NOTES ON SIMON'S PATTERN (PETITION) CROWN OF CHARLES II

MARVIN LESSEN

EXCITING numismatic times followed the return of Charles II in 1660. Even before the initial hammered coinage was underway, steps were being taken to introduce a modern, machine-struck coinage – Blondeau was to be recalled from France and the Roettiers brothers and their smith would be hired from Flanders to supplement the existing Mint staff. One minor by-product of all this activity was Simon's Petition crown, which is the subject of this paper. (This pattern coin takes its popular name from its normal, but not universally occurring, two-line edge inscription spelling out his petition or plea to the king for more prestigious and lucrative employment than he currently had.) Although this coin has been discussed many times before, it seems worthwhile to return to it once again, because it is now possible to further illuminate events during the period 1662-3, as they relate to the coin.

One purpose of this paper is to draw together the various manuscript and printed sources (Mint Record Books, Edward Nicholas's Privy Council Minutes, Calendars of State Papers, and Thomas Simon's warrants). Apart from two of Simon's drawings, and one posthumous note, no other contemporary records have been found which throw light on this particular crown.

Previous Discussions

John Evelyn was the first to mention, and illustrate, the coin and the Petition edge, but far more significant was George Vertue's publication fifty-six years later, which was based on the coin that had belonged to the Earl of Oxford. Vertue also published what is probably the first description of the Reddite edge. Modern accounts of the coin, and the connections between Thomas Simon and John Roettiers (Jan Roetjiers, Jean Roettiers), begin with Farquhar, and continue with Stride in
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1 J. Evelyn, Numismata. A Discourse of Medals . . . (1697), p. 239. Evelyn stresses the artistic merit of the coin, but says little more. It is not mentioned in his diary. Although cognoscenti of the time must have been familiar with the coin, this is the first notice of it in print.
2 George Vertue, Medals, Coins, Great Seals. . . . of Thomas Simon (first edition, 1753), Plate 35 and pp. 55–6. The second edition (Vertue 1780) was edited by Richard Gough, who had access to the "Simon Archive" and other materials by way of Stanelyly Alchome, and he put much of it into print. The "Simon Archive", held by the Raymond-Barker family (descendants of Simon), was originally published in Vertue (1780) and later in D.F. Allen, ‘Warrants and sketches of Thomas Simon’, BMJ 23 (1941), 439–48. Earlier Allen had published the sketchbook portion in D. Allen, ‘Thomas Simon’s sketch-book’, Walpole Society 27 (1939), 13–53. Around 1973 Allen and T. Raymond-Barker arranged for the Paul Mellon Centre to photograph the archive, including each page of the sketch-book, and the Centre retained this photographic file, a few sets of prints being made. The original archive was dispersed in a sale entitled Important English Drawings and Watercolours, at Christie’s, 14 July 1987, lots 16–29, each lot being illustrated, transcribed, and fully described.
3 Oxford’s collection was sold at auction by Christopher Cock, 18–20 and 22–24 March 1742. The Petition crown was lot 138. The Oxford coin is now in the National Museums of Scotland and is illustrated here as Plate 7, 9.
4 H. Farquhar, ‘Thomas Simon, one of our chief gravers’, NC 12 (1932), 274–310. This excellent paper was made more valuable by her publication of pertinent entries from the Nicholas Minute Book. Transcriptions were made for her by F. William Cock, MD, a correspondent of Farquhar’s from 1920–33, in whose possession the manuscript then was. Helen Farquhar’s letters to him are preserved in the British Library as BL Add MS 59792 (part). Nicholas is Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State under Charles I and Charles II, until Henry Bennet took over the position in 1662. The Minute Book is actually labeled ‘N.111 Warrants & Grants The
1957 and 1961. Linecar and Stone, and Linecar. The Farquhar and Stride papers are accurate and thorough, although Stride's suffer from a lack of references. Linecar and Stone are valuable for detailing and illustrating the patterns of John Roettiers as well as the Simon crowns and their edges; the descriptions remain useful, although some details are no longer correct. Linecar's final article was based on a series of lectures he gave at the time, which were intended to float ideas and encourage broader discussion. It remains useful, although again several ideas it puts forward can no longer be sustained. Finally, Nathanson has produced a more recent summary in his book.  

**Preliminaries**

It is assumed, although not certain, that the only Charles II crowns that Simon ever made, or made dies for, are the ones that we know from their edge inscriptions as the Reddite, the Render, the Petition, and the plain. All of these were struck from the same pair of dies and differ only in their edge treatment.

Simon struck fewer than thirty full coins from this pair of dies. Although we do not have accurate figures, there are perhaps fifteen or so silver Petition coins, five silver and three pewter Reddite coins, two or three pewter Render coins, and one plain edge pewter coin. In addition there is one thin silver obverse trial striking, and two later restrike lead impressions/squeezes from the obverse die. All were presumably produced at the Tower Mint, unless Simon used his own premises. Attempted pedigrees and listings can be found in many modern sale catalogues, going back to Bergne in 1854, but none will be given here, nor will the different bust and edge types of the Roettiers crowns be considered in detail.

The obverse legends and reverse types for the period are as follows:

**O1** (obverse 1) CAROLVS [space for hair] II DEI GRATIA (the format of Simon's Petition crown and his Scottish coins, and of some Roettiers coins dated 1662).

**O2** (obverse 2) CAROLVS II [space for hair] DEI GRATIA (the format of some Roettiers coins dated 1662, and of all his 1663 production coins).

**R1** (reverse 1) two of the four shields are quartered (the format of the Roettiers coins dated 1662).

**R2** (reverse 2) no shields are quartered, thus dating after the warrant of 8 April 1663 (see below) (the format of the Simon Petition crown, and all the Roettiers 1663 production coins).
Chronology

The old style calendar was in use at this period, with the New Year beginning on 25 March. This meant that the year 1662 ran from 25 March 1662 through 24 March 1663, so dates on coins and documents need to be interpreted with care. The standard way to indicate the period from 1 January through 24 March is to use the form 1662/3, denoting both old style/new style (os/ns) dates, which avoids any ambiguity. It is also important to bear in mind that the dates that we see on official warrants and orders are those that the documents were prepared; their subjects were normally discussed and decided upon earlier, and implementation could often have been underway before the document was written.

The documented events within the years 1662 and 1663 are as follows (coinage by the press is first considered in an order of 17 May 1661):

10 January 1661/2. Evelyn was present when Samuel Cooper was drawing the king for the new coinage (see discussion of the portrait below).

24 January 1661/2. There is reference to an order for the machine coinage, and what looks like the first notice of the Roettiers and their tools.11

31 January 1661/2. An order to Thomas Simon to make tools for 'presse or Screw'.12

3 February 1661/2. The previous warrant to Simon is repeated, implying some pressure.13

7 February 1661/2. The first item seen to relate to the crown. This is a full order to Simon and the Roettiers brothers to make a crown pattern 'trial piece', it states that both had already submitted obverse and reverse drawings.14

8 April 1662. Simon's 28 February project for the production of machine-made gold twenty shillings coins was terminated as a failure.15

11 SP 29495 56, 'At the Court at Whitehall the 24th of January 1661. By his Majestie & the Lords of his most honb: Privy Council, it was Ordered That the right Honble M. Secretary Nicholas be & is hereby desired to prepare a Warrant for his Majesties Royal Signature, authorising the Officers & others in his Majesties Mint to COin the Money by the way of the Press & Screw. And that Hee likewise prepare another Warrant for his Majesties Royal Signature, Impowrting John Roetters & Joseph Roetters Gravers of his Majesties Majst to COin Counter punshions, Matrices & Dyes for COining of Money, by way of the Presse & Screw - according to such draught as his Majesties shall direct. Edw. Walker' [signed]. The right side of the document is difficult to read. It is not clear from the photocopy supplied to the writer whether Counter punshions really is written as a single phrase, without a comma between the words but with one following 'pions', as transcribed in the Calendar, but this seems to be correct, and the p in punshions is definitely lower case. Thus we have here a very early mention of counter-puncheons. In contrast the edited summary (CSPD (1661–2), 253) reads, 'Order in Council for warrants authorizing the officers of the Mint to coin by press and screw; and for John and Joseph Roetters, gravers of the Mint, to prepare counters, puncheons, matrices, etc., for coming by that mode.'

12 Nicholas Minute Book, p. 145; also transcribed in Farquhar, as in n. 4, at p. 308: 'Mr Symons to make Stamps for the new Coyne To Thomas Symons Our graver of Our Mint [margin annotation by Nicholas] Our will & pleasure is and Wee doe hereby authorise & Command you that laying aside all other Our services you forthwith p pare and make ready the original & Master matrices Matrices & Dyes for COining of Our Gold & Silver Money by way of the Presse & Screw according to such draughts as Wee shall hereafter more particularly direct & appoynt. And for soe doing this shall bee your Warrant Dated the last of January 1661'. Farquhar's article omitted the phrase about the press, screw and draughts. SP 44/48, p. 3 is identical (except in spelling, capitalization and punctuation), but the date is given there in a later marginal annotation as '62 Jan. 31 d[ ... ]'. SP 44/5, p. 148, also has identical wording except that it ends ' ... dated the last of Jan: 1661/1 To Tho: Symons our graver of our mint' This is summarized in CSPD (1661–2), 250.

13 Nicholas Minute Book, p. 152; also transcribed in Farquhar, as in n. 4, at p. 308: 'The like Warrant to Thomas Symons to make Stamps for the new Coyne dated the 2d of february 1661 J' CSPD (1661–2), 264, taken from SP 44/5, p. 148, is identical.

14 Nicholas Minute Book, p. 152; also transcribed in Farquhar, as in n. 4, at p. 308: 'Mr Symons to make a triall piece of 5 Shillings [margin annotation by Nicholas] Whereas Wee have given order to Tho: Symons to make Stamps for our Money by way of the Presse Our will & pleasure is that they severely first make a trial piece of 5 Shillings in Silver according to such draughts of heads & arms shewed unto Us with all convenient speed that may bee & that noe persons be suffered to disturb or oversee their worke until [a] same shall bee perfected & presented to Us for Our Jud[ ... ] therein whereof the said parties are to take notice & to performe Our Commands herein accordingly And for soe doing &c Dated the 5th of february 1661 J' On the same page, but on the following day, Nicholas records that Simon was to be put into Briot's house. SP 44/5, p. 154, is identical, but is addressed 'To our Trusty and Well beloved Sir Wth Parkehurst Sir Ralph Freeman and the rest of our officers of our Mint in the Tower of London', and is summarized in CSPD (1661–2), 265.

