

# THE SCOTTISH RECOINAGE OF 1707–9 AND ITS AFTERMATH

ATHOL L. MURRAY<sup>1</sup>

THE Scottish recoinage of 1707–9 has been a neglected subject.<sup>2</sup> Cochran-Patrick prints a few relevant documents but seems to have considered it outwith the scope of his *Records of the Coinage of Scotland*.<sup>3</sup> It has received short shrift from historians of the English mint. Sir John Craig's *Newton and the Mint* does treat it at some length but is too dismissive of the contribution made by the Scottish mint personnel.<sup>4</sup> This paper is concerned less with the coins than with the administration that produced them, which worked well, despite a number of unforeseeable problems. Nevertheless, though the original project was completed successfully, it fell short of what was needed, leaving Scotland suffering from a shortage of small change for the rest of the eighteenth century.

The recoinage was undertaken in fulfilment of Article 16 of the Treaty of Union: 'That from and after the Union, the coin shall be the same standard and value throughout the United Kingdom, as now in England.' The English commissioners had proposed this, linking it to the adoption of English weights and measures. The Scottish commissioners had put forward their own proposal that 'After the Union the Mint at Edinburgh be always continued under the same rules as the Mint in the Tower of London or elsewhere in the United Kingdom'.<sup>5</sup> This was incorporated in Article 16, its effect being to put the Edinburgh mint on an entirely different footing from the temporary country mints set up for the English recoinage. In the event, however, this permanent mint ended by producing nothing but comfortable sinecures for a handful of officials.

It is appropriate at this point to look briefly at the officials in post in 1707.<sup>6</sup> The Master, George Allardyce, had been appointed in 1704 when a member of the last Scottish parliament. He was responsible for carrying out the coinage for which he received a statutory allowance proportional to the weight of money coined, from which he defrayed the workmen's wages and other necessary expenditure. He delegated most of the work to a deputy, Patrick Scott, his family lawyer. The warden, William Drummond, appointed in 1705, was a man with a grievance. He had had to pay a considerable sum to his predecessor, Captain Charles Billington, who had got the job after eloping with the Earl of Marchmont's daughter. He claimed that the payment had been made with Queen Anne's knowledge to provide for Billington's wife and children after his death.<sup>7</sup> The counterwarden, equivalent to the Tower mint's comptroller, was Walter Boswell, who had held office since 1691. Unlike the Tower mint, the mint was headed by the General, guardian of the mint's privileges and *ex officio* judge of its court of wardenry. John Maitland, fifth Earl of Lauderdale, was the third member of his family since 1660 to hold the office, which carried a salary of £300 sterling. Though it was to be criticised by Newton and others, its holder gave the mint some political clout. Four minor officials held permanent offices: the clerk, the assaymaster, the smith and the engraver. James Clark, engraver since 1686, held the separate office of letterer and grainer. He had produced the dies for the later coinages of William of Orange as well as Anne's pre-Union coins. He had also engraved Anne's Scottish seals, as well as

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised version of a paper given to the Society on 23 April 2002.

<sup>2</sup> A fuller account of the recoinage is given in A.L. Murray, 'Sir Isaac Newton and the Scottish recoinage, 1707–1710', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 127 (1997), 921–44.

<sup>3</sup> R.W. Cochran-Patrick (ed.), *Records of the Coinage of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1876), i, pp. cc–ccii, ccii. (hereafter *Recs. of Coinage*)

<sup>4</sup> J. Craig, *Newton at the Mint* (Cambridge 1946), ch. 7.

<sup>5</sup> *Acts of the parliaments of Scotland*, xi, app. 181.

<sup>6</sup> The author's lists of mint officials from 1660 can be consulted in the libraries of the National Archives of Scotland and the Royal Mint.

<sup>7</sup> Public Record Office (PRO), Sir Isaac Newton's mint papers, Mint 19/3, 116.

the plates for Bank of Scotland notes. Since 1706 he had shared the post of engraver with his wife's nephew, Joseph Cave.<sup>8</sup>

While the officers' salaries were guaranteed by the 1686 Coinage Act,<sup>9</sup> there was 'no allowance for maintainance of melters or labourers in this Mint otherways than when they are supplied with work'.<sup>10</sup> A list of 1707 enumerates 38 persons: James Shields, founder and melter, seven others in the melting house, Walter Broun, mill man, three cutters, eight adjusters, Alexander Hodge, 'neeler and blender', seven in the 'printing office', six smiths and file cutters and five wright.<sup>11</sup> Unlike the Tower Mint there was no permanent body of moneyers.

The cost of supporting the mint and coinage was defrayed from a dedicated fund, the bullion money, levied on a wide range of imports under the 1686 Act. In 1699 the office of collector of bullion, previously held by the warden, had been conferred on an outsider, Daniel Stewart. There was also a clerk of the bullion. Under the Act of Union the bullion money was to be replaced by extending the English coinage duty to Scotland, but the two fiscal systems were not to be merged until May 1708. In the meantime the residue of the bullion money was expected to meet all necessary expenditure. There was a separate issue, the discrepancy between the face and bullion value of withdrawn coinage, not only Scottish currency but also the extensive circulation of foreign silver coins. This was to be defrayed from the Equivalent, the lump sum to be paid to compensate Scotland for being burdened by a proportion of England's existing National Debt. This had been calculated by an arcane formula to be £398,085 10s.<sup>12</sup>

The Equivalent also provided funding to tackle another problem, that of revaluing English silver coins already in circulation in Scotland. The ratio of English and Scots money was to be 1:12, as it had been at the Union of the Crowns, but since 1686 the exchange rate for coins had fluctuated and from 1697 the English crown had been current for 65s. Scots with other coins in proportion.<sup>13</sup> A proclamation of 28 March 1707 provided that those who produced English coins at locations in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen on 17 April would receive certificates entitling them to compensation from the Equivalent at the rate of 5s. scots per crown. The Bank of Scotland was prohibited from receiving English money between 7 and 17 April but was compensated for what it held at that date.<sup>14</sup>

Preparations for the recoinage had begun on 18 March 1707 when Lord Treasurer Godolphin asked the officers of the Tower Mint to report on what was required. Their recommendations<sup>15</sup> were that:

1. A new set of Troy weights should be made for each mint. Previously the Edinburgh mint had used its own system of weights: 16 ounces to the pound and 16 pounds to the stone.<sup>16</sup>
2. New trial plates of gold and silver should be made. There seems to have been no question of a gold coinage at Edinburgh and the relatively small number of pre-Union Scottish gold coins remained in circulation.
3. The money coined in both mints should be the same, with some letter or mark set on coins struck in Edinburgh 'as was lately practised in the country mints'.
4. A copy of the rules for coinage in the indenture between the Queen and Newton, as master of the mint, should be sent to the Scottish mint. Hitherto the Scottish mint had worked under rules set out in the 1686 Coinage Act. In the event it was decided not to delay matters by drawing

<sup>8</sup> See A.L. Murray, 'Engravers to the Mint of Scotland: James Clerk and Joseph Cave', *Review of Scottish Culture* xii (1999), 23-34.

<sup>9</sup> 1686 c. 38, *Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, viii, pp. 603-8, at p. 607.

<sup>10</sup> H.W. Turnbull et al. (eds), *The Correspondence of Sir Isaac Newton* (Cambridge 1959-77), iv, p. 532 (hereafter *Newton corr.*).

<sup>11</sup> Lauderdale muniments, Thirlestane Castle, mint papers (hereafter Lauderdale mint papers), 69/24/1; microfilm in National Archives of Scotland, RH4/69/1. Quoted by kind permission of the Thirlestane Castle Trust.

<sup>12</sup> Treaty of Union, art. 15; P.W.J. Riley, *The English ministers and Scotland* (London, 1964), pp. 203-8.

<sup>13</sup> R. Saville, *The Bank of Scotland: a History* (Edinburgh, 1996), pp. 66, 840; *Recs. of Coinage*, ii, pp. 270-1.

<sup>14</sup> *Recs. of Coinage*, ii, pp. 291-6; C.A. Malcolm, *The Bank of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1948), pp. 35-6.

<sup>15</sup> W.A. Shaw et al. (eds), *Calendar of Treasury books* (London, 1904-57), xxi, p. 263; J. Roddington (ed.), *Calendar of Treasury papers* (London, 1868-98), 1702-1707, p. 494.

<sup>16</sup> *Newton Corr.*, iv, p. 533n; *Recs. of Coinage*, i, p. lxxxvii.

up a new indenture for Scotland. Instead a royal warrant extended the terms of the English indenture to the Scottish mint.

5. The Scottish officers might send 'any of the mint' to learn the practice of the Tower mint and, if they wished, an officer of the English mint might be sent to Scotland to see the rules put into execution. William Drummond, the Scottish warden, did come south to liaise with the Tower mint<sup>17</sup> but the preferred solution was to send personnel to Scotland.
6. Any 'engines' or other 'necessaries' could be supplied by the Tower mint.

