

THE ROYAL FARTHING TOKENS.

PART I., 1613-1636.

BY FLEET-SURGEON A. E. WEIGHTMAN, R.N.



OWING to a variety of causes, one of which—and perhaps the most important—was the high price of silver, it became a difficult matter to coin the penny in silver, and to so coin the halfpenny and farthing was impracticable altogether. As a consequence, the Crown, in the time of Elizabeth, restricted the issue of these small moneys to such an extent that the small traders took upon themselves the issue of private tokens, mostly made of pewter or lead. These proved extremely useful to the traders and their clients, but their use was accompanied by many abuses and resulted in losses to the poor who made use of them, and in loss of profit to the Crown. Elizabeth made some attempt to remedy the matter, but with no further result than the preparation of a few patterns for a token coinage in copper. In 1606, James I. took into consideration proposals for the coinage of farthing tokens. He had himself instituted a copper coinage in Scotland, and knew the convenience to the Irish of Elizabeth's copper coinage made for the payment of her army in Ireland; hence, in the year 1613, after much deliberation, he decided to accede to the proposal of Lord Harington to make farthing tokens in copper. The proclamation which authorised the issue of these tokens declared that: "the said farthing tokens should be made exactly and artificially of copper by engines and instruments, having on one side two sceptres crossing under one diadem, and on the other side a harp crowned, with the king's title—**IACOBVS DEI GRATIA MAGNAE BRITANNIAE FRANCIAE ET HIBERNIAE REX:** with a privy mark to be set upon them from time to time whereby to discern and distinguish them and to be altered according to occasion, for

preventing the falsifying and counterfeiting the same." It was also stipulated that the tokens should not be less than six grains in weight.

On obtaining the patent, Lord Harington appointed Gerard Malynes and William Cockayne as his agents, but William Cockayne, not liking some of the clauses of the patent, dropped out and was succeeded by John Couchman. Lord Harington also contracted with Christopher Warwick, Peter Malynes and Samuel Malynes for the manufacture of the tokens, and these engaged an engineer, a graver and other workmen. Gerard Malynes was the son of a mint-master who emigrated to Antwerp, where Gerard was born, and returned to England at the restoration of the currency by Elizabeth in 1561. Gerard was appointed, about 1586, one of the Commissioners of Trade sent to the Low Countries for settling the value of moneys, and later was frequently consulted on mercantile affairs by the Privy Council during the reigns of Elizabeth and James. He wrote considerably on mercantile subjects, and though much that he wrote has since been discounted, he was, no doubt, a great authority on his subject. Malynes spared no pains to make the scheme of the Royal farthing tokens successful, but the loss resulting from its early failure fell chiefly on him. In a petition which he addressed to the king from the Fleet Prison on the 15th of February, 1619, he complained that he had been ruined by his employers, who had insisted on paying him in his own farthings.

The after history of the patent is of considerable interest as elucidating some of the difficulties of duly classifying this very large series of an inferior coinage, and the following facts derived from Snelling, Ruding and a few others, are all that is known of it.

The patent was first granted to the first Lord Harington on the 19th of May, 1613, probably as some satisfaction for the expense he had been put to whilst having charge of that very extravagant lady, the Princess Elizabeth, daughter of James I. He held it until his death, nine months later, on the 27th of February, 1614. It then devolved upon his son, and he, dying after a few months, the patent came into the hands of his mother, Lady Harington. As some doubts arose as to the patent continuing in force upon the deaths of Lord Harington, the elder, and his son, a proclamation dated the 21st June, 1614, declared

it still valid and confirmed it to Lady Harington. Mr. Vaux, in a paper read before the Numismatic Society of London on the 20th of April, 1876, entitled, "Indenture preserved in the Bodleian Library relating to certain farthings of James I," states that Lady Harington gave up the patent on the 28th of June, 1614, and that she was succeeded in the working of it by Ludwick, Duke of Lennox. Ruding says that in a proclamation dated the 28th of June, 1622, the Duke of Lennox and the Marquis of Hamilton were stated to be in possession of the patent at that date. This was at a time when the Irish Government was trying to suppress the use of traders' tokens in Ireland and to enforce the farthings made under this patent. This Duke of Lennox was created Duke of Richmond in 1623, and dying in 1624 without leaving posterity, was succeeded in the patent by his widow Frances, Dowager Duchess of Richmond and Lennox, who had as partner in it, Sir Francis Crane, and it was confirmed to them on the 30th of May, 1625, by Charles I. upon his accession. The next holders of the patent were Henry, Lord Maltravers, and Sir Francis Crane, who are mentioned as such in a proclamation dated the 20th of June, 1634. In 1636 directions were given to Lord Maltravers and Sir Francis Crane "to make a new sort of farthing token which should have a little brass in the middle of the copper to distinguish the true farthings from forgeries." The harp on the reverse was replaced by a rose, and hence these pieces are known as the Rose farthings, and are the last made under the patent, which was abolished during the interregnum.

Therefore the patent was first held by the Haringtons and then by Lord Lennox in the reign of James I., and first by the Duchess of Richmond and then by Lord Maltravers in the reign of Charles I., Sir Francis Crane being a partner first of the Duchess of Richmond and then of Lord Maltravers.

The years 1613-1636 can be divided into four periods, distinguished by the name of one of the patentees who held it at the time, and we thus have the "Harington," the "Lennox," the "Richmond," and the "Maltravers" periods; and it will be my endeavour to assign the various farthings to these respective periods.

The Harington period was only short—probably not more than

thirteen months, according to Mr. Vaux, though he, unfortunately, does not give his authority ; but other evidence points to corroboration of this term. Snelling says that at the time the patent was first granted to Lord Harington, the Duke of Lennox was very anxious to get it from him, but that Gerard Malynes persuaded him not to part with it. At first the patent did not prove a remunerative scheme, for only £600 worth of the tokens were dispersed in six months, and that with great difficulty. If at the death of Lord Harington the Duke of Lennox again offered to purchase it, we can well understand why Lady Harington parted with it, for she had been left with debts of £40,000 by her husband and wanted money ; moreover, this scheme, which had not been successful in the hands of a powerful courtier, was less likely to be so in hers.

The Lennox period extended from 1614 to 1625. It should have ended in January, 1624, at the death of Lord Lennox, but as no change was made in the style of the farthing tokens until after March, 1625, when King James died and his name was replaced by that of Charles, it is convenient to regard the Lennox period as lasting until the latter date.

The Richmond period is to be looked upon as lasting from 1625 (when the patent was confirmed to the Duchess of Richmond and Sir Francis Crane) until 1634, when the change was made by the authority of the king of adding an inner circle to the design of the farthing tokens, from which fact the new pieces were known as "double rings."

The Maltravers period is only to be looked upon as commencing with the introduction of the double rings, and ending in 1636 when the "rose farthings" were introduced.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION.

There is a very large number of the Royal farthing tokens, representing many variations. They vary in shape, size and weight, in the design and the inscription, and lastly in the mint-mark. Many of the "rose farthings" also vary in the metal of which they are made, for some have a small piece of brass introduced into the copper ; but the "rose farthings" are so different in every way from the earlier tokens

that they must be treated separately, and are not referred to in the present description.

Shape, size and weight.

Two shapes of the tokens are found. A comparatively small number are oval; but by far the larger number are round. Of the round tokens there are two distinct sizes, a few being much smaller than others. The smaller measure about $\frac{5.0}{100}$ of an inch across, the larger vary from $\frac{5.8}{100}$ to $\frac{6.8}{100}$ of an inch. The average weight of the smaller tokens is a little over $5\frac{1}{2}$ grains; the average weight of the larger is over $8\frac{1}{2}$ grains. The oval tokens measure about $\frac{7.0}{100}$ of an inch in the long diameter, and about $\frac{6.5}{100}$ of an inch in the short, but they vary much in size. Their weight is generally about 9 grains.

