THOMAS Simon made seven related types (A–G) of screw press gold and silver pieces of Charles II with the dates of 1660, 1661 and 1662. They have a diameter of about 30 mm, and gold examples of the proper thickness can weigh about 140 grains, a weight similar to that of a ‘broad’.

This paper will show that the types dated 1660 are commemorative medals, not pattern broads, and that of 1662 is a 20-shilling gold production currency coin, or broad, not a pattern. The Coronation Medal of 1661 is a part of this group, because it is similar in style and format to the others, and it even shares one of the dies. Without much qualification it can be said that Simon said all of this in his billing account to the government, although the numismatic world has seldom paid attention.

Simon’s account for his work for Charles II may be found in Gough’s second edition of Vertue, and a very thorough document it is, albeit with some lacunae and ambiguities, and without dates. Simon was quite clear to differentiate between seals, coins and medals, and there is no conflicting antiquarian use of the word ‘medals’ for coins.

Medallic Illustrations (MI) correctly lists and illustrates five types (A–E) as medals, excludes the broad (G), and uses the Vertue/Simon reference. Carter wrote about five of the types (B–E, G), and North lists five of the types (B, D–G) as pattern broads. The Montagu

1 The terms mill, screw press, and machine-made are used interchangeably in this paper, and refer to the mechanical processes for making blanks and striking coins and medals. Better terminology would be ‘mill and screw press’.

2 Today we think of the broad as a machine-made 20-shilling gold coin, a familiar example of which is the Cromwell piece of 1656. However, this was a colloquial term for the denomination, and not a formal designation. In the 1660s, and maybe long before that, it was not Simon’s handful of mill pieces, but rather the wide 33-35 mm thin, hammered, 140 grain, 20-shilling unites that were commonly known as broad pieces until they disappeared at the Great Recoinage. And so they were then compared with the 25 mm mill guineas made from 1663 on. This is mentioned in H.G. Stride, ‘The gold coinage of Charles II’, BNF 28 (1958), p. 390. For usage as an adjective around this time cf. The Use and Abuses of Money, London, 2 Feb. 1670/1, p. 11. ‘You will find the like, if you examine our Coin with the French; otherwise ‘twere impossible that an old broad Piece of Gold, coined for twenty Shillings with us, should yield in France seven and twenty Shillings.’ (Wing U143) Surely this refers to the multitude of hammered unites in circulation, and hardly to anything else. Evelyn’s diary for 24 April 1665 mentions ‘...30 pieces in broad gold.’

3 George Vertue, Medals, Coins, Great Seals ... of Thomas Simon, second edition, edited by Richard Gough (1781), pp. 85–95. Assisted by Stanleys Alchorne, this edition of Vertue includes Simon’s account for the period 1660–65. The original is now in the British Library as Additional MS 45190, is from the Stanleys Alchorne sale, Puttick and Simpson, 12 November, 1851 (lot 134), and was given to the British Museum by Helen Farquhar in 1938. What looks to be an earlier version, and maybe Simon’s own, is British Library Additional MS 59792, ex. A.W.F. Fuller, ex Dr F.W. Cock, ex Philipps MS 10620, possibly Alchorne (lot 133). The transcriptions used in this paper are verbatim from MS 59792 as opposed to MS 45190 or the Vertue/Gough modernisation of 45190. Then a third version is British Library Additional MS 18762 from the Alchorne sale (lot 132), which might be a later copy c. 1667–8, when Elizabeth Simon’s petition for payment was in process. See Appendix, Nos. 3a, 4, and 5. It cannot be assumed that the order of Simon’s entries is chronological, for the report may be a summary from notes. However, chronology seems reasonable within a category heading. Most of the work concerns seals. An analogous Simon account covering 1650–57 of the Commonwealth period is PRO Mint 3/16 but, in contrast to the 1665 account, there are no specific entries in it or elsewhere for medal dies (the Lord Protector medal costs are for making the individual specimens). Nor have warrants survived, save for the Cromwell coins and one great seal. None of these various accounts appear to be in the same hand.


and Murdoch sale catalogues illustrate five of the types (B–E, G), in seven specimens, as pattern broads. The Coronation Medal (A) is consistently listed as a medal.

The Coronation Medal

Type A: The Coronation Medal of 1661 is in gold and silver, both of which were normal production metals (MI 472/76). That the medal was available for the Coronation in April 1661 is not in question, so work on the dies had to begin early in that year, and without Blondeau’s presence. Further specimens, especially those in gold, must have been made on demand over the next few years, so long as the dies were still useable. The medals are well made, and boldly struck on blanks that vary in thickness and degree of roundness. Only one pair of dies was used for this fairly substantial issue, and both developed cracks. Later vintage casts of no consequence exist in various metals.

obverse A: CAROLVS.II.D.G.ANG.SCO.FR.ET.H1.REX., bust right crowned and robed, signed T.S.
reverse A: EVERSOS.MISSVS.SVCCVRRERE.SECL0.XXIII.APR.1661., king on throne (pl. 9, 1, silver, 131.3 gr).

This writer once saw a silver medal with a very evident obverse die crack at the bust truncation. An illustration of a gold example showing the beginning of that crack may be seen in the 1935 Vaughan Morgan sale, lot 164. Perhaps the eventual loss of the obverse die was due to a catastrophic fracture at that location. But before that, and while still in its uncracked state, this obverse was at some time paired with the reverse of type B to form type C.

The flat reverse die, called a matrix by Hocking, in excellent condition, is in the Royal Mint Museum (pl. 9, 2). A faint crack is evident from outside the circumference, then through VS.SV, and maybe further down the word, and there are specimens of the medal exhibiting various degrees of this reverse die flaw, which occurred before the obverse flaw.

lettering: extensive bifurcation, fugitive beading.
edge: plain and has a fairly square profile, although the thickness is variable, and the profile may at times look rounded. Die axis: 0° (a silver one at 270° weighs 113 gr, and shows an early state of the reverse flaw, implying less care in the later examples).
weight: silver 113, 131–150 gr; gold 150–202 gr.

The Simon account has the following two entries for this particular medal under.

Meddalls
26 For the Coronation Meddall being Engraven on the one side with his Maj[ies] Effigies in his Royall Robes crown'd with his Maj[ies] Titles in the Circumference, & on the other Side his Maj[ies] Effigies from head to foot.

---

7 Montagu had the most extensive collection of all for this series, and it was exceptionally well catalogued, maybe even from his records, with weights and die descriptions and differentiations; especially for the broad, type G. Many of Murdoch’s pieces were Montagu’s. Montagu sale, Sotheby 13 November 1896; Murdoch sale, Sotheby 8 June 1903.
9 For a discussion of the striking and edge-marking of early mill coins see Peter P. Gaspar, ‘Simon’s Cromwell crown dies in the Royal Mint Museum and Blondeau’s method for production of lettered edges’, BNJ 46 (1976), 55–63, and G.P. Dyer and P.P. Gaspar, ‘The striking of proof and pattern coins in the eighteenth century’, BNJ 50 (1980), 117–27. The manifestations on the coins and medals of the techniques used in their manufacture, such as bifurcation of letter bases, fugitive beading of the rims, and the appearance of the edges, are factored into this paper.
10 A square, sharp edge is considered to be characteristic of the plain edge A, probably C, and G types. The few examples of A and G that have been examined seem to show the shearing or tearing effect that Dr Gaspar has noticed elsewhere. This is somewhat subjective, and does not guarantee that all specimens look the same or exist exactly as they came from the blank stamping procedure. The grained and lettered edge D types also have a square profile, but of course those edges are not in the same unfinished state as the others, and their profile is mainly influenced by the marking machinery.
11 Weight ranges are only a guide; they are not intended to be all-inclusive.
12 Vertue, Medals, Coins, Great Seals . . . , of Thomas Simon, p. 89.
sitting in his Royall Robes, with his Scepter in one hand & his other hand upon the Globe, Crowned by an Angell
with this Motto Everso missvs Sveccvrire Seclo, the 23 Apr' 1661 [£] 110
27 For making and Engraving the Originall Stamp of the Said Medals & coyning to the Value of five hundred pounds worth for the present Occassion, for the Use of his Majestie £ 10:10

