More Late Anglo-Saxon and Norman Coin Jewellery

Gareth Williams

In _BNJ_ 71, prompted by two recent Treasure cases, the author published a study of what appears to be a distinct group of coin jewellery running from the Expanding Cross type of Edward the Confessor to the Two Stars type of William I, although with some gaps in the sequence. A total of 18 pieces were listed. All of the pieces described were currency coins which had been converted into brooches, or badges, by the addition of some form of pin and clasp, and fourteen of the eighteen had been gilded. All of them were mounted in such a way as to leave the reverse visible, meaning that a cross was on display. Notably, one of the gaps in the series was the one type in this period without a cross on the reverse, the _PAX_ type of Harold II, although the overall numbers were too low to provide the basis for any statistical assumptions.

Since then, three further pieces have been reported which also seem to fit into the same group. These are as follows:

1. **Provenance:** Near Sudbury, Essex, 2002 (Treasure case 2002 T277)
   - **Ruler_Type:** Edward the Confessor, Expanding Cross
   - **Mint:** Bedford
   - **Moneyer:** Ælmon
   - **Obverse:** +EDPE:/-RDREX:
   - **Reverse:** +ÆLHONONBEDEFO
   - **Gilded:** Yes
   - **Visible face:** Reverse
   - **Disposition:** Braintree Museum

   **Comments:** The coin is a silver penny of Ælmon of Bedford, from the same dies as the four coins of this type and moneyer in the BM. It is gilded on both sides, although more complete gilding is visible on the reverse than the obverse. It is not immediately apparent whether this is because the gilding is more worn on the obverse, or because only the reverse was gilded in the first place, with a partial gilding of the obverse occurring only as a by-product of the gilding of the reverse, which would be possible given gilding techniques of the period. The coin was riveted to some kind of fastening, although the fastening has been lost and only the rivet remains, close to one edge. The coin brooches normally have a hinged pin and a catch-plate, and, although the precise form of these fittings varies, such fittings are normally attached with either two or four rivets. A contemporary coin-brooch is known with the fittings secured with a single rivet placed in the centre of the coin, but it is unlikely that the same type of fitting could have been effectively secured by a single rivet placed near the edge. The fitting is therefore likely to have been a single pin or, more likely, a loop for suspension so that the coin could be used as a pendant, either singly or as part of a larger necklace. It is also possible that a catch-plate was soldered on, rather than riveted, and that a bare patch in the middle of the gilding indicates where this was, although no trace of solder remains. Whether this was a badge or a pendant, it seems to fit well into this group of coin jewellery, displaying a gilded obverse, especially as the Expanding Cross type is the type most heavily represented in the group.

---

1 Williams 2001.
2. Provenance: North Walsham, Norfolk (Treasure case 2003 T238)
   Ruler/ type: Harold II, PAX type
   Mint: Thetford
   Moneyer: Godric
   Obverse: +HAROLD REX ANG
   Reverse: +GODRIC ON DEOT1
   Gilded: Yes
   Visible face: Reverse
   Disposition: British Museum

   Comments: Struck from the same dies as a coin in the British Museum collection (BMC ii, 474, no. 122). The reverse has been gilded, and a brooch fitting attached by rivets through two holes in the centre of the coin, representing the 'type a' fitting of my earlier article. The brooch fitting has become detached, leaving a cuprous residue on the back of the coin, plus the two holes for rivets. The combination of the residue of the brooch fitting, the crisp edges of the rivet holes (showing silver which does not have the same patination as the rest of the ungilded obverse), and scratch marks (combined with a slight bend) on both obverse and reverse, suggest that the brooch fitting has been removed since the object was discovered, possibly in the process of cleaning.

Illustration: Treasure Annual Report 2003, fig. 77.

   Ruler/ type: William I, Two Sceptres type (BMC iv)
   Mint: Thetford
   Moneyer: Cinric
   Reverse: _ENRIC ON DEOTF _
   Gilded: Yes
   Visible face: Reverse
   Disposition: Aldeburgh Museum

   Comments: Chipped at two points, with small traces of solder for the attachment of the catch on the obverse side, although the exact nature of this fitting is uncertain. The coin is rather worn with the secondary gilt finish only surviving in the recesses between the motifs and lettering on the reverse, and in small areas on the obverse where the gilding survives around parts of the border.

Illustration: Treasure Annual Report 2003, figs 78.1 and 78.2.

Chronological and geographical distribution

Combining the three new examples with the earlier material, the distribution of the coin jewellery by type now appears as shown in Fig. 1.

The chronological distribution reinforces the existing pattern, suggesting that this style of jewellery was introduced while the Expanding Cross type was current (or perhaps in the following type if demonetised, rather than current coins were used), remained popular in the subsequent two types, and continued to be produced in smaller numbers well into the reign of William I. With several types represented by a single example, the absence of the Hammer Cross and Bust Facing types is probably not significant, while the previous gap for the Harold II PAX type has now been filled.
The findspots of the three new pieces do not significantly change the pattern of the relationship between find spots and mint signatures. A Thetford find from Norfolk is obviously local, while both a Thetford find in Suffolk and a Bedford find in Essex can be seen as regional finds, but the general pattern remains much the same as before. This broadly accords with the wider circulation of the coinage, with a tendency towards the use of coins from larger mints, and from the surrounding area, but with no clear prescriptive relationship. However, the fact that all three new finds come from the east of England helps to balance the predominance of Wiltshire findspots, which I previously suggested might reflect recording as much as deposition. The overall distribution remains consistent with an entirely random distribution, although there remains a complete lack of northern examples of either findspots or mint signatures which may just possibly have some significance, although this seems unlikely.

Appearance and function

The new finds now give a total of seventeen of the twenty-one recorded examples showing gilding, and reinforce the existing tendency to display the reverse rather than obverse of the coin. The one change of any note is the addition to the corpus of an example of Harold II's PAX type. That diminishes the probability – never great – that this type of jewellery was some sort of factional badge. Perhaps more significant is the fact that the PAX type does not show a cross on the reverse, and this type of jewellery is therefore no longer restricted to stylised portrayals of the cross. However, the display of the word PAX, like the cross, is consistent with this type of jewellery representing some form of religious badge, and this remains the most likely interpretation of the group as a whole, although the exact significance remains unclear.
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EDWARD III’s long reign saw major changes to the currency of England. The resumption of a sustained issue of the groat and the introduction of the halfgroat from 1351 coupled with the introduction of a gold coinage – instituted to help restore the English role in the lucrative wool trade with the Low Countries – represent an important evolutionary phase in the monetary profile of the kingdom. Within the currency community of the mint many men made their name and their living.1 Two of the best-known names are Lot Niccoli and George Kirkyn, who were responsible for the first gold coinage in 1343–4. However, we know little about the process by which these two men were appointed. Now, a pair of documents in the Public Record Office can shed some light on this episode, and introduce us to someone whose name is rather more obscure: Peter Circos.2 In 1343 Circos petitioned for, but did not get, the job of introducing the gold coinage in England, and his original petition, as well as the indenture from the King and Council inviting him to come and show his skill at coining, survive, providing interesting new evidence relating to this significant change to the English currency. These two documents, which have thus far escaped the notice of numismatists, are included in Appendix 1.

Problems with the coin

During the fourteenth century, problems with England’s silver coinage had increased. The output of the mint had fallen significantly from the 1320s due to the steadily depreciating volume of bullion available with which to strike new coin. Indeed estimates suggest that the silver currency was greatly reduced in size in the early fourteenth century.3 From 1335 the production of pennies had almost ceased,4 and only silver halfpennies and farthings were produced, at the reduced fineness of 10 oz (as against 11 oz 2 dwt). At the same time, England was engaged in an expensive war with France, putting further strain on the Royal finances and the already debased coin.

Sometime presumably in early 1343 – the document is not dated – a moneyer named Peter Circos wrote to King Edward III, his petition outlining the problems with the English coinage.5 Circos states that there are too many counterfeit and false sterlings,6 and that good coin is leaving England rather than staying in circulation. He promises that he and his companions can show the king how to improve the situation, to make all money of the right weight and fineness, and to prevent false money from being used in England and good money from going abroad. The king will also be able to profit. Circos promises, by reducing the amount of silver in the coins slightly: from 7 3/4 oz to 7 oz per mark (equivalent to a reduction from 11 oz to 10 1/2 oz. per pound). In return, Circos asks that he and his companions will be masters of the money. The petition relates primarily to silver coinage but, almost as an afterthought, Circos added a final line mentioning that if the king wished to have gold money, he knew how to make that as well.

By the early 1340s it had become clear that the English needed to introduce their own gold coinage because they had become heavily reliant on foreign gold coins to fulfill the need for higher denomination monies. Gold coins from Italy and France were the international trading medium necessary for the kind of cross-channel transactions that were becoming increasingly prevalent among the merchant communities in England (and especially in London). Indeed, parliament had earlier petitioned for French and Italian gold coin to be made legal tender in the kingdom.7 By
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1 For the difficulties posed in tracing these men, and further discussion, see Freeman 2000.
2 His name suggests that Peter may possibly be linked to the Cerchi family of Florence, but no certain association can be made.
4 For the production of a limited number of pennies after this date see Allen and Vosper 1990.
6 The fullest survey of the problems associated with counterfeit sterlings of this period is to be found in Mayhew 1983, 10–28.
instituting a gold coinage in his own name, not only could Edward III produce a native English coin, thus reducing the dependence on externally administered and managed foreign money, but he could also extract a seignorage at the mint to fill his own depleted coffers. The temporary cessation of hostilities with France in 1343 enabled the crown to concentrate on re-establishing the wool trade with Flanders, which had been damaged by the conflict, and the introduction of the gold coinage was a step in remedying the situation.

