This is our eighty-fourth anniversary meeting and the last at which I shall be addressing you as President. It has been a great privilege to have held office as your President, and I am glad to say that I hand over to my successor a Society both a little larger in membership and rather stronger in financial terms than was the position when I assumed office at the end of 1983.

I can claim no personal credit for these achievements, for the foundations for our present relative prosperity were laid under my two predecessors as President, and such progress as we have made recently should be attributed to the collective efforts of our officers and council. Nevertheless I am pleased that my term of office should have coincided with a period in which the Society has prospered, for in my case the affection that we all feel for the Society is perhaps a little intensified by the fact that I have a family connection with it that goes back to the year of our foundation, for a relative of mine, Arthur Rutter Bayley, of Great Malvern in Worcestershire, was one of our members for the first forty years of our existence.

It may indeed interest you to know that my own first steps in collecting English hammered coins were triggered by the fact that when my relative drew up his will, leaving his two cabinets of coins not to me, for I was only three years old at the time, but to the Ashmolean Museum, he failed to notice that the wording of his bequest ('my two cabinets of coins') excluded his Oxford pound of Charles I, which had never fitted into either cabinet, and it therefore remained in my family's possession until a deal was struck by which I was supplied when a teenager with Ashmolean duplicates of equivalent value to it.

As of tonight our ordinary membership stands at 504, of whom 381 are personal members and 123 are institutions. We also have six junior members. This represents a net gain of twenty-four since the end of 1984, but a gain of only one during the present year, for although we have elected twenty-one new members, we have lost four members by death, eight by resignation and eight just now by removal.

The senior in age of the members who have died was Harry George Stride, who died on 7 February at the age of ninety-three. He worked for the Royal Mint in various administrative capacities between 1920 and February 1962, attaining the rank of Chief Clerk in 1949, and he became familiar to numismatists as the member of the Mint staff who dealt with enquiries of a numismatic nature. In this capacity he produced a brief but useful outline history of the Royal Mint, which found a place on many numismatists' bookshelves, and deserves a certain immortality in that it seems to have been incautious reading of a sentence in it about the London monogram type of Alfred which led, directly or indirectly, to the Royal Mint's interesting decision to hold 1100th anniversary celebrations in 1986. Although Mr Stride did not join our Society until March 1962, he had previously contributed a good article to volume 28 of our Journal on the evidence provided by the Mint records for the early stages of Charles II's gold coinage, and it is pleasing that he should have remained one of our members until his death.

Henry Mossop, who died about three weeks ago at the age of sixty-nine, had been a member since January 1959. He made fine collections of Ancient British coins and coins of Lincolnshire mints, many of them found in the vicinity of his Lincolnshire farm, and he will be remembered by his book The Lincoln Mint c.890–1279, edited by Dr Veronica Smart but based on Mr Mossop's initial research, which is still the only extensive die-study of the coins of an English mint to have appeared in print.

Another loss that touches us closely is that of Edward Remy Duncan Elias, a member of the Society since 1978, who died in Amsterdam on 5 August at the age of sixty-eight. Edward Elias enjoyed a successful career as a lawyer and banker both in his native Netherlands and in Indonesia, in the course of which he gradually became an ardent collector and student of coins. From the mid 1970s onwards his principal field of interest was the Anglo-Gallic series, which was badly in need of modern numismatic research, and he explored its complexities at first in various scholarly notes, of which the most substantial was one of the coinage of Bergerac published in our Journal, and then in his very useful book, The Anglo-Gallic Coins, published jointly by our member M. Emile Bourgey and by Messrs Spink in 1984. This book represented a considerable advance over anything previously available, especially in its treatment of the Aquitanian coinage of English rulers in the fourteenth century, and it will convey to posterity both Elias's knowledge of the series and something of his personality, for he wrote much as he spoke, and those of us who had the pleasure of meeting him will miss his courteous presence and his real enthusiasm for our subject.

The fourth member who we have lost by death is Mr David Baum, of Middlesborough, who we elected a member in June 1987 and who died in April this year.

I have as in previous years to express my warm thanks to my fellow officers for their hard work and support during the year. I single out for special mention Graham Oyet, who gives up his post this evening having served...
as our Director since 1981. During the last eight years he has coped admirably with the task of organising our programme of meetings and with the less demanding role of advising your President and your Council on any matter of difficulty that has from time to time cropped up. He now becomes one of the editors of our Journal and I have no doubt that we shall benefit from having him in that capacity. He will be succeeded as Director by Robert Thompson, who previously served as our Librarian from 1966 to 1981, and who we are very pleased to have again as one of our officers.

Our Secretary and Treasurer have continued to carry the main burden of the administration of the Society, and our ability, despite another year's inflation, to hold the annual subscription unchanged at £18, as it has been since 1 January 1981, reflects our Treasurer's skill in ensuring that we earn the maximum interest on the sums of money that we currently have on deposit. Our financial position could be stronger, for we have each year to find a substantial sum of money to pay the printing costs of BNJ, but our surplus of assets over liabilities did stand at £17,607 at 31 October 1987 and will be in the region of £18,000 in the financial year that has just ended. This makes it feasible to contemplate, as I suggested in my Presidential Address last year, producing a newsletter twice a year in addition to the BNJ, and this idea has been approved by Council in principle.

I take the opportunity to remind members that the Society is always glad to receive gifts or bequests of any size, and that in an age when publishing the results of scholarly research is less likely than ever to be paid for from the public purse, learned societies such as our own must be more active in asking for money and putting it to good use. In this connection our Council has indicated to the Royal Numismatic Society that we would be willing to make them an interest free loan of £2,000 towards the cost of their likely forthcoming publication of the first-ever complete listing of coin hoards from Roman Britain, compiled by Professor Anne Robertson, subject to our share in the publication being recognised on its title leaf and subject to our being satisfied that the publication is as commercially viable as is in all the circumstances practicable. Making this sum available to the RNS must be properly authorised by a general meeting of this Society at some future date, and all I wish to do tonight is to indicate what has been under discussion.

I have also to express our thanks to our Librarian, Roger Bland, who with a student assistant reorganised ours and the RNS's joint library during the summer, and has dealt efficiently with what was a threatening accumulation of unbound periodicals, sale catalogues and so on. Members generally may not yet be aware that the library has expanded beyond its traditional limits and that our collection of sale catalogues and some of our periodicals are now shelved in the area of the Warburg Institute's basement adjacent to our library room proper.