By the end of March the Scottish mint had produced a list of requirements. On 12 April Newton and his colleagues reported that the total cost would be £169 12s. 8d. However cast rollers were not to be bought: 'The man who makes them keeps the secret to himself and only lends the rollers to the moneyers at 10s. a day'. Instead hammered rollers could be purchased. In some cases the two mints seem to have been speaking a different language. 'What is meant by a sizing mill we are not certain . . . What is meant in the inventory by large scratches half wier do not understand'. Godolphin authorised the mint to provide what was absolutely necessary, the cost to be defrayed from the Equivalent. 'As to the expressions in the Scotch inventar which the mint officers do not well understand', he would ask Sir David Nairn, the Scottish under-secretary, to explain them and consider the speediest way of sending the items to Scotland.<sup>18</sup>

Following a meeting with the Lord Chancellor of Scotland, Newton and Ellis provided further advice to Godolphin. Coins minted at Edinburgh should be distinguished by the letter E under the Queen's 'effigies'. The silver should be minted in the same proportion as for the English recoinage: one tenth as sixpences; four-tenths shillings, three-tenths half-crowns and two-tenths crowns.<sup>19</sup> Although the Scots had contended that punches and dies could be made 'at home' by their engraver, and that 'they formerly have been and can still be made here, and shall be made with so much exactness, that the nicest eye shall not discern the difference',<sup>20</sup> Clark's proven experience took second place to the perceived need to ensure that 'the money of both mints may be exactly alike'. Thus the first batches of dies and punches were to be produced by the Tower mint. A royal warrant signed on 20 June 1707 directed the officers of the Scottish mint to observe the rules of coinage set out in a copy of the Tower mint indenture. Another authorised the master to coin crowns, half crowns, shillings and sixpences.<sup>21</sup>

On 8 July the treasury referred a memorial by Drummond, the Edinburgh warden, to Newton and his colleagues. This requested that a person well versed in the methods of the mint of England should be sent to Edinburgh, with a clerk and two moneyers.<sup>22</sup> Newton had already concluded that 'their assays and rating and standarding and way of book-keeping differ from ours and must be set right'. He had approached David Gregory, professor of astronomy at Oxford, and one of the Tower mint clerks about going to Edinburgh.<sup>23</sup> Gregory was an apt choice for overseer. Not only had he been professor of mathematics at Edinburgh University; he had also produced the 'tables for regulating the mint and bullion' for the Edinburgh mint's reopening in 1686-7, and more recently he had been involved in calculating the Equivalent.<sup>24</sup> Newton's own clerk, Richard Morgan, was to instruct the Edinburgh clerks; Thomas Seabrook, Henry Halley and Richard Collard were to go as moneyers. Royal warrants of 12 July 1707 directed Gregory and the others to go to Edinburgh and set out the allowances to be paid to them and the conditions under which

<sup>17</sup> *Cal. Treas. bks.* xxi, p. 353.

<sup>18</sup> *Newton Corr.* iv, pp. 484-7; *Cal. Treasury papers, 1702-7*, p. 501; there is a copy of the Edinburgh mint's list in Public Record Office (PRO) T17/1, p. 1. 'Scratches' may be 'scratch cards', lengths of wire on a leather or cloth pad used for polishing metal (*Oxford English Dictionary*).

<sup>19</sup> *Cal. Treas. bks.* xxi, pp. 264-5 (from T17/1, 70-1), 284; *Newton corr.* iv, pp. 491-3.

<sup>20</sup> PRO T17/1, 1.

<sup>21</sup> *Cal. Treas. bks.* xxi, pp. 353-4; *Recs. of Coinage*, ii, pp. 308-9.

<sup>22</sup> *Cal. Treas. bks.* xxi, pp. 350-1.

<sup>23</sup> *Newton corr.* iv, pp. 494-5; *Cal. Treas. papers 1702-7*, pp. 517-9.

<sup>24</sup> *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland* (3rd series), xiii, p. xxxvi, G.S. Pryde, *The Treaty of Union of Scotland and England 1707* (London 1950), p. 41n.

the moneyers had accepted the work.<sup>25</sup> Gregory left London on 21 July, arriving at Edinburgh ten days later along with Morgan. The three moneyers arrived on 8 August.<sup>26</sup>

At a meeting at the Edinburgh mint the following day, it was agreed that the moneyers should have a sight of the tools and report whether any more were needed. The assaymaster was to report on the tools in his office; the clerk on what books were needed. Finally Drummond delivered to the master, who passed on to the engraver fifteen pairs each of shilling and sixpences dies and a pair of punches for each.<sup>27</sup> At the next meeting, three days later the moneyers reported that they needed cutters for each of the species, flattening presses and a sixpence coining press. The assaymaster needed a pair of balances, the engraver letters for the inscriptions, punches for the reverse sides of the shillings and sixpences, as well as crown and half crown dies. Asked how much they could coin, the moneyers could promise no more than 2,000 pounds the first two weeks 'but after they had got all things set to rights they would be able to coin 4,000 pounds a week or near to it'. The smith, founder and carpenter were directed to carry out certain work and the master undertook that horses to power the mill 'should be had in due time'.<sup>28</sup> Eight arrived on 15 August but one had to be replaced, having been 'shott or sticked in the park before the work commenced'.<sup>29</sup>

An unrecorded meeting, probably in August, saw Gregory and the mint officers agreeing to bring staffing into line with the Tower mint. Three new clerks were appointed, for the master, warden and counterwarden respectively, to work with Robert Miller, the incumbent queen's clerk. Richard Morgan instructed them in 'the methods of rateing and standarding, and the formes of book-keeping used in the Mint of the Tower'.<sup>30</sup> He was recalled to London on 14 October. Thanks to him we have not only the detailed journals of the recoinage but also the records he had brought from the Tower as specimens, which might not otherwise have survived.<sup>31</sup> The three clerks were the only new appointments. Giving added responsibilities to existing officials provided other new posts needed to bring the establishment into line with the Tower mint. Thus 'the Warden and Counter Warden should by turns do the office of Surveyor of the Meltings, and that the Counter Warden should officiat also as Weigher and Teller, and that his Clerk should be Clerk to those Offices. It was also agreed that the Queens Clerk should be Clerk of the Papers and Irons'.<sup>32</sup>

The mint opened for business on 22 August 1707 when the Scottish privy council issued a proclamation inviting holders of Scottish or foreign coins to bring them to the mint. A second proclamation of 19 September called in foreign silver money.<sup>33</sup> In practice all coin was routed through the Bank of Scotland. It was delivered by the Bank to the mint in presence of three commissioners appointed by the privy council, assisted by Miller, the queen's clerk. In each batch, identified by a letter, a number of separate parcels were weighed individually, noted by the clerks, and then melted into ingots. The ingots were formally delivered into the master's custody, then re-melted into bars for the moneyers who struck the coins. New coins were cleared to the Bank in quantities corresponding to the batches originally received. When the difference between the face value of old and new coins had been calculated, the Bank was given a certificate to reclaim the amount of the deficiency. This amount was defrayed from the Equivalent, as was the cost of the first melting.<sup>34</sup> Thus Batch A, received from the Bank on 5 September 1707 with a face value of £2,000 sterling, was delivered to the moneyers in ingots on 6 October and received back from them in shillings on 15 October. It was cleared on 17 October by delivery of £1774 12s. in new coin, giving a deficiency of £225 8s., or approximately 11%.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *Recs. of Coinage*, pp. 305-8; *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxi, pp. 353-4.

<sup>26</sup> *Newton Corr.*, iv, pp. 497-8.

<sup>27</sup> Mint register, NAS E105/1, 26.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> Recoinage account NAS E411/1 p. 9, and vouchers E411/6/47.

<sup>30</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, p. 504.

<sup>31</sup> PRO Mint 19/3, 136; NAS E103/13-16.

<sup>32</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, p. 504.

<sup>33</sup> *Recs. of coinage*, ii, pp. 296-8.

<sup>34</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, pp. 521-2; the procedure differed from that originally proposed from Newton, which envisaged that the coins would be brought in by individuals (*ibid.*, pp. 502-3).

<sup>35</sup> Mint journal, NAS E103/7, s.d.

However, the appearance of smooth and efficient working presented by the records is somewhat illusory. There were complaints from Edinburgh of delays in sending the dies for crowns and half crowns and replacements for defective punches for sixpences and shillings.<sup>36</sup> More seriously it proved impracticable to follow Tower mint's method of alloying silver. Whereas the Tower furnaces were fired with charcoal, the Edinburgh mint used coal, which gave a fiercer heat. To maintain the standard fineness of 92.5%, Edinburgh's practice had been to add some grains of copper during pouring when the crucible was half-empty.<sup>37</sup> Gregory sent Newton accounts of trials following the Tower mint practice, in which he was unable to ensure that the last mould was the same standard as the first. On 9 October he requested further directions 'for this is a great uncertainty'. Newton blamed it on the melter: 'I fear your melter makes too much hast with the melting and putts in too much fire to make the silver melt quickly, and that your potts are too thin and your furnace not so substantiall as ours.'<sup>38</sup>

Shields, the melter, saw matters differently. On 28 October he was asked 'if he was able to fine the silver and melt both the species and Qweens pott so as to furnish the moneyrs allwise with barrs as fast as they cane coyne, answered he was, so long as he had health and strength, if the pott be allowed allay as there is need and hes been the custome in this mint'. He was admonished to follow the method of the Tower mint, and 'that he take care the metall be no hotter than it may rune to the bottom of the mold and that he endeavour to keep the fire in ane equall temper'. But at the next trial the following day 'the fire was so farr from being intense and the silver too hot, that the silver stuck to and weighed the ladle to a great inconveniency'. Finally on 10 November the officers and Gregory, 'finding that the keepeing back the fire and making the essays is a great hinderance to the work (the moneyrs now demanding much silver in barrs)', resolved that alloy should be added when required. This was to continue until new orders came from London 'or by the experience of a melter to come from London there be cause to change the same'.<sup>39</sup> By now Newton had been convinced. With his assistance Allardyce successfully applied to the Treasury for authority to 'use their ancient method of allaying the molten silver to make it standard untill the present recoinage of the moneys in Scotland shall be finished'.<sup>40</sup>

With this output of silver increased substantially. Whereas only 2,336 pounds had been melted in September and 4,337 in October, the figure for November was 7,696 pounds and for December 9,404.<sup>41</sup> Production of coins, too, had fallen under the minimum weekly figure of 1,000 pounds weight in the moneyers' agreement: 420 pounds for the whole of September and 2,760 pounds in October. There had been other problems: on 28 October the smith was ordered to provide rollers 'that will stand and not sink in working nor make the barrs uneqwall in going through the mill'. The moneyers were enjoined to blench the money better, which they 'promised to endeavor'. They, in turn, had problems with the local workforce and were given permission 'to turn off such servants as doe not please them and take others in their roome as they should see cause'.<sup>42</sup> Two more moneyers arrived from London on 12 November to replace Thomas Seabrook who had died at the beginning of October. His work completed, Gregory left Edinburgh on 21 November and with presentation of his report to Godolphin on 13 December his official part in the recoinage ended.<sup>43</sup>

All seemed to be going well. Output of coins rose from 4,920 pound weight in November 1707 to 10,620 pounds in December. By the end of January 1708 Patrick Scott could report to Newton that the mint was to receive the equivalent of £9,000 sterling from the Bank, weighing some 4,600 Troy pounds. They had already received £113,000 worth of foreign coins, but of the £19,000 still to come £16,000 would be in dollars which 'would occasion a great refineage and for which I see

<sup>36</sup> See Appendix 2.