These charges clearly include both production and die making, but not bullion costs. Yet the entries are confusing. If the second states the price for the pair of dies and for producing the medals, then the amount is too low when compared with other work. On the other hand, if it is what it claims to be, then to what could the first entry refer? The amount of £110 is too high to be for the dies and the manufacturing. Possibly there were unspecified wax models and drawings somehow involved (work he usually invoiced separately under ‘Draughts and Imbossings’). A guess is that entry 26 was the cost for design work, die making, and production, whereas 27 was some add-on, maybe relating to labour. Additional Manuscript 18762 prices these two entries together at £110. See Appendix, No. 3d, item 26, which says that there was no warrant for this medal, but the work was receipted.

Restoration Medals

All of the productions dated 1660 are established here as being medals, made probably to commemorate the Restoration, but well after the event. A discussion follows the descriptions of medal types B-F.

Type B: The earliest Restoration medal dated 1660 is of normal occurrence in silver, but it is very rare in gold, and there is one example in copper (MI 463/59, North 2776, Carter Type II).

obverse B: CAROLVS. II. D.G.MAG.BR.FR.ET.HI.REX, bust right laureate, draped, and cuirassed, with lion’s head on shoulder, signed S.

reverse B: MAGNA OPERA DOMINI 1660
lettering: only occasional very slight bifurcation.

a. edge plain: silver has a rounded () profile:
(pl. 10, 3, silver, 118.8 gr, Ashmolean), an excellent example;
(pl. 10, 4, silver, 129.7 gr), the usual worn example;
gold has a square [ ] profile:
(pl. 10, 5, gold, 175.3 gr, British Museum).
die axis: 180°
weight: silver 112, 119–136 gr; gold 175 gr.
examples in gold: British Museum; Carter 175 gr.

b. edge lettered type ‘a’:
(mark?) VERGINIAM CAVEAS [T(V)T?]AMNE.(S?)OLVITO ZONAM THO[.]S[1?]MO[N].
Parsons, following Carter, read this as VERGINEAM CAVEAS ISTAM NE SOLVITO ZONAM THO SIMON. Copper specimen only, Ashmolean Museum, ex Owen Parsons, ex Carter,
(pl. 10, 6, copper, 139.5 gr, Ashmolean), bifurcated letters, and this could be unique, in having a lettered edge, which is in poor condition, in the legend itself, and in the metal. This example was probably made later, at the time of the D series to practise with edges, or just to satisfy some demand.

The Simon account13 has the following entry for this particular medal under

13 Vertue, Medals. Coins, Great Seals . . . of Thomas Simon, p. 89.
Medallion
29 For the Original Stamps of Another Medallion, Graven in Steel Dyes, with his Majesties Effigies in an Imperial Dress, and his Majesties titles on the one Side & on the other Side, the four Coats of England, Scotland France & Ireland, Singly Quartered, with this Motto (Magna Opera Domini)

The charge is for making the two dies, and does not mention production. The price of £16 given in Vertue is incorrect. See Appendix, No. 3d, item 28, which says that this was covered under a general warrant for medals, and was receipted.

Hocking wrote that a bust punchion in the Royal Mint Museum is the one used for this medal (pi. 10, 7). However, it is not, nor is it clear just what this punch was used for. It has the characteristics of a Simon work, and it may have corroded and been cleaned over the years, for it is neither sharp nor fresh.

Type C: This is another Restoration medal dated 1660, or just a die concoction of Types A and B, in silver, with three specimens known (MI 463/60, Carter Type III).

- obverse A: this used the Coronation medal's obverse die in an uncracked state.
- reverse B: this used the MAGNA reverse die.
- lettering: bifurcated obverse and reverse.
- edge: plain and has a square [ ] profile.
- die axis: 180°
- weight: silver 126, 132 gr.

Examples: 1) (pi. 10, 8, silver, 131.5 gr, British Museum); 2) Spink 31 (299); 3) Montagu (828) = Murdoch (631) = Thorburn (293) = Vaughan Morgan 1935 (390), 126 gr.

Type D: This Restoration medal dated 1660 occurs normally in silver and rarely in gold, and it can have three different edges (MI 464/62, North 2777, Carter Type I).

- obverse D: CAROLVS * II. REX., bust right laureate, draped, and cuirassed with lion's head on breast, signed S.
- reverse D: MAGNALIA.DEI 1660.
- lettering: extensive bifurcation regardless of the type of edge, fugitive beading.

a. **edge plain**: there should be examples of this medal, which never underwent the subsequent edge marking. The silver example in the Montagu sale (826) at 143 gr was not illustrated, but it is likely to have had a legitimate plain edge. The thick silver one in the British Museum, with a die axis of 180° is reported as having a rounded ( ) edge (pi. 11, 9, silver, 171.7 gr, British Museum). However, its small diameter makes it appear that the original edge has been removed, and it should not be considered a plain edge, although it conceivably could have been struck on a blank smaller than the dies. In gold, Montagu (819) = Murdoch (620) = Mackerell (31) = Bruning (18) at 132 gr looks to be a full specimen and therefore a natural plain edge medal. But the 120 gr example that often recurs at auction has had its original and unknown type of edge ground off, and it is not a proper plain edge medal (Sotheby 26 May 1994 (167)).

  - die axis: 180°
  - weight: silver 143; gold 132 gr.

b. **edge grained** vertically, commonly referred to as a milled edge: both gold and silver have a square [ ] profile (pi. 11, 10, silver, 143.1 gr). This is the most common edge. On the particular example illustrated the rim beadings do not extend fully to the edge of the medal,

---

and it does not exhibit the characteristic overlap of several ‘grainings’ (pi. 11, 10A), which often results from Blondeau’s type of edge marker. Other specimens of the D medal do have the overlap, similar to that on a Cromwell shilling (pi. 11, 10B).

die axis: 180°
weight: silver 131–143, 159 gr; gold 130–140 gr.
examples in gold: (pi. 11, 11, gold, 130.2 gr, British Museum); Montagu (818) 137 gr; Murdoch (621) 140 gr.; in silver: Murdoch (629).

c. edge lettered type ‘b1’: (pi. 11, 12, silver, 185.9 gr, Manville) *REVERVS.SINE.CLADE.VICTOR [branch] SIMON.FECIT, with slight overlaps at * and DE. on the example illustrated.
die axis: 180°
examples in silver: British Museum E3462, 197.7 gr.

These lettered edge medals have a thick flan to provide a surface for the edge lettering. A cracked die would also necessitate a thick flan, and Montagu (825) at 193 gr mentions a cracked obverse die, but this has not been seen. There does not seem to be a lettered edge type D recorded in gold.

The Simon account has the following entry for this particular medal under

Medallis
30 For the Stamps of another Meddall wth his Majesties Cyphers, and the Badges of the four Kingdoms between them [£] 16.

