A PATTERN SHILLING IRISH OF MARY TUDOR

MICHAEL DOLLEY

On 15 July 1815 there was dispersed in the Great Room of the King Street, Covent Garden premises of the London auctioneers King & Lochée, a collection of some 3,500 'ancient and modern' coins and medals. It was a cabinet unusually strong in the Anglo-Irish series, and we find lot 8 described in the printed catalogue as follows:

8 A piece supposed to be a proof for a base shilling of Lady Jane Grey, obv. a rose surrounded with lions and fleurs-de-lis, DEVS NOBIS CVM QVIS CONTRA NOS, rev. three crowns, IVSTITIA. VIRTUTVA. REGINA.

The coin was bought for the very low price of seven shillings by one Walker who purchased extensively at the sale, and who is probably to be identified with the Thomas Walker whose superb cabinet of Anglo-Irish coins was dispersed at Messrs. Sotheby's sale-rooms on 1 May 1845. This early description and provenance are critical because they effectively dissociate the coin to be discussed in this note from a group of somewhat later forgeries to which it might well have been thought to belong. The coin then vanishes from sight, and it is suggestive of pretty general disbelief in the Lady Jane attribution that it is not given even a mention in the standard works of Ruding and of Hawkins. It is no less intriguing that there is not as much as a reference to it in Aquilla Smith's definitive review of Mary's Anglo-Irish coinages which appeared in 1855. In 1861, however, there was published in the Numismatic Chronicle an important note under the initials of the future Sir John Evans. This both illustrated and described what is undoubtedly the piece described in the sale-catalogue of 1815, but published it as something quite new, though curiously the 1815 'proof' is touched on as though it were a different coin and not the piece under discussion. That the note has been ignored by students of the Anglo-Irish series in this century is not altogether surprising inasmuch as the title Evans gave it was the not very promising, if not indeed downright misleading, 'On an English jetton, or pattern piece'. The note was occasioned by the recent purchase of the specimen by the well-known London coin-dealer William Webster, and it was doubtless with Evans's approbation that the piece was shortly afterwards acquired by the British Museum.

As already remarked, Evans failed to recognize the identity of the Webster piece with the specimen sold in 1815, but the latter clearly underlies the parallel he adduces of 'a forged shilling of Lady Jane Grey, probably fabricated about the close of the last [i.e. the eighteenth] century'. That Evans's 'English jetton, or pattern piece' and the 1815

---

1 Priced sale-catalogue in the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum. The vendor was anonymous.
3 It would be a quarter of a century before English collectors would be plagued by the products of men like Singleton, Emery, and Taylor.
6 JRSAI iii (1854/5), pp. 357–63.
7 NC 1861, pp. 109–11.
8 Accession number 1861, 9–10–1.
‘proof for a base shilling of Lady Jane Grey’ really were one and the same piece seems first to have been remarked in print by the 1885 editors, A. W. (later Sir Wollaston) Franks and H. A. Grueber, of Edward Hawkins’s justly censured—and in the event severely censored—work usually cited under the title *Medallic Illustrations of British History.* It is to them that we owe the information that the vendor of 1815 was a Mr. Moore, a British Museum tradition that did not survive the destruction of the Coin Room by bombing in 1941, and they add the significant details that Mr. Moore was ‘an Irish gentleman’, and that the piece had been ‘found in Ireland’. The character of the collection sold is such that neither statement occasions surprise, and it could even be remarked that the attribution of the piece to Lady Jane Grey is just what might have been expected of a West British squireen who was no stranger to ‘Boyne water’. It was nicely calculated to appeal to the romantic and the prejudiced, and it must have been a keen disappointment for the imaginative vendor that English common sense was reflected in the price actually fetched in the room. The identity of Mr. Moore has still to be established, but it is possible that he was one of the cadets of the line of the Earls of Drogheda. Certainly the composition of the collection sold would be entirely consistent with its having been put together by a family resident in North Leinster, while the Boyne Valley still is a happy hunting-ground for a coin-collector with local influence and a longish purse. In 1904 the Moore piece was again illustrated, this time photographically and through the medium of collotype, in connection with the first portfolio of places for the *Medallic Illustrations* prepared under the aegis of B. V. Head, and its dismissal on this occasion as being most probably a counter effectively secured its subsequent neglect by students of the Irish coin-series. In the present note it is proposed to rehearse a number of arguments which it is hoped will prove cumulatively to be of sufficient cogency to ensure recognition of the piece as an undoubted product of the sixteenth-century Irish mint in the Tower of London. In this connection it may be observed that the British Museum specimen has resolutely remained unique, though there is an electro-type copy in the Royal Irish Academy’s cabinet of medals in the National Museum of Ireland, a circumstance that is perhaps more likely in the case of a pattern than a mere jetton which of its very nature would cry out to be produced in quantity.

