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Foreword

Thomas Simon’s five Cromwell medals have an interest and importance somewhat in advance of and removed from the usual numismatic or collector channels. For one thing they are the work of probably the premier British medallist; for another they relate to one of the most important personages and periods in British history; and finally they are mostly official government rewards, not made in quantity and not made for the general public. Each was struck from dies and originals are of great rarity. It is doubtful that a total of even twenty contemporarily struck specimens exist of the five types, although re-strikes, casts and copies are relatively numerous and usually incompletely differentiated from originals. In light of this it is unfortunate that this small, elite series has not been fully studied and reported on in depth. The best material was written by Henfrey, but there is more to be learned since his flourishing in the 1870s. This paper discusses one of these medals, and it is anticipated that the remainder will be similarly covered in subsequent papers.

Some of the numismatically-related events in the life of Cromwell are:

appointed Captain or Lord General, i.e., Commander-in-Chief of Parliament’s Armies (26 June 1650);
Battle of Dunbar (3 September 1650); Simon in Edinburgh to sketch Cromwell for the Dunbar medal (before 4 February 1650/1); dissolution of the Rump or Long Parliament (20 April 1653); Nominated or Barebones Parliament (Saints) (4 July 1653–16 December 1653); first Protectorate, Cromwell inaugurated as Lord Protector (16 December 1653); first Protectorate Parliament (4 September 1654–22 January 1654/5); second Protectorate Parliament (17 September 1656–4 February 1657/8); Cromwell rejects offer of kingship (8 May 1657); apparent initial ‘issuance’ of the 1656 Cromwell coinage, at least the halfcrown (1 June 1657); second Protectorate, Cromwell inaugurated for the second time as Lord Protector (26 June 1657); death of Cromwell (3 September 1658); state funeral (23 November 1658).

In the old style calendar the New Year began on the 25th of March, and year dates in this paper show both old and new styles when there is a conflict (between 1 January and 25 March), in the form os/ns.

Various early works discuss the Lord Protector medal in very brief form, and these include:

J. Evelyn’s A Discourse of Medals, p. 118/XL, 1697, the first English book to illustrate it;³ G. van Loon’s Histoire Metallique, part II Liv. IV, p. 367, 1732; G. Vertue’s Medals, Coins Great Seals etc of Thomas Simon, PL XII/E, 1753 (his voluminous manuscripts do not appear to cover it); H. W. Henfrey’s Numismata Cromwelliana, PL 1/6 and p. 17, 1877, a work of immense importance although very little is written on this

¹ The small Dunbar medal, the large Dunbar medal, the unfinished Lord General medal, the Lord Protector medal, and the Death or Funeral medal. Except for the Lord General medal, each is signed.
³ On pages 18 and 226 Henfrey lists earlier illustrations in Raguenet’s Historie d’Olivier Crommel, 1691, p. 277; Leti’s original Vita di Oliviero Cromvele, 1692, vol. ii, p. 316; and facing p. 280 of vol. ii of his 1694 edition. I have seen Raguenet (p. 304) only so I cannot compare illustrations.
medal itself; and Hawkins, Franks & Grueber's *Medallic Illustrations etc.* (MI), p. 409/45, 1885. Other than Henfrey these works contain meager information, at best.

This paper attempts to show when and why the Lord Protector medal was issued. Hopefully it disproves the widely-held view that it was issued for Cromwell's first inauguration in late 1653 as stated by Leti,4 assuming Henfrey interpreted him correctly,5 or even for the second inauguration. The terminology 'Inauguration' to define the medal must be dropped, leaving the unfortunately nebulous designation of 'Lord Protector' medal, i.e., a medal depicting Cromwell, his official titles as Lord Protector, and his and the Commonwealth's arms. The struck medals, the broken reverse die, and the problem of the casts are here discussed. The general conclusions are that the medal was a monetary/political reward, perhaps in some cases also a monetary/military reward; only the struck medals were official and contemporary; and they were probably issued from midway or late in the first Protectorate to shortly before Cromwell's death, at least.