On 20 June 1343, the king replied to Peter Circos, issuing an indenture which survives in two copies. One of these is kept with the copy of Circos’s petition, both documents having been found loose among ‘ancient Chancery records’ in 1923, at which point they were allocated their present catalogue numbers. The second copy of the indenture is found in the Close Rolls, also from the Chancery. The medieval Chancery was where the secretarial business of the King was carried out; the clerks of the Chancery prepared charters and letters, and kept records and copies of correspondence in the various rolls. Of the various sets of rolls, the Close rolls recorded ‘closed’ royal letters sent under seal, which often included orders and instructions. That the indenture is found in the Close Rolls tells us that it was indeed issued, but the loose copy of the same document is also interesting because it is a draft of the enrolled indenture. Such an indenture would have been prepared by a scribe, checked by a supervisor, and then a fair copy issued, and the correspondence enrolled. This process can be seen in the two versions of the indenture: the draft document was corrected in a different hand than that of the main scribe and then copied to produce the indenture and the copy in the Close Rolls.

The indenture states that Circos is to show the King and Council how best to make both gold and silver coins, for the profit of the king and his people. If Circos and his companions give advice that is better than any other, they will be put in charge of making the gold and silver coinage and receive various benefits and payments for doing so. However, as another indenture from 14 December 1343 tells us, Circos was not successful, and the job went to Lot Niccoli and George Kirkyn, with the first florins being minted between January and August of 1344.

One of many?

When Peter Circos petitioned Edward III in 1343, promoting himself as the man to coin the new money of England, he was probably one of a number of men equipped with both the skill and reputation to be the new maistre de moneye. The king and his council must have been acutely aware that remedial action was necessary as the state of the currency at the time was poor. The presence of Italian moneymen in the mints of England was not unusual: Florentine masters were active in both the archbishop of York’s mint and at the mint at Durham from the mid fourteenth century. From the evidence of the petition and indenture discussed here, it seems as though the King and Council required them to demonstrate their skill. In the case of Niccoli and Kirkyn their level of expertise is beyond dispute, and is visible in the workmanship of the three gold florins (with the obverse design based on the French masse d’or) now known to exist. Peter Circos, although he didn’t get the job, nonetheless has much to tell us about the functioning of the Tower mint in the fourteenth century. More generally, this pair of documents shows the value of looking closely at the surviving manuscript records, and of considering them alongside the numismatic evidence. We still have much to learn about the medieval mint at London, and the people involved with it, but these documents demonstrate the importance of persisting with the sometimes difficult handwriting and language, to reveal the information that has been preserved.

---

1 Reddaway 1967, 1, citing Rot. Parli. ii. 105, 127a; Cook 1999, 231-84; Mate 1978.
2 Note in modern hand added to London, PRO, SC/8/39/1947B.
3 London, PRO, CS4/173 Part 1, m. 6d, or see Calendar of Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward III, vol. VI (1341 to 1342), 125.
4 The most recent discussion of the new gold coinage from florin to noble and the changes of weight is Woodhead 1996, 7. For information on the seignorage rates at the mint see Reddaway 1967, 3. The indenture is in London, PRO, CS4/173 Part 2, m. 4d, or see Calendar of Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward III, vol. VI (1341 to 1343), 261.
6 Two are in the British Museum collection, and a third has recently come to light as a metal detector find ‘somewhere in southern England’ (B. Cook, pers. comm.), sold at auction on 29 June 2006 for £460,000 (Spink auction catalogue 182, lot 301).
A nostre segn’ le Roy et a son conseil maistr’ Pieris de Circos maistre de moneye que come en vostre Reialme doy al auoir bene monaies ceste adire esterlings que les treses soiades et quatre denars peisent un mark en les quel mark’ doit auoir sepl ounces et trese’ dargent fin et en tiele moneye [...] auoyr le Roy et tote la peole mes il nest pas [...] car l totis les bans esterlings seurt portez de la [...] et en Engleterre demeurent les fables esterlings veilles et esterlings countrefeet et faud que v[...]lere de lamer19 sicune io9 qoy isse que tout esterlings que sunt en Engleterre vous trouurez comunemente quel les gr[...]se landz et auyet deniers poisent un mark’ ou mayus et laquel mark’ finut en tour vix ounce dargent fyn et chescun io9 vaut le dite moneys en permut et et en tiele manere est le Roy et le peole defutz / Et pour ces que vous et vostre conseil voisz mettre amender l et a redrester la moneye et garder vous vostre peole de tele damage le dit pieris vous trouvera vere manere [...] porrez faire Tuncl monnaie dargent siccune il doit estre et de loie et de pois au verez vous auerz bons monoye de loie y siccune il doit estre et les Esterlingsl serraront fort de pois quatre deniers p’ le mark que ces courent maintenant Engleterre et le Roi ganera et le people sera sauue sauze damage et si vous trouure manere que nulle faux monoye ne vendra en Engleter et nulle bone monoye ne serra porre de lal lamer14 mes que le Roi et son conseil metant a certeyn le dit Pieris et ces compaignons que nullis autres ne sera mestre des dite monoye forceque eux respenant au Roy et a les marchanz tiele prise comme nous porremis acorder ensemble en ete manerel pourrez vero faire riche dargent ceste le ces15 paius dengleterre sicune il soliste estre [...] vous ne le facex vous trouverez que tote people serrun riche de6 cones17 la ou quidint aer argent/ Et si vous veilez auoryr moneye dor nos troueres bon voie coment vous le porrez faire au proffat du Roy et a esement de people

To our lord the King and his Council, master Peter of Circos, master of money, how in your kingdom you must have good money, that is to say sterlings so that 13 shillings and 4 pence make18 one mark, in which mark there must be 7 and a third ounces of fine silver, and in such money the King and all the people to have [...] but it is not [...] because all the good sterlings are taken from the [lamer]19 and in England there remain the weak old sterlings, and counterfeit and false sterlings, that [v ... ser] of the [...] each one of them that is issued, that all sterlings which are in England you will commonly find that you will have [gr ... se] praise, and coins making20 one mark, or more, and each mark at the tower must be 7 ounces of fine silver, each of them worth the said money in circulation, and it is in this way that the

13 This word appears twice in the document, but its meaning is unclear.
14 This word appears twice in the document, but its meaning is unclear.
15 Inserted above line of text.
16 Inserted above line of text.
17 This word appears only once in the document, and its meaning is unclear.
18 Literally ‘weigh’.
19 This word presumably means something like ‘land’ or ‘country’.
20 Literally ‘weighing’.
King and the people are freed. And for those that you and your council wish to appoint to correct and to redress the money and keep you and your people from such harm, the said Peter will find you the true way [...] you can make do this. Then the money of silver, each one must be of the law and the true weight, you will have good money of the law and each one must be of it, and the sterlings being more abundant by 4 pennes to the mark by weight than those now circulating, England and the King will gain, and the people will be kept safe, without harm. And if you find the way that no false money will be exchanged in England, and no good money will be taken from the [lamer], but that the King and his council appoint for certain the said Peter and his companions that no others will be masters of the said money except that they answer to the King, and to the merchants such price as we can agree together. In this way you can truly make these countries of England rich in silver, each of which should be [...] you do not do it, you will find that all the people will be rich in [lamer] where they think to have silver. And if you want to have money of gold we will find a good way that you can do this to the profit of the King and the benefit of the people.'

The indenture: SC 8/39/1947B (Fig. 2) and Close Rolls 17 Edward III part 1 (C54/173 part I) m. 6d.

---

Ceste endenture tesmoigne que ces est le couenant faite per entre nostre seignor le Roi Dengletere et de Fraunce et son Chaunceller et Tresore23done parte et Pieris Sircos et ses compagnions mestres de faire monioie doure part Cest assoir que le dit Pieris et ses compagnions monstrenent le meillour voie et doneronl le meillour conseil qils sauront au dit nostre seignor le Roi coment il puse faire en Engletere monioie dor et dargent a son profit et de son peule et si ensi soit que leur conseil soit meillour que mal autre ne donnera le dit nostre seignor le Roi promette et asirait ab ditz Pieris et ses compagnions qils soient chaungeurs et Receveurs de tout lor et de tout largent que serra port pour ouvre et qils seront fesours et chesifs ouereurs de tout la diel monioie tantque ils se portent bien en meestre lofice24 peruant de nostre dit25 seignor le Roi pour lofice du ditz chaungeur mesmes les gages mesmes qil est acustume l de bailler us autres pour le monioie dargent et atant pour le monioie dor et paruant pour le dit ouerage mesme le pris qil est acustume de bailler asl autres pour le monioie dargent et pour la monioie dor al auenant et qele dit nostre seignor le Roi mettra garde au chaunge et gardeil del assail del monioie et taillour de fer dacoyer sa sa volente et paiera de son coustage Et le dit nostre seignor le Roi mon[egnor] Robert Payvyngs son Chauncheller et oyer William de Custance son tresorer prometent s'leir bone foi de tenir et maintenir toutes les choses quantités Enl tesmoignage de verite les parties quantités nostre dire seignor le Roi son chaunceller et tresorer Pieris Sircos pour lui et ses compagnionscet endentures enttacheablement ont mys leur seuls Don<ene> a Westm<aster> le XXme jour de Juyn lan du regne nostre dit seignor le Roi est assuer dengleterre dissepse et de Fraunce quart

'This indenture witnesses that this is the covenant made between our lord the king of England and of France and his chancellor and treasurer of this, and Peter Sircos and his companions, masters of making money, of the other part. It is to know that the said Peter and his companions will show the best way and give the best counsel that they know to the said lord the King, how he can make in England money of gold and of silver for his profit and for his people. And so if their counsel is better than any other will give, our said lord the King promises and arraigns to the said Peter and his