The description fits the reverse, unfortunately without the legend being noted. No specific mention is made of the obverse, nor is production included. See Appendix, No. 3d, item 29, which groups this into the same general warrant and receipt for medals as the Type B Magna medal.

Type E: A further Restoration medal dated 1660, having one completely new die, is in silver; with only two specimens known (MI 464/61, North 2778, Carter Type IV).

obverse E: PROBASTI. ME. DNE. SICVT. ARGENTVM, crowned shield. This could have been intended as a reverse die.
reverse B: this used the MAGNA reverse die.
lettering: bifurcated obverse and reverse.

edge lettered type ‘b2’:
*REVERVS.SINE.CLADE.VICTOR [branch] SIMON.F (Montagu)

edge lettered type ‘b3’:
*REVERVS.SINE.CLADE.VICTOR [branch] SIMON (BM)
(these edges have not been compared to see if they really are different)
die axis: 180°
weight: silver 165, 174 gr.
examples: 1) edge ‘b3’ – (pi. 11, 13, silver, 165.4 gr, British Museum); 2) edge ‘b2’ – Montagu (829) = Murdoch (630), 174 gr. Again the thick flan provided a surface for the edge lettering.

Type F: A possible Restoration medal die combination dated 1660 is reported in silver, and is listed only by North (North 2779). The existence of an actual specimen of this logical combination has not been verified; still it is carried throughout this paper as the sixth type. It is of no significance without knowing its characteristics.

15 Vertue, Medals, Coins, Great Seals . . . of Thomas Simon.
p. 90.
reverse B: this used the MAGNA reverse die.
reverse D: this used the MAGNALIA reverse die.

The term Restoration, as used by MI and Vertue, is a fitting one if these medals were intended to commemorate the return of Charles in May of 1660, and were ordered by him for casual rewards or gifts. According to MI some of the legends can be related to the Restoration. No warrants pertaining to these medals have been uncovered, and those documents that remained in the Simon family line until recent times did not include them (nor anything else in this present paper for that matter). Aside from Simon's account there is no known contemporary written material to explain how or why these medals were used.

Simon's Restoration medals have been uncritically assigned pattern coinage status for many years. They are not coins, nor do they look much like coins, and their relief is much too high to have been coins. There were no warrants or orders in 1660 for a mill coinage, and the 1660 date negates any thought that they could relate to the 1662 broad coinage. A discrepancy is their unexplained 180° die axis, an orientation which is contrary to the 0° used for medals.

It is hard to believe that these medal dies would have been made between mid-1660 and mid-1662, when there was such a great panic to produce coins and important seals. Even though it may be too early, a somewhat arbitrary date of late 1661 is considered for type B in this paper.

It is clear that types B–F were official medals, having been mentioned in at least one of their dies in Simon’s account. What may seem like random die mixtures or mules (C, E, F) could have been pièces de plaisir, or private orders. Types B and D are common enough in silver, are the only substantial issues, and may even have been sold commercially. More likely they were used for general distributions at various official functions. However, they are quite different from each other, with differences in fabric and appearance that are not easy to describe. Type D is heavier, a bit wider, and thicker. The letter fonts are not of the same style; the B letters are frosted while those of D are plain. Both types are always expertly made, but there is a ‘softness’ to B with a lack of finish in the fields, which contrasts with the ‘boldness’ and fine finish of D (and A, C, E too). It is unusual to see a bold example of B, with the frosting of the letters and bifurcation fully distinct (but see the 1907 O’Hagan sale (555) = Sotheby 9 October 1992 (977) for an unusually strong silver example). Wear contributes to those characteristics, and for some reason most of the B medals do show wear or rubbing. The edges of B are rounded; those of D and A are fairly square and sharp, as they came from the blank stamping press, assuming that they were not hand-filed, which seems unlikely. The B blanks could have been prepared differently or their edges hand-smoothed before or after striking. Because of these and other perceived differences the medals are almost surely separated in time, and perhaps even in some methods of manufacture, while it should be recognised that not all of one type were necessarily made in a batch. Some Bs could well have been made later during the D period. There may be a chronological significance to the fact that B always has a plain edge, whereas D usually has a grained or lettered edge, a significance that could relate to Blondeau’s assistance or lack thereof. Even though type B has a very fine, elaborate, and high-relief bust, and is consistently on a round flan, type D has the look of a more finished product, with a better prepared blank and finer edges, a higher quality of striking and a nicer general appearance, and with more examples in gold. Types C and E are of the style and quality of D. Without question each of the dies for the Restoration medals is a singleton.

To carry the separation in time of medals B and D further, and yet to associate medal B closely to Coronation medal A in order to form the type C mule, type B is assigned a date

---

c. late 1661 to mid-1662, if for no better reason than to place it prior to Blondeau’s return. The sole lettered edge (copper) B specimen would have been made later, maybe for practice while the edged Ds were in process, and it does not need to affect the sequence. Why it should also have a unique edge legend is unexplained. Type D is most likely to have been made any time after mid-1662, well after Blondeau’s return and with his assistance, and the date could even have been several years later, for it has similarities to Simon’s 1665 naval medal. When considering the sequence A–B–D, it must be admitted that A and D have an affinity to each other that B does not share. It is hoped that the reasoning for this sequence is not unduly influenced by the order in Simon’s account or by Blondeau’s whereabouts. Types C, E and F could fall in alphabetical order as listed. A preferable scenario is to move all of the Restoration medals to c. 1663–65, but that might be too late to account for uncracked type C.

The Broad

Type G: This is a currency production gold coin of 20 shillings made in March and April 1662 from several dies, and it may be unique in silver and copper (North 2780, Carter Type V).

The portrait is an excellent one, and looks like the familiar contemporary illustrations of Charles, including those of Simon’s medallic works, his sketches for the hammered coins, and the works of John Roettiers. In contrast, the elegant, regal, and well-finished tanked gold coin portraits are rather stylised and do not look much like Charles; many of the silver coin portraits do, but with a bust dominated by a multitude of hair (wig), lace and crown. The bust punchon is of a similar size and format to that used for the hammered gold, but it is doubtful that the same tool was involved.

obverse: CAR. II. D. G. M. BR. FR. ET. HI. REX., bust left laureate, draped, and cuirassed, signed with an S, or it may even be unsigned.
reverse: FLORENT. CONCORDIA. REGNA. 1662
lettering: varying degrees of light bifurcation.
die axis: 180°
weight: gold 137–142 gr; silver 146 gr; copper 89.3 gr.

Four obverse and four reverse dies have been recorded from a search of sale catalogues and museum holdings, resulting in five distinct die pairings, two of which are known from single coins only. These five pairs may represent all that were used. All dies were formed from the same puncheons, with hair, wreath, ties, and minor crown and arms details added or modified in the dies. At least three of the eight dies exhibit cracks. Pair G.1/2 is assumed to be the first in chronological order, because the dies are finer and more elaborate with frosted lettering. For expediency the letters on the other dies were not frosted. The sole surviving die is Obverse G.3/3, and it may have been saved because it was the final one in use. By far the commonest of all the coins came from the G.3/3 pair. A very gross count of coins noted by die, with no attempt to account for repeats, shows 42 specimens for G.3/3, 12 for G.2/3, 12 for G.1/2, one for G.1/1, and one for G.4/4. Of course these figures cannot provide legitimate ratios, but they have to be indicative, and one could scale up by any arbitrary factor.

