Short Articles and Notes
The Gold Coinage of Eadbald, King of Kent (AD 616–40)
Gareth Williams

Mark Blackburn has recently published a short discussion of the AVPDVARL REGES shilling type. This was prompted by the discovery in 1997 of a new example of the type at Tangmere, near Chichester, in Sussex. This was acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum, and Dr Blackburn’s article compared the Tangmere coin with the well-known examples from the Crondall hoard of 1828 (now in the Ashmolean Museum) and the Pas-de-Calais (now in the collection of the American Numismatic Society in New York). All three coins were struck from the same obverse die, but each was struck from a different reverse die. Dr Blackburn accepted the attribution of the type to Eadbald of Kent, and suggested that all three reverse inscriptions represent more or less blundered versions of a literate original which had the moneyer and mint form familiar from late Saxon coins. Both of these interpretations seem entirely reasonable, and the purpose of this note is not to challenge Dr Blackburn’s views. However, in the few months since the publication of Dr Blackburn’s article, two further examples of the type have come to light, and it seems appropriate to discuss all five coins together in a more accessible forum than Dr Blackburn’s original publication. (Pl. 26, 1–5)

One of the ‘new’ finds was actually the first of the five to be discovered. It was in the eighteenth-century cabinet of Dr William Hunter (although its previous provenance is unrecorded), and is now in the Hunterian collection in Glasgow. The existence of this coin seems largely to have escaped the notice of scholars, but the recent publication by Donal Bateson and Ian Campbell of a catalogue of Byzantine and early Medieval coins in the Hunterian has brought it to the public eye. The final example, like the Tangmere coin, is a metal detector find, discovered near Shorne in Kent in 1998. This has now been acquired by the British Museum, with the financial assistance of the British Museum Society. Like the other three coins, these two share the same obverse die, but have different reverses, giving a total of five reverse dies to one obverse. All five give distinct blundered versions of the reverse inscription, although there is some consistency between the five inscriptions, and both the Hunterian and the Pas-de-Calais coins contain a clear London mint signature.

All five coins share the same obverse. The inscription is partially off-flan in every case, but survives almost complete on the Crondall coin, as follows:

AVPDVARL REGES

There are three points of interest within the inscription. Firstly, the antepenultimate letter of the first word is only clearly visible on the Crondall coin, and even there the top of the letter goes off the edge of the coin. It is thus impossible to be certain whether this letter represents a B or an inverted R. The final letter of the name is a D with a line through it. The most obvious interpretation is that this represents the form δ, or edh, used in the Germanic languages to represent the sound <th>. Thus Michael Metcalf transliterates the name as Audvarld’, although Ian Stewart gives the form Audvarld. More recently however, Sean Miller has suggested that the stroke through the D may represent a suspension mark indicating an abbreviation of the Latin ending -us, giving a form Audvarldus or Auduabldus, and Marion Archibald has similarly suggested that it may represent an abbreviated Latin genitive ending. This would accompany the REGES, which she takes to represent Latin genitive singular regis, giving the overall meaning ‘Of King Audvarld’. This would explain the curiosity of the form REGES in place of the more usual REX.

5 Cited in Blackburn, Eadbald of Kent, p. 3.
The forms Auduarldus and Auduabldus are close to the forms Adualualdi and Audubaldi, given for Eadbald of Kent by Bede in his Historia Ecclesiastica, written nearly a century after the death of Eadbald. Apart from the coins, no contemporary form of the name survives. Nevertheless, the attribution to Eadbald is now widely accepted. Dating the coins to the reign of Eadbald (616–40) is consistent with the fact that one of the coins was found in the Crondall hoard. By analogy with the fineness of Merovingian coins, Crondall is thought to date to c. 640, while from its relative fineness the 'Eadbald' coin is one of the earliest pieces in the hoard. Furthermore, not only does the name-form on the coin resemble that given for Eadbald, there is no other king of the period who presents a viable alternative, especially since the coins may be attributed to the mint of London (see below), which effectively limits the production of the coins to kings of the East Saxons or of Kent. Eadbald is also known to have converted to Christianity in the course of his reign, which is consistent with the use of the overtly Christian symbol of the cross and globe on both obverse and reverse. Thus, whilst the coins cannot be attributed to Eadbald prima facie, there are a number of aspects which point to this attribution, and no evidence to the contrary.

Whilst all five coins share the same obverse die, each has a different reverse, although all are apparently different versions of the same inscription.

Pas-de-Calais

Hunterian

Shorne

Crondall

Tangmere

The five coins may be divided into two groups. Those from the Pas-de-Calais and the Hunterian have the form LONDONVS, which is taken to be a London mint signature, and both are close in style to the obverse die. However, the first part of the legend on the Hunterian reverse is clearly blundered, whereas on the Pas-de-Calais coin this part of the legend is illegible, since all but the bases of the letters are off-flan. It is thus possible that the Pas-de-Calais coin represents the original, (more or less) literate, reverse die, but it could equally well represent another blundered version of the legend. Thus while the Pas-de-Calais die may be suggested as the first in the series, it may actually come after the Hunterian die, with a literate original still to be discovered. The remaining three coins all have blundered legends throughout, although a form of the LONDONVS legend can be recognised in all three. Similarly, the first section of all three legends bears some resemblance to that on the Hunterian coin. Of the three, it is difficult to establish a clear sequence. Stylistically, the Shorne reverse appears closest to the obverse and to the earlier two reverses. The forms of LONDONVS on this reverse and the Crondall coin are close, suggesting that the two should be close in the sequence. This would suggest a sequence of Shorne, Crondall, Tangmere. This would also fit with the relative crudity of some of the letter forms on the Tangmere coin. By contrast, Tangmere and Shorne are both close to the Hunterian reverse in the first part of the legend, with Tangmere arguably the closer of the two, which could suggest the sequence Tangmere, Shorne, Crondall. However, one should note that the legend on the Crondall coin is partially obliterated, and if it were not for this, it might be equally close to the Hunterian coin. Thus on balance


9 Stewart, Anglo-Saxon gold coins, p. 147.

10 Sutherland, Anglo-Saxon Gold Coinage, pp. 44–5, 53.

11 Blackburn, Eadbald of Kent, p. 3.
an overall sequence of Pas-de-Calais, Hunterian, Shorne, Crondall, Tangmere is perhaps to be preferred, but this is clearly open to personal interpretation.

As mentioned above, Dr Blackburn has suggested that the reverse legend may represent a combination of moneyer's name and mint name, with the LONDENVS element clearly representing London, and the preceding elements representing different blundered versions of a personal name. He suggested that this might be a form ending in -DVNBAL, -AVNBAL or similar, Dr Bateson and Dr Campbell, however, suggest the form TIPNEAL for the Hunterian coin.13

### TABLE 1. Weights, diameters and fineness of the five coins of the AVDVARLD REGES type, in descending weight order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Fineness (% gold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow, Hunterian Collection</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, Pas-de-Calais</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, Shorne</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Tangmere</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Crondall</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weight and diameter are fairly consistent between the five coins, although there is greater variety in fineness (see Table 1). Interestingly, the coins which from their inscriptions seem to come earliest in the sequence have both the smallest diameters and the highest weights, the latter tending to confirm the sequence established by the inscriptions. However, this is not the case with the fineness. The Shorne coin, which should be relatively late in the sequence has the highest recorded percentage of gold, whilst the Pas-de-Calais example, which should be close to the head of the sequence, is of significantly poorer quality than the others. It is unfortunate that at present the fineness of the Hunterian coin, which one might expect to be closest to that of the Pas-de-Calais coin, is not yet available. It would be rash to read too much into the variation in fineness, however. At such an early stage in the English coinage one may question whether either king or moneyer was particularly concerned about the precise metal content of the coins as long as they appeared to be of reasonably high quality gold. The variation in the coins may simply reflect variation in the quality of gold artefacts (or Merovingian coin) melted down to provide the raw material for the coins. This is consistent with a broader pattern in the fineness of Merovingian and Anglo-Saxon gold coins of Eadbald's period. Fineness ranges from ninety down to fifty per cent. But whilst an overall decline can be traced throughout the late sixth to seventh century period, this was not a smooth progression. Furthermore, one may note that in other types found in the Crondall hoard, a variation of ten per cent in fineness is not remarkable, and furthermore this variation does not appear to be consistent with the sequence of dies within individual types.

Despite the range of fineness to be found within a single type, it may nevertheless be instructive to compare the fineness of the Eadbald coinage with those of the other Anglo-Saxon types found in Crondall.

### TABLE 2. Comparative fineness of those types from the Crondall hoard described by Metcalf as 'substantive Anglo-Saxon types', with a further subdivision (following Stewart) between the WITMEN prototype and WITMEN derivatives.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Upper limit</th>
<th>Lower limit</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross on Steps</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadbald</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'London derived'</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITMEN prototype</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDENVS</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbo</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMC</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAN</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Blackburn, Eadbald of Kent, p. 3.
13 Bateson & Campbell, Byzantine and Early Medieval Coins, p. 171.
14 R.F. Coleman, and A. Wilson, 'Activation analyses of Merovingian gold coins', in E.T Hall & D.M. Metcalf (editors), as in n. 8, pp. 88-92, 100-107; W.A. Oddy, 'The Analysis of Four Hoards of Merovingian Gold Coins', in Hall & Metcalf, (editors), pp. 111-26. I am grateful to Mike Cowell of the Department of Scientific Research at the British Museum for analysing the Shorne coin, and for helpful comments and references on the metallurgy of the period. 15 Metcalf, Thrymsas and Sceattas, p. 36 & pl. 1-3; Stewart, Anglo-Saxon gold coins, pp. 169-70.
Whether one looks at the upper limit, the lower limit or the mean, the coinage of Eadbald is close to the top of the table, with the only issue of comparable fineness being the Anglo-Merovingian ‘Cross on Steps’ type. Despite the caveat expressed earlier, this does suggest that these two types may well be earlier than the majority of coins in the Crondall hoard. This would be consistent with the opinion expressed earlier that the Crondall example of the Eadbald type comes towards the end of the type stylistically, as well as having the lowest weight of the five known examples, and the fact that the Eadbald coin is one of the finest pieces in the Crondall hoard. This would suggest that the coinage of Eadbald is so slightly represented in Crondall because the hoard was deposited at a period when the coinage in the name of Eadbald was falling out of use. Given Eadbald’s regnal dates of AD616-40, this would be consistent with the dating of the deposit of Crondall to the early 640s. It also tends to confirm that the coinage of Eadbald is one of the earliest, if not the earliest, of the substantive Anglo-Saxon coinages.