21 This word presumably means something like 'land' or 'country'.
22 This word presumably means something like 'bad money' or 'coins'.
23 et de Fraunce... et Tresore added above line in SC/8/39/1947B.
24 tantque... lofice added above line in SC/8/39/1947B.
25 dit added above line in C54/173 part I.
companions that they will be changers and receivers of all the gold and of all the silver which is brought to work, and that they will be makers and chief workers of all the said money, as long as they comport themselves well in the same office. Coming from our lord the King for the office of the same said changer, the same payments that it is customary to pay to the others for the silver money and as much for the gold money, and coming from the said working the same price as it is customary to pay the others for the money of silver and for the money of gold as before, and that our said lord the King will place a guardian of the exchange and guardian of the assay of the money, and a maker of coining irons, at his disposal, and will pay the cost. And the said lord the King, monseigneur Robert Paryngs his chancellor, and hearing William de Custance his treasurer, promise by their good faith to uphold and maintain all the aforesaid things, in witness of the truth of the foresaid parts, our lord the King, his chancellor and treasurer, Peter Sincs for him and his companions, have each put their seals to this indenture. Given at Westminster the 20th day of June the seventeenth year of the reign of our said lord the King of England, and the fourth of France.'
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HALFGROATS OF THE MIDDLE PERIOD OF HENRY VI

LORD STEWARTBY

HALFGROATS of the middle groups of this reign (1422-61), Leaf-Mascle (IV), Leaf-Trefoil (V) and Trefoil (VI), are very much scarcer than the groats. Fewer dies were made and their less intensive use gave rise to more interchanges between one group and another. The following notes are based on the standard work on the coinage of this reign published by Whitton,1 with the addition of one late Calais mule.

No true coin of group IV is known of London. The London IV obverse is, however, represented by a mule (W.22) described by Whitton as Leaf-Mascle/Trefoil (?), i.e. IV/VI. The reverse of this coin has extra pellets under tas and don, appropriate to the pellet-marked groups (VIII, X and XI); it also lacks stops, as do many Leaf-Pellet groats. It therefore seems more likely to be a Leaf-Mascle/Leaf-Pellet mule (i.e. IV/VIII). The London IV reverse is to be found only on two VA/IV mules (W.23 and 24a) which both have a leaf below Meum.

Of Calais, Whitton listed two varieties of group IV halfgroats (W.29a, b) and noted two more (W.29c and 30) in his addenda. W.29a, 29c and 30 have a leaf above the end of the inner reverse legend, and are therefore true coins of group IV. W.29b, however, lacks the reverse leaf, like the London halfgroats described by Whitton as Leaf-Trefoil A (W.24b and c); this coin is therefore probably to be regarded as a IV/VA mule, and if so constitutes the only Calais representative of group V, since no Calais halfgroats are recorded of group V itself. Since London Leaf-Trefoil halfgroats are the least rare of the three groups under consideration, the lack of true group V halves of Calais is an illustration of how quickly the activity of the Calais mint declined after group IV, reflecting the effect on the wool trade of the ending of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance in 1435.

1 Whitton 1938-41 (with addenda in Whitton 1941-4).
Of the London Leaf-Trefoil halfgroats, VA, with plain initial cross, is the rarer, listed by Whitton as nos 24b and c, with 23/24b noted in the addenda. While VA is also found muled with the preceding group (VA/IV), VB (W.25a–28b) is muled with subsequent reverses (VI and VIII).

No true halfgroat of group VI (Trefoil) is known of either mint. Whitton describes his nos 25c and 29 of London, which share a reverse die, as Leaf-Trefoil/Trefoil (?) mules (VB/VI); there seems little doubt about the correctness of this since the reverse die involved has a trefoil after Deum, like two London groats of VIb (W.35a and b). One other group VI London halfgroat die has been noted by Mr Greenhalgh, with a trefoil after both Posui and Deum; this die also is known only from VB/VI mules. Of Calais, however, there is a Trefoil obverse die on a recently discovered VIA/IV mule. This coin has a trefoil after Gra, like some London and Calais groats of VIA, and thus probably comes early in group VI, the last group of which any Calais coins are known.

No halfgroats (or any of the lower values) are known of group VII (Trefoil-Pellet) which consists only of London groats transitional between the Trefoiled and Pelleted groups. London halfgroats of the Leaf-Pellet group (VIII) include mules with earlier groups, IV and V. The IV/VIII mule (W.22) has been noted above. Mules of group VIII are also known both ways with group V, those with the earlier obverse (VB/VIII; W.25d and e, 30a and b, and 31) being, as one would expect, more often found than that with the earlier reverse (VIIIb/VB; W.33). The latter has a leaf before and a trefoil after London, appropriate to the groats and halfgroats of VB.

The resultant picture of the occurrence of halfgroats from dies of groups IV, V and VI is summarized in the following table. The mismatch between the entries for the two mints is absolute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London</th>
<th>Calais</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV/VA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA/IV</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB/VI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII/IV</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV/VIII</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB/VIII</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIIIa/VI</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IMITATIONS OF THE CRUX PELLIT COINAGE OF JAMES III
MICHAEL ANDERSON

In a recent article in this Journal on the Crux pellit coins now attributed to James III of Scotland (Fig. 1) and their imitations,1 Borys Paskiewicz reviewed the chequered numismatic history of these coins, with nineteenth-century attributions by Lelewel to James II of Aragon as James I of Sicily (1285–95),2 and by Duchalais to Jacques de Bourbon, briefly King of Naples (1415–16) as husband of Joanna II of Anjou (1414–35).3 A specimen in the Erslev catalogue of the Thomsen collection with the name ‘Karolus’ (Fig. 2) instead of ‘Iacobus’ was attributed to Charles III of

1 NCirc 102:3 (April 1994), 106.
3 Duchalais 1855.
Durazzo as King of Naples (1382–6). With regard to these ‘Karolus’ imitations, Paskiewicz refers to an article by Joan Murray and Claire van Nerom in which they discussed the Crux pellit coins and imitations either found in Flanders or currently in Belgian collections, including five with the name ‘Karolus’ as on the previously unique coin from the Thomsen collection in Copenhagen. When considering the Thomsen specimen in his 1983 article on Scottish imitations, Ian Stewart (Lord Stewartby) suggested that, if the name ‘Karolus’ on this coin related to a genuine king of that name, the choice would seem to lie between Charles VIII of Sweden and Charles VIII of France, and he was tempted to give preference to Charles VIII of Sweden, whose reign ended in 1470, if the date of issue of the coins could be taken back into the 1460s. However, if Joan Murray’s identification of the coins with the ‘threepenny pennies’ referred to in a chronicle of 1482 can be sustained, this no longer seems possible, and leaves a choice between a mythical King Charles, whose name was used to obscure the true origin of the coins, and Charles VIII of France, who acceded on the death of Louis XI on 30 August 1483.

![Regular Crux pellit coin, type III (author).](image1)

![Imitation type III, with ‘Karolus Rex’ obverse legend (author).](image2)

Murray and van Nerom demonstrated the differences between the original coins, which all bear the name ‘Iacobus’, and imitations, which can have either ‘Iacobus’ or ‘Karolus’, and stated that none of the imitations has ever been found in Scotland (or England). They concluded that they are continental imitations, perhaps struck not far from the Flemish coast, citing the wool trade as an explanation for the number of Scottish coins in Flemish finds.

Since Murray and van Nerom published their article, finds of Crux pellit coins have been reported from the Basque area of northern Spain. A further three ‘Karolus’ imitations, plus three ‘Iacobus’, were found in 1975 during reconstruction work at the church of La Asunción in the village of Lasarte, south-west of San Sebastián, grouped together with five French coins of Charles VIII and Louis XII, twelve Brabant pieces of Philip the Good, Charles the Bold and Philip the Handsome, two Neapolitan caballos of Ferdinand I, a Portuguese ceitil of John II, and three Castilian blancas of Ferdinand and Isabella, as reported by José Ignacio San Vicente at the Spanish National Numismatic Congress in Madrid in 1989. Anna Balaguér has suggested that these may have been coins of little value deposited in the church poorbox and set aside as impossible to exchange or circulate. Of particular interest is the fact that one of the Lasarte coins appears to have an inscription commencing ‘Karolus Dux’ instead of ‘Karolus Dei Gra Rex’ as on the other coins of this type (Fig. 3).

Also significant for the study of these coins is the 1995 find from the church of San Esteban de Lartaun in Oiarzun, east of San Sebastián, of which a complete catalogue, photographic record and detailed analysis has been published. During restoration work on the fourteenth-

---

4 Erslev 1873, 212 no. 2555.
5 Murray and van Nerom 1983.
6 Stewart 1983.
7 San Vicente 1989.
8 Balaguér 1994.
century church it was thought necessary to remove the floor and subsoil to a depth of 40 cm in order to insert drainage pipes, and the opportunity was taken to carry out an archaeological examination. In the course of this a large amount of material was found, including 900 coins, ranging in date from a small bronze half centenionalis of Constantine I to an 1882 two pesetas of Alfonso XII. Among these were 76 Crux pellit coins: one each of types I, II and III, and 73 imitations, five with traces of the name ‘Iacobus’, three with the name ‘Karolus’, seven of a previously unrecorded type with the monarch’s name and titles replaced with the legend ‘Sit nomen Domini benedictum’ (Fig. 4), and 58 with no legible traces of the obverse inscription at all.