*History of the Inauguration*6

On 4 July 1653 the Nominated or Barebones Parliament first met. In early November there was an election of a new Council of State. Though elected by the House it is likely that the majority of the Council were opposed to the proposals of this Parliament, and by early December it was generally suspected that some sudden change was pending—that Parliament would be dissolved and the Lord General, Cromwell, would become head of state in name as well as fact. On 12 December Parliament dissolved itself with the help of a file of musketeers, and delivered back to the Lord General the powers they had originally received from him. On 13 December Lambert presented his plan for government, probably based on the earlier Agreement of the People to some extent, replacing his previous proposal containing the title of 'King' with that of 'Lord Governour', and in that form it was presented to Cromwell. It is considered fairly certain that this type of proposal was brought up among Lambert and the other senior army officers before the dissolution, but went no further because Cromwell refused to dissolve Parliament again by force or accept the title of King. This would have been in late November. By 15 December the Council and Cromwell had agreed on his becoming the formal head of state, with the title now changed to 'Lord Protector', a known title with historical implications of a temporary position. The implementation was immediate and, in a rapid public function on 16 December, Cromwell took an oath and was inaugurated as 'the Captain-General of all the forces of this Commonwealth, and now declared Lord Protector thereof'. It was a quiet inauguration, and the main point to be made here is the brief time frame of late November to mid-December, which did not allow sufficient time for design, approval and die making. In contrast, the Second Inauguration of 26 June 1657, after Cromwell

4 Gregorie Leti, *La Vie d'Olivier Cromwell*, Amsterdam 1694 and 1696, vol. ii, p. 280. He wrote that medals were thrown to the people out of the windows of Whitehall on the occasion of the 1653 Inauguration. This has presumably been the strongest argument for the medal being assigned to the December 1653 period, at least since Henfrey interpreted it in 1877.


6 W. C. Abbott, *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, vol. 3, pp. 130-8 for most of this material. Abbott's four-volume work (Harvard 1937-1947) and his 1929 bibliography have been extensively used for this paper. Much of his material came from the *Calendar of State Papers of Venice*, Giavarina to Doge.
had finally rejected the latest offer of the crown, was a well-planned affair of great elaboration, virtually a regal investment. But by that time the Lord Protector medal had already been in production for some time.

The Portrait

The portrait itself is of interest, but it does not appear to be of great help in dating the medal. If the possibility of a fresh sitting is ignored, there are then three portraits to be considered, viz. the live sketch by Simon in 1650 for the Dunbar medal (the original sketch or sketches are not now known to exist); the profile-right miniature by or after Cooper in the Duke of Devonshire collection, and the Simon sketch for the first, but not the final version of the crown, as depicted on the warrant of 27 November 1656.

Medallic Illustrations, Vertue and Farquhar considered that the medal portrait was derived from the Devonshire miniature. Piper, the only modern art personality in the group of writers, considered the Devonshire miniature to be c. 1655 and not related to any medallic portrait. He felt the medal portrait was of a 1654 date (though he was likely influenced in this by its numismatic designation and history, which assigned it to the first Inauguration), and that it was probably based on the Dunbar portrait as opposed to a fresh sitting. Allen, when discussing the crown, considered that portrait to have been similarly derived from the Dunbar.

However, from my own perspective it would seem that the 27 November 1656 warrant sketch (and hence the coinage portraits) and the Lord Protector medal portrait derived from a common origin, likely from a fresh sitting. It will be shown that the medal was probably in production before the warrant sketch, so it appears the coinage portrait was derived from the medal. With a new and important coinage proposed six years after Dunbar, a new live sitting would have been in order if there had not been one previously for the medal. Yet there is no proof that Simon did not use his own Dunbar sketch, updated or not, or some other artist’s work as the basis.

There was no shortage of official Cromwell portraits available at the time.

Contemporary Account (Mint 3/16)

Until recently we knew of no documentary material specifically relating to this medal. However, in the Public Record Office under the classification/documentation number of ‘MINT 3/16’ is an eight-page folio entitled on the cover sheet, ‘The Accompt of Thomas Simon Chief Graver of the Mint, Seales, and Meddals. 1657’. The heading of the first page reads ‘The particulars of worke done and Disbursements made for the use of his Highness and the Common Wealth by Thomas Simon Chief Graver of the Mint and Seales, Since Anno 1650’. The various categories contained in the account are for Seales for England, Seales for Scotland, Seales for Ireland, for the Coynes, Meddals, Several Boxes (to hold treaties made with foreign nations),

\[7\] David Piper, ‘The Contemporary Portraits of Oliver Cromwell’, *Walpole Society* xxxiv, Pl. VIII, B.  
\[8\] Derek Allen, ‘Warrants and Sketches of Thomas Simon’, *BNJ* xxiii, Pl. II, 1. But this does not mean the sketch itself was anything more than an outline. There may have been more formal drawings involved. 
\[9\] Helen Farquhar, ‘Portraiture of Our Stuart Monarchs on Their Coins and Medals’, *BNJ* v. p. 222. But she seems to be simply quoting Vertue who was very confused with his plate references.  
Several Presses, Several Extraordinary Services and Expenses, and finally the summary General Accomp. The total for all this work was £1028/05/08.