The high point of our programme during the year was the first Howard Linecar lecture, delivered at our October meeting by our Vice-President Ian Stewart. In the course of it he discussed a number of topics of considerable general interest to British numismatists and I am pleased to say that it is intended that the text of his lecture should be printed in full in our Journal for 1988. His remarks excuse me from saying anything very lengthy about the same subjects, but I think that it is right that I should say as your President that I do very much share Dr Stewart's concern that better arrangements should be made for the publication of treasure trove coin hoards.

On the same theme, but on a happier note, I would like to welcome the publication of Edward Besly's volume on English Civil War Coin Hoards, available from the British Museum as British Museum Occasional Paper No. 51, both because it provides full reports on an interesting group of recently discovered coin hoards of the 1640s and because Besly's excellent discussion of Civil War coin hoards in general, and his listing of all those known to him, disposes of the popular belief among all but specialists that the composition of Civil War coin hoards is always much the same and that nothing can be learned from closer study of them. Indeed, it is clear to me, as it is to Besly, that in concentrating our attention on the fascinating but numerically scarce Royalist coinages of the period, we have closed our minds to all sorts of other issues presented by the coin evidence which we ought to have thought about, and we must try to do better in future.

This is one of the reasons why I am particularly pleased that I am to be succeeded as your President by Dr Christopher Challis, who will be our first President since Derek Allen whose specialist field of knowledge extends into this part of the seventeenth century, and who starts with the advantage that as a historian he can take a broad view of the role of the coinage in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. He has served us well as editor of our Journal since 1980, and I am confident that as the twentieth President in the Society's history he will give us the leadership that we will need as we move into the 1990s. I draw the first part of my remarks to a close on that satisfactory note, but before I proceed any further I must read you this year's list of coin hoards.

There are no hoards to report this year from Scotland, but there are, as Mr Besly tells me, two from Wales, respectively a hoard of eight silver coins of Elizabeth I from Cemaes Bay, Anglesey (Gwynned), found between November 1987 and February 1988, the latest coin being of 1593; and a hoard of 35 silver coins spanning the period Mary–Charles I, from Pontypridd, Mid Glamorgan, September 1988, the latest being 1639/40.

Miss Archibald has kindly supplied the following list of coin hoards from England:
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Celtic

Whitchurch, Hampshire. Oct 1987. 34 AV British E staters, 100 AV Chute-type staters. c.50 BC.
Clapham, Bedfordshire. Mar 1987. 2 AV British E staters. c.50 BC.

Cheriton, Hampshire. 1987-8. 11 AV British D staters, 6 AV quarter staters, 1 AV British Q stater. c.50 BC.
Snettisham, Norfolk. 1988. 40 AV and 2 AR British J and Iceni. Late 1st century BC.
The coins from Cheriton and Snettisham are further instalments of hoards previously reported.

Roman

Sutton, Suffolk. Nov 1987. 204 AR Roman denarii to 40 AD.
Ollerton, Notts. Mar.-Aug. 1988. 25 AR denarii and fragments to c.190 AD.
Sharrow Point, Cornwall. c.1980. 7 radiates to 268 AD.

Milton Keynes, Bucks. May 1988. 96 AE to 317 AD.

Sharrow Point, Cornwall, c.1980. 7 radiates to 268 AD.

Aldworth, Berkshire. Sept 1987. 2 AR miliarenses and 28 AR siliquae to 367 AD.

Anglo-Saxon

Barkby Thorpe, Leics. Nov 1987. 7 AR pennies fused together in pile, Burgred (and possibly Alfred?).

Mediaeval

Farndon, Notts. Nov 1988. 22 AR, denominations from groat to halfpenny, including a half-groat of David II of Scotland, 1360s.

Modern


(Coins identified by Dr Melinda Mays).


THE subject of the second part of my Presidential Address is the career of Thomas Simon, the seventeenth-century coin engraver and medallist who is generally recognised as the greatest artist among all those who have engraved dies for the British coinage. I shall not be saying a great deal about Thomas Simon that is positively new, for there is an existing literature on him that commences with George Vertue's book on Simon's medals, coins and seals, first published in 1753. and this literature includes substantial contributions from such scholars as Richard Gough, H. W. Henfrey, Helen Farquhar, Derek Allen, and Melinda Mays.

1 G. Vertue, Medals. Coins. Great-Seals, Impressions, from the elaborate works of Thomas Simon, Chief Engraver of the Mint, to K. Charles the 1st, to the Commonwealth, the Lord Protector Cromwell, and in the reign of K. Charles the 11th to MDCLXV (London, 1753). It is convenient to note here that, in all copies of the book that the present writer has examined, the text leaf describing plate XX states that the plate carries 'several cyphers, or signatures, briefly to distinguish, or signify the persons to whom I have been chiefly obliged for their communications, in relation to this work', whereas in fact the plate illustrates, at the point these cyphers might have appeared, an example of Abraham Simon's medal of Charles Seton, earl of Dunfermline, which is not referred to on the text leaf. The presumption is that this medal came to light at a late stage in the preparation of the volume and that the lower part of the plate was re-engraved to accommodate it, and it would be interesting to know if any copy of the plate in its original form exists today, for it might shed some light on the sources from which Vertue derived his knowledge of Thomas and Abraham Simon and their work.

2 Vertue's book was a revised version of Vertue's book which appeared in 1780, the chief merit of which is that he had access to the collection of Simon material later utilized by Derek Allen (below). He is also the only scholar to have offered identifications of the heraldry of three otherwise unidentifiable seals illustrated on Vertue's plate XXXI as by Thomas Simon; he assigns them respectively to John Downe, to the parliamentary general John Lambert, and to a member of the St Barbe family.

3 Henfrey discussed Thomas Simon's work in the Commonwealth and Protectorate period in his Numismata Cromwelliana (1877), and in a related article, 'On some medals and seals of the Cromwell family', JBA xxxiii (1877), 382-94.

4 Her two articles, 'Thomas Simon, 'one of our chief engravers'', NC (1932), 274-310, and 'New light on Thomas Simon', NC (1936), 210-34, provide a careful discussion of all the evidence then available for Simon's life and for his coinage work for Charles I and II.

5 Allen's interest in Thomas Simon stemmed from the reappearance in 1957 of Simon's sketchbook and other papers not seen since Gough's day. Such new information is published in his article 'Warrants and sketches of Thomas Simon', BNJ 23 (1938-41), 439-48.
S. A. H. Whetmore, and, most recently, Mr Marvin Lessen. But it so happens that one of these contributions, Allen’s long essay on Simon’s surviving sketchbook, was written almost exactly half a century ago, and I think that I can do no better than to conclude my series of Presidential Addresses by choosing Simon as my subject and by giving rather overdue recognition to one of the very best of the numismatic writings of a scholar, Derek Allen, who served as our President from 1959 to 1963 and occupied that position when I first began to attend the Society’s meetings.