Ibanez Arica suggests that, whilst some of the coins, particularly the earliest and latest outliers, are no doubt accidental losses, the majority, although scattered throughout the subsoil of the church, appear to be a systematic deposit and may arise from a custom of placing coins with the bodies of the deceased interred in the churchyard. No less than 871 of the coins belong to the period from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries, while 627 of these are of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Of the 252 fifteenth-century coins, the 76 of Scottish type are exceeded only by 78 Portuguese (of a total of 98 Portuguese coins in the group). It is clear, from this find and from others in the area, that Portuguese coins circulated widely in the Basque country and Navarre in the late fifteenth century due to the lack of low denomination Castilian coinage between the death of Henry IV in 1474 and the second reform of Ferdinand and Isabella, 13 June 1497. Of 28 fifteenth-century Castilian coins in the find, eight were blancas of the ‘rhombus’ issue of Henry IV, introduced in 1471, and eight were blancas of the 1497 issue of Ferdinand and Isabella. Of the 78 fifteenth-century Portuguese coins, 66 were of Alfonso V (1438–81), including 49 ceitis, and there was one coin (a ceitil) of John II (1481–95). It therefore seems that the Castilian blancas were superseded by Portuguese ceitis, and that the circulation of these dried up around the time that our Scottish imitations became available. It also seems clear from their context that, at least in the Basque country, the Crux pellit coins and their imitations were regarded as currency, and not as mere counters or jettons as suggested by Paszkiewicz.

Xavier Sanahuja Anguera of the Societat Catalana d’Estudis Numismàtics has informed me that the Scottish coins and their imitations circulated not only in the Basque country and Navarre, but also in Catalonia, and this is supported by the fact that the type was copied by Count Hug Roger III of Pallars (1451–1503). His coins, issued before Pallars was conquered by Barcelona in...
1491, have on both sides a Latin cross in a quatrefoil, exactly as on the reverse of the James III coins, with the initials HR flanking the foot of the cross and the inscription COMES PALLARESIUS (Fig. 5).  

Fig. 5. Pallars imitation (reproduced from Balaguer 1999, 491 no. 143-4).

As mentioned above, Murray and van Nerom suggested the wool trade as the reason for the number of Scottish coins in Flemish finds, and Antonio Roma Valdés has pointed out to me that the areas in Spain where the *Crux pellit* imitations are found are precisely those areas which provided the seamen who also conveyed the wool to the Low Countries. Joan Murray suggested that the coins were never intended to circulate in Scotland, but were an attempt to distribute false Scottish money on the continent. They would certainly have been welcome in northern Spain in view of the scarcity of other small change at that period, as already mentioned. If the Lasarte coin really does read ‘Karolus Dux’, this may perhaps give a more accurate indication of the ruler intended, making it possible to disregard both Charles VIII of Sweden and Charles VIII of France in favour of Charles the Bold, who died 4 January 1477 and who used both the ‘Karolus Dux’ title and the ‘Sit nomen Domini benedictum’ legend on his coins for Burgundy, Flanders and Brabant. (This possibility was also suggested by Paszkiewicz). Even if the legends on the Lasarte and Oiartzun coins do seem to relate the imitations to the coins of Charles the Bold, they may still have been the product of a freelance commercial enterprise rather than an official Burgundian mint, and need not necessarily have been produced during Charles’s lifetime, although a date this early is by no means impossible and may even be supported by the presence of a *Crux pellit* coin in the reclamation deposit which yielded the 1980 Leith hoard of c.1475.
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While searching in the National Archives for documents concerning the issue of royal and rose farthing tokens, I discovered an interesting set of papers that do not seem to have been noted before, and which throw important new light on the issue and use of these coins.

The document, of 1623, is a set of five sheets of parchment, concerning a judicial case brought by the King’s Remembrancer’s Office, part of the Court of Exchequer, against the son of the mayor of Bath, about a box of farthing tokens sent to the mayor in 1618.1 The first sheet is in Latin and the remainder in English. The sheets have been slightly edited to ease understanding and avoid much legal repetition, but apparent gaps and unanswered questions are there in the originals:

Sheet One (Latin: English abstract by Margaret Baker)

James, by the grace of God, King of England, France and Ireland, etc, sends greetings to Thomas Wyatt, gentleman, Richard Gaye, gentleman, George Chapman, gentleman, and Matthew Randall, gentleman, appointing them and giving them or two or more of them full power and authority to put to witnesses interrogatories (questions) both on behalf of Edward Woodward, esquire, and Thomas Garrett, gentleman, plaintiffs, and of Matthew Clift, defendant, summoning the witnesses to Bath, Somerset, questioning them individually on oath and taking down the answers in writing on parchment, sealing them and sending them, with the interrogatories, to the Barons of the Exchequer at Westminster within the quindecem of St Hilary [14–28 January]. The defendant should have six days notice of the time and place appointed.

Authenticated by Laurence Tanfeld, knight, at Westminster, 28 November 1622, on behalf of the Barons.

Sheet Two

Questions to be asked of the witnesses to be examined on behalf of Edward Woodward Esq. and Thomas Garret, yeoman, plaintiffs against Matthew Clift, defendant.

1. Do you know the defendant, and did you know his late father, William Clift, Mayor of Bath in the County of Somerset?
2. In or about the month of October 1618, or at any time, did you carry anything for others from London to Bristol or Bath or not? Declare your knowledge.
3. Did you, or your servant, at about this time receive at London or Bristol from the plaintiffs, or one of their servants, from Bristol or elsewhere, a box of farthing tokens to be delivered to William Clift, late Mayor of Bath. What do you know?
4. Did you, or your servant, or any other party directed by you, deliver the said box of farthing tokens to William Clift? Tell the truth.
5. After the box of farthing tokens was delivered from London to William Clift in Bath as you say, where did he, or any of his household, receive them?
6. Do you know or have you heard that the said box of farthing tokens came to the sum of £10, or have you heard some other sum stated?
7. Did William Clift, during the time of his mayoralty, issue forth any or all of the said farthing tokens? What do you know about the receipt of the farthings or their issuing in the City of Bath? Declare your knowledge, hearsay or belief that in any way may help the plaintiffs or acquit the defendant.
8. Do you believe or have you ever heard that William Clift ever received a box of farthing tokens from London or Bristol two or three years ago, or at any time? From whom did he receive them and into whose hands did he deliver them, and did he at any time issue or exchange any farthing tokens, what quantity and to whom as far as you know or believe.

Thomas Wyatt Richard Gaye George Chapman Matthew Rendoll.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank Margaret Baker of the Society of Genealogists for providing me with an abstract of the Latin document (Sheet One), and for an insight into the workings of the Exchequer. I am also grateful to Colin Johnston of Bath and North East Somerset Archives for details of William and Matthew Clift, and for checking the Chamberlain’s account rolls there for 1618–20.

1 The National Archives E134/20/AS1/H1L17.
Enquiry
Depositions of witnesses taken at Bath in the County of Somerset before Thomas Wyatt, Richard Gaye, George Chapman and Matthew Rendoll, gentlemen, on the fourteenth day of January in the twentieth year of his Majesty's reign of England, France and Ireland, and in Scotland the 56th [1623], by virtue of His Majesty's Commission out of the Court of Exchequer unto them directed for the examination of witnesses in the case between Edward Woodward and Thomas Garrett, plaintiffs, and Matthew Clift, defendant. As follows:

William Luff of the City of Bath in the County of Somerset, shoemaker, aged about 40, sworn and examined.
1. To the first question, he said that he did not know the plaintiffs but he knows Matthew Clift the defendant and also knew his father William Clift, once mayor of Bath.
2. To the second question, the witness said that in about October 1618 he was a carrier, and used to carry things for divers persons from the cities of London and Bristol to the city of Bath.
3, 4, 5. To the 3rd, 4th and 5th questions, this witness said that his servant, John Reedes, a carrier of Bristol, a certain box and letter addressed to William Clift. The servant gave this to the witness who sent the box and letter by his brother, John Luff, to William Clift. William Clift told John Luff that he would not give him anything for carrying it because it did not concern him, for it was a box of farthing tokens sold unto him to be distributed in Bath for others. When he had distributed them, he would give him (John Luff) something for his pains, and the same promise was made later to the witness (William Luff).
6. To the 6th question, witness said that he did not know what the quantity or sum of farthing tokens was, and he could not answer the other questions.

John Luff of the City of Bath in the County of Somerset, shoemaker, aged about 46, sworn and examined.
1. To the first question, he said he did not know the plaintiffs but he knew the defendant and also William Clift, his father, former mayor of Bath.
2. To the 2nd question this witness said that at about the time mentioned he was employed on divers occasions by his brother William Luff, a carrier, and he used to carry divers things between the cities of London and Bristol and the city of Bath, and that he used to help drive his horses to and from the city of Bristol and divers other places.
3, 4, 5. To the 3rd, 4th and 5th questions, witness said that about that time [October 1618] John Reedes, a servant to William Luff, his brother, brought a box fastened and sealed with a letter directed to the then mayor of Bath, William Clift, which he [Reedes] had received from Thomas Tyler, a Bristol Carrier. Reedes had delivered it to William Luff and now brought it to John Luff to deliver to William Clift, which he did. When he demanded something for the carriage, Mr Clift told witness that it did not only concern him, but that when the house (meaning he supposed the Common Council of the City of Bath) had met together, he would afterwards pay for the carriage.
6. To the 6th question, he said that at the time of delivery he did not know what was in the box. But afterwards heard it commonly reported that there were farthing tokens in the box. He also heard that divers of the farthings were distributed to divers persons within the city of Bath, namely to one Mr Sachefield & Phillip George and one Mr Blackieach, and he also heard that the farthings in the box amounted to the sum of £10.

