THE COMMONWEALTH NAVAL MEDALS FOR 1653, BY SIMON

MARVIN LESSEN

FOUR papers on Commonwealth naval medals were published in the Numismatic Chronicle during the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Authorship began with Hawkins, followed by Nightingale and Henfrey,¹ and the works improved in their detail as more public records were uncovered. Later, Hawkins's Medallic Illustrations (MI) provided classifications and summaries,² in what proved to be the finale of the subject in the numismatic literature, and where hard rules became established. But they all failed to see Simon's accounts for the 1653–4 medals, which may have been available even before their obscure mention when the Calendars appeared in print, accounts crucial enough to force a dramatic change to the picture. Much more thorough was Mayo, whose book on military medals incorporated descriptions from MI, complete Calendar entries, and illustrations.³ However, final credit must go to the historian, Oppenheim, for using the Simon records,⁴ reproduced here as Appendix A, and to Dr Capp for finding and researching them for this writer. Except for occasional useful data in sale and exhibition catalogues, other writings that include or refer to the subject have nothing to recommend them.

The present paper is concerned with the so-called Blake medals,⁵ those gold awards authorised for navy officers at the successful conclusion of the last of the three great naval
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¹ Edward Hawkins, 'Naval honorary medals', NC 1st (old) Ser. 13 (1850/1), 95–110, read 23 May 1850, covers all of the naval rewards from 1649–53, only the last of which relates to this present paper. He is referred to frequently here as Hawkins 1850, and is not footnoted again. B. Nightingale, 'Thomas Rawlins, and the honorary medals of the Commonwealth', NC 1st (old) Ser. 13 (1850/1), 129–133, who disputed Hawkins on the 1650 Wyard naval reward. Henry W. Henfrey, 'Historical notes relating to the naval honorary medals of the Commonwealth', NC 2nd (New) Ser. 15 (1875), 81–4, who used state papers records. H. W. Henfrey, 'Supplementary note on the naval medals of the Commonwealth', NC 2nd (New) Ser. 16 (1876), 158–60, discussed the 1649 medal only. The Calendars only appeared shortly afterwards.

² Hawkins, Franks and Grueber, Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland (1855), vol. i, pp. 398–400 and folio plates xxxv–xxxvi. This is the work of Hawkins, who died in 1867, and is mostly taken from his printed, but unpublished Numismatica Britannica, (1852), where the medals are NB 239/16, 240/17–19, in the same order as MI. Information was provided by Mark Blackburn where this, along with Hawkins's ms plates, The Medals of Britain and its Dependencies Chronologically Arranged... by Edward Hawkins, Volume I, 1833, are both at the FitzWilliam Museum. This naval section of the published MI was already obsolete when it appeared in print, adding only a few locations for these medals to what was in NB in 1852; otherwise it is the same.


⁴ Michael Oppenheim, A History of the Administration of the Royal Navy (1896), reprinted 1988, p. 328, was apparently the first to access the copies of Simon's accounts in the Admiralty Minute Books, mentioned in this paper in Appendix C, and he also used originals of the State papers.

⁵ Simon's small naval medals of 1649–50 were discussed only briefly in M. Lessen, 'The Cromwell Dunbar medals, by Simon', BNI 51 (1981), 112, as well as in the footnote 1 references.
battles of the First Dutch War (Portland, Gabbard, and finally Texel on 31 July 1653), nominally under Robert Blake as the senior rank. February and March of 1654 saw the most important of the medals finished and probably issued; the others were completed in June and distributed over the following months, although one additional medal was made as late as 1656. The medals take three forms, in order of rank and monetary value, and traditionally they were known as: the ‘admirals’ with the elaborate border of trophies (MI 398/26), previously thought to be four specimens for the fleet admirals, which is only partly true; the ‘flag officers’ with a smaller border of laurel leaves (MI 399/27), previously thought to be four specimens for the flag officers, but this is not so; and the borderless ‘captains or officers’ (MI 400/28 and 400/29), wrongly thought to be of an unknown quantity.

Those designations will now be changed, with nomenclature to include Simon’s own terminology (underlined) as follows:

MI 398/26: *Trophy Large Border (TLB).* Nine of these medals were issued in 1654 with *chains* of various weights to the four admirals of the fleet, and to four or five flag officers, and probably a tenth was issued two years later. In addition, *nine medals without chains* went to an unknown category of recipients. The medal itself was worth about £8 in gold. Three of the nineteen examples have survived, and eight recipients of chain medals can be named.

MI 399/27: *Laurel Lesse Border (LLB).* There were seventy of these medals with *less* of a border issued in 1654, to an unknown category of recipients, but which could have focused on the more senior ship’s captains. None had a chain. The medal was worth just under £6 in gold. Two of the seventy can be traced, and one recipient named.

MI 400/28 & 29: *Plaine Borderless (PB).* Eighty of these medals were issued in 1654, to an unknown category of recipients, who probably included less senior captains and captains of hired armed merchantmen as well as lower grade officers. None had a chain. Included in this group is MI 400/29: ‘Saving Ye Triumph’, a *Plaine Borderless* medal identical to the others, except for its unique engraved reverse inscription that was done by Simon. It was issued in 1654 without a chain to an unknown person from the *Triumph*, and it exists today. The medal was worth a little over £3 in gold. Between seven and ten of the eighty have survived, and five to eight recipients can be named.

There were thus a total of 169 gold medals, ten with chains, 159 with a ribband instead, and each came with a case.6 No ribband, and just one case has survived.

Only gold was used for the medals; those seen today in some other metal are not originals. Undoubtedly Simon made pewter or lead trial test strikings, as he often did, but none are known to have survived. From the still-extant cracked reverse die of the *Trophy Large Border* medal some uniface restrikes in lead, white metal, and possibly silver were made in the eighteenth century. Two-sided silver specimens are eighteenth-century cast copies made for collectors or for display purposes.

The Tools

The main conclusion to be drawn about the mechanical procedures is that a separate pair of dies was used for each of the three medals. All three obverses (centres) are identical, as are all
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6 Oppenheim (note 4) p. 328, discussed Commonwealth naval medals and rewards, and commented that the government was never unduly liberal in dealing with naval men. ‘... during 1652–4, but the whole number of medals for the war was only 169; of these 79 were small ones, and may have been intended for the seamen although, as they were all of gold, it is unlikely. Nine of the larger ones were with chains, the smaller weighed 18 dwt. 11 gr. each, and the total cost was £2060 [really 2012]. One alone had “the service done in the Triumph expressed on it”. His reference to Add. MSS 9305, f. 155 should have been to f. 157. Undoubtedly taken from Oppenheim, but not referenced and confusing, was Milford Haven, in his *British Naval Medals* (1919), p. 386, and more recently in J. R. Powell’s, *Robert Blake* (1972), p. 246, with similar figures, but an improper reference.
three reverses (centres), and this includes such characteristics as metal flaws, certainly noticeable on the reverse, and the three forms of Simon’s signature. Usually this would imply a single pair of dies, but the different borders make this impossible. The one existing die (Trophy Large Border reverse) shows that the elaborate border and the provision for a loop were integral to the die, and that clinches the fact that it could not have been used to make the other types. Loops were also integral to the other dies. To have made multiple dies of identical design required the use of full punches. That is, Simon sculpted the entire design in relief onto a single punch, sans border, and used that punch to create a die, adding the border in the die itself, possibly by hand engraving as opposed to punching, although it is admitted that both border sides are almost identical. It was usual for Simon to carve punches for the major portion of the design, hand finish the resultant, punched die with minor embellishments, and punch the letters separately. Here, there was no lettering with which to contend, and the reverse battle scene would not have lent itself to being built from multiple punches, nor would the obverse anchor and rope. No hand-engraved modifications are obvious in any of the dies; the punch was therefore the complete final design. Using a punch to sink a matrix in order to raise another punch was a method Simon may never have undertaken and, in this case, it would have been redundant. It follows that he made a large master punch for each of the two faces in order to create multiple dies directly from them. Therefore, the complement of tools would have been one obverse punch, one reverse punch, three obverse dies, and three reverse dies, assuming that the borders were engraved instead of punched; one die out of the eight tools remains.

The machinery used should have been the same as that which produced the earlier Simon medals in 1650–51 and/or the Blondeau/Ramage coinage trials in 1651, perhaps Blondeau’s press (if he had his own), perhaps Briot’s.

Simon or his goldsmithing workshop must have made the chains, because he applied his ‘fashioning’ fee to them the same as for everything else. He also supplied cases and ribbands, subcontracting the latter.

Borders in the dies are not the same as ‘moulded borders’ or ‘surrounds’, which were common among different cast medals during the Civil Wars, even though the end product may look similar.

The reverse die for the Trophy Large Border medal, MI 398/26, has been in the British Museum (Pl. 6, 1) since about 1791. It is a simple square flat steel plate, slightly convex on the die face surface, flat on the back side, 20–21 mm thick, and weighing 726.26 g. Around the edge, where the trophy border is depicted, the die is more deeply incuse than in the centre, and the impression at all points is quite shallow. Hawkins in 1850 wrote that it was bequeathed by William Belshaw, a jeweller, but there is no previous history such as when or how Belshaw got it. He implied that the restrikes were made before the die came to the BM, yet he mentioned nothing about the severe crack.

The Records

All of the medals were prestigious and important rewards, making it surprising that no obvious periodicals or pamphlets of the time known to the writer seem to have made reference to them. Documentation comes from various types of state papers or records, such as journal books and letters, seen today mainly in the form of the published Calendars of State Papers. For this paper the Calendars, and often of more importance their primary sources, provided most of the information. But these can only represent a portion of the material that originally

---

7 A study that Derek Allen had once hoped to undertake (personal correspondence).
existed, and are especially lacking in personal letters and casual notes between navy offices regarding individual awards. Details such as design sketches or warrants to and from Simon are unknown. The best records are complete Simon accounts of 23 August 1656, without which the other materials are useless. They exist in two places, and are reproduced here as Appendix A, and mentioned in Appendix C, with notations interleaved in this present section as they apply. Simon's later 1657 summary account requesting various payments (PRO Mint 3/16) does not mention these medals, because those accounts were cleared by then, and had been handled in a somewhat independent manner through the navy and prize offices. Most of the following quotations are from the Calendars, which unfortunately can sometimes be no more than brief summaries; others are primary where they were practical to obtain.