The new finds also shed a very different light on the comparative rarity of the type. Most of the types found in Crondall have yet to be discovered separately. Thus, whilst more examples are known in total of both the LVNDINIV (7) and Licinius (10) types than of the Eadbald type, the Eadbald type is known from five separate finds (all but one provenanced) including Crondall, the LVNDINIV type is known only from Crondall, and the Licinius type only from Crondall and one other find. Furthermore, each of these types is known from one obverse die and three reverses, compared to one obverse and five reverses for the Eadbald type. Both features suggest that the coinage in the name of Eadbald may have been more substantial than either of the others. This does not mean that it was such a substantial coinage as the WITMEN group (including derivatives), with twenty-nine known examples, of which only twenty-one came from Crondall, with only three others provenanced, giving a total of four to nine separate finds. The type has a total of eleven obverses and twelve reverses, suggesting a much more substantial coinage. Similarly the so-called ‘London-derived’ group (the London derivation is highly questionable) is known from thirteen examples, including nine from Crondall and another three with provenances, giving a total of four to five separate finds. This type has a total of four obverse and nine reverses, again indicating a more substantial issue.

Nevertheless, the existence of five reverse dies for the Eadbald type, with five separate finds, suggests a coinage of some size. One may reasonably question whether an issue made for purely donative purposes would be likely to require so many reverses. Whilst on the current evidence it appears to be a less substantial coinage than either the WITMEN or ‘London derivative’ types, it also appears to be earlier, and furthermore to be very close to the beginning of the Anglo-Saxon series. Thus the fact that slightly later issues appear to be more substantial may reflect the spread and development of a monetary economy in southern England. In that case, the gold coinage of Eadbald may plausibly be interpreted as the small-scale beginning of a monetary economy, rather than simply a symbolic issue for the purposes of royal status or religious donation.

KEY TO PLATE 26

1 Pas-de-Calais
2 Hunterian
3 Shorne
4 Crondall
5 Tangmere

16 Discussion of the unique (and early) LEVDARDYS EP and EVSEBMONTA coins, and of the broader category of so-called ‘Anglo-Merovingian’ coinage, falls outside the scope of this paper. A more substantial discussion of early Anglo-Saxon gold is planned for the near future.

17 Metcalf, Thrymsas and Sceattas, p. 58, lists 28 examples. A further example, without provenance, but from the same dies as Sutherland pl. IV, 13, was shown at the British Museum in 1990.
A FURTHER PARCEL FROM THE APPLEDORE HOARD

GARETH WILLIAMS

The hoard of Anglo-Saxon pennies discovered near Appledore in Kent in 1997 is now reasonably well known. Both my preliminary report, and a response to that report by Stewart Lyon, have already appeared in Spinks Numismatic Circular.¹ The hoard contained 490 silver pennies, which with a few exceptions were all of the 'Expanding Cross' type of Edward the Confessor, c. 1050–1053. This type is unusual in having two distinct weight standards, of which only the 'heavy' issue is represented in the hoard, although a handful of earlier lighter types are also included. On the basis of the composition of the hoard, I have suggested the possibility that the heavy issue of 'Expanding Cross' may precede the light. This view has been challenged, though not entirely dismissed, by Stewart Lyon, drawing on material of other hoards. Both of us are in agreement, however, that firm conclusions cannot be drawn until both the hoard and the type have been fully studied. The hoard has now been acquired by the British Museum, and full publication can be expected in due course. I therefore do not propose to renew the discussion at this point.

However, it does seem proper to draw to public attention the discovery of a further parcel from the same hoard, discovered in the summer of 1998. In all, this contained twelve coins, including one cut half-penny, and one penny broken into two fragments, with a further fragment missing. This takes the total of the hoard to 502 coins including twenty-eight cut halves, plus some very small fragments. The new parcel reflects the pattern of the hoard generally. All the coins are of the heavy sub-group of the 'Expanding Cross' type. Seven of the coins are from Canterbury, with just over half of the whole hoard from the same mint. However, as in the main hoard, coins from relatively distant mints are represented, with one coin each from Northampton and Nottingham. None of these mints was previously represented in the hoard, so this gives a total of thirty-four mints for the hoard; Bedford, Bristol, Cambridge, Canterbury, Chester, Chichester, Colchester, Dorchester, Dover, Exeter, Gloucester, Hastings, Hereford, Huntingdon, Ilchester, Ipswich, Leicester, Lewes, Lincoln, London, Northampton, Norwich, Nottingham, Oxford, Romney, Sandwich, Shaftesbury, Stamford, Steyning, Thetford, Wallingford, Wilton, Winchester, York.

The contents of the 1998 parcel of the hoard are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Moneyers and weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>EDPERD (1.70, 1.58), ELPED (1.57, 1.58), GYLFINE (1.66, 1.71), MANNA (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LEOFRED (1.68, 1.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEOPINE (1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PVLNOD (1.62) (in two pieces, with a further fragment missing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GODPINE (NE) (0.67) (cut half)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE ENGLEHEART PARCEL OF COINS FROM THE 1817 DORKING HOARD

HUGH PAGAN

In a previous article in this Journal the present writer drew attention in passing to a group of coins in a Sotheby sale of 11–12 April 1820 which were in his view evidently from the 1817 Dorking hoard of ninth-century Anglo-Saxon coins.¹ The vendor of the coins concerned could be identified as Nathaniel Brown Engleheart, a proctor in Doctors' Commons,² and this writer's comment at the time was that 'research will no


The coins were sold anonymously, but contemporary annotated copies of the catalogue identify the vendor of these lots as 'Engleheart, Doctor's Commons'.

The coins were sold anonymously, but contemporary annotated copies of the catalogue identify the vendor of these lots as 'Engleheart, Doctor's Commons'.
doubt show that he had some connection with Dorking'.

That the coins were from the Dorking hoard can now be securely established from a note by the celebrated contemporary collector James Dodsley Cuff against lot 210 in his interleaved and annotated copy of the 1824 sale catalogue of the collection of Thomas Dimsdale. The coin in question is one of the very rare coins of King Beornwulf of Mercia (823–825), of Portrait/Cross Crosslet type by the moneyer Eadnoth, and Cuff's note on it reads as follows:

One of those found near Dorking bought by Mr Engleheart of a Coachman. At his sale Mr Rodwell gave £11.11. for it. Mr D. obtained it for £11.0.06 at Mr Rodwell's sale.

As the coins acquired in this way by Mr Engleheart were not taken account of by Taylor Combe in his publication of the hoard in *Archaeologia*, they are effectively unpublished in the context of the Dorking hoard, and as they are identified in the 1820 catalogue by Ruding references not immediately intelligible today, it seems proper to list them here in a more up-to-date manner, with such annotation as seems necessary.

In the Sotheby catalogue of 11–12 April 1820 Engleheart's coin collection occupies lots 41–79, followed by his coin cabinet as lot 80. The coins in lots 41–43 and 59–79 constitute a small collection of English mediaeval and modern coins and medals without any items of particular interest, but those in lots 44–58, barring one coin of Edward the Confessor which was listed as a second coin in lot 58, are a homogeneous group of fifteen Anglo-Saxon coins struck between the 820s and the early 860s. The absence of any coins struck by London moneyers and the predominance within the parcel of coins of Open Cross type in the names of Kings Aethelwulf and Aethelberht are features entirely compatible with this being a parcel from the Dorking hoard, and there is no reason to suppose that any of the coins are interlopers from another source.

Of these, lots 46, 47, 54 and 57 were purchased by the dealer Whiteaves and no information is available on them other than that provided by the sale catalogue. Lots 44, 48, 50, 53, 56 and 58 were purchased by R.E. Rodwell, who died not long after and whose collection came up for sale in its turn as early as 27–29 November 1821; consideration of the 1821 sale catalogue adds a little to the information provided by the catalogue of April 1820. Lastly, lots 45, 49, 51, 52 and 55 were purchased by Lieut.-Col. William Durrant, and all five coins can be identified in the 1847 sale catalogue of Durrant's collection, annotated copies of which both confirm the 1820 provenance and are of actual or potential help in determining the history of the coins after 1847.

The coins may be listed as follows:

**EAST ANGLIAN MINT**

*Beornwulf of Mercia (823–825)*


   Lockett (1958) 2663 ex Rashleigh (1909) 55 ex Murchison (1866) 96 ex Dymock (1858) 64 ex Joseph Barratt ex Rich (1828) 15 ex Dimsdale (1824) 210 ex Rodwell (1821) 84 ex Engleheart (1820) 44.

2. *Cross and Wedges/SAXONIORVM type (Canterbury mint). Moneyer not stated in 1820 catalogue but Ruding reference given is to a coin of this type by the moneyer Osmund.*

   Engleheart (1820) 50, purchased by Rodwell = probably Rodwell (1821) 90, a coin of Aethelwulf, no other details (this lot added in ink in the British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, copy of the catalogue).