15 The 28 February warrant to make the twenty shillings pieces and the cancellation warrant of 8 April are found in Mint 1/4, pp. 25–27 (both are transcribed in Appendix I to this paper); also found in Nicholas Minute Book, pp. 178–9 and 230; and transcribed in Farquhar, as in n. 4, at pp. 308–10. The earlier warrant is also found in SP 44/5, pp. 185–6; the later one on p. 244. Both are summarized in CSPD (1661–2), 250 and 334. Existing presses would have been used, not new Blondeau engines; the dies did not hold up to even moderate use, hence the cancellation. See M. Lessen, 'Simon's mill gold coins and medals of Charles II, 1660–1662', BNJ 65 (1995), 151–68. Note that the gold coins were mostly made in March 1661/2, but are dated 1662.
13 or 18 April 1662. An extensive Mint report by Freeman and Slingesby regarding proposed machinery costs, prices and fees, as well as Blondeau's edge markings, ends with the lack of agreement between Simon and Roettiers, 'But by reason of a contest in the Art betwixt them, wee doe at present find it a very difficult thing to bring them into any agreement.'

29 April 1662. Pasted onto a warrant of this date for the Queen's seal is a drawing by Simon of what became the Petition Crown obverse, but it cannot be assumed to be of the same date as the warrant. See further discussion below.

17 May 1662. By this time the Roettiers designs must have been approved, for full specifications of denominations and designs were now warranted, although Roettiers is not named until two days later. We do not have those designs on paper, but we know that he turned in a pattern on 19 May 1662, and that it was approved. (Presumably either Simon failed to produce a pattern, which is likely, or Roettiers's work was simply preferred). Challis is probably correct in suggesting that Simon lost out because of the inferior metallurgy of his dies, which made them unsuitable for production work by the press.

19 May 1662. An order mentioning John Roettiers's pattern, and for him to prepare all the tools for the mill and press coinage; this is also the date when he became a chief engraver, a position Simon already held.

14 November 1662. A warrant to Thomas Simon, on which are his drawings for the Scottish mill coins in the style of O1/R1 (see below).

5 February 1662/3. A further warrant specifying the coins and designs 'according to the draughts lately made for Our new Silver moneys by John Roettiers one of Our Cheife Gravers'. It permits the reverse to contain either the star of the garter (found on the Roettiers coins) or the order of the garter (found on Simon's crown).

6 February 1662/3. Stride claims that the new coinage commences at this date: this is possibly a misinterpretation of the evidence.

---

16 Transcribed in full in Lessen, as in n. 15, at pp. 166-7, from BL Add MS 34358, folios 15-16, with a date of 13 April. The identical text is also found in Mint 111, pp. 142-6, with a date of 18 April 1662.

17 Mint 114, p. 31 (transcribed in Appendix I to this paper); Stride, as in n. 6, at p. 185. SP 44/7, pp. 60-1, is identical, and is summarized in CSPD (1661-2), 275. On that same day, Blondeau was given a pension and house (transcribed from SP 44/7, pp. 61-2, in Appendix I to this paper).

18 C.E. Challis (ed.), A New History of the Royal Mint (1992), pp. 349-50. Challis also determined that the Roettiers were accompanied by their own smith, Peter Johnson (or Jansen). John Roettiers was certainly as gifted a craftsman as Simon, but he was not as good an artist, and he was probably quite experienced in striking coins by machine. If the Roettiers only came in January to assist in the new coinage, it is surprising that a contest was decided upon in the following month. There may already have been the intention to replace Simon, which was strengthened by his failure in April. The formal papers that survive present only a part of the picture; there is no way to know what was discussed with Mint officials in early 1662, but it surely seems that there was displeasure with his 1661 performance.

19 SP 44/7, pp. 67-8: "to p-pace punchions for copying [marginal annotation] Our will & pleasure is & Wee doe hereby require & authorise you laying aside all other Our Services & Occasions whatsoever forthwith to p-pace all the Masterpunchons Levers & chargers for Our Silver Coyins by way of the Mill & pressse according to the punchions Letters & chargers for the S' piece of Silver shewed unto Us this day as also to prepare all the punchons letters & charges for the gold Coyins according to the droughnts shewed unto Us by Our trusty Servt Henry Slingsby Esq' & approved on by Us with all possible speed & to make dyes with them for copying in the New way according to such direct-ions as you shall from time to time receive from S' Ralph freezon Knt Our M' Worker or the said Henry Slingsby his deputy And this shoule yet sufficient War'd dated the 19th of May 1663 To Our Trusty & wellbeloved John Roetiers One of Our Cheife Gravers//. Summarized in CSPD (1661-2), 378. For the appointment of Roettiers as chief engraver see SP 44/7, pp. 69-70: "Jo Rotier to bee Graver of the Mint" [marginal annotation] "Our will & pleasure is that you prepare a Bill for Our Royalt Signing to passe Our Royalt Signature to passe Our great Seale conveying a Grant unto John Roetiers Graver of the Office or place of One of Our Cheife Gravers of Our Mint To have hold & enjoy the said office a place of Graver together with the fee of 50 p annuall to be paid out of the profits of Our Mint unto him or his assignees by even porc-ions from the feast of Our Lady the Virgin S' Mary last past & a convenient dwelling house in Our Mint in Our Tower of London & all other rights profits & priviledges to the said place belonging for by & during the term of his natural life & in as ample & benefical manner as The Simon Our Cheife Graver or other Graver of Our Said Mint have formerly had & enjoyed And for same doing de Dated the 19th of May 1662 To Our Attorney or Solicitor G-_roll".

20 Preserved at the National Museums of Scotland, Edinburgh, see n. 33 below.

21 Mint 1/4, pp. 42-3 (transcribed in Appendix I to this paper); Stride, as in n. 6, at p. 185. SP 44/9, pp. 259-61, gives the same text as Mint 1/4 and is summarized in CSPD (1663-4), 41. Stride, as in n. 5, at p. 337. The previous day's record in Mint 1/4 does not say this. The sentence in Linecar, as in n. 8, comes from Craig, as in n. 8, at p. 158: "The installations were sufficiently advanced to be brought into partial use on 6 February 1662; It rightly bothered Linocar, who was unfamiliar with the 1662 gold coinage, to which Craig was actually referring (a coinage which we believe was struck from existing presses and had nothing to do with the new Blondeau machines). Perhaps Stride used the same
9 March 1662/3. Pepys was shown the new gold and silver coins, so the dies had clearly been made, and some coins were coming from the machinery, but at an unknown rate. What gold coins are meant? (At this date two weeks still remained before the end of the year 1662 in the old style.)

8 April 1663. The most elaborate of the written warrants for the coinage, detailing the designs, inscriptions and weights. John Roettiers and his draughts (i.e. drawings) are mentioned again, and the new shield design (reverse R2, with no quartering) is prescribed.

The Portrait

The machine-struck coins produced by Simon and Roettiers would have been based on new (?) portraits by Cooper, most likely those chalk drawings shown in Gibson and Foskett, or copies of them. Evelyn's diary seems to confirm this: 10 January 1662. Being call'd into his Majesties Closet, when Mr. Cooper (the rare limner) was crayoning of his face & head, to make the stamps by, for the new mill'd mony, now contriving, I had the honour to hold the Candle whilst it was doing; choosing to do this at night & by candle light, for the better finding out the shadows; during which his Majestie was pleased to discourse with me about several things relating to Painting & Graving &.

There may be problems with this entry, however. Katherine Gibson disputes the date, arguing that 'the existing diary was written up from the year 1684 onward from earlier notes and it is my contention that the occurrence could have taken place as much as eighteen months earlier: a date such as 10 June 1660 may have been misread. The coins and medals, which so closely imitate Cooper's drawings, prove that the drawings belong to the year 1660, and Aubrey and Richardson substantiate the early sitting.' She contends that the Cooper portrait was a preparatory study for Simon's initial coinage, produced as a matter of urgency in 1660, and describes Cooper's standard procedure, which was to keep the original drawings from which he could make future copies. She also goes into the history of the drawings, discussing which of the two drawings Simon would have had (the worked-up copy, not the Ad...
Vivum original) and what Roettiers would have had (neither of these two, but a further copy). In Gibson’s opinion there was insufficient time between the January and February 1661/2 warrants for Cooper to have made his original drawing at the date Evelyn recorded.

Gibson’s arguments are convincing, but she is sometimes not altogether accurate over the dates of the coins and medals. For example, the Restoration medals dated 1660 have been shown to have been issued a year or two later, as commemoratives.29 Gibson also made a number of other errors. For example, the hammered gold coin she illustrates is not a pattern, nor do the left-facing busts used for the hammered coins look much like Cooper’s right-facing drawings. In 1660 there could (or indeed should) have been drawings, probably by Cooper, that Simon used as the basis for his sketches for the hammered coins in the warrant of August and for the coins themselves, but these are not the ones. It is likely that in 1662 the proposed new (machine-struck) coinage would have required new and more up-to-date Cooper drawings, as Evelyn’s diary entry states, even though Gibson does not feel this to be so. Linecar30 simply refers to Craig’s statement ‘Samuel Cooper commissioned to crayon the King’s portrait for the new coinage’, for 1662, but Craig may simply have used Evelyn, and not seen any Mint document. Stride had no hesitation in quoting Evelyn and accepting the date 1662.31

The writer accepts the January 1661/2 date for the portrait, but must admit that the profile on the Coronation medal, certainly issued in April 1661, looks the same as that on the Petition Crown. If the date must be changed, then 10 January 1661, instead of 1662, would make far more sense and fit better with Simon’s medals. (One possible explanation might be that the diary editors had simply confused a new style for an old style date reference for the incident.)

Simon’s Drawings

O2/R1. The ‘Simon Archive’ included loose cutout drawings of both sides of an English crown showing the date 1662 (Plate 5, 1).32 These are clearly Simon’s work, but the bust is not the Petition one. They may be those he submitted early in 1662, but nothing more is known about them. The obverse legend is type O2, but the II in the King’s title looks like an unbalanced afterthought. The reverse is the earlier type, R1, with quartered shields. The shields are shaped more like those of the Petition reverse, but there is no central motif, whether the Carter or otherwise. These designs are very similar to those for the Scottish coins in a separate warrant that will be discussed below.

O1/R1. Also included in the archive were two separate, original warrants (with drawings) for Scottish and English coins.