The handwriting is probably that of a government clerk, and not Simon's. So far as I can determine this account had previously only been noted by Hocking who published the Coynes entry, but otherwise it is an unpublished document. The related material seen by Henfrey will be discussed later. While the entire document should be published at some time, only the section on medals (Meddals) will be given in this paper, and that verbatim. It contains four entries only, each of which obviously applies to the Lord Protector medal, in gold and with a chain. These are as follows:

Meddals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For a Gold Meddall and Chaine, on the one side the Effigies of his Highnesse in Armor and the Title. And on the Reverse the Armes of England Scotland and Ireland Quartered with his Highness' Coate of Armes in an Inescutcheon Supported by a Lion with a Motto being for Major Redman the Gold weighted ounces 9:8dwt 10grs</td>
<td>£040.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a Gold Meddall and Chaine, on the one side the Effigies of his Highnesse in Armor and the Title And on the Reverse the Armes of England Scotland and Ireland Quartered with his Highness' Coat of Armes in an Inescutcheon and Supported by a Lyon with a Motto, being for Coll. Sadler Gold weighed 11oz. 16dwt</td>
<td>£050.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a Gold Meddall and a Chaine, on the one side the Effigies of his Highnesse in Armor and Title, And on the Reverse the Armes of England Scotland and Ireland quartered in a Compartiment Shield with his Highnesses Coate of Armes in an Inescutcheon and Supported by a Lion with the Motto. Being for the Swedish Agent. Gold weig. 23oz. 10grs</td>
<td>£100.00.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(and in the same hand, but written smaller and obviously inserted at a later date)

July 1657. More for a Gold Meddal and Chaine on the one side the Effigies of his Highness in Armor and Title and on the Reverse the Armes of England Scotland and Ireland quartered in a Compartiment Shield with his Highness' Coat of Armes in an Inescutcheon and Supported by a Lion with the Motto being for the Agent of the Duke Curland the gold wt 30oz | £120.00.00 |

Related Accounts

There are related accounts. Henfrey quotes Simon's Account, which he found among the State Papers at the Public Record Office (not the Mint papers which did not arrive until recently). This account is a summary form of MINT 3/16 and relates to the identical material, the sum of £1028.05.08 remaining due being the same. It is from the Council Entry Book No. 106, pages 404–5, under the date 14 January 1657/8. The medal entry simply states 'For Meddalls to Major Redman XL, Col. Sadler 50, Swedish Agent C, Duke of Curlands Agent CXX £310.00.00'. While always a tantalizing entry it had been meaningless until the uncovering of the full details in MINT 3/16. Henfrey goes on to give some interesting chronological details about this account, which of course hold equally true for MINT 3/16. He says the account was laid before the Council of State on Thursday 6 August 1657 and

---


12 The 1657 cover date implies the account was written after 25 March 1657 o.s. The added fourth medal entry date of July 1657 further implies the account was originally compiled between those two dates.

13 Henfrey, op. cit. p. 217ff. used for this material.
referred to two clerks for examination. It was then read before the Council on Thursday the 15th October when it was again referred back to the clerks to examine the rates charged. It was again presented to the Council on 14 January 1657/8 with the recommendation that it be paid. It can be seen that the last medal (Courland) entry date in MINT 3/16 of July 1657 is consistent with the account being presented to the Council in August 1657.14

The £1028. 5s. 8d. owed to Simon was the remainder from £1728. 5s. 8d. after payments to him totalling £700 in May 1655, September 1655 and January 1655/6. It is interesting to note, and perhaps even of significance, that these payments are defined by category in MINT 3/16 as £300 for Seals for England (out of £344); £200 for Seals for Scotland (out of £253); and £200 for Seals for Ireland (out of £308). There was no previous payment listed for medals, and this could be interpreted to imply that the Lord Protector medals were made subsequent to the last payment of January 1655/6, a date consistent with other events. It does not prove there were no medals made much earlier, paid for previously, and appearing in some unknown account. For example, Simon must have accounted for, if not necessarily been paid for, the c. 1651 Dunbar medals, which were certainly not a private commission, yet MINT 3/16 states the account is since 1650. At the same time it should be noted that there are only approximately ten original Dunbars known of both sizes in all metals. It could not have been a production issue as commonly believed.

