

## BURGUNDIAN DOUBLE PATARDS IN LATE MEDIEVAL ENGLAND

By PETER SPUFFORD

IN an earlier article I was concerned with the varying success of the efforts of the English government to prevent the circulation of continental coins, particularly Flemish nobles and Venetian soldini, or *galyhalpens*, in late medieval England<sup>1</sup>. In this present article I hope to survey the evidence relating to the circulation in England of the Burgundian double patard from 1469 to the 1530's. As with its predecessor, I have received help from many hands in the compilation of this article. I trust that all such help has been acknowledged in the relevant footnotes, but I should again like to single out for particular thanks Mr. Michael Dolley of Queen's University, Belfast, for his continual aid and encouragement.

The suppression of the import of *galyhalpens* and *blankes* by the 1420's and the final disappearance from circulation about 1435 of imitative continental sterlings restored a uniformity to the English currency that had been lacking since the first import of imitative sterlings. With a small admixture of Scots pieces, English coins alone circulated in England. The evidence for such an assertion must necessarily be negative in nature. After 1424 there were no further petitions in parliament against the circulation of continental coins, and no further statutes or proclamations were made against them, that I can find. Nor were there any further hoards containing continental pieces. The value of this last piece of evidence is largely nullified by the curious fact that no hoards whatsoever have yet been found in England from the period from about 1435 to about 1460. This surprising phenomenon of the absence of coin hoards from the mid-fifteenth century is paralleled in Scotland, the Low Countries and France. In the Low Countries and also in the Rhineland it coincided with a period at which it was difficult to obtain bullion for minting. Although issues from the Tower mint were relatively low, it did not have to close like many continental mints, including that at Calais, for lack of bullion. Such mintable bullion, of course, consisted mainly of foreign coin. It would, however, be rash to correlate the lack of intrusive continental coins in circulation with the general dearth of bullion in north-western Europe. It might be less rash to correlate both the total lack of continental coins in circulation in England, and the relative lack of continental coins as bullion for reminting, with the general commercial situation. This period saw a decline in the export of wool, hitherto England's principal export, without a corresponding increase in the export of cloth. These middle years of the century were in England, as elsewhere in Western Europe, the lowest point in the secular depression of trade in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Tower mint nevertheless managed to remain open, whilst those in the Netherlands, northern France and the Rhineland had to close. Unless either English mines were more productive than has been supposed, or there was an improbably large dethesuarization of precious metals, the survival of the Tower mint suggests that bullion, that is to say, foreign coin, was probably still flowing into the country, albeit in limited quantities. This presumably derived from Italian and Hanscatic merchants who bought more than they sold in this country. It cannot have come from the Staplers'

<sup>1</sup> 'Continental Coins in Late Medieval England', *British Numismatic Journal*, xxxii (1963), pp. 127-139

wool exports, else the Calais mint would have remained open, nor any longer from the profits of the Hundred Years War, and it hardly seems likely to have derived from Merchant Adventurers who are thought to have been as much importers as exporters at this date. From whatsoever source it came the foreign coin was channelled efficiently to the Tower mint and none escaped into circulation.

One may thus, with some confidence, assert that probably from the 1420's and almost certainly from the 1430's, the English government succeeded in its traditional aim of limiting the currency circulating in England to English coin. This so strenuously restored uniformity of circulation in England was hardly destined to last much more than thirty years. In 1469 the traditional policy was overthrown when the economic bonds between England and the Low Countries, and the political and family ties between Edward IV and Charles the Rash, were strengthened by a monetary convention allowing the circulation of English coin in the Burgundian Netherlands and of Burgundian coin in England. Since it resulted in so radical an alteration in monetary policy, it is perhaps worthwhile examining in some detail the negotiations which brought about the legal circulation of non-English coin in England for the first time.

The opening of these negotiations seems to have been repeatedly postponed. Originally a general commercial diet of English and Burgundian ambassadors and merchants was planned for 20 January 1469 at Bruges, Calais or Saint Omer. This was initially postponed until 12 May and on 1 May Edward IV named four ambassadors and seventeen merchants to go to Bruges for this commercial gathering. The diet was again postponed until 1 June so that a monetary conference, now mentioned for the first time, might be held with it. New commissions were therefore issued to the same ambassadors and merchants empowering them to deal both with general commercial problems and with monetary questions, and their numbers were specially reinforced by at least two monetary experts<sup>1</sup>. However, before its departure, the scope of the embassy was extended yet further, for three further ambassadors were added and additional powers were given to treat with the Hanse<sup>2</sup>.