Tobias Jackson of the City of Bath in the County of Somerset, mercer aged about 37, sworn and examined.
1. To the first question, witness said that he did not know the plaintiffs but that he knows the defendant and he also knew William Clift, sometime mayor and deceased father of the defendant.
6. 7. To the 6th and 7th questions this witness said that he, being one of the sergeants of the said city of Bath and then attending on the said Mr Clift, being then mayor, heard William Clift say that he had received around ten pounds in farthing tokens from the Duke of Lennox' officers. He heard that the same William Clift sent to divers tradesmen of the city of Bath to take some of the said farthings. What quantity he does not know, but he heard that part of them were issued to divers persons within the city.

Phillip George of the city of Bath in the County of Somerset, mercer aged about 38, sworn and examined.
1. To the first question, witness said that he did not know the plaintiffs but he knows the defendant and he knew William Clift, sometime mayor, the defendant's father.
6. To the 6th question, this witness said that he not know whether William Clift ever had this box of farthings but that about 3 or 4 years ago, William Clift had farthings to utter and disperse, but witness never received any farthings from William Clift by way of exchange, but only such as he sometimes received for wares sold to him by this witness. He does not know what quantity of farthings William Clift had or what sum of money they amounted to.
7. To the 7th question, witness said that at about the time concerned, he heard it said that if any did want farthing tokens, they might have them from William Clift as he had farthings to utter.

Bryde Clift of the City of Bath, widow aged about 70, sworn and examined.
8. To the 8th question witness said that William Clift, her late husband, at the time of his mayorality, received a box of farthing tokens from John Luff, the carrier's brother, of the city of Bath, but she did not know what they were for. She thinks they came to the value of about £5 and her husband did utter them for all necessary expenses in his house and to workmen for wages, and some by way of exchange.

Thomas Wyatt  Richard Gaye
George Chapman  Matthew Rendoll
Questions to be administered to witnesses to be examined on behalf of Matthew Clift, defendant, at the suit of Edward Woodward and Thomas Garret, plaintiffs.

1. Do you know either of the parties, plaintiffs or defendant, and did you know William Clift of the city of Bath in the County of Somerset? Declare your knowledge.

2. Do you know that the King's most excellent majesty did by his highness' letters patent under the great seal of England, bearing the date the 2nd August in the thirteenth year of his highness' reign in England [1616] for the consideration of the yearly rent of 100 marks (£66 13s. 4d.) of current money of England, did give and grant unto the plaintiffs, Edward Woodward and Thomas Garret, their executors, administrators, deputies and assignees, free and absolute power and authority to make a competent quantity of farthing tokens to be issued among his majesty's subjects within his majesty's realm of England, Ireland and Wales for the space of seven years following the date of the letters patent. Yes or no? Tell the truth of what you know.

3. Do you know that the plaintiffs or their deputies made ten pounds in farthing tokens on or about 27 October in the eighteenth year of his majesty's reign [1621: error for 1618] and did deliver £10 in farthing tokens to William Clift, then mayor of the city of Bath to be issued to his majesty's subjects trading in the city of Bath, to be exchanged by him for the benefit and on behalf of the plaintiffs. If yes, on what conditions was the £10 in farthing tokens delivered? Did he pay ready money or give the plaintiffs other commodities for them? For what reason did the plaintiffs send him farthing tokens? Do you know if William Clift issued or caused to be issued all or the most part of £10 worth of tokens? If yes, how many and to whom? Tell the truth.

4. Do you know whether the said ten pounds of tokens or any part of it came into the possession of the defendant Matthew Clift or to any other person, to use privately, or whether he received any money, profit or benefit by them? Declare the truth.

Thomas Wyatt  
Richard Gaye  
George Chapman  
Matthew Rendoll

Depositions of witnesses taken at Bath in the County of Somerset before Thomas Wyatt, Richard Gaye, George Chapman and Matthew Rendoll, gentlemen, the fourteenth day of January in the twentieth year of the reign of our sovereign lord James, King of England, France and Ireland, and of Scotland the 50th [1623], by virtue of his majesty's commission out of the Court of Exchequer unto them directed for the examinations of witnesses in a case between Edward Woodward and Thomas Garrett, plaintiffs, and Matthew Clift, defendant, as follows:

John Luff, formerly sworn and examined on behalf of the plaintiffs, now sworn and examined on behalf of the defendant.

4. To the 4th question, this witness said that he not know whether the ten pounds of farthing tokens or any part of them came into the possession of the defendant, Matthew Clift, or that he saw any money, profit or benefit by them.

John Luff, formerly sworn and examined on behalf of the plaintiffs, now also sworn and examined on behalf of the defendant.

4. To the 4th question, the witness said that he does not know whether the ten pounds of farthing tokens, or any part of them, came into the possession of the defendant, Matthew Clift or to any other to his use, or that he had any money, profit or benefit by them.

Discussion

Although the actual outcome of this case is not known, because verdicts were decided back at Westminster by the Barons of the Exchequer (Sheet One), and recorded in another document (not traced), this is a mere detail considering what the document does tell us.

Concerning distribution of farthing tokens at this time (1618), this is documentary proof that the patent holders approached mayors and probably other local government officials in order to get the farthings distributed around the country. This would be in addition to the tokens being available at the Token House in London.

William Clift was elected mayor of Bath in October 1618, and was immediately sent this box of farthing tokens for distribution. From the carriers, it is clear that the box was sent by sea to Bristol, then England's second largest city after London, and from there by carriage to Bath. John Luff says that the mayor told him that he would have to refer the tokens to the Common Council before he could be paid, which suggests that the farthings were to be paid for by the City of Bath and distributed by them via the tradesmen.

However, the accounts of the City of Bath survive for this period, and there is no mention of this box of farthings. From what Phillip George says (Sheet Three), the mayor paid him in
farthings for some services although he heard you could get them by exchange. The mayor's widow, Bryde, also suggests both payment and exchange, particularly for repairs to the mayor's house (!), and so it seems that William Clift uttered or exchanged them all on his own behalf without reference to the Common Council. The case was presumably brought as a result of the uncertainty as to whether William Clift had paid for the farthings privately, or whether the Common Council of Bath were to pay for them. In 1622 Gerard Malynes wrote that three or four months credit on farthings could be given to encourage local authorities to accept them. This might be another reason why William Clift did not pay for the farthings immediately. It seems that Edward Woodward and Thomas Garrett had still not been paid by 1622 when this case was brought against William Clift's son, Matthew, William Clift having died in 1620.

Another important fact here is the sum of money involved, 100 farthings. Two thoughts spring to mind. This is not a large sum for a city the size of Bath, but then we do not know what other despatches of tokens there might have been. Ten pounds is 9,600 farthings, and it is clear from the document that this is the actual number of the farthings, and the case does not concern an unknown number of farthings for which ten pounds was paid. A box containing this number of farthings would have weighed in the region of 6 kg. It is unclear how long it took for them all to be disbursed. The other thought is that this is a small sum to require a commission to be sent from the Exchequer to track it down just over four years later. Part of the explanation probably lies in a crackdown on corruption at the Exchequer, and the Court in general, which was occurring at this time under the Earl of Cranfield. Another consideration is that perhaps £10 was a large sum of money as far as Woodward and Garret were concerned, who needed every penny they could get to make their patent profitable.

We learn from these papers that Woodward and Garrett paid 100 marks (£66 13s. 4d.) a year for their letters patent, and so would have to make more than that to be in profit. In fact the profit probably amounted to several hundred pounds a year, but this is a far cry from the £60,000 originally estimated as a profit when the first patent was drawn up for Lord Harington in 1613. One hundred marks a year was also the sum paid by the Duchess of Richmond and Sir Francis Crane for the farthing patent from 1625, but this new evidence shows that it was the accepted worth of the patent as early as 1616.

A document in the Bodleian Library, published by Vaux, gives an indenture of various debts, covering the period 1616 to 1624, owed to the Duchess of Richmond for farthings issued under the patent by Thomas Garrett, after the Duke of Lennox and Richmond had died. Unfortunately, this does not include a £10 debt from William Clift or the City of Bath, but it does include various other debts, together with notes on whether they were likely to be paid. The largest debts are £50, but the smallest are only 5s., and show that Woodward and Garrett kept track of even very small sums of money. This document confirms that £1,000 per year was the most that the farthing patent could be expected to raise.

The date of Woodward and Garrett’s patent is given in the document published here as 2 August 1616, whereas the Calendar of State Papers Domestic lists it under 25 July 1616. The later date is probably the actual date of the proclamation. Edward Woodward and Thomas Garrett were London goldsmiths who were recommended to the patent by the Duke of Lennox. Although they appear to have held the patent until 1621, when new letters patent were issued giving the patent directly to the Duke of Lennox and the Marquis of Hamilton, Peck suggested that Lennox was the real ‘owner’ of the patent throughout. This document appears to confirm this assumption when Tobias Jackson, in his evidence (Sheet Three), confirms that Woodward and Garrett were officers of the Duke of Lennox. As for the patent being in their name in 1616, this would appear to be for reasons of political expediency. The ‘Addled’ Parliament of 1614 had complained bitterly about monopolies (like the farthing tokens) being handed to the King’s favourites, so when the farthing patent became available again in 1616, James I gave it to Woodward and Garrett, rather than directly to the Duke of Lennox. He was able to award the patent directly to Lennox (and the Marquis of Hamilton) in 1621 when the fuss had died down.