<sup>37</sup> Mint melting journal, NAS E103/10; *Newton corr.*, iv, p. 500n.

<sup>38</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, pp. 498–9, vii, pp. 452–4.

<sup>39</sup> NAS E105/1, 26v, 27, 28v.

<sup>40</sup> *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxi, p. 492; *Newton corr.*, iv, p. 500, draft *ibid* vii, p. 455.

<sup>41</sup> Monthly totals for silver melted and coined are taken from the comptrolment roll, E411/1 0/24.

<sup>42</sup> E105/1, 27.

<sup>43</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, pp. 503–5; *Cal. Treas. papers 1702–7*, p. 557.

no remedy since we cannot wait the inbringing of the other money'. He was also concerned about the quantity of defective coins, which the moneyers were returning to be re-melted along with the scissel. On top of this the arrangements for funding the recoinage from the bullion money were not working satisfactorily.<sup>44</sup>

A proclamation of 12 January 1708 had called in the larger-denomination pre-Union silver coins, 40s., 20s. and 10s. pieces. These ceased to be legal tender on 10 February and from 25 February were receivable only as bullion.<sup>45</sup> At this point a threatened French invasion in support of a Jacobite rising caused a demand for specie and the withdrawn coins had to be put back in circulation. Some were used to pay the forces but when they were finally recalled the Bank got back more 40s. pieces than it had reissued.<sup>46</sup> The proclamation of 28 April recalling them also called in the remaining denominations: the 5s. of William and Anne and Charles II's 4 merk, 2 merk,  $\frac{1}{2}$  merk and 3s. 6d. pieces. These would cease to be legal tender on 1 June but could be received by the Bank at full value until 1 November.<sup>47</sup>

In April 1708 6,120 pound weight was melted, followed by 1,980 pounds up to 14 May. Then work was halted by the death of the assaymaster, John Borthwick, allegedly caused by 'extraordinary toil and fatigue'. He was speedily replaced by James Penman, assaymaster of the goldsmiths, who had been assisting him,<sup>48</sup> but melting did not resume until 6 July, by which time the whole operation was threatened by shortage of funds.

Back in August 1707 the Scottish privy council had proposed that the Scottish treasury should pay for the recoinage out of the bullion money.<sup>49</sup> After nearly six months Patrick Scott reckoned that he received only £1,800 of which about £500 had gone on tools, repairs and other necessities. Newton was seeking reimbursement of £532 for what the Tower mint had supplied, as well as the sums due to Gregory and Morgan for going to Edinburgh.<sup>50</sup> On 4 March he sent William Drummond a warrant from Godolphin for the Scottish treasury to pay what was due. Drummond got the necessary precepts, only to find that Daniel Stewart, the collector of bullion, was dying.<sup>51</sup> Newton saw Stewart's death as an opportunity to put the finances of the two mints on the same footing. As an interim measure the under-collectors should pay the money they held to the crown's receiver-general in Scotland, who would issue as needed to the general and master of the mint. Stewart's executors should be ordered to pay £2,500 or £5,000 'that the service of that Mint receive no stop for want of moneys'. The executors declined to do so, apparently arguing that the recoinage ought to be paid for out of the Equivalent.<sup>52</sup> Part of the problem was an administrative hiatus in Scotland. The treasury ceased to exist on 1 May 1708 and the new court of exchequer, which partly replaced it, was not yet operational. Worse still political manoeuvring at Westminster had led to abolition of the Scottish privy council, which had had general oversight of the mint and coinage.

Despite the uncertainty, by 10 August 1708 Patrick Scott was able to assure Newton that 'our coinage goes on very well'.<sup>53</sup> Six weeks later there was a payment of £2,600 from Stewart's executors, but it seems that Allardyce had to keep the operation going with personal loans from the Bank of Scotland.<sup>54</sup> From October onwards the coins coming from the Bank for melting comprised the older issues such as dollar, merk and 3s. 6d. pieces, apparently including worn and clipped coins, as there was a big discrepancy between face and bullion value of some batches.

<sup>44</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, pp. 510–12, Patrick Scott to Newton, 31 Jan. 1708.

<sup>45</sup> *Recs. of Coinage*, ii, pp. 299–300.

<sup>46</sup> *Recs. of Coinage*, ii, pp. 300–1; T. Ruddiman, *An Introduction to Mr James Anderson's Diplomata Scotiae* (Edinburgh, 1773), p. 231.

<sup>47</sup> *Recs. of Coinage*, ii, pp. 301–4. Coins minted from 1675 onwards as multiples or fractions of merks were later revalued, the  $\frac{1}{2}$  merk (40d.) becoming 3s. 6d. (42d.). The 4 merk piece (revalued to 56s.) became known as the dollar (I.H. Stewart, *The Scottish Coinage*, London, 1955, pp. 112–13) and is so denominated in the mint journals.

<sup>48</sup> *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxxii, p. 262; *Cal. Treas. papers*, 1708–14, p. 38.

<sup>49</sup> NAS E105/60, extract act of privy council.

<sup>50</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, pp. 510–11, vii, pp. 456–8; *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxii, p. 148.

<sup>51</sup> *Newton corr.*, vii, pp. 459–63.

<sup>52</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, pp. 515–6, vii, pp. 464–5; *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxii, p. 338.

<sup>53</sup> *Newton corr.*, vii, p. 466.

<sup>54</sup> Payments of bullion money are listed in NAS E411/1.

One batch melted on 15 November had a face value of £3,300 but produced little more than £2,400 in new coins, a deficiency of £864 13s. 6d. (26.2%).

Production at the mint reached a peak in December 1708 with 14,155 pound weight melted and 13,700 pounds minted in new crowns and half crowns. The last batches of old coins were taken in and melted on 30 December. In January 1709 the moneyers' output was 7,440 pounds (in shillings only from 19 January), falling to 3,956 in February. By then Richard Collard had been 'in a languishing condition for some months past and thereby become useless to the company'. On 12 February the master, Allardyce, told Newton that the moneyers could be recalled 'since it may be a charge to keep them longer here and what further bullion may be brought in for coinage may be done by the old servants here'.<sup>55</sup> On 28 February the moneyers delivered a final batch of 716 pounds in shillings and by 8 March all silver melted up to 27 December had been cleared by delivery of coin to the Bank. They returned to London at the end of March, taking with them their book, attested by the Scottish mint officers, showing that they had coined a total of 103,346 pound weight of silver.<sup>56</sup>

Even before the moneyers left the operation had started to run down. The mill horses were sold in March and workers were laid off.<sup>57</sup> Allardyce was eager to retain James Shields, the melter, who was 'very skilful in all the parts of the coinage having wrought in the mint these many years bygone' and asked whether 'he may not be settled as a servant in this mint under the name of purveyor or such like with £15 salary'.<sup>58</sup> This was not to be, though he did resume melting on 1 June 1709, continuing until September. In this final stage Edinburgh moneyers produced shillings and half crowns, using silver from the two final batches melted on 30 December, supplemented by scissel and small quantities of coin and plate brought in by private individuals.<sup>59</sup> In all 375 pounds of silver were melted and 881 pounds 10 ounces minted before production ceased on 15 September 1709. Allardyce had been ailing throughout the summer. On 4 October his wife told Patrick Scott that 'he was very weak and she was expecting his change'. He died the following day and next day, 6 October 1709, the recoinage ended with a final delivery of coin to the Bank.<sup>60</sup>

### After the recoinage<sup>61</sup>

Some five months before Allardyce's death, Newton had helped him to procure a warrant for preparing punches and dies for small silver coins. The matter will be discussed more fully in the next section, but nothing could be done until a new master had been appointed. When he first fell ill Allardyce had tried to ensure that the mastership would go to his son: 'He is now in the 17th year of his age, and we think his minority may be no scruple, since he may be oblig'd to act by a sufficient depute, and it may be thought hard to give it to any other so long as I or my heirs may be unpaid'.<sup>62</sup> In many ways this might have been the best outcome. Patrick Scott would have continued to run the mint and the remaining bullion would have been available for coinage, whereas in the event it was claimed by Allardyce's executors.<sup>63</sup>

But the mastership was attracting attention from elsewhere. William Drummond felt that he deserved it in recognition for his own work during the recoinage, not to mention some compensation for having had to pay over the odds for the office of warden.<sup>64</sup> An antiquarian-minded lawyer, James Anderson, was looking for Queen Anne to provide him with a suitable post to maintain him

<sup>55</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, p. 531; vii, pp. 470-2.

<sup>56</sup> PRO Mint 12/25; *Newton corr.*, v, pp. 2-3.

<sup>57</sup> NAS E411/6/47, 54.

<sup>58</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, p. 532.

<sup>59</sup> Under the Coinage Act 1708 c.24 s.2, they received an equivalent amount of new coins (EI03/12, 29 July, 1 Sept. 15 Sept. 1709).

<sup>60</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, p. 541; NAS, E411/7/3.

<sup>61</sup> There is a fuller account of the later history of the mint in A.L. Murray, 'The Scottish Mint after the recoinage, 1709-1836', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 129 (1999), 861-86.

<sup>62</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, p. 541, Allardyce to Newton, 9 Aug. 1709.

<sup>63</sup> Murray (op. cit. n. 2), p. 934.

<sup>64</sup> *Cal. Treas. papers 1708-14*, p. 155; PRO Mint 19/3.116.

while he compiled his *Selectus Diplomatum et Numismatum Scotiae Thesaurus*, the monumental volume of facsimiles of Scottish charters, coins and seals, eventually published in 1739.<sup>65</sup> In a way it might have been appropriate, as Anderson's *Diplomatum* included the very first catalogue of Scottish coins.<sup>66</sup> John Philp, auditor of the Scottish exchequer, reported to Patrick Scott that Anderson had told him 'he had the promise of it, whereof I have very great doubts', and that Anderson 'was of such an unconstant unsettled humour that nobody thought him capable of such a post but that evry body wondered at it'.<sup>67</sup> The post remained vacant until June 1710 when it was given to an Ayrshire landowner, John Montgomerie of Giffen, apparently as part of the political manoeuvring leading up to the 1710 general election. Montgomerie, who was elected as MP for Ayrshire, seems to have regarded the mastership as a not very lucrative sinecure. In 1715 he was seeking to trade it in for a lieutenant-colonelcy in the guards but in the event the mint was stuck with him until his death in 1731.<sup>68</sup> As a result it fell to successive generals to try to keep it in business.