   Fitzwilliam Museum Cambridge ex C.E. Blunt ex Sir John Hanham, Bart., ex Lord Granville (1944) 979 ex Montagu (1895) 493 ex Shepherd (1885) 64 ex Dymock (1858) 107 ex G. Sparkes ex Durrant (1847) 9 ex Engleheart (1820) 51. The identity of the Dymock and Durrant specimens is shown by a note 'now mine T.F.D.' in Dymock's annotated copy of the Durrant catalogue.


   J.B. Bergne (but not in Bergne sale catalogue, 1873 ?) ex Durrant (1847) 8 (lot purchased by Bergne) ex Engleheart (1820) 49. By 1873 Bergne seems to have replaced this coin by another coin of the same moneyer of a rare type variant on which CANT appears on the obverse and DORIBI on the reverse (Bergne (1873) 139, subsequently J.H. Young (1881) 10).

5. *DORIBI/CANT type (Rochester mint). Moneyer Wealheard.*

   Rodwell (1821) 91 ex Engleheart (1820) 48. Although the Ruding references used to identify the coin in the catalogues of 1820 and 1821 vary, both are references

---

3 I owe this reference to the kindness of Tim Webb Ware, to whom Cuff's copy of this catalogue now belongs.
to coins of DORIBI/CANT type and the equation proposed here seems justifiable. Only the Rodwell catalogue names the moneyer.


8. Open Cross type. Moneyer Torhulf. Durrant (1847) 5 (lot purchased by Brockett) ex Engleheart (1830) 45.

Aethelbearht of Wessex (858-866)


12. Open Cross type. Moneyer Manninc. Presumably Cuff (1854) 440 ex Rodwell (1821) 92 ex Engleheart (1820) 53. The Rodwell catalogue does not name the moneyer of the coin in lot 92, but the coin purchased by Rodwell in the 1820 sale was of the moneyer Manninc; Cuff purchased lot 92 in the Rodwell sale; and lot 440 in the Cuff sale was of this same moneyer Manninc.

Archbishop Ceolnoth of Canterbury (833–870)

13. Bust/Monogram type. Moneyer not stated but the Ruding reference is to a coin of the moneyer Wunhere. Engleheart (1820) 57.

14. Bust/Monogram type. Type and moneyer not stated in 1820 catalogue, but the Ruding reference in the Rodwell catalogue is to a coin of this type of the moneyer Wunhere, as above. Rodwell (1821) 88 ex Engleheart (1820) 58 (first coin).

15. Open Cross type. Moneyer not stated but Ruding reference in 1820 and Rodwell catalogues is to a coin of the moneyer Hebeca. Rodwell (1821) 87 ex Engleheart (1820) 56.

A HOARD OF ÆDELRAED II ‘LONG CROSS’ PENNIES FROM BRAMDEAN COMMON, HAMPSHIRE

GARETH WILLIAMS

A parcel of nineteen late Saxon coins was discovered at Bramdean Common in Hampshire on 22 November 1997 by Mr Mark Carpenter, and a further coin of the same type discovered during subsequent archaeological investigation of the site. These coins were brought to the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum for examination on 5 February 1998. They were subsequently declared Treasure Trove, and have now been acquired by Winchester Museum. A photographic record of the coins remains at the British Museum.

The coins were largely found closely grouped, ranging from surface level to around one foot deep, with a further two or three coins found slightly to the north. All the coins are of the ‘Long Cross’ type of Ædelraed II, king of England, 978–1016. This type dates from c. 997–c. 1003, according to the currently accepted chronology. They were all produced by the moneyer Godric at the mint of London. The fact of all the coins being of the same type, mint and moneyer clearly indicates that they represent a single hoard, even though a few of the coins were discovered some distance from the rest. The disturbance of the soil in connection with clearance of the area in recent years probably accounts for the separation of these coins from the rest.

Archaeological investigation of the site yielded no associated finds, but did indicate more or less continuous use of the site from the Roman period to the later Middle Ages. The site is also close to a road which is thought likely to have existed in the period at which the coins were deposited.

The coins were all struck from the same pair of dies. This suggests that the coins had come more or less directly from the mint. Normally, it would also be reasonable to suppose that they came from a single striking, especially since all the coins share a die axis of 270°. However, close examination of the reverses suggests that the coins were struck on two or more occasions. Whilst all the coins came from the same dies, wear is apparent in the reverse die on some coins but not on others. The reverse inscription reads +GO/DRIC/MOL/VND, with the groups of letters divided by the crescent terminals of the central cross. While the coins are generally well preserved (the single coin found during subsequent excavation is bent, and rather more battered than the rest, possibly as a result of modern tree-clearance on the site), there is one point on the reverse inscription which shows notable variation in quality. The three-crescent terminal of the cross between the L and the V of the mint signature is perfectly clear on eight of the coins, but completely bare on five more, suggesting that a die flaw had developed between the two strikings. The remaining seven coins show some wear at this point, but it is not clear whether this represents simply
gradual wear or poor striking on the first of the two
strikings, or a separate striking as an intermediate
phase.

No comparable patterns of wear appear on the
obverse, which reads ÆDELRED REX ANGLO. The
weights do nothing either to confirm or dispel the
suggested pattern of striking. Coins of the suggested
first striking range between 1.39g and 1.55, coins of the
possible intermediate striking between 1.41g and 1.55g,
and coins of the final striking more closely grouped
between 1.44g and 1.49g. While the upper end of the
range is lowest on what is argued to be the latest group,
the difference is too slight, and the overall numbers of
coins too low, for any valid statistical conclusions to be
drawn.

This is interesting because it confirms what common
sense would suggest – that the moneyer kept a stockpile
of coins ready for exchange, rather than expecting his
customer to wait while he melted down the silver which
he had been given and prepared blanks on which to
strike new coin. Such a ‘production-line’ approach
seems particularly appropriate for a busy mint like
London. However, the coins themselves can tell us
nothing of why the depositor of the hoard should
have obtained his coins from London rather than the
nearby mint of Winchester.

A REVISED CHRONOLOGY OF THE ENGLISH COINAGE,
1317–1333

MARTIN ALLEN

PETER Woodhead and Ian Stewart used the recorded
outputs of the London and Canterbury mints, and the
representation of those mints in the Montrave hoard, to
calculate that Fox class 15 was probably introduced in
1320. The choice of 1 October 1317 as an arbitrary
starting date for class 14, to coincide with the
beginning of an accounting period, was a useful
working hypothesis, with a stated error of a few months
either way. Woodhead and Stewart assumed that class
13 was still in production at Durham in April 1317. The
class 13 pence of Durham with the lion and lis mark of
Bishop Lewis de Beaumont (1317–1333) were struck
no earlier than June 1317. The writ authorizing the
supply of dies for Bishop Beaumont was issued on 1
June 1317, and the first dies were at the exchequer on
10 June. The numbers of class 13 and class 14 coins of
Bishop Beaumont in hoards seem to indicate that class
14 was introduced relatively early in the period
between June 1317 and the inception of class 15. Table
1 shows data from five hoards, published substantially
intact using the Fox classification. The 1886 Aberdeen
hoard is tabulated separately, as only 9,754 coins from
over 12,000 found have been adequately published.

There is considerable variation in the statistics from
the smaller hoards, but the predominance of class 14 pence
is undeniable.

TABLE 1. Bishop Beaumont pence in hoards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Class 13</th>
<th>Class 14</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen 1983</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen 1984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1:3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ednam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Doon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1:4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen 1886</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1:6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Woodhead and Stewart had to use statistics from only one hoard, Montrave, which provided the largest adequately recorded hoard group of Edwardian pence available when they wrote. This hoard was published by Edward Burns using his own classification, which unfortunately cannot be completely converted to the Fox classification.

Burns types A48 and A49 seem to have been approximately equivalent to Fox classes 14 and 15a–c respectively, but the Woodhead and Stewart statistics assuming exact equivalence must be compared with data from hoards published according to the Fox classification. Table 2 provides a comparison between the Montrave hoard and three of the hoards analysed so far.

### Table 2. Pence of classes 14–15c in hoards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Class 14</th>
<th>Classes 15a–c</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Aberdeen 1983</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1:1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen 1984</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1:0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Doon</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1:1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrave</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1:0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Aberdeen 1983</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1:0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen 1984</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1:0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Doon</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1:1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrave</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1:0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between the ratios suggest that the Montrave coins of type A48 included substantial numbers of class 15 pence, in addition to the class 14 pence expected, preventing further use of the Montrave statistics. In Tables 3 and 4 aggregates for the other hoards in Table 2 are compared with the recorded Canterbury and London outputs from 1 October 1317 to 29 September 1327.