Evans confessed a doubt as to which was the obverse and which the reverse, and it would appear that his engraver reversed the true order. In order that there shall be no ambiguity in the mind of readers of this note, the Moore piece is once more reproduced, this time on the basis of greatly enlarged polaroid photographs of plaster-casts, the

---


2 The Department’s copy of the sale-catalogue cited *supra,* p. 98, n. 1 was not so annotated, and until recently the name of Mr. Moore did not figure in its invaluable manuscript index of sale-catalogues.

3 Op. cit., p. 63—the source of the information could well have been Hawkins.

4 No collector figures, however, in Anne, Countess of Drogheda, *History of the Moore Family* (Belfast, 1902), admittedly a very selective work.

5 B. V. Head et alii, *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland: Plates I-X* (London, 1904), pl. iv, no. 4. The fascicle is henceforth cited *MIBHP.*

6 The point of departure for this paper, see *infra,* p. 110, n. 2.

7 Op. cit., p. 109. The transposition will be found perpetuated in *MIBH* (p. 63) and *MIBHP* (pl. iv, no. 4).

8 For the casts I am indebted to the courtesy of Mr. R. A. G. Carson, M.A., F.S.A. and Mr. K. A. Howes of the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum, and for the photographs to the kindness of Mr. Colin Slack of the Conservation Laboratory attached to the Department of Archaeology at the Queen’s University of Belfast.
ordering being that which appears to the author the more convincing, though he would be far from rejecting the possibility that the piece in fact is a 'mule' of two reverses. In support of this arrangement it can be argued that a powerful precedent is afforded by the Anglo-Irish issues of Richard III and Henry VII where the three-crown groats in particular admit of no doubt as to the badge of the Irish lordship having to yield precedence to the armorial of England,¹ and this in the heyday of Garret More himself. The primacy of the English motif even where Anglo-Irish coins are concerned may seem to be further evidenced by the actual wording of the 1483 Indenture of Edward IV,² it being immaterial to our present purpose that the document can now be shown to have been allowed to lapse at the king's death without ever having been implemented.³ There is the further consideration that what is here considered the reverse legend of the Moore 'shilling'—Iustitia Virtutum Regina¹ ('Justice, Queen of Virtues')—finds so neatly balanced an analogue in what is undoubtedly the reverse legend of Mary's English groats and Anglo-Irish issues of 1553/4—Veritas Temporis Filia ('Truth, Daughter of Time').⁵ The sentiments are from the same stable, though we must not anticipate a later passage in this note, and the grammatical construction and the swing of the language are surely identical. It could be further suggested that the place of honour, which is the obverse by universal convention, should be assigned to the Scriptural verse (Romans 8: 31)—

¹ Numismatiska Meddelanden, xxx (1965), pp. 103-12—henceforth cited as NM.
² Ibid., pp. 108-11.
³ We may compare the similar but not identical terms of Richard III's proclamation of 18 July 1483 published by Aquilla Smith in NC 1881, pp. 310-33.
⁴ The VIRTUTVA of the 1815 sale-catalogue should not be dismissed as a misprint; the piece under discussion evidences weak striking at precisely this point of the legend, another indication of its identity with the Moore 'shilling'?
⁵ e.g., North 1960-2: Seaby 1884-6; and for the Irish pieces D & F 224-8; Seaby 4495-9 (excluding 4497A and 4497B which are nineteenth-century forgeries).
Si Deus nobiscum quis contra nos (‘If God be with us who against us?’) that is also the more substantial of the two legends, while the English rose in the natural order of things takes precedence over the three crowns of the Irish lordship. Granted that among numismatists there has been confusion as to the obverse and reverse of the various crowns and half-crowns of the rose, granted that the resemblance of the ‘English’ side of the Moore ‘shilling’ to the reverse of the normal English ryal is close enough to be the subject of valid comment, and granted that Regina is an element in a legend that is more proper to an obverse, still in the present instance the weight of the evidence very much inclines to the view that the obverse of the Moore ‘shilling’ is the side with the Pauline text and Tudor rose, and the reverse that with the secular aphorism and three crowns in pale, the badge—not the arms—of the fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century lordship—not kingdom—of Ireland.