Design and Legend.

The design of the obverse of both the round and oval tokens is that of the crown and crossed sceptres. In the round the sceptres cross to form a saltire. In the oval the ends of the cross are nearer together above and below than they are at the sides. The two sceptres are apparently to typify the two kingdoms of England and Scotland, as Ireland is represented by the crowned harp on the reverse. The claim of the English kings to the kingship of France, although made in the inscription, is not referred to in the design. At a later date, a pattern for a farthing was made in the reign of Charles II., which has on the reverse a design of four interlaced sceptres, and in this case France is probably referred to. There are two forms of the crown. In one the arches are segments of a circle, or slightly pointed in the centre; in the other, the arches are flattened or depressed in the centre to receive the mound which surmounts the whole. The former is the imperial crown, and is as now displayed in the arms of King Edward. The latter is the monarchical crown, and was usually borne in Queen Victoria's coat-of-arms. Both these forms may either be single or double arched, and all four different varieties are found on the Royal farthing tokens.

The crowned harp on the reverse presents several varieties, and

these may be divided into two groups : one, in which the front pillar of the harp is of some conventional design ; the other, in which the pillar has a bird's head, apparently intended for that of an eagle. The number of the strings in the harp is usually six or seven, but whilst some harps have eight, one has only four, and it occasionally happens that coins of the same variety differ from one another in having a varying number of strings. In some coins a dot or pellet occurs in the centre of the harp among the strings. Although this is found in a fairly large number of instances, it is not always found in coins of the same variety. I think the pellet is caused by the graver having made a small depression in the centre of the die from which to turn a circle, in order that his lettering should be symmetrical. There is no pellet on the obverse, but there the graver was able to use the central point of the crown, which would already be a depression in the die.

The legend or inscription is the title, in Latin, of the king reigning at the time, the words being contracted so that the whole of the kingly titles might be placed on the coin. The legend commences on the obverse and is completed on the reverse. The disposition of the words is not always the same, three different ways of placing the legend being found. In some coins, including all the small round tokens, the inscription commences above, between the sceptres. In the larger round tokens the inscription commences above, to the right, and in the oval tokens the inscription on both obverse and reverse commences below, to the left. There are three methods employed to mark the contraction of the words of the legend. In some, the punctuation is by a single dot, in others two dots in the form of a colon are used, and in others, again, an apostrophe over a dot marks the contraction. Later on it will be shown that by means of the differences in the forms of the contraction marks, we can form some idea of the relative dates of many of the coins.

Mint-marks.

The mint-marks on these tokens are exceedingly numerous and very diverse in character. They usually consist of some well-known

heraldic device, but in some cases it is not at all easy to say what particular object is intended to be represented, and in many cases there is no doubt that the same mint-mark will be given different names by different authorities. One mint-mark—the fret or Harington knot—which is found on all the small round tokens, must necessarily refer to the original holders of the patent. In the list of mint-marks given by Hawkins as being in use on the silver money of James, I find that all but two,—the escallop and the book—are found on the farthing tokens of that reign, the silver mint-marks forming about a third of the total number of copper mint-marks used. In the year 1613, the first year of the patent, the mint-marks on the silver coins were a trefoil and a cinquefoil, and in the small group of farthing tokens, which I believe were the coins made in the Harington period, that is, in the years 1613 and 1614, the mint-marks are a trefoil, a cinquefoil, a lys, a mullet, a saltire and a martlet. We, therefore, have two mint-marks, the trefoil and cinquefoil on the silver and copper of the same date. All the mint-marks on the silver issues of Charles I. used down to the year 1636, except one only—that of the anchor—also appear on the copper farthing tokens. In the year 1631 the mint-mark on the silver money was a rose, and I think that I shall be able to show that a farthing token was coined with mint-mark, a rose, about that date. In the years 1632, 1633 and 1634, the silver mint-marks were a harp, a portcullis, and a bell, and the “double ring” farthings, which are known to have been coined in the years 1634, 1635 and 1636, have as mint-marks these three devices. As there are only eight devices known on these pieces, a very large proportion are identical with the silver mint-marks of about the same date.

It would seem that the silver mint-marks suggested some of the copper mint-marks, and as more mint-marks were required for the copper coinage, other additional devices had to be chosen. The mint-mark is usually placed on the obverse. In one case it is on the reverse only, and in a few instances it is both on the obverse and reverse.

Classification.

After the above general description of the Royal farthing tokens, the next step is to assign the different coins to the respective periods to which they belong, and on attempting to do so, it is at once obvious that for whatever purpose they were made, the oval tokens belong to a different category from the round. We may, therefore, put them on one side for the time being, to be considered later, and deal only with the round.

Of the farthing tokens of James's reign, we find that they are easily divisible into two groups, differing in every detail of the design, and also differing in the way the words of the inscription are placed. In one group the word **IACO** is always between the sceptres, above the crown, which is of the single-arched imperial type, with but a single exception, in which it is of the double-arched monarchical form. The harp on the reverse is always that without the eagle's head. In the other, the inscription begins above, at the right, the crown is a single-arched monarchical crown, and the harp, except in two instances, has the eagle's head.

If we may assume that the two groups were not coined simultaneously, which it seems to me we may fairly do, then we have two entirely different groups of coins, and we have two periods in which the patent was held by two different families. We may, therefore, infer that one group was coined for the Haringtons and the other for the Duke of Lennox. One of these groups is much smaller than the other, that is, there are fewer mint-marks represented on the coins of the group. There are only seven mint-marks found in that group in which the word **IACO** is placed between the sceptres, and all are comparatively uncommon; whereas the mint-marks of the other group, viz., that group in which **IACO** is to the right of the crown, are much more numerous, for at least thirty occur. We may, therefore, infer that the coins of the first group were only used during a short period, and that the coins of the second group were used during a longer period. As the Harington period was of short duration, hardly more than a year, and that of the Duke of Lennox

a much longer period, extending to ten years, it is natural to infer that the small group with **IACO** between the sceptres was coined for the Haringtons, and that the larger group with **IACO** to the right of the crown was coined for the Duke of Lennox. In addition, the mint-marks offer the same indication. In the first group we have the mint-mark, the fret or Harington knot, a natural device as long as the Haringtons were coining under the patent; and in this group there are also the mint-marks, a trefoil and a cinquefoil, the silver mint-marks of the very year of the granting of the patent to Lord Harington. That the farthings of the second group were coined during the Lennox or later period of James's reign, we can be quite sure, as they are so very similar to the earlier farthings of Charles's reign, the chief difference between them being the substitution of **CARO** for **IACO** in the legend. Indeed, some of the tokens coined in the early part of Charles's reign show that at first the dies for the coins of the previous reign were retained and the letters **C** and **R** were punched in over the **I** and **C** of **IACO** to make **CARO**.

The alteration of style from the Harington farthings to the Lennox farthings may perhaps be explained in the following way. Gerard Malynes claims to have been the inventor of the farthing tokens, and he certainly was very largely interested in them; also it was, doubtless, through him that at least two others of the Malynes family were engaged in the making of the tokens. When Lord Lennox first proposed to purchase the patent from Lord Harington, the chief opposition to its transference came from Gerard Malynes, as he would thereby lose any benefit to be derived from it. The first dies for the tokens were sunk by the Malynes family, and when Lady Harington parted with the patent, it is not likely that the Malynes family would willingly turn over their dies. They would not be willing to assist in a scheme which could only be to their own detriment. When the Duke of Lennox obtained the patent he employed his own contractors, Thomas Woodward and Edward Garrett, and if the Malynes family did not surrender their dies, new sets would have to be sunk by different gravers, and so an opportunity would arise of having dies distinct from the Harington dies.