August 6, 1653 is the initial mention of the awards, when only chains were under consideration: 'That it be humbly reported to ye Parlam from this Councell, That two gold Chaines to ye value of 300l a peece may be made and given to Genl Blake and Genl Monke, as a marke of flavo from ye Parlam and a token of their good acceptance of ye eminent Services p'formed by them agst ye Dutch; and ye a Chaine to ye value of 100l may be made and given to Vice-Adml Pen, and one of ye same value to Reere-Adml Lawson upon ye same Consideration. And Mr. Moyer, and Mr. Courtney are desired to make this report to ye Parlement'. Somehow Penn's reward increased to £150 before it was issued, with another £30 added more than a year later (Appendix A). The £150 medal is determined to have been to Penn, and not Lawson, because Penn's medal and chain have a current weight close to the expected £180, and is much too heavy to have been only £130, a difference of about a Troy pound. Penn was also of a higher rank than Lawson. The word 'value' proves to mean the cost to the navy, not gold value.

August 8, 1653. '. . . that four gold chains of 401. may be given to the four flag officers for service in the late engagement, and that the money to be laid out in these chains, and in those to the Generals and vice and rear-admirals, be raised to 2000l., to be given in medals amongst the other fleet officers, by advice of the Generals'. Here is the first request for the full, but undefined complement of awards and their total funding. What these two oft-quoted orders say, but may or may not have intended, is chains to the admirals and flags, and medals only to the other officers, and in that order. Nothing gives the reason for three separate medal sizes.

August 16, 1653. 'Mr Simons to be employed in preparing medals for the officers of the fleet; the Admiralty Committee to speak with him concerning going in hand with them'. This may suggest that Simon was to visit the fleet with the committee to get ideas for the designs.

Paulucci, the Venetian resident, wrote about this subject to his superior in Paris on 26 August 1653. 'To meet the demands of the generals of the fleet and as a token of the nation's esteem for the captains who distinguished themselves in the recent fights and to encourage all others, parliament has this week ordered a number of gold chains with medals to be made to be speedily to the commanders, to be distributed among the deserving, as a conspicuous mark of the generosity and munificence of this parliament.' If Paulucci saw such words in print they have not been found today.

November 7, 1653. 'from William Sanders to Gen Monck. Desires his interest in procuring him the medal promised . . .'. He had taken the lieutenant's place during the battle, while on
board the *Triumph* and received a gratuity for that. The medal that should apply is the Plaine Borderless one, so here is a good instance of a senior officer (Monck) being involved in authorising or even issuing a medal to, in this case, possibly a temporary officer. Most likely he did get one next year.

On December 2, 1653 the Council of State issued a warrant for the Commissioners of Prize Goods to pay Thomas Simons, goldsmith 'In part of 2,000l. ordered by Parliament for chains and medals for the generals and officers of the fleet, any former orders notwithstanding, sum £1,500 0 0'13 This is the first of three payments to Simon for the project, and mainly covered the gold he had to purchase.

January 17, 1653/4 (Appendix A, Simon’s account). Simon received the above £1500 payment from the Prize Office for gold medals, some with chains for the Officers of the Fleet.

February 25, 1653/4 (Appendix A, Simon’s account). Simon delivered one Trophy Large Border medal and chain. This was the very first item to be released, and was the £300 award for either Blake or Monck.

February 28, 1654. '... That his Highness y e Lo. Protector be attended by —— to the intent his Highness direccon may be rec’d in what maner the Medalls p’pared for the Gen’ls of the fifleet shall be disposed of'.

March 17, 1653/4 (Appendix A, Simon’s account). Simon delivered to the Tower the remaining eight Trophy Large Border medals with chains plus the nine without chains, and they were weighed.

Monck was officially appointed to command in Scotland on 8 April 1654, was supposed to have left London on the 10th, and went to Scotland, or arrived there on the 22nd, so some time in March was appropriate for a presentation. The peace treaty was signed by Cromwell on 19 or 21 April, and proclaimed on the 26th.

May 11, 1654 (Appendix A, Simon’s account). Simon received a further £500 payment...
PLATE 2

HARRIS: COINS OF HENRY IV AND HENRY V (1)
HARRIS: COINS OF HENRY IV AND HENRY V (2)
PLATE 4

HARRIS. COINS OF HENRY IV AND HENRY V (3)
PLATE 5

HARRIS: COINS OF HENRY IV AND HENRY V (4)
from the Prize Office under a warrant dated 27 April. This was his second payment, which he actually underran by some £48. The unusually rapid payments were from prize money – loot.

June 13, 1654 (Appendix A, Simon’s account). Simon delivered to the Tower seventy Laurel Lesse Border and seventy nine Plaine Borderless medals. These medals were weighed three days later, and that amount summed with the March 17th weights exactly equal Barkstead’s total in the Calendar entry below for July 3rd.

June 14, 1654 (Appendix A, Simon’s account). Simon delivered one final Plaine Borderless medal of 443 grains, and this was the one he engraved ‘Saving Ye Triumph’.

On 26 June 1654 Paulucci wrote that ‘His Highness has ordered 2000 gold medals to be struck, their obverse bearing the arms of England, Scotland and Ireland and the reverse a sea fight, as he means to distribute them to those who distinguished themselves most in the state’s service during the late Dutch War’. Of course the 2000 referred to £ not quantity. This looks to be the only instance that the medal design was described, and it is possible that Paulucci saw one or read a news report.

July 3, 1654 (Appendix B). Col. Jo. Barkstead at the Tower to the Admiralty Committee: ‘Has delivered the gold medals and chains received from Mr Simons to Jno. Powell; their total weight was 385 oz. 4 dwts. 23 grains’. This is 184,919 grains or 32.104 lb Troy of alloyed gold bullion, equivalent to £1367.6 at Simon’s cost, and excludes the first medal and chain delivered in February.


July 23, 1654. Capt. Jno. Taylor from the Chatham yards to Robert Blackborne: ‘Begs his assistance in reserving one of the medals for his son Joseph Taylor, who served as commander in the Unity, Adventure, and Exchange, in 3 great fights with the Dutch in June and July, and was removed by General Monck into the Mayflower. Having gone to Russia in his own ship, he could not apply for it himself’. Here is a suggestion that the medals were cumulative for all the battles.

July 27, 1654. Capt. Giles Shelley of the Colchester in a request to the Navy Commissioners: ‘... desires leave to attend them to receive his medal’. Did every recipient have to go through this, and how did he know that he was entitled to a reward?

November 3, 1654. Capt. Jere. Smith from Hull asks the Admiralty Committee: ‘As they have given medals to several captains for services against the Dutch, and have one for him, desires it may be delivered to Capt. Jno. Northend’. Milford Haven confuses the award to Smith and other captains with the small gold naval reward of 1650.

These last two entries meant that recipients would normally receive their medals in person, possibly even at a social occasion, but that they could get them from a third party if unable to attend.

On January 15, 1654/5 there is a Protectoral warrant issued to the Admiralty Committee ‘to add 301. to the value of the medal appointed for Gen. Penn’. Abbott quotes the full warrant, and the comparison is a good example of how the Calendar summary is not always satisfactory: ‘Warrant to the Admiralty Committee: Oliver P. You are out of the money remaining in your hands for medals to add unto the medal formerly appointed for General Penn, the value of 301. or thereabouts. For which this shall be your warrant. Given at
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17 CSPV 29, p. 228.  
18 CSPD 7 (1654), Letters and Papers relating to the Navy, p. 516, and for the full transcription see Appendix B, which is Public Record Office SP 18/84/39–41.  
19 CSPD 7 (1654), p. 529.  
20 CSPD 7 (1654), p. 532.  
21 CSPD 7 (1654), p. 567.  
22 Marquess of Milford Haven, British Naval Medals (1919), p. 386. While some of his comments are noted in this paper, he is often confusing, with unreferenced statements, at least for the Commonwealth period.  
23 CSPD 8 (1655), p. 20.
Whitehall this 15th January 1654/5'. This additional piece of chain could be for West Indies services, added to what he got the year before. There were still some £48 remaining in the £2000 fund at this time.

March 16, 1655 (Appendix A, Simon's account). Simon delivered the £30 addition to Penn's chain, or added to it himself. This was 3415 gr and the bullion cost £25.25. The entry is actually dated March 16, 1655, which would usually translate to 1656, a year after the warrant for the additional chain. It is assumed that Simon made a mistake and really meant March 16 1654 (1654/5), or else he used the new style by accident, a not uncommon occurrence. It makes more sense in this position.

June 14, 1656 (Appendix A, Simon's account). At this strangely late date Simon delivered a further medal and small value chain, assumed to be a Trophy Large Border of 3391 gr, with a bullion value of about £25.1, or about £30 charged (cost) to the navy. It is not known who received this or if indeed it was the Trophy Large Border type, but one might look for some other high officer, perhaps someone upgraded around this period, such as Edward Montagu. When his accounting was completed on 23 August 1656, Simon was owed £11 18s. 6d., and that was authorised in the Calendar’s next and final entry on the subject.

23 August, 1656. There is an order from the Admiralty Committee to the Navy Commissioners ‘to make out a bill for the balance of £11.18.6 due to Thos. Simons, for making gold medals and chains for the fleet, he having received 2000l. from the Prize Office. With Simon’s accounts’. These last three ephemeral words are the only published clue, and translate into the accounts reproduced here in Appendix A.

Fleet organisation

In the summer of 1653 the fleet was divided into three squadrons for operational purposes, the Red, White, and Blue, each under the overall command of an admiral of the fleet. Actually there were four admirals of the fleet: two were generals-at-sea in the Red (commanding jointly on the same ship, which was why Monck was standing near Deane when the latter was killed in June), one a vice-admiral in the White, and one a rear-admiral in the Blue. Each squadron then comprised three divisions, one commanded by one of the admirals of the fleet, the other two by a flag officer; these latter were a vice- and a rear-admiral entitled to fly a flag. Technically there were nine flags since admirals of the fleet were also considered main flag officers. A general would have his ship handled by a flag captain, but an admiral, whether an admiral of the fleet, or a lesser flag officer, was supposed to captain his own ship. Captains commanded individual ships, each generally with a lieutenant under him, and there were several types of warrant officers, such as the master (who was the most senior figure, and directed the sailing of the ship), the clerk of the cheque/purser, gunner, boatswain, carpenter, surgeon, and cook, depending on the ship’s size. The Navy was administered by 1. the Admiralty Committee of the Council of State, 2. the Committee of Merchants of Navy and Customs (a group of no importance here, which was dissolved in 1654), and 3. the Commissioners of the Navy, the mainstay of the administration, and a highly efficient body of professionals, mainly military officers.