The trial of the pyx marked the formal conclusion of the recoinage. In the past this had been held before the Scottish privy council. As this no longer existed, it was to take place at Westminster on 21 August 1710 at the same time as the trial for the Tower mint. Lauderdale enquired about the procedure which had been followed for transporting the pyxes of the English country mints to London, but the Tower mint officers advised the Treasury that the arrangements should be left to their Edinburgh counterparts.<sup>69</sup> Meeting on 25 July 1710 they agreed that 'the safest way of carrying and transporting of the said pixes to London is by carrying it alongst with themselves in a coach' and that 'immediately a coach be provided for transporting the pixes and themselves'.<sup>70</sup> As the new master was excused attendance, the party that left Edinburgh on 2 August comprised the warden, counterwarden, assaymaster and queen's clerk, together with Patrick Scott and William Bowles, to whom Lauderdale had entrusted the key of the pyx. Soon afterward Lauderdale contracted a violent fever, of which he died on 13 August. The trial took place on 21 August 1710, but the Scots were in no hurry to return to Edinburgh. On 10 September the secretary of the Treasury was seeking advice on a speedy way of paying their allowances, 'so as the said officers may not be detained here any longer on pretence of soliciting for their charges'.<sup>71</sup>

The trial of the pyx was not quite the end of the story, as it took several years to sort out the financial tangles arising from the recoinage, which had left various parties disgruntled for different reasons. As late as 1714 the Bank of Scotland was still trying to collect its commission for the last six batches of coin as well as a 'gratification' for its services.<sup>72</sup> Allardyce's family was caught between the treasury, to which they were accountable for his expenditure, and his official creditors. The residue of the bullion money, which continued to come in until 28 June 1711, was insufficient to meet all claims, including those of the Tower moneyers. On 14 December 1711 the House of Commons resolved that the queen should grant the necessary funds and eventually on 21 March 1712 the treasury instructed Newton to pay them from money provided for the purpose. On 5 January 1714 Queen Anne signed a warrant for passing Allardyce's account, allowing sums still due to the assaymaster, engraver and clerk. Nearly £1,400 still owing to Allardyce's executors was to be paid, partly by Montgomerie and partly by the receiver-general for Scotland. Even then it was to be another five years before his account was finally closed.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>65</sup> NAS Papers re James Anderson, RH15/23/6, 8, 9.

<sup>66</sup> J. Anderson, *Selectus Diplomatum et Numismatum Scotiae Thesaurus* (Edinburgh, 1739).

<sup>67</sup> Murray (op. cit. n. 61), p. 863.

<sup>68</sup> Murray (op. cit. n. 61), p. 867-8; for Montgomerie's career see E. Cruickshanks et al., *The History of Parliament. The House of Commons 1690-1715* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 904-5.

<sup>69</sup> *Cal. Treas. papers 1708-14*, p. 164; *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxiv, pp. 350-1; *Newton corr.*, v, pp. 51-4.

<sup>70</sup> NAS, EJ05/1, 32.

<sup>71</sup> *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxiv, pp. 448, 450; *Cal. Treas. papers 1708-14*, p. 240.

<sup>72</sup> *Cal. Treasury bks.*, xxviii, p. 83; Malcolm (op. cit. n. 14), pp. 37-8; NAS E305/1, 106.

<sup>73</sup> *Cal. Treasury bks.*, xxviii, pp. 76-7. For fuller details see Murray (op. cit. n. 2), pp. 932-4.



### Small silver coinage 1709-32

The recoinage had followed current English practice in striking no silver coins smaller than sixpence. Of the withdrawn coins the 5s. Scots piece had been equivalent to 5*d.* sterling and the 3s. 6*d.* to 3½*d.* Already by December 1708 the Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland had received representations from 'our merchants and trading people that it would be of importance to them and to this wholl country of North Brittain that some small species of money, such a tuo pence, three pence and four pence, were coined to be circulat through this part of the kingdome, as was formerly in use before the Union'. On 3 December 1708 its standing committee agreed to approach Newton to procure a warrant to coin up to £8,000 sterling in 2*d.*, 3*d.* and 4*d.* pieces.<sup>74</sup> A royal warrant of 6 May 1709 authorised the preparation of punches and dies for coining small money at Edinburgh and it appears that silver bullion had been put aside for this purpose.<sup>75</sup> Allardyce's successor, Montgomerie, may have been unable to act until he received formal authorisation in a new mint indenture. On 25 July 1710 Newton and his colleagues were directed to prepare and transmit a draft to the treasury,<sup>76</sup> but nearly two years elapsed before it was finalised on 30 April 1712.<sup>77</sup>

In the event any initiatives for reopening the mint came, not from the master but from the general. Charles Maitland, the sixth Earl of Lauderdale, though only twenty-two, had hoped to succeed his father in an office that had been held by his family for forty out of the last fifty years.<sup>78</sup> As with the mastership, however, the outcome was decided by political considerations. In February 1711 the Earl of Mar, secretary of state, conferred it on Lord Balmerino as part of his schemes for managing Scottish elections.<sup>79</sup> To be fair Balmerino seems to have taken his duties more seriously than Montgomerie. At a meeting of the mint officers on 11 September 1711 he promised 'to lay before my lord high treasurer how necessary it was that the mint should be opened, their being severalls that had been offering bullione to be coyned as also annent other matters relating to the said mint'.<sup>80</sup> It was probably at this time that the engravers produced punches and dies for small coins (see Appendix 3) as these were in existence by January 1712 when their petition for payment was referred to the London mint officers.<sup>81</sup> As there is no record of any approach to the treasury for warrant to strike coins from these dies, it may be assumed that they were never used officially.

Meanwhile with the death of Patrick Scott in August 1711 the mint had lost the person who had played the leading part in the recoinage as deputy master and master's clerk, leaving the remaining bullion disputed between his executor and Allardyce's family.<sup>82</sup> Montgomerie's new deputy, Robert Sinclair, is unlikely to have had any relevant experience. Lord Balmerino should have been replaced as general in May, but the Earl of Strathmore died before taking office and no new appointment was made until November 1712. The Earl of Home lost out in the political upheaval at George I's accession, when the office finally fell into the hands of the young Earl of Lauderdale.<sup>83</sup> Over the next ten years he was to make sporadic attempts to reopen the Edinburgh mint, all blocked by the Tower officers.

According to R.S. Westfall Newton succeeded 'in keeping the Scottish mint inactive and even in further restricting its income',<sup>84</sup> but this is unfair both to Newton and to the Scottish officers.

<sup>74</sup> J.D. Marwick (ed), *Extracts from the records of the Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1870-1918), 1677-1711, pp. 474, 476.

<sup>75</sup> *Newton corr.*, v, pp. 317, 395; see Appendix 3.

<sup>76</sup> *Newton corr.*, v, p. 58; a draft, dated 1710 is in PRO Mint 19/3,81-93, and there are notes by Newton at Mint 19/3,48 and 60.

<sup>77</sup> NAS, great seal paper register, C3/16, no. 11; *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxvi, pp. 259-61 (abstract).

<sup>78</sup> NAS Mar and Kellie muniments GD124/993/1-2, 998/1.

<sup>79</sup> Riley (op. cit. n. 12) pp. 154-5; *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxv, p. 172.

<sup>80</sup> NAS E105/1, 33.

<sup>81</sup> W.J. Hocking, 'Notes on a collection of coining implements in the National Museum of Antiquities, Edinburgh', *Proc. Soc. Antiq. Scot.* 49,308-32, at pp. 330-1; *Newton Corr.*, v, pp. 314-5.

<sup>82</sup> Murray (op. cit. n. 2), p. 934.

<sup>83</sup> *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxvi, pp. 111, 519, xxix, p. 166; Riley (op. cit. n. 12), pp. 172, 178, 235.

<sup>84</sup> R.S. Westfall, *Never at rest: a biography of Sir Isaac Newton* (Cambridge, 1980), op. cit. n. p. 840; cf. Craig (op. cit. n. 4), pp. 74-5.

Newton had maintained excellent relations with them during the recoinage. According to Lord Seafield: 'You have been a great trouble in directing this coynage: you have done most justly to all concerned in it.'<sup>85</sup> Any hostility seems to have come from Newton's colleagues. Significantly he had written to Allardyce in February 1709:

I have been slow to return an answer for fear that some of those things may be referred to the officers of our Mint with whom I find it sometimes difficult to agree and therefore what I now write to you is to be looked upon as coming not from an Officer of the Mint but from a private friend.<sup>86</sup>

This is a clue to the problem facing Lauderdale. The Act of Union envisaged a Scottish mint that was independent, but operating under the same rules as the Tower mint. But it also operated under the directions of the treasury and on matters relating to the coinage where else would the treasury seek advice but from the Tower mint? Lauderdale's own misgivings were expressed in a memorandum on the renewal of the Coinage Act.

And as the officers of this Mint are not insensible of the ill indeavours and insinuations relateing to the Mint here, it being commonly represented that the same is altogether useless, or that it ought to be only a branch or dependent on the Mint of the Tower, so they have reason to believe that in this Act now to be past the Officers of the Mint in the Tower may endeavour to have a clause appoynting the payment of the Officers sallarys and other charges to be made out of the money that may arise yearly out of the coynage dutys in Scotland, which if it shall happened then this Mint is terminat.<sup>87</sup>

It is possible to sympathise with both sides. Back in 1708 Drummond, the warden, had told Newton 'the truth is the Union has disconcerted our foundation intirely'.<sup>88</sup> Before the Union the annual sum of £1,200 for salaries and maintenance had been paid net at Edinburgh. Although this amount had been written into the 1708 Coinage Act it was now a gross amount payable at Westminster, subject to deductions for treasury and exchequer fees. On top of these were costs involved in remitting the money, which meant that of the original £1,200 only some £1,060 actually reached Edinburgh.<sup>89</sup> Moreover there was no express provision in the act for the cost of producing coins.