The first farthings issued in Charles's reign during the Richmond period are very similar to those of the Lennox period, **CARO** being substituted for **IACO**. During this period counterfeiting became very general, and counterfeits were even made abroad and imported into England in large quantities. These counterfeits were so much like the true farthing tokens, or, at least, said to be so, that the patentees complained that they could not distinguish them from their own, and here it may be remarked that, doubtless, many of the better-made forgeries are now indistinguishable from the genuine pieces, and to attempt to separate them would seem to be hopeless, and they will continue to be retained in our cabinets.

In 1634, at a time when Lord Maltravers had a share in the patent, the patentees were allowed to decry all the old farthings, and a new farthing of better make was introduced, distinguishable by an inner beaded circle, the so-called "double rings."

Having thus divided the farthing tokens into the four main groups to which they belong, we may proceed further and consider their sub-divisions, pointing out some of the more important features by which they are distinguished.

Harington.

The first group, or what we may now call Harington farthings, is divisible into two sub-groups, depending on the difference in size and weight of the pieces, for some are much smaller than others. Though these differ in size, there is no difference in the design of the obverse or reverse, and apparently the same master punch has been used in making the dies of both kinds. The lettering of the inscription is smaller and closer to the central design in the smaller coins, and so space has been gained to admit of the coins being made so small. These smaller coins have always the fret clouée, or Harington knot, as a mint-mark, and are the only pieces so marked. These small Harington tokens were thought by Snelling to be half-farthings, an opinion with which Montagu did not agree. He considered them to be an attempt on the part of the patentees to impose on the public

HARRINGTON HALF-FARTHINGS—



HARRINGTON FARTHINGS—



LENNOX FARTHINGS—



RICHMOND FARTHINGS—



MALTRAVERS FARTHINGS,
OR, "DOUBLE RINGS"—



a token of lighter weight than the terms of the patent required, but his arguments were, I think, not very convincing even to himself, and he appears to have been quite willing to give consideration to the arguments against his own assertion.

Half-farthings, it is true, were not referred to in the patent granted to Lord Harington, though they had been in some of the proposals made to the king in previous years, and we should certainly expect them to have been mentioned if it had been intended to coin them under the Harington patent; but there are several arguments against Montagu's assumption. They are so much smaller that the difference in size would attract the attention of anyone into whose possession they came. If the patentees had wanted to deceive the public they would have made them thinner and not smaller. The undoubted farthings of the Harington period average a good 9 grains in weight, and some issued in the Lennox period weigh as much as $12\frac{1}{2}$ grains, although the patentees were only obliged to make them of 6 grains, a sufficient proof that the patentees were more willing to increase the weight of them and so encourage their use, than to attempt to gain a few pence in a sovereign's worth of tokens. "The patentees had the greatest difficulty in dispersing their tokens, they were absolutely refused in some parts of the country, and where they were taken it was only in small quantities." Their unpopularity was instigated and encouraged by the smaller tradesmen, who were no longer to be allowed to profit by the issue of their own leaden tokens, the abuses in connection with which it had been the original object of the king to put down by the issue of the Royal tokens. It is extremely unlikely that the patentees would risk the diminution of their profits for so small a gain as the value of a grain or less of copper in each token; their opponents would not be long in discovering such an attempted deception, and would use the fact as an additional, and very strong, argument against the use of the much-disliked Royal tokens. For the patentees to have given farthings of light weight was a crime and punishable, and we have no reason to believe them lawless men. Their offence against the State was much more serious and on a far greater scale, for by overcoining their miserable tokens and

forcing them on the public, all within the letter of the law, "they denuded the country of a sound gold and silver coinage." Many of these small pieces, and these pieces only, are coated with tin, which would distinguish them as half-farthings and prevent them from being taken by mistake as true farthings, which of itself is evidence against any attempt at deception. I prefer to follow Snelling and regard them as half-farthings, although not authorised by the patent.

HARINGTON HALF-FARTHINGS.

Obverse.—**IACO D G MAG BRIT** in small letters, a single-arched imperial crown through which pass two sceptres in saltire; all within a beaded circle.

Reverse.—**FRA ET HIB REX** in small letters, a harp crowned; the crown is single-arched and monarchical; the front pillar of the harp is sharply curved below and ends above without a bird's head; all within a beaded circle.

These pieces are only about half an inch in diameter and weigh about $5\frac{1}{2}$ grains. They are often found whitened by being tinned, the mint-mark is always the Harington knot, and precedes the legend on the reverse. A small letter or figure is often found between the sceptres below the crown A, B, C, D, E, F,—0, 1 and 2 are the only instances known. In some half-farthings there is a small mullet instead of the usual dot between the letters **D** and **G** in the legend of the obverse, and in some there is a small mullet, a lys, or a saltire instead of the usual stone in the centre of the circlet of the crown. One I have is counter-marked with a large trefoil; what this may mean, I do not know, but it is to be remembered that a trefoil is one of the mint-marks on the silver coinage of 1613, the date at which the half-farthings were probably coined.

Mint-mark.—Harington knot.

Copper.—Mullet between **D** **G**. Saltire in centre of circlet of crown.

"	"	"	Lys	"	"	"
Dot	between	D · G .	Mullet	"	"	"
"	"	"	Countersunk, a trefoil.			

<i>Tinned.</i> —Mullet between	DG.	A. between handles of sceptres.
"	"	B. " "
"	"	C. " "
"	"	D. " "
"	"	E " "
"	"	F " "
"	"	0 " "
"	"	1 " "
"	"	2 " "

I think most of the farthings with a letter or figure were originally tinned; when they are found not so it is probably due to erosion from the effects of damp and temperature.

HARINGTON FARTHING.

Obverse.—**IACO D G MAG BRIT** in large letters. A single-arched imperial crown through which pass two sceptres in saltire, all within a beaded circle (with one exception, mint-mark a martlet).

Reverse.—**FRA ET HIB REX** in large letters. A harp crowned, the front pillar of which is of a conventional design and has not a bird's head, all within a beaded circle (with one exception, mint-mark a martlet).

The Harington farthings vary in size from $\frac{5.8}{100}$ to $\frac{6.0}{100}$ of an inch. Their average weight is over 9 grains. The legend on the obverse begins above between the sceptres. The harp has usually seven strings, but in one variety it has eight. The mint-mark is on the reverse, to the right of the crown and precedes the legend. There are two varieties of the farthing, mint-mark a martlet. One is similar to those bearing all the other mint-marks, but the other differs in many respects. It is $\frac{6.2}{100}$ of an inch in diameter and weighs over 11 grains. It is of different style of design and workmanship from the other Harington farthings. The most marked difference is in the crown of the obverse, which is a double-arched monarchical crown and peculiar to this farthing; the crown on the reverse is a single-arched monarchical crown.

Mint-marks.

Trefoil.	Cinquefoil.	. Fleur-de-lys.
Saltire.	Mullet.	Martlet.
Martlet with double-arched monarchical crown.		

LENNOX FARTHING.

Obverse.—**IACO D G MAG BRIT** or **BRI**. A single-arched monarchical crown through which pass two sceptres in saltire; all within a beaded circle.

Reverse.—**FRA ET HIB REX**. A harp crowned, the front pillar of which terminates in an eagle's head (there are two exceptions); all within a beaded circle.

The Lennox farthings vary in size from $\frac{60}{1000}$ to $\frac{68}{1000}$ of an inch in diameter, and in weight from $8\frac{1}{2}$ to $12\frac{1}{2}$ grains. The average weight is about 9 grains. There are two spellings of the last word of the legend on the obverse. In some cases it is spelt **BRIT**, in others **BRI**. The mint-marks of the **BRIT** type are more numerous. The meaning of this difference in spelling is not known, but it is probably not accidental. The same two spellings are found on the Richmond farthings, where mint-marks of the **BRIT** type are but few and the mint-marks of the **BRI** type are very numerous. From the facts it may be inferred:—

- (1) That both these types were coined in both periods.
- (2) That there are many of the **BRIT** type in the Lennox period, and
- (3) That although there are few in the Richmond period, they were, in fact, coined, as will be shown, down to the end of that period, and it would appear that both types were coined concurrently.