2 Vaux 1876.
This interesting document thus throws light on farthing distribution, patent holders, profits and politics, and is a fortunate survival, occurring because nobody paid Woodward and Garret for a £10 box of farthing tokens in 1618.1
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DANIEL DEFOE, SON OF A TOKEN-ISSUER

R.H. THOMPSON

The writer and businessman Daniel Defoe (1660?–1731) is best known as the author of Robinson Crusoe (1719), and of other novels such as Moll Flanders, Col. Jack and Roxana. However, his writings also include the not entirely fictional Journal of the Plague Year, and A Tour thro’ the whole island of Great Britain, an important source on the economic development of the early eighteenth century. His significance in this area is such that Professor J.R. Moore called him ‘one of the great pioneers in economics’, and Professor Mayhew, in his history of sterling coinage, has entitled one of his chapters ‘The age of Daniel Defoe and Adam Smith’. Defoe anticipated the latter’s use of the phrase ‘The Wealth of Nations’ by more than seventy years.1

Among the hundreds of titles published by Defoe, the only specific consideration of the problems of small change seems to be Some farther Account of the original Disputes in Ireland about Farthings and Halfpence (1724), but his Complete English Tradesman (1726–7) brings him close to the subject of token-issuers. The chapter ‘Of tradesmen ruining one another by rumour and clamour’ recognises credit as a type of currency. In A Journal of the Plague Year the narrator, H.F., takes a letter to the Post-house, where a purse lay in the middle of the yard, but in that time of plague it was only taken up with red-hot tongs after being singed with gunpowder, and the contents shaken into a pail of water. The money therein was about thirteen Shillings, some smooth Groats, and Brass Farthings, so Defoe shows an awareness of tokens, if not of a family connection with them. The pseudonymous H.F. may have been based on Daniel’s uncle Henry Foe (d.1675), a saddler in Whitechapel.2

It is of some interest, therefore, that Defoe may well have been the son of a token-issuer. This note is confined to the task of establishing that possibility, and does not attempt to integrate token-issuing into Defoe’s thought.3 By 1703 D. Foe had dignified his name as Defoe, and was using the arms Per chevron three Griffins passant counterchanged, which appear below the portrait reproduced in ODNB. This was despite his earlier animadversions on ‘the tradesmen of England, as they grow wealthy, coming every day to the Herald’s [i.e. Heralds’] Office, to search for the coats-of-arms of their ancestors, in order to paint them upon their coaches, and engrave them upon their plate, embroider them upon their furniture, or carve them upon the pediments of their new houses’.4

His father is known to have been James Foe (d.1706), who was apprenticed to a Master of the Butchers’ Company, but went on to become a prosperous tallow-chandler in the London parish of

---

1 Peck 1964 discusses most of the previously known documents about the farthing patents and their holders in the introductions to his chapters on James I and Charles I. ODNB also covers all of the patent holders.
St Giles Cripplegate. His wife, Defoe’s mother, Alice, died between 1668 and 1671. In the light of these forenames, rare surname, and trade, Defoe’s parents must be represented on the following token (Alice of course by the initial A), though the location is a problem:

*Obv.* · IAMES · FOE · AT · NEW around the Tallow Chandlers’ arms

*Rev.* · STREET · CORNER · 1658 around · F · above I · A

Williamson, London 2055 (punctuation modified from knowledge of other tokens).

The arms of the Tallow Chandlers are illustrated in, for example, Boyne, pl. 2, so they should have been correctly identified. However, while there is no reason to doubt the existence of such a token (see Appendix), there is every reason to question its placing in Williamson under NEW STREET, COVENT GARDEN (subsequently New Row, WC2). The explanation for this must be the prior existence of that heading in Akerman and Boyne, with more tokens listed than under the next heading NEW STREET, SHOE LANE. This was a lazy assumption, and does not deserve to be considered more than one possibility. In the circumstances of James and Alice Foe it deserves less.

Their only son was probably born in London, or just outside the City, during the autumn of 1660, but, as Professor Backscheidr has pointed out, during that time of political unrest the lives of many citizens were disrupted, and normal record-keeping was overlooked. The surviving parish registers for St Giles Cripplegate do record in 1657:

*Mary daught’ of James Foe Tallowchandler & of Alice Not christened but borne November 13;*

and similarly in 1659:

*Elizab’ daugt’ of James Foe tallowchand’ & of Alice not Christe: borne June 19.*

According to Professor Novak, it is likely that the Foes felt that the manner of baptism practised in their parish church was unacceptable, and they need not have been Quakers (as suggested by Bastian in the case of Alice) to have come to such a conclusion. Since the token was dated for the year between these two births, it is certain that James and Alice Foe were living in the same parish when the token was issued.

Yet there was no New Street in the parish of St Giles Cripplegate. Harben’s standard dictionary mentions three City of London streets of the name recorded in the seventeenth century:

i New Street subsequently Burgon Street, off Carter Lane in the parishes of St Gregory by St Paul’s, St Ann Blackfriars, St Andrew by the Wardrobe, and St Mary Magdalene, Old Fish Street, and in Farringdon ward Within (Ogilby and Morgan 1992 [hereafter O&M], 34-17, k66).

ii New Street otherwise West Harding Street, off Fetter Lane in the parishes of St Bride and St Dunstan in the West, and in Farringdon ward Without (O&M 22-G4), occurring as West Harding Street alias New Street in 1664.

iii New Street subsequently Little New Street and New Street Square, between Shoe Lane and Fetter Lane in the parish of St Bride, and again in Farringdon ward Without (O&M 22-G4), first mentioned 1637–8.

iv In the Westminster parish of St Martin in the Fields there was a fourth, the one selected by the cataloguers: New Street subsequently New Row, named on Morgan’s 1682 map.

None of the above has any known Defoe connection. By 1667 the Foes were living in the parish of St Stephen Coleman Street, in Jones’s Rents off Swan Alley (O&M 26-F12); by 1671 James Foe was established in the parish of St Benet Fink, in French Court off Threadneedle Street (O&M 27-G14, h44); by 1678 he had remarried, but in 1683 he was back in Jones’s Rents, lodging with the widow Schapelinc.

---

5 Backscheidr 1989, 24 (reproducing the record of his apprenticeship), 27; and in ODNB.
6 Williamson 1889–91, 684.
7 Akerman 1849, 144–5; Boyne 1858, 273–4; Williamson 1889–91, 684–5.
8 ODNB: Bastian 1981, 9 (citing Guildhall Library MS), and 16; Novak 2001, 22.
9 For a supposed token of ‘New Street, Cripplegate’ see the forthcoming Norweb Tokens Part VII under Fore Street.
11 Bastian 1981, 9, 30, 88; Bastian 1964, 84. Bastian 1964, 85, mentions that the address of Fore Street, Cripplegate, given for James Foe by Wright 1894, 85, could not be found in the Butchers’ Company records and appears to conflict with other evidence.
A fifth New Street needs to be added, which in Harben is only a reference: Chancery Lane (O&M 21-G2), recorded in the thirteenth century as Newstrate etc., and as Convers lane commemorating the House of Converts in the lane, but ‘the name seems to have been altered to “Chauncellereslane” in the time of Ed. III’. Stow’s concentrating on the thirteenth century, when the street was new, has diverted even Harben’s attention from the names actually used by Stow in the seventeenth century: New streete (or Chancery lane) and Newstreet or Chaucerie lane in 1603, New streete (or Chancelar lane) in 1603, 1618 and 1633. New Street was still an alternative for Chancery Lane.12

This is evidently the correct identification of NEW STREET on the token, for in 1673 James Foe was one of several defendants in a complicated Chancery suit concerning the lease of a house in Chancery Lane.13 Therefore the token should be entered under CHANCERY LANE neighbourhood (City, Farringdon ward Without and Holborn and Westminster), the reading being AT NEW STREET CORNER, cf. New streete (or Chancery lane) 1603 Stow 375=ii. 22. At its north end Chancery Lane was on the corner of High Holborn (O&M 21-F1), and to the south on the corner of Fleet Street (O&M 32-13), all major thoroughfares.

The implications for the evidence of tokens are somewhat alarming. While it is not surprising that a man should practise a trade different from the Company in which he had been apprenticed, it is a surprise that he should use arms appropriate to that other Company. It is also a surprise to find evidence that the locality given on a token was not where the issuer lived, but where he traded. A further surprise is that this token bears the initial of the issuer’s wife, though her connection with that address was not domestic. As early as 1658 this token-issuer, if not exactly ‘something in the City’, was travelling outside his parish to work. Yet the journey to work has been seen as the distinguishing mark of a society later than ‘the world we have lost’.14

Biographical details of Daniel Defoe’s token-issuing father may be set out as follows:

FOE, James (1630–1706), baptised Etton, Northamptonshire. 13 May 1630, the fourth child of Daniel Foe (died 1631), yeoman, and of Rose his wife. Apprenticed 28 May 1644 to John Levitt, then Master of the Butchers’ Company, but described on his death 1666 as ‘tallow-chandler’, a trade which depended on butchers’ waste products. James Foe likewise, on completing his apprenticeship in 1652, became a tallow-chandler, but soon diversified his business activities and branched out into overseas trade. Married Alice i.e. Alice (d.1668x1671), dates and maiden name unknown. Daughter Mary born 13 November 1657, Elizabeth 19 June 1659, both in parish of St Giles Cripplegate; son Daniel b.1660?, afterwards Defoe (d.1731). In 1671 James was referred to as generosus (gentleman), and in 1673 as ‘Merchant and Citizen of London’. Had married again by 1678. Assistant in the Butchers’ Company 1679, Renter Warden 1680 (a post created to relieve the Master of financial responsibilities); auditor of the previous year’s accounts 1683.15 James’s character is indicated by a reference he wrote in 1705 for Sarah Pierce, who ‘behaved herself so well, that we recommended her to Mr Cave, that godly minister, which we should not have done, had not her conversation been becoming the gospel’.16 Moved in autumn 1705 from his seventeen-window house in Throgmorton Street to rented rooms at the Bell on Broad Street. His wife Elizabeth died that December, buried in Bunhill Fields. He made his last will 20 March 1705/6 (proved 25 February 1706/7); buried in ‘Bunhill Ground’ 21 December 1706.17

