ÆTHELRED’S coinage of the 980s and 990s has attracted much debate, and the three Hand types in particular have featured in wider discussions on the nature, duration of issues and the general implementation of Edgar’s reform of the coinage.1 The rare Benediction Hand type remains especially poorly understood. It is therefore worthy of note that a large quantity of new material – nearly 450 coins, more than half of which are Hand types, from three Dublin hoards found in 1993 and 1994 – has emerged for this formative period of Late Anglo-Saxon coinage. This will be fully published in the SCBI series (Dublin) and analysed in greater detail in due course. The purpose of this note is to draw attention to these as yet unpublished finds and in particular to the substantial Benediction Hand component, which includes seven new moneyers, here published for the first time. Other material has been brought to our attention by Kenneth Jonsson and come to light through reassessment of the Oslo collection for a SCBI volume on Norwegian collections; we have also taken the opportunity to re-examine the two Benediction Hand coins Jonsson attributed to an uncertain London moneyer only. A revised table of moneyers in Benediction Hand builds upon the data published in Jonsson 1987a, and provides an updated overview of the type (Table 4).

The Dublin hoards

The three hoards from Dublin (summarized below in Table 1) were unearthed in relatively close geographical proximity, on Castle Street and Werburgh Street (just north and west of Dublin Castle), in rapid succession in 1993 and 1994. The fact that they were also deposited in close succession means that their combined value in numismatic terms far outweighs that of a single isolated find. They are key witnesses to the Dublin economy on the eve of Sihtric’s economic reform (c.995), and to the vitality of trade and dependence on Anglo-Saxon coins prior to the introduction of the Hiberno-Scandinavian coinage. The deposits are particularly interesting since they contain a range of types that would never occur together in a hoard from England, where the practice of renovatio monetae prevented older types from circulating alongside the current issue.

The two hoards from the north side of 26–9 Castle Street were excavated by Martin Byrne in 1993.2 The first, smallest and earliest hoard contained mainly First Hand coins, with a small Second Hand and Benediction Hand element, suggesting that it was assembled immediately before the Crux coinage in c.991, or perhaps c.993/4.3 The Castle Street 2 hoard is about three times the size of the first find, and was deposited a few years later (c.995), with the Crux type making up nearly half of the deposit. The third hoard, comprising 125 coins all from the reign of Æthelred II, was found at Werburgh Street during excavations directed by Alan Hayden.4 Again, Crux coins make up nearly half of this hoard, which was also deposited in about 995. The overall geographical composition of the hoards is roughly similar, with over 60% of the mints represented in each being from the Midlands/South of England. Interestingly, however, it is the presence of mints active in the north-west that emerges as one of the most significant new features revealed through the Benediction Hand element of the new finds.

The coins from the Dublin finds, now preserved in the National Museum of Ireland, were identified by Michael Kenny in the first instance, and were subsequently studied in detail by
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1 For a summary, see Blackburn 1991, 158-62.
2 Simpson 2000, 32.
3 On the revised dating of Crux proposed by Jonsson, see Jonsson 1987b, 191.
TABLE 1. Composition of the Castle Street and Werburgh Street hoards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Castle Street 1 (c.991 or c.993/4)</th>
<th>Castle Street 2 (c.995)</th>
<th>Werburgh Street (c.995)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edgar:</strong> Reform Small Cross</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edward the Martyr:</strong></td>
<td>1 Small Cross</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Æthelred II:</strong></td>
<td>First Hand/First Small Cross</td>
<td>First Small Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Small Cross</td>
<td>First Small Cross? Cut ½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Hand</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>First Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Hand/First Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Hand</strong></td>
<td>16 Second Hand</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Second Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Hand/ Benediction Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benediction Hand</strong></td>
<td>3 Benediction Hand</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Benedictin Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Hand/Crux</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Second Hand/Crux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benediction Hand/Crux</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benedictin Hand/Crux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crux</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Crux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>79 Total</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bill Lean and Stewart Lyon. We are much indebted to these experts, whose fundamental and meticulous groundwork, including extensive die-linking, forms the basis for this and any future work on the new finds. There is clearly much more information to be gleaned, but this awaits full publication of the material and the opportunity for more comprehensive analyses of mints, weights and die-linking. In the interim, we wish to draw attention to the new moneyers these hoards have provided for the Benediction Hand type.

New information on Benediction Hand coins

When Kenneth Jonsson catalogued the Benediction Hand coins in the 1980s, 138 specimens were known, struck by fifty-one moneyers at twenty-two mints, and a further two Second Hand/Benediction Hand mules (see Table 4, column A, adapting Jonsson 1987a, 101–3). Although he did not list them, Jonsson noted that there are also a number of mules with Crux (including SCBI Copenhagen nos 989 and 1016 and SCBI West Country no. 460); three further examples are present in two of the Dublin hoards. Jonsson has since noted only eight additional Benediction Hand coins, all of previously recorded moneyers, which have appeared at auction or derive from Swedish and Polish finds (see Table 2). Re-examination of the Copenhagen Benediction Hand fragment (SCBI Copenhagen no. 1694), previously attributed to an uncertain London moneyer, suggested that this may be a coin of Eadmund. These additions and emendations to Jonsson 1987a are given in column B of Table 4.

The surprisingly low number of moneyers noted by Jonsson 1987a contributed to arguments in favour of the very limited nature and scale of Benediction Hand. However, we must now factor in the important evidence for new moneyers that has emerged from the three Dublin hoards. In total, these include twenty-nine new specimens of the Benediction Hand type, and four Benediction Hand mules, and add seven new moneyers to the corpus (Table 4, column C): Eadric and Æthelred (Chester), Askeville and Edwine (London), Leofsgis (Northampton) and Brugar and Wynsige (Shrewsbury). All of the moneyers are previously known at these mints for other types during Æthelred’s reign, as summarised in Table 3. All were also active prior to striking Benediction Hand, except for Brugar and Wynsige, who appear for the first time in this type.

Two coins in Oslo from the Norwegian Bore hoard (Bore s., Klepp pgd., found before 8 July 1848, tpq 997) have also been identified as struck by one of the new moneyers known


6 Jonsson, pers. comm.; we are very grateful to Professor Jonsson for sharing this information with us and allowing the details to be included in this note.

Canterbury
Eadweald – 1 (Swedish hoard: Riddare, Hejnum par., Gotland)
Leofstan – 2 (private collection)

Lewes
Leofwine – 1 (Baldwin sale no. 50, 24 April 2007, lot 206)

Norwich
Leofing – 1 (private collection)

Southampton
Isegl – 1 (Polish auction, from a Polish hoard?)

Winchester
Æffisige – 1 (Polish Museum, ex Quilitz hoard, preserved or lost in World War II?)

Uncertain Mint
[?]d – 1 (Cottbus Museum, ex Polish hoard)

TABLE 3. Types struck in the reign of Æthelred II by the newly recorded Benediction Hand moneyers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Small Cross</th>
<th>First Hand</th>
<th>Second Hand</th>
<th>Benediction Hand</th>
<th>Crux</th>
<th>Intermediate Small Cross</th>
<th>Long Cross</th>
<th>Helmet</th>
<th>Agnus Dei</th>
<th>Last Small Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eadric (Chester)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelmod (Chester)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwine (London)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æffisige (London)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofsige (Northampton)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brungar (Shrewsbury?)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynsige (Shrewsbury)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from one of the Dublin hoards, Oseytel (normalised as Asketill) of London.7 The recent conservation of the Bore hoard with funding from the Revita Project of the Museum of Cultural History, Oslo, has greatly improved the legibility of the coins, allowing the reattribution of a coin previously attributed to an uncertain moneyer,8 and the new attribution of a fragment previously recorded only as of the Hand type.9 Full descriptions of the twelve Benediction Hand coins and the Second Hand/Benediction Hand mule struck by these new moneyers are given in the Appendix. The coins are illustrated on Pl. 3.

Preliminary observations and conclusion

The Dublin hoards are remarkable for providing a wealth of material revealing the active circulation of Anglo-Saxon coins in Dublin in the early 990s, immediately prior to the introduction of the Dublin coinage. More specifically, the twenty-nine Benediction Hand coins, together with the four additional mules, significantly broaden our knowledge of the type, with the identification of seven new moneyers, an increase of more than 10%, from a sample of three hoards. In 1987 Jonsson noted the then apparent southern character of Benediction

7 On the Bore hoard see Skaare 1976, 147–8 no. 79, and Holst 1952.
8 Jonsson 1987a, 102.
9 Holst 1952, no. 4.
Hand, and identified three mints that were especially active in the type: Canterbury, London and Rochester. One might therefore have expected any new moneyers to be primarily from these most active mints, but this is true of only two of the seven new moneyers, Asketill and Eadwine of London. This is one indication that the earlier view of the type was incomplete. Jonsson also observed that, relatively speaking, Chester, even with only three coins known, was well represented in Benediction Hand when compared with the Second Hand type, of which only five or six coins were known. An additional coin of Second Hand from Chester has since come to light from a small find from Bishop's Lough, Co. Westmeath, while the Dublin hoards add only one further example. The contrast observed by Jonsson therefore emerges as even more remarkable today, with the addition of thirteen new Benediction Hand coins from Chester and one Second Hand/Benediction Hand mule. The two new moneyers from Shrewsbury also suggest an emphasis on north-western mints that was not apparent in the earlier picture of Benediction Hand, and also suggests that information previously was not only incomplete but regionally-biased. It is striking that there can be such a dramatic shift in our geographical understanding of the type without additions to the range of mints involved. The Dublin hoards thus fill a major gap in our knowledge of the type.

The type proper continues to be absent from north-eastern mints such as Lincoln and York, a situation that the combined evidence of the three new hoards suggests is real rather than perceived due to a bias in the finds. Despite its overall tendency towards coins from the Midlands/South, the Werburgh Street hoard appears to provide a unique perspective on the situation in north-eastern England, with coins of York and Lincoln comprising almost 40% of the Crux element. (By contrast, these mints make up less than 10% of the Crux component in the Castle Street 2 hoard, where Winchester and London, followed by Chester, are the dominant mints for Crux.) Interesting, then, are two Benediction Hand/Crux mules (dieduplicates) struck by Sumulf at York from the Werburgh Street hoard, which indicate that, at the very least, a Benediction Hand obverse die was available there briefly. As Jonsson indicates, there are also other mules with Crux that draw the north-eastern mints into the wider Benediction Hand picture, but only at a late stage; clearly these require closer attention in future work.

While these observations may raise more questions than they answer, the cumulative evidence does seem to suggest that Benediction Hand was a larger coinage than has sometimes been argued and should perhaps now be seen as a substantive type, albeit a short-lived one. This has implications for the wider picture of the coinage in Æthelred II's early years; the 'experimental stage' of the concept of renovatio monetae was perhaps a more complex and better-developed phase of the coinage than previously thought. While some have questioned the success of Æthelred's earliest attempts at recoinage, or argued that Benediction Hand, and its similarly elusive predecessor, Second Hand, were essentially sub-types of what should more broadly be termed as the Hand type, the new material suggests that Benediction Hand holds a place of its own in Æthelred's effort to initiate a regular cycle of revenue-producing recoinages.

10 Jonsson 1987a, 87 and 99.
12 Jonsson 1987a, 99; a number of these mules, and Benediction Hand type variants from Rochester and Guildford, are discussed in Dolley and Elmore Jones 1961.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added to Jonsson 1987a</th>
<th>Jonsson 1987a</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelric</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duda</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadweald</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loefstan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfstan*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelmod*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadric*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfwige*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfwig</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadnoth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loefsigne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4. Moneyers in Benediction Hand, revised from Jonsson 1987a. (New moneyers marked *).
APPENDIX. NEW MONEYERS IN BENEDICTION HAND: LIST OF COINS

Benediction Hand type

Chester, Eadric
(previously recorded at Chester for First Hand, Crux and Long Cross)
1. 1.63 g, 270°, 0/0 pecks
   Obv.: +/E-BELR/EDREXANLOX
   Rev.: +/E-EDRIEM-OLEGE
   Reverse is double-struck. National Museum of Ireland, Dublin, ex Castle Street 2 hoard, 1993. Same obverse die as seven coins struck by a known moneyer (Ælfstan/Chester) from the Castle Street 2 hoard; same reverse die as no. 2.
2. 1.55 g, 180°, 0/0 pecks
   Obv.: +/E-BELR/EDREXANLOX
   Rev.: +/E-EDRIEM-OLEGE
   National Museum of Ireland, Dublin, ex Castle Street 2 hoard, 1993. Same obverse die as nos 3, 4 and 5, and another struck by a known moneyer (Wulflaf/Chester) from the Castle Street 2 hoard; same reverse die as no. 1.