G.1/1 (obverse 1/reverse 1): Copper only. There is NO signature apparent, and even though the coin is extremely worn the area under the bust is fairly well protected.
Copper: this, the only specimen recorded, is in the Ashmolean Museum, (pl. 12, 14, copper, 89.3 gr, Ashmolean). The wear could have occurred from accidental circulation as a halfpenny. It seems to be struck, but even if not it confirms the existence of a specific reverse die, at the moment known only from this example, and likely to remain unique. All in all, it is a strange piece, perhaps a trial struck from unhardened dies, after which the reverse was rejected and discarded, but probably not re-worked to form one of the other reverses.
G.1/2 (obverse 1/reverse 2): wreath has 10 leaves, with berries, letters in both legends are frosted.

silver: NO signature (pl. 12, 15, silver, 146.1 gr, Manville), no die cracks, lettering very bifurcated. This would be an early trial piece, before the signature was added, yet the strong, bold strike implies that it was made after the dies were hardened. This probably is Montagu (830) = Murdoch (633).

Gold: has a vertical signature S at 0° (pl. 12, 16, gold, 137.0 gr). On later coins both obverse and reverse dies show cracks on top. A normal production coin.

Example: Montagu (822)

G.2/3 (obverse 2/reverse 3): wreath has 9 leaves, with berries.

Gold: horizontal signature S at 90° (pl. 12, 17, gold, 141.1 gr). A normal production coin. The possibility of a coin without the signature has been noted.17

Example: Montagu (820)

G.3/3 (obverse 3/reverse 3): wreath has 10 leaves, without berries.

Gold: signature S at 30° (pl. 12, 18, gold, Royal Mint). A normal production coin. On the later coins the obverse shows a crack across the tops of H.I.R, which developed and extended with use. The flat obverse die itself, called a matrix by Hocking, is in the Royal Mint Museum (pi. 12, 19),18 and Dr Gaspar noticed that the S is ground away on the die.19

Examples: Montagu (456), also (821) = O’Hagan (203) = Watters (491).

G.4/4 (obverse 4/reverse 4): wreath has 10 leaves, without berries. The most distinctive feature of the obverse is the first leaf, which extends almost to the beading. From the photograph, NO signature S is evident on this die. The reverse die is extremely close to reverse G.-/3, but it is not the same. The British Museum specimen (pl. 12, 20, gold, 140.4 gr, British Museum) is the only one recorded at present. It is very surprising to find two dies, not otherwise known, on the one coin.

The Simon account20 has the following entry for this coin under

Stamps for Coynes for England
[23] For making Stamps for a twenty Shilling Piece by way of the Mill working mySelf & my Servants Nine or ten weeks time
£ 45.

This entry follows the one for the dies for the hammered coinage. The only other billing for English coins is the final item of the account, and that is for the mill 1d, 3d, 4d (the 2d is not mentioned, Vertue/Gough being in error). There is a separate entry for Scottish coins. The price seems low for multiple dies. See Appendix, No. 3d, item 23, which says that these dies were covered under a general warrant for mill coins, and was receipted.

Type G has to be the only coin or broad, and it is not a pattern. Full documentation is available, and will be described further on, to show that a gold mill coinage was ordered, that Simon made dies for the purpose, that bullion was supplied, and that a few thousand coins were produced, halted only because of mechanical failures, which could have meant the fracturing of the dies. The design and legends match those of the currency hammered coinage.

---

17 When the Murdoch collection was sold, many to Spink, Samuel Spink noted the broad die varieties, and discussed them in 'An unpublished variety of Simon’s broad of 1662', NCirc March 1905, p. 8185. He said this variety was 'almost exactly as no. 1 [die G2/3] but it omits the artist's initial S beneath the King's bust'. Maybe it is that die, and maybe not, but it is not one of the dies predicted to lack the signature. He also noted the differences between dies of the cherub's wings on the breastplate.
19 Private communication.
20 Vertue, Medals, Coins, Great Seals . . . of Thomas Simon, p. 89.
There are two inconsistencies—a plain edge instead of an expected grained edge, and a signed obverse when coin dies were never signed.

The S signature is very tiny and unobtrusive, and it looks like an uncertainty or afterthought, as evidenced by the uncracked, unsigned silver and copper coins which, in the absence of other data, might be the earliest examples in the series. There may be gold coins, in addition to die 4, which completely lack the signature (as opposed to a faintly struck S), probably from die 3 after the S was erased, and less likely from die 1, before the S was added (but see footnote 17 that could apply to die 2). Normally the signature would point to a pattern or a medal. However, in this case the reality of a signed currency has to be faced. The removal of it from die 3 may have been done at official request during production, but too late to have had much effect.

It is unknown if the multiple dies were prepared in advance or only as the need arose, but the former is the method expected for a production coinage, with additional dies added while production progressed. The fact that unsigned Obverse 1 in silver and copper was coupled with two different reverse dies and then, signed in gold, with one of those reverse dies, shows that at least these three dies were made at the same time. Hypothetically, if only a single press was in use (an unknown), then one pair of dies could have remained in the press until a replacement became necessary, which was either at hand or forced the production run to stop until a new die was made. This looks to be the only instance where Simon made multiple dies for the screw press (excepting the little 1647 Essex medal with its die breakage, the 1653 naval rewards for different reasons, and ignoring the unstudied machine-made 1d-4d).

The edge is plain, and a collar was not used, nor could one have been used with these flat dies. While the craftsmanship of the dies reflects the highest standards of Simon’s work, the end products often are not of a like quality. What is seen on the many ill-formed coins are the results of the rolled plate, the blanks press-stamped from the plate, the marginal striking quality, the unfinished sharp plain edge, and undoubtedly the rush. Bifurcation of the letter bases is usually slight, but it is there.

No English coins or medals come to mind that have edge markings between the time that Blondeau left England c. late 1658 and his return from France early in 1662. Through 1658, anything that Simon made with a marked edge was done in conjunction with Blondeau, and the implication is that a marked edge required Blondeau’s presence, and certainly his machinery. This is consistent with Blondeau’s secrecy. He must have taken his edge-marking equipment with him to France, and maybe that hardware had not yet returned by April 1662. Surely Simon had to know all about its use, for it was he who would have made the dies (bars) for the edge markings. None of this addresses the possibility that there might have been some edge-marking hardware of Ramage’s still about (highly unlikely that Simon could have used it), or the fact that we do not know what equipment had been at Drury House in the Strand, where Simon and Blondeau produced the Cromwell coins, or what was actually used for the 1662 coinage.

Peter Blondeau had been in London for three or four months by this time of April 1662. Had he assisted Simon and/or the production workers with the machinery, which may or may

---

21 A further reason to believe that the Cromwell dies were initially used for trial purposes. The term pattern implies a preliminary or unused design, but those designs were official and approved and a coinage was ordered. However, had they gone into full production then multiple dies should have been prepared beforehand. For a proposed coinage of £10,000/week it had to be known that a single set of dies was impossible. Maybe the reason so many 1658 coins were released instead of being melted was because they were sold or given as gifts when Cromwell died, in the medallic sense, as keepsakes or for propaganda purposes. And perhaps production was even continued for that purpose. The earlier 1656 coins were more likely to have been distributed at the time as trial balloons, and some of the gold may have been stored for anticipated issue in 1658. Any explanatory Mint documentation was unfortunately lost to the rats.
not have been the same units recently returned to the Mint from Drury House, then better blanks, edge graining, and higher quality strikings would have been expected. Blondeau had just become the principal player in the technical workings of the Mint as it was becoming mechanised in the move towards mass production. In that same month of April he proposed the future mechanical equipment and conditions for such an undertaking (not to be confused with the already existing equipment used for the coins now under discussion). In a sense, Simon and Roettiers were nothing more than the die-makers. So Blondeau should have been involved with the actual press work for the 1662 coins, but the physical evidence does not support that.