*Type I. **BRIT**.*—Farthings of this type may be divided into three sub-types according to the position of the mint-mark:—

- a.* On the obverse.
- b.* On the reverse.
- c.* On the obverse and reverse.

a. Mint-mark on the obverse only.

Annulet.	Eagle's head erased.	Rose.
Lion passant.	Thistle-head.	Woolpack.
Trefoil.	Sun.	Dagger.

Mascle.	Key.	Fusil.
Triangle and pellet.	Star.	Crescent.
Star.	Star pierced.	

These last three have a harp without the eagle's head.

b. Mint-mark on the reverse only.

Bell.

c. Mint-mark on the obverse and reverse.

Flower.	Fusil.	Rose.	Cross.
---------	--------	-------	--------

Type II. BRI.—The mint-mark is on the obverse only.

Ball.	Three lys.	Triangle.
Dagger.	Stirrup.	Cross.
Lion rampant.	Trefoil.	Fusil.
Key.	Coronet.	

RICHMOND FARTHING.

Obverse.—**CARO D G MAG BRIT** or **BRI**. A crown through which pass two sceptres in saltire; all within a beaded circle.

Reverse.—**FRA ET HIB REX**. A harp crowned, the front pillar of which usually terminates in an eagle's head (there are two exceptions); all within a beaded circle.

With the exception of the alteration of the king's name, there is no great difference between the Lennox and the Richmond farthings. The former were coined for the Duke of Lennox, the latter were coined for his widow the Duchess of Richmond, and are a continuation of the Lennox farthings.

The Richmond farthings vary in size from $\frac{64}{100}$ to $\frac{68}{100}$ of an inch in diameter, and in weight from 5 to 10 grains. Their average weight is $8\frac{1}{2}$ grains, and they are therefore larger but lighter on the whole than the Lennox farthings. The mint-marks only occur on the obverse, and are very numerous.

On the Lennox farthings the contraction of the words of the legend is marked either by a single or a double dot. On the Richmond farthings a new form of punctuation was introduced, that of an apostrophe over a dot; and this form continued to be in use during the

Maltravers period, and through the period of the Rose farthings. The Richmond farthings having the single or double dot to mark the contraction would, therefore, appear to belong to the earlier part of the period, being like their predecessors; and those having an apostrophe over a dot to mark the contraction, will belong to the later part of the period, being like the Maltravers farthings or "double rings," which succeeded them.

The Richmond farthings, like the Lennox, are divided into two types in accordance with the difference in spelling of the last word of the legend of the obverse. There are very few of the **BRIT** type, and yet they were probably coined throughout the whole period. One of this type, mint-mark a masicle, has the **C** and **R** punched in over the **I** and **C** of **IACO** to form **CARO**, and would therefore have been coined about the time of the accession of Charles, at which time the Richmond period begins; it also has the earlier form of punctuation, that of the double dot. In another farthing of this type, mint-mark a rose, the punctuation is by the apostrophe over the dot, from which it would appear to have been coined towards the end of the period. The mint-mark rose is the silver mint-mark of the year 1631, and it is probable that is the proximate date of this particular farthing. From these facts it seems highly probable that farthings of the **BRIT** type, though few in number, were coined during the whole period. The farthing, mint-mark a rose, is peculiar in other ways, as the harp is without an eagle's head, and the front pillar is formed by a row of beads, being the only example of a headless harp in this type. It can hardly be a mere coincidence that there is a farthing of the **BRI** type which is so very similar that it has the same mint-mark, the same punctuation and the same shaped harp.

There are a great number of mint-marks of the **BRI** type, and, except for the difference in spelling, they are mostly very similar to the farthings of the **BRIT** type. In two **BRI** farthings the harp is without the eagle's head terminating the front pillar, as is generally found. In one case it is as the headless harp, mint-mark a rose, found in the **BRIT** type, and in the other the pillar is of a florid and conventional design. It also has mint-mark a rose.

There is a small group of the **BRI** type, on which I have only found two mint-marks, a harp and a cinquefoil, bearing a design quite different from all the other Richmond farthings. The crowns on both obverse and reverse are of the double-arched imperial form, whereas these on the other Richmond farthings are single-arched monarchical crowns. These two farthings are very like those of the next period, the Maltravers, and differ from them only in having no inner beaded circle and in having the Lennox-Richmond form of legend. The mint-mark, a harp, is a silver mint-mark of the year 1632, and is found on the Maltravers farthings of about that date. The two farthings would appear to mark a transitional stage between the Richmond farthings on the one hand, and the Maltravers farthings on the other.

*Type I. **BRIT.***

The mint-mark is on the obverse only.

Crescent and mullet. **CARO** changed from **IACO**.
 Mascle **CARO** changed from **IACO**.
 Mascle.
 Dagger.
 Rose.
 Cinquefoil.
 Annulet.
 Two Lys.
 Fusil.
 Cross.
 Sun.
 Triangle.

*Type II. **BRI.**—The mint-mark is on the obverse only.*

Mascle, altered from IACO .	Coronet.
Crescent and mullet, altered from IACO .	Cross patée.
Annulet and pellet.	„ patée fitchée.
Large annulet.	„ fleury.
Small annulet.	„ and two pellets.
Bell.	Large crescent with double dot punctuation.
Calvary.	Large crescent with apostrophe and dot punctuation.
Cinquefoil.	

Dagger.	Three lys.
„ with different harp.	Martlet.
Demi lys.	Nautilus.
Ermine.	Saltire.
Harp.	<i>Transitional type.</i>
Fish-hook.	Cinquefoil.
„ with D : G : G in legend.	Saltire fleury.
Fusil.	Shield.
Two fusils.	Star.
Flower.	Tower.
Gauntlet.	„ with different harp.
Harp.	Thistle-head.
Halberd, moon-shaped.	Woolpack.
„ square.	Rose with eagle's head-harp, and single or double dot punctuation.
Horseshoe.	Rose with eagle's head-harp, and apostrophe and dot punctuation.
Leaf.	Rose with beaded harp, and apos- trophe and dot punctuation.
Lion rampant.	Rose with florid harp, and apos- trophe and dot punctuation.
„ couchant.	
Large lys.	
Small lys.	
Two lys.	

Richmond farthings are sometimes found on square flans, and sometimes strips occur, the largest known having as many as nine impressions, side by side, forming a row. Therefore, in the making of the tokens, they were first struck on copper fillets, and then cut or punched out. The following is a description of a strip of nine. It is intact, and does not appear to have been cut off a longer strip. It is slightly curved from side to side, and though one edge is $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches long, the other is $6\frac{1}{16}$ inches. It is $\frac{77}{100}$ of an inch wide, and weighs 130 grains. On either side are nine impressions for a Richmond farthing of the **BRI** type bearing the headless harp and mint-mark, a rose, and as the punctuation of the legend is by means of the apostrophe and dot, it is one of the later farthings of the period, Plate II, Fig. 42. As all the strips that I have seen are similar to this, it is probably part of a stock of unfinished farthings which were in process of coining, and were not wanted because the "double rings" were to take their place.