For the entire Commonwealth period there were about 375 captains commissioned, and a further 150 commissioned officers served in hired merchantmen. Of more immediate

27 Capp, Cromwell’s Navy, p. 155.
relevance is that at the time of the early June battle at the Gabbard, there were ninety-four ship’s captains, six flags, and four generals/fleet admirals listed in 105 ships.28 There were perhaps 100–120 ships in the 31 July battle at the Texel. Thus, there was some rough equivalence in the size of the English forces for the two battles.29

**Bullion gold**

Simon’s account (Appendix A) shows that he paid, or charged the navy, £3 11s./ounce, or £42.6/pound Troy for the gold bullion. Coinage crown gold of 22 ct (91.67%) converts to £41/lb Troy, and the cumulative weights and sterling figures listed by Challis for the period 1653–7 also convert to £41/lb Troy.30 It is worth an attempt to calculate bullion prices independently, because the technique might be useful for other work. Snelling31 listed the price of fine gold in 1612 as £44.78/pound Troy, and he defined fine gold as 23.875 carats, which is 99.479% of pure gold for about the same period. He shows no other figure until a considerable change in 1663, a very long period. The medals have not been assayed, and specific gravity measurements must suffice by making use of tables, and assuming that the alloy is copper. Four sg measurements were made by this writer many years ago, these being 17.83 (BM M7347, MI-27), 17.70 (BM M7348, MI-28), 17.86 (BM M7349, MI-29), and 17.70 (author MI-28). The range in the table32 shows such gold to be about 92.5%. Then, 0.925 × 0.99479 × £44.78 = £41.21/pound Troy, which is low compared with Simon’s £42.6 figure, and is nearer to coinage specifications of the less-fine crown gold.

**Simon’s charges**

In his account (Appendix A) Simon states that his charge or fee, what he calls ‘for the fashion[ing of the gold]’, was 13s. 4d./ounce (Troy), which is £8/lb Troy or 15.8% of the total (£313 12s. 8½d. out of £2011 18s. 6d.). This format of charge does not appear in either of his other surviving accounts, from 1657 or 1665. The lack of die-making charges is unbelievable, unless he made them as a salaried employee, and yet he had to make many steel tools, for which he should have charged at least £100. This comment is based on later Simon billings, for we lack anything earlier from him. A digression will compare this fee with some of his other charges.

There are Simon accounting figures for the Lord Protector medal a year or two later.33 Two available sg measurements are 18.11 for a 448.5 gr medal (BM) and 18.26 for a 458.4 gr example (author), somewhat finer gold than that for the naval medals, and neither has a loop, ring or chain. The conversions in the table give about 94.5% gold. Thus, 0.945 × 0.99479 × £44.78 = £42.10/pound Troy, the approximate bullion value for the Lord Protector medal. Knowing what Simon billed for Lord Protector medals with chains and loops, makes it

---

28 C. T. Atkinson, ed., *Letters and Papers Relating to the First Dutch War 1652-4*, v. 5, Navy Records Society (1911), pp. 16-20, reproduces the list that was originally published in a pamphlet for the 2–3 June battle. Unfortunately there is no similar list for 31 July.  
30 C. E. Challis, *A New History of the Royal Mint* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 319, where he shows 563 lb 8 oz 3 dwt 16 gr totaliing £33,111, but that sterling figure may have been derived from £41, instead of the other way round.  
32 Earle R. Caley, *Analysis of Ancient Metals* (New York, 1964), p. 46, who shows how difficult and imprecise specific gravity measurements are, and his table thus gives the nearest per cent only, because the uncertainties negate precision. All the measurements were made by this writer and they are definitely uncertain. The resultant figures should be understood in that light, although the weights of these naval medals coupled with their gold content are both high enough to reduce the errors. Another table may be found in J. Vagel, ‘How to determine the exact specific weight of coins’, *SCMR*, March 1967, 111.  
possible to say that he charged about 20–25% over his bullion expense to produce them, all of which had chains (those in the invoice) that made up 90–97% of their total weight. The calculations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LP Medal</th>
<th>Simon’s charge (£)</th>
<th>Weight in Simon’s Account: weight (gr)</th>
<th>weight (lb Ty) × gold (£/lb Ty) =</th>
<th>gold cost (£)</th>
<th>charge/cost ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>4522</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>£42.10</td>
<td>£33.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5664</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>£42.10</td>
<td>41.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11050</td>
<td>1.918</td>
<td>£42.10</td>
<td>80.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14400</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>£42.10</td>
<td>105.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13092</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>£42.10</td>
<td>95.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a discrepancy with d, the Courland medal. CSPD for 14 July 1657 said to give him a medal and chain of 100 pound value. But in CSPD/Venice for 6 August 1657 it says a gold chain worth about 120 sterling. Simon’s account specifies a charge of £120. Perhaps Simon’s figures are in error, reflected in the low ratio. Lord Protector die-making charges, if any, are unknown. Differences due to fine or pure gold or specific gravity inaccuracies are not crucial factors in these calculations, but they are quite sensitive to the price of bullion. If £1 is added to the bullion price, because the calculation above was low by a little more than that, then the profit figure drops by about three percent.

The enigmatic gold IAM FLORESCIT medal of the early 1660s to cooks and musicians, MI 475/83, presents a story with a still higher profit. Three of these weighed a total of 0.3865 lbs Troy, and Simon billed £31 for them, and charged separately for the dies or whatever he used. Snelling’s base price for pure gold in 1661 and 1663 is listed between £49 and £51 (or £43.73 and £44.5 for crown gold for that period) and, assuming crown gold, one can approximate a 42–45% profit if they were made as late as then, or 49% if they were made in the lower bullion price period around 1660. For the Lord Protector and IAM medals Simon could have lumped various other charges into profit, and that might account for some of the difference from the 15.8% fashion fee for the naval medals. Or he became a costlier goldsmith/artist/medalist.

**CORPUS**

Often these medals were popular enough to have been publicized at auction and in museum exhibits, so in a sense they were fairly well recorded, albeit with traditional poor cataloguing and pedigrees, and seldom with their weight stated, a serious impediment to tracing. There are two types of pedigrees: one is that from collection to collection, and the other is a family history or tradition tracing back to the original recipient, really a provenance. It is not a guarantee that an auction catalogue’s mention of a previous sale is accurate. In this paper many of the pedigree details up to 1850 are from Hawkins, who was interested and knew many of the players. His views are accepted here as being accurate, although with qualifications and uncertainties, and sale details are filled in as available, mainly from Manville. When a family history is specified by Hawkins, or is in sale and exhibition details.

---

34 Public Record Office document Mint 3/16.
35 J. Robertson, British Numismatic Auction Catalogues (1986), figues of £43.73/lb Troy for crown gold between August 1661 and December 1663, and £44.5/lb Troy after that.
36 Private correspondence, as well as H. E. Manville and T. J. Robertson, British Numismatic Auction Catalogues (1986), figures of £43.73/lb Troy for crown gold between August 1661 and December 1663, and £44.5/lb Troy after that.
catalogues, it is accepted as truth. Appearances in war medal sales in the earlier part of this century were not uncommon, but those catalogues have only rarely been searched for the purposes of this paper due to a lack of access, nor were Continental auction catalogues or museums investigated, the latter a possibly lucrative area for study.

The design of the obverse is similar to the small Commonwealth naval medals of c. 1649–50 (MI 390/11 and 12), now with the addition of a Scottish shield, and the reverse to typical Dutch medals of the period.

**obverse**: oval shape, anchor suspending three shields of England, Scotland, and Ireland, surrounded by a rope cable, TS monogram initials on top of the anchor.

**reverse**: naval battle scene, blank field for the sky. SIMON on the stern of the sinking ship, and T.S. on the prow of another ship.

All three medal types included an integral loop in the die, really a bulb of gold that was drilled after striking, so the loop will not be mentioned again as a separate characteristic, but the presence or absence of a ring is noted. A ring was always included, for it was needed to attach the chain or ribband. The two larger medal dies had a bottom bulb also, similar to the top one, but these remained solid as a counterbalance, either for weight adjustment or for aesthetics. Two medals lack this bottom piece today, but it is not known if they originally came with or without it. When a (gram) weight is shown it is the actual measurement, then converted to grains for this paper. Each medal came in a fitted case, and those without a chain had a ribband for hanging instead. The wide, blank sky in the reverse field was so obviously intended for an engraved inscription to or by the recipient, that it is surprising, and unfortunate, that only one medal has come down to us that way (Saving Ye Triumph, engraved by Simon or his workshop).

**The Trophy Large Border Medal, TLB, (MI 398/26)**

This has a broad border of naval motifs or captured trophies, such as flags, drums, and cannon. According to Simon’s accounts there were nine, probably ten, such medals issued with chains and nine without.

The four admirals of the fleet who were recipients of TLB medals with chains, are clearly identified as General George Monck £300, General Robert Blake £300, Vice-Admiral William Penn (£150+£30 later), and Rear-Admiral (after March 1653) John Lawson £100. General Deane was killed in June; Blake was recuperating, and not present at Texel. At the end of 1653, Penn and John Desborough became generals-at-sea, in association with Blake and Monck, and Lawson advanced to vice-admiral.37 Penn’s promotion might be the reason he received £150 instead of the £100 originally ordered, but then so should Lawson’s chain have been increased. Sterling amounts represent the cost to the navy, not the gold melt value.

To his nephew, Robert Blake, who may also have been a naval captain during the Dutch wars, Blake bequeathed ‘the gold chain bestowed on me by the late Parliament of England’.

The medal must also have been included. It is wrong to assume that this medal should have survived simply because it was bequeathed, but at least it represents a little advanced information.

John Lawson, of Scarborough, left his gold chain (and medal undoubtedly) to his daughter, Isabella, who had married first Daniel Norton, and second Sir John Chicheley, and left a large family (DNB). Tancred39 noted from a *Gentlemen's Magazine* that the medal and chain were

---

37 CSPD 6 (1653–4), p. 280, December 2, and Monck and Blake were recommissioned for six months.


bequeathed to Richard Chichley in the will of December 1727 by his brother's brother-in-law, Richard Norton, who was the grandson of Sir John Lawson. Since Lawson's medal survived to this late date and had that publicity, connoisseurs should have been sufficiently alerted for it to have escaped the melting pot—the medal, not the chain—and be one of those known today.

Four or five flag officers also received these Large medals with shorter chains of £40 each. Who were these flag officers? The Navy Records Society reprinted the disposition of the ships and commanders of the summer fleet at the time of the 2–3 June battle at the Gabbard, and lists the two flag officers for the Red Squadron (under Fleet Admirals/Generals Deane and Monek commanding jointly in the Resolution) as Vice-Admiral James Peacock in the Triumph, and Rear-Admiral Samuel Howett in the Speaker. The White Squadron (under Fleet Admiral/Vice-Admiral Penn, in the James) had as its two flag officers Vice-Admiral Lionel Lane in the Victory, and Rear-Admiral Thomas Graves in the Andrew.40 In the Blue Squadron (under Fleet Admiral/Rear-Admiral Lawson, in the George) the two flag officers were Vice-Admiral Joseph Jordan in the Vanguard, and Rear-Admiral William Goodsonn in the Rainbow. That gives six flags in June, some of whom can be projected to the end of July. Peacock and Graves were still flags at Texel, 31 July, but were killed in that battle, the former dying perhaps a few days later from his wounds (DNB). Other names who appear as flags in this period and need to be considered are Packe, who was killed before then; Ball and Mildmay, who were killed while flag captains; Richard Badiley, who was in the Mediterranean and not in the Dutch Wars; and George Dakins and John Bourne, who only became flags the next year.41 So it looks like those who survived for their medals were Lane, Jordan, Howett, and Goodsonn, coincident with, what Milford Haven stated outright,42 with the presumed fifth flag being undefined. Posthumous awards were not characteristic then, hence probably none for a Peacock or Graves, or even Deane, whose survivors tended to get cash stipends. The bulk of Jordan's property was left to his eldest son, Joseph (DNB), with or without the medal/chain.