The embassy eventually left London on 19 May 1469. The ambassadors were Thomas Rotherham, keeper of the privy seal<sup>3</sup>, Master William Hatteclyffe, secretary to Edward IV<sup>4</sup>, Sir John Scott, comptroller of the royal household<sup>5</sup>, and John Baron Wenlock, chief butler to the king<sup>6</sup>. All these were trusted servants of the king and key members of the royal household, typical of those through whom the Yorkists, as Henry VII after them, ruled England and managed their diplomacy. Of these men, Wenlock had a special interest in the Low Countries as Lieutenant of Calais, as did Scott, who had been one of the negotiators of the marriage alliance with Burgundy and the earlier commercial treaty. Hatteclyffe had a special interest in monetary affairs, as farmer of the King's Exchange<sup>7</sup>, although he had

<sup>1</sup> This summary derived from C. L. Scofield, *Life and Reign of Edward the Fourth*, i (1923), pp. 485-6.

<sup>2</sup> T. Rymor, *Foedera*, xi, pp. 645-7.

<sup>3</sup> At this time Bishop of Rochester, later to be Archbishop of York. See the *Dictionary of National Biography* for details of his career.

<sup>4</sup> Secretary to Edward IV from about 1466 to 1480. Previously physician to Henry VI and Edward IV. See *Dictionary of National Biography* and J. Otway-Ruthven, *The King's Secretary and the Signet Office in the 15th Century* (Cambridge, 1939).

<sup>5</sup> See *Dictionary of National Biography*.

<sup>6</sup> See *Dictionary of National Biography*.

<sup>7</sup> In 1462, as Edward IV's physician, he had been granted forty marks per annum out of the profits of the Exchange. In 1464, together with Moreys Burghill he had obtained the farm of the Exchange within the whole realm for £30 per annum and that of Calais for £20 per annum. They appear to have lost these almost at once as a by-product of an Act of Resumption later the same year. In 1468 both Exchanges were granted to him as King's Secretary at thirty pounds a year for seven years, or until someone should be willing to pay more. R. Ruding, *Annals of the Coinage of Great Britain*, 3rd ed. (London, 1840), quoting from patent, fine and parliamentary rolls.

been named in the original commission, before monetary questions had been added to commercial ones.

The merchant members of the embassy were led by John Prout, mayor of the staple at Calais, and William Caxton, at this date at Bruges as 'governor' of the English merchants in the Low Countries but shortly to be more famous as a printer. The importance of these two in the commercial negotiations is obvious.

Burgundian sources speak of the presence at the meeting of the 'general masters' of the mints of England, but the office of 'general master' did not exist in England. English sources only indicate the presence of two monetary experts; Hugh Bryce, who deputized for Lord Hastings as master of the Tower mint,<sup>1</sup> and Ralph Tikvill, who was probably an assayer, perhaps at the mint.<sup>2</sup>

The Duke of Burgundy was represented on his side by his chancellor, Guillaume Fillastre<sup>3</sup>, and by others of the great council of Burgundy, who were supported in a consultative capacity by a number of specialists in monetary affairs. These included Arnoul Musch<sup>4</sup> and Guillaume de Troyes<sup>5</sup>, the general masters of all the mints of the Duke of Burgundy, and Marc Bingneteur<sup>6</sup>, assayer-general of the Burgundian mints, also Thierry de Beaumont<sup>7</sup>, exchanger-general of Holland and Zealand, and the officers of the Bruges mint, Ypol Terrax<sup>8</sup> and Jehan Roland<sup>9</sup>, the joint masters, Henry de le Kienrue<sup>10</sup>, the warden, and Jaques Collebrant<sup>11</sup>, the comptroller.

What part the monetary conference played in the general negotiations is not clear, but it seems to have been one of the earliest matters to be dealt with. The negotiations were due to commence on June 1st, and the periods of attendance of the monetary experts suggest that coinage was under discussion in late June and early July<sup>12</sup>. Certainly coinage was the only subject on which a successful conclusion was reached. The commercial negotiations

<sup>1</sup> Bryce or Brice, goldsmith and citizen later sheriff of London. Described on 6 March 1469 as deputy to William Lord Hastings in his office of master and worker of the king's moneys of gold and silver and keeper of the mints and exchanges in the Tower of London, the realm of England and the town of Calais. *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1467-77, p. 149; and in the previous year as 'one of the Governours of the Kyngs mynte at his Toure'. *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, v, pp. 634-5. However, in 1471 and 1475 he was only described as 'clerk of the mint'. *Calendar of Close Rolls*, Edward IV, ii, nos. 862 and 1420.

<sup>2</sup> I suggest this on the grounds that he was paid twenty marks for accompanying Bryce and others beyond the sea to examine the value of money in circulation in the domains of the Duke of Burgundy. Scofield, op. cit., p. 486. To assay it seems the only possible way to examine the value of money.

<sup>3</sup> At this date Bishop of Tournay. See the *Biographie Nationale de Belgique* for his career.