### Table 3. Canterbury hoard aggregates and mint output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Coins</th>
<th>Cumulation</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Cumulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>123 (45%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1.10.1317–30.9.1318</td>
<td>£21,751 (33%)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>34 (12%)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1.10.1318–30.9.1319</td>
<td>£17,883 (27%)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>84 (31%)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1.10.1320–30.9.1321</td>
<td>£5,618 (8%)</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>24 (12%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7.10.1322–30.19.1323</td>
<td>£1,090 (2%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Peter Woodhead, B.H.I.H. Stewart and G.L.V. Tatler, "The Loch Doon treasure trove, 1956", BJN 38 (1969), 31–49. Pence described as transitional between classes 13 and 14 have been counted with the coins of class 14.
1 Mayhew, p. 47, notes the occurrence of a class 13 face on coins with a class 14 crown.
1 See also the references cited above.
1 Mayhew, The Aberdeen Upperkirkgate hoard, pp. 37–38, compared the 1886 Aberdeen find with the Loch Doon hoard, and suggested that the Aberdeen hoard's representation of the Canterbury and London mints was relatively unaffected by the dispersal of over 2,000 coins. However, this hoard's ratio between London coins of class 14 and classes 15a–c (1:1.73) is abnormally high, and it has been excluded from Tables 2 ad 3. The Boyton and Ednam hoards have also been excluded, as they seem to have been deposited during the issue of class 15c and class 15b respectively, causing under-representation of classes 15a–c.
1 The London statistics in Table 4 exclude one coin of class 15b from the 1983 Aberdeen hoard counted in Table 2. The outputs are taken from A New History of the Royal Mint, edited by C.E. Challis (Cambridge, 1992), p. 678. The evidence for the ending of class 15c at the London mint with silver purchased in November 1326 and recorded in the account of 1 October 1326 – 29 September 1327 is discussed by Peter Woodhead, "The early coinages of Edward III (1327–43)", J.J. North et al., The J.J. North Collection, 54–78, at pp. 56–59.
It is probable that the earlier classes in Tables 3 and 4 are under-represented in the hoards, owing to losses from circulation, so that the true cumulations should be larger than the stated percentages, possibly implying later dates. Furthermore, it is possible that class 14 began later than 1 October 1317, requiring later estimated dates for subsequent types than would otherwise be suggested. Nevertheless, some tentative conclusions are possible. Class 14 probably ended in 1319. Woodhead and Stewart may have been right to suggest that class 15a was struck for only a few months, and it was probably produced in 1319 or 1319-1320. The production of class 15b seems to have ended in 1321. Woodhead, in his review of the early coinages of Edward III, has shown that class 15c dies were still being used in London in November 1326, during the 1 October 1326-30 September 1327 accounting year. Class 15d2 dies seem to have been used at Canterbury to strike the silver received between 20 December 1330 and 26 March 1331, and class 15d2 dies were certainly supplied to York between 5 July and 28 December 1331. The dates for class 15d in Table 5 are consistent with Woodhead’s evidence and conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Coins</th>
<th>Cumulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>79 (51%)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>14 (9%)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>37 (24%)</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>25 (16%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounts</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Cumulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.10.1317-30.9.1318</td>
<td>£13,185 (30%)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.1318-30.9.1319</td>
<td>£8,729 (20%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.1319-30.9.1320</td>
<td>£8,577 (20%)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.1320-30.9.1321</td>
<td>£9,325 (21%)</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.1321-6.10.1322</td>
<td>£1,189 (3%)</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10.1322-29.9.1327</td>
<td>£2,500 (6%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Lord Stewartby has independently reached this conclusion.
12 Class 15d2 is distinguished from class 15d1 by a pellet in the centre of the initial cross on the obverse, and by three additional pellets on the reverse.
14 H.B. Earle Fox and J.S. Shirley-Fox, 'Numismatic history of the reigns of Edward I, II, and III' BMJ 10 (1915), 95-123. at p. 107 suggested that the crown on the class 15d1 reverse dies of Durham symbolized the bishop’s quasi-regal palatine rights, which included the mint. Bishop Beaumont petitioned for the maintenance of his palatine rights in both of the parliaments that met in 1327, obtaining an apparently unprecedented judgement confirming them in the January 1327 parliament. Class 15d2 dies seems to have been used at Canterbury to strike the silver received between 20 December 1330 and 26 March 1331, and class 15d2 dies were certainly supplied to York between 5 July and 28 December 1331. The dates for class 15d in Table 5 are consistent with Woodhead’s evidence and conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1317/18-1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>1319 or 1319-1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>1319/20-1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>1321-1327/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d1</td>
<td>1327/8-1330/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d2</td>
<td>1330/1-1335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Lord Stewartby has independently reached this conclusion.
12 Class 15d2 is distinguished from class 15d1 by a pellet in the centre of the initial cross on the obverse, and by three additional pellets on the reverse.
14 H.B. Earle Fox and J.S. Shirley-Fox, 'Numismatic history of the reigns of Edward I, II, and III' BMJ 10 (1915), 95-123. at p. 107 suggested that the crown on the class 15d1 reverse dies of Durham symbolized the bishop’s quasi-regal palatine rights, which included the mint. Bishop Beaumont petitioned for the maintenance of his palatine rights in both of the parliaments that met in 1327, obtaining an apparently unprecedented judgement confirming them in the January 1327 parliament. Class 15d2 dies seems to have been used at Canterbury to strike the silver received between 20 December 1330 and 26 March 1331, and class 15d2 dies were certainly supplied to York between 5 July and 28 December 1331. The dates for class 15d in Table 5 are consistent with Woodhead’s evidence and conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1317/18-1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>1319 or 1319-1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>1319/20-1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>1321-1327/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d1</td>
<td>1327/8-1330/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d2</td>
<td>1330/1-1335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HALFGROATS IN THE HENRY IV – HENRY V PERIOD

ERIC HARRIS

A study of the die-links in the transitional period between Henry IV and Henry V was made on the small corpus of the recorded groats and halfgroats which I was able to assemble. An unexplained observation was that the proportion of dies for halves to those for the groats diminished as the series progressed. The ratio between the numbers of the dies for halves to groats of the Henry IV ‘Light Coinage’ type III described by Potter and supplemented in my paper is 3:5, which is very close to the ratio 15:24 between the numbers of coins with these obverses I was able to trace. In contrast the numbers of dies for the ‘Emaciated Bust’ (= type A) and those for the ‘Scowling Bust’ (= type B) count 3:11 and the numbers of coins I recorded are in the ratio 8:38. The striking of halves of these types seems almost to have ceased. This prompted the question whether halfgroats of new or different types without the mullet mark were being struck at this time. This leaves open the question of what the type will be. Given the importance of the mullet, as attested by its use on other denominations, it is perhaps surprising that there were so few examples of this type. The purpose of this note is to describe what may be candidates for inclusion in Henry IV issues and to detail a certain mullet-bearing type of which the dies might have been struck from new dies. One particular difficulty is that wear or encrustation removes or obscures the mark. References to type III, type A and type B are to descriptions in the previous paper.

To commence with an account of the ‘new’ halves with low crown, it is appropriate to provide such evidence as is available to put them in the temporal sequence of the issues; this depends upon linking their dies or the dies used to strike what may qualify as additional halfgroats of new or different types. There are single and perhaps unique coins from two distinct dies with a low crown and no mullet but with elements of design which occur elsewhere. The obverse of PL. 14, no. 1 has the face as on type III halves but on a longer neck, and the crown is like that used on halves of types A and B. On the breast above the treasure there is a faint trefoil or quatrefoil. The reverse has a distinctive 0 with a swollen side and a small T in TAS; the arms of the long cross are longer than usual, as was the case on the Richard II reverse type IIa B illustrated by Potter on PL. XX in his paper on that period. The larger size allows the outer legend to have ADVIVTO all in one quarter. The obverse of PL. 14, no. 2 has the face and bust as on the types A and B halves, and the reverse has the normal long cross and letter Y, but the O is similar to the last. These two coins seem to have been struck from dies made from assorted puncheons. A third coin with low crown has a mullet added over a pellet to the right of the crown (PL. 14, no. 3); whether the die had been used before the addition is a question. The face here is completely different – there is a fault in the crown band at the left. The same portrait and crown is seen on a penny which also has a mullet over pellet to the right of the crown. Both the halfgroat and the penny have reverses bearing the 0 with swollen side. The reverse for the halfgroat is also found with a new obverse (PL. 14, no. 4 obv.) which has a portrait with the high crown and no mullet. An annulet replaces the fleur on the treasure cusp at the left of the crown. The same obverse (PL. 14, no. 5 obv.) is also found with a different reverse (PL. 14, no. 5 rev.) which has no stops in the inner circle.

From this series it appears that the high crown die was used briefly before the presence of the mullet was obligatory. The same applied to five other obverses (PL. 14, nos. 6, 7, 8=9, 10 and 11=12). The obverse no. 8 was used both with a Richard II reverse (PL. 14, no. 8 rev.) (as noted by Potter) and also with a new reverse (PL. 14, no. 9 rev.). The coins at PL. 14, nos. 11 and 12 may well be struck from the same pair of dies in different states of wear; they are both included to illustrate the problems met when attempting to match the dies. Hence, there are seven possible obverses being used to strike what may qualify as additional Henry IV halfgroats. This addition brings the new ratio...
between dies for halves and groats before the mullet to 10:11 and removes the disparity between the respective numbers of groat and halfgroat dies in this transitional period. Evidence that the die-sinkers were hard pressed at this time is provided by the repeated use of the letter O with swollen side on the reverses of a mullet-modified light coinage penny and on a halfpenny described before in a brief note. It is important to emphasise that many of the coins are so worn or encrusted that the mark is not easily perceived. Of the twenty-six high crown halves in the Reigate (II) hoard, only a quarter were in a 'fine' state; most of these can however be seen to bear the mullet mark.

The details of the high crown halves without and with mullet were extensively noted by Mr D. Greenhalgh in a regrettably unpublished collation of data on halfgroats. Here I have confined illustration and detail, with one exception, to strikings which apparently have no mullet. These show a surprising variety of detail in their design. They differ in the marks left of the crown, which may be an annulet below the tressure fleur (Pl. 14, nos. 6=7, 11=12), or (Pl. 14, nos. 4=5, 8=9, 10) an annulet replacing the fleur at the left of the crown band. These variants are coupled with the presence or absence of fleurs above the crown band, and with the king's bust having different lengths of neck and shape of face (either U- or V-outline) and the number of tressure arcs being eleven or twelve. It appears that the die-sinker or sinkers had no set pattern to reproduce. Several of the possible combinations are known only by one example, and few (two to five) are recorded for most others, though doubtless more exist in collections. The obverses are accompanied by variants of reverse having different stops and abbreviations in their legends, of which I have listed only the eight on the mullet-less specimens. Following Greenhalgh's information the number of different obverse dies when the mullet mark is included in the count is fourteen or fifteen and the number of reverses is nearly thirty.