At present it has been impossible to assign or categorize the rest of the TLB medals. Who received the fifth (flag?) medal and chain of £40? It seems unlikely that Desborough was given it, for he was not involved in the war, and actually never served aboard ship, even after he became a general-at-sea. Even so, he must be considered a candidate, and the dates of his promotion and the issuance are consistent. A possible person to have received the tenth medal and chain of June 1656 valued at about £30 was Mountagu, a military officer, who was not in the Dutch war. Colonel Edward Mountagu, a protege of Cromwell, was made a general-at-sea 2 January 1655/6, having fought against the Spanish navy. He replaced William Penn, and the dates and his rank fit well enough. More confusingly, who got the nine without chains? Although not very likely, could each 1654 recipient have been given two, one with chain for formal presentations and one without for casual wear? The symmetry of the issue might lead to that belief but, assuming the chain was detachable by a clasp, there should not have been a need for the extra medal. The numbers would fit nicely. The basic medal of 1124 gr had a cash value of about £8; the real monetary value was in the chain. The survival is seventeen per cent.

The Reverse Die Restrikes

Lead (Pl. 6, 2) and white metal (Pl. 7, 3) examples made later show the die crack the same as in the current state of the die (arrow). Interesting are the paper illustration and notes pasted to the reverses, all of which are shown (Pl. 7, 4). The origin of the engraved or woodcut

41 CSPD 7 (1654), p. 241, for July 1654, lists their daily pay.
42 Milford Haven, British Naval Medals, p. 385.
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...illustration, which shows the die crack, is not clear, for it is not from one of the standard books, such as van Loon, Vertue, Snelling, or Pinkerton. One must believe the annotations that claim these restrikes to be from the Trattle sale of 1832, but they are not in the sale catalogue. Several similar restrikes are in the British Museum, and the M.M. Sykes sale in 1824 included a uniface impression under the silver category as part of lot 95. An unusual piece in the British Museum is MI 401/30, a thin silver impression from the uncrackecl reverse die. United by a rim, the other side is a separate engraved silver plate of 'Blakes's' fancy portrait, and is of no consequence. What is of interest is that the reverse striking is from the die while apparently in uncracked condition. If this was made while the die was in private hands in the eighteenth century, then its significance lies in showing that the die did not break in Simon's time. It could be a cliche test by Simon. There is no obvious rust (Pl. 7, 5).

The Medals

TLB1. William Penn's. National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, No. L8. (formerly (L6). medal with ring of about 23 mm, bottom bulb, and full chain (Pl. 8, 6a-6b). For its weight see the discussion that follows. It was lent to the Museum by Mrs Wynne in 1937, and now by her grandson as Trustee of Mrs Stuart's trust. This, with its original case and later oak box, was exhibited to the Numismatic Society of London about 1850 by Hawkins, courtesy of Mr Granville Penn. It was then owned by William Stuart of Watford of the Penn family. In 1891 Trancred said that Penn's medal and chain were in the possession of Mr Stewart of Aldenham Abbey. and Milford Haven in 1919 said it was in the possession of Lt Col W.D. Stuart of Tempsford Hall, Beds. (Mrs Wynne came later.) This is certainly Vice-Admiral William Penn's medal and chain costing the navy £180. He bequeathed it to his Quaker son. William. Here is the most important example of the naval medals today, and indeed of all Simon medals, for it appears completely original, well-defined, and has the only known chain and case of any of his works. The family deserves credit for their centuries of unique care.

Penn's case (Pl. 9, 6c) has an overall length of 186 mm, and a maximum width of 105 mm. It is a wood structure composed of two compartments, each covered in black leather with gold leaf decoration, and lined with dark green wool felt. A brass-hinged lid on each is fastened with a brass hook. The smaller compartment for the medal is somewhat oval and measures 68 mm wide and 27 mm high. The chain compartment is about 105 mm in diameter and 48 mm high, and the chain must be spiralled down carefully to fit properly.

The chain is about eight yards long, the links are each about 5.2 mm and the attaching ring about 23 mm, both in outside diameter (crude measurements scaled from a photograph). A count taken by the museum showed sixteen links in 2 inches, which would total approximately 2300 links. There is a small clasp, not obvious to see, which probably allowed the medal to be detached. For such a long chain to have been worn, if indeed at all practical, to say nothing of the much longer Blake and Monck chains, some form of multiple-strand looping around the neck and through the ring about five times would have been necessary.

In 1850 Hawkins tried to calculate the gold value of Penn's medal and relate it to its specified order of £100, but his result was unsatisfactory, and more can now be done with better data. The medal and chain were ordered at £150, with £30 added a year later, so its cost to the navy was £180. A current accurate weight of the medal and chain is, unfortunately, not available owing to the complexity of its display mounting. There are several approximate weights that can be used instead.

a. Simon's account figures for the original order plus the added chain are 35 oz 9 dwt 10 gr and 7 oz 2 dwt 7 gr; the sum converts to 20441 gr (3.549 lb Troy).

b. Hawkins's 1850 figures in (Troy) ounces are 2'A for the medal and 40' for the chain; the sum converts to 20520 gr (3.563 lb Troy).

c. National Maritime Museum catalogue card figures (avoir) are 4 oz for the medal and ring and 2 lb 10 oz for the chain; the sum converts to 20125 gr (3.494 lb Troy). A postal scale was used.

d. A note in its case, dated 28 July 1911, states 'Medal and Chain complete weighs 166 sovereigns'. Whether this was based on a measurement or derived estimate is not known, but it converts to 20459.5 gr (3.552 lb Troy).

Using £42.6/lb Troy for the bullion gold price, adding a fee of £8/lb Troy, and estimating £0.5 for the case, results in actual charges of between £177 and £181 compared with the £180 charges to the navy, a better...
correlation than one could expect. And if c. is eliminated, because it is inconsistent with the other three, then the range comes even closer at £180–181.

TLB2. Royal Collection, Windsor Castle, with ring of about 12 mm, but no bottom bulb. (73.24 g) 1130.26 gr (Pl. 10, 7a–7b). Royal Collection copyright, published by gracious permission of Her Majesty The Queen. There is no record in the Royal Library of the medal’s accession. However, Hawkins in 1850 wrote that it was from the Trattle collection, but not in his May 1832 Sotheby sale, because Hawkins arranged for Trattle’s three (?) undefined Commonwealth naval medals to be bought from the estate for William IV – at the time Russia was interested in the collection en bloc. From the Tyson sale, Sotheby May 1802 (2977) £148 Is. 0 d.; from the Heer Francois Fagel, Griifer der Alegemeene Staten, collection (see Appendix D) as noted in print and illustrated by van Loon in 1726. 47 According to Hawkins 1850, Tyssen had purchased the entire Fagel collection, and this is accepted on faith. In 1891 Tancred wrote that it was Blake’s medal that was bought for William IV for 150 guineas. 48 However, the Royal Collection’s medal cannot be defined other than to say that it is one of nineteen, unless something in Fagel’s records were to be uncovered. In comparison with the size of the ring and chain-links of Penn’s medal, TLB1, the small ring here might well obviate a chain.

TLB3. John Lawson’s (?). Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (Pl. 11, 8). (72.68 g) 1122 gr, with ring of about 15 mm, gig. Lawson’s (?). Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (PI. 11, 8), (72.68 g) 1122 gr, with ring of about 15 mm, but no bottom bulb, (73.24 g) 1130.26 gr (PI. 10, 7a–7b). Royal Collection copyright, published by gracious permission of Her Majesty The Queen. There is no record in the Royal Library of the medal’s accession. However, Hawkins in 1850 wrote that it was from the Trattle collection, but not in his May 1832 Sotheby sale, because Hawkins arranged for Trattle’s three (?) undefined Commonwealth naval medals to be bought from the estate for William IV – at the time Russia was interested in the collection en bloc. From the Tyson sale, Sotheby May 1802 (2977) £148 Is. 0 d.; from the Heer Francois Fagel, Griifer der Alegemeene Staten, collection (see Appendix D) as noted in print and illustrated by van Loon in 1726. 47 According to Hawkins 1850, Tyssen had purchased the entire Fagel collection, and this is accepted on faith. In 1891 Tancred wrote that it was Blake’s medal that was bought for William IV for 150 guineas. 48 However, the Royal Collection’s medal cannot be defined other than to say that it is one of nineteen, unless something in Fagel’s records were to be uncovered. In comparison with the size of the ring and chain-links of Penn’s medal, TLB1, the small ring here might well obviate a chain.

Dr Mead sale, Langford February 1755 p. 197 (48), 2 oz 6 dwt 20 gr = 1124 gr, with ring, £21 sold to L. Royston (in author’s copy). The Manville copy has Dr Barton for L. Royston; and another copy says Ld Royston. 51 By weight this is the Ashmolean’s medal. Mead’s medal happens to be the one that Vertue said he used for his illustration 52 which, just like the Ashmolean’s (and also the Royal Collection’s), lacks the bottom bulb. As far back as 1755 there was no chain, One would have expected that Dr Mead’s/Ld Royston’s medal should have remained in the collector’s market, and not casually available to be bought at near bullion price later on.

The Lawson medal would be hard to associate by date with the one in the Royal Collection, TLB2, which was once in the Fagel collection. The reasoning is that there seems insufficient time for Chichley to inherit Lawson’s in 1727, find the Dutch buyer Fagel, and still have it appear in print in Holland in van Loom in 1726 as belonging to the Fagel collection, which was later bought by Tyssen. Since it is not Penn’s either, by default it might well be the Ashmolean/Wadham specimen TLB3, disposed of by Chichley after 1727, losing its chain, and somehow getting into the Mead collection. While the Mead/Ashmolean pedigree seems firm, the thread is tenuous when attempting to bring it back to Lawson. But if there are really only three medals now extant, and if Lawson’s survived the eighteenth century, and is neither the National Maritime Museum or Royal Collection specimens, then it will be

47 G. van Loon, Beschrijving van Nederlandsche Historie-Penningen, vol ii (Amsterdam, 1726), p. 378, where the medal is illustrated and attributed to Fagel’s collection (or it says that there is one in his collection); it shows neither the top loop nor a bottom bulb.