<sup>4</sup> Ducal Councillor, Burgomaster of Malines, General Master since 1454, previously master in turn of the mints of Holland, Zevenbergen and Ghent.

<sup>5</sup> Ducal Councillor, General Master 1455-1480.

<sup>6</sup> Bingneteur or le Bungueteur, Assayer-General 1468-1474, goldsmith and money-changer, citizen of Bruges. Master of Bruges mint 1474 to 1480.

<sup>7</sup> Burgomaster, later Echevin, of Dordrecht. Master of the Dordrecht mint 1454-7 and 1474-5, Exchanger-General 1469-70.

<sup>8</sup> Of Malines. Master of the Bruges mint 1468-74, and of the Antwerp mint 1474-8.

<sup>9</sup> Money-changer. Citizen of Bruges. Master of the Bruges mint 1467-9.

<sup>10</sup> Ducal Councillor, Warden of the Bruges mint 1455-72; previously master of the mints of Zevenbergen, 1433, and Flanders 1437-9.

<sup>11</sup> Comptroller of the Bruges mint 1469-80. The biographical notes on these mint officials were compiled from manuscript material at Lille, Brussels and the Hague in the course of preparing *Monetary Problems and Policies in the Burgundian Netherlands* 1433-96 (Ph. D. Thesis, Cambridge 1962).

<sup>12</sup> Musch was away from Malines from 14 June to 5 July. Bingneteur made seven assays in June in the presence of the deputies of Edward IV, using up a mark of patards in the process. He also provided a banquet in honour of the English. Since he was allowed expenses for seventeen days at the conference, and part of this was in June, one might guess that he was in attendance for approximately the same dates as Musch. Kienrue and Collebrant were equally allowed expenses for seventeen days attendance. Beaumont on the other hand was away from Dordrecht from 19 June to 12 August, so it might be suggested that he was concerned with the general commercial negotiations as well. Archives Générales du Royaume, Brussels, Chambre des Comptes, 18106, 18107, 18108.

ran into difficulties over the refusal of Charles the Rash to 'enlarge' English cloth in the Burgundian Netherlands. The military negotiations also ran into difficulties, and no plans were drawn up for the projected military expedition against the King of France. The negotiations with the Hanse came to nothing, if they ever started, and hostilities broke out<sup>1</sup>.

The momentum of the negotiations was increasingly slowed down by the natural reluctance of the English delegates to commit themselves to anything concrete in view of the revolutionary political situation at home. In July Edward IV's supporters had been defeated and control of the government had temporarily fallen into the hands of Warwick. The king himself was virtually a prisoner of Warwick during the earlier part of August<sup>2</sup>. It is little wonder that the negotiations were abandoned at this point, and the principal member of the English delegation, Rotherham, returned to London on 19 August. The king's secretary, Hatteclyffe, however, remained away until November and was presumably one of those who saw to it that the successful conclusion to the monetary discussions in June and July should be salvaged from the general wreck of the conference. On 23 August 1469 a monetary agreement was published in Bruges.

This monetary agreement elaborated a relatively simple table of values at which the coinage of England should circulate in the Low Countries and that of Burgundy in England. The key to the relationship was the equivalence of the Burgundian double patard and the English groat, known in the Low Countries as the stoter<sup>3</sup>. Both were to circulate in England for four pence sterling, and in the Low Countries for four Flemish groats. Likewise the English halfgroat was to circulate in the Low Countries for two Flemish groats and the English penny for one Flemish groat, whilst the Burgundian patard was to circulate in England for 2d. sterling. The smaller Burgundian denominations were not, however, to circulate in England, as being too base to be acceptable. By the convention the relationship of gold to silver was assumed to be twelve to one in both countries. Hence the English noble was to circulate in the Low Countries for 120 Flemish groats, with its half and quarter in proportion, whilst the florin of Burgundy was to circulate in England for 3s. 6d. sterling, with its half in proportion. The delegates of the Duke of Burgundy reserved the right to strike a double florin.

Certain points remained inconclusive—whether or not the English pound sterling and the Flemish pound groat were to be equal as money of account and equally usable in both countries; what degree of loss in weight rendered coin fit only as bullion; and whether or not Burgundian coin might be exported from English continental possessions, and whether or not English coin might be exported from the Burgundian dominions. Behind this last unresolved point lay the Burgundian fear that their coin might leak into French melting pots through Calais, and the English fear that their coin might flow rapidly into Rhenish melting pots through the Low Countries<sup>4</sup>:

The political situation in England was in great confusion whilst the negotiations were in progress, but it was shortly to grow even more chaotic. A further turn of fortune's wheel brought Edward IV to the court of Burgundy as a throneless exile. As a result agreements made in his name, as King of England, can have had little validity, and I have been unable to find documentary evidence of any formal ratification of the agreement either on the

<sup>1</sup> Scofield, *op. cit.*, pp. 486-7.