The weight is proper. The gold coin, mill and hammered, remained at 140 3/4 grains, regardless of its tally, even though the bullion value was greater than twenty shillings. Not until the guinea coinage of December 1663 did both the weight and value change.

Defining these coins as currency is not a new concept. Stride may have been the first to write about the broad being actual currency and not a pattern, and Schneider was quite explicit to support that twenty years later. For some reason the subject was ignored in the traditional writings of Folkes, Ruding, Kenyon, and Brooke. The coining records, the quantity produced, and the reversion to a hammered coinage because of problems, leave no room to deny this claim. On the other hand it is not proved that the broads were actually released for public circulation, although the average coin exhibits some wear from whatever cause. Since they were apparently not mentioned in pyx trials we are faced with something like the Cromwell dilemma, but perhaps such a small coinage did not need to be delineated in the pyx records as a separate entity.

The history of this coin begins with an authorization of 31 January 1661/2 ‘to prepare punches, matrices, dies, etc for coining by press and screw’, and of 3 February ‘to make stamps for the new coin’. From 24–27 February 167 lb of gold was delivered to the Mint, and a 28 February warrant was issued to the Mint officers ‘to coin gold ... by the press and screw into pieces of twenty shillings each; making them less than before, so as better to receive the stamp, but with the same figure, inscription, and arms, with slight differences; and permitting for better dispatch, the plates of gold to be passed for the press at St. Katherine’s water-mill near the Tower ...’, It would have taken considerable time to process this into coin blanks. By 8 or 9 April no more than 82 lb had been coined (this converts to about 3360 coins), for at that date a warrant was issued to the Mint ‘to coin by the hammer into 20s. and 10s. pieces such defective gold as Stephen Fox shall deliver into the Mint – the dyes made by Thos. Simon for coining with press and screw being found insufficient for the service.’ Badly struck coins, scissel, and the remainder of the bullion would have been included, and that may have finished rapidly by 19 April 1662, even with new blanks, but using existing...
hammered dies. Die cracks are evident, yet the coins that survive today are not exceptionally flawed; most likely if terrible dies did strike terrible coins, such coins were melted at the time.

Modern thinking accepts that Simon had trouble with his dies vis à vis the power of the screw press, whereas John Roettiers did not, or at least had fewer problems. Many of the screw press coin and medal dies throughout the Commonwealth period show die fracture, and this continued for the rest of Simon's life. Whether it was his fault or the smith's, it was a recurring problem, and Simon's attempt at a mass production coinage by the screw press ended in failure. Challis makes the interesting observation that the Roettiers provided their own steel, and hired their own smith.\(^{31}\) Except for the mill series of 1d–4d money, invoiced April 1665, and the Petition/Reddite crowns, the Spring of 1662 was the end of Simon's coinage monopoly, as the Roettiers brothers took over. His remaining years would have been spent on seals and medals, and undoubtedly in other capacities, such as on tools for the Scottish coinage, for he was still fully employed and paid by the Mint until his death in July 1665.

**Dies and production in summary**

The production coins, G, are a mixed lot. Many of them are of high quality work, but the general run of them are not, with many being carelessly made, both in striking and blank preparation (thickness, roundness, and the occasional filing of the blank's surface for weight adjustment), and this is not particularly surprising. They are of the marginal quality that would be expected from a new type of hurried production run, especially if they were made without Blondeau's help. In contrast, the medals, A–E, are carefully made.

The two dies that remain today (reverse of A and obverse of G3) are called matrices by Hocking. In his terminology that means a flat die without a shoulder or neck, but these are not matrices at all. Flat dies could not use a collar, and the resultant lettering must be bifurcated (fish-tailed letter bases) to some degree, whether extensively or barely noticeable. Any edge marking would have been applied by use of Blondeau's parallel bar, Castaing type of machinery, before striking (a characteristic of his). Therefore, all the examples of A–G, whether unmarked (plain), lettered, or grained edge should show letter bifurcation, and there should also be fugitive beading around the periphery as the metal flowed outward. Even where bifurcation is not especially evident, the letter bases are not very square. Hot blanks that required less striking force might have been used at times, resulting in less bifurcation. The Mint's and Blondeau's methods for punching and rounding the blanks (if separate operations) is not known for certain for that period.\(^{32}\)

It is concluded that all of the dies used for the coins and medals in this paper were of the same general, flat type, the production processes were similar, except for how the edges were finished, and the end products had similar characteristics. Thus the Coronation Medal (1661), the type B Restoration medals (dated 1660), and the coins (1662) with their plain edges did not use Blondeau's edging machinery, whereas the grained and lettered edge Restoration D–E medals, and the sole copper type B (dated 1660), did.

When all is said and done, and when the documents described in footnote 3 and the Appendix are considered, one has to wonder if Simon's responsibility ended when he supplied his dies. Such of course had to be so for seals and possibly for coins. But this could also be true for these medals, in contrast to his involvement during the Commonwealth. Except for the Coronation Medal, the accounts specify charges only for making dies or stamps, and then

---


submitting or surrendering the dies to Mint officials, not for using them. This paper does not propose that Simon was not involved with the manufacture of the finished products, for the writer believes that he certainly was. However, it needs to be stressed that there are no obvious charges by him for striking or supervising medals B–F. With coin G it is less clear what he and his workers did for nine or ten weeks.

The tools illustrated in the plates are all that are known today, and there is no record, evidence, or rust traces to imply late post-Simon restrikes of the medals. However, since the dies were official, and Simon turned them in, then they were available for use on request, until broken, throughout Charles's reign, and maybe even later.

No attempt has been made to estimate production quantities, except for type G, or survival figures. It is not intended that the designations A–G be used outside this paper. *Medallia Illustrations* remains the proper reference for medals A–E, and '1662 currency broad of 20-shillings’ should now suffice to define type G, broad being a convenient and familiar term to differentiate it from guinea, even though it is inaccurate.

### Die and Coining Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>letters</th>
<th>dies</th>
<th>edge</th>
<th>edging machinery</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Coronation)</td>
<td>bifur.</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>plain</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>April 1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Magna)</td>
<td>bifur.</td>
<td>(flat)</td>
<td>plain</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>&gt;mid-1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lettered</td>
<td>Blondeau's Castaing</td>
<td>&gt;mid-1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Coro/Magna)</td>
<td>bifur.</td>
<td>(flat)</td>
<td>plain</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>&gt;mid-1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Magnalia)</td>
<td>bifur.</td>
<td>(flat)</td>
<td>plain</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>&gt;mid-1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (Probasti)</td>
<td>bifur.</td>
<td>(flat)</td>
<td>lettered</td>
<td>Blondeau's Castaing</td>
<td>&gt;mid-1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F? (Magna/Magnalia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lettered</td>
<td>Blondeau's Castaing</td>
<td>&gt;mid-1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (20/-broad)</td>
<td>bifur.</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>plain</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>March 1662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where flat means not shouldered, (flat) means assumed, all letter bases should have a tendency to be bifurcated, and beading should be fugitive.