Thomas Simon is unique among British coin engravers in that scholars have from the first taken almost as much interest in the details of his biography as in his professional output, and there is now a body of biographical information about him which I shall briefly summarise for your benefit. He was the second surviving son of Peter Simon, a merchant of French origin but resident in Walbrook in the City of London, by his wife Anne, daughter of Gilles Germain, a wealthy merchant in St Peter Port, Guernsey, whose family house there, as Mr Robert Tostevin tells me, is now occupied by one of the principal branches of the Trustee Savings Bank in the Channel Islands. It was evidently because of his family background that when he was baptised on 26 April 1618 the ceremony took place at the French Protestant Church in Threadneedle Street. The next known event in Simon’s life was his apprenticeship, when aged about fifteen and a half, to George Crompton, a London goldsmith, for an eight-year term beginning on 30 August 1633. Two years later he transferred to the service of Edward Greene, also a member of the London Goldsmiths’ Company, but more significantly the chief engraver at the Mint, and commenced a new seven-year apprenticeship which would have expired on 28 September 1642, more or less at the outbreak of the English Civil War. When this came, the middle ranking and junior members of the Mint staff, including Simon’s master Edward Greene, remained in their existing posts, and it is evident that Simon, though not yet on the Mint establishment, must have continued to work there, for he was ordered to make a new great seal for Parliament in July 1643, and on Greene’s death at the end of 1644, the post of chief engraver was granted by parliament jointly to Edward Wade and Thomas Simon, by letters patent dated 4 April 1645. Wade died shortly before the end of 1648 and it was thus that when new appointments were made to all the Mint’s posts after Charles I’s execution, Thomas Simon became the new Commonwealth government’s sole chief engraver, his patent being dated 25 April 1649. Earlier that year on 15 February 1649, he had married Elizabeth Fautrart, daughter of Cardin Fautrart, of a Guernsey family, by whom he was to have one surviving son, Samuel, born on 1 April 1653, and two surviving daughters, Elizabeth and Ann. By this time he or his wife had a connection with the parish of All Saints, Maidstone, Kent, where he was married and where two of his children were baptised, and he also possessed a

---

6 S. A. H. Whetmore, ‘Some further notes on Thomas Simon’, *BNJ* 30 (1960–1), 159–73.
8 D. Allen, ‘Thomas Simon’s sketch-book’, *Walpole Society* xxvii (1938–9), 13–53. Allen’s article is fundamental to an understanding of Thomas Simon as an artist, medallist and engraver, and also offers the first coherent account of the medallic work of Abraham Simon.
9 The older literature exhibits some uncertainty about Thomas Simon’s position in the family and his date of birth, but Miss Farquhar’s article of 1936 established that his brother Abraham was baptised in the French church in Threadneedle Street on 27 April 1617 and that Thomas was baptised there a year later almost to the day.
10 Whetmore, p. 161.
12 Whetmore, p. 164.
13 There is a Faculty Office marriage licence dated 2 May 1674 for the marriage of Ann Simon to John Hibbert; Hibbert, described in his will dated 6 March 1715 (with codicil of 30 October 1717 and proved 24 September 1718) as citizen and Skinner, of London and Hampstead, refers in it to his wife Hester, indicating that Ann had died some time earlier, and to his daughter Frances, widow of Samuel Barker, of Fairford, Gloucestershire, who must evidently have been his child by Ann, since it was the Barker family of Fairford who inherited the Thomas Simon sketchbook and other papers.
substantial house in the parish of St Clement Danes, which was to become his principal London base, although at the time of his death he still owned house property in Walbrook that had belonged to his father.\textsuperscript{14}

Simon received a fresh grant of the position of sole chief engraver for the Mint and Seals from Oliver Cromwell on 15 February 1655, held jointly with that of 'Medal Maker for the State', and his tenure of the posts was confirmed by letters patent issued on 9 July 1656.\textsuperscript{15}

On Charles II's restoration his appointment as chief engraver automatically lapsed, for Thomas Rawlins had been granted the post by letters patent from Charles I as far back as April 1645 and was still living.\textsuperscript{16} But the production of a new coinage was one of the restored regime's priorities, and on 10 August 1660 it was Simon who was instructed to prepare the necessary patterns and irons, Rawlins clearly not being thought capable of the task, and on 31 May 1661 Simon's continuing role at the Mint was recognised by his formal appointment as 'one of the King's engravers', his patent being dated 2 June.\textsuperscript{17} By April 1662 the main responsibility for the production of dies for what was to be for the future a milled coinage had passed from Simon to the Roettiers brothers, in circumstances which have long intrigued numismatists, but he was still working on the dies for Charles II's Scottish coinage until shortly before he died in the summer of 1665, and he also remained extremely busy as an engraver of official seals. He was buried at All Saints, Maidstone, on 26 July 1665, but may later have been reinterred, in accordance with the provisions of his will, at St Clement Danes.\textsuperscript{18}

These are not the only certain facts about Thomas Simon, for there is a fair amount of contemporary documentation for his role in the production of individual coins, medals, and seals, but before proceeding to consider his actual output, it is as well to recognise how little we still know of him as a person despite the efforts of two and a half centuries of scholarship. What is unfortunate is that by the time George Vertue began to collect information about him in the 1720s, there was no-one left alive, or at least no-one living who Vertue met, who had any personal knowledge of Simon himself, and everything that Vertue says about Simon is either gleaned second hand or is deduced, not always correctly, from numismatic or documentary evidence. A further distorting element in Vertue's view of the situation arises from the fact that although he did not meet anyone who had known Thomas Simon, he did meet at least two people, the famous physician and collector, Sir Hans Sloane, and a city jeweller called John House, who had known Abraham Simon, Thomas's elder brother, who although a year older than Thomas was apparently still alive in the late 1680s, and their entertaining stories about Abraham make Abraham seem a more significant figure than he really was.\textsuperscript{19}

That said, it is not impossible to put a little more flesh on the bare facts about Simon assembled by Miss Farquhar and Mr Whetmore, for more ought to be discoverable about his family circle and about his property interests in Guernsey, London and Kent. I shall not embark on that except indirectly tonight, but I have come by a little information of relevance to Simon that I do want to put on record on this occasion, because it ties up rather satisfactorily with statements in Vertue's notebooks and with a view which can be formed about the nature of Simon's business as an engraver. Mr Whetmore pointed out in our Journal for 1960 that after Simon took out the freedom of the Goldsmiths' Company

\textsuperscript{14} The Fire Court, vol. 1, edited by P. E. Jones (1966), 171-2, records the litigation that took place when Simon's two houses in Walbrook had to be rebuilt after the Great Fire of London.