That for the Scottish machine-struck coins, dated 14 November 1662 (Plate 5, 2),33 shows coins very similar to those on the above cutouts for an English crown, although with obverse legends of the opposite style, O1. Here at least we have an obverse associated with a year date. The reverse is R1.

By way of comparison, a warrant of 25 August 1660 to Thomas Simon for the English hammered coins illustrates his impression of Charles about a year and a half earlier, based on an unknown portrait (Plate 5, 3).34

---

29 Lessen, as in n. 15.
30 Linecar, as in n. 8, at p. 431.
31 Stride, as in n. 5, at p. 334.
32 British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings (the obverse is their Registration No. 1987-7-25-29(2) PDB434, the reverse is 1987-7-25-39(1) PDB435), ex Christie’s, 14 July 1987, lot 23; Allen, as in n. 2, at pp. 44-5. These may have been originally submitted in this manner, or (more probably) were later cut from an originally larger sheet. Plate 5, 1 is taken from the Christie’s catalogue.
33 National Museums of Scotland, Edinburgh: ex Christie’s, 14 July 1987, lot 26; Allen, as in n. 2, at pp. 443-4 (transcribed in this paper as Appendix II, no. 1). Plate 5, 2 is taken from the Christie’s catalogue. Simon supplied only the puncheons, but the coins produced by Falconer in 1664 did look like these drawings.
34 Spink auction no. 95, 25 November 1992, lot 99; ex Christie’s, 14 July 1987, lot 21; Allen, as in n. 2, at p. 440, Wrongly dated by Allen (and subsequently by Christie’s) to 1662. Three of the ten specified obverses are illustrated. (Transcribed in this paper as Appendix II, no.2). Plate 5, 3 is taken from Allen.
A Petition bust drawing does, however, exist. Pasted onto an unrelated large, illustrated warrant to Thomas Simon of 29 April 1662, for the seal of Queen Catherine, is a drawing on vellum of the Petition crown obverse. The drapery is the same, but the bust is smaller and of a better proportion than on the crown that was ultimately produced (and became famous for its edge inscription). The obverse legend is type O1. This cutout could have been added to the warrant at any time, so the date of the warrant is of no help. A reverse drawing would have been unnecessary, and none was probably ever produced, because Simon’s original cutout would have sufficed, even with its obsolete quartered shields. Unfortunately, the lack of an accompanying reverse makes it futile to try to assign a date to this sketch, although the assumption is that it is likely to belong to 1662. On the accompanying plate (Plate 6, 4a-b) the full warrant is shown at reduced size, with the drawing of the crown repeated at full size.  

Signature

On the crown the signature is Simon in a script matching those on the 1665 Dominion of the Seas medal (which incidentally has a bust similar to that on the crown), on his 1656 invoice for the naval medals, on other invoices, and in his sketchbook. It is the formal hand that he used for his last name when he wanted to embellish it. Signatures in his major accounts of 1657 and 1665 are not in the same script, and may be copies by clerks. Such a flamboyant medallic signature makes no sense on a coin, although it does on a presentation pattern. He used an $ in similar script on his currency gold coins of 1662.

Simon’s Account

Simon died around July 1665. His long account (accompt) for Charles II of c. April 1665 ends with item 73 (altering dies for the small value coins), but contains nothing relating to a crown. However, when payments to his widow were being assessed a few years later (1667–8), a report by Lord Ashley refers to three additional items, 74, 75 and 76. These were on a separate, loose sheet supplementing Simon’s basic account. This supplement has not survived, but Ashley’s report has, and refers to,

‘[item] 75 ffor two Stampes, or dyes, for the Crowne peice of Silver/ yo’ Mats Warr′ for makeing them./ The Receipt of the Officers of the Mint for them./’

No other tools or date or price is mentioned, but it looks like the three additional items totalled £110. What this statement, along with the other Ashley documents, tells us is that Simon was officially ordered to make a pair of crown dies, that the Mint physically took receipt of them, and (as we know from other documents) that years later his wife was paid for them. What other crown did Simon make but the Petition crown? No Roettiers crown can be mistaken for a Simon.

Unfortunately, we cannot put a date to item 75. Supplemental item 76 is the Dominion of the Seas medal (M1506/145) dated 1665. Supplemental item 74, a steel signet for Arlington, is not datable, but could also belong about or after April 1665, when Secretary of State Henry Bennet became Lord Arlington. Simon’s entries can use Bennet and Arlington interchangeably, so it is not

---

35 British Library Add MS 16400. Reproduced by permission of the British Library. (Transcribed in this paper as Appendix II, no.2). The crown is drawn on a piece of vellum which has been pasted down onto the paper leaf. Catherine’s seal itself became item 15 in Simon’s account of 1665, and he charged £100 for it ‘a Great Double Seal, for the Queens Maj.’. It is interesting that this sheet seems to be the only Simon drawing(s) outside the ‘Simon Archive’. References to drawings for seals being attached to orders appear in some Commonwealth Council proceedings in The National Archives/Public Record Office, as calendared in various volumes of the CSPD, but the drawings are gone, and one would guess that they were returned to Simon to carry out the work. However, one may hope that some might yet remain buried in the records.  


37 There are three copies of the account in the British Library: Add MSS 18762; Add MSS 43190; and Add MSS 59792, which is the one published in the 1780 edition of Virtue, as in n.2.  

38 BL Add MSS 18762, part 4, of 18 July 1665. It appears to be unique in referring to these three additional items. The text of this document can be found in Lessen, as in n. 15, at p. 165.
certain that item 74 post-dates Bennet's elevation to the peerage, although it is probable. One might expect items 74–76 to have been made after the final entry, item 73, in the main account, but it is possible that Simon had forgotten some things and that his notes were later consolidated by his wife, Elizabeth, who was seeking payment after his death, and who may have done the original accounting and record keeping, too, as his bookkeeper.

Item 75 has to be our Petition crown, and the dies have to be deemed official, with the first bill for payment probably submitted in or after 1665. The date of the invoice only provides a *terminus ante quem* for the production of the crown. The warrant necessary to initiate the production of the coin must have been the early, generic one issued to Roettiers and Simon on 7 February 1661/2, instructing both parties to make a trial piece, and not some separate one, which has subsequently been lost.

**Roettiers’s Crowns**

To judge from the standard references, and from an unpublished list kindly supplied by Harry Manville, Roettiers’s pattern and currency coins have not always been clearly differentiated with respect to their obverse legend and reverse shield types. Using the O/R types defined above, it seems that, regardless of whether they are patterns or currency issues, the Roettiers 1662 coins are O1/R1 with rose below the bust or O2/R1 without rose, while those dated 1663 and later are always O2/R2, which suggests that this may be the correct sequence of production. Simon’s crown is inconsistent, with its O1/R2 combination. The use of R2 implies a date after 8 April 1663, and indeed both Simon’s and Roettiers’s reverses dated 1663 properly have the expected new shields.

The warrant of 8 April 1663 proves that Reverse type 2 followed type 1. We also know that Obverse legend 2 was the one eventually chosen for use, because all currency coins from 1663 on (and even some coins dated 1662) used that style. However, it is not certain that Obverse 1 definitely came first, rather than being casually interleaved by Roettiers or Simon. Knowing that would help to place Simon’s drawings in their correct sequence. Similarly it is not known when or why Roettiers used a rose on some of his obverse dies. Alan Broad was against the traditional idea that it represented the use of West Country silver, as it did in later years, and proposed instead that it could have indicated silver from one of the two major bullion sources of the time – the French payment for Dunkirk (November 1662 to mid-1663) or the silver derived from the melting down of the Commonwealth coins (after May 1662). If this is correct, then rose-marked coins cannot be regarded as earlier than non-rose coins. In 1981 Broad stated that the issue crowns dated 1662 were not struck until early the following year, but he did not give any source for this statement.

**The Edge Inscriptions**

The three raised-letter edge inscriptions themselves cannot be associated with any dates. At some time long after 19 May 1662, when he had already lost his competition with the Roettiers, Simon conceived the petition text to accompany his overdue pattern. Designed for presentation to King Charles and his officials (a good reason why none with that edge are known in pewter), the Petition crown was intended to impress and to serve as a challenge to the Roettiers’ work. The other legends, with the biblical Reddie and its English translation ‘Render’, were not prescribed in any official document, and were probably also Simon’s own choice. Illustrations of some Petition and Reddie edge inscriptions (taken from plaster casts) have been published in the literature, but the Render edge has not yet been illustrated.

The following readings are compiled from a number of sources, but the various terminal symbols are not shown:

---


SIMON'S PATTERN (PETITION) CROWN OF CHARLES II

THOMAS SIMON. MOST. HUMBLY. PRAYS. YOUR MAJESTY TO. COMPARE. THIS. HIS TRYALL. PIECE. WITH. THE. DUTCH. AND. IF. MORE TRULY. DRAWN. & EMBOSSED. MORE. GRACE. FULLY. ORDER'D. AND. MORE. ACCURATELY. ENGRAVEN. TO. RELIEVE. HIM.

REDDITE. QUÆ. CÆSARIS. CÆSARI &c. POST

(Vertue records this legend as ending POST. NYVBILA. PHOEBUS, reflecting the full meaning of the pictured motif, 'after the clouds comes the sunshine', but it actually ends with POST, unless he had access to an otherwise unpublished specimen.)

RENDER TO. CÆSAR. THE. THINGS. WHICH. ARE. CÆSAR'S. &c

Evelyn claimed to have been the source of Roettiers's decus. et. tutamen edge legend: '... Mr. Slingsby, to whom I suggested the Decus & Tutamen out of a Vinet in Cardinal de Richelieu's Greek Testament ...', although he did not mention this in his diaries, where it could have supplied a useful date. The instruction to add the regnal year to the edge inscription was given in a warrant of 10 April 1663, so the Decus wording itself, which had been specified as early as 5 February 1662/3, had been decided upon at least two months earlier. In fact some coins by Roettiers have the date on the edge even before then.

Edge Lettering and Die Striking Methods

On the Roettiers crowns, the letter bases on the faces are bifurcated (indented, fish-tailed), the edge lettering having been applied by the Blondeau/Castaing parallel bar method in a separate operation, as might have been expected since that is why Blondeau was there. It is just possible that a careful examination of the various Roettiers patterns might even show some collar use since they were experimenting in 1662, although Professor Gaspar, who has examined the coins in the British Museum, says there is no evidence for the use of a collar.