### THE PLATES

1. Medal Type A. Coronation, silver, 131.3 gr., author.
2. (1x and reversed 2x) Reverse steel die to Medal Type A, Royal Mint Museum, Hocking, p. 192/4.
3. Medal Type B. Magna, silver, plain edge, 118.8 gr., Ashmolean Museum. An especially sharp, unworn example.
4. Medal Type B. Magna, silver, plain edge, 129.7 gr., author. A typical worn example.
5. Medal Type B. Magna, gold, plain edge, 175.3 gr., British Museum M7463.
6. Medal Type B. Magna, copper, lettered edge 'a', VERGINIAM ..., 139.5 gr., Ashmolean Museum, from Owen Parsons, ex E.C. Carter.
7. (1x and 2x) Steel bust punch, similar to, but not the one used for Type B, Royal Mint Museum, Hocking p. 101/100.
8. Medal Type C. Coronation/Magna, silver, plain edge. 131.5 gr., British Museum, E3458.
9. Medal Type D. Magnalia, silver, plain edge, 171.7 gr., British Museum E3460.
10. Medal Type D. Magnalia, silver, grained edge, 143.1 gr., author.
10A. The edge of No. 10, showing regular graining and no overlap.
10B. The edge of a 1658 Cromwell shilling, showing regular graining with overlapped grains.
11. Medal Type D. Magnalia, gold, grained edge, 130.2 gr., British Museum E3459.
12. Medal Type D. Magnalia, silver, lettered edge 'b1', REVERSVS..., 185.9 gr., H.E. Manville collection.
13. Medal Type E. Probasti, silver, lettered edge 'b3', REVERSVS..., 165.4 gr., British Museum E3463.
14. Broad of 20 shillings, Type G, Dies G.1/1, copper, 89.3 gr., Ashmolean Museum, A prototype.
15. Broad of 20 shillings, Type G, Dies G.1/2, silver, 146.1 gr., H.E. Manville collection, A die trial.
16. Broad of 20 shillings, Type G, Dies G.1/2, gold, 137.0 gr., author, Currency.
17. Broad of 20 shillings, Type G, Dies G.2/3, gold, 141.1 gr., author, Currency.
I wish to place on record the Simon papers in the British Library's Department of Manuscripts, for two reasons. First, three of the documents are copies of Simon’s Accomp’t-book, one of which was published in Vertue, and another is directly related to one of those copies. Second, this is an attempt to transcribe the short, and at least to note the long, Simon-related papers, with a hope to consolidate and publish them all in the future. All but one of these documents are listed in volume 9 of the 1985 Index of Manuscripts in the British Library. Some have been referred to from time to time, but only MS 45190 seems to have been published in its entirety (Vertue). Helen Farquhar owned or had access to various documents, some of which she presented to the British Museum, and some she published. Henry Howorth spoke on the gathering of numismatic records in his presidential address to the Royal Numismatic Society 19 June, 1913, printed in NC 4th Series 13 (1913), and said that the subject had been favourably discussed with the Council of the British Numismatic Society at the time. The talks seemed promising, but nothing further was ever done.

No. 1. Sloane MS 856, f. 4b, the 16th entry:

‘Warrant for graving of severall Seales
It is his Ma’ts will & pleasure that you forthwith make the severall Seales hereafter named vidt his Ma’ts Seale for the Dutchy of Lancaster & the privy Seale for England a great Seale for Ireland & the Seales for the Court of Justice there vidt kings bench Comon Plea & Excheqr in the usuall formes & figures of the severall Seales respectively & agreeable to those belonging to the said Courts in the time of the Late king of blessed memory adding onely in the Inscription immediately after the word Carolus the word secundus and for soe doing this shall be your Warr* Given at Our Court at Whitehall the 13th of June 1660
To Thomas Symon his Ma’ts Engraver’

No. 2. Sloane MS 856, f. 9, the 33rd entry:

‘Thomas Symon to make severall Seales
Our will & pleasure is that you doe forthwith prepare all the Originall or Master Punchins & charges necessary for the coynage of our gold & silver monies by way of the presse or screw as alsose some stamps or dies of each sort of Our Coynes according to these draughts. The first thereof (with the Armes of Our kingdoms of England Scotland France & Ireland in single leustions crowned with their points turning inwards & a star in ye middle) to be for Our gold coynes. The other (with foure double [Letters] or Cyphers of Our name crowned likewise & with the severall badges of Our kindgomes) to bee for O of Silver monies and concerning O r portraiture on the other side of O Coynes together with the severall Mottos & Inscriptions for the flat sides and Edges thereof, as likewise concerning the severall sizes of O monies. Our further will & pleasure is, & wee doe strictly b[eg] you to pursue such directions & Instructions for the better carrying on & perfecting of Our service therein as you shall from time to time receive from Our trusty servant Henry Slingsby Esqr & this shall bee your Warnt Given at Our CIT at Whitehall etc
To Thomas Symon one of O Cheife Engravers’

This is probably a copy of the general warrant for mill coins (see item 23 in No. 3d, below), except that one can see descriptions of what became Roettiers gold and silver coins of 1663 and later, and even of the Simon Petition/Reddite crown. The manuscript copy unfortunately lacks a date but, based on what is written before and after it, the date may fall between 6 July and 12 December 1661. This is not in CSPD.

Sloane 856 is considered to be a 17th century volume consisting entirely of copies of writs of Privy Seal, Parliament warrants and other State papers, chiefly in the time of Charles II. This volume was the property of one Henry Gregory. The original warrants for these two entries are not known to exist.

No. 3. Additional MS 18,762 deals with Elizabeth Simon’s request for payment owed. It is described in Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the years 1848–1853, 1868, p. 147. “The Accomp’t of Thomas Simon, one of his Majesties Cheife Gravers for the Mint, Seales and Meddalls; 1660–1667;” From the Stanesby Alchorne sale. Puttick & Simpson, 12 November, 1851 (lot 132). The British Library accession assigns all five parts of this Alchorne lot to MS 18762.
3a. A copy of Thomas Simon's account (c. 1667?)
3b. 8 November 1667 letter from Ashley to Slingesby to consider the rates in Simon's account.
3c. 13 December 1667 letter from Slingesby to Ashley in reply.
3d. 18 July 1668 detailed report from Ashley to Charles II.
3e. Undated, unsigned answers of Elizabeth Simon to Ashley.

No. 3a. Additional MS 18,762 (part 1). Folio.
Wrapper: 'The Accompt of Tho: Symons One of his Ma: Cheife Gravers'. Then 14 pages, ending with a summary of the charges £3070, the amount received £1000, and the remaining due £2070.
This is probably the latest of the three account copies, more than likely made up in 1667 just for this case, and it is very similar to Nos. 4 and 5 below.

No. 3b. Add MS 18,762 (part 2). Folio. One page: 'I desire Mr. Slingsby Master & Worker of his Ma: Mint to consider of the Rates set upon the Services mentioned in this book and in a Paper herewith sent amounting to the Summe of one hundred & ten pounds, and to certificate his opinion thereof Novemb'r 8th 1667 Ashley'
The 'Paper and £110' refer to the lost account sheet in Nos. 3c and 3d, below.

No. 3c. Add MS 18,762 (part 3). Docketed: 13 Decem 1667 Copy of Mr Slingesbys Reporte to the Lorde Ashley, concerning M's Symons Accompt, upon an Order of Reference of the 8 November 1667.