The Council Entry Book continues with Simon again requesting payment on 13 July 1658, where he added a further bill for £132, obviously for new work, which included £120 for a gold medal and chain weighing 27 oz. 5 dwts. 12 grs. for presentation to the Portuguese Ambassador. It would now be impossible to deny that this is the fifth listed Lord Protector medal.

Abbott15 states 'During the week of Monday November 16 (1657), the Envoy from the Elector Palatine left London, receiving from the Protector a parting gift of a gold chain worth just over a hundred pounds, which seems to indicate that he and his mission were of no little importance'. In his footnote to this comment he includes a reference to 'the Dunkirk Ledger in Child's Bank, in “An Accompt of moneys due from the State to Edward Blackwell, not comprehended in the Dunkirk Accomp’t” is an item “For 2 chaines of gold—for Envoy of Prince Palatine of Rhine and Resident of Portugal” . . . £202/15/00'. Since only chains are mentioned, it is not reasonable to postulate a further medal for the Palatine Envoy. If there was such a medal it should have appeared in Simon's addenda, which covered the period well past November 1657. Additionally, since Simon was charging for chains as well as the medals16 (chains which he probably had to purchase elsewhere) this Dunkirk Ledger is inconsistent if an attempt is made to relate it to Simon's accounts. Whether the Portuguese Resident was the same as the Portuguese Ambassador I cannot say, but the November

---

14 In Henfrey's personal scrapbook (Lessen collection, ex Ockenden and Warner) on Cromwell is a further note from the Council Entry Book No. 106, p. 4 'On Tuesday, 14th July, 1657 the Council of State ordered that a Gold Chain (value £100) and a Medal (value £20) should be presented to the Minister of the Duke of Curland, now upon his departure'. The values are inconsistent, for the ratio of the total weight of 30 oz. (14,400 gr.) at £120 and the average medal weight of 450 gr. would give a contemporary value to the medal itself of about £4, not £20. Possibly a portion represented Simon's labour. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic (1657-8), p. 27 states £100 for a gold chain and medal.
16 Henfrey, op. cit. p. 36. Simon was sole maker of the Protectorate and Commonwealth medals and their chains based on the formal patent granted 9 July 1656, but ordered 16 March 1654/5.
1657 date for the former is unrelated to the July 1658 date for the latter. The implication here is that the Dunkirk chains are just that, and do not imply a medal for either the Portuguese Resident or the Palatine Envoy.

The Recipients

Major Daniel Redman became major in January 1650 (it is not clear if this is 1650/1) of Cromwell’s own original regiment of horse, a post he retained in Ireland until c. March 1657/8, when he became colonel in another regiment replacing Colonel Sir John Reynolds who had drowned on his return from Flanders 5 December 1657. Possibly of most importance to this paper is that from Ireland in January 1654/5 he landed in Scotland commanding 600 horse in conjunction with Colonel Sadler’s 2,600 foot to meet the anticipated uprising in the West of England. Redman was a staunch Cromwellian, and he sat in the second Parliament of 1656 as the member for Kilkenny and Carlow. Firth & Davies are confusing with regard to the Redman/Reynolds replacement of 1657/8. On 25 April 1657 Reynolds had been given overall command of the 6,000 foot sent to Flanders in support of the French army. When Reynolds died Redman became colonel to replace him, but whether Redman remained in Ireland or actually went to Flanders is unclear. Firth & Davies imply that Redman was not in Reynolds’s Flanders regiment although they say he replaced Reynolds, perhaps meaning that he replaced Reynolds in the Irish regiment that may have been left behind. However, Abbott implies that the replacement was in Flanders. Regardless, he was certainly in Ireland in 1659 when he was discharged, but in 1660 he was apparently in Monck’s favour and after the Restoration he was knighted.

Colonel Thomas Sadler similarly had numerous posts, mostly in Ireland. In 1649 he was adjutant general of foot; in March 1650 he captured some small castles in Tipperary and Kilkenny; in November 1652 he was made Governor of County Wexford; and later in his career he was Governor of Galway. In January 1654/5 he landed in England with 2,600 foot in conjunction with Redman’s landing in Scotland with the horse contingent.