There is no comparable confusion amongst the common stereotyped 'Smiling Bust' groats with mullet on the right breast though, as documented by Brooke and Potter, there are changes in certain letters, some of which are merely due to breakage. It is relevant to remark that groats of this Henry V period catalogued as without mullet (for instance Norweb sale lot 1352) show as much trace of a mullet as many of the coins which I have rejected from this survey of possible mullet-less halves. The mullet is on an outstanding feature and so is exposed to wear.

Table 1 lists the variable features on the high crown coins so far as I could see them. The description of the many varieties of the coins having the mullet mark is a topic still outstanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Neck (mm)</th>
<th>Position of Annulet at l. of crown</th>
<th>Fleurs over Crown</th>
<th>No. of Arcs</th>
<th>Shape of Pl.</th>
<th>No. on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>on cusp</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>on fleur</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>11 &amp; 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>on fleur</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>on cusp</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>on cusp</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reverses: only Pl. 14, no. 9 has an initial cross. Where double saltire stops have been visible they are shown; on several examples only a lower saltire can be seen, so the presence of a second saltire is in doubt.

---

7 Harris, as in n. 1, no. 72.  
8 E.J. Harris, 'The Repeated Use of a Faulty Punch on Some Henry V Dies', SCMB 850 (May 1990), 107-08.  
10 Potter, as in n. 2.
THREE NOTES ON THE TUDOR MINT

C.E. CHALLIS

1. Robert and Richard Harry Yonge

In the later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the moneyers in the Tower of London were organised as a Fellowship or Company under the leadership of their senior man, the provost. It was the moneyers themselves rather than the Crown who appointed him, by election, and it was he who presided over Moneyers' Hall where they met to dine and administer their affairs, according to their rules and orders. These are known to us through the version 'newly written and set forth' in 1578, when Thomas Denham, a London goldsmith, was provost.1

Because they worked as sub-contractors to the master-worker the accounts which the moneyers drew up with him form no part of the official mint accounts audited by the Exchequer and it is for this reason, coupled with the absence of any records from Moneyers' Hall (if any such records were indeed ever kept on a systematic basis), that so little is known about the moneyers and their provosts. The senior of the two men who form the subject of this note, Robert Harry Yonge, died in 1500 leaving to his son Richard twelve silver spoons and a maser, and the same to both his son William and his daughter Joan Butler. He also bequeathed 20s. to his apprentice, John Cole, presumably the man of the same name who is known to have worked as a molder in the Tower from c. 1515 to 1518.2 Precisely when Robert became provost is unclear, as is the date when he joined the mint, but it is possible that his arrival was in or before 1462 because on 1 December in that year a man of the same name and of the same parish, Hoxton in St Leonard's, Shoreditch, London, coiner, was given the goods, chattels and due debts of John Browne, citizen and butcher of London.3 If this is so, the Robert Harry Yonge who is recorded in 1466 as the apprentice of John Amadas, citizen and goldsmith of London,4 could have been a relative and, indeed, it may even have been this second Robert who went on to become provost. Either way, Robert whose will is dated 2 May 1500 was the son of John Harry Young (Heryong) also 'coiner' and of St Leonard's, Shoreditch. The first mention of him is in 1457, the second in 1464 in connection with the possession of a tenement and lands in Hoxton (to which Robert Harry Yonge was one of the witnesses) and the third in 1470 when he was given (with three others) all the goods, chattels and due debts of John Mane, citizen and butcher of London.6 Richard Harry Yonge is an altogether simpler figure, although once again it is not known when he was born or entered the mint. He was certainly provost by 1536 and continued in post until his death on 23 August 1545,7 it was during this period that the provost became one of those to whom instructions concerning the manufacture of coins, either indentures or commissions, were directed. The first naming Richard was the commission of 6 March 1536 for an issue of Irish coins. A second followed on 13 July 1540, and a third on 13 May 1544, both for Irish coin. Therefore, his successor as provost, John Germyn, was mentioned in the instructions of 24 January and 12 April 1549 for English gold and silver coin and again in those of 18 December 1550 and 5 October 1551. Germyn's successor, John Monnes, appeared at first, intermittently, from 20 February 1553 until 5 August 1557, and then in successive orders up to and including that of 26 March 1561. From then until the end of the reign the provost of the moneyers was not one of those to whom the Crown addressed its instructions, save on 11 January 1601 when there was a commission ordering coins for the East India voyage, Thomas Denham then being provost.8 The explanation of this pattern of events is unknown.

Richard, also of Hoxton in St Leonard's, Shoreditch, bequeathed to his company 'after my months day be past' 20s. 'to pray for my soul and to make them merry withal' and a similar sum 'after my yeres mynde be past'.9 He was not childless, for his daughter, Alice, married Thomas Morowe (Marow), whom he named as one of his executors. The other was his wife Margaret who, so far as Stephen Vaughan, the king's agent in Antwerp, was concerned was clearly an attractive

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Lord Stewartby and Dr Wendy Callis for their help and encouragement in the preparation of note 2 and to Mr Philip Whittemore and Mr Robert Thompson for their ready help with note 1.

Thomas Thornton's bequest to his son-in-law of his 'featherbed at the Tower' indicates that some sleeping accommodation was available to the moneyers close to their place of work but whether this was actually in the Hall is unclear. F.G. Emmison, Elizabethan Wills of South-West Essex (Waddeston, 1983), no. 367.


Calendar of the Close Rolls, 1461–68, 155.

I owe this reference to Mr Philip Whittemore


Challis, 'Mint officials', as in n. 2, p. 74.

Challis, The Tudor Coinage, as in n. 2 appendix III.

PRO. Prob. 11/181, 34.
proposition. A widower with a large household and young children to care for, Vaughan had confided on 9 December 1544 to William Paget, principal secretary of state, that he was on the lookout for ‘a sad, trusty, and womanly matron to look upon th’one and th’other’, and requested that if any such came Paget’s way he should keep her in store for him. On Margaret Harry Yonge’s bereavement such a person seemed to have come in view, and although he had never seen her, Vaughan lost no time in soliciting the help of Chancellor Thomas Wriothesley: ‘seeing what occasions I have to marry, if she is such a wife as your lordship would counsel me to have, “then I would most humbly desire your Lordship to devise and take some way for me, without whose counsel I intend not to adventure upon so dangerous a matter”’. Writing to Paget on the same day, 13 September 1545 also from Antwerp, he opined that she had been ‘left substantial’, which he thought would be all the better because ‘you [Paget] perceive what occasions I have to marry, seeing I leave my things in mine absence so rawly’. This marriage of convenience never materialized.

Richard’s death brought to an end the Harry Yonge association with the mint. His achievements and those of his father were commemorated, as were his wives, in an inscription on a monument in the church of St. Leonard, (Fig. 1), which, according to Stow, was dated 1545 and related to ‘Richard and Harry Yong’. In his edition of Stow Strype gave the reading as:

Hereunder lieth Robert Hary Young, and Margery, his Wife; Richard Hary Young, his Son, and Elisabeth and Margaret, his Wives; some Time both Provosts of the King’s Mint within the Tower of London: Which Richard Hary Young deceased the 23d Day of August, in the Year of our Lord God 1545, in the 36th Year of the Reign of King Henry the Eighth. The rest scratched out.

The inscription, like the church (demolished 1735), has long since disappeared but the importance of Robert and Richard lives on, not as is sometimes said as former masters of the mint, but as sometime provosts of the moneyers, and thus as two of the most important directors of coin production in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

10 Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII, edited by J.S. Brewer, J. Gardner and R.H. Brodie (21 vols London, 1862–1932) (LP), XX (2), nos 363–4; W.C. Richardson, Stephen Vaughan, Financial Agent of Henry VIII (Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1953), p. 21. That the Harry Yonges were respected and of some importance is borne out by the fact that between 1160 lb. 10! 4 oz. in June, peaked at 2341 lb. in October and then fell back to average 638½ lb. per month from November 1522 to the end of September 1523. The lesson was clear: a higher mint price would bring in bullion but, if a real killing was to be made, 39s. 6d. per lb Tower (the equivalent of a little over 42s. per lb. Troy), though encouraging, was not enough. In 1526 Wolsey and his advisors seized the bullion by the horns, settled on a rise to 45s. per lb. Troy, and once again the mint sprang into life.

11 Survey of London, VIII, St Leonard’s Shoreditch, p. 81; J. Stow, Survey of London, edited by J. Strype (1755), p. 91; J. Stow, A Survey of London, edited by C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1908), II, 75. Note: 23 August 36 Henry VIII is 23 August 1544, not 1545. That 1545 is indeed the correct date, however, is attested by the date of both Richard’s will, 21 August 1545, and Vaughan’s correspondence with Wolsey. See also the wording given in H. Ellis, The History and Antiquities of the Parish of St. Leonard Shoreditch and Liberty of Norton Folgate in the suburbs of London (1798), p. 54. Mr Whitmore tells me that a more schematic drawing of the monument, done for a herald’s Visitations, is in the British Library, Lansdowne MS 874 fo. 67v.
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appendix III, where the values of successive issues were listed. Nor was this remedied in A New History of the Royal Mint.14 As Lord Stewartby has pointed out, with his usual tact and charm, this does leave (if unintentionally) the numismatist at something of a disadvantage. To remedy this the principal details of the text relating to the trial are now rendered in English from the original Latin, as follows:

26 October 1523

The other assay of silver made the same day and year aforesaid in the presence of the aforesaid Lord Cardinal and others of the king's council: that is to say, by the viewing of silver money made and coined in the Tower aforesaid, in the time aforesaid, i.e. between 1 June 1522 and 26 October 1523.