That the Moore piece is a genuine product of its period seems generally to have been admitted, and the present writer has no hesitation in endorsing the verdict of authorities as diverse as Webster, Evans, Franks, Grueber, and Head. This authenticity may be thought doubly welcome inasmuch as so preposterous an attribution as that to Lady Jane might have been expected to attach to its very nature to some impudent forgery of the type which deceived too many collectors of Moore’s generation. What is not so easily determined is the precise period for which the ‘shilling’ is authentic, and the virtual unanimity of previous writers could suggest a possible dulling of the critical faculties. Without exception they have favoured a date in the early 1550s, and one is left with the feeling that too little importance has been attached to the consequent anachronism of the reverse type. What needs to be stressed and stressed again is that at least twenty and probably thirty years earlier the crowned harp had replaced the three crowns as the arms and badge of the Irish lordship, and it should further be noted in this connection that the substitution had antedated Henry’s usurpation of the kingdom of Ireland by at least seven years. Indeed, the most recent suggestion is that the change of arms dates back to the early 1520s when the English king still stood in high favour at Rome, the argument being that an actual Irish harp had been sent by the music-loving Leo X to the reputed royal composer of ‘Greensleeves’, and was returned by the latter to the land of its origin as part of a propaganda exercise designed to impress on the Irishry and Englishry alike their immediate lord’s intimacy with the current successor of the coarb of Peter who had entrusted the Irish lordship to the English crown. However this may be, it remains a fact that the earliest of the ‘coins of the harp’ can now be dated no later than 1536 and probably to 1534, so that on purely heraldic grounds the terminus post quem non for the Moore ‘shilling’ is the early 1530s. Not so readily established is a terminus ante quem non for the type of the three crowns, and here discussion could too easily degenerate into argumenta e silentio of the most dubious validity. It can be said, though, that the first attested incorporation of the three-crowns

\[1\] e.g., North 1787-96, 1834-40, and 1867-70; Seaby 1667-82, 1787-92, and 1823 and 1824.
\[2\] For this characteristically perceptive observation I am indebted to Mr. W. A. Seaby, F.S.A., F.M.A., of the Ulster Museum.
\[3\] NM, p. 111.
\[4\] A PATTERN SHILLING IRISH OF MARY TUDOR

BNJ xxxviii (1969), pp. 2 and 3.
motif into an Anglo-Irish coin-type occurs under Edward IV, albeit the crowns are there very differently disposed, while the recent association with Lambert Simnel of the three-crown groats in the name of an Edward means that the first numismatic deployment of the three crowns in pale belongs no earlier than 1482. However, there is no good reason to suppose that the three crowns as the arms and badges of Ireland do not go back in other media at least to the beginning of the fifteenth century, and what is perhaps a more satisfactory terminus ante quem non is provided by the obverse type of the Moore 'shilling'. As Mr. W. A. Seaby has been quick to remark, the obverse of the piece in question has affinities with the reverse of the English ryal, and it is difficult in consequence to suggest a date for the Moore 'shilling' earlier than 1464. However, purely typological considerations prove to be self-evidently fallacious when pressed to their logical conclusion. It is too easy to overlook the circumstances that the ryal was not struck by Edward IV after 1470, was totally eschewed by Henry VI restored and by Richard III, and was only nominally resurrected under Henry VII, and then with a quite novel reverse. In other words we are faced with the problem that the obverse type of the Moore 'shilling' argues for a date in the 1460s—or after 1553 when Mary restored the ryal with its traditional reverse—while the reverse type suggests a date not earlier than the 1480s or later than the 1520s. It is a conflict of testimony that must alert any thoughtful student, and it is not good enough to remark it and then ignore what is a very real difficulty. Under a Tudor government heraldic anachronism could have political connotations, and as such would be a perilous pastime.

Already remarked is the singular unanimity exhibited by earlier writers who assign the Moore piece to the 1550s. The 1815 vendor by implication dated it between 6 and 19 July 1553, and we are told by Evans that this view was shared by Webster nearly half a century later. Evans himself was a good deal more guarded, but very properly drew attention to the fact that the obverse legend is also found employed as a text or motto set at the head of a pamphlet which was put out by some of Mary's partisans in the summer of 1553. His identification of the piece as Marian is shared by Franks and Grueber who finally detached it from the coinage proper and placed it third among the medals of the reign, implying thereby a date not substantially later than 1553. In this century, the attribution to Mary Tudor was not disturbed by Head and his colleagues at the British Museum, though their tentative acceptance of the jetton hypothesis must suggest that they were prepared to allow a rather wider date-bracket than the piece's position on their plate could be thought to indicate. Such a consensus cannot but impress, and it is the more remarkable inasmuch as the 'shilling' under discussion is regally anonymous. This anonymity, incidentally, might have been supposed to be one of the strongest arguments against instead of in support of the attribution to Lady Jane Grey.