\textsuperscript{15} Whetmore, p. 165.

\textsuperscript{16} Farquhar, 'Thomas Simon', p. 287.

\textsuperscript{17} Whetmore, p. 167.

\textsuperscript{18} Whetmore, pp. 163, 167-9.

\textsuperscript{19} Extensive selections from Vertue's notebooks were published by the Walpole Society in six volumes, with an accompanying index volume, between 1930 and 1955. In what follows these will be cited as Vertue I-VI. For Sloane and Abraham Simon see Vertue II, 84 and V, 32, and for House and Abraham Simon see Vertue I, 123-4 (where House's personal knowledge of Simon is not explicitly asserted but may be deduced from what Vertue records).
on 12 June 1646, the first apprentice that he took on, on 7 May 1647, was his younger brother Laurence.\textsuperscript{20} In fact Simon went on to take on eight further apprentices between 1647 and his death, usually employing three together at any one time, but having five at the peak of his career between Michaelmas 1660 and March 1662. Of these apprentices, two came from Guernsey, Daniel Lefebvre,\textsuperscript{21} apprenticed on 22 March 1648, and Thomas de Beauvoir, apprenticed on 23 March 1659.\textsuperscript{22} One, Lewis Payne, apprenticed on 14 February 1655, was the son of the Rev. Stephen Payne, preacher to the English protestant congregation at Bergen-op-Zoom in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{23} Four others came from seemingly ordinary English backgrounds; Samuel Moody, apprenticed on 27 April 1655, son of a blacksmith in Richmond, Surrey;\textsuperscript{24} Richard Ballard, apprenticed on 9 July 1658, son of a yeoman in Willersey, Gloucestershire;\textsuperscript{25} John Wightman, apprenticed on 19 October 1660, son of an ironmonger in Maidstone;\textsuperscript{26} and Launder Smith, apprenticed on 25 April 1662, son of Thomas Smith, gentleman, of Guildford, Surrey.\textsuperscript{27} Simon’s remaining apprentice was Thomas East, of a yeoman family from Carburton in Nottinghamshire, who had at first been apprenticed to Thomas Rawlins, the royalist coin engraver, on 24 June 1647, but who was taken over by Simon from Rawlins at some date between 1647 and 1654.\textsuperscript{28} These are not wholly new names in relation to Simon, for at least three, and perhaps four, of them, figure among the previously shadowy witnesses to Thomas Simon’s last will and its codicils,\textsuperscript{29} but they enlarge our view of his immediate circle and what is really reassuring is that we can now see that Vertue was on the right lines when he attributed to Simon a group of seal impressions which had come to the eighteenth-century coin engraver Richard Yeo.

\textsuperscript{20}Whetmore, p. 161.

\textsuperscript{21}I am grateful to Miss Susan Hare, FSA, Librarian to the Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths, for kindly supplying me with photocopies of the entries in the Company’s records relating to Simon’s apprentices. Daniel Lefebvre was a son of Peter Lefebvre, merchant, of Guernsey, but nothing otherwise is known of him (he did not take up the freedom of the Company after the expiry of his apprenticeship and may indeed have died or left Simon’s service before his seven-year apprenticeship was over).

\textsuperscript{22}Thomas de Beauvoir was the son of another Thomas de Beauvoir, merchant, of Guernsey, described as ‘deceased’ in the entry of his son’s apprenticeship in March 1659. His apprenticeship would have expired on Lady Day 1666, and he took up the freedom of the Company of Goldsmiths on 7 October 1668. He must evidently have been a distant relative of Thomas Simon, for there had been a German–De Beauvoir marriage back in 1585, but it is difficult to determine his place in Simon’s extended cousinhood; he seems not to have been the Thomas de Beauvoir who was a Jurat of the Royal Court of Guernsey and father of William de Beauvoir, DM, Regius Professor of Medicine at Oxford 1729–30, for Dr A. L. Reade gives the Jurat’s year of birth as 1632 (A. L. Reade, \textit{Johnsonian Gleanings}, V (1928), 182).

\textsuperscript{23}Lewis Payne took up the freedom of the Company on 25 April 1662, and became a member of its livery in September 1674. See also HMC \textit{Laing I}, 211–2, for a letter dated 4 November 1642 from his father to a Dutch grandee.

\textsuperscript{24}Mr John Cloake, CMG, kindly informs me that Samuel Moody, son of Matthew Moody, blacksmith, of Richmond, by his wife Margeret, was baptised at Richmond parish church on 27 May 1638 and was buried there on 27 January 1709. He took up the freedom of the Company on 11 July 1662, and was evidently the Samuel Moody, of St Martins in the Fields, goldsmith, bachelor, aged about twenty-five, who had a licence to marry Frances Hooper, spinster, aged about thirty, on 17 September 1663.

\textsuperscript{25}Richard Ballard was son of Thomas Ballard, Willersey, Glouces, yeoman, and took up the freedom of the Company on 27 April 1666. He was the Richard Ballard, St Clement Danes, goldsmith, bachelor, aged about twenty-seven, who had a licence to marry Anne Robson, spinster, aged about twenty-six, on 20 December 1675.

\textsuperscript{26}Wightman’s father, Henry Wightman, ironmonger, of Maidstone, was already dead when his son was apprenticed to Simon. John Wightman took up the freedom of the Company on 4 March 1668, and was of the parish of St Peter le Poer, London, in October 1668 when his testimony was required for the purposes of a marriage licence granted to Henry Wightman, ironmonger, Maidstone, Kent, bachelor, aged about twenty-five (presumably his brother).

\textsuperscript{27}Launder Smith took up the freedom of the Company on 9 June 1669. He was living in the parish of St Mary Abchurch with his wife Prudence, a son Thomas and daughters Mary and Elizabeth in 1695 (\textit{London inhabitants within the walls 1695}, edited by D. V. Glass, (1696), p. 271), and was a Tory member of the Common Council of the City of London, representing Walbrook ward, as late as 1716.

\textsuperscript{28}When East took up the freedom of the Company on 30 June 1654 it was noted that he had been ‘turned over to Thomas Symon’ at some unstated date in the past. East’s father, Thomas East, yeoman, Carburton, Notts, was already dead in June 1647. East’s sister, Jane, was the wife of John Roos, of Laxton, Notts, and mother by him of John Roos, Chief Engraver of the Seals from March 1705 to his death in June 1716 (for the relationship between Roos and East see now \textit{The Visitation of Nottinghamshire begun in 1662 and finished in 1664}, edited by G. D. Squibb, (1986), p. 52).