Professor Novak sees in James Foe the steadiness and reputation of an honest and dependable businessman, named as trustee in a number of wills, who was probably close to being that ideal tradesman whom Defoe canonized in the Complete English Tradesman: a man who regulates his time, who knows the language of his trade, who is not distracted by the schemes of projectors, or

12 Stow 1971, 375=ii. 22, 395=ii. 42, 444=ii. 91; Stow 1618, 746, 824; Stow 1633, 435, 487.
13 Grimmaraens 1912, 241; Bastian 1981, 53; Bastian 1964, 84.
15 Bastian 1981. 10, 30, 88; Bastian 1964, 84; Jones 1976, 54.
16 Wilson 1839, 17.
by the lure of politics or society, and actually takes pleasure in his work. Novak suggests also that James and Alice Foe had a 'companiate marriage', based on the love of parents for each other and for their children. The token may be seen to symbolize such a marriage, with its triangle of initials:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
F \\
I \\
A
\end{array}
\]

APPENDIX

The record in Williamson does not give the authority of an actual specimen of James Foe’s token. There is none in the Norweb Collection, nor, as their curators kindly report, in the Ashmolean Museum, the British Museum, the Fitzwilliam Museum, or the Museum of London. The token had not been catalogued by Boyne in 1858, but in an interleaved copy of Boyne which carries the armorial bookplate of Nathan Heywood (1856–1918) the token has been inserted in pencil, probably by Heywood himself. After 1889 it could have been copied from Williamson, but a space in place of AT in the first of two insertions may suggest transcription from an imperfect specimen. Nevertheless, the piece is not amongst Heywood’s seventeenth-century tokens which Harold Raby bought en bloc in February 1919, and bequeathed in 1958 to Manchester Museum; other insertions are annotated Sin[allfield?] and Fl[?]20 Apparently a single specimen has passed through the sale-rooms, in lot 57 of the 1907 sale of 3,500 seventeenth-century tokens (etc.) belonging to an unidentified “Well-known Collector”, but the purchaser is not marked in the British Numismatic Society copy of the catalogue, and that piece has not been traced.21 For helping to search for a specimen I am grateful not only to the relevant curators, but also to Messrs Michael Dickinson, Peter Preston-Morley, John Rainey, John Theobald, and to Mr Roy Wilde, Clerk to the Worshipful Company of Tallow Chandlers.
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At about 9 o’clock on the morning of 20 December 1798 James Turnbull drew a pistol on a young apprentice moneyer at the Tower and robbed him of more than 2000 newly-struck guineas – a dramatic but happily rare incident in the long history of the Royal Mint.

The story of Turnbull’s capture, trial and execution need not be retold here, but the court proceedings are nevertheless of real interest to students of minting technology. For at the time of the robbery Turnbull, a soldier stationed in the Tower, had been one of four labourers operating a coining press and the evidence subsequently presented in court provides a glimpse of the day-to-day working procedures of the late eighteenth-century Royal Mint. In one particularly important respect, indeed, they throw light on the speed achieved by a manually-operated screw press under normal working conditions.

Briefly, Turnbull along with a colleague in the Guards and two members of the Tower Hamlets militia had been recruited early that morning ‘to turn the fly’, that is to say, to swing the arms of the press in order to control the movement of the large central screw which in turn controlled the movement of the upper die. It was the job of the fifth member of the team, the apprentice moneyer Thomas Finch, ‘to feed the fly’, a skilful and nimble-fingered task that required him to place a blank disc of metal on top of the bottom die, wait for it to be struck between the dies by the descending screw of the press and then, as the upper die and the screw recoiled, to flick away the struck coin and insert a new blank. The ‘amazing’ dexterity of an apprentice, like Finch, putting in the blank with his forefinger and thumb and flicking out the struck coin with his middle finger, is described in a sixpenny guidebook of the Tower, published in 1788. Concentration and rhythm were clearly vital and the story that a moneyer could feed the press and read a newspaper at the same time must surely be apocryphal (though not, perhaps, the associated suggestion that the labour was ‘musically-timed’).

The team had begun work at about 7 o’clock, Finch having been issued with eight bags of guinea blanks by a senior moneyer, Richard Franklin. They continued until 9 o’clock or just before, when as was the custom Finch invited the four men to stop for breakfast, and it was at this point that the robbery took place. The timings, which are crucial for our calculations, seem secure enough from the evidence given in court by Finch and they are corroborated by Franklin, who was in the nearby Mill Room when the alarm was raised. Turnbull, in a subsequent written confession, put the time for breakfast at about five minutes before 9 o’clock, while in court a witness claimed with helpful if surprising precision that the escaping Turnbull had come into the Cat’s-hole public house at about eight minutes past 9 o’clock, the public house being perhaps five or six minutes’ walk from the Press Room of the Mint. So, give or take a few minutes, we can feel reasonably confident in estimating at two hours the working time of the team that morning.

What of their production during that time? Finch had begun with eight bags of guinea blanks, each said to contain 668 pieces, the nearest whole number to make up a gold journey of 15 lbs troy. This gives a total of 5344 blanks, but unfortunately the evidence of neither Finch nor Franklin is clear as to how many of these had been converted into guineas before the robbery. A minimum figure is 2308, that being the number of guineas that Turnbull stole, and since it can be safely supposed that a bag would not have been left partly uncoined this minimum figure may be increased to 2672, the contents of four complete bags. What in fact may be the true figure is provided by Turnbull himself, who said in his evidence to the court that six journeys had been finished, equivalent to 4008 guineas.

If Turnbull’s figure is to be believed, then we can say that over a period of two hours the press team had struck almost exactly 4000 coins. This gives a sustained average rate of production of

1 Royal Mint Library, ‘The Trials of James Turnbull &c for robbing the Mint’ and associated papers in Trials, 1799–1834.
2 An Historical Description 1788, 64.
nearly thirty-five coins a minute and if, as must have been the case, the press was occasionally at rest while blanks were emptied out of a bag and struck guineas were put into a bag, the speed when the press was actually in motion must have been faster still. It is conceivable, too, that the press may have stood idle for a few minutes to allow one or both of the dies to be changed, though whether this was necessary is not recorded in the court proceedings. In any event, whatever the detail, there is welcome evidence here of the rate of production that could be sustained by the normal operation of a press over an extended period of time.

The information to be gleaned from the court proceedings is usefully supplemented by none other than Matthew Boulton, who had visited the Tower just a few months earlier to assist the Privy Council’s Committee on Coin in its investigation of the Mint. In a report of May 1798 he gives the speed of a five-man team as forty-four to forty-five guineas a minute.4 This seems to be the speed of the press while it was in operation and is therefore a less helpful measure of output than the sustained rate achieved by Finch and his team in December. But, assuming that Finch’s team could operate at the same speed as that observed by Boulton, the implication is that a press might stand idle for perhaps a quarter of the time, giving the team an opportunity to rest and enabling dies to be changed and blanks and coins to be fetched and carried.

That there might be extended breaks in production during the day is confirmed by an earlier but undated reference in the Newton Papers, where Sir Isaac Newton reckoned that a press might be active for five hours a day, with the remaining four or five hours being spent ‘setting or changing the dies, bringing the blanks & carrying back the new moneys’.5 The context of this reference is an estimate of the cost of producing copper coins, and Newton calculated that a five-man team similar to that in 1798 was capable of coming at the rate of fifty-four pieces a minute. The daily average is thus between twenty-seven and thirty a minute, a rate not entirely dissimilar to that being achieved at the end of the century. A second document, neater and not in Newton’s hand, unfortunately seems to halve this rate of output but does not specify the speed of a press while it is in operation.6

An additional reference is provided by the Crosby Records, where a visitor to the Tower, William Blundell, notes against the date 3 June 1676: ‘I saw twenty-six guineas impressed in the space of one minute, measured by my minute-watch’.7 Given that the men may have been stimulated by the presence of a spectator with a watch, this figure seems surprisingly lower than that indicated by the later references, but it may be relevant that Blundell speaks of three labourers and not four.

Ultimately it is the question of the Mint’s capacity in the eighteenth century which gives the speed of the press and its sustained rate of output its real relevance. If the average rate during the working day is something like thirty a minute, which is what it seems to be, then a single press should be capable of a daily production of perhaps 10,000 coins and an annual production of perhaps 3,000,000 coins. To put that figure in perspective, during the last fifty years of the eighteenth century the average production of the Royal Mint was about 2,250,000 coins a year. This average conceals a wide variation from nothing at all in 1780 to over 11,000,000 coins in the peak year of 1775, but in nearly thirty of the fifty years the total annual output was probably comfortably within the capacity of a single press.8 And there is evidence that at the end of the century the Mint may have had at least nine presses and possibly thirteen.9

It is true that the demands on the Mint might not have been capable of being spaced out evenly over the course of the year and it may also be true, with larger coins requiring a heavier-framed press, that the presses may not have been readily interchangeable and may have operated at different speeds and with different numbers of labourers. Certainly, contemporary descriptions

5 NA, MINT 19/2, fol. 418. Another draft of the estimate (fol. 419) reduces the time the press is in operation to four and a half hours but retains the striking rate of fifty-four a minute, while Newton uses a similar estimate of 50/55 pieces a minute for the silver denominations at the time of the Great Recoinage.
6 NA, MINT 19/2, fol. 399.
7 Gibson 1880, 141–2. We originally owe this reference to Farquhar 1909, 214.
refer to presses by denomination, but it is clear that this is not as exclusive as it seems, since the Newton Papers indicate that half-crown presses could be used for halfpennies and shilling presses for farthings, while accounts prepared in connection with the Great Recoinage of 1696–8 include a charge for ‘fitting up’ two half-crown presses for shillings.\textsuperscript{10} We therefore draw support for the view that we have expressed previously that the eighteenth-century Mint was not crippled by lack of capacity, but has been unfairly maligned because of the inaction of Government in reforming the currency.\textsuperscript{11}
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VARIATION IN PENNY REVERSES OF 1860–1 FROM RE-CUT PUNCHEONS