Of these landings of Redman and Sadler in January 1654/5, the whole brigade under the overall command of Colonel John Reynolds, there is no mention in Abbott even though he devotes considerable space to the uprising. This would imply that Redman and Sadler were not especially famed for these actions. Most of their efforts seem to have been in the Shrewsbury area. Except for the fact that the two men seem to have played relatively small parts in the suppression of this abortive insurrection (the ‘Penruddock’ rising of January–March 1654/5), it appears possible that their Lord Protector medals were rewards for this action, although there were other and more important military personnel involved, and the other listed medals went to foreign officials, not to English military personnel. Of course there is some possibility that they received these medals as cumulative political rewards since both were activists. However, they seem to have been issued together and at a time when Sadler was of a higher rank than Redman (Redman also became colonel in or about March 1657/8), and the January 1654/5 action is likely. They could have been presented

17 Firth & Davies, Regimental History of Cromwell's Armies, 1940, 2 volumes. Most of this material is from volume 2.
18 Abbott, op. cit. vol. 4, p. 696.
considerably later in time, but all that can be said at present is that they were issued between c. April 1655, when the insurrection was considered over, and July 1657 when the Courland medal was entered into Simon's account. Why this seemingly small incident was justification for a rare and somewhat costly reward can perhaps be understood as appreciation for the loyalty of troops coming from Ireland during a time and for an event which was very highly publicized by the Protectorate.

The Swedish Agent is probably Christiern Bonde, Ambassador Extraordinary from Charles X Gustavus, King of Sweden. He signed an important treaty with the Protectorate on 17 July 1656. He left England in October 1656 for he wrote his thanks to Cromwell from Hamburg 19 October 1656 on his way home. It is not clear if he ever returned to England. Assuming Bonde is the person who received the medal and chain, the date would probably be between July and October 1656. At the same time it should be recognized that Benjamin Bonnel was Bonde's predecessor; he was the regular Commissioner for Sweden under Christina, who abdicated in favour of Charles X on 5 June 1654. Bonnel remained in England, and on 26 July 1654 he received new credentials from Charles X and was received by Cromwell. About 20 June 1655 he announced his impending departure, which inspired a commendary letter from Cromwell to Charles X, and on 17 July 1655 Bonnel asked the Protectorate for money for his passage home. The new ambassador, Bonde, landed in England at that time. Abbott also points out that a George Alkinton was paid £410. 4s. 6d. for a gold chain and a jewel with Cromwell's portrait for the Swedish envoy, Coyet, probably to present to his master. Petrus Julius Coyet was the trade envoy, overlapping both Bonnel and Bonde. The combination of Alkinton, portrait and jewel certainly do not mean a Simon medal, and perhaps it is not improbable to suggest that the Lord Protector medal had to be post-July 1655. However, jewelled portraits were also issued later. For example, in July 1657 the revenue committee had to pay Alkinton £565 for a jewel for Admiral Blake in the form of four diamonds case fashion enclosing Cromwell's portrait, as a reward for his victory over the Spanish at Santa Cruz, 20 April 1657. Some caution should be exercised here and in the next paragraph with regard to the terminology of 'agent' in the account and the titles of 'ambassador' and 'envoy', for they could actually relate to different individuals.

In September 1656 Rudolf von Strauch, the envoy from James, Duke of Courland (north of Lithuania), arrived in England. Possibly his first audience with Cromwell was in November 1656, when he sought aid from England since Courland was being threatened by Sweden. He left England about 3 August 1657. This then is consistent with the entered date of July 1657 for the medal in the Simon account.

The ambassador extraordinary from Portugal, Don Francisco de Mello, arrived in England in June 1657 in company with the dying Admiral Blake. He was still in England 31 December 1657, but I have not determined when he left. From the additional Simon entry of July 1658 the medal would have to have been issued between January 1657/8 and July 1658. Judging from the other examples of the issuing of this

---

19 Abbott, op. cit. vol. 3, p. 753.
20 Abbott, ibid., vol. 3, p. 780-1. 'his master' probably meant Charles X.
21 Abbott, ibid., vol. 4, p. 585. Full details are given by Henfrey in Notes & Queries 2nd December 1876, 5th Series vol. vi, p. 444.
22 Abbott, ibid., vol. 4, p. 297.
medal it would probably have been done very late in, or at the end of, Mello's stay. If his leaving date could be ascertained it would likely show the medal to have been issued sometime during the winter of 1657/8. Since an Anglo-Portuguese treaty was only signed with him in April 1660, Mello was apparently in and out of England numerous times over the years.

