set up by the printer. The Staffords were of Protestant stock, and it is a pleasing thought that this particular note could have been first uttered in connection with pious celebrations of the 'twelfth'.

Wm. Stafford. This is the holograph signature of the issuer. As already remarked, he was a farmer in Graddum townland. He was also the great-great-grandfather of the 'note's' present owner. The family later farmed just over the Cavan/Leitrim mearing at Newtown Gore, and, towards the end of the nineteenth century, removed entirely to Belfast, giving up the land and going into business.

Ireland, printer. As already remarked, this name provides most useful independent corroboration alike of the identification of the place of issue and of the family tradition. Reference to the standard papers on the history of printing in Co. Cavan, shows that probably in the last years of the eighteenth century there was a Cavan printer by the name of Henry Ireland (Ulster Journal of Archaeology, n.s. VIII (1902), pp. 23 and 24), while from 1813 onwards there is a steady trickle of items printed at Cavan by a firm William Ireland & Son (The Irish Book Lover, IV (1913), pp. 165–167). Both papers are by the late Mr. E. R. McC. Dix, and those familiar with his work of Henry or of William—or perhaps of some intermediate Ireland—but the fact that we now have a piece of work by a member of that family which is firmly dated to 1804 must favour the view that the enigmatic Roman date on Henry Ireland's unique pamphlet (MDCCXIX) should be read 1790—or possibly we would suggest 1799—rather than 1709. This, however, is a problem for bibliophiles; for the numismatist it is sufficient that the William Ireland of a score of pamphlets etc, dated 1813–1827 must be the actual printer of the Graddum 'note' or his heir.

General Observations

As already remarked, there are complaints in all the relevant literature concerning the flood of petty paper characteristic of the Irish economy in the first years of the nineteenth century. On p. 18 of his book The Irish Pound (London, 1955), one of the leading modern authorities on the subject, Prof. F. W. Fetter, has written:

'In addition, the practice became increasingly common of merchants issuing I.O.U.'s which frequently were not payable in cash on demand but at best were simply accepted in trade by the issuer.'

This is thought to be, though, the very first time that an actual specimen of the 'I.O.U.' has been seen by a modern student, let alone recorded. Nor is it difficult to suggest a reason why an issue once so prolific should be today so ill represented. Any issuer who valued his reputation would have been genuinely anxious to redeem his 'notes' on presentation just as soon as small change became available in quantity, and the years immediately following 1804 saw not only the Bank of Ireland silver but a mass-produced coinage of copper pence, halfpence and farthings. Once he had redeemed his 'notes', though, the issuer would be careful to destroy them lest they be abstracted and presented again. Cancellation would be as pointless as laborious, whereas the fire is convenient and certain. Where, on the other hand, there was reason to think that an issuer might seek to evade his obligations, and in fairness it must be said that there is no real evidence that this was generally the case, the trivial sum involved must have made it unlikely that an unlucky possessor would hoard any specimens in the unlikely hope that the issuer would experience a change of heart.

We are particularly grateful to Professor K. H. Connell of the Queen's University of Belfast for the following reference which shows just how effective a proper coinage was in driving from circulation the 'I.O.U.'s. On p. 417 of his fascinating book A Stranger in Ireland (London, 1806), an account of a peregrination of the island in 1806, the English traveller Sir John Carr comments on the entire abolition of the abomination known as 'shopkeepers' I.O.U.'s.' At the same time we would wish to put on record our indebtedness to Mr. N. Allen Stafford, the owner of the 'note', for permission to publish it here, and to Mr. P. Spiro, the Librarian of the Institute of Bankers in London, and Dr. W. O'Sullivan, the Keeper of the Art and Industrial Division of the National Museum of Ireland, who have been unsparing both in bringing to our notice such comparative material as is possessed by their respective institutions, and in encouraging us to illustrate a class of 'note' which appears not to correspond to anything as yet published.

MICHAEL DOLLEY and W. A. SEABY.