Chester, Æthelmod
(previously recorded at Chester for First Hand and Crux)
3. 1.61 g, 180°, 0/0 pecks
   Obv.: +/E-BELR/EDREXANLOX
   Rev.: /EÆTHLÆLDM-OLEGE
   Chipped. National Museum of Ireland, Dublin, ex Castle Street 1 hoard, 1993. Same dies as nos 4 and 5; same obverse die as no. 2 and another struck by a known moneyer (Wulflaf/Chester) from the Castle Street 2 hoard.
4. 1.72 g, 90°, 0/0 pecks
   National Museum of Ireland, Dublin, ex Castle Street 2 hoard, 1993. Same obverse die as nos 3 and 5; same obverse die as no. 2 and another struck by a known moneyer (Wulflaf/Chester) from the Castle Street 2 hoard.
5. 1.53 g, 180°, 0/0 pecks
   National Museum of Ireland, Dublin, ex Castle Street 2 hoard, 1993. Same dies as nos 3 and 4; same obverse die as no. 2 and another struck by a known moneyer (Wulflaf/Chester) from the Castle Street 2 hoard.

London, Eadwine
(previously recorded at London for Small Cross, Second Hand, a Second Hand/Crux mule, Crux, Long Cross, Helmet and Last Small Cross)
6. 1.48 g, 90°, 0/0 pecks
   Obv.: +/E-BELR/EDREXANLOX
   Rev.: +/EEDPINEM-OLVN

London, Asketill
(previously recorded at London for First Hand, Second Hand and Crux)
7. 1.49 g, 0°, 0/0 pecks
   Obv.: +/E-BELR/EDREXANLOX
   Rev.: +/OE[TEL][OLVND]
8. 1.19 g (1.13 g after conservation), 0°, 0/0 pecks
   Obv.: +/E-BELR/EDREXANLOX
   Rev.: +/OE[TEL][OLVND]
9. 0.52 g (0.52 g after conservation), 270°, 3+/1+? pecks
   Obv.: [1E-BELR/ ]
   Rev.: +/OE[TEL][OLVND]
Northampton, Leofsige
( previously recorded at Northampton for First Hand and Crux)
10. 1.46g, 180°, 0/0 pecks
Obv. +ÆBERL/EDREXANLOX
Rev. HELESEIM-OMHT

Shrewsbury?, Brungar
( previously recorded at Shrewsbury for Long Cross)
11. 0.75g, 270°, 0/0 pecks
Obv. +Æ] ANLOX
Rev. [RVNEGARM[ ]

Shrewsbury, Wynsige
( previously recorded at Shrewsbury for Crux, Long Cross and Last Small Cross)
12. 1.29g, 340°, 0/0 pecks
Obv. +ÆBERL/EDREXALO*
Rev. +PI[ ]IGEM-OXCROB

Second Hand/Benediction Hand Mule

Chester, Æthelred
13. 1.30g, 270°, 0/0 pecks
Obv. +ÆBERL[EDREXANGO
Rev. HELEMODM-OLEG[ ]

REFERENCES
SCBI Copenhagen. See Galster 1966.
THE MILFORD HAVEN HOARD OF HENRY I

EDWARD BESLY

Two hoards from the time of Henry I (1100–35) have been recorded from Wales, one very well known, the other 'mysterious' and 'one of the many secrets of Treasure Trove'. The first is the Llantrithyd hoard, discovered during archaeological excavations in the Vale of Glamorgan in 1962. At the time this accounted for around one-third of all known specimens of type XI, the Double Inscription issue. The second, mysterious hoard was found at Milford Haven, Pembrokeshire, before 1900. It was said to comprise around fifty pennies of Henry I, types XIII and XIV (almost entirely the latter), though an incorrect reference to types V and IX in the Inventory (no. 268) has served to muddy the waters. To the present writer, the hoard long appeared to be quasi-mythical.

However, the sale in 2005 of the W.C. Boyd collection, mothballed since its creator’s death in 1906, brought to light a penny of Henry I ‘found at the Benedictine Priory, Milford Haven’. This and two other coins from the same sale, which may with confidence be attributed to the Milford Haven find, have been acquired by the National Museum of Wales. These coins enable us to pinpoint the hoard’s location and date of discovery with reasonable precision. The three coins and two further examples (whereabouts now unknown) attributable to ‘Milford Haven’ are all to be found in W.J. Andrew’s paper on Henry I in the Numismatic Chronicle for 1901. All five coins are of type BMC XIV, Pellets in Quatrefoil, as follows (see Fig. 1, 1–4).

a. From the W.C. Boyd sale:
1. London, moneyer Godwine:

Obv. [HENR] [VS R. ]
Rev. +GODPINE : OJN U L]V]ND
1.29 g (19.9 gr); 240°.

Lot 888, ‘found at the Benedictine Priory, Milford Haven’. Andrew 1901, 300: ‘W.C. Boyd, 20grs. from the Milford Haven find. Mr Boyd supplies most of the information of this hoard.’

2. London, moneyer Rawulf:

Obv. [HEN[ ]
1.28 g (19.7 gr); 140°.

Lot 889, no provenance given, but Boyd’s ticket ‘from Milford Haven’. Andrew 1901, 306: ‘T. Bliss, Pl. VII No. 5, Milford Haven’. The attribution to Bliss must be an error – Bliss’s specimen of this type (lot 173 in his 1916 sale) was apparently acquired from the 1903 Murdoch sale, after Andrew’s work was published. The coin illustrated by Andrew is this Boyd example, acquired by him in 1898.

3. Winchester, uncertain moneyer:

Obv. [ ]
Rev. [ ] : ON : PING[ ]
1.38 g (21.2 gr); 330°?

Lot 890, no provenance given, but Boyd’s ticket ‘from Milford Haven’. Andrew 1901, 471: ‘W.C. Boyd. From the Milford Haven find’ describes a Winchester coin with an identical partially legible reverse legend.

b. Other coins noted by Andrew:
4. Southwark, moneyer Algar:

Obv. +HENRICVS R [ ]
Rev. +ALGAR : ON : SVDPE :

Andrew 1901, 293: ‘W.J. Andrew, Pl. VII No. 4. From the Milford Haven find’ and two others. This coin was also noted by Boon.6

1 Boon 1986, 105 n.2; Andrew 1901.
2 Dolley 1962 and 1964, Boon 1986, 103-5.
3 Thompson 1956, 103.
4 Baldwin Auction no. 42, 26 September 2005.
5 Accession number 2005.67H/1-3.
6 Fig. 1, 4, reproduced from NC 1901, pl. VII by courtesy of the Royal Numismatic Society; Boon 1986, 105 n.2.
5. Southwark, moneyer Alfwine:
Revd. +ALFWIN : ON : SVDPER
Andrew 1901, 290, notes 'Milford Haven find' as one of four specimens recorded. (No image available.)

Fig. 1.

Boyd acquired all three of his Milford coins from T.P. Angell, the first in 1891, the others in 1898. His ticket for no. 1 gives further information, not included in the Boyd sale catalogue: 'from find at Benedictine Priory, Milford Haven, when making railway' and this enables us to date and locate the find. The priory itself is a slight red herring: Pill Priory was a Tironian house, founded in 1170, to the north of Milford Haven at the head of Hubberston Pill [creek] and therefore has no direct relationship to the hoard. Its site, however, is cut by the line of the Milford Junction Railway, which opened on 7 September 1863, a three-miles-long line built to link the town of Milford to the South Wales Railway. The Milford Haven hoard was therefore found no later than 1863 – probably between 1858 and 1860, when the bulk of the work was carried out – in the area of the later priory (NGR: SM 9007). The hoard itself, based on Blackburn’s suggested chronology of types, was buried or lost around 1123–25 or a little later.

The five coins identified as coming from the hoard are too few for meaningful comment on its overall composition. This was a period of active Norman-Flemish settlement in the area, with a mint already established at Pembroke; however, it is extremely unlikely that any of its products were in the hoard. Only three specimens of BMC XIV are recorded for the Pembroke mint:

i. British Museum: ex Elmore Jones 1082 and Carlyon-Britton 1393;
ii. Fitzwilliam Museum: ex Doubleday 797;

All three may in fact be traced to the Carlyon-Britton collection through their illustration as pl. XLI, 12–14 ('P.C.B.') of BMC Norman Kings and thence to the 1901 'Canterbury' hoard.9
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BMC Norman Kings. See Brooke 1916.

7 D. Jenkins, pers. comm.
8 Agreement on the link to the main line was delayed until 1863, by which time the Great Western Railway had taken over the S.W.R.; G.W.R. provided the trains for the new line. For further details, see www.pembrokeshirevirtualmuseum.co.uk.
9 Carlyon-Britton 1927–8.
TWO NOTES ON STEPHEN BMC TYPE 7

MARTIN ALLEN AND T.G. WEBB WARE

ONE of the authors of these notes (MA) has published a study of Stephen BMC type 7 (the ‘Awbridge’ type of 1153/4–58) in the last volume of this Journal.¹ The other author (TGWW) has discovered three type 7 pennies not included in the study, which add a new mint (Durham) and a new Warwick moneyer to the corpus for the type.

1. Durham, a new mint for type 7

In March 1995 a penny of Stephen type 7, found shortly before at Embleton, north of Alnwick in Northumberland, was shown at the British Museum, where it was identified as a coin of Huntingdon, moneyer Derling, reading ‘+DELINGON:hVN’. As such it has been tentatively published by Robin Eaglen in his survey of the Huntingdon mint, with the coda ‘the whereabouts of this coin is unknown’.² This important coin has now become available for study. It tells an interesting story, removing moneyers from the canon of type 7 at Huntingdon and Pevensey, and adding Durham to the list of mints in the type.

The coin (weight 1.40g) is quite well struck, although slightly off-centre, and it might be read as ‘+REL[–]JON:HV[–]EM’ (Fig. 1). The keys to the identification are the first letter of the moneyer’s name and the first letter of the mint signature, but unfortunately neither letter is entirely clear. The former is a large letter, clearly open at the bottom, possibly an R. Only the lower half of the latter letter is visible. It has a vertical upright and a curved limb, and could equally well be a D or h. Further examination of the first letter of the moneyer’s name, however, raises another possibility, that it might be an elaborate F, with a vertical bar connecting the two horizontal strokes on the right. This would greatly reduce the number of possible readings, for only one Norman moneyer with a name beginning with ‘FEL...’ is known: Felipe, recorded in exactly this type at the mint of Pevensey. The coin attributed to Pevensey, now in the British Museum, was first published by H.H. King in his review of the Sussex mints, where the reading is given as ‘+ELIP:ON:P–EN’, and this attribution was accepted by F. Elmore Jones in his paper on Stephen type 7 in the same volume of the Journal.³ Examination of the illustration provided by Elmore Jones reveals that the ‘Pevensey’ coin and the ‘Huntingdon’ piece are struck from the same pair of dies. Very fortunately the two surviving legends are largely complementary. The only uncertain letters remaining are the first and

Fig. 1.

¹ Allen 2006.
² Eaglen 1999, 144; Allen 2006, 272 (no. 86).
³ King 1955–7, 74 (no. 12); Elmore Jones 1955–7, 537, 550, Pl. XXXI, 17; Allen 2006, 280 (no. 216).
third of the mint signature. The third letter is almost certainly an R, and the first letter can be resolved by deduction. The Embleton coin shows that it cannot be a P, while the British Museum coin confirms that it is not an h. The only remaining possibility is a D, giving the full reading +FELIPEONDVREM, an unequivocal reading for Durham.

One of the authors (MA) has suggested that the Durham mint closed after the usurpation of the bishopric by William Cumin (1141–44), remaining closed during the pontificate of Bishop William of Ste Barbe (1143–52), before reopening under Henry II for the Cross-and-Crosslets (Tealby) coinage in 1158. The fortunate die identity of these two examples of type 7 now demonstrates that the Durham mint was active in the coinage of 1153/4–58, during the early years of the pontificate of Bishop Hugh of Le Puiset (1153–95). It was thus the most northerly mint of England until Henry II’s recovery of Cumberland and Northumberland from the Scots in 1157, and the opening of English mints in Carlisle and Newcastle for the production of the new Cross-and-Crosslets coinage from 1158.

The addition of Durham to the corpus of mints in type 7 raises the possibility that some or all of the type 7 coins attributed to Dunwich might be coins of the Durham mint. There are three cut halfpennies and one cut farthing of the moneyer Nicole, and a cut halfpenny of a moneyer having a name beginning with R (possibly Rogier). The mint signature of the ‘R’ coin is DVN, and three of the coins of Nicole have mint signatures that can be reconstructed as DVN or DVNE (the name of the mint is completely missing on one coin). When the first coin of Nicole was discovered in 1988, it was suggested that the appearance of a moneyer of that name at Ipswich and Norwich in the Cross-and-Crosslets coinage, together with its East Anglian findspot (Thetford), supported an attribution to Dunwich. Another halfpenny of Nicole has been found at Andover in Hampshire, but the farthing was found at Dunwich itself. The halfpenny of the enigmatic moneyer ‘R’ came from the Wicklewood (Norfolk) hoard. On present evidence the attribution of the Nicole coins to Dunwich seems to be plausible, but the attribution of the ‘R’ coin to Dunwich or Durham must remain an open question for the present.