Then one page: 'My Lord I have according to yo'r LoPP's commands perused Mr Simons book of Acco'ts and the paper of one hundred and ten pounds sent with it, and upon consideration of the severall rates for the services therein mentioned doe finde that if he were to have been paid ready money for them, there might then very reasonably have been some Abatements made upon most of the Particulars in the Accompt. But in regard that the Services aforesaid for his Ma'tie did in a manner for severall years together see wholly take up the time both of Mr Simons and his Servants that he could not gaine leisure to work for private persons whereby to get money to maintain his family; And in respect he was out of purse soe much ready money for the Silver & Gold for the severall Seales & Medalls in the Accompt mentioned, at the Mint rate onely. I doe therefore humbly conceive & certify that the rates demanded for the particular Services in Mr Simons booke of Accompt & the aforesaid Paper, cannot now be judged unreasonable to be allowed unto his Widow & Children, after so many yeares attendance for payment before & since his death, nevertheless I most humbly submit the same unto yo'LoPP's better Judgement. 13 December 1667 H Slingesby'
The 'Paper and £110' again refer to the lost account sheet in Nos. 3b, above, and 3d, below.

No. 3d. Add MS 18,762 (part 4). Folio. Docketed: 'A copy of the Lord Ashleys Report in the Case of M's Eliz: Symon, widdow 18 July 1668'. Seven pages:

In Pursuance of yo'r: Mats Reference upon the Annexed petic'on of Elizabeth Symon, I have exam'ed the Vouchers exhibited by the pr'te relating to the particulars menc'oned in her Accompt hereunto also annexed. And have desired of Mr Slingesby master worker, of yor Ma'tie, Mint, his opinion of the prices demanded, And doe humbly represent to yo'r: Maty first the state of ye said Vouchers vizt:

This is a very interesting document copy, and eventually all pages need to be transcribed and published. Each item has a direct relationship to the entries in the Simon account No. 3a, above, and for each it tells whether or not there was a warrant to do the work, and an official receipt for the finished product. In other words, in trying to assess the validity of each Simon charge, Ashley wanted to know if the specific item was genuinely ordered, and if a finished product (dies) was supplied. From this it is usually possible to determine the items in Simon's account that originally had associated warrants, few of which now survive. All three copies of the Simon Account have the same content and order, but the numbering is not always the same; pairs can be combined into one number, and later items are not numbered. For use of document No. 3d, it is best to use the associated Accompt No. 3a, and count by hand. Even so, the entries have sufficient descriptions associated to avoid ambiguity, regardless of the numbering system.

The medals and coins discussed in the body of this paper, and thus of interest here, can be expanded as follows:

For Type A Coronation:
26: 'for the Coronac'on Medalls./. Noe Warr for making them./ M's Slingsby's Certificate, that they were made by yo'r Mats appointment & delivered to ye Ld Cornwallis for yo'r Mats use/. And the Receipt of the Officers of ye Mint of ye dyes of those Medalls.'
For Type B Magna:

'28 For the Original Stampes of a Medall engraven in Steele dyes./ with your Mats Effigies in an Imperiall


dresse pr[etc?]./ Noe particular, but your Mats gen[11] Warr[1] for making of Medalls./ The Receipt of


the Officers of the Mint, for these Stampes./'

For Type D Magnalia:

'29 For the Stampes of an other Medall, with your Mats Cyphers pr[etc?]./ The Same War[1]; & like receipt,


with that last before mencioned'

For Type G broad:

'23 For the Stampes for a twenty shillings piece, by way of the Mill./ Noe particular, but your Mats gen'


Warr[1] for the Stampes, for Coyne by the Mill/. The Certificate of ye Officers of ye Mint, of your delivery


of this paticular/'

But most interesting are the listings for items not in the Simon account, and which have numbers greater


than 73 ('ffor Altering the Stampes for ye Small mony . . .' - the familiar final entry in the account). See Nos.


3b and 3c, above, where it appears likely that the 'Paper and £110' represent Simon's total charge for items


74-76. Preceding new item 74 is mention of the 'Paper' or account now apparently lost.

'These are in an Accompt in a sheet of paper apart from the Brooke./ [Booke]


74 For a Steele Signet for ye L[1] Arlington./ your Mats Warr[1] to make it./ The Lord Arlingtons Receipt for it./


75 For two Stampes, or dyes, for the Crowne peice of Silver/ your Mats Warr[1] for making them./ The


Receipt of the Officers of the Mint for them./'

Item 75 must be for the Petition crown, since Simon is not known to have made any other crown. So the


(Petition) crown dies have to be considered official. See No. 7, below. The next item, 76, is two pages further


on, and might be the only reference known to the 1665 Dominion of the Seas medal, MI 506/145.

'76 One pair of dyes, with your Mats head, & your Mats on ye Reverse in a Sea Chariott, with horses./


Noe Warr[1] for making it./ The Receipt of the Officers of the Mint for it./'

There is no higher item number than 76, and the lost separate sheet for these three items could be the last


accounting that Thomas Simon ever did. The final page concludes with,


'18th July 1668 Ashley


This is a true Copy.'
in the Alchorne sale) is later and probably a clerk's copy in much better condition. But 45190 has the fourth and fifth entries from the end dated. This seems a contradiction, for a later copy should not have more annotations.

No. 6. Additional MS 34358 ff 15-16

'At the Court at Whitehall the 13th Aprill 1662

persons

His Royal Highness the Duke of York
Lord Chancellor
Lord Treasurer
Lord Privy Seal
Duke of Ormond
Marquiss of Dorchester
Lord Chamberlaine
Earl of Barkshire
Earl of Anglesey
Earl of Carlisle

The King's most Excellent Majtie
Earl of Lauderdale
Lord Wentworth
Lord Seymoure
Lord Hatton
Lord Hollis
Lord Ashley
M. of the Ordnance
M. Treasurer
M. Vice Chamberlaine
M. Secretary Nicholas

M. Secretary Maurice

The agreement of Sir Ralph Ffreeman Knight Master worker of his Majts Mint and Henry Slingesby Esq Deputy to the said Master worker concerning the several proposals made by them about coining his Majts money by way of the Mill and Press being this day read and debated at the Board his Majtie present in Councill, it was approved off and confirmed by his Majtie and their Lordps and ordered to be Entered in the Book of Council Causes as it followes in haec verba.

To the Right hono ble the Lord Treasurer
and the Lord Ashley Chancellor of the Excheq

The humble Representation of Sir Ralph Ffreeman Knight Master worker of his Majts Mint and of Henry Slingesby Esq Deputy unto the said Master worker concerning this agreement about coining his Majts moneys by way of Press and Mill.

In obedience to yo r Lordps Order of the 10th instant signifying his Majts further pleasure and Express Commands concerning the Speedy settlement of the new way of Cointing and directing the drawing up in writing the several agreements with the Corporation of Moneyers in the Tower, with Peter Blondeau, with the Gravers and Melters upon their respective undertakings, tasks and allowances Wee doo humbly certify unto yo r Lordships./.

Concerning the undertaking taske and allowances of the Moneyers, having several times treated with the Provost and Moneyers of the Mint in the presence and with the advice of the rest of his Majts officers there, concerning the proper Tasks in coining the moneys and the allowances fitt to be made them in coining by way of the Mill and Press. We have agreed and setled the undertaking Taske and allowance of the said moneys in manner following.