In contrast, Simon's crown letter bases are square, implying that the edges were applied by band/collar and that everything was done in a single striking operation. Are there any tell-tale witness lines from band endings? None are obvious on the Reddite edge, unless there is one in the terminal sun/cloud motif, as Gaspar felt he saw in the British Museum's pewter Render and silver Reddite coins in 1978. However, there is a single curved raised line at the end of the Petition text, which almost certainly shows it to have come from an inscribed band.

Several theories have been proposed for how the edge marking was applied and it may be useful to rehearse them here, since the issue remains undecided.

Ansell published a sketch of what he presumed was a single thin, flexible steel petition-lettered fillet (band), and a large washer-shaped disk collar enclosing it. He suggested the coin was struck in a single operation, with the dies surrounded by the collar and band. When struck, the coin was knocked out of the collar and the band would spring loose. He went on to measure the Mint's silver coin and found that the reverse diameter was 0.0053" greater than that of the obverse, thus making it easier to punch the coin out of the collar. His assertion that this coin had still been in existence in the living memory of some of the Mint employees is hard to accept - why would a heavy metal washer have been kept, or been recognized as significant, while the lettered band, a gem had it still been around, is not mentioned and clearly had not survived.

Gaspar suggested that the edges were put onto the planchet before it was struck with the real dies, most likely by using a lettered band (perhaps as proposed by Ansell) and striking the

---

41 Vertue, as in n. 2.
42 Evelyn, as in n. 1, at p. 225. Apparently from Virgil's Aeneid.
43 Mint 1/4, pp. 42-3 for 5 February 1662/3, and again pp. 49-50 for 8 April 1663, specified the Decus edge legend as well as the obverse and reverse legends. For the addition of the regnal year to the edge legend on 10 April 1663 see Mint 1/4, p.3 (transcribed in Appendix I to this paper). SP 14419, p. 348 gives the same text with a marginal note 'addition to silver & gold Coyne &c.' and is summarized in CSPD (1663-4), 107.
44 G.F. Ansell, The Royal Mint (1870), pp. 54-5, based on the opinions of the Deputy Master, William Henry Barton. Craig, as in n. 8, at p. 163, has similar suggestions about the edge marking, which may derive from Ansell. Hocking also seems to have followed Ansell (W.J. Hocking, 'Simon's dies in the Royal Mint Museum, with some notes on the early history of coinage by machine', NC* 9 (1909), 56-118.)
planchet with blank or preparation dies. The final striking then took place with the real dies, without the use of a collar. He explains away the lack of bifurcation in the lettering from discussions he had with Mint personnel at the time of preparing his paper and also several years later. In substance, his argument is that the diameter of the shouldered or necked obverse die was larger than that of the coins actually produced, and thus it could not have fitted within a collar that simultaneously added the edge lettering.\(^\text{45}\) (Gaspar's current thinking about the final striking has changed somewhat; see below.)

In 1974 Graham Dyer supplied Gaspar with coin and die dimensions (see Plate 7, 10, and Appendix III), which Gaspar then used in his paper. Dyer also expressed the then-current Mint opinions about the edge marking, as follows:

As you will see from the enclosed table, the measurements for which you asked have proved to be as significant as you expected and demonstrate, probably conclusively, that a lettered collar was not used with the obverse and reverse dies during the striking process. The steel band idea therefore looks good, especially as I gather from my colleagues that they would expect no great difficulty in removing a concave blank from the band and collar. But on the other hand one or two people here, impressed by the quality and uniformity of the edge lettering, incline to the view that the edge is more likely to have been lettered after striking, with the engraver putting right by hand any damage caused to the coin.

We have also given further thought to the fact that the obverse die has a neck. One possible explanation that has occurred to us is that the neck would have enabled the die to be used with a soft locating collar; thereby making it easier to centralize the lettered blank in the press. Such a collar, being soft and larger in diameter than the blank, would not damage the edge lettering and it may interest you to know that one of my colleagues remembers striking some Maria Theresa Thalers in this fashion and for this reason years ago. He tells me that he used rubber for the locating collar.

It is true that our Petition Crown has nevertheless been struck slightly off-centre but if you look at the enclosed photograph you will see that the die itself is somewhat eccentric. The die is also rather the worse for wear and the pitting suggests that at some time it has been necessary to remove rust; but at least it has survived, unlike the reverse die, which sadly is not there.\(^\text{46}\)

In 1978 Gaspar had further discussions at the Mint with Mr Hinkley and Eldon Philips. They suggested that striking multiple blows to the planchet could produce letter bases that lacked bifurcations even when no collar was used. And for the Petition crown, Philips proposed that the collar could have sat on the shouldered obverse die while the band sat on the obverse die face, meaning that the (no longer extant) reverse die must have been of smaller diameter to sit within the same band. He also felt that an apparent ridge within the rim denticles was due to metal flowing under the band on the obverse and between the band and die on the reverse.\(^\text{47}\) Gaspar does not now agree with this suggestion.

Recently Professor Gaspar was good enough to provide the writer with a new survey of the subject, which modifies some of his originally published views, as well as the ideas subsequently advanced by the Mint staff. This is reproduced here in extenso:

Bifurcated letters provide a positive indication of striking without the confinement of a planchet by a collar, but the absence of bifurcated letters is not conclusive evidence for the use of a collar. The extent of bifurcation depends on many factors, including the hardness and thickness of the planchet, the height of relief of the design, and the nature of the blow delivered by the coining press. In addition, multiple impressions of the dies can eradicate or at least obscure the bifurcations present after the first, or first several blows.

Gaspar agrees that Ansell's statements about edge marking of the Petition Crown are dubious. Ansell recognized the concavity of the edge of the Petition Crown (1.5874" at the obverse face.

\(^\text{45}\) P.P. Gaspar, 'Simon's Cromwell crown dies in the Royal Mint museum and Blondeau's method for the production of lettered edges.' BNJ 46 (1970), 55-63, at pp. 60-1, a paper that firmly and finally defined the edging technique for the Cromwell coins.


\(^\text{47}\) Information from Gaspar's unpublished notes.
1.5741” at the center, 1.5837” at the reverse face), and to accommodate this he proposed that an inscribed steel band with a curved cross section in the direction normal to its length (also curved) held within a solid collar was employed to constrain the planchet while the obverse and reverse dies struck the coin. The struck Petition Crowns were, according to Ansell, knocked out of the collar together with the steel band as were medals in Ansell’s day.

Gaspar does not believe that the struck Petition Crowns could have been knocked out of the collar without shearing off some edge lettering in the arrangement depicted by Ansell. A band with a curved cross section would have had to be coiled within a split collar, itself held within a solid collar.

A hitherto unrecognized problem, according to Gaspar, is: how would such a band have been fabricated. A strip of steel with a curved cross section normal to its length resists bending – thus such a band would likely have had to be engraved while flat, then bent into a circle, and then given its curved cross section perpendicular to its length.

Gaspar was persuaded that the Petition Crowns and Reddite Crowns were given their edge inscriptions in an operation separate from the striking of the obverse designs by the observation that the surviving obverse die has a considerably larger diameter (1.6390 and 1.6668” vs 1.577 and 1.5836” for the Petition Crown, 1.5565 and 1.5688” for the Reddite Crown) than the coins struck from it. This 0.05 to 0.11” difference would have prevented the die, although provided with a neck, from fitting within a collar which simultaneously impressed the edge lettering. Gaspar believed then (1976), and still believes, that the doubling of some of the rim denticles on the BM specimen of the Reddite Crown were due to multiple strikes which served to suppress the indentations on letter bases that are often visible in the inscriptions on coins struck with a screw press without the use of a collar to constrain the outward flow of metal caused by the blows from the dies. With the use of modern knuckle-action coining presses apparent doubling, often termed machine doubling, can cause manifestations similar to those from multiple impressions of the dies, but Gaspar does not believe that the doubling seen on the BM Reddite Crown is due to this cause.

The suggestions by Mr. Eldon Phillips of the Royal Mint that an inscribed band within a collar sat on the Petition Crown obverse die, and the reverse die with a diameter smaller than that of the obverse die fit within the band held by the collar, allowing the edge and face designs to be impressed at the same time (but of course not necessarily with a single blow) is plausible, but raises the question why was the obverse die given a neck? An explanation consistent with the multiple blow hypothesis is that a collar was needed to hold together the assembly of planchet and obverse and reverse dies and the diameter of the neck was chosen to prevent crushing of the edge inscription previously applied to the planchet. The Phillips explanation for a ridge within the rim denticles is considered implausible by Gaspar.48

In other instances for which we have evidence, Simon’s edge marking was applied by Blondeau’s parallel bar method before striking, the dies were flat (not shouldered), and the resultant face lettering was bifurcated. This was a two-step operation in 1651 and 1656–8, where one expects to and does see some overlapping of the edge inscription, but we do not see this on the few Reddite or Render edges that were examined. Of course this became Blondeau’s production method from 1663 on. We do not know if Blondeau assisted Simon at all in the period 1662–3, nor do we know the relationship between the two, if any. Once the Roettiers began production Blondeau’s involvement had to be with them. We do not even know if Simon was privy to the parallel bar machinery, though he probably was, having had to make the lettered strips. One is hard pressed to think of anything Simon made after 1658 that used Blondeau’s edging techniques; yet it has been proposed that some lettered-edge Restoration medals of around 1662 were made that way, and had the expected bifurcated letter bases on their faces.49 It seems safe to say that the parallel bar technique was not used for the Charles II Simon crowns.

48 Private communication from Gaspar in 2004.
49 Lessen, as in n. 15, at p. 161, although he failed to examine the edges himself to study their methods of production. These are the Magna/Magniulus medals dated 1660, but actually produced a little later. Since Simon made nothing on his own with edge markings, independent of Blondeau, one wonders if there was a Blondeau connection with these medals around 1662.
Just a handful of genuine Simon coin and medal dies survive, and only the unfinished, cracked 1650 Lord General medal obverse die comes to mind as being shouldered – the rest are flat. What mechanism he intended to use to strike that medal is unknown for, aside from an initial lead trial, nothing was struck from this fractured die until it was used at the Mint in 1738, where split band/collars left very definite witness lines as evidence on the plain edges. However, even without other dies being available today, it can be seen that Simon used blank collars for some plain edge medals. This is not a guarantee of shouldered dies, but it certainly points in that direction. Sometimes we find evidence both for collar use (the edge has a witness line; the letter bases are square) and for non-collar striking (the edges have no witness line; the letter bases are bifurcated) for a single medal type. This is true for the Lord Protector medals of 1655–58 and the 1665 Naval medals, both extant in each mode. In the 1655 case, the early strikings were without collar, the later ones with, presumably to hold things together when the reverse die fractured: those later examples display a clear edge witness line.