48 Tancred, Historical Record of Medals, pp. 30–31. This has some useful pedigree information, when such came from his personal knowledge.

49 The notes to these were made several years ago by the author, but unfortunately their origin has since been lost, and the chain melting, jeweller and nineteenth century part of it will have to be disregarded as being unsubstantiated, especially because the century is too late. It would be important to know if this medal once had a chain, in order to narrow the possibilities, and even lend some credence to it being Lawson’s.

50 T. G. Jackson, Wadham College Oxford (Oxford, 1893), p. 188 describes the medal and a little of its history. Dr John Griffiths (1806–85) was Warden of Wadham from 1872 in his death when the two Commonwealth naval medals were bequeathed.

51 Tancred, Historical Record of Medals, p. 30.

52 Till said this was bought by Ld Hardwick (Philip Yorke who died in 1764) and goes on to say it then went to Tyssen. Trattle, and William IV, but Hawkins in 1850 said Hardwick never had it, so Till’s note has to be wrong, especially since Tyssen had the Fagel specimen. W. Till: Descriptive Particulars of English Coronation Medals . . . (1838), p. 27.

53 George Vertue, Medals, Coins, Great Seals, and other works of Thomas Simon (1753), pl. XVIII, p. 28, and the 1780 second edition edited by Richard Gough. Vertue’s extensive notebooks were published by the Walpole Society, but mention nothing on these naval medals. Pinkerton’s, The Medallic History of England simply used redrawn copies of the Vertue illustrations.
tentatively assigned to the Ashmolean. The lack of the bottom bulb, which could have acted as a counterweight and might be expected to be part of a chain medal, is inconsistent, but we cannot be certain of that. In comparison with the size of the ring and chain links of Penn’s medal, TLB1, the 15 mm ring is a negative factor, especially when we know nine were issued without chains.

TLB4.-TLB19, unknown. Besides the National Maritime Museum, Royal, and Ashmolean specimens, Milford Haven said that one was in the possession of Col A. E. Whitaker, of Babworth Hall, Retford. However, Spink’s annotated copy of Tancred mentions only a captains (that is, a PB) medal in the Whitaker collection, so there might be this simple discrepancy, while recognising that Milford Haven wrote post-Tancred. Otherwise there is no trace of any further survivals, and Milford Haven will be assumed wrong.

The Cast Copies

There are several elaborate and high quality silver cast and chased copies of the Trophy Large Border medal, which can generally be considered to be by someone like James Stuart or John Kirk in the eighteenth century, although without any evidence that either was the maker. They are very much in the style of a number of Cromwell medals made the same way. Three examples that differ in detail are in: the Hunter Museum, which was in Hunter’s collection before 1785 (Pl. 11, 9); Hill and Pollard, Medals of the Renaissance, plate 30, no. 5 (Pl. 11, 10); and in the Stucker sale, lot 63, Bourgey, 21 November 1977 (Pl. 11, 11). In the Thomas sale of 1844, lot 285 seems to have been one of these, and it sold for 19 shillings to Cureton, who bought heavily for the BM at that auction. Lot 94 in the M. M. Sykes sale of 1824, under the category of ‘restored English Medals, in Silver’, was ‘A fine cast of the Commonwealth Premium Medal presented to Admiral Blake’ at £3 10s. 0d. Probably very few were made, and those perhaps on individual order from collectors who understood what they were, as opposed to their being forgeries. Some are said to read A. SIMON on the ship.

The Laurel Lesse Border Medal, LLB, (MI 399/27)

This has a border of laurel leaves, a clean, simple design similar to some Civil War medal surrounds.

Who got these seventy examples awarded without chains? This and the next, Plaine Borderless (PB), type must have been for captains and below, differentiated in some unknown manner, but probably more senior captains for the LLB, and less senior captains and lower grade officers for the PB. A differentiation between regular navy captains and those in hired merchant ships does not seem to be the case, because William Haddock was one of the latter, yet he probably got an LLB; in fact he is the only recipient we presume to know.

The basic medal of 782 gr had a cash value slightly below £6. The survival is three per cent, an amazing, low figure.

The Medals

LLB1. William Haddock’s. National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, No. L10, (Pl. 12, 12a) (50.7 g) 782.4 gr, with ring of about 12 mm, and with a bottom bulb. Purchased 1950 from Spink & Son, exhibited at the RNS in December 1904 by Charles Winter, from the Murdoch sale, Sotheby June 1904 (150) £405 (Pl. 12, 12b); from the Thomas Whitehead sale, Sotheby May 1898 (55) £430. Whitehead bought it at the late Mrs Charles Desborough Holworthy sale, Christie July 3, 1879 (6) for £105, and that was its first sale offering. The description of the next lot (7) in the Holworthy auction catalogue, which was the Plaine Borderless medal, PB8 below, stated that ‘These two medals were given to Captain William Haddock R.N., who commanded the America [incorrect, it was the Hannibal] in the action of 31st July 1653’. Other Holworthy lots included such items as the King’s cabinet from Naseby, the source of the famous letters, and the satin cap given to Richard Haddock jnr by Charles II in 1672. In 1850 Hawkins wrote that Charles Holworthy was a nephew of Charles Haddock, (of Wrotham, Kent in Tancred)
who was the owner of the medal in 1798, and that Charles was the [last surviving] son of Admiral Nicholas Haddock, who in turn was a great grandson of Captain William Haddock. The DNB can help with those Haddocks pertinent to this story, because there were many of them, often with the same names. Richard Haddock (senior) at age 70 was a vice-admiral in 1652, but was not employed in 1653. His son, our Captain William Haddock (1607–1667), commanded the hired merchant ship, Hannibal, in 1653, and possibly throughout all of the Dutch battles (and the America in 1650–1). William’s son, Richard (junior) (1629–1715), was at least a lieutenant during the 1653 war, and may even have been on the same ship with his father on 31 July. It was this Richard jr’s son who became Admiral Nicholas Haddock (1686–1746) in the next century, continuing the chain to Holworthy and the 1879 auction. Anthony Thompson, in doing some research on Commonwealth naval medals for this writer considered, among other things, that William Haddock might have received two medals, the laurel border as a junior flag officer and the plain borderless as a captain in a hired merchant vessel, and that he may have acted as rear admiral of the Red Squadron after vice-admiral James Peacock was killed at Gabbard in June, when Samuel Howett probably, not certainly, took his place. Charnock’s biographies include a 1796 engraving of the medal, with the plate captioned ‘A Gold Medal given by the Parliament to Cap N. WILLIAM HADDOCK as a reward for his Gallantry in the Memorable Action with the Dutch Fleet in 1653. Captain William Haddock was the Grandfather of Admiral Nicholas Haddock. The Medal is now in the possession of Charles Haddock Esq, of Wrotham in Kent, son to the Admiral abovementioned’. Both Hawkins in 1850 and Tancred must have relied on that reference. The long family tradition will be accepted that William Haddock received a Laurel Lesse Border medal and some Haddock, perhaps William again or Richard jr, the Plain Borderless medal, PB8 below. Dr Capp adds the possibility that a medal may have been awarded to the elderly vice-admiral Richard senior for his previous services; he was a surviving major Commonwealth naval figure from 1652 and before. Could the Desborough family name associated with Holworthy have any significance? The Holworthy ancestor was John’s younger brother, Samuel, who died in 1690. An illustration, some of its sale record, and the Haddock connection can also be found in NCirc, May 1905, column 8336, where Spink’s owned the Murdock medals.

LLB2. — British Museum M7347 (Pl. 12, 13), (50.35 gr) 776.90 gr, sg 17.83, with ring of about 12 mm, and with a bottom bulb. Bought from Edward Hawkins, bought for him by Cureton from the Webber sale at Christies, January 1846; bought by Dantziger for Webber for £11 15s. 0d, from the Thomas sale, Sotheby February 1844 (567) ‘this medal is a good deal rubbed and perhaps cast. Or if not false’ (annotated in the author’s copy, but there seems nothing wrong with it, although the price is very low) (1 oz 12 dwts 11 gr = 779 gr); from the M. M. Sykes collection Sotheby May 1824 (276) £32; bought by Thane for Sykes for £48 19s. 0d, from the Samuel Tyssen collection Sotheby May 1802 (2978), who had bought it privately from Mr Miles for £20. These pedigree data were taken from Hawkins 1850, not from sale catalogue descriptions. Richard Miles (1740–1819) was an accountant to the British Museum and a London coin dealer, whose coins and books were sold at Sothebys in May 1820 (HEM). Hawkins’s ms of plates is dated 1833, yet on plate 54 he illustrated the Haddock medal cut from Charnock’s plate, and he initialed it EH, which initials must have been added after he bought LLB2 years later, just to show that he owned the type, not that specific specimen.

LLB3.—LLB70, unknown

The Plaine Borderless Medal, PB, (MI 400/28 and MI 400/29)

There is no border. Among the probable recipients of the eighty medals, and their June ships, were acting lieutenant William Sanders of the Triumph, which was under Peacock, captains Joseph Ames of the Samuel Talbot, Roger Cuttance of the Sussex, and William Haddock or his son Richard of the Hannibal, and clerk of the cheque John Clifton, possibly of the George,
which was under Lawson. Captains Joseph Taylor (who is not listed for any ship in June), Giles Shelley of the Waterhound, and Jeremiah Smyth of the Advice should have received this, or the LLB medal above, based on the Calendar entries. Some of the captains listed as killed at the Texel battle, besides flags Peacock and Graves, were Chapman of the Golden Cock, one of the Taylors of the William, Newman of the Mayflower, and Crisp of the Prosperous.64 None of these last four nor their ships were even listed at the June Gabbard battle. Ships and assignments changed between early June and late July, and even more so by the time the Calendars mention some of them months later. Dr Capp65 felt that lower grade officers who had particularly distinguished themselves could also qualify, especially if they were under close scrutiny in a flagship, such as clerk of the cheque Clifton and acting lieutenant Sanders must have been.

The basic medal of 443 gr, with ring, had a cash value slightly more than £3. Their sparse survival is twelve per cent.

Hawkins in 1850 opined that these Plaine Borderless medals could also have been awarded for actions subsequent to the Dutch wars, but that theory is not consistent with dates or budgeted costs.

The following list should represent a very high percentage of those medals still in existence, with most of the uncertainty coming from the frequent inability to differentiate one sale catalogue entry from another.

The Medals

PB1. — Bonhams 25 March 1998 (35), with ring of about 11 mm, (28.9 g) 445.99 gr; to Hayward from the Heckett collection, Sotheby May 1977 (216) £5500 (Pl. 13, 14). This could be PB15.