\textsuperscript{29}Simon’s will, dated 17 June 1665, is witnessed by Ballard, Wightman, and a still shadowy ‘Thomas Gruwin’ (perhaps a misreading of Thomas Beauvoir), while its codicil, dated 25 June 1665, is witnessed by Wightman and Launder Smith.
via two intermediate owners from Thomas East. Similarly, we can now recognise a reference to John Wightman in Vertue’s notebooks, and we can identify Launder Smith as the unnamed person who Vertue records as telling the jeweller, John House, that ‘Simon was a good like man, but his nose was wry’. What is also interesting is that although Simon had in all a total of nine apprentices, not one of them is known to have been involved after his death either in coinage work or in the production of medals, and even if their participation in coinage work was blocked by the Roettiers family’s dominance at the Mint, the absence of any signed medal by any of them must be of some significance. As there is evidence that Thomas East and Lewis Payne were not medallists at all but seal engravers, and a hint that Launder Smith may have been a jeweller and gem engraver, we may provisionally conclude that seal engraving and gem engraving played a much larger part in Simon’s own business as an engraver than numismatists generally have recognised, and this accords both with Allen’s suggestion that there are substantial numbers of seals by Simon that have still to be identified and with recent research both by the Russian scholar Y. Kagan and by Diana Scarisbrick that has added to our knowledge of Simon’s work as a jeweller.

I can also tell you that Humphrey Gyfford and Robert Blanchard, who were appointed by Simon as executors of his will and described in it as his ‘loving friends’, were both substantial members of the London business community, Blanchard heading the banking firm at No. 1 Fleet Street (‘the Marygold at Temple Bar’) which later became Child’s Bank, and Gyfford, a member of the Drapers’ Company, representing Cheap Ward on the Common Council of the City of London for two periods between 1666 and 1676. One can divine from that, as indeed from the scale of the legacies specified in Simon’s will, that Simon was himself a prosperous London citizen and it is only perhaps because his duties at the Mint excused him from civic responsibilities that he does not figure more in contemporary London records.

Simon’s work as a coin engraver will be relatively familiar to most of you and all I need to do is to remind you of its chief features. What is most obscure about it is the extent to which he was responsible for the coinage struck at the Tower Mint in Charles I’s reign up to 1649, for although his earliest datable work as a seal engraver belongs to 1638 and his earliest signed medal, existing in three varieties, is one celebrating the end of the Scottish

---

32 Vertue IV, 125 (to be read in conjunction with Vertue V, 43).
33 Vertue II, 90.
34 Vertue I, 123, where it is stated that House’s ‘master’ was ‘servant to this Simmonds’ and Vertue records this observation as his. Miss Hare has supplied the evidence from the Company of Goldsmiths’ records to show that House was apprenticed to Launder Smith, for a seven-year period commencing on 10 September 1679, thus proving that Smith is the person concerned.
35 East engraved the official seals required during the reign of James II, the actual Chief Engraver of Seals, Henry Harris, not being competent to do so. That East’s business was essentially that of a seal engraver only can be indirectly inferred from the fact that when his nephew and professional successor John Rose applied for the succession to Harris in 1704 a report from the Mint Board noted that ‘Mr Rose (sic) desires to succeed Mr Harris only in his place of Graver of Seales to her Majesty, and ... seems to be a good workman for seales and sufficiently qualified for that place’ (The correspondence of Isaac Newton, Volume IV 1694-1709, edited by J. F. Scott (1967), 417). For Lewis Payne as a seal engraver see Vertue V, 59, where he is noted as the engraver of two signet seals for the duke of Lauderdale as Charles II’s principal minister in Scotland in 1671-8.
36 This is not more than a conjecture based on the fact that Smith’s former apprentice John House was carrying on a jewellery business including engraved gems in its stock when Vertue knew him in the 1720s, but as Launder Smith’s long business career has left no trace of activity by him as a working goldsmith, goldsmith-banker, or engraver of coins, medals or seals, involvement by him in the jewellery trade seems by no means unlikely.
37 Mrs Scarisbrick has very kindly supplied me with both a photocopy and a translation of Kagan’s article on the history of seventeenth-century gem engraving in England, published in Russian in Leningrad in 1981.
38 Blanchard had married the widow of William Wheeler, the previous head of the firm, and managed the business from Wheeler’s death in 1663 to his death on 5 June 1681, control of it then passing to Wheeler’s son-in-law, the future Sir Francis Child.
39 Gyfford appears to have been Simon’s closest friend (he is the ‘one Mr Giffard an intimate acquaintance’ mentioned to Vertue by the Lombard Street jeweller ‘Mr Marlow’, Vertue II, 90).
40 This was the great seal of Algernon Percy, earl of Northumberland, as lord high admiral, a post to which he was appointed on 30 March 1638. Vertue seems to have seen the seal itself, but he records in his book of 1753, p. 63, that it had by then been melted down, and it is not clear whether there are surviving wax impressions from it.
rebellion in June 1639, the Tower coinage of the 1640s has not yet had the die-by-die scrutiny which might show which dies were engraved by Simon and which were not, and all that I can do is to repeat Helen Farquhar’s summary of the position as it appeared to her in 1932: ‘it is generally assumed on technical grounds that the dies for the finer coins of the Tower Mint after Parliament had seized the Mint were engraved by our artist. I believe we recognise his hand and lettering in the shillings (P) and (Eye) of 1643, 1644, and 1645, of which two specially fine proofs are in the British Museum — and it is assumed that the equestrian figure on the crown, initial mark Sun, should be attributed to him in 1645–7’. From this point onwards we are on firmer ground, for it is clear to me that it was Simon who as sole chief engraver must have been responsible for the initial design of the Commonwealth coinage of 1649–60, even if some of the engraving was from the start not done by him but, as Miss Farquhar suggests, by his official under-engravers. Here indeed, while sharing Miss Farquhar’s view that the coinage was poorly executed, I would like to dissent from her opinion, which is also I expect an opinion held by most of you, that ‘the coinage was of singularly unfortunate design’. My own view is that the design was by no means bad, given the fact that the obverse type had been specified by Parliament well before the production of the dies commenced, and that Simon was thus compelled to have the shields of England and Ireland side by side on the coins’ obverse. He could not in fact combine the arms on one shield, for the two kingdoms were independent entities and when there was no reigning dynasty, the arms could not be quartered without special parliamentary enactment. Indeed the design seems to me to be enviably fresh and uncluttered in comparison with the preceding issues in Charles I’s name, and although it does not work as well on the smaller denominations, the only criticism of it that I would fully accept is that by a contemporary royalist wit who observed that the design showed that God was on the opposite side to the Commonwealth.