The writer has examined just a single pewter Reddite coin. It has a clean edge inscription, but there is no obvious trace of a witness line in the clouds or elsewhere, nor is there any overlap from parallel bars. Both faces overlap the edge in a strange manner, more obviously from the obverse, creating a flattened or squashed effect, with the denticles (beading) beginning to wrap around or overflow the edge, rather like melting ice cream dripping over the rim of its cone (Plate 7.5, giving several views). This could indeed suggest that an edge was put on first using blank dies, band and collar, and that the planchet was then struck with the real dies, surrounded only by a loose collar. This could flatten the soft metal and create this effect. (Picture a large obverse die, striking a smaller diameter soft metal blank, over a smaller reverse die, resulting in the slightly dominant obverse overflow.) Unfortunately we cannot draw any broader conclusions from just one specimen.

So, how were the edges made? We cannot be sure how Simon worked – at least not without experimenting with new tools made for the purpose. Because of its unusual two-line concave profile, the superb and fascinating Petition edge is very distinct from the square, more production-oriented Reddite/Render edges. However, regardless of the edge type, all the coins display similar square letter bases in both the obverse and reverse legends. The conclusion must be that Simon used a collar/band, not parallel bars, for all three edges; that these edges were applied to the blanks in a separate process prior to the final striking; that a similar final striking process was employed for all three, using some form of loose collar principle; and that the equipment used was one of the medal screw presses, which Simon had so frequently used before without Blondeau's assistance. The fact that there is no evidence of any previous lettered band/shouldered-die work by Simon is bothersome and, if he did use such a combination at this time, then this was a new technique, at least for him. Professor Gaspar's conclusions must be near the truth, although the writer still remains unhappy about the lack of bifurcation, on any (?) of the examples.50

In fact, working out how Simon made these edges is something of an academic exercise, since by 1663 Blondeau's process had already become established, so all the elaboration in the Petition edge, and the difficulties involved in its production, were incidental. Simon could afford to adopt a complicated, slow, medallic process for promoting his dies, the edge, and the (large) portrait. His shouldered dies, if used in production, would have been incompatible with Blondeau’s flat-die production methods, which Simon knew as well as anyone else.

Thin Silver Obverse Striking

This unique piece (Plate 7, 7) must be a die trial. It has been well known in the salerooms since the Wakley sale in 1909,51 and has been improperly referred to as a cliché since the Farquhar sale in 1955,52 where the term may have originated from her notes. It is an obverse impression on a thin

50 The writer examined a number of double-struck medals with completely bifurcated or completely square letter bases, but never saw one having a combination of ghost letters showing bifurcation underlying square final letters. The pieces examined were non-Simon English and Dutch medals from about 1661 to 1740. A heated blank, requiring less force and thus less resultant outward flow, would also have helped to reduce bifurcation.

51 Thomas Wakley, collection sold at Sotheby, 6-8 December 1909, lot 157.

piece of silver (precise thickness unknown), which has at some time been mounted on a thick silver disk, which unfortunately means that it is no longer possible to see if the reverse is incuse or flat. The waviness in the field is probably a result of its thinness and fragility before mounting.53 The legend on the left arc shows doubling, and even tripling – effectively ghosting. This is less pronounced on the right arc, which implies an imbalance in the press setup. All letter bases are square, which would be the case if the silver blank sheet was cut much larger than the die, and the striking was trimmed or punched out afterwards. It could also result from the use of a thin blank sheet. It is certainly not produced by the use of a collar. The letter 'C' is unflawed. Little triangles surrounding the denticles are a result of the later mounting process, and are nothing to do with the die.

It is not clear what the term cliché was supposed to mean in this context. Normally it refers to an electrotyp or a negative mould in the printing-type world, and this carries through in French numismatics to mean an electrotyp. Farquhar defines it as 'signifying a thin shell of silver – a uniface plate, usually in high relief and incuse on the reverse'. Going on to compare this to the French usage, she says 'for in England the word does not necessarily imply that the piece in relief is cast and not struck'.54 None of these definitions applies here, and the word cliché should not be used to describe this item.

The writer would argue that this is simply a trial impression, possibly made before the die was hardened, in order to see what it would look like in silver. It was probably struck manually in a medal press, gently softening the blows to avoid stressing the die too much (which would also help the letter bases to remain square), possibly with a hardwood block below the silver. This would result in some incuseness depending on the hardess of the base/wood, the force used, and the thickness of the silver, but it is now impossible to tell how much. Alternatively there is at least a possibility that it was a hammered striking instead, since very similar thin obverse silver strikings of the first hammered issue twenty shilling and halfcrown pieces are also known. As well as these, there are also normal thickness trial strikings in lead of the obverse of the 1656 halfcrown and, in pewter, of a shilling and a couple of sixpences of 1658. Simon must have made many others that are no longer with us; the surprise is that any of them have survived.

The Die

The original steel obverse die is in the Royal Mint.55 It is cracked (as described below) and badly corroded (Plate 7, 6). It is a normal shouldered type, and, from his visual examination, Graham Dyer considered it to be of a homogeneous composition, without a separate cap for the die face. Linecar and Stone were wrong to include this specimen in their discussion of the dies kept in the Simon family until Newton bought them back.56 During the Commonwealth, or rather at its collapse, Simon retained in his possession his tools, including the dies and punches (understandably since he was owed a lot of money, which would probably now never be forthcoming). However, during the reign of Charles II such tools were the property of the Mint – the Ashley papers confirm this for the crown dies (see above). It was Mint officials who decided which tools were subsequently retained for study or for posterity: in this case the obverse die was kept, but the reverse was not. No puncheons relating to this die have ever been mentioned.

The Die Crack

A crack began to develop at the 7 o'clock edge position of the letter 'C' early on in the life of this die, and is evident on most of the pewter and silver coins, independent of their edge type. The thin
silver trial piece just discussed should be the earliest piece struck since it is without a trace of the flaw (Plate 7, 7). A pewter Reddite striking shows the flaw in its early stages, as just a blip (Plate 7, 8). Murdoch's silver crown with a Petition edge (Plate 7, 9) is a good example of the more developed crack, although the illustration in the sale catalogue, which is taken from a plaster cast, actually makes the flaw look more extensive than it does in this direct photograph. Ignoring the later effects of rust, the die itself exhibits the final extent of the flaw, as do the two lead obverse restrikes.

These lead impressions were made at the Mint from the rusty die, one a little earlier than the other, when the die was somewhat less rusty. This may have been done in the mid-eighteenth to late nineteenth century, when Simon's work was popular. Since they were removed from the Mint, they must have been made for, or got into the hands of, people of some influence. Using such a fragile die precluded hard striking in a normal press, but rather called for a slow, manual operation into soft metal — a squeeze. The lettering exhibits no bifurcation. An examination of the illustrations of the many silver and pewter crowns pictured in auction catalogues makes it clear that all the types show the flaw gradually spreading downwards, proving that they were all being struck reasonably concurrently. There is no evidence pointing to any sequencing as a function of edge type. The same developing flaw is seen on pewter and on silver specimens, and on Reddite, Render and Petition coins. Many of the specimens illustrated in auction catalogues seem to have only the tiniest start of the crack, or appear to have no trace of it at all, but this can probably be attributed to the use of plaster casts or to the vagaries of photographic lighting and printing. Dr Cook kindly examined the pewter Reddite and the two Renders at the British Museum and reports that they have medium length flaws, similar to that of the Museum's oft-illustrated Grueber Petition crown. The entire production run was probably of short duration, possibly just a few weeks, until the die crack became too obvious for further use.

**Discussion**

By the end of 1661 it was apparent that a machine-struck coinage would be produced. That this was so smoothly funded and implemented, without excessive confrontation with the existing moneyers and without the delays that had occurred under the Commonwealth, is surprising. Although the Committee for the Mint had approved Blondeau's proposals as early as mid-1651, there was no great sense of urgency, nor funds, even though counterfeiting and clipping were deemed serious problems. No further consideration was given to the matter until two years later, but this was still-born because Parliament was dissolved soon after. At the time the Protectorate seemed ready to make a tentative new start, Cromwell died, and the impetus for coinage reform died with him. In 1661 both the Mint officials and King Charles were ready to act.
In 1661 and very early into the following year it was still intended that Simon would produce the new machine-struck coinage. The Roettiers brothers probably arrived in January 1662, ostensibly to provide additional manpower, while Blondeau had already been brought back to London by Simon a month or so earlier. January saw orders issued for die making, and by February drawings ('draughts' as they were known then) had been submitted by both die makers, based on the Cooper portraits arguably drawn the month before. 'Trial' (i.e. pattern) crowns for the 'mill & presse' were then ordered, so clearly a comparison or contest of sorts was intended. Simon's drawings may well have been those we know today (Plate 5, 1, the loose cutouts with the 1662 date), but Roettiers's are not known to have survived. The original idea was for them to work together, but this proved to be wishful thinking.

Nothing concrete is recorded for April, which is when we would expect both men to have been busy making dies and patterns. Pre-occupied with the severe mechanical difficulties and the metallurgical problems with his dies that he was experiencing in his gold coinage, however, Simon is unlikely to have done so, and he clearly underestimated his opponents. The Roettiers team, newcomers needing to prove the quality of their work, did make pattern dies and coins at this time, as they had been ordered to do. The variety of Roettiers's crowns makes it difficult to work out how they relate to each other and which was the one he turned in on 19 May. In any event, the collapse of Simon's gold coinage project a month earlier (as a result of die breakage) effectively put an end to his part in the machine-production of the major English coinages. By 17 and 19 May 1662 Roettiers's designs were approved from his drawings and pattern. The order for Roettiers to prepare the tools for the gold and silver milled coins made it certain that Simon would effectively not be involved in the coinage for the last three years of his life, other than with small change. This is the significance of the disappearance of Simon's name from all available records connected with English coins after May 1662 (although he does appear in 1663 in connection with punchcans for the Scottish coinage, in 1664 in connection with seals, and in 1665 making a request for payment). He was replaced.