Before 1 June 1522, i.e. 31 May 1522, the king, considering the scarcity of money and bullion of sterling silver within the time lately elapsed and that less was brought in than was formerly the case, and wishing that a mass of bullion should be brought in for the good and profit of the same.

And to the intent that whosoever of his subjects or other persons, having a disposition to bring in bullion, by the advice of his council, had determined that each person bringing bullion into the country should henceforth obtain a greater profit than they were accustomed to obtain, i.e. on each lb. 2s. or 2d. per oz., by the authority of the council through a certain warrant subscribed under the sign manual, 31 May 1522, commanding amongst other things John COPYNGER, warden of the Tower, and William Blount, Lord Mountjoy, master-worker, and Henry Wyatt, comptroller, that all bullion from 30 June 1522 shall, during the pleasure of the king, be coined at the standard purity and at 39s. 6d. per lb. Tower.

And the pyx [i.e. the box in which the money was placed] having been opened there was found in the same 18 sinchiae [i.e. leather bags] coined according to the weight aforesaid, containing £7. 16s. in groats and half-groats selected out of 14,886 lb. 5/2 oz. of silver paid out of the mint between 1 June 1522 and 26 October 1523.

Of the groats and half-groats taken from all the sinchiae and intermingled an assay was made and it was found that 39s. 6d. agreed with the Tower standard weight. And as to the alloy, they took from the aforesaid groats and half-groats five ounces for the fire assay, that is to say by the pound subtle after the coins had been cut, as is customary at the fire assay, and it was found that the money was good and legal.

And it was ordered by the Lord Cardinal and the other councillors, on behalf of the king, that the warden and master-worker should not in future coin or make any other silver by virtue of the king's mandate according to the weight aforesaid.

And the residue of the £7. 16s in groats and half-groats found in the pyx was melted down.15

3. Revisions to and amplifications of 'Mint officials and moneyers of the Tudor period', BNJ 45 (1975), 51-76

Since the publication of this list the names of a handful of officials and moneyers have emerged and it has been possible, largely through the study of testamentary records, to define more closely the careers of a few others. The abbreviations and conventions used here conform to those in the original article, with the exception of BM which is now rendered BL.

Mint officials of the Tudor period

Berkley, Sir William (d 1485)
master-worker, Tower, 17 Sept. 1485
17 Sept. - 2 Nov. 485

Welshe (Walsh), Hugh (d 1532), goldsmith of London
deputy to master-worker (W. Blount)
Dec. 1530-June 1532
(J.D. Alsop, 'The Mint dispute, 1530-32', BNJ 51 (1981), 197-9; Challis, A New History, p. 182)

Moneyers of the Tudor period

Austin, Richard, the elder (d 1592), of Shoreditch (Middlesex)
moneyer, Tower
c. 1571-1592
(BL. Harleian Ms.698 fos 56v-56r, 89v; Survey of London, viii, St. Leonard's Shoreditch, p. 66; GL. 7499/1; PRO. Prob. 11/79)

Bryan, John – see Smith, John

Cole, John
apprentice moneyer to Robert Harry Yonge,
Tower
1500
presumably the man of the same name who is mentioned as a moneyer c. 1515-18
(BNJ 45 (1975), 73; PRO. Prob. 11/12)

Cornewe, Thomas, of Walthamstow (Essex)
moneyer, Tower
c. 1591-c. 1595


15 PRO. E101/302/17 (L.P. IV. no. 2338 no. 6).

Garnett, Richard, of Walthamstow (Essex) moneyer, Tower 1591 (Emmison, *Elizabethan Wills*, no. 280)

Gibbs, Richard (d 1596), of West Ham (Essex) moneyer, Tower to 1596 (Emmison, *Elizabethan Life*, p. 143)

Harry Yonge (Heryonges), Robert, son of John (d 1500), of Shoreditch (Middlesex) moneyer, Tower c. 1462–1500 provost of the moneyers to 1500 (CCR. 1461–68. 155; BNJ 45 (1975), 74; PRO. Prob. 11/12; Survey of London, viii, St. Leonard’s Shoreditch, p. 98)

Hayen, John (? John Hayne, see below) moneyer, Tower 1540 (LP xv no. 63)

Hayne, John (d 1558), of Shoreditch (Middlesex) moneyer, Tower to 1558 (GL. 9051/1 fo. 229)

Heynes, Hugh (d 1561), of Shoreditch (Middlesex) moneyer, Tower to 1561 he had an apprentice, Nycholas (GL. 9051/2 fo. 297v)

Lucas, Thomas – see Estfield

Marsh, William (d 1559), of West Ham (Essex) moneyer, Tower to 1559 (Emmison, *Elizabethan Life*, p. 148)

Permyn, John moneyer, Tower 1540 (LP xv no. 63)

Pyc, John (d 1576), of Stepney (Middlesex) moneyer, Tower c. 1559 to c. 1576 (GL.9171/16 fo. 281v; BL. Harleian Ms 698 fos 55v–56r; GL. 7499/1)

Smith, John (alias Bryan, d 1571), of Hackney (Middlesex) moneyer, Tower to 1571 (GL. 9171/16 fo. 62v)

Thorneton, Thomas (d 1598), of Walthamstow (Essex) moneyer, Tower c. 1576–1598 (Barns, as above (Cornewe). p. 7; BL. Harleian Ms 698 fos 55v–56r; GL. 9171/19 fo. 55v)

White, William (d 1574), of Hackney (Middlesex) moneyer, Tower to 1574 (GL. 9171/16 fo. 153)

---

**TWO UNRECORDED FINDS**

**DAVID SYMONS**

**Unprovenanced, 1987 or before**

In the summer of 1987 Format Coins of Birmingham acquired a group of twenty-five coins of Elizabeth I, James I and Charles I. They were made available to the writer to examine at Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery, where they were also photographed and weighed. The coins had been bought from a dealer at the Birmingham Rag Market and there was, unfortunately, no information on their provenance. It nevertheless seems clear that they comprise all or part of a Civil War period hoard. The date range – 1575 to 1644/5 – and the composition are both typical of the smaller hoards of this period, although coins of Elizabeth are perhaps under-represented, suggesting that we may be dealing with a parcel rather than a

---

1 I am grateful to Mr G. Charman of Format Coins for his willing assistance in the preparation of this note.

2 By my colleagues Mr D. Bailey and Mrs J. Selwood respectively.
complete hoard. All the coins of Charles I are Tower Mint issues, no Royalist coinages being represented. On the available evidence a date of deposition of c. 1645 seems likely. The hoard contains twelve half-crowns, ten shillings and three sixpences with a face value of £2 Is. 6d.

The figures in brackets after the weights of the individual coins show these as a proportion of the theoretical standards — 3.11g for the Elizabethan sixpence and 3.01g, 6.02g and 15.05g for the sixpences, shillings and half-crowns of James I and Charles I. What are striking are the comparatively high weights of the half-crowns, which average 98.6 per cent of the standard. If no. 5, the earliest (and, at 13.92g, the lightest) is excluded, then the other eleven specimens actually average 99.2 per cent of the standard.

**CATALOGUE**

**Elizabeth I**

**Sixpence**
1. Eglantine, 1575. 2.195g (70.6%). 290°. North 1977.

**James I**

**Shillings**
2. Lis, 1604–5. 5.690g (94.5%). 25°. North 2073.
3. Rose, 1605–6. 5.710g (94.9%). 190°. North 2100.

**Sixpence**
4. Thistle, 1604. 2.841g (94.9%). 190°. North 2075.

**Charles I**

(Titles read MAG:BR:FR:ET HIB:REX unless otherwise noted).

**Half-crowns**

12. Triangle-in-circle, 1641–3. 15.137g (100.6%). 325°. North 2214.
15. (R), 1644–5. 15.069g (100.1%). 70°. North 2213.

**Shillings**
20. Tun, 1636–8. 5.638g (93.7%). 45°. (Titles as no. 19). North 2225.
21. Triangle, 1639–40. 5.804g (96.4%). 255°. (REX). North 2231.
22. Star, 1640–1. 5.864g (97.4%). 270°. (HI:REX). North 2231.
23. Triangle-in-circle, 1641–3. 5.571g (92.5%). 60°. (HI). North 2231.
24. (P), 1643–4. 5.967g (99.1%). 135°. North 2232.

**Sixpence**

**"Yorkshire Moors", 1990**

The three coins described were shown at Format Coins in 1991. They had supposedly been found in the previous year by a family walking on the Yorkshire Moors. Specifically, one of the children was said to have kicked aside a stone and so revealed the coins. The name of the find-spot could not be remembered properly, but was thought to be 'Kilversley' or similar; unfortunately I have not been able to identify such a
place. The complete hoard was said to have consisted of eight coins "all of the same types" and this, together with the full flans and relatively unworn condition of the three coins that have been recorded, suggests that the hoard probably contained only coins of Elizabeth I. Unfortunately all that can be said for certain about the date of deposition is that the hoard has a terminus post quem of 1573, although it seems unlikely that it can have been very much later than that. Again the figures in brackets show the weights as percentages of the theoretical standards (3.11g for the sixpences and 6.22g for the shilling).

