

THREE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY NOTES

MICHAEL SHARP

1. More Tower shillings of Charles I discovered

FOUR previously unrecorded shillings have come to my attention: A D4 obverse muled with a halfcrown reverse, m.m. portcullis (pl.26, 1) an E1/2 mm. crown (over bell obv.) an F1/1 with large mark of value, m.m. anchor to left (over tun rev – pl.26, 2) and an F5 obverse muled with a reverse of Briot's hammered issue, m.m. triangle (perhaps over anchor rev. – pl.26, 3).

The F1/1 coin, which Mr David Holt kindly drew to my attention, is a particularly interesting discovery since the type has hitherto been known only with m.m. tun and small mark of value. Since the obverse mintmark is clearly not punched over tun and the mark of value not punched over the smaller one, it has to be concluded that this type was re-issued with the anchor mark and large mark of value after the issue of type F2, m.m. tun and (very rarely) m.m. anchor (over tun obv.), ceased. Although the portrait is slightly double struck, giving an appearance suggestive of type F3, the presence of the double arched crown establishes its identification.

The discovery of the Briot mule, exciting though it was, came as no surprise in view of the occurrence of mules with Briot's obverse and Tower reverses with small or large cross ends.

2. An Interesting Parliamentary Issue of 1642/3

It has generally been considered that there was continuity of type production after Parliament's seizure of the Tower Mint on 10 August 1642.¹ There are, however, very rare shillings, halfcrowns and crowns with mintmark triangle in circle which are different from the norm and which I consider to form a distinct, and possibly experimental, currency issue.

The shillings are those of Group F bust 7. Production of Group F shillings was otherwise discontinued during the use of the triangle mark when the prolific issue of Group G commenced. The striking of Group G coins continued during the use of mint marks star and triangle in circle. No Group F coin is known with the star mark and the issue of the F7 shillings with their recut F3 portraits must be regarded as an unusual one.

There was also a change of halfcrown type which occurred during the use of the star mark. Type 3a², known with mintmarks tun, anchor, triangle and star, was replaced by type 4, known only with mintmarks star and triangle in circle (it has been noted as occurring with mintmark P in brackets but the only

piece I have seen has m.m. P in circle and is an obvious contemporary forgery!). Parliament discontinued type 4 and reverted to type 3a² but adopted new obverses (Osborne's 60's and 80's) and reverses (Osborne's 97 and 99). These coins occur with m.m.'s (P), (R), eye and sun. However, as with the shillings, an odd issue appears with m.m. triangle in circle. This issue was recorded by Osborne who acquired two examples which are die duplicates.² Their obverse is from a type 3a² m.m. triangle die overstruck with the triangle in circle mark and their reverse (Osborne 95) is that of type 4. It is perhaps strange that these pieces, technically mules, occur with m.m. triangle in circle as opposed to the earlier star mark during the use of which the type change occurred.

In the light of the foregoing it seems both necessary and appropriate to consider the status of the, so called, pattern crown with m.m. triangle in circle. It has presumably been regarded as a pattern because of the use of a Briot equestrian portrait with a mintmark not associated with any of his coinages, its rarity and the non-existence of an ordinary Tower type with that mintmark. Cooper considered that the obverse mark was probably punched over anchor and that the coin possibly belonged to Briot's hammered coinage.³ The $\times 2$ illustration of the obverse mark on the British Museum's specimen clearly shows the ring, stem and bar of an anchor immediately to the left of the triangle in circle. The obverse die does not seem fine enough for it to be regarded as suitable for use in connection with Briot's second milled coinage and I therefore consider it to have been intended for his hammered issue. Lozenge stops (one of Briot's 'hallmarks', as Cooper mentioned) are evident but with commas above; an unusual combination, but it is the portrait which is of particular interest since it is taken from that of a Scottish sixty shillings and not, as one might expect, from that of an English crown. The king is shown wearing the Scottish crown instead of the more rounded English one, his sword extends to the edge of the coin (as it does on the Scottish piece but does not on the English) and his features are those found on the Scottish coin (pl. 26, 4).