By definition, the Roettiers currency and pattern crowns dated 1662 could have been struck until about April 1663, but we have no starting date for them, unless it was 19 May. Leaving aside the occasional patterns struck from old equipment, if Blondeau's new machinery (then called 'engines') really commenced production on 6 February 1662/3, as alleged by Stride, should any Roettiers crowns have been in production for currency before then? If Stride's date for the introduction of this machinery is correct, then that would leave only six weeks before the end of 1662 by the old style reckoning (i.e. on 24 March 1663), and it is difficult to square this with the relative abundance of Roettiers crowns dated 1662. It is of course possible that Blondeau's machinery may have seen some limited use before the date suggested by Stride. If Stride's dating is correct, and assuming that the date on the coins really means what it says, then six weeks must have been sufficient for a large mintage. For our purposes, the important point is that production of the new coinage was under way before, or perhaps long before, our Simon crown made its appearance.

Unless Simon made an earlier reverse die dated 1662, to go with the design on the cutout drawing for an obverse die (Plate 6, 4b), his crown does not fit well in the events of 1662, suggesting that he never actually produced any dies in that year. If he did attempt to make dies at that time, we can only speculate why he then produced a pattern at all at a later date, after the order for the new coinage had already been issued. Had Simon won the order instead of Roettiers, his crowns would have been another failure from a production standpoint if struck on the screw press, since his dies did not hold up for more than a handful of strikes.

---

63 Nicholas Minute Book, p. 39; also transcribed in Farquhar, as in n. 4, at p. 306: 'Pass, 8. Nov.[er [marginal annotation by Nicholas] To M. Thomas Symon to goe & returne from france about his Ma.'s Service, with his Servant & necessaryes. Nov[em]b. 8th 1661.' SP 44/5, p. 40, is identical, and is summarized in CSPD (1661-2), 146. Item 44 in Simon's account of 1665 charges £65 for the journey, which he says took a month. It is assumed that this journey was to get Blondeau, whose return is thus assigned to December 1661.

64 See above, p. 94 and n. 22.

65 We assume that the dates on the coins follow the old style calendar. However, this is not absolutely certain, since the new style was also sometimes used in official contexts. Did it really matter what year was stamped on a coin? The first crown dated by regnal year is marked 1663 and year XV. It thus belongs after 30 January, the date of Charles's execution in 1649 (Charles II's year I being 1649-50). It should also post-date both 8 April (when new shields were ordered with 'four severall Escutcheons . . .') and 30 April (which saw the order to add the 'Year of Our Raigne' to the edge legend).
Summary and Conclusions

The sequence of events between February 1662 and April 1665, when Simon wrote his final ledger account, three months before he died, seems to be approximately as follows. Early in 1662 Simon submitted drawings for the new coinage, as he had been instructed to do. However, he failed to follow these up with a pattern, although he may have made the new obverse drawing later that year. He may have made the crowns we know in 1663 (as they are dated) or conceivably even later, intending them to showcase his talent and as a way of registering his annoyance at the turn of events. He still called it his ‘tryall piece’, as in the original order. He seems to have retained some hope that he could still win the order to strike crowns long after the competition with Roettiers had made such hopes illusory. In fact his coins must have been produced after 8 April 1663, when the new shield types were specified for the reverse, unless he had anticipated the required change. His final accounting of c. April 1665 did not include the crown, but it was specified on a later supplemental sheet. That, and all the related papers we have, specify a crown and make it clear that there had been an official warrant for it, that Simon had turned the dies in to the Mint (where they were formally receipted), and that years later the bill was allowed and his widow paid for the die work. This seems sufficient to justify the claim that these crown dies resulted from the official order of 7 February 1662 to make patterns, even though they were in fact produced too late to affect the decision as to who should strike the currency issue. As such they were legally Mint property. The coins struck from them are what we know today as the Petition/Redlite/Render coins.

Some lacunae in our knowledge still remain. For example, we do not have accurate dates for the Simon drawings, or for the (now lost) supplemental sheet to Simon’s account. We do not know why specimens were struck in pewter, why a medallic die axis of 0° was used, why the coins weigh 10% – 20% above average, and why a signature should appear on a coin die. Similarly it is not obvious why Simon should cut shouldered dies for a coin that was supposed to be struck using Blondeau’s machinery. Finally, what method did Simon use to mark the edge, and why would he apparently use a medai press, whose operations would be far too cumbersome and slow for a projected mass-production coinage.

Many of these problems disappear once we accept the Petition crown as a pattern. One can explain the presence of the provocative plea on an official pattern by assuming that Simon intended the Redlite edge to be the official one, and that he produced the Petition edge as a private statement – all after the issue had already been decided in favour of Roettiers. Perhaps the inconsistent die structure and striking processes should not perturb us so much, since they were never intended for the production of more than a few elaborate, medallic-style presentation pieces in the guise of a crown, produced partly at his own expense. If Simon had been able to regain favour as a result, he could have used the punches he had presumably prepared to make new (but probably not stronger!) flat, production dies. Even the late date (at a guess in the second quarter of 1663) could be explained – he knew that he was out of the current picture, but he still had a license from 1662 to make a trial crown, so why not do so, demonstrate his superior artistry, and try to obtain some more profitable orders than for seals and medals and small change. Simon was only in his forties and he could well have anticipated that a new round of coin orders would be placed in the future. If so, it was probably necessary to keep a good foothold at the Mint, even though he may have made a comfortable living as a private goldsmith. It would be interesting to know if there had been complaints about the Roettiers coins that might have encouraged him.

In the most fitting of formats, the text on the edge of his crown is one of only a very few lines of personal writings that Simon has left us, all of which are petitions: the rest are detailed invoices and his will.

---

66 But not drawings, and the status of the punches he probably produced is unknown.
67 Receipt information was passed back to Ashley, but no such notes or papers appear to be extant today.
68 Simon must have absorbed the silver, pewter, and labour costs for making the crowns themselves, since they were not mentioned as charges in his account supplement.
SIMON'S PATTERN (PETITION) CROWN OF CHARLES II

KEY TO THE PLATES

Plate 5
1. Simon’s earliest drawings for a crown, 1662.
2. Simon’s drawings for the Scottish mill coins, 1662. A portion of the warrant only.
3. Simon’s drawings for the English hammered coins, 1660. A portion of the warrant only.

Plate 6
4a Simon’s drawings for Queen Catherine’s seal, 1662. Pasted on is Simon’s drawing for the obverse of the ‘Petition’ crown. The complete warrant is shown, reduced to 0.78 life size.
4b The attached crown drawing, at full size.
Both photographs Courtesy of the British Library.

Plate 7
5. A pewter Reddite crown edge, showing the overflowing beading.
6. The obverse steel crown die. Photographs Courtesy of and Reproduced by Permission of the Royal Mint.
7. Thin silver uniface crown trial, showing the unflawed letter ‘C’ as well as the multiple strikings and the square letter bases.
8. Pewter Reddite crown showing the tiniest trace of the letter ‘C’ flaw. Same coin as in Plate 7.5.
10. Measurements of the Royal Mint Petition and Reddite coins, relating to Appendix III.

APPENDIX I. TRANSCRIPTIONS OF SOME MINT RECORDS

Mint 1/1 – At The National Archives/Public Record Office, from the Royal Mint. Record Book, vol.1 of Mint Class 1. Includes Proceedings and Orders of the Privy Council Board of Mint affairs March 1614 – July 1730, Proceedings and Orders of the Star Chamber November 1618 and June 1634, and Proclamations October 1587 – December 1717. The Privy Council entries from 1661 – 1666 are in a completely consistent, more modern hand, different from any in Mint 1/4, and have mostly just the bodies of the orders, without the full embellishments as in Mint 1/4. They were examined to see if they were Stride’s source for the crown competition information, but they were not.

Mint 1/2 – At The National Archives/Public Record Office, from the Royal Mint. Record Book, vol.2 of Mint Class 1. Includes Constitution and Proceedings of the Council of the Mint, August 1663 – September 1664. Nothing applicable was found there, for the entries deal mainly with bullion, wire and thread.

Mint 1/4 – At The National Archives/Public Record Office, from the Royal Mint. Record Book, vol.4 of Mint Class 1. Includes proceedings and orders of the Privy Council Board on Mint Affairs, April 1661 – December 1664; and Warrants and Orders giving authority and directions to the Principal Officers of the Mint, June 1660 – July 1665. Written in professional secretarial hands as copies of records of the original orders and notes. It is strange that some of the Privy Council warrants are not here, but are in the Nicholas Minute Book. There are numerous earlier orders and warrants from 1660–63 dealing with Simon’s hammered coinage, clearing Mint houses for the machinery, and so on, but only those which seem to be of relevance to this paper are transcribed below.

Ordering the production of traditional hammered coins, from dies engraved by ‘Rawlins’, 11 June 1660

Mint 1/4, p.1:
‘Charles R: Whereas Our Affairs doe require and much Import, That some speedy course bee taken to sett in hand the making and Imprinting of Our Moneys, and that Iron Stamps, and other Instruments may be prepared in Order Hereunto, Our Will – therefor is And Wee doe hereby require and authorize you, forthwith make or cause to be made ready all sorts of Irons, Punches, Instruments, and all other expeditious for the well making and Imprinting of Our said new Moneys, and that you cause Thomas Rawlins Our Gravour to Grave and cause to be engraved all such Irons with Our Effigies, Title, and Inscriptions, according to such directions and Commands as you shall receive from Vs, And for soe doing this shalbe your Warrant, Given at Our Court at Whitehall the Eleaventh Day of June 1660.


By his Ma:"es Command. Edw: Nicholas.’
Machine-striking of coins is first suggested, 17 May 1661

Mint 1/4, p.10.

'The Court at Whitehall The 17th of May 1661. 

It was then Ordered by the Lord and others of the Committee appointed to consider of the best ways to prevent the Calling Clipping Casting and otherwise Counterfeiting his Majesty's Coyn (his Majesty being for the future enjoined that all moneys both of Gold & Silver should be made by the way of Screw or Press or Letters or graynings about the Edges equal in weight and bignesse and curiously graven and Stamp'd) That the officers of his Majesty's Mint and the Provost and Company of Moneyers in the Tower of London should consider of the cheapest and lowest rate they could possibly under take to Coyne the Gold and Silver moneys at alter the way of the Press and to Report the same unto the Committee upon Monday next at three of the Clock in the Afternoon in the Council Chamber at Whitehall Edw: Walker.'

Funding ordered for the production of machine-struck coins, 17 January 1661/2

Mint 1/1, pp.140–1.