2. A new Warwick moneyer in type 7

The Warwick mint has been recorded in type 7 on the basis of a penny now in the British Museum, from the Awbridge hoard, reading +EVERARD[---]PARPI. In 2002 a new type 7 penny of Warwick (weight 1.39g) appeared in an Australian sale, and it has recently been donated to the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (Fig. 2). The reverse of this new coin is difficult to read, because the coin is creased and it has been repaired after three small fragments became detached. The first letter of the reverse inscription is an S, which is followed by an upright which may be an I, and a letter which might be M or N. The central portion of the inscription reads VND:ONPA, and finally there are faint traces of two letters which might be RP, before a final colon and the initial cross. Thus the inscription may be tentatively reconstructed as +S[M]VND:ONPA[RP]; and it can be suggested that this is a coin of a previously unrecorded Warwick moneyer, Simund. The identification of this new moneyer is supported by a second coin (weight 1.34g), which is from different dies but with a similar reverse reading (Fig. 3). Part of the reverse inscription on this coin is off the flan, and the beginning and ending of the reading are again in doubt. There is a letter which might be an M, then VND:ONPAR fully legible, and finally an upright which might be part of a P. This coin does not clarify the reading of the moneyer’s name, but the unambiguous mint signature confirms the attribution to Warwick.

---

5 Allen 2006, 269–70 (no. 56–60).
6 M.M. Archibald and Barbara Green, BNJ 58 (1988), 162, Coin Register no. 232; Allen 2006, 269 (no. 56).
7 Allen 2006, 270 (no. 37, 59).
8 Allen 2006, 270 (no. 60).
10 J. Noble sale 70, 9 July 2002, lot 1580; ex Dr W.J. Conte.
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SOME LATE RICHARD NOBLES

LORD STEWARTBY AND T.G. WEBB WARE

An escallop shell, symbol of pilgrimage in the Middle Ages, appears on English coins on occasions from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. Late in the reign of Richard II (1377–99) it is found on some pence from the archiepiscopal mint of York (type III) and on some of the last gold (type IV). On nobles it was placed on the ship's rudder and on quarter-nobles above the shield. Now we have also found the escallop used on one noble die instead of the saltire stops before and after Gra. Before the reign of Henry VI the use of pictorial symbols within the inscription is a most exceptional occurrence.

We have noted three specimens from the die in question.

(i) Glendining, 18 Nov. 1970, lot 148, now in Mr Webb Ware's collection; wt 119.1 gr. There is little sign of rust on the die, and this is the earliest of the known strikings. No mark on the rudder. Because of double-striking the escallop stops are not clear.
(ii) Formerly in the collection of Mr H.H.S. Mygind. This is a later striking, with incipient rust marks above the fess'le (and a die-crack along the sword?). It is not clear whether there was a mark on the rudder.
(iii) From a recent find off the coast of Holland, via Baldwins, to Lord Stewartby's collection; wt 116.1 gr. The escallop stops are clear. Rust marks are more prominent and there may be a mark (escallop or lis?) on the rudder. (Fig. 1).

The hoard from which noble (iii) derives, apparently lost as a result of shipwreck, is said to have been discovered off the north coast of Holland, near Emden, c.2002. It consisted of more than one thousand gold coins of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, mostly Netherlandish and German gulden, but with more than one hundred English nobles. Several of the coins had iron deposits on their surface, of the kind produced by iron nails in seawater. The hoard has been recovered and dispersed gradually, through the agency of MPO, coin and stamp auctioneers of Ijsselstein, near Utrecht. The first parcel was sold at MPO's auction on 30–31 May 2003; further parcels containing nobles have been sold subsequently through the trade and at MPO's sale on 1–3 December 2005. We are indebted to Mr Edward Baldwin for this information. Record of this important find is held by the Dutch Money and Bank Museum in Utrecht.
Two nobles from another obverse die also deserve mention here, since the stops by Gra seem, possibly, to be saltires over escallops. This obverse die is very similar to the one with escallop stops.

(iv) Formerly in the Mygind collection. There is no mark evident upon the rudder. There is a slight die-flaw in the first quarter of the shield of arms.

(v) From the Reigate II (1992) hoard, Glendining, 8 Dec. 1992, lot 7; wt 105.1 gr, clipped. This has advanced die-flaws on the shield, and a small crescent on the rudder.

Late Richard nobles with an escallop (IVa) or a crescent (IVb) on the rudder are well-known rarities, but specimens with escallop stops do not appear to have been noticed previously. The question therefore arises where they should be placed in the sequence of Richard’s nobles. An example without a mark in the field or on the rudder might be classed as type IIIa, types IIIb and IIIc both having marks added. Against this, however, the face punch on the escallop-stopped die is unlike that of the IIIa period, having a skull-like appearance, with sunken eyes. More generally, one would expect use of the escallop punch for stops to have been not far removed in time from its use as a ruddermark. The fact that the obverse of Reigate 7 had a crescent added on the rudder is also indicative of association with type IV nobles, which might now provisionally be subdivided as follows:

| IVa1 | Escallop stops before and after Gra |
| IVa2 | Escallop on rudder |
| IVb  | Crescent on rudder |

In the Schneider collection there are two Richard nobles of type IVb. The second of these (SCBi 47 no. 187) exhibits mutilation of the first three letters of Ricard in a manner similar to that noted by Blunt on a late Richard halfgroat and on a London penny from a late Richard obverse die paired with a reverse of Henry IV. The occurrence of a noble with the same feature lends support to Blunt’s view that this was the result of deliberate defacement, and to his suggestion that the most likely circumstances in which it was done would have been shortly after Richard had been deposed by his cousin Henry in September 1399.
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SCBi 47. See Woodhead 1996.


1 Blunt 1936.
THE DEBASED COINAGE OF 1492

P. R. CAVILL

Henry VII made sustained efforts to maintain and enhance the standard of his coinage, a process which culminated in the major reforms of 1504. The king adopted various strategies to protect the circulating medium: he issued new coins, targeted counterfeiting and clipping, and restricted the use of inferior Irish and continental coins. Henry also sought to prevent English coins being taken overseas. At the beginning of his reign, he issued a proclamation forbidding the export of gold or silver as money, bullion, or plate; in 1490 a statute made the unlicensed export of coin a felony. It was this determination which led Henry in 1492 to mint debased coins that would become known as 'dandyprats'. The precise nature of these coins has remained mysterious. Henry's foreign policy explains why they were minted.

Dominating English foreign policy in the years 1489 to 1492 was the duchy of Brittany. Henry VII, with the support of Maximilian, King of the Romans, and Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, was seeking to prevent the French Crown from annexing this semi-autonomous duchy. In March 1489, under the terms of a treaty concluded with Duchess Anne, English forces landed in Brittany. Divisions at the Breton court, the unpopularity of the English occupation, and the unreliability of Henry's allies combined to reduce the effectiveness of the English intervention. Henry failed ultimately to prevent the French king marrying Anne in December 1491 and thereby absorbing the duchy into his kingdom. In retaliation, under the terms of treaties agreed with Maximilian and with Ferdinand and Isabella, Henry prepared to launch an invasion of France. The king landed in France early in October 1492. There he campaigned in Picardy and besieged Boulogne. On 3 November, however, Henry concluded a peace with the French king Charles VIII, whereupon the English army returned home.

Philip Grierson has provided the fullest discussion to date of the debased coins. Professor Grierson's comments were based primarily upon a letter written on 1 April 1525 by Thomas Howard, the third Duke of Norfolk. The duke was reporting on his efforts to levy the 'Amicable Grant' in Norfolk. At Norwich, Howard found the citizens unwilling to contribute in cash, but prepared to give plate at a lower rate. Howard recommended that their offer be accepted, 'and than suche a Coyne might bee devised as were the dandypratts at the king of d'ed is going over to Bullen [Boulogne], Wherewith the kinges highnes thought recompence his losse and yet the same good enough to bee spent in firaunce'. The precedent Howard cited can be substantiated. In July 1491 Henry VII had likewise requested a 'benevolence' from his subjects. Contributions were allowed to take the form of plate and bullion, possibly because of a shortage of coin. The collectors gave what had been raised to Sir Reynold Bray, treasurer of the king's wars, who then passed the plate and bullion to John Shaa, the graver of the mint. According to William Cope, one of Bray's clerks, Shaa used the plate and bullion to mint £17,392 15s. of two-penny pieces – over two million of them – which he then

Acknowledgements: I should like to thank Drs Martin Allen, Barrie Cook, and Hannes Kleineke for their comments, Dr Kevin Clancy for inviting me to speak at the summer meeting of the Royal and British Numismatic Societies in July 2007, and the editors for their forbearance.

1 Challis 1978, 44-63.
2 Hughes and Larkin 1964-9, i, no. 10; 4 Hen. VII, c. 23.
3 Challis 1978, 52-4.
5 Currin 2002.
7 British Library, Cotton MS Cleopatra E.VI, fo. 267-9, printed in Ellis 1846, i, 376-81.
8 For the 'Amicable Grant', see Bernard 1986 and Bernard and Howe 1994.
9 BL, Cotton MS Cleopatra F.VI, fo. 268v (Ellis 1846, i, 380-1). The phrase 'at the king of ded is going ouer to Bullen' has been garbled by the copyist. It means 'when the king who is dead [i.e., Henry VII] went over to Boulogne'.
11 For the shortage of coin in 1525, see Bernard 1986, 3, 77, 85, 115, 117.
12 For Shaa, see Kleineke and Hovland 2004, 168-9.
delivered to Bray.\textsuperscript{13} These were quite probably the debased coins to which Howard was referring in 1525.

On the basis of the Duke of Norfolk's observation, Grierson proposed that 'Henry VII had a large consignment struck of half-groats of inferior fineness or low weight – their name, with its suggestion of smallness, suggests the latter – with the intention of unloading them on unsuspecting Frenchmen, who would have no standard for comparison and might consequently be ready to accept them at their face value.'\textsuperscript{14} What Grierson lacked was contemporary corroboration of Norfolk's comment. There survives, however, a copy of a royal proclamation issued in the immediate aftermath of the French campaign. This proclamation explains why Henry minted debased coins, how much these coins were worth, and what happened to the coins when the royal army returned from France. Although the dating clause is omitted, the proclamation must have been issued in late 1492 or in the first weeks of 1493. It is transcribed in full in the appendix below.

This proclamation proves Grierson's hypothesis to have been correct. The debased coins of 1492 were two-penny pieces minted by the king, and not – as has been suggested – foreign imports.\textsuperscript{15} They were issued in order to reduce the amount of specie transferred to the continent as a result of Henry's campaign. Some of the coins, however, made their way back to England when the soldiers and victuallers who had received them returned home. The proclamation therefore ordered that the coins were to cease being legal tender on 14 January 1493, and that they were to be exchanged at the mint at the Tower of London by Candlemas (2 February). This process can be traced through the records of the tellers of the Exchequer. John Shaa, now joint master-worker of the mint, was appointed to receive the debased coins and to exchange them for coins of the correct weight.\textsuperscript{16} The Exchequer then reimbursed Shaa for his outlay. On 31 March Shaa received £1,643 1s. 9d. from Thomas Stokes, one of the tellers.\textsuperscript{17} By the close of the Exchequer year on 29 September, Shaa's total reimbursement amounted to £5,274 19s. 9d.\textsuperscript{18} By setting this figure against the number of two-penny pieces given to Bray, we could calculate that thirty per cent of the debased coins were exchanged.\textsuperscript{19}

What the proclamation does not resolve is what these coins looked like. Its silence on this subject is remarkable given the fact that proclamations issued later in Henry's reign went into considerable detail in explaining the features of particular coins.\textsuperscript{20} Men who had brought the coins back with them from France might reasonably have been expected to know that their two-penny pieces were debased, but it is hard to see how those who were simply offered these coins in transactions in England might have been expected to identify them. One possibility is that only their lightness distinguished the debased coins from other two-penny pieces, and that it was this defect which it was presumed would alert those receiving the coins.\textsuperscript{21} The success of the royal proclamation is also a matter for conjecture. Proclamations issued later in the 1490s, although they did not mention the debased coins, commented on the 'smallness' of English pennies.\textsuperscript{22} It is conceivable, as Grierson speculated, that some of the debased two-

\textsuperscript{13} The National Archives: Public Record Office (TNA: PRO), Exchequer of Receipt, account of William Cope, deputy of Sir Reynold Bray, treasurer of the king's wars, E36/285, fo. 19r.
\textsuperscript{14} Grierson 1973, 85.
\textsuperscript{15} Cook 1994, 71–4.
\textsuperscript{16} Challis 1992, 718.
\textsuperscript{17} TNA: PRO, Exchequer of Receipt, tellers' books, accounts of Thomas Stokes, E36/125, p. 237; E36/131, p. 369.
\textsuperscript{18} TNA: PRO, Exchequer of Receipt, tellers' rolls, E405/78, rot. 57d, 58, 60d, 63. Shaa seems to have received no further payments explicitly for exchanging the debased two-penny pieces.
\textsuperscript{19} This statistic needs to be hedged with caveats. We do not know whether the entry in Cope's accounts records all the debased two-penny pieces minted, or indeed whether all the two-penny pieces passed to Bray were in fact debased. Furthermore, we do not know how many of the coins minted were actually distributed: the proclamation states that only part of the coinage was distributed.
\textsuperscript{20} Hughes and Larkin 1964–9, i, nos 44, 54, 57.
\textsuperscript{21} Dr. Challis noted that 'An alternative suggestion, that the first dandyprats are to be identified with a light issue of half-groats weighing roughly 14–16gr instead of the customary 24gr, founders, Dr. Metcalf tells me, on the grounds of chronology'; Challis 1978, 53 n.23. This chronology is presented in Metcalf 1976, xiii–xxxix. The absolute chronology of Henry's coinage, however, remains uncertain.
\textsuperscript{22} Hughes and Larkin 1964–9, i, nos 38, 42, 43, 44.
penny pieces of 1492 remained in circulation and thus contributed to this problem. By 1511, Grierson found, the word ‘dandyprat’ was taken to represent the value 1½d. It should be noted, however, that none of the evidence from 1492 and 1493 refers to the debased two-penny pieces as ‘dandyprats’. It may be that the name developed as a description of various underweight coins (including foreign imports) worth 2d. or 1½d., which was then applied retrospectively to the coins minted in 1492.