In view of the absence of a crown from both Briot's second milled and hammered coinages, there is nothing else with which the obverse of the triangle in circle crown may be compared but this absence does perhaps enable the conclusion that no reverse die was made by Briot to match his anchor or mark obverse. Assuming this, it seems possible to further conclude that Briot realised his mistake in using the Scottish

¹ Sir John Craig, *The Mint* (Cambridge, 1953) p. 150.

² Glendining's 23.4.91 (lots 170 and 171).

³ F.R. Cooper, 'Silver crowns of the Tower Mint of Charles I' *BNJ* 37 (1968), 116.



1

2

3



4



5



6



SHARP: THREE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY NOTES

portrait and put the die to one side. He may also have noticed that the portrait punches were not properly aligned since the backward leaning body of the king seems slightly detached from his hips. I therefore think it likely that this die was picked up after Parliament's seizure of the mint and matched with an ordinary Tower reverse die with the star mark, both dies being overpunched with the triangle in circle mark before use.

The wear sustained by the three known examples coupled with the knowledge that crowns of the triangle in circle mark were tried at the pyx on 29 May 1643 must establish these as currency pieces since no other type bearing that mark is known. Furthermore there are otherwise no known patterns produced by parliament and its only known (to me) trials are in the form of shilling bust and shield punches struck on roughly cut lozenge shaped flans. The crown is therefore argued to form part of a rather strange and very limited issue made when the mint was under parliament's control.

3. *A Badge of Colonel Hammond and a counter of Charles I*

THE badge of Colonel Hammond, Governor of the Isle of Wight (pl.26, 5) is made from a bust of Charles I cut from a medal (c.f. MI 373/ 267-270) and affixed to an engraved convex plate, pierced to enable it to be stitched to a garment. It is dated 18 September 1647, the day on which Hammond was elected and sworn as a Burgess of Newport. On 1st October he was appointed (by parliament) Vice-Admiral of the county of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. The following month he took charge of his royal 'guest', Charles I, who had escaped from Hampton Court on 11 November.

The counter of Charles I and Henrietta Maria (pl.26, 6) is in the style adopted by Simon de Passe but of coarser workmanship. It is dated 27 January 1649, the date on which sentence of death was passed on the king who is shown wearing the tall hat he wore during the proceedings at Westminster Hall.

THE TEYNHAM, KENT, HOARD OF COINS AND BANKNOTES

B. J. COOK and VIRGINIA H. HEWITT

THIS small hoard represents a rare example of coins and banknotes apparently forming part of the same hoard. The material was found on 19 August 1989 in a sixteenth-century farmhouse in Deerton Street, Teynham, Kent, hidden beneath a false cupboard. The finder was the owner, Mr John Trevor, who was engaged in renovating the interior of the property. Twenty-three coins were found wrapped up in an old handkerchief, with the seven banknotes close by. A further coin was discovered two weeks later lodged on a beam a little distance away.

The twenty-four coins and the notes were brought to the British Museum for examination. Reports were provided on the basis of which an inquest was held on 18 October. Not being of precious metal, the banknotes could not be considered as potential treasure trove but as apparently part of the deposit, they had to be taken into account. Their presence contributed to the value of the material when deposited, and thus was relevant to the question of whether the hoard was deliberately concealed. The inquest jury decided that the twenty-three coins found in the handkerchief constituted treasure trove. These have since been acquired by the Kent County Museum Service. The coin found apart from the others was not declared treasure trove and was returned to the

finder, as were the banknotes. The case well illustrates some of the limitations of the treasure trove laws, with a single find split up and museums not having the option to acquire the banknotes.

The contents of the find are as follows:

Coins

George II guinea	intermediate head	1745	1	8.31
George III guinea	second head	1763	1	8.30
	third head	1768	1	8.36
fourth head		1772	1	8.33
		1774	1	8.29
		1775	1	8.34
		1776	3	8.29, 8.28, 8.36
		1777	2	8.31, 8.30
		1782	1	8.30
		1784	1	8.38
fifth head, spade shield		1787	3	8.37, 8.38, 8.35
		1788	1	8.36
		1792 ¹	1	Wt not recorded
half-guinea	fourth head	1786	1	4.17
	fifth head, spade shield	1787	3	4.19, 4.16, 4.19
		1789	2	4.20, 4.19

¹ This is the coin found apart from the others, not contained within the handkerchief, which was declared not to be treasure trove.