Finally, there is the doubtful possibility of an issue to the Envoy of the Elector Palatine, Karl Ludwig. This envoy was probably George Frederick, Baron von Eilenburg, who had arrived in England at the end of June 1657, had an audience with Cromwell 5 August 1657, and left England 16 November 1657.24

Table I. Recorded Struck Gold Specimens of The Lord Protector Medal
(Compilation of documented issues plus presently known specimens)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Issued to</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Where Recorded</th>
<th>Present Location</th>
<th>Loop</th>
<th>Chain</th>
<th>Original Cost</th>
<th>Approx. wt. (grains troy)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Major Daniel Redman</td>
<td>c. April 1655- July 1657</td>
<td>MINT 3/16</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>4,522 with chain</td>
<td>Likely a military reward for services between Jan. &amp; March 1654/5 but likely issued 1656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colonel Thomas Sadler</td>
<td>c. April 1655- July 1657</td>
<td>MINT 3/16</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>5,664 with chain</td>
<td>Likely a military reward for services between Jan. &amp; March 1654/5 but likely issued 1656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Christiern Bonde-Swedish Agent</td>
<td>c. July 1656- Oct. 1656</td>
<td>MINT 3/16</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Probably Yes</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>11,050 with chain</td>
<td>Ambassador from the King of Sweden, July 1655-October 1656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>Montagu lot 234. Perhaps one of the above five specimens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>448.5</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>Lessen</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>458.4</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td>Murdoch lot 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Struck Specimens

The following list of struck Lord Protector medals is derived from a study of museum holdings, and auction and fixed price sale records, all in Britain. While it

obviously cannot be complete it should be reasonably accurate and quite representative of those specimens now in museums or that have appeared on the British market over the past 150 years. It should be noted that Henfrey, by 1877, knew only of the single gold and silver specimens in the British Museum and, though he recorded a copper specimen, it is doubtful he ever saw it. Continental sources have not been investigated but, in view of the discussion in this paper, it is expected that some must be there.

Survival rates are impossible to determine. While some were likely melted for bullion, and the chains undoubtedly so, the survival rate should be high. On a rather simplistic basis I am assuming this to be so, because the types of recipients and their heirs seemingly could have afforded to retain their medals. Regardless, there would not have been very many produced and the distribution would have been restricted. Unfortunately the Simon accounts we know of do not cover all his work, at least in their details. We find no accounts relating to: the Dunbar medals, yet he made two sets of dies and struck a very few apparently trial specimens; the Lord General medal, though this was unfinished and he probably never charged for it (it might have been a private commission); or the Funeral medal, which was undoubtedly official.

1. Copper. Miss ffarington of Worden reported by Henfrey (p. 225), but not traced further.

These four gold specimens are distinct examples since sale catalogue or museum illustrations are available for each. The following four gold specimens have been recorded, but they were never illustrated, and I suspect most or even all are repeats of 3–6 above.
7. Gold. Thomas Granger collection as reported by Vertue in 1753.
8. Gold. SCMB M311, March 1940 (64049) EF/FDC £100.

Thus, only one silver, doubtfully one copper, and a minimum of four gold specimens

---

25 So far as other possible silver specimens are concerned, the James O'Gray sale of 11 December 1879 lists a struck specimen as lot 386, sold to J. Williams for £2. Henfrey notes in his MS. (Ockenden collection) that Lincoln considered it to be cast, and the price also implies this. I have examined the example listed in the January 1977 NCirc (551) and I am certain it is a worn cast.
26 However, there is a real possibility that the Murdoch specimen is ex-Montagu with the loop removed. They show a number of similar characteristics, but it is almost impossible to determine this with certainty from the plaster cast catalogue illustrations.
can definitely be recorded at present. Surprisingly only one public collection in Britain, the British Museum, appears to contain struck examples.27

The Dies and Striking Methods

The methods Simon used for striking medals are not really known. The Cromwell medals were undoubtedly struck in the Tower, by Simon or under his supervision, and on existing machinery such as that used by Mestrelle or Briot. The dies were probably sunk using puncheons—this is not a certainty—but, unlike the coins, there are no medal puncheons extant (except for the bust puncheon for the Cromwell/Fairfax concoction, MI 411/48).28 The dies themselves were likely similar to the Lord General medal die in the Museum of London, viz. a square shank roughly 45 × 45 mm. with the round die face raised above the shank, i.e., a shoulder die. The dies are not known to be in existence.