APPENDIX

British Library, Stowe MS 501, fos. 35r–v, 36r, 41v

[fo. 35r] Rex vicecomitibus Londonii salutem. Precipimus vobis etc. Where as the kyng our souereyne lord, by thadysse and counsell and at the specyalle prayer and request of the lordes spirituelles and temporalles and of other the nobles and wisemen of this his realme of Englonde, for the necessary defense of the same and to resiste and represse the incessant malice of his and our ancients enmyes the Frencche kyng, of late intende and in feete prepared an armynge and expediunc royalle and therwithe intende in his moeste royalle persone to have arryved in suche parties of Fraunce where the coygne cyrrant is fulle steyghte and of fulle smalle vallour; and forasmuche as it was thene thoughte that so grete ane armynge and expediciunc cowde ne myghte be susteyned withoute grete sommes of money, his highnes, hauynge a tender and inwardy respect to the comer and politeque wele of this his seyd realme, and to thentent that the gode money of golde and sylyer [fo. 35v] shuld not in oure grete porcioun and quantite be borne and spente oute of this his seyd realme but rather asmoche as possible were to be saved and kepte within the same, ordaigned and dyd do to be coygned a certeyne somme of peny of ij jorde more feble and of lesse value thane his coygne cyrrant within this realme and yet somewhat better in value thane the money of the parties where his highnesse thene intende by Goddyes grace to have arryved, there to have beene expendyd and employed for vital and other necessaries for the forseyd armynge, and neuere to have beene transportyd into this his seyd realme. But in asmoche as his seyd hignes, in perfoormyng his promys made to his subgettes and at the instant request of the kyng of Romayns (the whiche to accomplishe his hignes had by his lettre and hym self promysed [fo. 36r] as by their bothe lettres betwixte thayme bothe engroced more pleyly dothe appare), dyd of late entre with an arme royalle into the parties of Parycide where the mony currant is of fulle smalle vallour, for the whiche cause the kynges hignes dyd parte of the seyd peny of ij jorde to payde to his vitellers and soudeours there, neuethingles his grace nowe vnderstandithate diuers his sylyer vitellers and soudeours and other his subgettes whiche haue take and receyved of the seyd lighte money nowe in their retorn oute of the seyd armynge haue broughte thayme into this his realme of Englonde grete parte of the seyd money contrary to the kynges mynde and intente. His seyd hignes therefore, not willing he intende his coygne and money cyrrant within this his realme in any wyse to be impaye and diminischyd but rather to be increasyd, and specially that none of his subgettes therby shuld be indamaged or here eny losse but vterly intende to here hyme self, stevely chargethe and [fo. 41v] commaundeth the alle and euereye his true liegemen and subgettes of what estate, degre, or condition they be of that halle eny of the forseyd lyghte and feble money that they bring or send it unto the kynges mynt within the Towe of London and deluyer it there to the master and keper of the forseyd monet on thysdye the feste of Candelmas next commyng, and the seyd mastre and keper shall delaunger every suche persone as bringethe in any of the seyd money for every pece of the seyd lyghte peny of ij jorde other ij sylge peny or one peny of ij jorde of gode and lawfull money without any thing payeng for the cutage of the same; and that no persone after the (xiiith) day of January next commyng; yter, take, ne receyve eny of the seyd lyghte money yppone payne of forfeiture of the same and fether to be punyssed at the kynges pleure. Et hoc etc.

(. . .): interlineated over <seyd feste of Candelmas>
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25 One explanation of the name, based on the Portuguese ‘dinheiro de prata’, is suggested in Cook 1994. 74.
26 This document is published by permission of the British Library. Capitalisation and punctuation have been modernised, and contractions and abbreviations have been removed; the one substantive change, however, is indicated.
MERNICK: FRUITERERS' TOKENS (1)
The tokens catalogued below have not been brought together previously, though many have been published individually. Most are in white metal (pewter, tin or lead), and have similar dimensions and weights. They are quite unlike both the familiar seventeenth- and late eighteenth-century series of tokens. The style of die-cutting is quite consistent, indicating one source of production.

The trade of FRUITERER is named on nos 8–9, implied by the devices on nos 2–4, 7, 10–11, 19–20, and remarkably documented in the case of no. 1. All except four mention 3 CRANES, i.e. Three Cranes Lane, Stairs, or Wharf, south of Upper Thames Street in the Vintry ward of the City of London. The exceptions are:

No. 1, which gives no location, but (as reported by Roy Hawkins) in 1681 the issuer was in nearby Queen Street;
No. 13, at STOCKS MARKET, a City market (Woolchurch ward) which, after the Great Fire of 1666, sold fruits, roots and herbs until removed in 1737 for the eventual construction of the Mansion House;
No. 19, in THAMES STREET, which bisects New Queen Street;
No. 20, in QUEEN STREET, which was formed after 1666, with the southern portion occupying the site of the Three Cranes tavern. The 1734/5 (Robert Seymour) edition of Stowe refers to ‘New Queen-Street, commonly called The Three Cranes in The Vintry, . . .’

Three Cranes Lane was so called from three strong cranes of timber placed on Vintry Wharf to raise wines from the Thames. According to Strype’s 1720 edition of Stow, it was taken up by Costermongers (a term which originally meant apple-sellers). His 1755 edition calls them Fruiterers.4

Acknowledgement. The author is indebted to Robert Thompson for encouraging him to complete this paper and for laying out the draft for him.

1 Analysis of specimens of nos 4b and 6a showed both tin and lead with higher levels of the former, i.e. pewter.
2 Harben 1918, 495, 554 and 577–8.
3 Stow 1711, 241.
4 Stow 1711, 241; Strype 1720, i. iii. 13.
Fig. 1. Three Cranes area from John Rocque's plan of London. Westminster and Southwark, 1746.

The London Mystery of Fruiterers was incorporated on 9 February 1605/6 as the Worshipful Company of Fruiterers, with the right of supervision and search of the trade within the City and a three miles radius. The Company uses the unauthorized arms Azure on a mount Vert the tree of Paradise environed with a serpent between Adam dexter and Eve sinister all proper, which appear on tokens 3 and 19 in simplified form. The dates recorded on the tokens run from 1700 to 1739, whereas the records of the Worshipful Company, apart from charters and ordinances, are very incomplete before 1748. Apprenticeship bindings have been published from the court minutes up to 1815, but there is little relevant to the tokens in the company history.

References to Fruiterers' records are taken from Gould 1912. A fire in the Clerk's house, in 1748, destroyed most early records. This is why the exact entrance dates for early members are not known. In 1696 the wardens and assistants signed a petition referring to a 'horrid and detestable conspiracy by Papists etc' (The Assassination Plot). There is no record of early masters of the Company apart from this 1696 reference, but we have a list of Renten Wardens from 1713 to 1748, and it appears that the normal progression was Renter Warden to Upper Warden (in the following year) to Master (after a further two years). Evidence of dates of tenure (although not of the nature of the business) can be found in the land tax records.

5 Bromley 1960, 105-6.
6 City Livery Companies, 57.
7 Webb 1997; Gould 1912.
housed in The Guildhall Library. Unless otherwise stated all information is from Vintry Ward records.

Any explanation of this series of tokens needs to take account of the following points. First, the existence of different tokens bearing the same date, as with nos 4–5 and 6–7, which argues against their use in some annual feast, for example. Second, the presence on some tokens of more than one name, viz. Coates & Biddle, Gould & Turner, Holland & Cooke, Kelham & Fisher, and Miller & Spotswood, which argues against their use by an individual office-holder. Third, land tax records produce one instance (Kelham & Fisher) of the same pairing of names as appears on a token. This would appear to confirm the use of the tokens as part of the running of a business. The author’s suggestion is that they were used for the unloading of goods at the riverside wharf. (The use of tokens to pay carriers and porters was well established at this time in Cumbria, although apparently not common in London until the nineteenth century.)

The lists below are chronological for those bearing dates, then alphabetical by the first-named issuer for undated tokens. Each entry describes obverse and reverse, and gives available details of metal, of shape (if not round), of diameter, of weight, and of published references or other authority. An asterisk distinguishes pieces which have not been confirmed from a specimen or a photograph. There follows documentation of the issuers in order of their surname. The number of different tokens so far recorded, combined with their individual rarity, suggests that there may have been additional issues that have not survived or have not yet been recognised. It is to be hoped that new varieties will come to light as a result of this article.

**CATALOGUE**

BM indicates that there is a specimen in the British Museum collection.
BM Guest indicates that there is a specimen in the British Museum collection which is published in *BM Guest*.
WM indicates that the token is made of white metal.

**Dated tokens (nos 1–10)**

1. **Obv. S R: IAMES: COLETT** around script *I-C*
   **Rev. HIS HALFE PENNY** around 1700
   WM, 21 mm, 14.9 g
   A sketch was exhibited by the late Roy Hawkins in March 1968 on behalf of Major Pridmore, who hoped its ‘blatant wrongness’ as a home issue might point to an overseas possession, such as a plantation in Jamaica (*BNJ* 31 (1968), 212–13). Presumably the same specimen is Mitchiner 1998, no. 5472, illustrated at 1:1 and x2 (Pl. 4, 1).

2. **Obv. HOLLAND & COOKE Y HAND. & | APPLE | 3 | CRANES**
   **Rev. Hand holding apple | 1708**
   WM, 27 mm
   Noble 61B, lot 1117 (Pl. 4, 2).

3a. **Obv. EDW: | BERRY | AT THE 3 | CRANES** | 1715
   **Rev. A Tree environed with a serpent between Adam, right, and Eve, left**
   WM, square, 25 mm, 8.1 g
   BM Guest no. 1254 but for THREE read 3, as may be seen in Pl. VI (Pl. 4, 3).

3b. Similar but round, 25.8 mm, 7.9 g
   BM, ex Freudenthal 3293. Neumann 1865, no. 27575 (EDW?) (Pl. 4, 4).

4a. **Obv. KELHAM | & FISHER | AT THE 3 | CRANES**
   **Rev. From a frilled or ruffled wrist right a hand holding an apple by the stalk | 1721**
   ?Copper, square, 26 mm, 8.24 g
   BM J2598, ex Spink 1960 (gift) (Pl. 4, 5).

4b. As above but round. WM, 27 mm, 7.8 g
   P. Mernick coll. (Pl. 4, 6).

5. **Obv. CHARLES | AVDLEY AT | 3 CRANES** | 1722
   **Rev. Arms of Audley of Hough and Welbourn (Linns.), Quarterly, 1 and 4 Ermine a chevron Gules, 2 and 3 Gules a fret Or; all within a bordure gobony Argent and Azure; crest, a Saracen’s head in profile couped at the neck proper crowned with a circlet Or**
   WM, 27 mm, 7.9 g
   BM, ex Parkes Weber (1906 acquisition), 4265 (Pl. 4, 7).