PB2. — Glendining 17 Nov 1988 (265), 441.77 gr, with ring of about 12 mm; Spink Auction 50, March 1985 (930) £5245 (Pl. 13, 15), from David Spink's collection.

PB3. John Clifton's, author (Pl. 13, 16), 410.32 gr, sg 17.70, no ring. Bought privately from David Spink's estate in 1986 (he had two); Dwight Thompson collection; bought by Spink from Glendining 12 February 1964 (10) no ring £700; Brigadier-General G. J. Palmer, T.D., M.P. Military and Naval Medals sale, Glendining, June 18, 1919 (10) £145 (no ring is noted, so it may have disappeared between 1910 and 1919); bought by Baldwin at the Robert Day sale, Sotheby April 1910 (8) for £170, where a ring of about 12 mm was present, catalogued as 'Capt Clifton of the George'. Spink's copy of Tancred has a November 1898 notation saying that Day has one of the (Plaine Borderless) captains medals, a dating consistent with the following; bought by G. Mortimer (unknown, but conceivably a buyer for Robert Day) from the Poyser, Wynn sale, Sotheby 11 July 1898 (265) for £205 'Property of a Lady', with the ring, 'exceedingly fine . . . has been carefully preserved in the Clifton family, to a member of which it has been awarded'. This has to be the first sale offering, and the catalogue goes on to discuss the Captain John Clifton mentioned in the Calendar for March 1654 as being in command of the George, and that he must not be confused with the John Clifton who was appointed clerk of the cheque in the George the previous October, also in the Calendar.66 The family tradition should be accepted that the medal came through the Clifton family, although such assurance does not guarantee that the recipient was named Clifton. But assuming that he was the clerk, then much of the confusion has been eliminated by Dr Capp,67 who feels certain that the so-called captain and clerk of the cheque were one and the same person, pointing out that the Calendar editors were often wrong in their assumptions and turned warrant officers into captains, because the clerk would commonly write ship's reports and covering letters that accompanied sea-books, thus confusing the editors 200 years later. So it seems that John Clifton received the medal for his services as a warrant officer. This is consistent with the original order to reward the 'officers', not necessarily captains, and with the distribution being made by the senior officers, apparently at their discretion. If Clifton was clerk on the George in the summer of 1653, as he was a few months later, then he was in a good position to have been chosen for an award, for that ship was one of the most important. He is

65 Personal correspondence.
66 CSPD 6 (1653-4), p. 439 for Oct 18, 1653 'Warrant of the Council of State from Genl. Blake and Monck to the Navy Commissioners to enter John Clifton as clerk of the check in the George'.
67 Private correspondence.
mentioned as being pursuer of the Worcester in August 1656, and that is the final notice of him in the Calendars, at least from the indices. The ring shown in the Day catalogue disappeared after 1910. There might be further war medal sales between 1910 and 1964 that show this specimen. Some of the sale-to-sale tracing was possible because of faint toning characteristics.

PB4. — British Museum M7348 (PI. 13, 17), (27.01 g) 416.76 gr, sg 17.86, no ring. Bought from Edward Hawkins; bought for him by Currer from the Thomas sale, Sotheby February 1844 (568) (17 dwts 9 gr = 417 gr) for £8 (no pedigree listed), and this is another Hawkins purchase at a strangely very low price; bought by Young from the Hollis sale, Sotheby May 1817 (484) £43 ls. 0d. (no pedigree listed). This Hawkins/Thomas/Hollis sequence is given by Hawkins in 1850. One accompanying ticket is stamped with Hawkins's griffin or dragon, annotated by him 'AV Fleet Anchor & 3 Shields' and in pencil in another hand '1400/28 Presented to Capt Joseph Ames'. A second ticket says 'Sr M. M. Sykes £28.' The logo means that BM M7348 was Hawkins's. If he ticketed it in 1844 and the NC article was in 1850, then he had time to come up with a better pedigree, or the tickets could have been swapped and annotated later by someone else. However, the £28 figure is proper for the Sykes specimen. PB11 below, making the entire scenario a mystery, for there is no reason for such a ticket to be in the British Museum.

PB5. 'Triumph'. British Museum (MI 400/29) M7349 (PI. 13, 18), (25.91 g) 399.79 gr, sg 17.86, no ring. Purchased by Dr Southgate in 1792 for £23 10s. 0d. according to Hawkins in 1850. Engraved by Simon (or his workshop) in the reverse field FOR EMINENT SERVICE IN SAVING Y' TRIVMPH. FIERED IN FIGHT WITH Y' DVCH IN IVLY 1653, it was delivered by him at 443 gr on 14 June 1654, and he charged £4 for it, including fee and case (Appendix A). It is hoped that the missing ring accounts for the 43 gr weight difference between them and now. MI gave this a separate number, but it is simply a Plaine Borderless medal. There is an unsubstantiated attribution of this to Joseph Ames, but it is not known who on that ship received this medal or why the engraving was unique. Peacock was the Triumph's captain, who did not survive the battle.

PB6. Roger Cuttance's. National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, No. L11, formerly L86 (28.7 g) 442.9 gr, with ring of about 11 mm. From Emmanuelle College, Cambridge (PI. 13, 19), unprofessionally engraved with the initials R.C. on the obverse, and from that it was ascribed to Roger Cuttance, a June captain of the Sussex in Howett's squadron (DNB). Since he was a navy captain, not a hired merchant captain, then if this medal really was issued to him, it cannot be said that LLB medals went to navy captains, and PB medals to merchant captains as a lower order of award. Indeed, if William Haddock got an LLB as a merchant captain in his hired ship, then the argument is weaker still.

PB7. — Ashmolean Museum (PI. 14, 20), (28.64 g) 441.9 gr, with ring of about 12 mm. From Wadham College in 1922, given by John Griffiths about 1885. (This was not bought for Griffiths from the Sanders/Hamilton sale, as was the Trophy Large Border medal TLB3 above, nor is such said by Jackson, but it is sometimes thought that the two were always together. That would be contrary to the Murdoch/Addington pedigree. PB8 below.)

PB8. Haddock's. (probably NCirc, 1914, column 477 (21313) £275). Murdoch sale (PI. 14, 21), Sotheby June 1904 (151) £200; from the Montagu sale, Sotheby May 1897 (215) £240; from the Addington sale, Sotheby May 1886 (95), which states that it is from the Sanders/Hamilton collection. The Sanders/Hamilton sale took place at Sotheby May 1882 (98), and the medal was sold to Addington for £64, as confirmed in an annotated copy (HEM). At the late Mrs Charles Desborough Holworthy's sale, Christies July 3, 1879 (7) Sanders (this spelling in Christies MS notes of Griffiths that Jackson consulted.

68 DNB for Joseph Ames (1619–1695) says that in July he was present at the engagement with the Dutch, and that the 'saving y e Triumph' medal was awarded him by parliament, referencing the Commons Journals, vii. 296. This is convoluted, and the CJ for 8 August 1653 just gives the usual Council orders for admirals' and flag officers' chains readily found in CSPD for 6 and 8 August. DNB probably had information that Ames received a medal, and transposed it to this particular example.


70 R. J. H. Jenkins, 'Two gold medals from the Emmanuel College Collection', Emmanuel College Magazine xxx No. 1 (1935–6), 13–20. It was lent to Greenwich for the exhibition in 1937, and is still there. Jenkins placed a query in the Mariners Mirror, vol. 22 (1936), 247, asking for information on Cuttance, the medal, how it came to be at Emmanuel College, the will, etc., but there was no printed response noted in subsequent issues.

71 Jackson, Wadham College Oxford, p. 188, describes the medal, but without a provenance except for Dr Griffiths, although he goes into detail about the Trophy Large Border medal. There might have been no further information in the MS notes of Griffiths that Jackson consulted.
America in the action of 31st July 1653. For the other Holworthy/Haddock medal see the discussion under Laurel Lesse Border LLB1, above, and see Trophy Large Border TLB3, above, for the other Sanders/Hamilton medal.

PB9. Joseph Ames’s. Bought by Webster for £60 from The British Museum Duplicates sale, Sotheby 10 February 1876 (28). This should be the one that Hawkins in 1850 said was purchased by the British Museum as part of the Barre Roberts collection, who bought it at the Tyssen sale, Sotheby May 1802 (2979) £35 (no pedigree listed). Tyssen got it when he bought the entire (?) Hodsol collection; bought by Hodsol for £28 from the Joseph Brown sale, Greenwood 16 March 1791 (76). (At this point there is a conflict with PB14, below, where Hodsol is said to have bought Lindgreen’s in 1784 for £4 17s. 0d. and the price, too, is inconsistent in the sequence). Bought by Snelling for Browne for £31 12s. 6d. from the (William) Joseph Ames sale, Langford February 1760 (81), which has to be its initial sale offering. The Langford catalogue stated that Ames was the grandson of Captain Joseph Ames, and Hawkins adds that he commanded the Somerset. Dr Capp has pointed out that he has no knowledge of a ship called the Somerset in the fleet during this period, rather that in 1653 Ames commanded the Samuel Talbot, a hired merchant ship, and the confusion could be due to a misreading of the script in the records consulted. The fairly distinctive weight and logo associated with Hawkins’s specimen, PB4 above, shows that the two were not accidently swapped.

PB10. — Bought by Spink from the Col. Murray war medals sale, Sotheby 10 May 1926 (17) £100, with ring of about 11 mm; only the obverse is illustrated in the catalogue (Pl. 14, 22). This could be either PB1 or PB2 or PB8.

PB11. — bought by Dantzinger for Lord Holmsdale from the Gentleman sale (D. Jones Long or James Long as in this writer’s copy), Sotheby January 1842 (686) for £12, stating that it was ‘probably’ from the Hollis [1817] collection. However, that seems to be an incorrect pedigree. Hawkins in 1850 does not mention Hollis for this specimen, rather he gives the following (expanded): M. M. Sykes sale, Sotheby May 1824 (275) highly preserved for £28, and stated to be formerly in the possession of Samuel Tyssen (no further pedigree listed); Samuel Tyssen duplicates sale December 1802 £18 (perhaps, but that catalogue has not been examined to see if there was such a medal); sold to Thane at the Joseph Browne sale 2 June 1791 (56) for £15, the dealer probably for Tyssen; bought by Morriesson for Browne for £30 from the James West sale, Langford January 1773 (47); bought by Carter (HEM copy gives the buyer as Gardiner) for £4 14s. 0d. from the Bryan Fairfax sale, Langford 26 April 1751 lot 78 listed at 18 dwt 12 gr = 444 gr. If Hollis does not apply, then this medal could be PB2, or even the Oxford specimen, PB7.

PB12. — bought by Cleghorn from the J. K. Ford sale, Sotheby June 1884 (596) £61.

PB13. — bought by Matthew Young from the A. Edmonds sale, Sotheby March 1834 (127) £14.