The several plates of Gold and Silver being cast by such Melter or Melters as the Master worker shall trust and employ therein of fitting breadth and thickness according to the respective Coins, cleaned barbed and made fitt for the Mill the said Corporation are after the usual charge of the Mint to refine the same in standard from the office, and his Majtie is to be at the first charge in providing and furnishing them with all necessary Tools Engines and Buildings for coining in the new way and if the said Peter Blondeau shall then out of his Allowance maintain in good and sufficient repair all the said Tools and Engines except such as are particularly undertaken to be repaired by the Moneyers and shall likewise make new ones in the room of such as shall break or faile at his own charges, and shall teach and instruct the Moneyers in the using of his new invented Tools and Engines, and in coining by way of the Mill and Press the said Corporation are willing and have undertaken to pass the said plates at the Horse Mill and to cut flatten seize neal blanch and coin the pieces to maintain the Horses to find Allom Argoll and Sawdust to keep in repair the oven, furnaces utensils for nealing and blanching to make good the Ballances, Small files pans Tubbs Trayes Bowles and Sacks and all wast of Gold and Silver in nealing working and blanching.

In consideration of which said Taske and undertaking his Majtie is to allow and the Masterworker is to pay unto the said Corporation of Moneys Eight pence for every pound weight of Silver and Three shillings for every pound weight of Gold coined in the new way. And they doe humbly referre and submit six pence more for the pound weight of Gold and one penny upon the pound weight of Silver for better sizing unto his Majtie gracious pleasure to be bestowed as upon a full tryal of the new way of coining they may be found to need or deserve the same. And in relation to the better establishing of the new way of Coining the said Corporation are ready and willing to be directed in all other things by the officers of the Mint and will likewise submit to such Rules and Orders as his Majtie shall at any time please to appoint by Indenture of the Mint for the better Government of the same as in duty to allegiance they are bound.
Concerning the undertaking Task and Allowance of Peter Blondeau. It is agreed likewise with the said Peter Blondeau and he doth undertake for the sum of one Thousand pounds to prepare and make ready all the Rowlers Instruments to cutt flatten make round and size the pieces, the Engins to mark the Edges of the moneys with letters and grainings, the great presses for coining the moneys and all other necessary Tools and Engins for the New way of Coining according to an Inventory delivered unto the Council with the proposition. And if his Maj'ty shall hereafter have occasion upon the weekly coining of greater quantities of Silver moneys to employ more Tools Engins etc The said Peter Blondeau is to provide such likewise at the same rate and proportion.

The said Peter Blondeau is to maintain in good and sufficient repair all the said tools and Engins such only Excepted as are part of the undertaking of the Moneyers or that belong unto the Mether or Graver. He is to provide men and materials as Brass Copper Iron Steel and Lead wood and Coal and all other necessaries for keeping them in repair and making new ones in the place of such old ones as shall fail and at the Expiration of the Termene limited unto him upon his agreement he is to leave all such Tools and Engins as his Maj'ty shall have paid for in good and sufficient repair fitt for use.

The said Peter Blondeau is to direct and instruct the Moneyers in coining the Gold and Silver moneys by way of the Mill and Press and in the using of all such of his new invented Tools and Engins as shall be employed in their Taske and undertaking.

He is to make all Gold and Silver pieces round before they are sized and to make the Edges of all the Gold and Silver Coins with letters or Grainings according to their respective sizes before they are stamped on their flatt sides. He is likewise to prepare and grave the Rings or viroles of Steel for marking the Edges of the Several coins with letters and grainings and to make good all his wast of Gold and silver in rounding the Edges.

The said Blondeau is to discover his Secrets in rounding the pieces before they are sized and in marking the Edges of the Moneys with letters and grainings unto his Maj'ty if he should please to doe him the honour of being a witness unto his Art and Inventions, unto the M. & Warden, Master and worker and Comptroller of the Mint and to such other persons only of trust and confidence as the said Peter Blondeau shall from time to time find necessary to employ in assisting him to round the pieces and to marke the Edges of the moneys according to the quantities weekly coined.

And lastly for the defraying of all his Expenses in the said several Tasks and undertakings and in satisfaction for his labour and industry he is to be allowed Three pence for every pound weight of Silver and one Shilling for every pound weight of Gold coined in the New way, small silver moneys under the value of six pence only excepted which are not any part of the agreement with him or the moneyers, and the said allowance for such his undertaking is to be continued unto the said Peter Blondeau for the space of one and Twenty years and no longer unless his Maj'ty shall be pleased at the Expiration of the said Termene to continue the same/[page]

Concerning the Gravers Wee doe humbly certify.

That wee have proposed unto Thomas Simon and John Roettiers Gravers severally to accept of one penny in the pound weight for Silver and four pence the pound weight for Gold for the furnishing the Mint with Stamps for coining in the new way. But by reason of a contest in the Art between them, wee doe at present find it a very difficult thing to bring them into any agreement.

Concerning melting remelting and casting the Gold and Silver Wee doe humbly certify that in respect the Master worker is according to his Indenture at fine and Ransome in case the money shall not prove of due fitness, and in regard the manner of melting and casting in this way so also the quantity of Seizell allowed to be remelted and cast by the Master worker will occasion a greater expense and wast than ordinary and wee have not thought fitt before a tryall had both of the way and persons to be trusted and employed therin to make any certain agreement concerning the same, yet does not doubt but to settle it in such manner as to bring the charge thereof within the remainder of the Eighteen pence for the Silver and the Seaven Shillings for the Gold allowed by his Maj'ty and the Council for the whole Expense upon the proposition and undertaking

Ra. Ffreeman
H. Slingesby

Portions of this document have been published in Ruding and Challis, and alluded to elsewhere.

No. 7. Additional MS 16,400, 305 × 185 mm.

Charles R

Our will and pleasure is that you forthwith make and prepare a Scale in Silver for Our Royall Consort the Queen according to these draughts. Given at Our Court at Whitehall the 29th day of April 1662.

To Thomas Simon one of Our Cheife Gravers

On this original warrant there are 114 mm sketches of both sides of the seal for Queen Catherine. More interesting is a 39 mm sketch between them of a coin obverse with a right-facing bust of Charles and the legend CAROLUS II DEI GRA; in other words a sketch of one side of the Petition/Reddite crown. Why it is here is unknown. A loose pair of cut-out crown drawings with a different bust, and a reverse dated 1662.
without the garter, and with heraldry like the first Roettiers crown, is found in D.F. Allen, 'Warrants and sketches of Thomas Simon'. *BNJ* 23 (1940-1), p. 444 and Pl. III/3, sold at Christie's 14 July 1987, lot 23. Those sketches are really an image of the Roettiers crown, and it is probable, though not absolutely certain, that they were drawn by Simon as Allen assumed.

**Acknowledgements** go especially to H.E. Manville, who early on examined and provided many details, including edge readings, of the coins and medals in the British and Ashmolean Museums, for his photographs, and for a review; G.P. Dyer of the Royal Mint for photographs of the three tools and a coin; P.P. Gaspar for a review and many helpful suggestions; M. Sharp of A.H. Baldwin & Sons for several medals for study; N.J. Mayhew of the Ashmolean Museum for photographs and details; J. Larkin, L. Syson, the Photographic Services, and the Trustees of the British Museum for photographs and details; M. Blackburn of the Fitzwilliam Museum for a photograph; J.D. Bateson of the Hunterian Museum; and the Department of Manuscripts at the British Library for document photocopies.

**Addendum**

An interesting discussion of the portrait is by Katharine Gibson, 'Samuel Cooper's profiles of King Charles II and Thomas Simon's coins and medals', in *Master Drawings*, vol. xxx, no. 5 (New York, Autumn 1992), 314–19.
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