1 D & F 115: Seaby 4404.  
3 D & F 176-9: Seaby 4412 and 4413.  
5 Supra, p. 101, n. 2.  
6 North 1693: Seaby 1574.  
7 North 1957: Seaby 1881.  
8 Supra, p. 101.  
11 The so-called 'Epistle of Poor Pratte to Gilbert Potter' (London, 1553) which was reprinted on pp. 115-21 of J. G. Nichols, The Chronicle of Queen Jane etc. (London, 1850).  
12 MIBH, p. 63.  
13 MIBHP, p. iv, no. 4. It heads the series attributed to Mary Tudor.  
14 A suspect claim to the crown will often be accompanied by massive coinage at the earliest possible opportunity, e.g. the proliferation of pennies of Harold II to which the total absence of coins of Eadmund Ironside is in such stark contrast.
and the fact remains that Evans, Franks, Grueber, and Head were numismatists of the very highest reputation, while Webster was a dealer of unusually wide experience whose opinion commanded universal respect. There is some reason to think, too, that Hawkins approved if he did not suggest the dating which they proposed. One cannot dismiss their collective pronouncement as capricious, for all that one may suspect that in this case their interests and even prejudices may have conspired to impede consideration of the full spectrum of possibility. We do well to ask ourselves, therefore, why these exceptionally qualified judges should have assumed so confidently, and even loftily, a date for the Moore ‘shilling’ no earlier than the middle of the sixteenth century. Part at least of the answer lies in their very familiarity with the coinages of the Tudor period. They knew only too well, for example, that the earliest English—and Anglo-Irish—coins to have legends executed solely in Roman as opposed to Lombardic or Gothic lettering belong to the last years of Henry VIII or to the reign of Edward VI, and the epigraphy of the Moore piece, after all, is purely Roman. Indeed, and as we shall be seeing, the actual font can be exactly matched on products of the Irish mint in the Tower which unquestionably were put out under Philip and Mary and in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth, say between 1555 and 1560. It could be thought, too, that the whole fabric of the Moore ‘shilling’ is redolent of the 1550s, even if issue must be taken with the suggestion that the piece was intended as a jetton and not a pattern. Official jettons of the class postulated form no part of the English, let alone Anglo-Irish, series at this juncture, and there is the further consideration that in the 1550s there was not available in the Tower, and least of all in the Irish mint there, the stock of bullion that would have permitted the mint-master to indulge in this sort of paranumismatic extravagance.

On balance, then, it can be accepted that the Moore ‘shilling’ really does belong to the 1550s, but it must be stressed that there can be no satisfactory attribution that fails to take into account the glaring anachronism of the reverse type. An argument in support of a date in the 1550s that seems not to have been advanced, however, is the fact that the dating is sufficiently close to the late 1540s for there to be the possibility of some connection with a period when there is known to have been experimentation with obverse legends which might omit both the name and the style of the sovereign, the most obvious examples being afforded by some of the fractional gold of 1549/50 with such obverse legends as \textit{Timor Domini fons vitae}, \textit{Scutum fidei proteget eum}, and \textit{Lucerna pedibus meis verbum tuum}. Equally it should be remarked that there could be chronological significance in the association of the epigraphy of the Moore ‘shilling’ with the lettering that is found on the post-1555 products of the Irish mint in the Tower. This mint was the creation of Henry VIII and dated back to the early 1530s. In 1546 it had been transferred to Bristol, and shortly afterwards it returned to Dublin. There is, however,

1 He had retired from the Keepership of Coins and Medals only three or four months previously, but still lived in London and was prominent on the numismatic scene.
3 D & F 231-51: Seaby 4500-6.
4 The precise date for the termination of Elizabeth’s first coinage for Ireland remains to be established, cf. NSIOP x-xiv (1970), p. 15.
5 It is significant that Mary, a would-be \\textit{restitutrix monetae} if ever there was one, did not feel able to go beyond a 7-oz. standard for Ireland, and even then was soon forced to revert to a 3-oz. one.
6 North 1907-10: Seaby 1826-9.
8 NC 1915, p. 207.
documentary evidence to show that an Irish mint was back in the Tower not later than September 1553, and probably the re-establishment of this mint went back a few weeks before that since it was then in full production. It is unlikely, too, that the Dublin mint functioned later than 1552. The mint-master was dead, and the outstanding personality, the assayer William Williams who found himself on Mary's accession hopelessly compromised by his intimacy with John Bale, seems to have decamped in the summer of 1553 leaving behind him all the tools and clutter of the old Dublin mint. This must suggest that Mary's new Irish mint in the Tower received entirely new punches, and it is interesting that there is no real identity between the lettering of the Moore 'shilling' and the Philip and Mary coins, on the one hand, and the several 'Roman' founts that had been supplied to Dublin at the end of the 1540s on the other. It will be objected, of course, that between the early autumn of 1553 and the summer of 1554 the Irish mint in the Tower was using the deliberately archaizing 'Lombardic' or 'Gothic' epigraphy favoured by Mary for her English gold and silver, but there may well have been a delay of a few weeks in July and August 1553 while the punches for this were being engraved and one must remark the close correspondence between the letter-forms of the Moore 'shilling' and those found on a number of coins of Edward VI struck at all three of the London mints engaged on his English coinages. Thus, 'Roman' punches could have been at the disposal of the London die-sinkers in the days immediately following Mary's accession on 19 July 1553, and there is the intriguing detail, which seems not before to have been remarked, that Mary's penny Irish, a coin presumptively struck in the early autumn of 1553, has 'mixed' lettering, some of the letter-forms being 'Lombardic' or 'Gothic' but others 'Roman' and so indicative of access to 'Roman' founts at a time when the archaizing epigraphy was de rigueur. In other words, consideration of the lettering of the Moore piece corroborates the attribution of it to the 1550s that was the unanimous verdict of nineteenth-century expertise at its most favourable.