6. **Obv. IOHN | SKINNER | AT 3 | CRANES**

---

8 Finlay 2006.
Rev. Arms of Skynner of Lines, and of Kent | 1722
Ermine three lozenges Sable each charged with a fleurdelis Or.
(i) WM, 27mm
P. Merrick coll., ex Gladdle, ex Greenall (PL 4, 8).
(ii) WM, 27mm, 7.5g
BM 2395.
This is the only token from the series that could be considered 'common'. At least five examples survive.

7. Obv. RICH* FISHER AT 3 CRANES, 1723 [in five lines]
Rev. Hand holding rose [apple, as on no. 4]
WM
Burn 1853, no. 1017; 1855, no. 1163.

8. Obv. THO: | BALLARD | AT 3 | CRANES
Rev. FRVITERER [A griffin] 1723
WM, 29mm, 7.6g
BM Guest no. 1248 (PL 4, 9).
The Ballard arms (various locations) are a Griffin Segreant.

9. Obv. RICHARD | OWEN | FRVITERER | AT 3 CRANES | 1730
(i) WM, 28–30mm
N. du Quean Bird in NCirc 87 (1979), 390: illus., but reading Y* CRANES
(ii) WM, 30mm, 10.4g

10. Obv. GOULD | & | TURNER | 3 | CRANES
Rev. Hand holding apple | 1735
WM, 27mm
John Whitmore sales list no. 5, 1998 (PL 4, 11).

11. Obv. GOULD | 3 | CRANES
Rev. Hand holding apple | 1739
WM, 27mm
Noble 61B, lot 1117 (PL 4, 12).

Undated tokens (nos 12–23)

12. Obv. JOHN | ASKEW AT | THE HAND | & BOTTLE | 3 CRANES
Rev. From a frilled or ruffled wrist left a hand holding a bottle upright
WM, 26mm, 8.1g
Dalton and Hamer 1910–18, 454 (illustration cancelled); token now in BM (J2392) (PL 4, 13).

13. Obv. EDWARD | BARRETT | AT STOCKS | MARKET
Rev. Arms of Barrett, A chevron between three bears passant; crest, a griffin segreant.
WM, 26mm, 8.2g
Williamson 1889–91, London no. 2950 (descriptions of arms on reverse and metal are incorrectly given).
Museum of London (PL 4, 14).

14. Obv. THO-BEST | AT Y* SWAN | AT 3 CRANES
Rev. Arms of Best (London), Ermine three bucks' heads erased Gules armed Or
WM 26mm, 7.2g, countermarked with lion rampant
BM, ex Freudenthal 3294. Neumann 1865, no. 27576 (PL 4, 15).

15. Obv. EDWARD | BVRFORD | NEAR: 3 | CRANES
Rev. THE RISING SVN AND CHERRY TREE around Bird in Tree
(i) WM, 26mm, 7.3g.
BM, Williamson 1889–91, 802, no. 1 (legend incorrectly interpreted from worn specimen)
(ii) WM, 28mm, 7.6g
Private collection (PL 5, 16).

16a. Obv. COATES | & BIDDLE | AT 3 | CRANES
Rev. Arms of Coats or Cotes (Yorks. and Shropshire), Quarterly, 1 and 4 Ermine, 2 and 3 paly of six Or and Sable; crest, a cock proper, combed wattled and legged Gules
WM, 25mm, 7.03g.
BM, Williamson 1889–91, 802, no. 2. (PL 5, 17).

16b. Obv. COATES | & BIDDLE | AT 3 | CRANES [different obv die]
Rev. Arms as on no. 16a, between counter-marked 17 13
WM, 25mm, 6.90g
BM J2393 (PL 5, 18).

17. Obv. THOMAS | COATES | AT 3 | CRANES
Rev. Arms as on no. 16a
WM, 27mm, 8.4g
BM J2393 (PL 5, 19).
18. **Obv.** <I>OHN | <GV> NTER | <A> T THE 3 | CRANES
Rev. Arms of Gunter (Sussex), Sable three gauntlets Argent within a bordure Or. Crest, a stag's head erased (sometimes couped), per pale Sable and Gules, attired Or.
WM. 25 mm. 8.1 g
BM. Williamson 1889-91, 802, no. 9, as HVNTER and 'Leathern' (Pl. 5, 20).

19.* **Obv.** WILLIAM | HADD<OCK> | AT YE ADAM | & | EVE
Rev. A Tree environed with a serpent between Adam, right, and Eve, left <THA> M ES | <STRE> ET
WM. 27 mm
BNJ 26 (1949-51), 338, fig. 13. Ashmolean Museum?

20. **Obv.** MILLER | & SPOTSWOOD | THE GOLDEN | PIPPIN TREE | IN QVEEN | STREET
Rev. Apple Tree between the incuse letters G K
WM. 25 mm. 7.7 g
Roach Smith 1854, no. 810 (but reading QVEENE): token now in BM (J2389) (Pl. 5, 21).

21a. **Obv.** EDWARD PEMBERTON | AT THE 3 | CRANES
Rev. <1> -70 <?> . Arms of Pemberton (Lord Mayor of London, 1611, and of Rushden, Northants.), Argent a chevron between three buckets Sable, hoops Or
WM. 25 mm
P. Mernick coll.
Dickinson 1986. London no. 3141 A (reading 1670, Shield with 3 buckets) (Pl. 5, 22).

21b. **Obv.** EDWARD | PEMBERTON | AT THE 3 | CRANES
Rev. Arms, as above
WM. 27 mm
Noble 61 B, lot 1117; ex Baldwin 1992 and Wetton coll., Spink auction no. 74, 29 Nov. 1989, lot 253 (Pl. 5, 23).

22.* **Obv.** PHILIP SALL AT THE 3 CRANES
Rev. Arms: On three mounds three trees
WM. rev. countermarked with a small shield charged with a lion rampant
Burn 1853, no. 1018; 1855, no. 1164. The arms quoted by Burn appear to be those of Shrubsole (Canterbury), Argent three cherry trees Vert, fructed Gules, each on a mount of the second. Therefore the name given by Burn as appearing on this token may be incomplete.

23.* **Obv.** <Wجموع> SHRVB<ASS> | AT 3 CRANES
Rev. Arms: a lion rampant; countermarked
WM. square

24. **Obv.** (JA)MES (WICH)LOE (AT) THE 3 CRANES
Rev. Monogram, date -30?
WM. 25 mm, 7.5 g
BM J2388 (Pl. 5, 24).

---

**THE ISSUERS**

*References to Boyd are to Percival Boyd, [Inhabitants of London], MS, Society of Genealogists.*

---

*Askew, John, no. 12
Fruiterers Company. John Askew, 1733, Faversham. Renter Warden 1723
Land tax 1703-27 pov

Audley, Charles, (1722), no. 5
Fruiterers Company. Charles Audley, 1727, Water Lane; 1733, 3 Cranes
Land tax 1723-24

Ballard, Thomas, (1723), no. 8
Fruiterers Company. Thomas Ballard, 1727, 3 Cranes. Renter Warden 1741
Land tax 1715-17

Barrett, Edward, no. 13
He occurs on the Association Oath Roll of 1696, and in the Poll list of 1700 (Boyd 40398a)
Fruiterers Company, not found
Land tax 1708-19? Widow 1721/2

Berry, Edward, (1713), no. 3
Fruiterers Company, Edward Berry, 1710, no location stated. Renter Warden 1713
Land tax 1704-24

Best, Thomas, no. 14
Fruiterers Company, Thomas Best, 1727, 3 Cranes. Renter Warden 1730
Land tax 1706-30

Biddle, see Coates & Biddle*
SHORT ARTICLES AND NOTES

Burford, Edward, no. 15
Fruiterers Company, Edward Burford, 1710, location? Renter Warden 1716
Land tax - not found in Vintry Ward

Coates & Biddle, no. 16
Fruiterers Company, Thomas Coates, 1722, location? Thomas Biddle, 1727, 3 Cranes
Land tax, Thomas Coates & Co. 1713-21, Thomas Biddle 1722 (same location)

Coates, Thomas, no. 17, see Coates & Biddle

Collett, Sir James, (1700), no. 1
James Collett must have been born about 1645, since his tomb gave his age as 66 at his death on 24 April 1711. A Freeman of the Fruiterers' Company, he became Master in 1687. His parish was St Martin Vintry, and he was Common Councilman for Vintry Ward 1681-83, 1689-91 and 1693-1701. He was described as 'An Independent, never goes to Church; a very hot Whig'. As one of the Sheriffs of London for 1697-8 he was knighted in Kensington Palace bedchamber on 17 November 1697. In the year of his token, described as of Faversham [i.e. Faversham], he married his second wife Elizabeth (or Eleanor), daughter of John Skinner, merchant, d. 1701 (Boyd 19640). Their children included the wife of Thomas Cromwell, great-grandson of the Protector. He occurs on the Association Oath Roll of 1696, and was a candidate for Alderman in 1708 (Boyd 19643). His will, proved on 17 May 1711, mentioned City property and lands in Essex and Kent. The remarkable documentation mentioned above is from Squibb 1956, 107-8.

Cooke, see Holland & Cooke

Fisher, Richard, (1723), no. 7 see Kelham & Fisher

Gould, (1739), no. 11 see Gould & Turner

Gould & Turner, (1735), no. 10
Fruiterers Company, John Gould, 1733, 3 Cranes. Renter Warden 1738. William Turner Snr, no date or location stated
Land tax, not found

Gunter, John, no. 18
Fruiterers Company, John Gunter, 1700, location?
Land tax 1703-12

Haddock, William, no. 19
Fruiterers Company, William Haddock, 1701, Thames Street
Land Tax?

Holland & Cooke, no. 2
Fruiterers Company, Richard Holland, 1700, ? William Cook (sic), 1700, ?
Richard Holland signed the 1696 'horrid and detestable' petition as Master; William Cooke signed the petition as Assistant
Land tax, Holland, 1703-27. Cooke 1703-19, then widow Cooke

Kelham & Fisher, (1721), no. 4: see also Fisher, Richard
Fruiterers Company, James Kelham, 1713, 3 Cranes. Richard Fisher 1722, 3 Cranes
James Kelham, Renter Warden 1715. Richard Fisher, Renter Warden 1724
Land tax, Kelham 1703-?, Fisher 1717-24, Kelham & Fisher 1721-24

Miller & Spotswood, no. 20
Fruiterers Company, Thomas Miller, 1727, 3 Cranes; John Miller, 1727, Queen Street; 1733, 3 Cranes. Renter Warden 1731
James Spotswood, 1727, Queen Street
Land tax 1717-27,? Spotswood not found Queen Street or 3 Cranes?

Owen, Richard, (1730), no. 9
Fruiterers Company, Richard Owens, 1727, 3 Cranes
Land tax 1713-24

Pemberton, Edward, no. 21
Fruiterers Company, Edward Pemberton, 1700, ?
Edward Pemberton signed the 1696 'horrid and detestable' petition as Assistant
Land tax, 1705-16, widow, 1717-23
He occurs on the Poll list of 1709 (Boyd 33975). He and his wife Elizabeth had sons John, a Fruiterer, and Henry (1694-1771), FRS, physician and mathematician (ODNB).

Stoll, Philip, no. 22
Not found in the Fruiterers records or Vintry Ward land tax. If Shrubsall, see no. 23.

Shrubsall, William, no. 23
Fruiterers Company, William Shrubsall, 1713, 3 Cranes. Renter Warden 1720
Land tax, 1709-24

10 Hearne 1898.
11 Marshall 1873, 459.
12 Hunter 1894-96, i. 415.
13 Woodhead 1965, 51.
Leonard Wyon’s Small Sir William Browne Medal for Greek and Latin Epigrams

H. Pagan

The medal which is the subject of this note may be described as follows:

O. Bust of Sir William Browne, bewigged and draped, facing left, with the inscription D. GVLIELMVS BROWNE. EQUES. above the bust, and the inscription ESSE ET VIDERI. below the bust. Signed L.C. WYON on truncation.

R. Apollo, facing left and seated on a raised dais, conferring a laurel wreath on a scholar kneeling before him. A surrounding inscription reads ELECTUS COLL. MED. LOND. PRAES. A. S. MDCCCLXV, and an inscription in the exergue reads SUNT SUA PRAEMIA LAUDI.

Silver gilt, diameter 25mm, wt. 10.97g. Pierced. (Fig. 1).
The types are those of an earlier Sir William Browne medal, designed for the University of Cambridge in 1775 by Lewis Pingo (Eimer no. 52), diameter 37 mm. (Fig. 2).  

Although a specimen of the present medal was known to Col. M.H. Grant, and features in his list of British medals published in *BNJ,* and trial or archival strikings of it in bronze are held both in the Royal Mint and in the Army Medical Museum, Washington, DC, it is unrepresented in the British Museum or the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, and it does not feature in the relevant volume of Laurence Brown’s *British Historical Medals.* It turns out that only very few examples of the medal were ever awarded, and its surrounding history is of sufficient interest to deserve to be put on record here.