The complete hoard was said to have consisted of eight coins ‘all of the same types’ and this, together with the full flans and relatively unworn condition of the three coins that have been recorded, suggests that the hoard probably contained only coins of Elizabeth I. Unfortunately all that can be said for certain about the date of deposition is that the hoard has a terminus post quem of 1573, although it seems unlikely that it can have been very much later than that. Again the figures in brackets show the weights as percentages of the theoretical standards (3.11g for the sixpences and 6.22g for the shilling).
issue was of course struck in very large quantities, and the presence of only a single example may indicate that the hoard was concealed earlier rather than later in its period of issue, but there are various other factors which should also be taken into account. Most obviously, the location of the find, within sight of Broughton Castle, which was surrendered to the royalists very shortly after the battle of Edgehill in October 1642, strongly argues for a date of deposit connected with these early military manoeuvres. However, the presence of three large denomination coins from the Spanish Netherlands (nos 14 to 16) in a British hoard is also worthy of comment, and may be of some relevance to the question of the hoard’s date. English kings have always attempted to exclude foreign coins from circulation in their territory. A small proportion of intruders have sometimes penetrated the English money supply and won informal acceptance, but for the most part it was English (and Scots and Irish) money which circulated in England and Wales. Certainly, when compared with the currency of mainland Europe, England was far more completely assimilated into the currency, the current evidence is summarised in Table 1.9 There are two gold coins, of which the half-rijder is of interest both as a fraction of a type validated by the 1644 proclamation and for its find spot, Newark. Eight hoards, five of them found since 1980, contained patagons and/or ducatons. Three are from Yorkshire, two from the Newark area and one each from Devon, Lancashire and Oxfordshire. To these may be added one each from Devon and Lancashire and two Yorkshire finds containing unspecified ‘dollars’ or similar. Is a pattern beginning to emerge?

Because Civil War hoards are so numerous compared with those from the decades either side, it is hard to say whether the appearance of these continental coins in hoards is specific to the war years, though no certainly pre-war hoard from Charles I’s reign contains them. Spanish and Portuguese coins were, for instance, a familiar sight in the Exeter of the 1630s: the city had strong trading links with the Iberian countries. Continental silver was no doubt similarly familiar in east coast ports. However, there are very few records of single finds of Spanish Netherlands silver coins from England or Wales, which might perhaps be expected were they a regular part of the currency.6 We know, too, that the royalists acquired consignments of foreign silver, probably through their continental fund-raising: Thomas Bushell is recorded exchanging ‘dollers’ at Shrewsbury – presumably at the outset, while the Earl of Newcastle was sent ‘a little barrel of ducations’, amounting to £500 sterling, probably late in 1642.7

On 22 February 1643 Queen Henrietta Maria landed at Bridlington in Yorkshire, bringing substantial supplies garnered during her year-long stay on the continent. She proceeded to York (6 March), staying there until late May, before heading south to a reunion with the King on the field of Edgehill on 13 July. The meeting and the coincident victory at Roundway Down, near Devizes, were commemorated on the ‘Kineton’ medal by Rawlins, of which the apparently unique survivor is in the British Museum. Her itinerary took in Doncaster, Newark (16 June – 3 July), Ashby, King’s Norton, Walsall and Stratford-on-Avon;9 and on 13 July the royal couple spent the night at Wroxton, which lies approximately 3½ km/2½ miles north of Broughton, before moving on to Oxford.10

References


2 British Library 1851, b3 (37); E. Besly, Coins and Medals of the English Civil War (1909), pp. 70–3.

3 References in the first column are to the Inventory in E. Besly, English Civil War Coin Hoards (1987), pp. 76ff. Caunton: B.J. Cook, ‘Four Seventeenth Century Treasure Troves’, BNJ 60 (1990), at pp. 91–6; Mediumham: C. Barclay, ‘A Civil War hoard from Mediumham, North Yorkshire’, BNJ 54 (1994), 84–98. One further hoard, unprovenanced (perhaps Kent) and buried 1645 or later, included two eight-reales (Mexico and Potosi) of Philip IV, three patagons and a half-rijder (H5: ‘Mr Binney’s’).

4 A quarter-patagon was found in Norfolk in 1997 (BNJ 67, Coin Register 1997, no. 243); a ducaton of Philip IV reported to E.B. in 1998 from the ‘Yorkshire Dales’ may be of 1639 or 1659; its date is unclear on the scanned image seen.


TABLE 1. English Civil War hoards containing European Coins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Latest coins</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>%P</th>
<th>%D</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Newark, Balderton Gate</td>
<td>Notts</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>97+</td>
<td>£61-0-0d+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>Oxon.</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>£0-18-10d</td>
<td>T-in-C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19</td>
<td>Newark, Crankley Point</td>
<td>Notts.</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>£31-19-4d</td>
<td>T-in-C.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21</td>
<td>Painswick</td>
<td>Gloc.</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£22-15-10d</td>
<td>T-in-C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Breckenhrobough</td>
<td>N. Yorks.</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>£93-5-0d</td>
<td>(P)/York 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Lancs.</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£0-10-3d</td>
<td>'1643-4'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-</td>
<td>Caunton</td>
<td>Notts.</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>£62-14-9d</td>
<td>(P)/1643</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>Pocklington</td>
<td>Yorks ER</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>161+</td>
<td>£17-6-6d+</td>
<td>(P)/York 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>Sowerby</td>
<td>Yorks.</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>£11-18-6d+</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Buckfastleigh</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>£2-2-9d</td>
<td>Exeter 1644</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/J-</td>
<td>Middleham A</td>
<td>N. Yorks</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>£74-17-8½d</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Philip IV, 8-reales, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleham B</td>
<td>N. Yorks</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>£146-7-9½d</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Philip IV, 8-reales, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleham C</td>
<td>N. Yorks</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>£91-8-11d</td>
<td>Sceptre</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Spanish dollar c. 1630'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>East Worlington</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>5188</td>
<td>£242-18-10d</td>
<td>Sceptre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Spanish coins'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>Whittingham</td>
<td>Lancs.</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>£157</td>
<td>Sceptre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campan: Arends-shelling, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7</td>
<td>Wyke, Bradford</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>£38-13-8d+</td>
<td>Sceptre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philip IV ‘a crown piece'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K22</td>
<td>Preston (Fulwood)</td>
<td>Lancs.</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>'Charles I'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philip IV ‘dollars'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K45</td>
<td>Newby Wiske</td>
<td>N. Yorks</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>'Charles I'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philip IV ‘dollars'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finds with worn half- and 1-realms are omitted. P: patagons D: ducatons
How much money the Queen was bringing is not known, though the Venetian ambassador believed her to have large sums; but there is, prima facie, a remarkable coincidence between her route, the time spent at York and Newark, and the distribution and broad dates of the hoards containing coins from the Spanish Netherlands. Future finds may, of course, modify the picture, but it appears to us that disbursements en route by the Queen's entourage might have provided the mechanism whereby some at least of these foreign coins went into local circulation in royalist-held areas. This observation does not in itself date the Broughton hoard for us, but it allows for a third possibility: that the coins may have been deposited in or after July 1643, nine months or more after Edgehill and the capture of Broughton Castle. In spite of its small size, this find raises interesting questions regarding the interpretation of coin hoards, even in well-documented historical periods, and underlines the need for caution in associating them with specific historical events.

**CROMWELL COIN TOOLS IN THE ROYAL MINT MUSEUM**

MARVIN LESSEN

In 1973 Graham Dyer arranged for photographs of the Cromwell coin dies and punches in the Royal Mint Museum. The task was sponsored at the time by Mr Collin Southern, and the photography was by Mr H.T. Mozley, Senior Photographer at the Royal Mint. This paper presents those photographs, generally in the same order (by denomination) as Hocking used to catalogue the tools in 1910, with a concordance to the resultant coins as listed in papers by this writer. Die photographs are reversed, and the side-view sketches, made by the author in 1970, are only of approximate full size. Tools 12-15 and 31-36 are shown both full size and double size; 16-30 and M are full size. Punch M is 103 mm high.

The Cromwell tools were never officially retained by the Mint, and remained in Simon's possession. In the introduction to this section of his catalogue, Hocking stated that in 1700 Isaac Newton, Master of the Mint, purchased ten puncheons (including the one for a medal) and nine dies, all of which were at the time assumed to be by Simon, and then he went on to describe which they were, the ones he considered Simon's, the ones of doubtful origin, and the remainder he attributed to Tanner. An earlier work by Hocking was more explicit, quoting the minutes of a Board meeting of 9 November 1700, and it is reproduced here from his article: 'The Master reported that he had bought, according to the direction of the Board, 10 puncheons and 9 dies graven by Mr Simonds famous graver in the time of Ol. Cromwell for 14 guineas. Mr Croker, Ingraver of the Mint, chose out of them to pair 2 puncheons, one a head and the other an armes for crown pieces, two puncheons being a head and armes for sixpences, and two dies being a head and armes for 21 pieces of gold, giving his receipt, and the rest were locked up in the Treasury.'

Whetmore was unable to find any reference to the subject in the Board Minutes of the Royal Mint from 23 March 1699 to 26 February 1701. However, he did find in Newton's Warden's account for 25 December 1700, "To Eliz Winter for old Puncheons and Dyes of Symonds Work for our Gravers to copy after £15.1.0''. Nothing has been found in the published volumes of Newton's correspondence.

The trail from Simon to Newton is a rocky one. In 1665 Simon (1648-1665) willed his tools to nephew William (dates unknown), only if he served an apprenticeship as an engraver, else they were to revert to his son, Samuel (1653-?) who would already inherit the medals, patterns, waxes, paintings, and so on. Daughter Ann (1659-?) married Mr Hibbert in 1674.

12 The two apparently exceptional areas are Devon and Lancashire; but only two of the five hoards in question are securely dated (Buckfastleigh, 1644+: East Worlington, 1647+: both therefore 'late' in this context) and only one (Buckfastleigh) certainly contains ducatons/patagons [information on this find from John Allan].

Acknowledgements are to Graham Dyer, who provided the inputs and critical review to this paper, and to Hugh Pagan for his research into Marlow, the jeweller.


3 W.J. Hocking, 'Simon's dies in the Royal Mint Museum', NC 1909, 98-116. His tool descriptions here were more extensive than his later summary for the Royal Mint catalogue. The Board minutes were probably from what is now identified as PRO MINT 1/7, p. 20. Craig has only a sentence on this from the 1701 Warden's Accounts, and states that the purchase cost £5 and the purpose was as models for training. J. Craig, Newton at the Mint, Cambridge, 1946, 37.