PB14. — bought by Hodsol for £4 17s. 0d. from the Charles Lindegren (Lindgreen) sale, Skinner 26 May 1784 (79) ‘Admiral Blake (without the border)’, a provenance in conflict with Hodsol in PB9 above, as is the price.

PB15. — G. Hamilton-Smith, War Medals sale, third portion. November 21, 1927 (1004) £100 with ring. Only the reverse is illustrated in the catalogue (Pl. 14, 23), and this undoubtedly is one of the above, almost surely PB1., Heckett’s.

From this list seven distinct specimens can be defined today, with one or two more possibles out of the fifteen listed, so perhaps eight or nine in total. In November 1898, Spink’s annotated copy of Tancred listed seven known examples as: British Museum, Col. Murray, Col. Eaton, Maj. Hay, Capt. Whittaker, Murdoch, Robert Day, really eight when the TRIVMPH is added.

Cast Copy

In the British Museum is a silver cast (Bank of England Medal 72), with a reverse that might have been chased, of the Plaine Borderless medal at 182.9 gr (Pl. 14, 24) of similar work to the ‘Stuart’ Trophy Large Border medals previously discussed. There is no Simon signature. Another, or the same, specimen that was apparently highly valued and even considered genuine appeared in the Thomas sale of 1844, lot 286; and this was a silver Plaine Borderless (captains) medal ‘fine and rare’ that sold for £8 15s. 0d. to Cureton, who was a major buyer for the British Museum during that sale. However, this has not been seen, unless it is the one shown here.

72 Private correspondence.
73 Tancred, Historical Record of Medals, p. 31, in Spink’s copy, hand-annotated by Tancred or Spink.
Conclusions, and summary of medals issued

Contrary to expectation, the medals and chains went readily into the melting pot, most likely after the recipients’ deaths and, at a guess, mainly in the seventeenth century.

Time and new data should narrow some of the pedigrees, add very few additional specimens, and clarify the inaccuracies and discrepancies in this paper. There may never have been paperwork assigning the mass of the plain and laurel leaf medals, leaving all of this to the discretion of the more senior officers. On the other hand those of high value with chains should have had more related documentation than we have now, with named recipients. Bold face type refers to medals currently known that can be traced to the original recipients, either by supposition or with some degree of confidence.

There were nineteen Trophy Large Border medals. Nine of them with chains went to William Penn (d. 1670), George Monck (d. 1670), Robert Blake (d. 1657), and John Lawson (d. 1665) as admirals of the fleet, and to Samuel Howett (d. ??), Lionel Lane (d. ??), Joseph Jordan (d. 1685), and William Goodsonn (d. 1662) as flag officers, and to an unknown, possibly another flag officer, or perhaps John Desborough (d. 1680). A tenth medal, at £30, had the shortest of all chains; it was issued to an unknown two years later, perhaps Edward Mountagu (d. 1672). A further nine Trophy Large Border medals without chains went to nine unknown persons. Three of these large medals exist today, but only one has a chain, and the other two may never have had one. This was the only medal type to be issued with a chain.

The seventy Laurel Lesse Border and eighty Plaine Borderless medals can be assigned in just the few instances already discussed. As a minimum these two types would almost have to have been a blanket award to each of the surviving ship captains in some manner of differentiation. If William Haddock (d. 1667) got the LLB and Roger Cuttance (d. 1678) and Joseph Ames (d. 1695) and maybe another Haddock the PB, all as captains, then it is not clear where the distinction would be. Clerk of the cheque John Clifton would fit satisfactorily as a PB recipient. It is conceivable, but unlikely, that some persons could have been awarded more than one type of medal. If each captain received one of the two medals, that amounts to about 100, and adding in an unknown number of lesser grade officers could arbitrarily bring the figure up to the necessary 150. By not limiting the award to Texel, the addition of further captains/officers from the previous battles would change the mixture somewhat. If the admirals of the fleet or senior officers had the authority and means to issue these on their own at their discretion, then very little official correspondence and few records might be expected. Even so, the awards must have been controlled and not randomly given for favouritism or nepotism, although some of that surely must have occurred.

Dr Capp makes the intriguing suggesting that a detailed study comparing rated warships amongst themselves and against hired merchantmen, their guns and tonnage, and the respective captains throughout the war, might provide clues to a dividing line between recipients of LLB and PB medals, and perhaps also help with the nine TLB medals without chains. That is, the larger and more important the ship, the more valuable the medal.

Measurements of the attaching rings were done crudely from photographs. All known PB and LLB medals have rings of 11 or 12 mm in outside diameter, as does TLB2 at Windsor Castle. They must weight about 25–40 gr, and played a role in weight adjustment. The Ashmolean TLB3 ring is 15 mm, and the sole medal with a chain, TLB1 at Greenwich, has a ring of 23 mm. Therefore, it appears that an 11–12 mm ring was for the ribband, a 23 mm one for the chain, at least for a £100–150 medal/chain, and that at 15 mm is unclear, but perhaps was for a £40 medal/chain. This implies that TLB2 was one of those nine medals issued without a chain, and TLB3 possibly with a chain. Penn-sized links would readily fit through the 15 mm ring, and much less comfortably through the
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smaller ring. It is hard to imagine that all chains were not of one standard link size, with the weights controlled by the chain’s length. The larger the ring, the more strands of chain that could fit through it.

Postscript

Work on this paper was well advanced, and was based on physical evidence from the available specimens, the presumption that survival rates must have been very high, and the adequacy of the summary information in the published Calendars, when the reading of Simon’s accounts turned the entire subject upside down, and showed that such assumptions were very wrong. The question had arisen as to the source of Milford Haven’s and Powell’s surprising statements on medal quantities. Dr Capp found the probable origin to be Oppenheim, whose reference to State Papers turned out to be accounts of Simon’s, of sufficient impact to make previous work on the topic futile, or at best obsolete. In hindsight, it must be granted that there were pointers to these accounts, but not in the numismatic literature. They were casually mentioned in only three words in a back section Calendar entry dealing with a period three years after the events, and thus missed.

Our numismatic world has not done particularly well in finding, detailing and publishing records. Ruding did the overall pioneering work on coins, many others have added information on their specific topics, and Henfrey did a great deal on Cromwell/Blondeau/Simon as did Gough in his second edition of Vertue. However, there has been no concerted effort to establish or consolidate a groundwork of primary sources on which numismatic studies could be built, and this criticism is not intended to be limited to Simon’s work, which might even be better covered than most. What is needed is a sylloge of numismatic documents and records of the British Isles.

It is clear that one cannot hope to define the history of (Simon) issues solely from the physical evidence of examining almost every specimen, or at least type, thought to exist today. Simon’s products were very popular in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, even before Vertue, so by now almost all of the material should have surfaced, with no ground burial problem to face, though there may still be a degree of concealment in strongboxes. With reservations, we have probably seen what there is to see, yet the relationship of the number of surviving specimens to the quantities that were produced cannot be established independently of original documentation.

The caveat is not to place great reliance on the low numbers of survivors in any numismatic area, not to assume that we know all the original records and notices, and to employ published secondary sources as guides only and with caution.

Therefore, a step backwards needs to be taken to this writer’s paper on Dunbar medals, a study developed from the evidence of surviving examples, without recourse to documents, since none have surfaced. High survival rates were assumed at the time, and because of this and the meagre number of original medals known today, the writer concluded that there could not have been an issue of silver medals to the troops, and that an issue of gold medals to the officers was unlikely. The survival of five or six medals was hardly the stuff of general distributions.

The present study of naval medals makes it probable that, in an analogous manner, Simon did submit an account for his Dunbar work which, if known today, would change our understanding of this medal. Similar to the poor survival rate of naval medals (nine per cent), gold Dunbar medals of one or both sizes may well have been issued to the principal officers and perhaps even to junior officers, and most of these medals would have been melted in the seventeenth century. Survival into the next century would have increased their chances of coming down to the present, because collectors then began to provide a market that could compete better with the melt price from goldsmiths. Only the writer’s opinion that there was no issue of silver medals to the thousands of troops has not changed, for those had a
sufficiently low value to have escaped the melting pot in far greater numbers than the two or so examples recorded today.74

We are fortunate to have Simon's 1657 account that includes the Lord Protector medal, although there may have been later records that were lost, leaving the known account to represent only a portion of the medals made. There is no documentation for the Funeral medal, so their survival figures mean nothing; it is clear that the Lord General medal was an unfinished product; and we have no documentation or accounts for the production of Cromwell coins, leaving them in a perpetual state of limbo. A recent Charles II/Simon paper by this writer might have benefited somewhat from a study into the PRO originals from which the Calendar entries were summarised.

Numismatists are usually well aware of the importance of combining their studies of the physical coins and medals with a thorough search and use of whatever documentation for their production and issue can be found, and they understand the potential consequences of historical records for their arguments. A more active partnership between numismatists and historians can be rewarding, if not indeed essential. Historians can provide primary source material and interpretations and illuminate the circumstances of a particular issue and, in turn, numismatists can make historians aware of distinctive characteristics and use that allow coins and medals to convey their own historical information. Unfortunately, studies are often forced to be developed in the absence of documents, requiring that numismatists first be certain that documents truly do not exist, and then stress the limitations and uncertainties that attend any such lack of records. These limitations may be particularly severe in the case of items of high intrinsic value and low original issue, with the survival rate often too small for statistics to offer assistance.

APPENDIX A – SIMON'S ACCOUNTS

Public Records Office, State Papers, Domestic, cxliv, leafs 66, 67, 68 or, in their terminology, SP 18/144, 66–68. This writer's comments are in square brackets [ ], and the transcription is by Dr Bernard Capp. Simon's arithmetic is correct, with weights in agreement with those audited for payment by Barkstead (Appendix B). How individual weights could be considered so exact as to equal the sums is unclear, unless rings and chain links were used for adjustment, and even that is seldom consistent with the weights of specimens known today. These should be the original documents, transcribed for Simon from his notes, with each page verified by his signature, probably in his own hand. They were then copied into the minute book defined in Appendix C. The style of the accounts is much different from Simon's other ones of 1657 and 1665. No recipients are named, other than Penn for his additional chain.

[SP 18/144/leaf 66] ...............
[Navy's seal] '23.August 1656
By the Comm[iss] for the Ad[miral] & Navig.
Whereas by two several accounts delivered unto the said Comm[iss] by Mr Thomas Simon, there appears to be due unto him the sume of Eleaven pounds eighteen shillings and Six pence (over and above the Two Thousand pounds already receaved by him from the prize Office for the makeing of severall Gould Medalls & Chaines for the fleet. It is ordered that it be referred to the Comm[iss] for the Navy to make out a bill unto the said Thomas Simon for the said sume of Eleaven pounds eighteen shillings & Six pence, being the balancie of the said Accompts.