'At the Court at Whitehall the 17th of January 1661: The 3 following Orders about the Mint:

[Order 1 was to change the calling in of the Commonwealth moneys to 1 March; Order 2 was for an Irish mint; only Order 3 is transcribed here]:

It was this Day Ordered (His Majesty present in Council) That the Clerk of the Signet now Attending do forthwith prepare a Bill for His Majesty's Royal Signature to pass his privy Seal for payment of the Sume of 1400 l. to Sir William Parkhurst, and S. Anthony S. Leger Kn. Warden of the Mint by way of the Imprest Accoart, to be Imployed for Erecting the Houses, Mills, Engines, and other Materials for the Coyning of Money by the Mills.'

To begin the production of twenty-shilling mill gold coins, 28 February 1661/2

Mint 1/4, p.25.

'Charles R. Our Will and Pleasure is, And Wee doe hereby Command and authorize you to Coyne or cause to be Coyned with all possible speed such Gold as is or shall be delivered into the Mint, by our Trusty and wellbeloved Servant Stephen Fox Esqr or any other psen or psons for Our use by way of the Press or screw and for the present to make pieces of Twenty shillings only according to the Standard of Our Crown of Gold in weight and fineness observing the course directed by the Indenture of the Mnt, and making the said Twenty shillings pieces of Compease that formerly for better taking of the Impression of the Stamps, but with our figure and Inscriptions upon them as usually, and with Our Armes quartered as antiently in a plaine Escutcheon Adding the yeare of our Lord above the Crown upon the Armes and Leaving out the Letter C. on the one side and the Letter R. on the other side of the Escutcheon of Our Armes, And this shall be a sufficient Warrant unto you for the doing, And also unto all other psen employed by you in the making or preparing of any the necessary Tools and Engines for this Our Service and in Coyning with them in Our Mint within the Tower of London according to their Commands and direcons. And whereas there is a Water Mill in S. Katherine Neere unto the Tower of London longe since erected for passing of plates for the press Woe doe hereby for the better dispatch of this Our present Service in coyning the said Gold mnt and authorize you as also the Moneys of Our Mint and such as they shall Employ to pass or cause to be passed the plates of such Gold at the Mill in S. Katherine aforsaid as need shall require Provided always that it be done in the presence of the Surveyor of Our Melting-house, or in his absence in the p'sence of some other officer or officers of Our Mint deputed thereunto by you and not otherwise, for which this shall ye Warrant, Given at Our Court at Whitehall the Last day of February 1661./

By his Majesty's Command / Edw: Nicholas/

To Our Trusty and Wellbeloved S. William Parkhurst kn. S. Ralph Sireman kn. Master Worker Henry Slingeby Esqr Deputy unto our said M. & Worker James Hoare Esqr. Comptroller and the rest of the officers of Our Mint./

[This is the same as the report on the subsequent page of Mint 1/4, p.26, dated March 1661/2, and as Farquhar (as in n. 4), pp.308–9, from the Nicholas Minute Book, pp.178–9. A fourth copy will be found in SP 44/5, pp.185–6. Some, perhaps all, of the copies are by Nicholas.]

To halt the production of twenty-shilling mill gold coins, 8 April 1662

Mint 1/4, p.27, top.

'Charles R. Whereas Wee have formerly Commanded and authorized you, to Coyne or cause to be Coyned such Gold as Our Trusty and wellbeloved Servant Stephen Fox should deliver into the Mint for Our use by the way of Press or screw, and for the present to make pieces of Twenty Shillings only. Now for as much as the Dyes made by Thomas Synonds for that use hath hitherto proved insufficient for Our present Service. Our Will and pleasure is, That you forthwith Coyne or cause to be Coyned by the way of Hammer the Seisell and defective pieces of such Gold as Our said Servant Stephen Fox hath delivered into Our Mint, into pieces of Twenty, and of Ten shillings, with such marks of valuation for more plaine distinction sake as Wee have formerly appointed. And this shall be a Sufficient Warrant unto you for so doing Given at Whitehall the 8th day of April 1662/ By his Majesty's Command Edw: Nicholas./


[This is the same as Farquhar (as in n. 4), pp.309–10, from the Nicholas Minute Book, p. 230, and is identical (except for spelling) to SP 44/5, p. 244, although the latter has interesting asides, such as a marginal note in the same hand 'Bologne Gold by the Hammer', and an error in the text saying '... and for the present to make pieces of 10. only'.]
Defining the new mill coinage, 17 May 1662

Mint 1/4, p. 31.

"Charles R. Having Resolved for the preventing of Culling Clipping and otherwise Counterfeiting of Our Current Coynes to make Our Gold and Silver monies for the future by way of the Mill and Presse with Letters or Graynings about the edges or thickness of the pieces according to their respective Sizes lesser in Compass than formerly (for the better taking the Impression of the Stampes) and more embossed. And having in order thereunto appointed certaine Buildings, HorseMills, Tooles and Enginges to be made and sett up in Our Mint within the Tower of London: Our Will and Pleasure is and Wee doe hereby require and authorize you, when the said Buildings Tooles and Enginges shall be ready and fit for Our Service to coyne or cause to be coyned in the said new way, the severall sorts of silver and Gold Coynes hereafter mene-oned: That is to say, one peice of five shillings a halfe Crowne peice, a shilling and Sixpence in Silver, and one peice of five pounds one peice of Twenty shillings and one peice of Ten shillings in Gold with Our Portraiture and these words Carolus II Da.Gra. on the one side, and the Armes of Our Kingdome in rounder severall Escutcheons Crowned with the yeare of Our Lord and their words. Mag.Brit.Fra. & Hib.Rex. on the other side according to the Draughts presented by Henry Slingsby Esqr deputy unto Our M'r Worker of the Mint, both for Our gold and Silver Coynes, and approved on by us, together with such Mottoes and Inscriptions upon the edges or thickness of the gold and Silver peeces as you shall receive directions therein from us by our Trusty and welbeloved Servant Henry Slingsby Esqr. Our further Will and pleasure is and Wee doe hereby require and authorize you to make the twenty shillings piece of Gold coyned by way of the Mill and Presse, just twenty shillings in value, and see the rest of Our gold Coynes accordingly in proportion after the Rate and value allowed by our late Proclamation for the raising of the Price of Gold in this Our kingdome. And this shalbe a sufficient Warrant unto you and every one of you for soe doing Given at Whitehall this present 17th day of May 1662/

By his Ma's Command Edw:d Nicholas

To our trusty and welbeloved Sir Wm. Parkehurst kn.; Warden S r Ralph ffreman kn.; M r Worker Henry Slingsby Esq.; Deputy unto the said M r Worker James Hoare Esq.; Comptroller and the rest of the officers of Our Mint within the Tower of London, & unto all Workmen and others employed by them in Our Service."

Grants to Blondeau, 17 May 1662

SP 44/7, pp. 61-2.

"[marginal annotation] Peter Blondeau 100l p annu - Inventer of Mill Money. Having lately receaved into Our Service of the Mint Peter Blondeau a French man, Inventer of several Tooles Engines & instramt of the coyning of gold & silver money, with L50 or Graynings about the Edges of the peeces & in a more exact & expeditious way then any ever yet in practive & being pleased as a reward & encouragent unto Art & ingenuity as also for the better enabling of the said P Blondeau in the carrying on of Our Service in the new way of coyning to grant unto him an Annuity or yearely pens-anon Wee doe hereby require & authorise you forthwith to p-pure a bill for Our Royall Signature[?] imposing a Grant of an Annuity or yearely pens-on of 100l to bee quarterly paid out of ye profit of Our Mint unto the said P Blondeau for the terme of his natural life under the title and quality of Ingenieur our Mint w/in the Tower of London & all other Our Mints w/in this Our Kingdome of England together with a convenient dwelling house for himselfe & family within Our said Mint in the Tower of London And Our further will and pleasure is that you doe likewise insert into the said Grant the perticular agreemt made by S Ralph ffreman kn. Master Worker of Our said Mint & H Slingsby Esqr his deputy w/th the said P Blondeau concerning his taske & undertaking in the New way of coyning - confirmed by Us in Counsell the 18th Day of April last past for the Securing & making good the said agreemt and allowance unto the said P Blondeau his lieyns and assigns for the space of 21 years And for soe doing &c dated the 17th of May 1662/

To Our Attorney or Solicitor Generall"

Further details of the new coins, the edges, and Roettiers, 5 February 1662/3

Mint 1/4, pp. 42-3.

"Charles R. Whereas Wee have resolved by the Advice of Our Council for the better p-venting the defects. Inconveniences and abuses incident unto monies made in the old way by the hammer. To make Our Gold and Silver Coynes for the future in the new way by the Mill and Presse. with the letters or Graynings about the Edges or thickness of the pieces, And whereas wee have in Order thereunto appointed all necessary and convenient buildings Tooles and Enginges to be made and set up in Our Mint in Our Tower of London. Our Will and pleasure is and Wee doe hereby require and authorize you as aforesaid as the said Buildings, Tooles and engines, shalbe sett up and fitted for Our Service to cause to be made by way of the Mill and Presse the severall and respective Silver Coynes hereafter mentioned that is to say, one peice of five shillings, one peice of two shillings and sixpence and one shilling with Our Portraiture and their words — Carolus II. Del.Gra. on the one side, and the Armes of Our Kingdome in fower severall Escutcheons Crowned with their points turned inwards, a double letter C or Cipher of Our Name thus. Cltrevd.C. betwenee the said Escutcheons, and the Starr or Order of Our Garter in the Middle under the pointes of them and their words Mag.Brit.Fra. & Hib.Rex. and the yeare of Our Lord on the other side of each of the said several pieces, one peice of Sixpence one peice of floruerpence, one three pence, one two pence and one penny in Silver with Our Portraiture and the same Inscriptions as upon the greater Coynes in the one side and the said double Letter or Cipher of Our Name, with the severall Badges of Our kingdomes, and Inscriptions on the other side of each of the respective pieces of Our smaller
moneys, according to the draughts lately made for Our new Silver moneys by John Roettiers one of Our Cheife Gravers, presented unto Us, by you, and approved on by us. Our further Will and Pleasure is, and Wee doe hereby Commande and authorize you to cause to be put upon the Edges or thicknesse of Our peeces of fiffe shillings and of two shillings and Six pence in silver these words following that is to say Deceus et Tatum, and upon the Ringe or edges of Our shilling, you are to raise asmall straight or Crosse grayning only to be put as you shall judge it most? Secure for Our saide Coynes: Our Will and pleasure also is and Wee doe hereby Commande and ensiogne you, in respect the Indenture of Our Mint cannot soe suddenly be altered and made suitauble in all things unto Our said New way of Coyning that until such alteraccon be made you doe carefully observe the Rules and Orders appointed by the p'sent Indentures of Our Mint in the Assaying weighing and Receiving, Rating, Commingeling, Melting, Coyning, Pixing, and paying or delivering of Our owne as well as Our Subjects Gold and Silver when converted into Our Current moneys. Provided alwaies and Wee doe hereby paticulery and strictly Commande and ensiogne you, That upon the Coyning of the fift hundred thousand Crownes of Silver lately brought out of France and delivered unto you as also of all other Our, Gold and Silver, that shall hereafter be paid or delivered into yo.' hands to be Coyned you doe from time to time faithfully bring upon Accompt unto us before the Auditors of Our Mint according to the Annint and Usall forme of the same all such profit as shall arise or grow one Unto Us, by reason of the Remedy allowed by the said Indenture both in weight and finnesse, without taking or receiving yo.' selves or suffering any other pecon or poson whatsoever to take or receive any benefit or advantage by them or either of them. And this shalbe yo.' sufficient Warrant for soe doing, Given at Our Court at Whitehall this fift day of february 1662 /