From their different perspective the Tower mint officers saw Edinburgh as an unwelcome charge on the Coinage Duty to which Scotland made an inadequate contribution. More narrowly based than the Bullion duty, it fell heaviest on Scotland's traditional imports of French wine and brandy. Lauderdale admitted that 'the same has hitherto decreased in the importation in proportion to what was before the Union above one half, particularly as to Brandy, there is hardly any imported, at least entred at all'.<sup>90</sup> In fact importation had probably continued at pre-Union levels but with its long coastline and overstretched customs service Scotland became and long remained a smuggler's paradise. Lauderdale was quite justified in fearing that Scotland could not support a mint from its own share of the Coinage Duty.

He was probably responsible for a second, shorter memorial submitted to the treasury when the Coinage Bill was at its committee stage. This referred to 'the great discouragement of the merchants and people there, who for want of having their bullion coined at that mint (which has been offered in considerable quantities) were obliged to export it again to forreign countrys'. Moreover the Edinburgh mint had been unable to provide the four pence and three pence pieces 'so necessary for dayly use in buying and selling and small payments, of which her late Majesty was so sensible that a warrant was directed for that end and dyes were prepared accordingly'. Echoing the earlier memorial, it proposed a new clause for the bill providing for a sum not

<sup>85</sup> *Newton corr.*, v, pp. 58-9, Seafield to Newton, 2 Aug. 1710.

<sup>86</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, pp. 534-5.

<sup>87</sup> Lauderdale mint papers, 69/25/13; for the bullion duty see *APS*, viii, pp. 603-4.

<sup>88</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, p. 523, Drummond to Newton 12 July 1708.

<sup>89</sup> *Cal. Treas. papers 1708-14*, p. 528; *ibid.* 1714-19, p. 315; *Newton corr.*, vii, pp. 174, 263-4. On 21 Aug. 1713 the Treasury referred to the Auditor of receipt a complaint that the officers of exchequer at Westminster were exacting higher fees from the Scottish mint officers than from the Tower mint. *Cal. Treasury bks*, xxvii, p. 336, where the editor mistakes this for a complaint against the Scottish exchequer.

<sup>90</sup> Lauderdale mint papers, 69/25/13.

exceeding £500 'for defraying all the charge of a free coynage, essaying, melting down, coynage and furnishing of tools and other necessarys in the Mint of Scotland'.<sup>91</sup>

Newton considered the proposed clause inconsistent with the Act of Union, as there was no such statutory provision for the Tower mint. The £1,200 allowed to the Edinburgh mint was sufficient for all charges, 'especially if the Generall's Office upon the next voidance of the place should cease pursuant to the Act of Union'.<sup>92</sup> In a draft letter he made more radical proposals; the clerk of the bullion should be made comptroller, not exceeding £1,000 should be allowed for salaries, maintenance of the fabric and incidents, and up to £400 for coinage 'if you think fitt to put a limit to the last allowance'.<sup>93</sup>

It is not clear whether these proposals were ever put to the treasury and Lauderdale would surely have resisted any suggestion of doing away with his post. While he failed to get assured funding for coinage, the outcome was otherwise favourable. Under the 1716 Coinage Act provision for the Edinburgh mint remained at £1,200, but the general became its treasurer. Newton thought that Lauderdale was now master and worker 'though he be not called by that name'.<sup>94</sup> In February 1718 Lauderdale ordered the mint's furniture and equipment to be inventoried,<sup>95</sup> probably in anticipation of its reopening. A royal warrant of 17 November 1718, replacing the 1712 indenture, authorised him to pay salaries and other charges and to strike coins.<sup>96</sup> Newton had agreed to this with some reluctance: 'And that there be no more complaints of the want of moneys to beare the charge of coinage, the said General may have notice to pay those charges in the first place, and let the deficiency (whenever there shall be any) fall upon the salaries'.<sup>97</sup>

While there is no clear reason why Lauderdale did not go ahead, there are a number of possibilities. Most probably he was not prepared to jeopardise the payment of salaries, then two years in arrears.<sup>98</sup> There was also a lack of experienced staff. Of the chief officers who had taken part in the recoinage only the warden, Drummond, remained in post. Penman the assaymaster and Brown the smith also survived, but Clark, the senior engraver, had died on 29 October 1718, leaving his less competent colleague, Cave.<sup>99</sup> Though Robert Miller remained king's clerk, the additional clerks appointed in 1707 had been discontinued at Newton's insistence.<sup>100</sup> As in 1707 it would have been necessary to recruit moneyers from the Tower, if not replacements for other members of the workforce dispersed in 1709. Finally would Edinburgh have had more success than London in obtaining a regular supply of bullion? While Lauderdale remained confident that Scottish merchants were eager to provide this, hopes of an indigenous source of silver in Scotland had proved illusory.<sup>101</sup>

At the next renewal of the Coinage Act in 1722 Lauderdale tried to enlist the help of George Baillie of Jerviswood, as Scottish lord of the treasury, pointing out that 'the want of coinage for now almost fourteen years occasions a scarcity of coin in Scotland and is a great discouragement to importers of bullion there'.<sup>102</sup> Though the 1722 Act gave back financial control to the master, Lauderdale persisted, eventually persuading Newton to concede that the Treasury should give the master sufficient funds to pay salaries and leave £500 to £600 in his hands 'for defraying all the charge of the coynage till more moneys shall be issued unto him'.<sup>103</sup> In 1726 the Convention of

<sup>91</sup> Copy in PRO Mint 19/3,23, proposed clause *ibid.* 26; for original see *Cal. Treas. papers* 1714-19, p. 50.

<sup>92</sup> *Newton corr.*, vi, pp. 263-4.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 264-5. The editors' suggestion that the intended recipient was Lauderdale seems incorrect, as he would not be addressed as 'Sir'.

<sup>94</sup> PRO Mint 19/3,217; *Newton correspondence*, vi, p. 263.

<sup>95</sup> Inventory printed in Murray (op. cit. n 61), pp. 881-3.

<sup>96</sup> *Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxxii, pp. 627-8; copy in NAS E105/2, 36.

<sup>97</sup> *Newton corr.*, vii, pp. 6-7, Newton to treasury 14 Oct. 1718 (draft).

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, a warrant for payment of £1,200 (for 1714-15) in August 1717 (*Cal. Treas. bks.*, xxxi, pp. 493, 507) had led Newton to complain that this would leave insufficient funds from the coinage duty to meet the Tower Mint's charges (*Newton corr.*, vi, pp. 410-1); in October 1721 payments to the Edinburgh mint were again 1½ years in arrears (*Ibid.*, vii, pp. 170-1).

<sup>99</sup> Murray (op. cit. n. 8), p. 29.

<sup>100</sup> *Newton corr.*, vi, pp. 263-5.

<sup>101</sup> See *Newton corr.*, vi, pp. 378-9, 395-7, for investigation of a silver mine near Alva, Clackmannanshire.

<sup>102</sup> Lauderdale mint papers 69/25/5-6.

<sup>103</sup> Lauderdale mint papers 69/2511; *Cal. Treas. Papers* 1720-8, p. 205; *Newton corr.*, vii, pp. 245-6.

Royal Burghs still had hopes that silver threepences might be produced.<sup>104</sup> But responsibility now lay with Montgomerie, whose habitual inaction ensured that any prospect of striking silver coinage in Scotland had gone for good. By 1732 Newton's successor, John Conduit, could assert that there had been no coinage in Scotland since the Union and that 'there is no probability of any'.<sup>105</sup>

If this was the case, there might seem to have been a logical case for saving over £1,000 a year by abolishing the Edinburgh mint. This does not seem to have been considered, perhaps because it would have seemed a breach of the Treaty of Union but more probably because the mint offices provided ministers with a useful, if minor, source of patronage. Furthermore some in Scotland still considered that the mint could help to solve the country's critical shortage of copper coinage.

### Copper coinage 1717-64

Under the 1686 act new issues of copper had been restricted to the sixpence or bawbie, equivalent to the English halfpenny, and the twopence or 'turner' (also called bodle, one-sixth of a penny).<sup>106</sup> Prior to 1682 the first Maitland general had illegally produced a huge quantity of copper coins and at the Union the total copper coinage in circulation has been estimated as equivalent to £96,000 sterling. Over the next thirty years this disappeared, 'so that the scarcity of copper money does now occasion frequent complaints; and likewise, an opportunity is given for forging bad money in place of the good'.<sup>107</sup>

This was another area where the post-Union arrangements worked to the detriment of Scotland. In January 1717 Lauderdale complained that a House of Commons resolution had deprived him of 'the benefite of the copper coinage, which was the only considerable profit belonging to the Generall of the Mint'.<sup>108</sup> That apart, there was a need for copper coinage, which the Tower mint failed to satisfy, partly perhaps because there were no standing arrangements for transporting coins to Scotland.

By 1725 the Convention of Royal Burghs was expressing concern over the shortage. On 9 July it directed its standing committee to enquire 'how much is necessary to circulat in this country and what species thereof is most usefull and convenient for our commerce' and to apply to the king and ministry to have a coinage. On 24 March 1726 the committee wrote to the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, then in London, on various matters, including repeated complaints from 'all corners of the country' about the scarcity of copper coin, 'which verry much emberraces our commerce especially at fairs and mercats'. As this was prejudicial to those burghs whose revenues consisted of petty customs and to the poor, 'it would be of verry great use to have a coper coynage here of half-pence, farthings and Scots two pennies, and if possible silver three pences'. Their hope that any grant 'may be so guarded that no ill consequences arise from it', perhaps alluded to the furore over Wood's halfpence in Ireland.<sup>109</sup>

Where government had failed to act, private enterprise moved in. An Edinburgh shoemaker who offered to strike halfpennies and farthings in 1728 was exceptional in seeking to operate legally.<sup>110</sup> By 1729 both pre- and post-Union copper had largely disappeared. 'Turners' (twopence Scots) were replaced by Dutch 'doits', worth less than the old Scots penny; halfpence or pre-Union sixpences by Irish halfpence or counterfeits. For lack of a copper coinage in Scotland 'that kind of specie so necessary for circulation of money became extreemly scarce and for that reason anything bearing the name of halfpenny became current without complaint. This encouraged several persons to drive a verry unlawful trade of importing clandestinely from Ireland and

<sup>104</sup> *Convention of Royal Burghs 1711-1738*, p. 396.