The will of Sir William Browne (1692–1774), President of the College of Physicians in London, drawn up for him in February 1772, provided that his executors ‘should procure a die to be engraved, proper to strike medals of gold of five guineas value, and that his estate should bear in perpetuity the cost of two gold medals, of five guineas value each, which should be awarded each year to the two Cambridge University undergraduates who respectively delivered to the Vice-Chancellor the ‘best Greek ode in imitation of Sappho’ and ‘the...
best Latin ode in imitation of Horace'. By a subsequent codicil, dated 1 July 1773, Browne endowed a third gold medal, of the same value, to be given annually by the Vice-Chancellor 'to the undergraduate who shall produce the best Greek epigram, after the model of Anthologia, and the best Latin epigram, after the model of Martial'.

The names of the first prize winning undergraduates were officially announced in July 1775, and it may be presumed that they received their medals either then or at some slightly later date in 1775. From then onwards until 1857 the three medals continued to be awarded annually on the basis laid down in Browne's will and codicil, but it came to be recognised in the middle of the nineteenth century that there was an inherent difficulty in the provisions of the codicil relating to the medal for Greek and Latin epigrams, in that in any given year the same individual might not produce both the best Greek epigram and the best Latin epigram.

After some internal debate in the Council of the Senate of the University, the Council issued a new draft statute on 23 November 1857, providing that the third medal 'shall be given alternately in one year for the best Greek epigram and in the next year for the best Latin epigram'. This statute had to be approved at a subsequent meeting on 30 November 1857, and what happened is vividly recorded in a pamphlet entitled The Battle of the Epigrams, issued by one of the members of the Council, William Selwyn (1806–1875), Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge University, who had found himself in a minority of one in opposition to the new draft statute in the Council's previous internal discussions.

The issue, and Selwyn's solution to it, is best explained in a passage from Selwyn's sparkling speech to the meeting on 30 November, which occupies pp. 3–12 of the pamphlet:

The great argument in the Council was this: the best Greek and the best Latin are not always found in the same pair [of epigrams]; and Sir W. Browne directs the prize to be given for the best of each. Hence the Council determine that there shall be only one Epigram in each year — cutting the knot, not untying it. Even if it could be proved that the best of each were never found in the same pair, it does not follow that we should have only one. But I deny the premise. A friend says, the second Epigram is only a piece of weighing meat, thrown in together with a prime joint. I ask Prof. Pryme, who got the prize in 1801, was his second Epigram a piece of weighing meat? I ask the Public Orator. I repudiate this argument as altogether unworthy; it is argumentum a macello.

But even if it were so, I deny the consequence drawn from it, that we must have only one. I proposed a plan much better, as I think, and more in accordance with the Founder's will; viz., instead of dividing the Epigrams, to divide the prize. Let the Greek and Latin be sent in separately, with different mottoes; if the best of each come from the same author, give him the prize for both; if not, divide the prize between the two. Not by splitting the medal; Apollo to one — Sir W. Browne to the other; but a medal of 2 1/2 guineas value to each. The smaller medals will be very appropriate to the Epigrams.

Although Selwyn's solution had failed to find favour with the Council, the force of his oratory carried weight with the wider audience present on 30 November, and after a number of supporting speeches, notably from William Hepworth Thompson, Regius Professor of Greek, and from Professor Pryme, the Vice-Chancellor declared that he saw no difficulty in accepting Selwyn's solution. A new Statute along these lines, authorising a division of the prize into two medals of half the original value, should the best Greek and the best Latin epigram be not written by the same person, was issued in draft form by the Council on 4 December 1857. It was accepted by the Senate on 10 December, and eventually approved by the Queen in Council on 6 April 1858.
Selwyn’s victory was complete, and all that remained was to provide a new medal, of half the value of the existing one. This was a more straightforward undertaking than might be supposed, for the dies for the existing medal were already in the possession of Leonard Wyon, whose surviving day-book records payments for striking the Sir William Browne medals on an annual basis from 1853 onwards.\(^{12}\) Leonard Wyon was thus the natural person to be entrusted with the commission to design dies for the new medal, and it is clear that his brief was simply to replicate the designs of the Pingo medal in a smaller format, for the eventual medal reproduces every feature of the Pingo medal except for that part of the Pingo medal’s obverse inscription which provides Sir William Browne’s date of birth in Latin (\textit{NATI.III.NON.JAN. A.I. MDCXCII}).

The first Epigram competition under the new statute was held in the summer of 1858 and different winners were declared for the Greek epigram and the Latin epigram, necessitating the award to each of them of the new medal. It was not, however, until 7–8 December 1858 that Leonard Wyon hardened the dies for the medal,\(^{13}\) and delivery of the two specimens struck from it may not have taken place until January 1859, when Wyon’s day-book records the receipt of a payment to him of £10 2s. from Sir William Browne Ffolkes, Bart., Sir William Browne’s lineal heir and inheritor of the estates on which the cost of the medal was charged.

Between 1858 and 1866 just ten of the new medals were awarded, to nine different individuals. This came about because in three of the years (1861, 1863, 1865) the same individual was adjudged the winner in both the Epigram categories and consequently received the Pingo medal, not the Wyon one, while in two of the years (1859, 1862) an award was made in one of the Epigram categories only. It was thus only in the years 1858, 1860, 1864 and 1866 that different winners were declared in each Epigram category, and it would appear that it came to be regarded as an anomaly that some Epigram winners would receive the small Wyon medal, while others continued to receive the original Pingo medal, for in October 1866 Edward James Herbert, 3rd Earl of Powis, the University’s High Steward, was to make a gift of £200 to the University so that each of the Sir William Browne Epigram medals might be of the uniform value of five guineas.\(^{14}\) All future winners of an Epigram medal were consequently to receive the Pingo medal, not the Wyon medal, regardless of the fact that theirs was the best Greek epigram only or the best Latin epigram only.

The nine individuals to whom the Wyon medal was awarded were the following:

- Henry Sidgwick (Greek epigram, 1858)\(^ {15}\)
- George Otto Trevelyan (Latin epigram, 1858, 1859)\(^ {16}\)
- Henry Yates Thompson (Greek epigram 1860, also winner in both categories 1861)\(^ {17}\)
- Smith Wild Churchill (Latin epigram 1860)\(^ {18}\)
- Henry Lee Warner (Greek epigram 1862)\(^ {19}\)
- John Maxwell Image (Greek epigram 1864)\(^ {20}\)

\(^{12}\) Philip Attwood has kindly supplied me with a summary of relevant entries from Wyon’s surviving day-book, preserved in the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum. It is to be noted that new dies for the Pingo medal, replicating Pingo’s original design, have been required on a number of occasions between 1775 and the present day, and it may well be that the dies for the medal that were in Wyon’s possession in 1853 were not in fact the original dies prepared by Pingo, but substitute dies prepared by Leonard Wyon or by Leonard Wyon’s father William Wyon (see Searle 1871, 29, for a Sir William Browne Medal stated by Searle to have been ‘engraved by W. Wyon, R.A.’, in addition to one that Searle describes as having been engraved by Pingo).

\(^{13}\) As noted by Leonard Wyon in his diary for those dates (information from Philip Attwood).

\(^{14}\) Clark 1904, 104.

\(^{15}\) Prof. Henry Sidgwick (1838–1900), Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Knightsbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy, Cambridge.

\(^{16}\) Right Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, Bart., PC OM (1838–1928), Liberal politician and historical writer.

\(^{17}\) Henry Yates Thompson (1838–1928), newspaper proprietor and collector of illuminated manuscripts.


\(^{19}\) Henry Lee Warner (1842–1925), schoolmaster.

Bulkley Samuel Young (Latin epigram 1864)\(^{21}\)
Thomas Moss (Greek epigram 1866)
Frederick Pollock (Latin epigram 1866)\(^{22}\)

The specimen illustrated here (Fig. 1), the only one of which the present whereabouts is known to the writer, is that awarded to Thomas Moss (1845–1872), one of four clever sons of a Lincoln draper, all of whom won scholarships to Cambridge and three of whom were successively Fellows of St John’s College, Cambridge. Thomas Moss himself had a glittering prize-winning career at the University, successively winning a Craven Scholarship, the Sir William Browne Medals both for a Latin Ode and for a Greek epigram (thus obtaining a Pingo medal as well as a Wyon one), the Porson Prize and the Chancellor’s Medal for an English poem, and graduating 4th Classic in 1868. He became a Fellow of St. John’s College in 1868, but his health failed and an ocean cruise undertaken in an attempt to find a cure ended in his death in New Zealand in August 1872. The medal was subsequently inherited by his niece, Dr Rosalind Moss (1890–1990), familiar to three generations of Egyptologists as the presiding genius of the Porter-Moss Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings.\(^{23}\)

It remains to note that the Moss specimen is named to Thomas Moss and dated 1866 on its outer edge. In this context, it seems unlikely that Col. Grant’s decision to list Wyon’s medal under the year 1866 (rather than under 1858, the correct date) stemmed from any knowledge by him of the example of the medal awarded to Moss, which has remained in family hands until very recently, and it seems a reasonable conjecture that his entry was based instead on the specimen awarded in 1866 to Frederick Pollock; but if so, where is Pollock’s specimen today?\(^{24}\)
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\(^{21}\) Bulkley Samuel Young (1843–1866), law student, killed while climbing Mont Blanc in August 1866.
\(^{22}\) Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart. (1845–1937), Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence, Oxford University. For completeness, those who received the Pingo medal during this period as being winners in both Epigram categories were Henry Yates Thompson (winner in 1861, as recorded above); Handley Carr Glyn Moule (winner in 1863), subsequently Bishop of Durham; and William Rann Kennedy (winner in 1865, and again in 1867), subsequently Lord Justice of Appeal.

\(^{23}\) For Dr Moss see James and Malek 1990, and the entry for her in ODNB by T.G.H. James. The medal passed at her death into the possession of the present writer’s godmother, Mrs Venetia Phair, daughter of Dr Moss’s long-time collaborator Ethel Burney, and it may be of interest to record that Mrs Phair has left what has been described as ‘an indelible signature on the map of the universe’ by giving the planet Pluto its name when an eleven year old girl in Oxford in 1930.

\(^{24}\) Nick Mayhew has confirmed to the present writer that Grant’s own collection, acquired by the Ashmolean Museum in the 1950s, does not contain any specimen of the medal.
A DRUIDS’ MEDAL OF 1806

DAVID SYMONS

This note was prompted by an e-mail received in June 2006 from an enquirer who was looking for information on a specimen of this medal that had come into his possession. A check quickly revealed that there was another specimen in the Birmingham Museum collection, but it also became apparent that this is a medal which escaped the notice of Laurence Brown when he compiled *British Historical Medals*. It therefore seems worthwhile to place on record both a description of the medal and what it has been possible to find out about the occasion that it commemorates.

The Birmingham Museum specimen, accession number 1968 N 1016, came to the Museum as part of a collection of more than 300 miscellaneous numismatic items that were bought from Oscott College, Sutton Coldfield in 1968. It is illustrated here as Fig. 1 and may be described as follows:

*Obv.* A druid’s head left, signed B.PATRICK on the truncation. Above, VENERABLE ORDER OF DRUIDS; below, in two lines, IN COMMEMORATION OF THE FIRST PUBLIC / PROCESSION TO S.T. PHILIP’s BIRM. M. AUG. T. 18 ANNO DOMINI 1806.

*Rev.* An oak tree at left, with a branch hanging over three druids who are worshipping at an altar at right, from which flames and smoke rise; in the exergue, AMITY.

Diameter 53 mm, weight 39.39 g.

The legend is interrupted between the R and D of the word ORDER on the obverse by a circle that acts as a guide to indicate where the medal should be pierced for suspension. The Birmingham Museum specimen has the number ‘32’ stamped onto the obverse, below the bust. The example owned by the original enquirer has been pierced and fitted with a suspension ring at the appropriate point, and lacks the stamped number.

B. Patrick, whose signature appears on the medal, is the Birmingham die-sinker and engraver Benjamin Patrick, who was active in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to colleagues in the Birmingham Library, particularly Richard Abbott, Rob Ryland and Charlotte Tucker of the Local Studies Department, for their generous assistance during the preparation of this article. I am also grateful to Mr Barry Wood, International Grand Secretary, Great Britain, of the Ancient Order of Druids for responding to my enquiries about the early history of the Order and for commenting on an early draft of this article.

1 Brown 1980.
century. He is thought to have engraved the dies for a number of tokens in the 1790s and in the years 1811–12. Perhaps most notably, he is also alleged to have engraved the dies for the penny token issued in 1811 by William Booth, the notorious Birmingham forger.