By his Ma.'s Command Henry Bennett

To Our Trusty and welbeloved S' Ralph freeman kn.' and Henry Stingesby Esq' Masters and Workers of Our Mint in the Tower of London, or either of them. /' The final details of the mill coinage, with details of the new shields, 8 April 1663

Mint (/8, pp. 49-51). 'Charles R. Whereas Wee have by former Order appointed you to cause Our Silver moneys made by the Mill & Press to be graven with the Armes of England and France quarterly in the same Escutcheon whereby the Lyons and Flower Delves of other Large Crowne Coyne is to be made. And for the expressing thereof, and better discovery of Counterfeits Our Will & Pleasure is, and Wee doe hereby require and Command you, that you doe from time to time make or cause to be made by the Mill & Press (as soon as you can be fitted for the same) the several and respective Silver and Gold Coynes in manner and forme following, that is to say, One Crown or five shillings pce, one half Crown pece one shilling and one Sixpence pce of Silver with Our Portraiture having a laurel upon the Head and a Saref about the Neck and their words Carolvs II Dei Gratia on one side of each of them, and the Armes of Our Kingdom in fower severall Escutcheons. That is to say, the Three Lyons of England only in one Escutcheon, the Armes of Our Kingdom of Scotland in another the three flower Delves for France alone in a third, and a Harpe for Ireland in a fowerth Escutcheon Crowned with their points turning inwards with a double letter C or Capheer of Our Name thus [C reversed] C between the said Escutcheon and the Saref or Order of Our garter in the Middle under the points of them and these words Mag.BRI.FRAN.ET.HIB.REX. and the yeare of Our Lord on other side of each of the said several and respective Silver Coyne, one pce of Double pence one of three pence two pence and one penny of Silver likewise with our Portraiture and Inscriptions as before Upon the greater Crownes on the one side of them, And in respect the Armes of Our severall Kingdoms cannot soe conveniently be put upon such small Coyne. Our Will and Pleasure is that you doe only put upon Our pce of flower pence flower Letters C intersecting each other with the severall Badges of Our Kingdomes between them upon Our threepence three Letters C intersecting likewise each other, upon Our Two Pence the double Letter C or Capheer of Our Name and upon Our pence one C. On the other side of the said severall and respective small Silver Coyne being Crowned according to the draughts lately made for Our new Coyne by John Roettiers one of Our Cheife Gravers presented unto Us by you and approved of by Us and with the same Inscriptions as upon Our greater Silver Coyne, one piece of fivve pounes, one piece of Forty pence, one Twenty shillings pce, and one Ten shillings pce of Crown Gold with Our Portraiture having a Laurel upon the Heade and for distinction sake without a Saref about his Neck and their words CAROLVS II. DEI GRATIA on the one side of each of them, and the Armes of Our severall Kingdomes in single Escutcheons as in Our aforesaid Silver Coyne with flower Scepters between the said Escutcheon in the place of the said double Ciphers for distinction sake with their words MA/BR. ET. HIB. REX and the yeare of Our Lord on other side of each of the said severall and respective Gold Coyne. Our will and pleasure likewise is, and wee doe hereby Command and authorize you to cause to be put upon the Edges or thicknesse of Our Crowne and half Crowne of Silver, and of Our Five pounds piece of gold their words DECVS. ET. TVTAMEN, and the yeare of Our reign in words of length, or in figures if you shall finde most convenient and upon the Edges or thicknesse of Our shillings and Sixpences in silver as also upon our Forty shillings Twenty shillings and Ten shillings pieces of Gold which are too thin to receive Letters you are to cause to be small striate or Crosse grayning only to be put And Wee doe hereby also impower and authorize you for your own satisfac-ion and Security as well as for the better discovery and knowing of Counterfeite Coynes if any shall be made to put or cause to be put such privy markes or markes upon the fift sides or edges of any or all of our said Silver money and gold Coynes as shalbe made by you in such place or places and the same from time to time to alter as you shall judge most safe and convenient. [...] And for the better and more easy dispatch in the coyning of Our Silver moneys by way of the Mill & Press Our Pleasure is that Sixty pounds weight Troy be hereafter accounted a Journey of Silver and accordingly used in all Receipts and deliveries in Our Mint And for the more exact Sizing of the gold and Silver Coynes to be made by the Mill & Press, and the reducong of them unto a
greater Exactnesse and equalitie in weight. Our pleasure is and wee doe hereby authorize you that the Counter poises of the said severall and respective Gold and Silver Coynes be hereafter made higher than their just weights according to the pporcion following [?]Unto.

That
2 Graines be taken from the Counterpois of the Crowne
1 Graine
1/2 Graine
1/4 Graine
That
2 Graines be taken from the Counterpois of the five pounds piece
1 Graine
1/2 Graine
1/4 Graine
And the Warden and Comptroller of Our Mint and all others Concerned herein are to take notice of this Our will and pleasure. And for soe doing [] this shalbe to you and them a Sufficient Warrant Given at Our Court of Whitehall the Eighth day of April 1663 in the 15th year of Our Reign. / By his Majtie's Command Henry Bennet.

To Our Trusty & Welbeloved Sir Ralph Freman kn' & Henry Slingesby Esqr Masters & Workers of Our Mint or either of them:

[SP 29/71, 40 is an (or the) original two-sided warrant (no illustrations) with Charles’s seal and signature, and is identical though with good punctuation, except that it lacks the two mentions of gold Forty shilling pieces, and all the material between [] and []].

To add the calendar date or regnal year to the edge legend, 10 April 1663

Mint 1/4, p. 51.

‘Charles R. Our Will & Pleasure is & Wee doe hereby require & authorize you to cause to be Added unto the Words DECUS ET TUTAMEN by us formerly appointed to be put upon the Edges of the new gold and Silver Coynes the yeare of our Lord or the yeare of Our Raigne in words of length or in Figures, as also such privy marke as you shall judge most safe and Convenient for Our Moneys, and this shalbe your Sufficient Warrant for soe doing Given at Our Court at Whitehall this p'sent Tenth day of April 1663/ By his Majtie Command Henry Bennet

To Henry Slingesby Esqr M' & Worker of Our Mint.’

[SP 14/9, p. 348 gives the identical text with a marginal note ‘addic’ on to ye silver & gold Coyne &c.’]

APPENDIX II. TRANSCRIPTIONS OF WARRANTS TO SIMON

These are the original signed and issued warrants, with Simon's own drawings. (The other warrants and all other manuscript material published in this paper survive only as secretarial records made at the time; if original orders were issued to the individuals concerned, they are no longer extant.)

1. For Scottish coins, 14 November 1662 (ex Christie’s, 14 July 1987, lot 26).

'[signed] Charles R
Silver Gold
[drawings of the 20 and 4 mark coins, and beaded outlines for seven others]

Our will and pleasure is That upon Sight hereof you Sett about the makeing of Puntions w'h Our effigies thereupon for the Species of Coyns following viz'. For Gold: the twenty Markes piece, the tenn Marke piece, the five Marke piece the two Marke and a halfe piece, after the restoring of Our Kingdome of Scotland, And for Silver the fowre Marke piece, the two Marke piece, the Marke piece, the halfe Marke piece, and the fortie penny piece. All after the aforesaid reckoning, And for each one of the Said Species one Puntion w'h Our Effigies thereon, And likewise Our Royall Coate of Arms for each of the Said Species. And that you make all according to the draughts herein exprest for the use of Our Mint of Scotland, and being finished, that you forthwith deliver them to Charles Maitland Generall of Our Said Mint for which and for the promised this Shall be to you a Sufficient Warrant. Given att Our Court at Whitehall the 14th day of November 1662. And of Our Reigne the fourteenth yeare.

By his Majtie's Comand
Lauderdall
For Thomas Simon
one of our Cheife Grabers.'
2. For English hammered coins, 25 August 1660 (ex Christie's, 14 July 1987, lot 21).

[drawings of the gold 20 shillings, and the silver shilling and proposed halfcrown and farthing, and beaded outlines for six others]

' [signed] Charles R

These are to require, and authorize you forthwith to prepare these several Stamps for Silver, and Gold according to the Draughts herein expressed; for which this shall be your Warrant: given at our Court at Whitehall the 25th day of August in the twelfth Yeare of our Reigne. To Thomas Symons our Cheife-Graver.'

3. For Queen Catherine's seal, 29 April 1662 (British Library Add MS 16400).

' [signed] Charles R

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

To Thomas Simon one of Our cheife Gravers.'

[drawings of both sides of the seal]

APPENDIX III. DIMENSIONS OF COINS AND DIE AT THE ROYAL MINT

'These measurements (in inches) were supplied by Graham Dyer in a 1974 letter to Peter Gaspar and relate to the sketch in Plate 7, 10. The die and coins are not exactly circular as the plate illustration would imply.

Obverse die diameters:  
A=1.6576"; B=1.639"; C=1.6487"; D=1.6668"

Length of die neck =0.130"

Obverse silver Petition crown diameters:  
A=1.577"; B=1.580"; C=1.581"; D=1.5835"

Thickness of the Petition edge:  
Minimum=0.113"; Maximum=0.117"

Obverse silver Reddite crown diameters:  
A=1.5688"; D=1.5565"; C=1.565"; D=1.539"
LESSON: SIMON'S PATTERN (PETITION) CROWN (1)
PLATE 6

LESSEN: SIMON'S PATTERN (PETITION) CROWN (2)
PLATE 7

LESSEN: SIMON'S PATTERN (PETITION) CROWN (3)