I have nothing to say about Simon’s role in the production of dies for Ramage and Blondeau’s milled patterns in 1651, or indeed about his role in engraving dies for Oliver Cromwell’s milled coinage, beyond repeating the conclusions first reached by Henfrey that the Cromwell coinage dated 1656 was actually struck in the summer of 1657 and that both this coinage and the coinage of 1658 were intended as official coinages for general circulation.

On the Restoration, as we have seen, Simon was displaced as chief engraver by Rawlins, but this made no material difference to the existing arrangements for die-cutting, for by August 1660 it had been decided that Simon should be ordered to produce the dies for the new coinage, and Simon and his apprentices, perhaps with some help from the Mint under-engraver, produced all the dies for Charles II’s hammered coinage. It was however soon clear that the duration of this coinage would be limited, for milled coinage had a powerful advocate at court in the person of Henry Slingsby, who had played a minor part in the administrative arrangements for the milled coinage of 1657 while simultaneously acting as a royalist secret agent; and at some point early in 1661 Charles II asked Slingsby ‘to have the way of coining by the mill and press and letters and grainings about the edge of the moneys settled’. To achieve this, Blondeau had to be got back from Paris, where he

41 Farquhar, ‘Thomas Simon’.
42 Henfrey’s discussion of the Cromwell coinages in his *Numismata Cromwelliana* (1877), pp. 91–154, is still well worth reading, even if his conclusions have been refined on various points of detail by subsequent scholarship.
43 Henfrey, p. 126 (a reference to Slingsby which does not appear to have been widely noticed).
44 So Slingsby recorded in a self-justificatory memorandum drawn up by him after his suspension from the post of master of the Mint in 1680, inherited with others of his papers by the Graham family of Norton Conyers, Yorkshire. There is a summary calendar of these in the *Appendix to the Sixth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, but they require full scholarly publication.
had gone after Cromwell’s death, and it was Simon who went to Paris in November 1661 to
make the necessary arrangements. Simon must have been back in London before Christmas, and preparations for the milled coinage were actively under way by 31 January 1662, when Simon was instructed to prepare the punches, matrices, stamps and dies. Just a week later, on 7 February, another Order in Council reveals that similar instructions had been given to the Roettiers brothers, and it was now directed that Simon and the Roettiers should each make a pattern crown piece between which Charles II could judge. It is not clear whether any such patterns were produced, for Simon's Petition and Reddite crowns were produced no earlier than the late spring of 1663, and a possible Roettiers pattern crown is dated 1662 rather than 1661 as it probably would have been if the dies for it were engraved before 25 March 1662. At all events, it was Simon, not the Roettiers brothers, who prepared the dies for a coinage of milled 20s. pieces ordered on 28 February, and it was thus by no means a foregone conclusion that the Roettiers would triumph over him. What was decisive was the fact that by 8 April Simon’s dies had ‘proved insufficient for our service’, as an Order in Council puts it, and it seems certain, as Dr Challis will argue in the forthcoming history of the Royal Mint, that the Roettiers owed their ultimate victory not to their greater skill as engravers nor to the greater favour that they enjoyed at Court but to their ability to produce dies that would not crack, as Simon’s had, under the pressure of the machinery used to strike the milled coinage.

I turn to Simon’s work as a medallist. This has not been discussed as a whole since it was discussed by Allen fifty years ago, and I am certain that it will not be as familiar to you as Simon’s work as a coin engraver. All I can do this evening is to say something about two of the three main groupings into which his medallic work falls.

I begin with the series of cast profile portrait medals produced by Simon at intervals between the early 1640s and his death. These represent Simon’s most individual contribution to English medallic art but they are also in various respects problematic. Allen was able to list nineteen such medals which he attributed to Thomas Simon, of which sixteen were round and three oval, and a further eleven very similar medals, all round, which he attributed to Thomas Simon’s brother, Abraham. By using the evidence of Thomas’s surviving sketchbook in conjunction with the evidence provided by the medals themselves, he found it possible to divide the medals into three groups: an undated and unsigned group in low relief, similar in conception to drawings in the sketchbook and the earliest of which Thomas Simon probably produced between 1640 and 1645; a dated group belonging to the years 1645–7, also in low relief but with a more vivid style of portraiture, all but one of which carry Abraham’s initials on the truncation, and all of which Allen was inclined to attribute to Abraham; and a group in higher relief in a more developed style, carrying dates from 1653 onwards and all carrying Thomas’s initials.

The resemblance between Thomas’s medals and Abraham’s medals is however so close that some collaboration between the brothers seems certain, and here, without disagreeing with Allen’s conclusion that this collaboration was confined to the period up to 1647, I am in a position to present a rather clearer picture than Allen was able to of Abraham’s early life and to suggest to you exactly what the extent of the brothers’ collaboration was. No previous scholar seems to have followed up the hint provided by Vertue’s statement that Abraham Simon was ‘trained to scholarship, with intention to recommend himself to some ecclesiastical preferment’, but a little investigation shows that Abraham matriculated at
Oxford University, as an undergraduate of The Queen's College, on 8 May 1635, aged eighteen,\textsuperscript{54} and that after Oxford he did not in fact go into the church but became a law student, being admitted to Grays Inn on 2 October 1640 and then for some reason being readmitted there on 8 November 1642.\textsuperscript{55} Further, we know from an official letter written on 29 June 1646 by Lord Hertford, chancellor of the University of Oxford, recommending Abraham for the degree of master of arts there, that Abraham, having spent ‘three yeares or theaboutes’ at The Queen’s College, then spent ‘neere seven years in the study of the lawes’.\textsuperscript{56} In short, he was a law student, not a professional artist or engraver, in 1645, and Allen’s statement that ‘there is no doubt that at this period Abraham was the better known and more successful of the two artists’ seems plainly wrong.\textsuperscript{57} What seems likely is that Abraham, who certainly possessed a gift for taking rapid likenesses and for caricature, made the original sketches or wax models from which the medals were created, but that their casting was done by Thomas and that Thomas allowed Abraham to put his initials on them because it was Abraham, not Thomas, who was the lesser known of the brothers and whose career needed boosting.\textsuperscript{58}