4 S.A.H. Whetmore, 'Some further notes on Thomas Simon', BNJ 30 (1960), 172-3. The Warden's account volume for 25 December 1699 to 25 December 1700 (MINT 1948) only came into the Mint's possession with the acquisition of the Newton Papers in 1936, long after Hocking. These are now in the PRO.

and their daughter, Frances, married Samuel Barker (the Barker, Raymond, Lamb family lines for the warrants and sketches); and there was another daughter Elizabeth (1657-?), Wife Elizabeth (c. 1616–1696), who remarried in 1669 to Mathew Poole, was the executrix of Thomas's will, and the dominant force in getting long overdue payments from the Treasury for the work detailed in his 1665 account. An oft-quoted Vertue notebook extract, perhaps written c. 1725, implies that Mr Marlow, a jeweller of Lombard St, told Vertue directly that in 1676 he bought from the widow of Simon all the tools etc. that had been willed to the son. 5 Was this Marlow really alive a half century later to tell this to Vertue? Were William and/or Samuel dead by 1676, or just disinterested? How did Elizabeth Winter in 1700 relate to Mr Marlow in 1676? This story is true, should not be considered a family member, and he most likely bought the material for commercial purposes. And when did these tools get to 'Holland' and return with the new dies between 1676 and 1700? Could someone like Marlow have contracted with a Dutch, or even a local, medallist to loan him the tools? and 1700? Could someone like Marlow have contracted with a Dutch, or even a local, medallist to loan him the tools?

### Table: Hocking vs. Lessen Tool Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hocking No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Lessen Coin Nos</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>Twenty shillings</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Bust punch</td>
<td>By Simon, but it did not make the twenty shilling die.</td>
<td>(pl. 15, 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>Ten shillings</td>
<td>B3-B7, C8-C9, D10-D11</td>
<td>Bust punch</td>
<td>By Simon. Cracked punch is ringed to provide strength during its eighteenth-century use.</td>
<td>(pl. 15, 13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Transcribed from one of Vertue's notebooks (V.105, B.M. 78b) in Walpole Society, vol. 20 (1932), Vertue II, 99: 'of Thomas Simons. Engraver of Coins & Seals – says M' Marlow, Jeweller of Lombard Street – that in the year 1676, he then bought of the Widow of Simons (who was then remarried to M' [Poole] a dissenting Parson) all the tools stamps punches wax impressions & that did belong to M' Simons which he left and appointed by Will to be preserved together for the use of his Son if he lived, and should follow the profession of his Father; but as he was of weak understanding when he grew up, and not fit for such an employment he was otherwise provided for, and these things sold – amongst which are many punches for the figures heads & of the broad Seals. Medals coins Letters & that Simons always made use of and actually made punches, for every purpose being extream ready at it, and liked that way more much better than cutting inwards with tools or gravers as most others do. Nay at that Time lived, Martin Johnson a Seal Cutter, whose works in Seals are very good and he did Catt heads of persons in steel seals very well, but was an opposite temper or practice. for he would not make nor use any punches: but cut all with tools inwards, was so adverse to Simons that he would say of him, that he was a puncher, not a Graver’ – A summary of this is also found in Whetmore, p. 173, and Helen Fauquhar, “Thomas Simon. “One of our chief gravers”, NC 1932, 365, where the name was read for her at the time as Mr Martin, not Marlow.

7 Apparently so. From the periodical ‘The Political State of Great Britain’, vol. x (1730), 228, is a death notice among those for the month of August 1730, stating ‘on the 29th, died Mr Joseph Marlow, many years a Goldsmith in Lombard Street.’ Hugh Pagan found this, is confident that this is Vertue’s Marlow, and goes on to note that the fact that he is described as a goldsmith rather than as a jeweller, could well mean that although his trade was that of a jeweller he was a member of the Goldsmiths’ Company, as Simon was. A pity that Marlow’s age is not given, for this is 54 years after 1676.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hocking No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Lessen Coin Nos.</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14*</td>
<td>Ten shillings</td>
<td>B5–B7, D10–D11</td>
<td>Obverse die</td>
<td>Dutch. From Simon punch 13.</td>
<td>(pl. 15, 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ten shillings</td>
<td>C8–C9</td>
<td>Obverse die</td>
<td>By Tanner. From Simon punch 13.</td>
<td>(pl. 15, 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>E12–E13, G22–Ga24a, maybe F16–F17</td>
<td>Bust punch</td>
<td>By Simon.</td>
<td>(pl. 16, 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17*</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>E12–E13, G22–Ga24a, maybe F16–F17</td>
<td>Arms punch</td>
<td>By Simon.</td>
<td>(pl. 16, 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>E12–E13, Ga24, E12–E13, Ga24a</td>
<td>Reverse die</td>
<td>By Simon. From Simon punch 17.</td>
<td>(pl. 16, 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Obverse die</td>
<td>By Tanner. Unfinished. From Simon punch 16.</td>
<td>(pl. 17, 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Reverse die</td>
<td>By Tanner. Unfinished. From Simon punch 17.</td>
<td>(pl. 17, 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25*</td>
<td>Halfcrown</td>
<td>H25</td>
<td>Arms punch</td>
<td>By Simon.</td>
<td>(pl. 18, 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26*</td>
<td>Shilling</td>
<td>J28–J29, K34–K38</td>
<td>Bust punch</td>
<td>By Simon.</td>
<td>(pl. 18, 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27*</td>
<td>Shilling</td>
<td>J28–J29, K34–K38</td>
<td>Arms punch</td>
<td>By Simon.</td>
<td>(pl. 18, 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28*</td>
<td>Shilling</td>
<td>K34–K38</td>
<td>Obverse die</td>
<td>Dutch. From Simon punch 26.</td>
<td>(pl. 18, 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29*</td>
<td>Shilling</td>
<td>K34–K38</td>
<td>Reverse die</td>
<td>Dutch. From Simon punch 27.</td>
<td>(pl. 18, 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30*</td>
<td>Shilling</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Reverse die</td>
<td>Probably Dutch. Unfinished. From Simon punch 27.</td>
<td>(pl. 18, 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31*</td>
<td>Sixpence</td>
<td>L39–L40, M41–M42</td>
<td>Bust punch</td>
<td>By Simon.</td>
<td>(pl. 19, 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32*</td>
<td>Sixpence</td>
<td>M41–M42, B5–B7</td>
<td>Arms punch</td>
<td>By Simon, probably.</td>
<td>(pl. 20, 32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SHORT ARTICLES AND NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hocking Type</th>
<th>Lessen Coin Nos.</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sixpence</td>
<td>M41-M42</td>
<td>Obverse die</td>
<td>Dutch. From Simon punch 31.</td>
<td>(pl. 19, 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten shillings (sixpence)</td>
<td>B5-B7</td>
<td>Reverse die</td>
<td>Dutch 1658 ten shillings. (Hocking listed it as a sixpence die). From punch 32.</td>
<td>(pl. 20, 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixpence</td>
<td>M41-M42</td>
<td>Reverse die</td>
<td>Dutch 1658. From punch 32.</td>
<td>(pl. 20, 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten shillings (sixpence)</td>
<td>C8-C9, D10-D11</td>
<td>Reverse die</td>
<td>By Tanner. 1656 ten shillings. (Hocking listed it as a sixpence die). From punch 32?</td>
<td>(pl. 20, 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bust punch</td>
<td>By Simon.</td>
<td>(pl. 19, M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This further tool, M, from the purchased group, is mentioned but not listed by Hocking (although he does discuss it in his NC 1909 paper, page 106, as high relief punch (D) having a resemblance to the bust on the Dutch funeral medal). It is a rusty bust punch by Simon, but its use is unclear, partly owing to its condition. It might be the punch used for the Cromwell/Fairfax medal, *Medallic Illustrations* 411/48, where the description claims that the medal bust is also that used for the great seal, but it is not; this one is much larger. The MI 411/48 medal itself is an anomaly, and could well have been constructed in the eighteenth century from Simon punches.

**Addendum:** There are or were electrotypes of these tools. The William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, Los Angeles, has a manuscript on paper watermarked with the date of 1865 stating ‘This case contains electrotyped casts, silvered, & varnished, of Oliver Cromwell’s Dies they are deposited in the Royal Mint-cabinets, and it is believed they are the only specimens of his Money Dies extant.’ Then it lists and describes all 26 tools, checking off 14 of them to ‘shew the plaster casts in existence.’ In addition there was ‘The unfinished Punch of a Unit, or Broad of Charles the First, also by Simon.’ This manuscript must be English, but there is nothing to trace it further.

---

### THE ST. PATRICK COINAGE OF CHARLES II

**MICHAEL SHARP**

There has been debate about this coinage for some time. The obverse designs pose little problem. On the halfpence, St. Patrick is shown wearing mitre and robes, holding a crosier in one hand and a small cross (or is it a shamrock?) in the other and standing before the multitude. On the farthings, he is shown similarly attired but holding a long cross in one hand whilst the other is extended to show the departure of the snakes he reputedly cleared from Ireland; a (the established?) church is shown behind.

There has, however, been much contention regarding the reverse design. I suggest the harp is the Irish harp (its human front and general form are as used on the coinage up to and including that of George IV), the figure playing it to represent Charles I, bearded and wearing an open (martyr’s) crown, the large crown above being the temporal crown he once wore and the legend, Floreat Rex, ‘May the king flourish (in heaven)’.

Many medallic memorials were struck to commemorate Charles I after the Restoration and the late king’s memory was further preserved by the legend, CAROLUS A CAROLO, on the English copper coinage, a theme possibly echoed by the interlinked Cs on the reverses of the silver. I think, therefore, it reasonable to suggest the St. Patrick coinage to have been a memorial one.