Such a date-bracket is not without relevance to the further problem of whether the Moore piece is or is not a shilling. That its epigraphy is that of the Irish mint in the Tower must suggest that if a coin it is one that belongs to the Anglo-Irish series, and the weight supports this line of reasoning. Were it a shilling English of the period one might have expected it to tip the scales at somewhere about 96 gr. (6.22 g.), the standard of the post-1550 and pre-1601 shillings English in the names of Edward VI, Philip and Mary, and Elizabeth. In point of fact the Moore piece weighs no more than 82.1 gr. (5.32 g.), and this in itself may be thought a fairly decisive argument against the theory that the piece is 'a proof for a base shilling of Lady Jane Grey'. On the other hand, a weight of this order does accord very neatly with the hypothesis that it is a pattern for a relatively fine shilling Irish from the middle of the sixteenth century. Unfortunately one is ignorant of the precise fineness of the Moore 'shilling' itself—a recent paper may be claimed to have a wide scatter of relevant pieces over the whole reign.

1 BNF viii (1911), p. 200.
2 NC 1915, p. 226.
3 For information in advance of publication concerning this intimacy I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. J. G. Simms of Trinity College, Dublin.
4 BNF viii (1911), p. 196.
5 D & F 213-23: Seaby 4485-94A.
7 e.g. North 1871-3: Seaby 1795-7—but there is a
demonstrated how little there is to be gained from the determination of the specific gravity of a single piece struck in what may be presumed to be a silver-copper alloy—and there is the further problem that a pattern or proof may not be struck to the same standard or even in the same alloy as the planned denomination. Optically, however, the Moore ‘shilling’ has the appearance of being struck in a relatively fine silver, conceivably the 11-oz. 1-pennyweight English standard of 1550-3 or the 11-oz. one of 1553-60. This might suggest that a reasonably fine coinage was in contemplation, and support for this line of argument comes from the weight. It is very noticeable that at this period ‘fine’ Anglo-Irish coins are appreciably lighter than their English counterparts, whereas ‘base’ ones are substantially heavier. The essential truth of this observation may be verified by reference to so elementary a manual as that of Coffey. Here are listed, for example, six of the relatively fine 7-oz. shillings Irish of Mary with the dates 1553 and 1554, and the mean weight is a trifle over 85 gr., which could suggest that the standard was no more than 90 gr. and perhaps only 88. Elizabeth’s even finer 9-oz. shillings Irish of 1561 are rare, but four are recorded with a fairly consistent mean weight of 70 gr. which could be thought to indicate a standard of 72 gr. In marked contrast, the thoroughly base shillings Irish of Philip and Mary struck on a 3-oz. standard have survived in quantity, and a long run of recorded weights amply attest a nominal weight of 144 gr. What is being said, in short, is that the weight of the Moore ‘shilling’ is consistent with its being a pattern for a relatively fine shilling Irish from the 1550s.

As already remarked, the lettering of the Moore piece is ‘Roman’, whereas that of the 7-oz. coinage for Ireland of 1553/4 is predominantly ‘Lombardic’ or ‘Gothic’. For all this there is one highly significant link between the ‘pattern’ and the coins actually put in issue, the pyx mark which is in both cases *lis.* The mark was, of course, singularly appropriate for the inception of a coinage in the name of a Mary, and on the basis of it one might well feel that the Moore ‘shilling’ cannot be earlier than 19 July 1553 or later than 25 July 1554. Certainly the bracket is a close one, but a further suggestion of this note is that it should be capable of being narrowed considerably further. The obvious positions within it come right at the beginning, when experimentation is to be expected and when there would be limited continuity of epigraphy from the ‘Roman’ founts evidenced by a proportion of the late coins of Edward VI, or at the very close when there would be direct continuity, inside the Irish mint in the Tower, with the lettering found on the Anglo-Irish coins of Philip and Mary. A review of all the evidence suggests that it is the former alternative that is to be preferred.

Mary Tudor reckoned her regnal years from 6 July 1553, the day of her half-brother’s death, but she was effectively queen of England only from 19 July when her unhappy cousin fell into her power and she was able to assume unchallenged control of the