The Lessen example was certainly struck in a collar for it exhibits a witness line from a steel band within the collar. Some specimens show bifurcation of the lettering (indentation at the base of a letter) and some do not. Those showing bifurcation imply they were not struck in a collar. However, this would relate to the method of attaching the collar and the striking process used.29 It is presumed that each of the medals was struck in a collar. Various small die flaws or cracks are evident but, without the opportunity to compare all the existing medals, the relative order of striking is not possible to determine.

It is assumed the chains issued with the medals were attached with a loop, and it is therefore surprising that only one of the four existing specimens has a loop. The implication is that the medals without a loop were issued at a minimum value (and without chains) and do not appear in Simon’s accounts. Yet it is conceivable that the loops were removed from the three specimens (although I see no evidence of this on my own medal), or that they were issued in a separate mount with a chain, or that the chains were never attached. A loop could not have been integral to the die or flan since a collar was used in striking. The Montagu specimen is not available for study so its method of attachment is unknown. Simon did use an integral loop as part of the die for his oval medals. His 1653 Naval Reward (the reverse die is in the British Museum) and the Lord General die had this feature and, judging from some existing specimens, the small earlier Naval Reward, the small Dunbar and the Funeral medals probably had the loop integral; if not then the loop was integral to the flan. The loops were not attached after the strikings on these oval medals.

The Casts

The question of the casts is somewhat confusing and not readily resolvable. They fall into two groups, viz. poor quality light silver ones and very high quality silver

27 The other museums queried were the Ashmolean, Fitzwilliam, Hunter, London, Huntingdon, National of Scotland, Royal Scottish, and Royal Mint. The Royal Mint specimen catalogued by Hocking is an electrotype.
and silver-gilt ones. There are no known gold casts. All types could of course have been made at any time since the 1650s, but the two distinct groupings by quality imply they were made at two distinct times, and probably eminated from unrelated sources. Apparently no recorded information is available that can shed light on these. A number of hypotheses can be advanced as explanation, and a discussion of these is in order since it is the cast examples of the medal that are normally encountered.

It is simple enough to consider the best of the casts as legitimate issues, or contemporary, made after the 'early' reverse die break occurred. This theory can be followed by the assumption that perhaps the worst of the casts were the ones thrown to the public as stated by Leti. It is now seen that the struck medals were made for a number of years, in fact very late into Oliver's Protectorate, and the reverse die crack, as evidenced by the single silver specimen, was thus not early, but probably after mid-1658.

The possibility that the die did break early and thus the medals invoiced by Simon might have been silver-gilt casts (recall that there are no recorded gold casts) is obviously untenable, if for no other reason than the account entries give the total weight in gold, including chains, and the silver-gilt productions would have been explained in detail had those been the ones produced. It is inconceivable that the formally issued medals would have been anything other than gold, either cast or struck.

Next, there is the possibility that the reverse die broke in 1658, and sometime after that, but prior to the Restoration, high quality casts were made, perhaps by one of the Simons (experienced as they were with cast medals), not as official issues, but as a private enterprise for interested parties. The low grade casts could then be considered much later productions. But I could not fathom a distribution of casts so near in time to the struck medals. The gold strikings were very selectively made and issued, and it would have cheapened their purpose or impact if side issues were made for the general public, regardless of the method. Similarly, an official parallel production of cast and struck medals makes no sense. If dies are available one does not make casts. The dies probably came close to serving their purpose, for it would seem that Simon could have sunk a new set (assuming he used puncheons for them) had the need for further strikings been important enough.

Finally, the most reasonable explanation is that all casts are simply later productions, made by different people at different times and thus differing in quality. At the same time it should be recognized that nothing else in the Cromwell line parallels the Lord Protector casts in extent or quality, for there are only occasional casts of the various coins, the Dunbar medals, and the Funeral medal (possibly none for the Lord General medal), and these at best are never of exceptional quality.

---

30 Identifying a cast specimen is usually straightforward. The designs and lettering lack definition, and the field is dull and may be pitted. It is less obvious for the high quality casts where examination under a low power microscope is often necessary; again the definition of the lettering is of importance. None of the casts has been subjected to X-ray diffraction testing.