On what may be called the obverse surface there are three pellets

arranged perpendicularly at either extreme end. So exactly similar are these two groups to one another that they must have been produced by the same means; midway between each impression there is a smaller pellet at the level of the centre of the coin. On the reverse surface there are no pellets at the ends, but there are very faint indications of pellets midway between the impressions. No two impressions of the farthings, either on the obverse or on the reverse, are alike. They are so different one from the other that each must have been produced by a different die. Suppose a copper fillet to be passed between two rollers under pressure, it would spread in all directions equally; that is, it would be lengthened and widened according to the amount of pressure. Now we have here a strip of copper which was possibly 6 inches long and $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch wide, and if it had under the pressure of the rollers become $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches long we should expect it to become $\frac{1}{48}$ of an inch more than the original $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch wide, and these are practically the dimensions it has assumed. If the pressure were unevenly disposed, so that there was more pressure at one end of the roller than at the other, we should find the fillet assume a curved shape, one edge being longer and thinner than the other, as we have in this strip. I think it may be safely assumed that these unfinished farthings were produced from copper fillets 6 inches long and $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch wide, and that the impressions on them were made by passing such a fillet between two rollers, on one of which were nine dies for the obverse, and on the other there were nine dies for the reverse. The groups of pellets at either end of the obverse surface are so exactly alike in shape, size and relative position, that there is no doubt that they were produced by the same sunken portions of the roller, and so mark a complete revolution of the roller die. Here I may remark that the late Mr. Hoblyn had in his collection a set of Harington half-farthings in the usual separated and finished form, on which appear the letters A B C D E F and the number 2, and that as the numbers 0 and 1 are known to exist, they form a series of nine distinguishing marks, which seem to corroborate the theory of the nine dies on the one roller.

As previously mentioned, the strip weighs 130 grains, and

50 strips of 130 grains would weigh 6,500 grains, that is, 500 grains less than one pound avoirdupois, and 54 such strips would weigh 7,020 grains or 20 grains more than a pound, but 50 strips of 140 grains would weigh exactly one pound avoirdupois. It would, therefore, seem very natural that the copper fillets were ordered to be 50 to the pound, and that this example was 10 grains light.

MALTRAVERS FARTHING.

Obverse.—**CAROLVS D : G : MAG : BRIT.** A double-arched imperial crown through which pass two sceptres in saltire. There are two beaded circles, one inside the legend and one surrunding the whole.

Reverse.—**FRAN : ET. HIB : REX.** A harp crowned. The crown is the double-arched imperial. The harp has an eagle's head. There are two beaded circles, one inside the inscription, the other surrounding the whole.

From a proclamation, dated 1634, authorising the issue of the "double ring," we find that Lord Maltravers and Sir Francis Crane were in possession of the patent at that date. When it passed out of the hands of the Duchess of Richmond is not known, but it is interesting to note that the Duchess and Lord Maltravers were both of them Howards, and that the latter had married the niece of the former.

So serious had the counterfeiting of the farthing tokens become, that the patentees were allowed to introduce a token slightly different in design. The general design continued in accordance with the terms of the original patent, but all the details were altered, and as a mark to distinguish the new issue, a second beaded circle was placed on the obverse and reverse, whence these farthings were known as "double rings."

The "double rings" vary in weight from 6 to 15 grains, their average weight being about 9 grains. They are about $\frac{6.8}{100}$ of inch in diameter. The sceptres on the obverse are short, and are wholly within the inner beaded circle. The inner beaded circle on the reverse is broken above to allow for the crown, which divides the beginning from the end of the legend. The harp is of a more florid design than those of the previous periods, and presents two distinct types. These

two types are both found with mint-mark, a bell, but with each different mint-mark there is a slight change in the harp. The harp may have from five to eight strings. The legend is changed by the King's name being given in full; **CAROLVS** and **FRAN** being used instead of **CARO** and **FRA** as previously. The method of punctuation is by the apostrophe and dot, and is similar to that of the later Richmond farthings. The mint-mark is generally on both the obverse and reverse, but I have one piece with mint-mark, a rose, on the obverse only; and Montagu¹ gives an instance, and Dr. Philip Nelson² records two others. The mint-mark may be the same on both sides, but in many cases there are different mint-marks on the two sides. Besides the mint-mark, a dot is often used as a distinguishing mark—it may precede **CAROLVS** on the obverse, the word **FRAN** on the reverse, or the mint-mark on the reverse may be followed by it. In some cases the dot, as described, is absent; in others, one, two, or all three dots are found. This system of using the dot in connection with the mint-mark was further elaborated in the period of the rose farthing.

VARIETIES OF THE MALTRAVERS FARTHING.

Mint-mark the same on obverse and reverse.			Mint-mark different on the obverse and reverse.			Mint-mark on obverse only.	
			<i>Obverse.</i>		<i>Reverse.</i>		
Large lys	Harp	...	Billet	...	Rose.
Small lys	"	...	Bell...	...	Woolpack ¹ .
Bell	"	...	Woolpack ¹	...	Harp ² .
Rose	Woolpack	...	Portcullis	...	Fleur-de-lys ² .
Woolpack	"	...	Rose ¹	...	—
Harp	Fleur-de-lys	...	Portcullis	...	—
Martlet	Fret	...	Fleur-de-lys ¹	...	—
Cross ¹	Martlet	...	Bell ¹	...	—
Eye ²	Portcullis	...	Woolpack ²	...	—
Nautilus ²	Bell	...	Cross	...	—
Shield ²	—	...	—	...	—

¹ *The copper, tin and bronze coinage*, by H. Montagu, F.S.A.

² *The coinage of Ireland in copper, tin and pewter*, by Philip Nelson, M.D., *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. i.

As I have not seen all of the above pieces, I have indicated by references the authorities for some of them, namely, the late Mr. Montagu and Dr. Philip Nelson.

OVAL FARTHING TOKENS.

It is not known for what purpose the oval tokens were coined. They are approximately of the same weight as the round, but differ from them in the design and in the disposition of the words of the legend, as well as in their shape. They are comparatively rare, and present but few varieties. They were coined in James's reign, and at the end of that reign, as is shown by some of the dies being again used for the coining of tokens in Charles's reign, the word **IACO** was altered into **CARO** by punching the letters **C** and **R** over the letters **I** and **C** of **IACO**; the same change as that made in some of the dies for the round tokens. This alteration of the dies also shows that they were coined at the beginning of Charles's reign, and, as will be presently demonstrated, they were being coined after the year 1634. They were, therefore, coined throughout the period 1624-1634. During these years there were considerably over seventy mint-marks on the round tokens, but there are not more than ten mint-marks on the oval tokens, and specimens of the oval tokens are considerably rarer than specimens of the round tokens. It is, therefore, to be inferred that they were issued in much smaller quantities than the round, which were being coined concurrently.

How is the fact of this concurrent issue of the two descriptions of tokens to be explained? I shall later suggest an explanation, but, meanwhile, offer the following considerations:—In the first place, they would not be intended to be used in common with the round tokens; for the difficulty of forcing these farthing tokens upon the people would have been increased had there been two different descriptions in use at the same time and place, and the occasional oval piece would, when met with, have been rejected as a forgery.

Secondly, if they were not intended to be in use at the same time

LENNOX OVAL—



RICHMOND OVALS—



MALTRAVERS OVAL—



STRIP OF NINE IMPRESSIONS FOR A RICHMOND FARTHING—



and in the same place with the round tokens, they cannot have been intended for use in England at all.

Lastly, they were not intended for use in Scotland, for the Scots of that time would on no account permit English interference in their coinage.

My suggested explanation is that they were coined for use in Ireland. The Harington patent had made the farthing tokens current in that country from the time it was granted in 1613. But even if any serious endeavour had been made to introduce them, it had been unsuccessful; for long after that date traders' tokens were in such extensive use, and the cause of so many abuses, that it became necessary to entirely prohibit them, and a further proclamation, dated the 25th of September, 1622, was issued, establishing the Royal farthing tokens "upon such conditions as they were current in England."

There is only one mint-mark on the oval tokens of James's reign, and that same die was, as already mentioned, used in Charles's reign also, hence the oval tokens must have been first coined towards the end of James's reign; that is somewhere about 1622. If this be so, then they were first coined at about the time a special effort was being made to introduce the Royal farthing tokens into Ireland.