<sup>105</sup> W.A. Shaw (ed.), *Calendar of Treasury books and papers* (London, 1897-1908), 1731-4, pp. 231-2.

<sup>106</sup> *Acts of Parliaments of Scotland*, viii, p. 607.

<sup>107</sup> Ruddiman (op. cit. n. 46), p. 232.

<sup>108</sup> NAS Montrose muniments, GD220/51115.

<sup>109</sup> *Convention of Royal Burghs 1711-1738*, pp. 368, 370, 396; J. Craig, *The Mint* (Cambridge, 1953), pp. 369-71.

<sup>110</sup> PRO State papers (Scotland), SP36/5/1, 110.

coining within this country great quantitys of false halfpennies of verry base mettall which has been dispersed throw the whole country'.<sup>111</sup>

On 16 May 1729 the Royal Burghs' standing committee met at the request of the magistrates of Edinburgh to consider what should be done for suppression of bad copper money and obtaining a supply of good coins. As an interim measure the Royal Bank of Scotland was to be asked to bring some from the London mint. It would be inexpedient to seize the bad money until sufficient good money was available, but burgh magistrates should try to stop more getting into circulation. In Aberdeen the magistrates seized some £60 worth of Wood's halfpence (approximately 29,000). In Edinburgh a rumour circulated 'that the magistrates were about to discharge the currency of the false halfpennies and therefor the people refused to take them, soe that our poor people who had no other coin but those false halfpennies could purchase nothing for their subsistance. This occassioned a hideous outcry amongst the lower sort which the magistrats were apprehensive would end in a mob.' This episode confirmed that it would be inexpedient to stop the currency of bad coin until good coin was available.<sup>112</sup>

The committee drew up a petition to the king setting out the evil effects of bad coin and need for a coinage of halfpennies and coins equivalent to the old turners. Because consignments of copper coins would be bulky, not to be transported from the Tower without 'great expense and risq', and the turners would only be used in Scotland, they suggested that 'the granting of a copper coynage in Scotland limited to a certain sum would prevent those growing mischiefs and be of great advantage to trade in this place'.<sup>113</sup> Lord Ilay, Walpole's Scottish political manager, who was asked to forward the petition, warned the Duke of Newcastle: 'There is at present almost a total want of copper coin which is supplied only by a remedy worse than the disease, I mean by false coining which is spread in a manner all over the country, and will of course breed such number of rogues of that kind, that I fear that our other species of money will suffer by it, as has already appeared in many instances.' He suggested a coinage of halfpence and turners either 'in our mint here' or at London. Turners were 'a species absolutely necessary here for answering many payments according to the laws and customs of the country'. Although he believed that halfpence were being coined at the Tower, 'unless there is some method fallen upon to send them here free of charges to the people, I don't well see how they can be any relief here, for no private person (and such are almost only the poorer sort) will give more for 12 halfpence than 6 pence'. The turners might be coined at Edinburgh or, 'if they are coined in England, they must, as I mention concerning the halfpence be sent here gratis'.<sup>114</sup>

On Walpole's instructions Ilay had mentioned the matter to the secretary of the treasury and Conduit, master of the Tower mint. Nothing was done, perhaps because the Tower mint had resumed striking copper coinage<sup>115</sup> or because Walpole feared a repetition of the row over Wood's halfpence. Ilay had warned that 'when the new coin appears the whole of the loss upon the false money must fall upon the lower sort of the people and the poor which will inevitably produce a great clamour.' Charles Erskine, solicitor-general for Scotland, feared that it would be difficult to prevent disorders 'in regard the loss must fall upon the meaner sort, who are least able to bear it, and aptest to mutiny'.<sup>116</sup> In any case Ilay's suggestion that the Edinburgh mint might produce copper coins may have been ruled out by the master's absence from the scene. Since 1727 Montgomerie had been in America as governor of New York and New Jersey, where he died in 1731.

Ilay had warned that producing copper coins at the Tower mint would not help without some arrangement for bringing them up to Scotland. In May 1729 the Royal Burghs' standing committee had proposed that the Royal Bank of Scotland should import £2,000-worth, to be changed for silver by inhabitants of burghs, subject to reimbursement of the Bank's costs. In July, however,

<sup>111</sup> *Convention of Royal Burghs 1711-38*, p. 487.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 485-6, 488, 494, 499.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 487.

<sup>114</sup> PRO SP54/19, 339, no. 92.

<sup>115</sup> C. Challis, *A new history of the Royal Mint* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 751.

<sup>116</sup> SP54/19, 323, 329, nos. 90 and 92.

the Convention decided to cut the amount back to £500 until the committee saw 'what will be farther necessary'. A year later it remitted to the committee to 'endeavour to procure a quantity of copper coyne without charges to the burrows'. On 5 July 1735 it directed its agent to pay one of the Bank's tellers £5 sterling for 'his loss and trouble in giving out the copper half pennys'. The committee was directed to procure such quantity of halfpennies and farthings as they should think proper.<sup>117</sup>

Seemingly the Royal Burghs were unaware of a proposal to strike copper coins at the Edinburgh mint. This was initiated by Lauderdale's successor, Lord Belhaven, then in charge of the mint's finances during a prolonged vacancy in the mastership.<sup>118</sup> In May 1735 he proposed that the Edinburgh mint should coin 60-70 tons of copper halfpence and farthings of the same weight and fineness as those coined in London. He should have the same allowance of five pence per pound weight as the master of the Tower mint had been given for copper money sent to Ireland, and to facilitate production the copper should be supplied in ready-cut blanks. The treasury referred the proposal to the Tower mint, which presumably reported against it.<sup>119</sup> Belhaven found himself surcharged with the cost of the application,<sup>120</sup> no doubt deterring him from ever raising the matter again, and in any case responsibility passed back to the master in 1736, with Archibald Bothwell's appointment.<sup>121</sup> The Treasury's failure to provide for Scotland contrasts with the regular supply of copper coinage to Ireland, averaging (1733-58) £2,250 in halfpennies and £450 in farthings, though there the costs were borne by the Irish government.<sup>122</sup> Belatedly in July 1738 the Convention recommended to its committee 'to make such application as they shall think proper to procure a copper coinage in this place, or to be supply'd with such a quantity of copper coin as may be necessary for making a circulation in this part of the Kingdom'. Once more nothing happened and the matter does not seem to have been raised again.<sup>123</sup>

Meanwhile the situation in the country worsened. In the 1730s the collections at the episcopal chapel at Banff contained large quantities of 'Bad ha-pence commonly called Maggy Robbs', 'old Irish harps', 'Wood's ha-pence nam'd Hibernies' and 'French Bytts and lettered bodles'.<sup>124</sup> Elsewhere we hear of Dutch doits, probably brought in by sailors. Nearly all parishes financed poor relief by collections at the church doors. At Mauchline in 1740 the kirk session found in the poor's box of good money £66 17s. 6d. Scots and of bad copper £33 19s. 7d. Many parishes sold the bad money for what it would fetch as scrap metal, only for it to find its way back into circulation.<sup>125</sup> Losses incurred cut into the already limited sums available for distribution to the poor.

The extent of the problem and the difficulty of countering it are well illustrated by proceedings of two Church of Scotland synods. In April 1748 the synod of Moray found that 'the currency of doits and other bad copper coin proves very prejudicial to public collections for the poor'. Presbyteries were asked to give their opinion 'which method may prove most effectual to put a stop to the currency of such coin'. As the synod only met in April and October progress was necessarily slow. In October 1748 it concluded that 'untill farthings can be dispersed through the Country in greater plenty, it will not be practicable to remove or prevent the currency of such bad coin'. It therefore recommended that presbyteries should find out how much each kirk session would be able and willing to contribute 'for bringing from London some quantity of farthings'. Royal burghs in Moray and also the adjoining synods of Aberdeen and Ross were to be invited to participate. In April 1749 one presbytery reported that its sessions would contribute 20 shillings sterling each; other presbyteries would only offer to 'contribute pretty largely, but cannot

<sup>117</sup> *Convention of Royal Burghs 1711-38*, pp. 486, 498-9, 512-3, 599-600.

<sup>118</sup> *Cul. Treasury bks. and papers 1735-8*, p. 136.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

<sup>120</sup> NAS, Exchequer minute books, E305/4, 230, 245; E411/13/4.

<sup>121</sup> *Cul. Treasury bks. and papers 1735-8*, p. 286.

<sup>122</sup> Challis (op. cit. n. 115), pp. 750, 752-5; Craig (op. cit. n. 109), pp. 741-2.

<sup>123</sup> *Convention of Royal Burghs 1738-59*, p. 43; no references in the volume for 1759-79.

<sup>124</sup> P. Jones, 'The Qualified Episcopal Chapels of the North-East of Scotland 1689-1898', *Northern Scotland* xx (2000), 58.

<sup>125</sup> H.G. Graham, *Social life of Scotland in the eighteenth century* (London, 1906), pp. 238-42.

immediately ascertain the sum'. By the following October two ministers, Robert Dunbar and Alexander Irvine, had undertaken to get information 'how farthings may brought from London'. Two years were then spent urging presbyteries to come forward with their contributions, but on 17 October 1751 Irvine reported that 'Mr Forbes coppersmith at Aberdeen was willing to bring farthings at the discompt of five per cent, as he had done to the Synod of Aberdeen'. He and Irvine then commissioned £90 worth of farthings and in April 1752 'those who want farthings and have not yet contributed', were desired to 'make out their contributions'. In October Irvine reported that Dunbar had been told that no farthings were ready 'but that they were coining and should be soon sent'. In April 1753, however, 'they were not yet come' and a year later the synod decided that, as Dunbar and Irvine had 'not attained getting farthings from London', contributors could get their money back.<sup>126</sup> Six years efforts had achieved nothing.