The druid's head on the obverse of this medal is clearly based on that on the Parys Mines Company's tokens. The motif was apparently chosen by Thomas Williams, the Copper King, who was the moving spirit behind the Company. The original design is said to have been drawn by William Collins, a Birmingham manufacturer and one of Williams's associates. The evidence that Collins provided the original druid design comes from a note made by W.R. Hay in his copy of the first edition of Pye (1796), which is now in the possession of Dr Dykes. Dr Dykes also notes that it is possible that Samuel More, the secretary of the Royal Society of Arts, 1770–99, who was a friend of both Williams and Collins, also had a hand in the design.

The first (undated) Parys patterns were produced in 1786 from dies engraved by John Milton, who was soon after appointed third engraver at the Tower Mint. The patterns themselves were struck by Westwood. However, Milton's work was not adopted and the dies for the first large-scale issue in 1787 were cut by J.G. Hancock, although it is possible that Westwood may also have overseen the striking of Hancock's design for Williams. Some later dies were cut by yet other engravers.

Stainton suggested that the inspiration for the design — though not the precise types — derived from the medals of the Anglesey Druidical Society, which were published by Boon. (The society was founded in 1772 and survived until 1844 as an association of gentlemen who met for convivial evenings and raised funds for good causes. Their medals depicted a hooded, bearded and moustached three-quarter facing bust of a druid.) However, Boon himself derived Milton's and Hancock's designs from two quite different sources. Milton's he saw as possibly drawn from a figure in a painting by Thomas Jones (The Bard, of 1774, now in the National Museum and Gallery of Wales), which had been engraved in mezzotint in 1775, while he suggested that Hancock's design was modelled on a 1724 engraving of a druid by 'Chyndonax Britannicus' (i.e. William Stukeley) which was published as Plate I in Stukeley's Stonehenge. . . (1740).

However, the closest parallels to the head on Patrick's medal is on Dalton and Hamer 413, a halfpenny which is not in fact part of the official Parys Mines series. Interestingly, a very similar druid's head reappears on the obverse die engraved by Peter Wyon for the penny tokens issued in Walsall in 1811 by Joseph Parker, testifying to the enduring influence of the original design.

The local Birmingham newspapers give us some background to the events commemorated by the medal:

2 Forrer 1909, iv, 429; Withers and Withers 1999, 20.
3 For example, Dalton and Hamer 1910-18, 269 nos 70-71 (Birmingham halfpennies, 1792) and 398 no. 12 (North Wales halfpenny, 1794).
4 Including Davis 1904, 56 no. 1 (Hampshire County shilling, 1811), 60 no. 36 (Romsey shilling, 1812), and 129 nos. 18, 20 (Staffordshire 'Commeres' pennies, 1811 = Withers and Withers 1999, 152; Bell 1964, 171-2 no. A1).
5 Davis 1904, 129 no. 90 (= Withers and Withers 1999, 20, 139; Bell 1964, 64-5 no. 17). Booth is particularly famous for being 'twice tried, twice hanged, twice buried'.
6 Dr Dykes, pers. comm.
7 Milton technically became 'probationer or apprentice under the chief engraver' by Treasury warrant dated 13 March 1787. He served until March 1797, when he was dismissed for cutting dies for counterfeits lous d'ors (Stainton 1983, 134–5).
8 The respective roles played by Milton, Westwood and Hancock are confirmed by Stainton 1983, 145–6 no. 26. See Dykes 1999, 174, for Pye's attribution of the original (1786) patterns to Westwood, and 182 for Westwood's possible involvement in striking the main series.
13 Dalton and Hamer 1910-18, 390 no. 413. There is a particularly close resemblance in the details of the drapery.
14 Bell 1964, 71 no. 24.
15 Technically the medal should be called a 'jewel'; a custom the Druids share with the Masons. I owe this information to Mr Wood.
DRUIDS ANNIVERSARY
LODGE No. 17, EDMUND-STREET, Birmingham
(Joinied by the DUDLEY LODGE)

WILL be celebrated on Monday the 18th Instant, when each Brother is requested to attend by Nine o’Clock in the Forenoon, to join the Procession to St. Philip’s Church, where an appropriate Sermon will be preached by the Rev. J. MAULE, M.A. During the Course of Divine Service, select pieces of Sacred Music will be performed by several Brothers of the Order, assisted by the Children of the Blue Coat Charity School, under the Direction of Mr. SIMMS, Organist, who kindly gives his Aid on this Occasion; after which a Collection will be made in Aid of the Dispensary.

A. BULLOCK, Secretary.

N.B. Dinner Tickets to be had of Brother Barber, at 3s. 6d. each, of whom Medals, &c. may be had on Application.

Birmingham, August 11, 1806.16

A virtually identical notice also appeared in the same day’s Birmingham Commercial Herald.17 A copy of the programme for the ceremony, listing the order of proceedings, is preserved in the Local Studies Department of the Birmingham Library. To judge from the description given on p. 8, the procession must have been an impressive sight:

**BAND**
Guard, with drawn Sword.
Two Stewards, with their Wands.
Brother Barber, P.C.

**DUDLEY LODGE:**
The Brothers, two and two, Hand in Hand, with a Sprig of Oak in the other, bespeaking the Strength and Stability of the Society.
Two Stewards, with Wands.
Two Supporters to the V.A.
The V.A. with the badge of his Office.
Two Bards, with Wands.
M.N.A. with Crook, &c.
Two Stewards close the Dudley Lodge.

**BIRMINGHAM LODGE:**
Two Stewards, with Wands.
The Brothers, two and two, as above.
Two Stewards, with Wands.
Two Supporters to the V.A.
The V.A. with the badge of his Office.
Two Bards, with Wands.
The Holy Bible, Borne by Junior P.A. supported by two Stewards.
M.N.A.
Two Stewards close the Whole.18

---

16 Aris’s Birmingham Gazette, Monday, August 11, 1806 (Vol. LXV, no. 3378), 3. The Dispensary referred to was established by a private society in 1792/3, to provide outpatient treatment for the needy. Matthew Boulton became its treasurer in 1793 and promised to make up any shortfall in funding. The number of patients treated grew rapidly (to 1,470 in 1802) and construction work began on a new building in Union Street in 1806. It was finally opened in 1808 (Dent 1880, 364-5).


18 Birmingham Reference Library (BRL) 296726. Towards the end of the proceedings, The Druid’s Hymn was sung – ‘How blest the sight, the joy how sweet, / When Brothers, joined with Brothers, meet / In bands of mutual love’ (the full text may be found on p. 6 of the programme). Mr Wood informs me that the various initials used in the programme and the newspaper notices reflect ranks within the Order – V.A. stands for Vice Archdruid (vice chairman of the lodge), M.N.A. for Most Noble Archdruid (chairman), and P.A. for Past Archdruid (a former chairman); as it stands, P.C. makes no sense and Mr Wood suggests it may be an error for D.C., Director of Ceremonies.
Evidently the proceedings went off smoothly, for the following notice appeared in the local press:

The M.N.A. Officers, and Brethren of the LODGE OF DRUIDS, No. 17, desire to return Thanks to CAPTAIN MATCHETT, his Officers and Company, who kindly attended the Procession on Monday last to St. Philip's Church, thereby very much contributing to their Convenience and Accommodation [sic] on that Occasion: also, to Mr. SIMMS, Organist, for his generous Offer of taking upon him the Conduct and Direction of the Musical Performance, and for his kind Attendance on that Day.19

Once again an almost identical notice was published in the Birmingham Commercial Herald, but this does add the information that the company led by Captain Matchett belonged to the Birmingham Volunteers.20

The Ancient Order of Druids was part of an eighteenth-century revival of interest in Druidism that took a variety of forms.21 It was established at an inaugural meeting held in London on 29 November 1781 at the King's Arms in Poland Street, off Oxford Street. The leading light was Henry Hurle, a carpenter and builder, who seems to have been heavily influenced by Freemasonry. Although the Order did envisage providing help for impoverished members, its founder originally seems to have seen it more as a mystical brotherhood. The tension between these two aims led to a split in 1833/4, with the majority of the lodges breaking away to form the United Ancient Order of Druids, which had a more charitable emphasis. The others retained the Ancient Order of Druids name and continued along the lines laid down by Hurle.22

It has proved very difficult to find out any more about the Birmingham lodge of the Druids. All the early records of the Ancient Order of Druids were kept at their headquarters in Lamb's Conduit Lane, London, and were unfortunately destroyed by bombing in the Second World War.23 However, again thanks to a notice in the local press, we do know that a year before their procession to St. Philip's the Birmingham Lodge opened a new Lodge Room in Edmund Street:

ANCIENT ORDER OF DRUIDS
LODGE No. 17, EDMUND STREET

The Brethren are hereby cited to attend the Duties of the Lodge on Thursday Evening next, the 30th Instant, precisely at Five o’Clock, for the Purpose of installing the Officers in the new Lodge Room, and opening it with all due Solemnity, therefore Punctuality to Time is requested, that no Delay or Interruption may take Place during the Ceremony. Visiting Brothers will be welcome.

By Order of the M.N.A.
A.B. Sec.

Birmingham, May 24, 1805

Books, directing the Order of Procession, Songs, Odes, &c. to be had of B. Barber, Price 3d.24

The only other published contemporary reference I have been able to find to the presence of the Druids in Birmingham comes from a book on Birmingham said to have been published

---

20 Birmingham Commercial Herald, and General Advertiser, Monday, August 25, 1806 (Vol. III, no. CXXXIX), 3. The notice of thanks is dated August 23 and presumably reflects an original letter written by Mr Bullock, the Druids' Lodge Secretary. The Loyal Birmingham Volunteers were raised in 1803 as a regiment of three battalions, each of ten companies. 'John Matchett, Gent.' was commissioned as a lieutenant in the 2nd battalion when the regiment was formed, but had clearly risen in rank by 1806. When the Volunteer Corps was disbanded and replaced by the Local Militia in 1808, Captain John Matchett is listed as joining the 5th battalion raised for Warwickshire (Hart 1906, 60-3, 90-2).
21 See, for example, Piggott 1968.
22 Piggott 1968, 180; see also the Ancient Order of Druids website at www.aod-uk.org.uk.
23 Information from Mr Wood.
24 Aris's Birmingham Gazette, Monday, May 27, 1805 (Vol. LXIV, no. 3315), 3. A copy of the order book for the ceremony is preserved in the Local Studies Department, Birmingham Library (BRL 506616).
in 1794 by J. Morfitt, a barrister who had lived in Birmingham since at least 1791, which is quoted by Langford. Unfortunately it has not so far proved possible to track down the exact title of the book or to locate a copy. However, according to Langford, Morfitt refers to ‘lodges of Free-masons, Bucks, Druids, Odd-fellows, and Knights of the Wood’ and says that he is ‘convinced that the principle of most of them is philanthropy, and of all harmless hilarity’. There is clearly scope for much more research on this subject.
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A MISSING LINK: HOW TAYLOR MADE THE 1807 PROOF HALF PENNY OBVERSE DIE

R.J. PEARCE

When discussing the restrike proof halfpenny dated 1807 (R100, P1381–5) Peck noted:

Exactly how Taylor concocted the *obv.* is uncertain. The bust is undoubtedly from the ‘broken jewel’ proof die, not from a current die (cf. the ear and closed lips), hence it is difficult to account for the date which shows no sign of having been altered, and also for the legend which shows clear evidence of being an original one recut; note that all three GSs have a lower pointed serif, and that they appear to have been punched over the original Soho letters. Both rims and rim-edges are usually heavily filed. No genuine Soho proof halfpenny of this date has been traced.1

---

25 Langford 1868, ii, 281, 283.

Acknowledgement: I am indebted to William McKivor ([www.thecoppercorner.com](http://www.thecoppercorner.com)) for allowing the use of the image of the Peck no. 1384 in this article. I am also grateful to Mr McKivor, and to a number of other collectors, for helpful discussions which resolved how Taylor pieces came to be in the Boulton family collection.

1 Peck 1964, 383.
Peck’s observation that the source of the 1807 die was the ‘broken jewel’ proof die (KH35) was reasonable given that the only alternatives would be an unidentified Soho die which had used the same defective jewels bust punch or a new die manufactured by Taylor using the defective jewels punch. The latter can be almost completely ruled out because of the traces of original Soho lettering, unless Taylor had acquired a partially-made die containing the legend but no bust, which he had subsequently punched in. In fact the evidence supports Taylor’s use and modification of the KH35 die (in its late stage as KH37), as outlined below.

The coin shown as Pl. 6, 1 was acquired from Colin Cooke’s Dr Nicholson halfpenny sale (March 2004), where it appeared as lot 306.² It was described as

George III. BMC1383. Weight 10.05g.
Restrike Bronzed Proof by Taylor. Note that no genuine, original Soho Proof is known for 1807. Note the recut letters and filed rims.
Practically FDC, rare. (1807 proofs are much rarer than 1806 Proofs.) Purchased from Colin Cooke, 11-5-1992, £85.