The object of the patentees was to make as much money as possible by the dispersal of their tokens; they would, therefore, prefer that those made for Ireland should remain there, and not be sent back to England and so interfere with the dispersal of the English tokens. Irish money was of a lower standard of fineness than that of England, and was not current in this kingdom; if the patentees could discredit their own copper tokens, made for Ireland, in their other market, that of England, there would be no interchange between the countries, and they would be able to fill Ireland as full of tokens as they had already filled England. The patent did not allow of any alteration in the design, but it contained nothing against an alteration of the shape. Thus, by making the Irish coins oval, they could be very easily distinguished. That it was possible to distinguish the Irish from the English tokens is indicated in the indenture between the Duchess of

Richmond and Edward Garrett—the subject of Mr. Vaux's paper already mentioned—for in that indenture special reference is made to Irish tokens of the value of £160.

Lastly, the design of the obverse gives evidence of the oval tokens having been coined for Ireland. The design of the obverse of the round tokens is always a diadem, through which pass two sceptres in saltire, but on the oval tokens the crossed sceptres are not in saltire, the ends of the cross formed by them being nearer together above and below than they are at the sides, and this form of the crossed sceptres is found on other Irish, but never on English coins.

We have now to assign the various oval tokens to their respective periods.

There are no oval tokens in any way like the Harington farthings, and we should not expect to find any Harington ovals. The Harington period was but short, and during it the scheme had not developed sufficiently to enable the patentees to turn their attention to Ireland.

All the oval tokens of James's reign are similar in design to the round Lennox farthings and may, therefore, be looked upon as Lennox ovals.

All the oval tokens similar in design to the round Richmond farthings may be looked upon as Richmond ovals.

Lastly, there is one oval so similar in design and in the various peculiarities of the "double rings," or Maltravers farthings, that it must have been coined at the same date as they were, and is, therefore, a Maltravers oval.

THE LENNOX OVAL FARTHING.

Obverse.—**IACO D G MAG BRI.** A monarchical crown, through which pass two crossed sceptres; all within a beaded oval.

Reverse.—**FRA ET HIB REX.** A harp crowned, the front pillar of which has an eagle's head; all within a beaded oval.

The sceptres on the obverse reach up to the legend above; they are a little longer below and divide the beginning from the end of the legend, reaching almost to the beaded oval. The mint-mark is a cross

and pellet, and is placed on both obverse and reverse. On the obverse the cross immediately precedes the legend, and the pellet is between the sceptres. The harp on the reverse reaches almost to the beaded oval below, dividing the beginning from the end of the legend. The mint-mark is also a cross and pellet and immediately follows the legend. The legend on this, as on all the oval tokens, begins below at the left on both sides.

RICHMOND OVAL FARTHING.

Obverse.—**CARO D G MAG** or **MA BRI, BR** or **BRIT**. A monarchical crown through which pass two crossed sceptres; all within a beaded oval.

Reverse.—**FRA ET HIB REX**. A harp crowned, the front pillar of which has an eagle's head, or is of some conventional design; all within a beaded oval.

The Richmond ovals are very similar in design to the Lennox oval, and some of them are from the Lennox dies. The most remarkable distinction about them is the differences in the spelling of the words of the legend on the obverse, and by means of this spelling we can divide them into four types.

In type 1 it is **CARO D G MAG RRI**.

" " 2 " " " " **MAG BR**

" " 3 " " " " **MA BRI**

" " 4 " " " " **MA BRIT**

What the meaning is of these differences of spelling is hard to surmise, but it is to be noted that the same mint-mark, that of a cross and pellet, is found in all four types, and in each case the die is one in which **IACO** has been changed to **CARO**. The mint-mark of type 1, on which the legend is spelt **MAG BRI**, is placed (*a*) on both obverse and reverse, (*b*) on the obverse only, (*c*) on the reverse only, and (*d*) a different mint-mark on the obverse from that on the reverse. In this type we therefore have four sub-types. The mint-mark of types 2, 3, and 4 is on the obverse only. The harp on the oval farthings is generally that with an eagle's head, but the harp on the farthings, mint-mark a rose, on the obverse only, and mint-mark a rose on the obverse

and a rose and pellet on the reverse, is of a florid and conventional design, similar to that on a round Richmond farthing, also with mint-mark a rose. As all the farthings with mint-mark a cross and pellet—and they include all the four types,—have been changed from **IACO**, it is not impossible that these different spellings may eventually be found among the Lennox ovals.

MALTRAVERS OVAL FARTHING.

A/ Obverse.—**CØROLVS D G MAG BRI**. A double-arched imperial crown, through which pass two crossed sceptres; all within a beaded oval.

Reverse.—**FRAN ET HIB REX**. A harp crowned, the front pillar of which is of a conventional design; all within a beaded oval.

The Maltravers oval is the largest of all the ovals, but is only 9 grains in weight. The crown of the obverse is a double-arched imperial crown of the same form as that on the round Maltravers farthings or "double rings." The sceptres are long and reach nearly to the letters of the legend above; they pass between the first and last word of the legend below, and between the handles of the sceptres is the mint-mark, which is always a fleur-de-lys. The mint-mark is also placed on the reverse, is at the end of the legend, and is followed by a dot or pellet. The Maltravers oval farthing is like the Maltravers round farthing in the spelling of the legend, the use of the apostrophe over a dot to mark the contraction of the words of the legend, in the shape of the double-arched imperial crown of the obverse and reverse, and in the form of the harp.

VARIETIES OF THE OVAL TOKENS.

Lennox.

Cross and pellet on obverse and reverse.

*Richmond.**Type I. MAG BRI*

<i>a.</i>	<i>b.</i>	<i>c.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Mint-mark on obverse and reverse.	Mint-mark on obverse only.	Mint-mark on reverse only.	Different mint-mark on obverse and reverse.
Cross and pellet.	Demi lys.	Martlet.	Rose and scroll.
9	Rose.	Mill-rind.	Crescent and crescent and pellet.
			Rose and rose and pellet.

Type II. MAG BR

Cross and pellet on obverse only.

Type III. MA BRI

Cross and pellet on obverse only.

Type IV. MA BRIT

Cross and pellet on obverse only.

Maltravers.

Fleur-de-lys on obverse and fleur-de-lys and pellet on reverse.

BIOGRAPHIES.

Harington, John, first Lord Harington of Exton (d. 1613), was the eldest son of Sir James Harington, Knight of Exton Hall, Rutlandshire, by Lucy, daughter of Sir William Sidney, and a cousin of Sir John Harington the writer (1561-1612). His younger brother, Sir James Harington, was grandfather of James Harrington or Harington, the author of *Oceana*. His descent, in the female line, from the Bruces first brought him under the notice of James I. He entertained the King at Burley-on-the-Hill, Rutlandshire, on the royal progress from Scotland (April, 1603), and (in June) received Princess Elizabeth for a few days at Combe Abbey, near Coventry, Warwickshire, Lady Harington's inheritance. At the coronation (21st July, 1603) Harington was created Baron Harington of Exton, an honour which gave great offence to the Catholics. By privy-seal order dated 19th October, 1603, he received the charge of the Princess Elizabeth with an annual pension of £1,500 (afterwards increased to £2,000) for her diet, a sum which proved inadequate. Harington established Elizabeth with his wife and family at Combe Abbey, and retired from Parliament and public life in order to devote himself wholly to her. He was present at the creation of Henry as Prince of Wales, and in 1605 attended the king at Oxford. The conspirators of the gun-powder plot planned to abduct Elizabeth and proclaim her queen, but Harington escaped with his charge to Coventry (7th November, 1605) two hours before the rebels arrived. Here he left her to be guarded by the citizens, while he and Sir Fulke Greyville besieged Catesby at Holbeach. On 6th January, 1606, he writes from Combe to his cousin Sir John, that he has not recovered from the fever caused by these disturbances when he was "out five days in peril of death and fear for the great charge I left at home" (*Nugæ Antiquæ*, I, 370). In 1608, Elizabeth was given an establishment of her own at Kew, the Haringtons receiving the first places in her household. Her guardian continued to control her movements and expenditure, and had to buy her bridal trousseau and arrange the expenses of her wedding. On 13th February, 1613, he preceded the princess in the wedding procession to Whitehall, and

received a gift of plate, valued at £2,000, from the Prince-palatine in recognition of his services. By the Princess's extravagances, her current expenses for one year alone (1612-1613) had involved Harington £3,500 in debt, and he was reduced to beg a royal patent (granted May, 1613) for the sole privilege of coining brass farthings for three years, "a thing that brought with it some discredit though lawful" (*Somers Tracts*, II, 294). The coins were called "Haringtons."