---

2 North, table on p. 173.
3 BNJ viii (1911), p. 195.
4 It must not be forgotten that English coins were thought of as commanding a substantial premium when and if imported into Ireland. Had such a piece ever been struck, then, it is doubtful if a ‘fine’ shilling Irish would or even could have weighed more than two-thirds as much as its English counterpart.
7 Ibid., p. 75, Second Coinage 1-4.
8 Ibid., pp. 73 and 14—the groats may be thought particularly relevant to the discussion.
9 Supra, p. 103.
10 In both series the mark occurs after the queen’s name and not at the head of the legend.
11 HBC, p. 39.
administration. Until then the position of the mints in the Tower was ambiguous in the extreme, and if there had been activity it would have been of a kind designed to proclaim Jane’s apparent *fait accompli* to the widest possible audience. After 19 July, on the other hand, Mary’s position was reasonably secure, and the mint-personnel at least knew where they stood. The new queen came to the throne an avowed Catholic, while her partisans included many genuinely Catholic as well as a number who now professed a militant Catholicism purely for political advantage. What it is not perhaps very easy for us today to appreciate is that there was at least one serious anomaly in her constitutional position as regards Ireland, an anomaly that she very soon resolved, and characteristically, as a Tudor monarch and not as a dutiful daughter of Holy Mother Church. Technically her father had first held Ireland as a lordship dependent on the Holy See, and it was only in 1541, nearly a decade after the overt breach with Rome, that he had had himself proclaimed king of Ireland, a unilateral usurpation which was in violation of the notorious grant of 1177, itself a strange echo of the purported jurisdiction over the islands of the western ocean that the forged Donation of Constantine had represented that emperor as having conferred upon Pope Sylvester.¹ In strict logic, a Catholic queen of England should have reverted to the style ‘lady of Ireland’ as soon as possible after her accession—too much significance must not be given to the circumstance that she had been proclaimed ‘queen of Ireland’ by her partisans inasmuch as on that occasion the titulature had been necessarily identical with that of her predecessor.² It’s all too easy to overlook the fact that ‘bloody Mary’ had also been proclaimed at her accession ‘supreme head of the church of England and of the church of Ireland’, an embarrassment which for the time being could be as far as possible camouflaged by a discreet ‘&c’ in the royal style, but which was not finally disposed of until the Spanish marriage of 25 July 1554 gave a pretext for a new proclamation two days later.³ As regards her realm of Ireland, on the other hand, the erastian Mary showed herself to be much more ‘king Harry’s daughter’ than her half-sister Elizabeth was ever to be, and it was soon made plain that she had not the least intention of revoking her father’s consolidation of royal authority, and the papacy had no alternative but to accept the position with the best grace it could. By the summer of 1554 nobody could have been in the least doubt about her Irish titulature, but in the summer of 1553, on the other hand, some at least of her supporters may have assumed that their Catholic queen would wish to revert to the position as it had been before the breach with Rome. On this telling it seems perfectly possible that an engraver in the Irish mint in the Tower could have anticipated an instruction to eschew the harp emblem that had been introduced by Henry VIII, and an obvious replacement would have been the three crowns in pale that had been the distinctive Irish reverse type under Richard III and Henry VII. Such archaizers were to be disillusioned, but this does not mean that something of this sort cannot have happened, and certainly there seems to have been no other date after 1534 when a reconsideration of the propriety of the harp emblem is feasible, let alone likely. By the summer of 1554 Mary was firmly committed to the harp, while as early as 1557

¹ It is worth noting that as recently as 1467 *Laudabiliter* had been formally invoked by the English Crown as the justification of its Irish lordship—cf. H. F. Berry, *Statute Rolls . . . Ireland . . . Edward IV*, i (Dublin, 1914), p. 436, c. 8.

² It is to be noted, though, that she is styled ‘queen of Ireland’ on her ‘harp’ coins that seem to have begun leaving the Irish mint in the Tower no later than September 1553—cf. *BNJ* viii (1911), p. 200.

³ *HBC*, p. 40.
Elizabeth’s first coins for Ireland\textsuperscript{1} were all too clearly a continuation of those of her predecessor. Yet, the three harps that appear on the coinage of 1561 may be a hint that even in England and a generation after the change to the harp somebody connected with the mint still remembered that the old arms of Ireland had been three crowns.\textsuperscript{2}

It is hoped that if this note shall be found to have any merit it will be because it has at least attempted to find a plausible occasion for the resurrection of the reverse type, and as it happens there are other reasons why the first weeks of Mary’s reign provide a satisfying context for the Moore ‘shilling’.