John Clerke
Edw. Hopkins
Rob. Beake'

[endorsed] I [???] RM [initials]

74 M. Lessen, 'The Cromwell Dunbar medals, by Simon', BNJ 51 (1981), 126–7. The discussion here is about the original, contemporary medals, and has nothing to do with restrikes or false dies. In light of such a low survival of naval medals this writer has to reconsider the question of the quantity of gold Dunbars that might have been made in 1651. The few Dunbars known today, at what was claimed in his paper to be a very high survival, had implied that there was no real distribution or issuance. Perhaps it now should be argued that, although there could not have been a silver issue to the troops, maybe gold medals were given to the highest ranks, resulting in a poor, but not longer atypical, survival. In that case the major military figures at Dunbar would be the first candidates to consider for the gold medals, and then maybe all the other officers. There are no accounting records for the Dunbars. The two small naval medals of 1649 and 50 (MI 390/11 and Wyard's MI 390/12) similarly tend to imply very low survival, but figures here have not been researched.
1653. February the 25th Delivered to the Honble The Comrs of The Admiralty and Navy one Meddale with a Large border and Chaine of gold weighing as is here under mentioned.

March the 17th more Delivered 17. gold Meddales with Large borders (Whereof 8 with gold Chaines) which were sent to the Lieut. of the Tower with their Honrs letter directed to him for to receive them seeing their weight which was as here after is expressed.

1654. June the 13th more Delivered by their Honrs order to the Lieut. of the Tower 70. Meddales with Lesse borders, and 79. plaine all of gold which were weighed the 16th instant, and found to weigh, particularly as followeth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meddales</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>ou. dw. gr.</th>
<th>ou. dw. gr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9. 8. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2. 6. 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1. 12. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 plaine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23. 12. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142. 1. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35. 9. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23. 12. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47. 2. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21. 1. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72. 18. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. 40 pticularly 9. 8. 10 Severaly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47. 2. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21. 1. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72. 18. 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

167

Cost £3 11s. y e ou. is £1619. 15. 4\(\frac{1}{4}\)

For the fashion of 456. ounces 5 pennywts & 11 grains at 13s. 4d the ounce is £304. 3. 7\(\frac{1}{2}\)

flr Cases for the aforesaid 167. Meddales cost £14. 2. 2

June the 14th Delivered to their Honrs one Meddale weighing 18 penny Weight and 11 grains with a Case, given for Service donn in ye Triumph expressed on it £4. 1. 1

July the 22nd paid by their Honrs order (of 21st instant) to Mr Thomas Edwards for ribbands to hang the Meddales £9. 17. 6

Restitution due for the Balance £48. 1. 6

Tho:Simon [Pl. 14, 25]

£2000

1653. January the 17th Received out of the Prize Office by vertue of a Warrant bearing date the 2.d of December given to me by the Honble The Comrs of The Admiralty and Navy for 1500. pounds, for gold Meddales (Whereof some with Chaines) for the Officers of the Fleete £1500

1654. May ye 11th. more Reed. from the aforesaid Office by another Warrant from their Honrs dated the 27th of April for 500. pounds for the use aforesaid. Rec. £500

Tho:Simon

[cover endorsed] ‘Account of Meddales’

£2000

1655. March the 16. delivered unto the Honble The Comrs of the Admiralty and Navy an addition of chaine for Gen: Penns Meddall weighing as followeth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oz dw gr</th>
<th>7. 2. 7 [3415 gr = £30 cost to the navy]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1656. June the 14 delivered to their Honrs a Medda\(\uparrow\) and chaine weighing 7. 1. 7 [weight is unfortunately the sum of medal and chain, so the medal type itself cannot be determined] £ s

is together 14. 3. 14. cost 3 11 y e o h. is £50. 6. 9

The fashion at 13 sh 4 pence ye ounce is £9. 9. 1

for a case for the said Meddale [singular] £4. 2

Tho:Simon £60
'Remaineth due unto the Honble The Comrs of the Admiralty and Navy upon account of the 2000. pounds imploited in Meddalls and chaines for the Officers of the Fleete, maid by Thomas Simon, and also by him delivered to their Hon's in the year 1653, the 25th of February. 1. Meddall and chaine. The 17.th of March delivered 8. Medalles whereof 8. with chaines. In the year 1654. the 13.th of June delivered 149 Meddles, and the 14.th of the same 1. Medall more delivered which makes 168. [169 with the medal and chain of June 14, 1656, which he omitted in this summary] The weight of all beeing particula-zed in the account thereof given; wherein is comming to their Hon's the some of

For the Balance of this account ...... [£] 48. l. 6
[£] 11. 18. 6
[£] 60. – –

Aug’th 1656
Tho:Simon.'

APPENDIX B – BARKSTEAD’S CONFIRMING WEIGHTS

Public Records Office SP 18/84/39–40; very briefly summarized in CSPD 7 (1654) p. 516, referencing SPD lxxxiv, 22. These figures match those in Simon’s account (Appendix A), remembering that the very first £300 medal to Blake or Monck was not part of this shipment. The meaning of the term ‘double’ is not known (probably strands). The writer’s comments are in square brackets [ ].

[SP 18/84/leaf 39.covers endorsed] .................
‘Colo Barkstead note of ye weight of ye Medalls 3 July 1654’
‘These To ye Right Honble ye Comrs of ye Adm’lty & Navy/[signed . .]’

[SP 18/84/leaf 40] .................
‘Right Honble’
In answer to your [?re?] of ye 16th March 1653 & yo’re orders one of ye 13th June 1654 yo’re other of ye [?§] July instant, I have delivered to M’ John Powell & M’ Symonds all those meddalls of Gold I formerly received from M’ Symonds of the ptticular weights whereof are as follows

| Blake or Monck | One greate meddall with a Chaine 12 double | oz dwt gr |
| Penn | One greate meddall with a Chaine 6 double | 71:00:12 |
| Lawson | One greate meddall with a Chaine 4 double | 35:09:10 |
| Flags | five other meddalls with chaines 2 double each meddall weighing | 23:12:10 |
| [no chains] | Nyne other meddalls with out chaines each meddall weighing | 09:08:10 |

These being ye first 17 that I received weigh all :198:05:22

| laurel | 70 Smaller meddalls weighing each | oz dwt gr |
| plaine | 79 Smaller meddals weighing each | 01:12:14 |

The totall of ye 2 last pcells is :186:19:01

The totall 6th 385:04:23

Not more but that I am
Tower Lond
July 3d, 1654
yo’re, very humble serv’t
Jo Barkstead”
In the British Library, Additional MS 9305 comprises two Admiralty minute books, totalling 243 folios (486 pages). The first, folios 1-107, covers the period 19 April 1645 to 17 May 1648. The second, folios 108-243, covers the period 1 April 1656 to 31 March 1657. Folio 157 verso and recto, for 23 August 1656, is an exact and full copy of Simon's accounts shown in Appendix A, allowing for spelling differences, and is therefore not repeated here.

**APPENDIX D - FRANCOIS FAGEL**

This information on the well-known Dutch collector, who owned the Royal Collection's medal illustrated in van Loon, was kindly written by Dr Gay van der Meer in a personal communication, 1996.

'The archives of the Fagel family are preserved in the Dutch State Archive (Algemeen Rijksarchief, Prins Willem Alexanderhof 20, Den Haag). Many members of this family held official functions. Their archives contain many documents on official business, but also many private papers and letters. There is an inventory by N. M. Japikse, *Het Archief van de Familie Fagel's*, 's-Gravenhage 1964, comprising 5280 numbers.

Francois Fagel was the third of the five Fagels who became griffier (chief secretary) of the States-General of the Dutch Republic. At that time this was about equivalent to the function of Minister of Foreign Affairs. He is usually named Francois Fagel de Oude (the elder), to distinguish him from similarly named members of his family. He lived from 1659 to 1746, and was griffier from 1690 to 1744. He was succeeded in this function by his nephew Hendrik Fagel de Oude (1706-1790), to whom he also left his large medal collection. His successor and grandson Hendrik Fagel de Jonge (1765-1824) later inherited the collection. This Hendrik was in England as extraordinary ambassador when French troops occupied the Dutch Republic in 1795. Between 1798 and 1823 he also lived in England. [Tyssen's dates were 1756-1800] If the Fagel collection of medals was sold to Tyssen, as Hawkins says, he must have been the seller. There may be references to this sale in his private letters. Francois the elder often referred to his medals in his unpublished private letters (nos. 2024-2094), especially in his correspondence (in French) with his friend Philippe Baron de Stosch, who bought many medals for him in Italy.

There is a very good booklet with the title *Francois Fagel. Portrait van een honnete homme*, by Dr J. Heringa, Assen 1982, ISBN 906011.109.5 (an offprint from *Jaarboek Die Haghe* 1980), which treats his character, life and work exhaustively, on the basis of his correspondence.'

**KEY TO PLATES 6-14**

Where oversized photographs are shown, they were the only direct ones available, in which cases photographs from other publications may be included to show actual size. None of the illustrations are from 1:1 contact prints, making precise measurements inadvisable.

**Trophy Large Border type (TLB):**

1a steel die, negative normal, British Museum photograph.
1b steel die, negative reversed, British Museum photograph.
1c view of the steel die from a plaster cast by Keith Howes.
2 lead uniface restrike, and its reverse with the paper annotation, author.
3 white metal uniface restrike, and its reverse with the ink annotation, author.
4 print, engraving(?) which accompanied 2 and 3 and shows the die crack, author.
5 silver plate restrike(?) MI 401/30, photographed from *Medallic Illustrations*.
6c TLB1 – sketch of the case, not to scale.
6d TLB1 – the display at the National Maritime Museum.
7a TLB2 – Royal Collection, Windsor, *oversize*. Royal Collection copyright photograph, reproduced by gracious permission of Her Majesty The Queen.
7b TLB2 – same, plaster cast, photographed from Mayo, *Medals and Decorations of the British Army and Navy*.
8 TLB3 – Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; the commercial postcard.
9 TLB – cast in silver, Hunterian Museum photograph.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Lesse Border type (LLB):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>LLB1 – same. Plaster cast. Photographed from the Murdoch sale catalogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LLB2 – British Museum photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaine Borderless type (PB):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PB1 – Photographed from the Heckett sale catalogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PB2 – Photographed from the Spink Auction 50 catalogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PB3 – John Clifton’s author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>PB4 – British Museum photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PB5 – SAVING Y’ TRIVMPH. British Museum photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>PB7 – Ashmolean Museum photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PB8 – Haddock’s. Photographed from the Murdoch sale catalogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>PB10 – Photographed from the Col. Murray sale catalogue, re-scaled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>PB15 – Photographed from the Hamilton-Smith sale catalogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PB – Cast in silver. British Museum photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Excerpt from the account with Simon’s (?) signature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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