Lord and Lady Harington escorted the royal couple abroad (April, 1613), he being deputed to settle the Princess's jointure. Though Harington was made a Royal Commissioner and given the title of Ambassador, none of the expenses of this journey were paid, and his money difficulties increased. At Heidelberg the Haringtons remained four months in Elizabeth's household, Harington having to arrange her money affairs and to arbitrate in quarrels among her attendants. Worn out by these cares, he died of fever at Worms (23rd August, 1613)¹ on his journey home. (See *Dictionary of National Biography*.)

John, second Lord Harington of Exton (1592-1614), the surviving son of John Harington, first Lord, was born at Combe Abbey near Coventry, Warwickshire, in April, 1592. He succeeded to his father's title and a heritage of debts in August, 1613,¹ and he vainly attempted to retrieve the family fortunes. He died at Kew on 27th February, 1613-14,¹ and was buried at Exton. On 18th February he had sold the lordship of Exton to Sir Braxton Hicks, and by his will, made at the same time, left the overplus of the estates, after the creditors had been paid, (according to his mother, the debts amounted to £40,000), to his two sisters, two-thirds to the Countess of Bedford and one-third to Lady Chichester. The Countess of Bedford eventually sold the remaining family estates in Rutlandshire. (See *Dictionary of National Biography*.)

Malynes, Malines or de Malines, Gerard (*fl.* 1586-1641), merchant and economic writer, states that his "ancestors and parents" were born in Lancashire (*Lex Mercatoria*, 1622, p. 263).

¹ There is some uncertainty as to these dates. Compare pages 182 and 211.

His father, a mint master (*ib.*, p. 281), probably emigrated about 1552 to Antwerp, where Gerard was born, and returned to England at the time of the restoration of the currency (1561), when Elizabeth obtained the assistance of skilled workmen from Flanders. Gerard was appointed (about 1586) one of the Commissioners of Trade in the Low Countries "for settling the value of monies" (*Oldys*, p. 96), but he was in England in 1587, for in that year he purchased from Sir Francis Drake some of the pearls which Drake brought from Carthagen. Malynes is probably identical with "Garet de Malines," who subscribed £200 to the loan levied by Elizabeth in 1588, on the City of London (*J. S. Burn*, p. 11). He was frequently consulted on mercantile affairs by the Privy Council during her reign and that of James I. In 1600 he was appointed one of the commissioners for establishing the true par of exchange, and he gave evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons on the Merchants' Assurance Bill (November and December, 1601). While the Act for the True Making of Woollen Cloth (4 Jac. I, C. 2) was passing through Parliament, he prepared for the Privy Council a report showing the weight, length, and breadth of all kinds of cloth.

During the reign of James I., Malynes took part in many schemes for developing the natural resources of the country. Among them was an attempt to work lead mines in Yorkshire and silver mines in Durham, in 1606, when, at his own charge, he brought workmen from Germany. He was joined by Lord Eure and some London merchants, but the undertaking failed, although "his action was applauded by a great person then in authority and now [1622] deceased, who promised all the favour he could do" (*Lex Mercatoria*, p. 262). The object of these schemes was probably to make England independent of a foreign supply of the precious metals. Monetary questions were, indeed, his chief care. He was an assay master of the mint (*ib.*, p. 281). In 1609, he was a commissioner on mint matters along with Thomas Lord Knyvet, Sir Richard Martin, John Williams, the king's goldsmith, and others. Shortly afterwards he engaged in a scheme for supplying a deficiency in the currency of coins of small value, by the issue of farthing tokens.

Private traders had, for some years, infringed the royal prerogative by striking farthing tokens in lead. A "modest proposal," which seems to have been inspired by Malynes, was put forth in 1612 to remedy this evil. The scheme was adopted, and John, first Lord Harington, obtained the patent for supplying the new coins (10th April, 1613), which he assigned to Malynes and William Cockayne in accordance with an agreement previously made with the former. Upon the withdrawal of Cockayne, who did not like the terms of the original grant, Malynes was joined by John Couchman. But from the first the contractors were unfortunate. The Duke of Lennox tried to obtain the patent from Lord Harington by offering better terms than Malynes. The new farthings, which were called "Haringtons," were unpopular. They were refused in Staffordshire, Derbyshire, Flint and Denbigh; and even in counties where they were accepted, the demand for them was so small that in six months the issue was less than £600. The death of Lord Harington in 1614 gave rise to new difficulties, the patent was infringed, and private traders continued to issue illegal coins. Malynes spared no pains to make the scheme successful, but the loss, resulting from its failure, fell chiefly upon him. In a petition which he addressed to the king from the Fleet Prison (16th February, 1619), he complained that he had been ruined by his employers, who insisted on paying him in his own farthings. But he appears to have surmounted these difficulties. In 1622, he gave evidence on the state of the coinage before the Standing Commission on Trade. Malynes was deeply impressed with the evils which the exactions of the usurers inflicted on the poorer classes. "The consideration hereof," he writes, "hath moved my soul with compassion and true commiseration, which implyeth a helping hand. For it is now twentie years that I have moved continually those that are in authoritie, and others that have beene, to be pleased to take some course to prevent this enormitie" (*ib.*, p. 339). Hopeless of success and "stricken in years," he had to content himself with publishing his last project. He proposed the adoption of a system of pawnbroking, and a *Mons Pietatis* under government control. In this way he hoped to enable poor people

to obtain loans at a moderate rate of interest. Malynes lived to a great age, for in 1622 he could appeal to his "fiftie yeares" observation, knowledge, and experience, and he addressed a petition to the House of Commons of 1641. (See *Dictionary of National Biography*.)

Stuart, Ludovick, second Duke of Lennox, and Duke of Richmond, 1574-1624, eldest son of Esmé, first Duke of Lennox, by his wife, Catherine de Balsac d'Entragues, was born on the 29th of September, 1574. After the death of the first duke in Paris on the 26th of May, 1583, the "King," says the author of the *History of James Sext*, "was without all quietness of spirit till he should see some of his posterity to possess him in his father's honours and rents" (p. 192). He therefore sent the Master of Gray to convoy the young Duke to Scotland, and they arrived at Leith on the 13th of November. He was received into the king's special favour, and, although a mere boy, was, as next in succession, selected to bear the crown at the next opening of Parliament on the 28th of May, 1584. On the 27th of July, 1588, he was appointed one of a commission for executing the laws against the Jesuits and Papists, and on the 1st of August he was named Chief Commissioner to keep watch in Dumbarton against the Spanish Armada. When King James left Scotland in October to bring home his bride from Denmark, Lennox, though only fifteen, was appointed President of the Council during his absence. By his marriage on the 20th of April, 1591, to Lady Jane Ruthven, daughter of the Earl of Gowrie, whom the previous day he took out of the castle of Wemyss, where she had been "warded at the King's command for his cause," he gave great offence to the King; but, nevertheless, on the 4th of August he was proclaimed Lord High Admiral in place of Bothwell. About May, 1593, he was reconciled with certain nobles with whom he was at feud, and was allowed to return to Court. On the accession of James to the English throne in 1603, he attended him on the journey south, and on the 18th of June he was naturalised in England, and in the same year he was also made a Gentleman of the Bedchamber and a Privy Councillor.