A feature of the piece in question is the absence from it of Mary’s portrait and royal style. The first could readily be explained by uncertainty as to the queen’s intentions, and it must not be forgotten that there were Tudor precedents for an Anglo-Irish coinage without portrait.\textsuperscript{3} It might even be argued, too, that in the summer of 1553 Mary still was not so securely in the saddle that there could not have been some of the mint-officials who yet hesitated prematurely and gratuitously to broadcast their allegiance. Derrick Anthony, we must not forget, had been appointed by Edward VI,\textsuperscript{4} so that there is the intriguing possibility, to put it no higher, that he or one of his colleagues produced a pattern-piece that in a crisis could be represented as a muling of two reverses—as it may well be—each of them being of unexceptionable content where personal allegiance was concerned. In this connection it is worth recalling that Mary was the first queen regnant in English since Matilda, William the Conqueror’s granddaughter.\textsuperscript{5} As such she posed to the mint-engravers quite a novel set of problems, and even if there was in fact no discussion of the propriety or otherwise of a woman’s portrait appearing on the coinage of England, there would still have to be an element of delay while a suitable likeness was prepared and submitted for her majesty’s gracious approval. Since, too, Mary was still nubile, a certain standard of portraiture would be necessary as well as prudent, and it is easy to see that the engraver would have time on his hands for the execution of one or more reverses while awaiting the verdict of the queen. The time-factor, indeed, is something that cannot be left out of the discussion. Mary, as we have seen, was not undisputed mistress of the Tower of London until 19 July 1553, and not until 20 August was she in a position to put her signature to documents authorizing coinages for England and Ireland alike.\textsuperscript{6} Clearly the Irish mint in the Tower acted on these with the greatest possible dispatch since already by 7 October ‘harp’ coins were figuring in the High Treasurer’s accounts.\textsuperscript{7} It is unlikely, therefore, that there was much experimentation in that establishment after the ordinances of 20 August, and we have already seen how the type of the three crowns virtually precludes an attribution to Lady Jane Gray—\textsuperscript{8} or, for that matter, to Edward VI.\textsuperscript{9} Given that activity was unlikely in the few days immediately following 19 July, the month of August 1553 seems the only plausible bracket for the striking of what is best described as a pattern shilling Irish.

It is a curiously narrow dating for a piece that is regally anonymous as well as undated.

\textsuperscript{1} D & F 240-6: Seaby 4503 and 4504.
\textsuperscript{2} As late as 1536 the three crowns still figured in the Great Seal of Ireland—cf. NM, p. 103, n. 2.
\textsuperscript{3} D & F 183-7, 191 and 192, 201-12: Seaby 4414-25, 4431-48, 4472-848.
\textsuperscript{4} BNJ viii (1911), pp. 184 and 185.
\textsuperscript{5} Supra, p. 100.
\textsuperscript{6} For another most acute observation I am again indebted to Mr. W. A. Seaby.
\textsuperscript{7} BNJ viii (1911), pp. 180 and 195.
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., p. 195 while p. 200 suggests that coins were being struck in September.
\textsuperscript{9} Supra, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{10} One wonders, though, to what extent the REGINA of the aphorism may have precluded due consideration of the possibility that the piece might have been struck for a king.
but it is hard to see when else this remarkable coin can be slotted into the Anglo-Irish series to which it so patently belongs.

There is one possibility that remains to be considered. Could the Moore 'shilling' be a relatively modern concoction? There is, after all, the passage in Evans's note of 1861 which runs: 'It is certainly very remarkable, as confirmatory of this suggestion, that, on the reverse of a forged shilling of Lady Jane Grey, probably fabricated about the close of the last century, the same motto . . . is to be found . . .'. 2 Leaving aside the consideration, though, that Evans had in front of him the coin that has been the subject of this note, and concluded his sentence just quoted with the verdict that it is 'undoubtedly genuine', it would not be too difficult to demonstrate that he was imputing forgery to a piece which he knew of only by repute and had not seen, the process of his reasoning doubtless running on the lines that no genuine coin of Lady Jane Grey ought to exist, and so any piece purporting to be hers must by definition be false. It is an argument that ignores the possibility that a perfectly genuine piece has been mis-attributed, and we have already observed the identity of the 'forged shilling . . . probably fabricated about the close of the last century' and the piece pronounced 'undoubtedly genuine' not just by Evans, but also by Webster, Franks, Grueber, and Head. 2 The last is a struck piece, and its pedigree takes it back well before Taylor. Moreover, it would be asking too much of coincidence for a late eighteenth-century forger to have hit on the hapax legend 'Si Deus nobiscum . . .' and it then to have been published half a century later as heading a rare pamphlet of precisely the correct date. 3 If, on the other hand, the forger knew of that work, surely he would have adduced the coincidence as proof of authenticity when his product began to be questioned, for if anything is certain it is that the Moore 'shilling' was thoroughly discredited as a result of its appearance in the London saleroom. Admittedly the attribution was injudicious, but the price fetched was miserable, and the vendor would have had every reason to vent his wrath on the scoundrel who had fabricated both coin and provenance. The purchaser, too, might have had cause for recrimination, but there is probably significance in the way the 'coin' quietly slipped out of the public eye. The Lady Jane Grey attribution exploded, the piece ceased to have any real attraction, and this would explain the silence of Ruding and of Hawkins. It was no part of their task to condemn what was no longer controversial, still less dangerous.