Aberdeen had been more successful, receiving its first batch of farthings before October 1751. On 9 October 1753 the synod decided that 'as the good effect of bringing down the last quantity of farthings from the Mint at London was sensibly felt thro'out the whole country, and had been in a particular manner so beneficial to the poor, that therefore some proper person should be again employd to bring down to the amount of fifty pound sterling for the use of the several sessions within the synod'. As before provision of good coins was to be matched by melting down the bad ones sent in, two ministers being appointed to oversee this.<sup>127</sup>

It may be significant that neither synod seems to have considered the possibility of having farthings struck at the Edinburgh mint. That it could have been made operational is shown by a Treasury warrant of 23 May 1753 authorising the general and officers to strike medals for the Revolution Club of Edinburgh.<sup>128</sup> It was left to a new master, George Mackay, to raise the matter of copper coinage for a final time. According to a contemporary source:

Upon being allowed a copper coinage of two presses for three years [he] agreed to enter into a contract with the Treasury on the same terms as Mr Chetwynd, Master of the Mint in England, the present size, weight and fineness of the copper at the Mint of England to be the rule, and for preventing fraud or complaints of any kind that a certain quantity of the Tower halfpence be lodged in the Exchequer in Scotland for a standard, and that all those coined here that are not of the outmost exactness the same in dye, figure, weight and fineness of copper with the standard should be cutt down and not issued.

The source is a draft of a return of the establishment of the Scottish mint sent to the treasury on 28 December 1761, which noted that 'The allowing of a small copper coinage at present would be a useful and popular measure, as that kind of coin is scarce, and what is in the circle chiefly run over from Ireland or made by tinkers and in general of base mettals'.<sup>129</sup>

The proposed contract does not appear in the treasury records and its date and circumstances remain obscure. It must have been between May 1756, when Mackay was appointed, and the death of George II in October 1760. For whatever reason it was dropped after 1761, possibly because the existing supply of copper coins was deemed adequate for England, though Scotland remained as badly off as before. On 11 October 1763 the synod of Aberdeen recommended that its members should 'endeavour to try it out among their acquaintance in Town', a proper way of getting £100 worth of farthings brought down from London. But its next meeting, on 10 April 1764, heard that the Aberdeen merchant, who had contracted to obtain them, had been informed by his London correspondent that 'no farthings are presently to be got and that none will be coined for some years'.<sup>130</sup> Scotland continued to suffer from a shortage of small change until officially minted copper coins became available in larger quantities in the late 1790s.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>126</sup> NAS Moray synod minutes, CH2/271/6, 366, 375, 393, 406, 422, 429, 441, 445, 451-2, 459, 471.

<sup>127</sup> NAS Aberdeen synod minutes, CH2/840/4, 46. Graham (op. cit. n. 125), p. 254n, prints an inaccurate version of this minute from a secondary source and attributes it to Moray. Aberdeen synod minutes for 1735-51 are missing.

<sup>128</sup> Murray (op. cit. n. 61), pp. 883-4.

<sup>129</sup> National Library of Scotland, Saltoun papers, MS 17558, 179.

<sup>130</sup> NAS CH2/840/4, 255, 260; Graham (op. cit. n. 125), p. 254n, attributes these minutes to Moray and misdates the second.

<sup>131</sup> N. Holmes, *Scottish coins: a history of small change in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp. 78-81, 100-2.

### The end of the Scottish mint

The mint offices continued as comfortable sinecures. From 1775 the post of general was held successively by an uncle and nephew who were serving naval officers. All the officers supplemented their income by letting their lodgings to tenants and for a while the mint was 'inhabited by persons of station, and even rank'. By the early 1800s its upper class tenants had moved into the fashionable New Town and the fabric was in poor repair.<sup>132</sup> The Mint Act of 1817 provided for sale of the buildings and the abolition of Edinburgh mint offices as they fell vacant. This proved a lengthy process and in 1836 the Whig government lost patience and pensioned off the two remaining officials, the general and master. The buildings had been sold off in 1830 but survived another forty years until they fell victim to the twin scourges of Edinburgh's built heritage, slum clearance and road widening. A few small artefacts survive in the collections of National Museum of Scotland.<sup>133</sup>

Curiously, the mint maintained a notional existence in the form of the office of Governor of the Mint of Scotland held by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his capacity of Master of the Mint until its final abolition by the 1971 Coinage Act. The previous decade had seen Scotland coming close to having a mint again at Cumbernauld, but in the event the Royal Mint went to Wales, no doubt for very good reasons, not unconnected with the fact that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was MP for a Welsh constituency.<sup>134</sup>

If the history of the post-recoinage Scottish mint was a sorry story of missed opportunities, the recoinage itself can be counted as a success. Despite unforeseen problems it was brought to a successful conclusion in just over two years, with no hint of mismanagement or corruption. According to the 1761 draft return it had been 'well executed and the coins, particularly the crowns and half crowns, were so much above the standard of their currency that they were picked up and carried abroad, where they fetched from 5 to 6, 7 per cent above their current value in the country. And hence it happens that there is scarcely a single crown or half crown coined in Scotland in the circle to be seen, except in the custody of such whose curiosity have led them to make a collection of coins'.<sup>135</sup>

<sup>132</sup> Murray (op. cit. n. 61), pp. 872-6.

<sup>133</sup> Hocking (op. cit. n. 46), pp. 308-22.

<sup>134</sup> Murray (op. cit. n. 61), pp. 876-7; Challis (op. cit. n. 115), pp. 623-32.

<sup>135</sup> Nat. Lib. Scot., MS 17558, 180.



## APPENDIX 1: DELIVERIES OF NEW COINS 1707–9

The mint journals<sup>136</sup> provide a daily record of the movement of bullion and coins to, within and from the mint: receipt of old coins from the Bank of Scotland, melting, assay, delivery of ingots to the moneyers, receipt of new coins and scissell from the moneyers, and clearance of new coins to the Bank. Denominations of new coins are only specified in the deliveries from the moneyers, presumably fairly soon after they had been struck. Work was suspended following the assaymaster's death on 14 May 1708, resuming on 8 July. All coins struck prior to March 1709 were credited to the Tower moneyers, though some work was presumably carried out under their supervision by local personnel, who were solely responsible for the later mintings in July and September 1709. The amounts coined were £320,372 12s. by the Tower moneyers up to March 1709 and £2,544 10s. thereafter, making a total of £322,917 2s. This may not include £402 10s. coined from bullion and plate brought in by four private individuals in July and August 1709, cleared by delivery to them of new coin on 29 July and 15 September.<sup>137</sup>

<i>Sixpence</i>	<i>Shilling</i>
13 Jan 1708–26 Feb 1708	25 Sep 1707–23 Oct 1707
	3 Mar 1708–7 July 1708
22 Oct 1708–25 Nov 1708	9 Sep 1708–15 Oct 1708
	17 Jan 1709–28 Feb 1709
	29 July 1709
	15 Sep 1709
<i>Half-crown</i>	<i>Crown</i>
29 Oct 1707–10 Dec 1707	17 Dec 1707–13 Jan 1708
	26 Feb 1708
28 July 1708–27 Aug 1708	27 Nov 1708–20 Dec 1708
27 Dec 1708–12 Jan 1709	
15 July 1709	
15 Sep 1709	

Silver bullion was to be coined as crowns, half crowns, shillings and sixpences in the proportion 2: 3: 4: 1. In round figures these represent face values of £64,600, £96,900, £129,200 and £32,300; in terms of coins struck 258,000 crowns, 775,000 half crowns, 2,584,000 shillings and 1,292,000 sixpences.

<sup>136</sup> There are several copies of the mint journals in the National Archives of Scotland. Those used here are EI03/8 and EI03/12.

<sup>137</sup> E403/12, sd.

## APPENDIX 2: DIES AND PUNCHES 1707-9

Coins are found with mintmarks E and E\*, the latter solely on sixpences dated 1708 and shillings dated 1707-09, sometimes in association with the 'Edinburgh' bust. Although the significance of E\* has been the subject of speculation,<sup>138</sup> the limited documentary evidence for the supply of dies and punches during the recoinage has not been examined in detail.

While the first dies and punches were to be made at the Tower mint, the royal warrant to George Allardyce, master of the Edinburgh mint, authorised him to command the engraver to clean and polish the dies, 'to make new dyes with the puncheons sent from the Mint in the Tower of London and also to make new puncheons, and to use them for making of dyes', subject to approval by the master, general, warden and counterwarden.<sup>139</sup> Drummond, the Edinburgh warden, seems to have brought up from London the first batch of dies and punches produced by the Tower mint. This comprised fifteen pairs each of sixpence and shilling dies and punches for both. He delivered them to Allardyce on 9 August 1707, at the first meeting between the Edinburgh officers and David Gregory, and Allardyce handed them over to Clark, the engraver. At the next meeting on 11 August Clark reported that he needed letters for the inscriptions of shillings and sixpences and punches for the arms on the reverse of both, as well as crown and half crown punches and dies made from them.<sup>140</sup> Gregory wrote to Newton the following day listing items needed by the Edinburgh mint and stressing that the Scots wanted to coin crowns and half crowns, as half the Equivalent money sent to Scotland had been in sixpences and shillings. A memorial to the treasury in similar terms was referred to the Tower mint officers on 28 August and answered by them the following day. They said that punches for crowns and half crowns had been made but 'failed in the hardning' and were being replaced. Until these were ready Edinburgh should coin shillings and sixpences.<sup>141</sup>

Meanwhile Clark had started to make his own dies. On 21 August the smith was ordered to get four pairs each of shilling and sixpence dies ready for him by noon the following day.<sup>142</sup> However Clark found the punches supplied from London inadequate, complaining to Newton that 'the sixpence head punshion was broken before I did see it and now it is all shaken and split with the sinking of only two dyes'. He had made a new sixpence head and would have to make a new reverse punch for the shilling, 'because the sides of the shields are some sunk and some broken'.<sup>143</sup> It is not clear when the crown and half crown dies arrived, though James Shiels, founder at the mint, did make brass patterns for all the coins on 19 September.<sup>144</sup> A consignment arrived by carrier on or about 6 October but, after a search of all the boxes, Gregory reported that punches for small arms and letters for shillings and sixpences could not be found. These were probably in the next consignment which arrived on 31 October.<sup>145</sup> As Clark had undertaken to do all the dies of the several species as needed, Gregory and mint officers thought it unnecessary to have any more dies sent from London 'than what are already come down or are on the rode'. All the head and reverse punches, small arms and letters already made at London 'should come down that Mr Clark may doe the dyes by them'. Patrick Scot, the deputy master, was to write to Allardyce, then in London, 'that they may be sent down with all dispatch, also in the mean time to write for some few pair of dyes for the year 1708'.<sup>146</sup> This probably refers to the final consignment that arrived on 20 November, though Allardyce may have brought the 1708 dies with him when he returned to Edinburgh, perhaps as late as January 1708.<sup>147</sup> This would explain why sixpences dated 1707 are relatively common, though the mint records suggest that most were struck in January and February 1708 (see Appendix 1). Newton's account for goods and service supplied to the Edinburgh mint, submitted to Lord Treasurer Godolphin on 21 January 1708, included £207 14s paid to the engraver and smith in the Tower for punches and dies for all the species of money and for small punches and letters.<sup>148</sup> This presumably included everything provided up to that date.