31 Casts such as the various private commission portrait medals are best illustrated by D. Allen in 'Thomas Simon's Sketch-Book', Walpole Society xxvii, Pl. IX.
Conclusions and Summary

The conclusions drawn from the evidence and from various assumptions are as follows:

1. The Lord Protector medal was an official Protectorate monetary political reward and, perhaps to a lesser extent, a military reward, or more reasonably a reward for cumulative military services. It was presented both to Englishmen and to foreign diplomats.

2. The struck gold specimens are official and contemporary, whether looped or not, and were made by Thomas Simon c. 1656-1658.

3. The struck silver specimen was contemporary or possibly slightly later, and represents the final use of the dies as evidenced by the reverse crack coupled with the apparent uniqueness of the known example. There is no evidence of a regular struck silver issue, and the one extant example should be considered as a pièce de plaisir and not for issue.

4. There is no evidence of any type that would imply the dies survived the Simon period, and it should be assumed they were destroyed contemporarily.

5. The copper specimen noted by Henfrey will be assumed to be a cast, unless it should appear and prove to be otherwise.

6. The high quality silver and silver-gilt casts were likely made c. 1740, and very possibly at the Royal Mint or by their personnel, when various other Cromwell items were being struck and re-struck to satisfy apparent collector demand (Dunbar and Lord General medals and Tanner and Dutch coin copies). Vertue mentions they are ‘sometimes seen in Silver, and one I have seen in Gold’. He probably saw silver casts, but it is doubtful that he would have been able to distinguish between one struck or cast, nor would he have cared. The text for his book was probably written c. 1743.

7. The poor quality silver casts were made at any time after that, such as in the late 18th or early 19th centuries, and are of no consequence. I can discern no common master for the casts.

8. The statement by Leti that medals were thrown to the public at the 1653 Inauguration probably means nothing since the possibility of the medal being ready at that time has hopefully now been dismissed. The 1657 Inauguration would not be fitting either for the medal is much too rare, and casts would not be made for that purpose. There are really no Cromwell or Commonwealth medals that could fit the requirements. Leti’s biography, according to Abbott, was the most popular Continental work on Cromwell before the 19th century, but he considered it a largely fabulous work. Leti’s statements on this subject must be disbelieved.

9. The Table I summary chart is a compilation of the struck gold specimens, listing nine examples. The dynamic range of dates of issue seem to be from April 1655 to June 1658, but early 1656 might be more realistic than 1655. No Continental collections have been queried, but it should be expected that examples exist there. Since specimens 7-9, because they lack a loop, seemingly cannot be related to any of Simon’s invoice entries it may be assumed that there were earlier or later invoices now lost or, if they exist, do not separate out the medals. However, the possibility

---

exists that the medals were attached to their chains in some other, non-permanent fashion, or that the loops were removed and the edge area polished to leave no trace. Specimens 6-9 could be repeats of 1-5.

10. For catalogue reference the following may be used:
   'Lord Protector Medal of Oliver Cromwell, by Thomas Simon (MI409/45)'
   Type 1—gold, struck, c. 1656-1658 (Plate XII, 1, Lessen collection)
   Type 2—silver, struck, c. 1658 (Plate XII, 2, British Museum, photo by Peter Davey, courtesy C. Southern)
   Type 3—silver-gilt, cast, high quality, c. 1740 (Plate XII, 3, Lessen collection. 271.2 gr. with loop)
   Type 4—silver, cast, high quality, c. 1740
   Type 5—silver, cast, poor or average quality, c. late 18th-19th century (Plate XII, 4, Lessen collection. 147 gr.)

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. P. P. Gaspar and Dr. R. E. Ockenden for numerous and useful critical comments and suggestions, and to the museum personnel who have provided data over the years.

ADDENDA

Since the preparation of this paper Dr. Gaspar has uncovered a further silver medal reference. At the anonymous Sotheby sale 5 June 1907, lot 136 was an illustrated Lord Protector medal, sold to Ready for £36. I do not know if this was Talbot Ready, but medals were not in his 1916 sale. The letters are bifurcated, but I am unable to determine anything further from a photo of the plate illustration. The price was very high, and it was accepted as struck, which is probably true. This specimen, which is additional to the one in the British Museum, does not imply silver medals were issued as a lower level reward, although the trend may be in that direction.

The information on collars presented on p. 124 was obtained from discussions with Dr. Gaspar, and is based on the paper by P. P. Gaspar and G. P. Dyer, 'Shouldered Dies and the Striking of Early Proof Coins', read at the Colloquium on Dies held at the Royal Mint, 9 June 1976.