To sum up. What this note has sought to establish once and for all is that the British Museum's purchase of 1861 was rightly identified by Franks and Grueber as a piece which had passed through the London saleroom in 1815. The coin has in consequence an Irish provenance, and the reverse type has always been recognized as Irish. Advanced in this note is the further suggestion that its weight and fabric are consonant with its identification as a pattern shilling Irish emanating from the Irish mint established by the Tudors in the Tower of London. The denomination and the 'Roman' epigraphy argue for a date no earlier than the late 1540s, and there seems no place for such a coin in the Anglo-Irish series after the late 1550s. The obverse legend is a numismatic hapax, but the same text in fact appears at the head of a political tract put out by Mary's partisans in the summer of 1553. For a short time in that very summer it may have seemed to some of Mary's supporters that she would wish to repudiate her father's
usurpation of the kingdom of Ireland, and against this background the resurrection of the old arms of the Irish lordship must seem quite plausible. For the first time, then, there has been suggested an explanation of the apparently hopeless anachronism of the piece's reverse type, and the writer has little hesitation in claiming that Mr. Moore's 'proof for a base shilling of Lady Jane Grey' in fact is a pattern shilling Irish of Mary Tudor from the first weeks of her reign. What is perhaps a little disquieting, though, is the light that this whole episode sheds on the state of Irish numismatics in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Aquilla Smith does seem to have been consistently and constitutionally reluctant ever to return to a series to which he had once given his masterly mind, and it is perfectly true that his excellent paper on the Irish coins of Mary had appeared in 1855.\(^1\) In 1861 and again in 1885, however, he allowed to go unchallenged English annexation to the English series of a highly relevant coin with an Irish reverse type. Admittedly Evans seems to have been a close friend, but in 1861 both Lindsay\(^2\) and Sainthill\(^3\) were alive and in full possession of their faculties. All three must be presumed to have read the Numismatic Chronicle note which declared English a piece with the badge of the Irish lordship dominating the reverse field.\(^4\) Both Lindsay and Sainthill had had to endure their share of patronizing resentment of their excellence,\(^5\) and the 1890 obituary notice of Aquilla Smith would describe him as 'a thorough Irishman—Irish of the Irish'.\(^6\) That all three should have held their peace cannot altogether be attributed to the circumstance that in 1861 the coin's Irish provenance had been overlooked by Evans. At least a factor in their silence would be the undue deference to the opinions of English confrères that was not the least of the evil consequences of the Union where the intellectual life of the old Ascendancy was concerned. This deference may well have contained the seeds of its own destruction but it was something new where the Anglo-Irish gentry and professional classes were concerned, and it is a sobering thought that the reaction of James Simon,\(^7\) a far less sympathetic character, a century earlier would have been very different. This is not to say that the coin would not have left Ireland, but at least Irish numismatists might have been spared the humiliation of witnessing its expropriation to the English series. If the contention of this note is accepted, formally this coin in the English national collection is the oldest Irish pattern to have come down to modern times.\(^8\) Perhaps, though, that distinction really attaches to some even older pieces of which there are two specimens

\(^1\) In the National Museum of Ireland there is preserved the first draft of the paper which shows that it was substantially complete in 1854.

\(^2\) John Lindsay, of Cork, died in 1870.

\(^3\) Richard Sainthill, of the same city, died in 1871.

\(^4\) Aquilla Smith was a member of the Numismatic Society of London and so would have received NC, while references in Lindsay's and Sainthill's voluminous correspondence show that they exhibited lively interest in the contents of that journal.


\(^6\) Dublin Journal of Medical Science, lxxxix (1890), p. 476.

\(^7\) Simon was the author of the classic and still invaluable Essay towards an Historical Account of Irish Coins (Dublin, 1749) but figures in none of the standard biographical works of reference. The manuscript catalogue of his collection (NLI MS. 301, ff. 1-120) is notable for two representations of the English royal arms on successive pages and the inscription 'James Simon, Fellow of the Royal Society, and of the Society of Antiquaries of London; Member of the Physico-Historical Society and of the Society in Dublin for promoting Arts and Manufactures; and of the Society for promoting English protestant Schools in Ireland'. His coins were sold in London at Ford's rooms on 8 December 1757, copies of the printed catalogue being in the British Museum.

\(^8\) The only systematic listing of Anglo-Irish patterns known to me is in J. Lindsay, A View of the Coinage of Ireland (Cork, 1839), p. 130, but it is doubtful if any new revision could flush pieces earlier than the seventeenth century.
in the Royal Irish Academy's cabinet, the King John pennies by a purported Dublin moneyer John,¹ but this problem is one that merits a paper all to itself.²

¹ Coffey, op. cit., p. 9, nos. 1 and 2. The argument is not vitiated by at least one early hoard-provenance.

² Three gentlemen have been most forthcoming with their time and encouragement while I have been collecting the material for this paper, Mr. A. J. H. Gunstone, M.A., F.S.A., Keeper of Archaeology at the Birmingham City Museum, who drew my attention to the electrotype in the medal cabinets at the National Museum, Mr. S. A. Castle of the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum who has answered a number of inquiries with equal patience and accuracy, and Mr. W. A. Seaby, F.S.A., F.M.A., of the Ulster Museum with whom I have been able to discuss the problem at frequent intervals. It would be unfair to saddle them with all or any of my opinions, but ungracious not to acknowledge publicly their generous assistance.