PAUL M. HOLLAND

Four important variations have been discovered in toothed border ‘LCW below shield’ pennies of 1860–1 that have apparently gone unnoticed by previous authors. These variants arose from the re-cutting of three of the puncheons for producing reverse dies for pennies of 1860–1, which together with use of the unmodified puncheon for 1860 have resulted in four distinctive reverse types. The features on the unmodified type, which originated from the common matrix used for all three puncheons, closely resemble those of the previous beaded border reverse type and depict a relatively smooth sea to the left of the shield. The first re-cut puncheon type shows a very distinctive incuse ‘rock line’ plus a rougher sea, and has also only been observed on 1860 dated pennies. The other two types are more subtle, with the ‘smooth’ sea being re-cut to provide a more distinctive pattern of waves but without the rock line. One of these has only been observed on 1860 dated pennies, the other on 1861 dated pennies. Careful analysis shows that these four puncheon types for the toothed border ‘LCW below shield’ pennies were used to produce numerous working dies. The numismatic significance of the observed variants is that they provide a useful insight on intentional design changes made during the bronze re-coinage of 1860, and show evolution toward the standard ‘no signature’ penny reverse type of 1861–74, which exhibits both a distinctive rock line and sharply defined waves for the sea.

The ‘LCW below shield’ penny reverse is the first of the ‘toothed’ border reverse die types, continuing the placement of the designer’s initials below and to the left of the shield as in earlier beaded border pennies. This reverse type corresponds to Peck Reverse C\textsuperscript{8},\textsuperscript{1} Freeman D\textsuperscript{2} and Gouby d,\textsuperscript{3} and, based on Freeman’s survey, was used for more than 90% of 1860 pennies and perhaps 40% of those of 1861.\textsuperscript{4} The design elements closely resemble the previous beaded border penny reverse (Peck reverse type C, Freeman C, and Gouby c), so closely in fact that Peck kept the same letter designation, adding a star to distinguish it. To help simplify the discussion here, we

\textsuperscript{10} NA, MINT 19/2, fol. 399 and MINT 1/6, fos. 64–66.
\textsuperscript{11} Dyer and Gaspar 1992, 399.
\textsuperscript{1} Peck 1970, 422.
\textsuperscript{2} Freeman 1985, 28.
\textsuperscript{3} Gouby 1986.
\textsuperscript{4} Freeman 1966, 12.
will use D to label the reverse without re-cutting, following Freeman’s notation (Gouby’s would be the same but in lower case), D* to designate the first re-cut reverse type with incuse ‘rock line’, and D’ and D'' to designate the second and third re-cut sea types.

In reverses C (Fig. 1a) and D (Fig. 1b), there is little to differentiate the sea from the rocks, and one might suppose that Britannia is ‘floating’ on water. The re-cutting in reverse D* is apparently designed to address this deficiency, as shown in the close-up in Fig. 1c. The incuse rock line of the re-cut reverse can be clearly seen, along with a slight flattening of the edge of the shield just above it. Interestingly, the re-cut rock line of D* is also clearly visible in Peck’s book, and can even be

Fig. 1. Close-up comparison of LCW reverse types (see text).

---

5 Peck 1970, pl. 36N and pl. 33 for p. 1630.
seen in Weightman's 1907 article in this journal. Gouby's photo of reverse d shows reverse D' which is also illustrated in the Spink catalogue, while the lower quality images in Freeman's books appear to show D*. It should be pointed out that none of these authors distinguish between reverse D, D' and D*.

Reverse D' is the second re-cut type of 1860 with a strongly incuse area above LCW shown in Fig. 1d, and Reverse D" is the re-cut type of 1861 with a pattern of incuse lines in the sea only (Fig. 1e). The strongly patterned sea of Reverse E, the 1860 LCW below foot type (Peck reverse D, Freeman E, Gouby e), is shown for comparison in Fig. 1f.

That Reverse D* has arisen from a single re-cut 1860-dated puncheon, which has been used to make multiple working dies, is evident from the observation of numerous reverse D* coins exhibiting different reverse die cracks, together with the fixed position and spacing of the final date numeral. Microscopic examination also shows the re-cut 'rock line' to be identical on each of them. Because incuse lines are observed on the coins, this must have arisen from a re-cut puncheon and not from a matrix since otherwise raised lines would have resulted. That the purpose of the re-cutting was to define a clear rock line to separate Britannia's perch on the rocks from the sea is somewhat speculative, but is supported by subsequent changes in the design of the penny reverse. For example, Figs 2a and 2b show corresponding close-ups of the first penny reverse which omits LCW (Peck reverse type E, Freeman F, and Gouby f), and of the final 'standard' penny reverse type used from 1861-74 (Peck reverse type F, Freeman G, and Gouby g). Reverses F and G both show a distinctive demarcation from the sea, with rocks in high relief and a rock line in lower relief, respectively.

![Fig. 2. Close-up comparison of 'no signature' reverse types (see text).](image)

That both Reverse D' and D" are also from re-cut puncheons is again demonstrated by the presence of incuse lines and the observation of multiple coins with different reverse die cracks. The re-cutting on these types is more subtle than that on Reverse D*, and only became apparent to the author during careful examination of high grade 1860 and 1861 dated pennies. The pattern of waves above Britannia's foot on both of these re-cut puncheon types is distinctive, as shown in Fig. 3 in comparison to Reverses D and D*. The re-cutting of the sea in Reverse D' is especially bold, so that it resembles the sea of Reverse E (Fig. 1f). The Reverse D' re-cutting involves numerous incuse lines as in Fig. 1e. Numismatic analysis shows that Reverse D' originated from re-cutting a Reverse D puncheon with the final date numeral removed, allowing working dies to

---

be dated 1861 by the addition of the final date numeral by hand. This is evident from the variation in the position and spacing of the final date numeral observed on the coins themselves.

A survey of coins in the author's reference collection was carried out to assess the distribution of Reverse D, D*, D' and D'' coins by date and obverse die type. It should be emphasized that although these survey coins have a bias towards the scarcer varieties, the relative ratio of reverse D, D*, D' and D'' coins for each obverse type should be largely unaffected. The condition of the coins surveyed was also a factor, with coins down to a grade of about fine being suitable for distinguishing between Reverses D, D* and D', whereas coins in somewhat better condition were needed to identify Reverse D''. The results of this survey are presented in Table 1. This lists the number of Reverse D, D*, D' and D'' coins observed by their die pairings with different obverse types during 1860–1. It should be noted that the obverse type labeled 4* is from a Freeman Obverse 4 puncheon with the ribbon end centrally cut (Gouby Obverse G). Through the generosity of other collectors of British penny varieties, a further selection of coins was examined for Reverses D, D*, D' and D''. The results of this examination confirmed the initial findings, although one additional die pairing (1860 6+D*) was noted and this is indicated in Table 1 with an asterisk (*).

As an examination of Table 1 makes clear, Reverses D, D* and D' are only observed on 1860 dated pennies and Reverse D'' on 1861 dated coins, which is consistent with the puncheons for Reverses D, D* and D' being dated 1860, and that for D'' occurring with the final date numeral removed. It is interesting to note that it is the re-cut Reverse D* type that is particularly paired with earlier obverse types, including the rare beaded/toothed 'mule'. This suggests that re-cutting to provide clear demarcation between the sea and rock was recognized as desirable and that the

---

12 Gouby 1986.
Reverse D* puncheon was created very early during the transition from beaded to toothed border pennies. Such a puncheon could be used to make many different working dies. However, the observation of several Reverse D* coins with damaged (or repaired) legends, including the 1860 ONF variety paired with obverse 4*, suggests that this puncheon may have begun sustaining significant damage. While such a damaged puncheon can continue to be used for making dies, this requires the re-punching of individual letters and other repairs, and the puncheon would eventually be taken out of service. This might help explain why Reverse D* was used primarily with the earlier obverses. Reverse D', which exhibits a strongly patterned sea, is only observed to be paired with the Obverse 3, as is also the case for Reverse E, which it resembles. The unmodified Reverse D type was apparently used throughout 1860, and since it is presumed to have been made directly from a Reverse D master die, it is possible that several nearly identical Reverse D puncheons were fabricated. Because Reverse D' was produced from a re-cut puncheon, it should be classed as a distinctive variant, as in the case of Reverse D* and D'.

The results of this study demonstrate that the reverse dies for toothed border ‘LCW below shield’ pennies can be divided into four distinctly different types based on differences in the puncheons used to produce them. The observed re-cuttings appear to be deliberate attempts to enhance the demarcation between the sea and Britannia’s perch on the rocks by sharpening the relief of waves in the sea and by defining a rock line. This interpretation is supported by comparison with subsequent ‘no signature’ reverse die types, especially Reverse G. From a dedicated variety collector’s point of view, there are only a few additional bronze penny die pairings to acquire, all 1860 dated coins. This includes one each of obverses 2, 3, 4, 4* and 6, although it is certainly possible that other die pairings may be discovered in the future. It should also be noted that Royal Mint die sinkers often ‘touched up’ individual working dies, so other minor variants may exist. That distinctive ‘LCW below shield’ reverse die variants resulting from re-cut puncheons have gone unnoticed until now demonstrates that surprises still remain, even in a series as extensively studied as this one.
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