While studying the halfpennies in his collection as part of a more comprehensive search for unrecognised varieties, the author noticed that this piece had evidence of a recut 6 around and on top of the 7 in the date (Pl. 6, 2), which did not occur on any other 1807 proof. Further comparison showed up a number of differences which proved that this was a definite unrecorded variety. Further consideration made it clear that this must be the missing link between a Soho proof and Taylor’s 1807 obverse.

Some general observations can be made about the coin (hereafter identified as Nicholson 306). The letters are distinctly inferior to all other restrike 1807 proof halfpennies that the author has seen, which have thicker, sharper, more angular lettering, although still showing signs of being recut. It also appears to be struck in copper and not bronzed copper as described in the sale catalogue. Although the reverse is toned a mottled bronzed-like colour, the obverse is considerably darker and resembles many examples of current halfpennies. The obverse field has no proof-like characteristics. All the other Taylor restrikes examined have had obviously smooth, reflective fields, as one would expect on a proof. Even allowing for this specimen having been severely mishandled, there are no obvious signs of a proof finish, even in the recesses. The reverse is better, but still not proof-like. In addition, the inverted die axis and plain edge are normal for Taylor restrikes of this date. The rim/edge is at the lower end of Taylor’s quality standards, which in turn are worse than genuine Soho rims and edges. Finally the whole bust is also heavily rusted, there is extensive evidence of the die having been filled and repunched, and the reverse die is the same as that used for the 1806 proof restrike halfpennies (R99) and obtained from a current die.

The author compared specimens of KH36, KH37, Nicholson 306 and R100 bronzed pieces to confirm that the first two were definitely the same die. This threw up the interesting fact that the author’s example of KH37 (Pl. 6, 3) has considerable signs of rust already visible around the detail, particularly within the boundaries of the lettering, and the rim also shows signs of degradation. Taking these two facts into account, it seems that although KH36 and KH37 are both attributed to the late Soho period, the former probably belongs earlier in that period than the latter. A note of caution must be sounded here as a KH36 copper proof halfpenny, lot 130 in the Dix Noonan Webb sale no. 63 on 7 October 2004, also had a slightly less serrated rim, so the evidence is not conclusive. However the author has not found an example of a KH37 obverse without this rim defect to date.

The following list compares Nicholson 306 with known proof halfpenny features. Much legend detail has obviously been filled and recut, while the remainder has been completely filled and subsequently polished, leaving no trace of the outline of the original character.

Fully recut.

The original 6 on the die has been filled and a 7 punched in its place. The new digit has not been punched to the same depth as the 6, so the outline of the 6 can be seen on the top of the raised surface. The curved feature close to the top horizontal edge of the 7 is the lower edge of the top curve of the 6 which is positioned higher with respect to the other letters. In the immediate field, the outline of the 6 is clearly visible under magnification.

Recut, with remains of the original letter.

Recut less deeply than the original letter, with traces of the original serifs on the top and bottom legs clearly visible.

Recut, with most of the original character present.

Recut and recut slightly to the left (anti-clockwise) of the original position.

Recut, with a possible trace of an irregular raised line near the top of the character corresponding to an original feature.

Recut, with a faint residual trace of the rough raised line found running down the centre of the left vertical on Soho pieces.

Recut, with serifs in the style of R100 characters, but with a narrower letter. The top of the letter is very badly cut.

Recut, with a low relief second cut, narrower on this piece than that found on R100.

Recut.

Stop filled and recut with a smaller stop.

Recut to a shallower depth than the original character.

Colon filled and recut with smaller stops.

Partly recut. The shape is not quite right for either Soho or the eventual Taylor letter.

Filled and recut with a smaller stop.

Partially recut.

Recut lower i.e. farther away from the rim and also to less depth than the original letter so that the serifs of the original E are clearly seen and misaligned, the top serif appearing as a lump between the new E and the rim. This is the most prominent of the original features remaining, being present on the fully reworked die and appearing as a defective upper limb.

Recut.

No obvious signs of filling, but replaced with a smaller diameter stop.

Other features on this coin include a raised spot near the top left-hand side of the figure 1. This does not correspond to any feature on the KH37 die and must therefore be assumed to be a rust spot. The Nicholson 306 bust shows extensive signs of rust and pitting, but there are signs that attempts have been made to polish some of these away, notably in the area to the lower right of the brooch jewels. The beaded border has been filled in from IU to X and partially recut with half stops featuring a cut off sharp edge to one side. Specimens of R100 have fully rounded hemispherical border beads.

Confirmation that KH37 was the die modified to produce Nicholson 306 was provided by taking measurements using the tie knot behind the head as a reference point and comparing these with the visible features on Nicholson 306 which could be identified from the KH37 die. In all cases the distance to the relevant feature matches the distance found on KH37. Further comparison of these points relative to each other provided planar location data. Although the Gs might appear to be easy to compare, they were not used as all have been extensively reworked, including the addition of serifs and re-profiling of the shape. The obviously filled in characters 6, the R of GEORGIUS and the stops agree with those on KH37 while the recut part of characters replacing them may or may not do so.

Importantly, on the obverse of the author's specimen of KH37 the rim has started to become defective at 12 o'clock and from 2–3 o'clock by taking on a variably serrated appearance, so that the gap between the rim and the beaded border is partially (and in a couple instances fully) filled (PL 6, 4). Compare this with Nicholson 306, which shows the original stops filled in and the partially recut border beads (PL 6, 5). The defective section on KH37 is over a shorter arc, but is within the limits of the recut rim on Nicholson 306, which extends to either side of it. The small overlap would permit an aesthetically pleasing smoother curve
as it became necessary to reduce the diameter of the die at this point to remove the serrations. An examination of three other KH37 specimens showed the same serrated effect, implying that this defect is common to this type. On examples of R100, the distance from the tie knot to the rim is the same as that to the nearest point of the serrated rim on the KH37. On KH36 the distance to the rim is the same as that to the serration free sections. On Nicholson 306 the rim touches the marks showing the filled in beaded border. Taylor must therefore have removed the serrations as one of his first steps in reworking this die. Pl. 6, 6 shows a bronzed example of R100 where the beads are seen in their fully formed state, with the letters distinctly thicker. I would suggest the latter accounts for the absence of original detail on the periphery of the characters, which would be visible had they simply been recut with a punch of the same dimensions. The positions of the filled in beads on Nicholson 306 match those of KH37 relative to the legend and filled in stops.

Pl. 6, 7 shows the final digit of the date and the final G in chronological order (from left to right KH36, KH37, Nicholson 306, R100: the images on Pl. 7, 8–9 are set out in the same order). The die flaw extending to the right of the 6 is barely detectable in the hand as a shadow in the field on Nicholson 306 and does not reproduce well with a scanner. On R100, the finished product, it has disappeared. The contrast in the image has been increased to show the relative position of the underlying 6, the upper limit of the top arm of which is clearly seen above the 7 on Nicholson 306. The G in the image from Nicholson 306 clearly shows a lightly punched Taylor style G with lower serif and more pointed top serif although he has clearly made a deeper punch with a differently shaped lower portion, altering and thus partly masking the original character.

In Pl. 7, 8 the S is strange. It shows no signs of being filled, although this must be the case, and the shape is markedly different to that on the Soho pieces, although obviously related to that on R100 because of the shape of the serifs. Taken in isolation or in combination with other characters showing no signs of filling and where the character shape is indisputably Taylor's, the S would not appear to support the view that this die is derived from a Soho piece. The other evidence, however, contradicts this, so the author has concluded the S and the other characters were cleanly filled and polished. The first I of III (pictured on the bottom row of Pl. 7, 8) clearly shows the first two examples as being from the same punch and the last two to be the Taylor recut character, lightly punched on Nicholson 306. As with all the characters, the unknown state in which Taylor acquired the die means that blockage and rust can potentially disfigure the characters.

Pl. 7, 9 shows the D with a partial recut and the remnant of the raised line on the base of the left hand upright of the U on R100. The latter is relatively at the same position as the obvious feature on the Soho lettering with respect to the tie knot. It is visible on Nicholson 306 too, although the picture is not clear. Pl. 7, 10 shows the two Es as they appear on KH37 and two Taylor pieces. The different shapes used by Soho and Taylor are quite apparent. The remnants of the serifs can be seen on both Nicholson 306 and R100 and provide location evidence. The narrower, more steeply angled inner serifs on the Soho piece (KH37) would be completely within the footprint of a Taylor E if correctly superimposed. Traces of their existence can only be seen because the original serifs were punched to a greater depth than the rest of the character. In addition, the E of REX on the restrike is displaced away from the rim relative to its position on KH37. This is the most obvious feature carried over from the Soho die and no 1807 restrike has been found without it, to the author's knowledge.

On the R100 obverse the whole legend is punched to a greater depth than on Nicholson 306 and to a higher standard, with sharp angles to the cut legend. This has resulted in the obliteration of any evidence for the 7 being over a 6, which is why Peck could not say how the die was made, and is proof that he could not have seen Nicholson 306.

The author believes that there is sufficient evidence to say that Taylor made the R100 obverse die from the KH37 die and that it was in a dire condition when he came to use it. He
then made many repairs to bring it up to a standard good enough for producing restrikes. With the exception of the bust, virtually all details were filled in or recut, but sufficient evidence remains on Nicholson 306 to make the link. This coin should be categorised not as a proof but as a trial piece because it clearly makes no pretence to be of proof quality, given the imperfections as seen. Taylor went on to further polish away the defects which has resulted in weakness to the drapery and fewer pits on the front of the profile (although many remain). Notably, he mainly produced bronzed restrikes, which would help to mask the imperfections.

Cue the numismatic equivalent of London buses. No sooner had the first draft of this article been written than a second intermediate piece surfaced in Baldwin’s Gregory Part 1 sale, 2 May 2006, lot 552, which the author was able to acquire for his collection (Pl. 7, 11). As with the Nicholson piece it is obviously copper rather than bronzed and is not proof-like, but it does have the correct die axis and lower quality rim commonly found on Taylor restrikes. It too has most of the legend completely recut with incomplete letters, but investigating this piece posed more questions than it answered. The most obvious feature is the filling in and recutting of virtually the entire legend when compared with the Nicholson piece, the characters having been recut up to half a letter’s width from their previous position. Quite where this stands chronologically is open to conjecture. Whether Taylor was unhappy with the position or quality of the legend as initially cut or whether it is a much later recutting as a result of die degradation due to striking is not clear, although the author would lean towards the former because of the dull reverse field. The width of the filled characters is greater than that of Taylor’s letters as used on the final product, which leaves open either possibility but it would require a large number of individual coins in order to solve this question. As in the case of Nicholson 306, traces of the previous date figures can clearly be seen superimposed on top of the newly cut figures, in particular the 8 and the 0, in addition to the sideways displacement (Pl. 7, 12).

One would assume that this repeated punching, filling and recutting must have some lasting effect on die detail and so it may well be possible to establish a pattern for early and later restrikes given enough examples to work with, in the same way that Peck was able to attribute the Soho pieces to either the early or late period. As the Baldwin piece clearly post-dates Nicholson 306 in not showing any trace of the original figure 6 from the KH37 die, and as the author does not have access to huge numbers of Taylor 1807 restrike halfpennies, its position in the sequence of dies must be left for others to determine. The lack of proof fields on both pieces (including the reverses) raises the possibility that the reverse tooling had been completed but the fields had not received a final polish, so the 1807 piece may have been produced before the 1806 (which is a common date for Soho pieces) in order to give Taylor a notable ‘new’ variety. The discovery of this piece also supports Peck’s assertion that no genuine Soho 1807 proof halfpennies are known to exist and furthermore probably tells us that should one ever turn up, it will be from different dies to the existing proofs. Pl. 7, 13 is included to show the bare copper detail of Peck no. 1384 (R100) as opposed to a bronzed finish, which can mask the finer points.

In his Appendix 10(e) Peck reproduced the text of a letter dated 1887 which relates that some years previously Mr Boulton had come to see Taylor and was ‘amazed’ to see him with the tub of Soho dies in front of the fire. This was Matthew Piers Watt Boulton (d.1894), the grandson of the founder of the Soho mint but someone who had no interest in it or its workings. The same person arranged for a number of restrikes to be made and is clearly referred to in the same letter as still living at the date of writing. The letter hints, but does not explicitly state, that Boulton initiated the restrikes. Significantly it also refers to the fact that some of the dies were incomplete and some rusted beyond use. This is the reason why we must leave open the option that Taylor finished a die started at Soho. This

---

1 Peck 1964, 616.
anecdotal evidence also provides ‘proof’ that some dies were in such a condition that they could only be used following extensive repairs: the author believes that the die used for Nicholson 306 is one of these. It also explains the large number of restrikes from the Boulton family collection sold a few years ago, which were presumably struck by Taylor on commission from Boulton, as alluded to in the letter.
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