On the 6th of August, 1603, he had a grant of the manors of Settrington, Temple-Newsam, and Wensleydale, Yorkshire, and £600 a year. He also received a large portion of the Cobham estates upon the attainder of Henry Brooke, Lord Cobham. In 1604-5, he was ambassador to Paris, and in August, 1605, he accompanied the king to Oxford, where he was on the 31st of August made M.A. On the 21st of July, 1607, he was named High Commissioner of the King to the Scottish Parliament. On the 6th of October, 1613, he was created Baron Settrington in the county of York and Earl of Richmond. In 1614 he was named Deputy Earl Marshal, and in November, 1616, he was made Steward of the Household. In May, 1617, he accompanied the King on his visit to Scotland. He was named Lieutenant of Kent in November, 1620, and from May to July, 1621, was joint Commissioner of the Great Seal. On the 17th of August, 1623, he was created Earl of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Duke of Richmond. He died suddenly in bed in his lodging at Whitehall on the morning of the 16th February, 1623-4, the day fixed for the opening of Parliament, which, on that account, was deferred; and on the 19th of April his corpse was conveyed "with all magnificence from Ely House in the Holborn to interment in Westminster Abbey, where a magnificent tomb was erected in Henry VII.'s Chapel by the widow. "His death" (says Calderwood) "was dolorous both to English and Scottish. He was well liked of for his courtesy, meekness, liberality to his servants and followers." The Duke was thrice married, first to Sophia, third daughter of William Ruthven, first Earl of Gowrie; secondly, to Jane, widow of the Hon. Robert Montgomerie, and daughter of Sir Matthew Campbell, of London; and thirdly, to Frances, daughter of Thomas Howard, first Viscount Howard of Bindon, and widow of Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford. She died on the 8th of October, 1639, and was buried in Westminster Abbey with her last husband. (See *Dictionary of National Biography*.)

Crane, Sir Francis (*d.* 1636), was the director of the tapestry works established at Mortlake under the patronage of James I. His

origin is generally assigned to Norfolk or Suffolk, but of his early history little is known. In April, 1606, he had a grant for life of the office of Clerk of the Parliament, and he was secretary to Charles I. when Prince of Wales, and during his secretaryship he was knighted at Coventry (4th September, 1617). C. S. Gilbert, in his *History of Cornwall*, asserts that Crane was a member of the family of that name seated at Crane, in Camborne; but this statement is unsupported by any authority. Nevertheless, he was intimately connected with that county. His eldest sister married William Bond of Erth, in Saltash, and his second sister married Gregory Arundel, and to the Arundels his estates ultimately passed. Through the influence of these connections, and through the support of the Prince of Wales as Duke of Cornwall, he was twice (1614, 1621) returned to Parliament for the Borough of Penryn and Launceston in 1624. In February, 1618, his name was dragged into the Lake scandal, as Lady Lake charged the Countess of Exeter with having been on the death of her first husband, Sir James Smith, contracted in marriage to Sir Francis Crane, and with paying him the sum of £4,000 in order that she might be freed from the bargain. Tapestry had been worked in England by fitful efforts for some time before 1619, but in that year a manufactory was established with the aid of the King in a house, built by Crane, on the north side of the High Street at Mortlake, with the sum of £2,000 given to him from the royal purse. James brought over a number of skilful tapestry workers from Flanders, and encouraged the enterprise with an annual grant of £1,000. The report spread about in August, 1619, that the privilege of making three baronets had been granted to Crane to aid him in his labours, and the rumour seems to have been justified by the fact. In June, 1623, it was rumoured that ten or twelve serjeants-at-law were to be made at the price of £500 apiece, and that Crane would probably receive the payment "to further his tapestry works and pay off some scores owed him by Buckingham." In the first year of his reign, Charles I. owed the sum of £6,000 for three suits of gold tapestry, and in satisfaction of the debt and "for better maintenance of the said worke of tapestries" a pension of £2,000 per annum was

granted for ten years. Grafton and several other manors were conveyed to Crane in February, 1628, as security for the sum of £7,500 advanced by him for the king's service, but the magnitude of the grant was hateful to his rival courtiers, and the transaction caused him much trouble, which, however, seems to have ended at last with his triumph. Stoke Park was granted to him in 1629, and there he built, after designs which he brought from Italy, a handsome house, afterwards visited by Charles I. As a further mark of royal favour he had a joint patent with Frances, Dowager Duchess of Richmond and Lennox, for the exclusive coinage and issue for seventeen years of farthing tokens. He suffered from stone in the bladder, and for the recovery of his health he went to Paris in March, 1636. Next month he underwent the usual operation, and at first it seemed successful, but "the wound grew to an ulcer and gangrene," and he died at Paris on 26th June, 1636. His body was brought to England and buried at Woodrising, in Norfolk, 10th July, 1636, a gravestone to his memory being placed in the chancel of the church. (See *Dictionary of National Biography*.)

Howard, Henry Frederick, Lord Maltravers, was the second son of Thomas, Earl of Arundel, to whose honours and titles he succeeded. He was born 15th August, 1608, and married in 1626 Lady Elizabeth Stuart, eldest daughter of Esmé, afterwards Duke of Lennox, succeeding his brother Ludovick (*q.v.*). (See *Dictionary of National Biography*.)

The patent for the farthing tokens passed at the death of the Duke of Lennox to Sir Francis Crane, who had a half share, to the Duchess of Richmond, who had a third share, and to Edward Garrett, who had a sixth share. The Duchess parted with her share to her relative, Lord Maltravers, who had married her niece, Lady Elizabeth Stuart.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PLATES.

PLATE I.

Harington Half-Farthings.

1. Obverse, showing mullet between **D** and **G**, and trefoil in centre of coronet.
2. Obverse, with mullet between **D** and **G**, and saltire in centre of coronet.
3. Obverse, with dot between **D** and **G**, and mullet in centre of coronet.
4. Obverse, with letter **B** between the sceptres below the crown.
5. Obverse, counter-marked a trefoil.
6. Reverse, with mint-mark the fret clouée, or Harington knot.

Harington Farthings.

7. Obverse of usual type with single-arched imperial crown.
8. Reverse, with mint-mark a star
9. Mint-mark a martlet with double-arched monarchical crown on the obverse and single-arched monarchical crown on the reverse.

Lennox Farthings.

10. Type I. **BRIT**.
11. Type II. **BRI**.
12. Different types of eagle-headed harp.
13. " " "
14. " " "
15. Reverse, with mint-mark a bell.
16. Headless harp.

Richmond Farthings.

17. Type 1. **BRIT**. Mint-mark masicle; **CARO** altered from **IACO**.
18. Type 2. **BRI**. Mint-mark crescent and star; **CARO** altered from **IACO**.
19. Mint-mark a rose, of **BRIT** type, with beaded front pillar of harp.
20. Mint-mark a rose, of **BRI** type, with beaded front pillar of harp.
21. Mint-mark a rose; florid conventional front pillar of harp.
22. Transitional type with double-arched imperial crown and harp similar to those of the "double rings."
23. Different types of eagle-headed harp.
24. " " "
25. " " "
26. " " "
27. " " "
28. " " "

Maltravers Farthings.

- 29. Obverse.
- 30. Reverse, type 1.
- 31. „ type 2.

PLATE II.—OVALS.

Lennox.

- 32. Obverse and reverse.

Richmond.

- 33. Type 1. **MAG BRI.**
- 34. „ 2. **MAG BR.**
- 35. „ 3. **MA BRI.**
- 36. „ 4. **MA BRIT.**
- 37. Type 1. *a.* Mint-mark the same on obverse and reverse.
- 38. „ *b.* Mint-mark on the obverse only.
- 39. „ *c.* Mint-mark a mill-rind on the reverse only.
- 40. „ *d.* Mint-mark, a rose and scroll, different on either side.

Maltravers.

- 41. Obverse and reverse.

Richmond.

- 42. Strip of nine impressions for a Richmond farthing.