What is somewhat surprising is Abraham’s choice of subjects, for of the medals known to Allen four are of Scotsmen (the earls of Dunfermline, Lauderdale and Loudoun, and Sir Charles Erskine),\textsuperscript{59} three are of Dutchmen (Baron de Reede, Albert Joachimi, and Peter Manteau van Dalem, the last of whom was a Dutch hydraulics expert who became engineer to the siege train of the New Model Army),\textsuperscript{60} one is of an Irishman (Lord Inchiquin),\textsuperscript{61} another may be of a French Huguenot refugee (M. La Martinay),\textsuperscript{62} and the only two that represent Englishmen portray respectively Sydenham Poyntz, a parliamentary general whose chequered career as a soldier of fortune had included spells both as a mohammedan and as a roman catholic,\textsuperscript{63} and an unknown young man called William Pope.\textsuperscript{64} One new medal has turned up since Allen wrote, but it is not enlightening, for the only inscription on it is the enigmatic word VIRET.\textsuperscript{65} My best guess is that Abraham had

\textsuperscript{53} Vertue, Medals, Coins, Great Seals, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{54} J. Foster, Alumni Oxonienses 1300–1714, IV, 1450 (under Symon).
\textsuperscript{55} J. Foster, The register of admissions to Grays Inn, 1521–1889, (1889), pp. 228, 237.
\textsuperscript{56} Ms M. Macdonald, archivist, Oxford University Archives, has provided me with a transcript of the letter in question.
\textsuperscript{57} Allen, p. 32.
\textsuperscript{58} Although this explanation for the presence of Abraham Simon’s initials on the medals differs from that offered by Allen, Allen himself suggests that the medals were cast by Thomas and our views on the division of responsibility for the medals between the brothers do not diverge.
\textsuperscript{59} It should be noted that Lords Lauderdale and Loudoun, and Sir Charles Erskine, were all Scottish Commissioners at the Treaty of Uxbridge in 1645, and it seems most likely that it was this that gave Abraham Simon the opportunity to take likenesses of them, although Lauderdale’s medal is dated 1646 and Erskine’s 1647.
\textsuperscript{60} Of these three, Jan de Reede, Heer van Renswoude, was ambassador extraordinary of the United Provinces on a mission to negotiate between the king and parliament in 1644–5; Albert Joachimi (1560–1654), Heer van Oostende, had been the resident ambassador of the United Provinces in England in the 1620s and was especially attached to De Reede’s mission; and Peter Manteau van Dalem (1647–88) held his position with the New Model Army in 1645–6. Here again, although Joachimi’s medal is dated 1646 and Manteau van Dalem’s 1647, the likenesses may have been taken earlier.
\textsuperscript{61} Since this address was delivered, Inchiquin’s medal has been discussed by Gerard Brady, The Lord Inchiquin Medal of 1646 (Abraham Simon), NCirc (1989), 41–3.
\textsuperscript{62} The attribution of this medal as one portraying ‘Monsr La Martinay’ – it carries no obverse legend and only the cryptic inscription I E N E V S O V A REGRET on the reverse – goes back to Vertue, who saw a specimen in the collection of his friend the 2nd earl of Oxford, from whom or from Oxford’s librarian Humphrey Wanley the identification presumably derives (Vertue IV, 154). It should be observed that the individual portrayed is wearing armour, and therefore doubtless held a commission in one or other of the rival armies in the English Civil War.
\textsuperscript{64} William Pope is traditionally identified as the younger brother of Thomas, 2nd Earl of Downe (1622–60), a keen Royalist supporter. This may well be the case, but Pope, like ‘Monsr La Martinay’, is shown as wearing armour, and it may be that he was the William Pope recommended for a commission as Lieutenant in the Parliamentary army in Ireland by an order of the committee of Lords and Commons for Irish affairs on 20 June 1647 (CSP Ireland, 1647–60, 756).
\textsuperscript{65} This is now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, ex Sotheby sale 12 June 1974, lot 11. I am grateful to Graham Pollard for providing me with details of this and of other Abraham Simon medals acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum in recent years.
already become a hanger-on at gatherings of diplomats and the like, as he certainly was in later life, and that he had decided that in any case foreigners were more likely than Englishmen to pay for medals of themselves.

Abraham fades out of the picture after 1647 and I am in full agreement with Allen that he played no part in Thomas’s later medallic work. However, Allen was wrong to say that Abraham remained continuously abroad in Sweden and elsewhere from soon after 1647 until after 1660, for Evelyn records that he met ‘a virtuoso fantastical Symons’ in England on 8 June 1653, and the reference is clearly to Abraham and not to Thomas. By coincidence, 1653 is the year when Thomas’s later series of dated profile medals commences, and it could be argued that this was because Abraham had returned to England and was available to do the sketches or models for them. Fortunately, one of Thomas’s two medals dated 1653 is of Bulstrode Whitelocke, the prominent parliamentary lawyer who was sent as ambassador to Sweden in November 1653, by which time Abraham Simon was also in Sweden, and a rather cruel passage about Abraham in Whitelocke’s published memoirs, under 25 March 1654, makes it seem really rather unlikely that Abraham had been responsible for the portrait of Whitelocke on the medal, of which Whitelocke seems to have been reasonably proud.

The remaining medals in the later series include a medal of 1653 portraying Sir James Harington, a member of the Cromwellian council of state, a medal of 1658, now lost, of Edward Montagu, another member of the council, and later Earl of Sandwich, a medal of 1660 of George Monk, the general who restored Charles II (the inscription shows incidentally that it dates from the period March-July 1660), and medals respectively dated 1662 and 1664 with portraits of the earls of Clarendon and Southampton, respectively Lord Chancellor and Lord Treasurer in Charles II’s restored government. All these were prominent figures in public life, as indeed were John Thurloe, secretary to the council of state. Henry Scobell, clerk of parliament from 1648 to 1658, and Elizabeth Claypole, Oliver Cromwell’s favourite daughter, for all of whom undated round portrait medals of the 1650s by Simon exist. The one remaining dated medal is a medal dated 1662 of a lady identified by a reverse inscription as Dorcas Brabazon, beloved wife of Sir George Lane, and this is not unnaturally identified as a medal of Dorcas, Lady Lane, wife of Sir George Lane, Charles II’s personal secretary in exile, who later became Secretary of State for Ireland and first Viscount Lanesborough. As it happens, Dorcas (Brabazon), George Lane’s first wife, had already been dead for several years in 1662, not actually surviving to become Lady Lane, and Lane himself had been married at least since

---

66 The entry in Evelyn’s diary for that date reads: ‘Came my brother George, Capt Evelyn the great traveller, Mr Muschamp, my co. Tho. Keightly, and a virtuoso fantastical Symons who had the talent of embossing so to the life’.

67 B. Whitelocke, A journal of the Swedish embassy in the years 1653 and 1654 . . . a new edition, revised by Henry Reece (London, 1855), II, 63 (entry under date 25 March 1654). Whitelocke’s appreciation of the medal is at p. 86, where a rather obscure sentence records his presentation of a striking of the medal in gold to the Spanish ambassador in Sweden, with the comment that it was ‘very like him’ (i.e. Whitelocke).