As the Edinburgh mint minutes end with the last meeting attended by Gregory on 21 November 1707, before his return to London, there is little further evidence about dies and punches. On 2 June 1708 John Simpson, carrier, was paid for carriage of a box 'with dies and puncheons' weighing five stones which had been handed over by another carrier at Newcastle on 29 May. William Simpson received another box at Newcastle on 9 October, directed to Patrick Scott and 'supposed to containe one hundred pound value'.<sup>149</sup> The £100 value was presumably scots, not sterling, as the only other reference to dies in the Edinburgh mint accounts is a payment of £14 1s. 5d. to Newton's clerk, Richard

<sup>138</sup> See the discussion in H. Farquhar, 'Portraiture of our Stuart monarchs on their coins and medals'. Part VI. Anne, *BNJ* x (1914), 199-266, at pp. 234-9.

<sup>139</sup> *Recs. of Coinage*, ii, p. 309. *Cal. Treas. bks.* xxi, pp. 264-5, misinterprets this as saying that punches had to be approved by the Tower mint. *Newton corr.*, vii, p. 450, alleges that a memorandum from Edinburgh (*Cal. Treas. bks.* xxi, p. 423) admitted that no one in Scotland had the necessary skills for producing dies and puncheons, whereas all it said was that cutters could not be made locally.

<sup>140</sup> *NAS*, 105/1.26.

<sup>141</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, pp. 497-8, vii, pp. 450-1; *Cal. Treas. papers 1702-7*, p. 530.

<sup>142</sup> *E105/1.26v*.

<sup>143</sup> *Newton corr.*, vii, pp. 451-2.

<sup>144</sup> *NAS* E411/6/45.

<sup>145</sup> *Newton corr.*, iv, pp. 498-9. E411/6/16 lists payments for carriage of dies 6 Oct., 31 Oct. and 20 Nov. 1707 and 15 Oct. 1708.

<sup>146</sup> *E105/1*, 29, undated but entered between minutes dated 10 Nov. and 13 Nov. 1707.

<sup>147</sup> Drummond's letter to Newton of 31 Jan. 1708 suggests that his 'principal' (Allardyce) had been 'on the place' (at London?) until shortly before that date (*Newton corr.*, iv, pp. 510-1).

<sup>148</sup> *Newton corr.*, vii, p. 456.

<sup>149</sup> *E411/7/27*; *E411/6/26*.

Morgan.<sup>150</sup> This small amount seems to preclude the consignment having contained complete sets of punches, as these cost from £10 for the sixpence to £25 for the crown.<sup>151</sup> New or altered dies dated 1709 were made for shillings and half crowns but there is no evidence to show how these were sourced.

Two explanations of the E\* dies can be rejected straight away. First they do not distinguish coins struck by Edinburgh moneyers. The whole output up to March 1709 was credited to the Tower moneyers, which includes E\* shillings and sixpences dated 1707 and 1708. On the other hand there are no E\* 1709 half crowns, even though two batches were delivered on 15 July and 15 September, long after the Tower moneyers had departed. Secondly they do not distinguish different origins or fineness of the silver used. Certainly foreign coins were called in first, but it is clear that great trouble was taken to ensure that all the bullion issued to the moneyers was of the same standard, as the mint journals attest.<sup>152</sup>

The most likely explanation of E\* is that it distinguished dies produced by the Edinburgh engravers from those supplied from London. Ian Stewart's tentative suggestion that these were specifically dies produced by Clark's colleague, Cave,<sup>153</sup> seems unlikely. Cave had been appointed because he was Clark's wife's nephew and it is clear that his role was to be limited to that of assistant.<sup>154</sup> He did not take the oaths qualifying him for office until 18 September 1707, by which time Clark had been at work on the dies for almost a month.<sup>155</sup> He was away from Edinburgh again in August 1708, when he is known to have been in London purchasing and arranging for shipment of supplies for the mint.<sup>156</sup> His actual part in the recoinage remains obscure.

While E\* may distinguish locally produced dies, it may not apply to all of them, as this would exclude crowns and half crowns. It is conceivable that some 250,000 crowns could have been struck using only the dies supplied by the Tower mint. It seems less likely with three times as many half crowns, especially those dated 1709, produced some months after the last known batch of dies arrived from London in October 1708. Their commissions as engravers required Clark and Cave to produce dies without any additional payment on top of their salaries. They could, and did, claim for making punches, but only those for shillings and sixpences and the small silver coins authorised in May 1709. The treasury referred their petition to Newton and his colleagues who recommended that they should be paid at the same rate as the Tower engravers.<sup>157</sup> It may be, then, that E\* denotes specifically dies made by the Edinburgh engravers using their own punches.

<sup>150</sup> E411/1, p. 5.

<sup>151</sup> *Col. Treas. bks*, xxi, p. 354, where the prices of punches are given, erroneously, in shillings.

<sup>152</sup> Farquhar (op. cit. n. 138), p. 235.

<sup>153</sup> Stewart (op. cit. n. 47), p. 121.

<sup>154</sup> Murray (op. cit. n. 8), p. 28, quoting letter from Clark to Cave 26 June 1706, 'If there be any punshions made and if you assist you shalbe paid for it'.

<sup>155</sup> NAS, E105/3, 6.

<sup>156</sup> E411/6/14-15.

<sup>157</sup> Newton corr., v, pp. 314-15, 16 July 1712.

## APPENDIX 3: DIES AND STRIKINGS OF SMALL SILVER 1711

A royal warrant of 6 May 1709 authorised the general and master of the Edinburgh mint to give order to the engraver to prepare master punches, letters and charges for small pieces of silver coins and to make dies from them for coining small moneys of silver like those coined in the mint in the Tower of London. The coins were to be groats, three pence, two pence and pence, the heads and inscriptions as on the large pieces already coined, with figures and crowns on the reverse.<sup>158</sup> Following a petition by the Edinburgh engravers the officers of the Tower mint reported that these had been produced,<sup>159</sup> though probably not until 1711. The evidence for this date is a pair of dies for the twopenny (half groat) coin and reported strikings of the groat, all dated 1711.

The dies, now held by the Museum of Scotland (QN 154-5), were presented to the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland in 1865 by Robert Sclater. The note of the donation in their *Proceedings*<sup>160</sup> refers to him as 'the late' but gives no further details. He was not a Fellow of the Society. Presumably these dies had passed out of official custody, unlike the large collection of dies presented by the Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in 1862.<sup>161</sup> The strikings of the groat get a brief mention in catalogues of Scottish coins, although recorded sightings of them are well over a century ago.

Burns records an impression in silver of the reverse of a 'Maundy groat', as being in the Richardson Collection.<sup>162</sup> It is not known what became of this when the collection was dispersed. 'Maundy' is, of course, a misnomer, as the projected coinage was for general circulation. In any case there had been no distribution to the poor in Scotland on Skire (i.e. Maundy) Thursday since 1579, when the date had been changed to the king's birthday.<sup>163</sup>

The only other known impression of a 1711 groat was recorded in 1869 by an amateur numismatist, James Wingate. He was a marine insurance broker in Glasgow, with a residence at Linnhouse, Hamilton, who was elected a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland in that year and died in 1877.<sup>164</sup> According to his account a friend had called on him, 'with a pattern of a groat, in copper, of Queen Anne, of the Edinburgh Mint, bearing the date 1711, which, being a nondescript coin, I sent for exhibition before the Numismatic Society'. He had also visited the 'Antiquarian Museum' where he saw the die for the twopenny piece which 'although rather worn, is quite recognisable as belonging to the Edinburgh Mint'. He concluded that 'a series of the Maunday money was intended to be struck in 1711. Whether or not any were really struck is doubtful, as none are known in any cabinet, public or private with which I am acquainted'.<sup>165</sup>

Presumably Wingate's friend lived in the neighbourhood of Glasgow or Hamilton. No doubt the coin was produced at the Numismatic Society's meeting on 20 May 1869, at which a letter from Wingate was read.<sup>166</sup> His note in the Society's *Chronicle* appears to have been written subsequently, in which case the coin may have been returned to him before he visited the Museum. Whether or not he gave it back to his friend is unclear. It was not sold along with his collection of coins in November 1875.<sup>167</sup> There has been no record of it since 1869.

<sup>158</sup> *Cal. Treas. bks.* xxiii, p. 165.

<sup>159</sup> *Newton corr.*, v, pp. 314-15, 16 July 1712.

<sup>160</sup> *Proc. Soc. Antiq. Scot.*, vi (1865), 90.

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*, iv (1862), 97.

<sup>162</sup> *The coinage of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1887), ii, p. 535.

<sup>163</sup> D. Masson (ed.), *Register of the privy council of Scotland*, iii (Edinburgh, 1880), p. 137.

<sup>164</sup> *Obituary in Proc. Soc. Antiq. Scot.*, xii (1877), 372.

<sup>165</sup> J. Wingate, 'Interesting discovery in Scottish Numismatics', *Numismatic Chronicle*, new series ix (1869), 215.

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>167</sup> I am indebted to Neil Taverner for obtaining this information from David Rampling, Adelaide, who has a copy of the Wingate sale catalogue.