68 Harington (1607-80) was chairman of the committee of the Council of State for the Mint in 1651-3, and this seems a sufficient reason for the existence of Simon’s medal of him.

69 In 1657, when this book was first published, all the surviving specimens were from the collection of the Earl of Arundel. It is therefore possible that Simon produced only one reverse of the medal, and that this was engraved as a separate item for this book.

70 Simon’s responsibility for this fine portrait medal of Monk, the only such medal dateable to this stage in his career, may have been of some indirect help in his maintaining a toehold at the Mint on Charles II’s restoration.

71 Simon also seems to have intended to produce a portrait medal of Sir Edward Nicholas, Charles II’s secretary of state (below), but against the original medallist.

72 Reverse inscriptions reading ‘H Scobell C P’ and ‘Hen Scobell’ again owe nothing to Simon.

73 Allen (p. 38) recognised that the portrait of Mrs Claypole on this medal is based on that in a miniature by Samuel Cooper.

74 This identification, based solely on the reverse inscription, has passed unquestioned by any previous writer.
June 1655 to Susan, daughter of Sir Edward Nicholas, Charles II's secretary of state. It is of course possible that the medal does represent Lane's first wife — it has been pointed out that it does not have 'that exquisite delicacy' which marks Simon's later works, and that may be because he was working from an inadequate portrait of a lady long dead — but since Vertue illustrates a round portrait medal of Sir Edward Nicholas which Simon never completed, it may be that the Lane medal also was unfinished at Simon's death, and that, although it had been intended to portray Lane's second wife, Nicholas's daughter, Simon's obverse die was ultimately matched with a reverse die not by Simon wrongly referring to Lane's first wife. I record this because, whatever the truth of the matter, it illustrates the fact that the study of British historical medals of the seventeenth-century is still at the primitive stage when inscriptions and dates tend to be taken at face value and traditional identifications pass unquestioned.

We now come to Simon's struck medals of the 1640s and 1650s. The most important of them, fortunately, are explicitly documented in contemporary records — the Naval Reward medals, the Dunbar medal, and the Lord Protector medal — and the only detail I need add to previous discussions of them, is that there is a contemporary record of the dates, 1 August 1655, and 18 September 1655, when orders were issued that medals should be bestowed on Major Redman and Colonel Sadler, the two known English recipients of the Lord Protector medal, indicating that the dies for this medal were likely to have been produced in the late summer or early autumn of 1655. Otherwise there are two varieties of a medal carrying the portrait of Sir Thomas Fairfax, apparently issued by him in 1645 to deserving soldiers under his command; a small medal in gold commemorating the death of the earl of Essex, parliament's general early in the war, on 14 September 1646; a similar medal commemorating the death of Cromwell on 3 September 1658; and the apparently unfinished Lord General medal known only from strikings from its cracked obverse die.

One further medal carries on its obverse a bare-necked male bust, facing left, surrounded by the legend 'quid tibi retribuam?' which is shorthand for a Latin verse in Psalm 116 which reads in full in English: 'what reward shall I give unto the Lord; for all the benefits that he hath done unto me'. The reverse type has given scholars considerable trouble — Vertue described it as 'a military man, climbing up a rock near the sea, reaching with a torch, to fire an eagles nest', and the editors of Medallic Illustrations describe it, with somewhat greater accuracy but no great verve, as 'a soldier climbing up a rock and setting fire to the roof of a cottage; in the distance a battle' — while my own interpretation, in which I hope you will concur, is that the image of the soldier setting fire to a cottage (if it is a cottage) on a precipitous hill is intended to convey the idea of the destruction of a fortified town surrounded by an army in the plain beneath, whose commander, as Mark Jones has pointed out to me, is visible on horseback in the foreground. The surrounding latin inscription 'IVSTITIA necessitas q ivbet' — 'justice and...
necessity command' - is presumably intended as an explanation for what the soldier is doing. What relevance this type and legend have to the obverse type and legend is somewhat baffling, and I draw your attention to the fact that the style of the obverse and reverse dies is rather different. Since the 1720s the accepted view about the medal has been that the obverse portrays Henry Ireton, Cromwell's son-in-law and deputy in Ireland from the end of May 1650 to his death in November 1651, and the only interpretation of the reverse that has ever been offered is that it is 'evidently an attempt to apologise for the acts of cruelty and bloodshed perpetrated by Ireton, chiefly in Ireland, in 1650'. I have however checked with the National Portrait Gallery and I am told that the portrait on the obverse bears no particular resemblance to known portraits of Ireton, while the interpretation of the reverse as referring to acts of cruelty and bloodshed by Ireton in Ireland is made difficult by the fact that the obverse is dated 1650 and Ireton had not committed any particular acts of this nature when in independent command in Ireland in that campaigning season.

What by comparison makes excellent sense is to disassociate the reverse from this so-called Ireton obverse, and pair it instead with the obverse die of the Oliver Cromwell Lord General Medal, which is of the same dimensions and of not dissimilar style, the medal as a whole therefore not apologising for Ireton's acts of cruelty and bloodshed, but justifying Cromwell's notorious storming of Drogheda and Wexford in the previous year, the reference to 'justice' in the phrase 'justice and necessity command' picking up Cromwell's own remark that the massacre at Drogheda was 'a righteous judgment of God upon these barbarous wretches'. I surmise that what must have happened is that the intended Lord General medal obverse die cracked and its accompanying reverse die then had to be paired with the so-called Ireton obverse die, which may in fact also represent Cromwell but was obviously engraved by Simon on a different occasion.

Time is short and I have not time to discuss the remainder of Simon's medallic output, but I hope I have said enough to show you the range and interest of his medallic work and to encourage further study of it.

89 The identification of the portrait as that of Ireton may first have been made by Humphrey Wanley (Vertue, *Medals, Coins, Great Seals*, p. 35, footnote d).
90 Hawkins.
91 Portraits of Ireton mostly show him with a beard (letter from Sarah Wimbush, research assistant, Archive and Library, National Portrait Gallery, 5 September 1988).
92 The remark is in Cromwell's letter to the speaker of the House of Commons dated 17 September 1649, reporting the storming of Drogheda.
93 The passage in this address referring to Abraham Simon's sojourn in Sweden was written without knowledge of the article by S. Stenström, 'Abraham Simon in Sverige', *NKA* (1942), or of the excellent note on Simon by Dr N. L. Rasmussen, *Svensk Konstnars Lexikon*, V (Malmo, 1967), p. 15, but although these add usefully to our knowledge of Abraham Simon's activities in Sweden, they do not affect the general tenor of the remarks made here.