<sup>2</sup> Scofield, *op. cit.*, pp. 495ff.

<sup>3</sup> The Burgundian double patard, struck uniformly in Flanders, Brabant, Holland and Hainault, at this date weighed 3.16 gm. and was 0.878 fine, whilst the

English groat weighed 3.11 gm. and was 0.925 fine.

<sup>4</sup> For a fuller description of the content of the agreement see A. de Witte, *Conférence Monétaire Internationale tenue à Bruges en 1469 and Histoire Monétaire du Brabant*, ii (1896), pp. 38-42.

Burgundian or the English side, either in the autumn of 1469 or after the restoration of Edward IV. Whether formally ratified or not, the agreement was implemented, at least in part. English silver coin circulated more largely in the Netherlands, whilst in England Burgundian double patards of this period did circulate and were legally protected as an integral part of the currency.

It is interesting to notice that, when in 1475 Edward IV reversed his alliances and joined France against Burgundy, the treaty of alliance specified that, within a year, a monetary conference between English and French should be held on similar lines to that between English and Burgundians in 1469<sup>1</sup>. Nothing appears to have come of this. I know of no evidence for such a conference having taken place, and certainly French pieces are not found in England in the same way as Burgundian ones.

The Burgundian pieces found in English hoards seem to be exclusively double patards. Alongside 260 English groats and one Irish groat in the hoard categorised by J. D. A. Thompson as 'Unknown Site No. 5', possibly Wymondham in Norfolk, deposited about 1485, there were 39 Burgundian double patards of Charles the Rash, 29 from Flanders and 10 from Brabant, in other words about 13% of the hoard<sup>2</sup>. In the Hounslow, Middlesex, hoard, deposited between 1495 and 1500, there were 86 double patards of Charles the Rash together with 289 English groats and half-groats and one Irish groat, altogether about 23% of the hoard<sup>3</sup>. In the Norham Castle, Northumberland, hoard, deposited after 1507, there were three double patards of Charles the Rash with 20 English groats, again about 13% of the find<sup>4</sup>. In the Hartford, Huntingdonshire, hoard, deposited about 1508 or 1509, there were 83 double patards amongst over a thousand coins, under 8% of the hoard<sup>5</sup>. There was also a single double patard in the Witchingham, Norfolk, hoard, probably also deposited about the end of Henry VII's reign<sup>6</sup>; and in the Maidstone hoard, deposited about 1538, there were twelve double patards of Charles the Rash amongst the 498 silver pieces, in other words just over 2% of the hoard<sup>7</sup>. Double patards probably found their way to Ireland as a by-product of their circulation in England. The Kilgorman, Co. Wexford, hoard of 459 coins, almost entirely groats, which was apparently deposited in the early or middle years of Henry VIII's reign, contained four pieces of Charles the Rash. These were presumably double patards<sup>8</sup>.

In addition to hoards, there have been a considerable number of stray finds of double patards. Those that have come to my notice include one in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, found near Clare<sup>9</sup>, and another in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, found at

<sup>1</sup> Item, quod infra Annum a Data Praesentium, per antedictos Principes Nova statuatur DIETA, in qua eorum Legati et Deputati talem Pecuniae et Monetae utriusque Regni Angliae et Franciae, AEstimationem et Valorem apponant et statuunt, quo ipsa Regna dictorumque Principum Subditi exinde magis habundare et ad comune eorum Bonum utilius prosperari valeant.

T. Rymer, *Foedera*, xii, 20.

<sup>2</sup> J. D. A. Thompson, *Inventory of British Coin Hoards 600-1500* (London, 1956), no. 369. There are in my collection 13 double-patards of Flanders and five of Brabant which may have come from this hoard.

<sup>3</sup> Thompson, *op. cit.*, no. 195.

<sup>4</sup> *British Numismatic Journal*, xxvi (1951), pp. 348-50.

<sup>5</sup> I am indebted to Dr. John Kent of the British Museum for an opportunity to examine, and for details of, this hoard, discovered in 1964, which

Miss Marion Archibald and he will be publishing shortly. As well as eighty double-patards of Charles the Rash, 55 of Flanders and 25 of Brabant, there were, unusually, three double-patards of the last issue of Philip the Good, one of Flanders and two of Brabant, and two pieces of Alfonso V of Portugal.

<sup>6</sup> I am indebted to Mr. Christopher Blunt for information about this hoard, discovered in 1805, which he and Mr. Michael Dolley publish above, pp. 107-109.

<sup>7</sup> *British Numismatic Journal*, xxvii (1952), pp. 58-65.

<sup>8</sup> *Journal of the Kilkenny and South East of Ireland Archaeological Society*, new series, v (1886), pp. 521-3. I am indebted to Mr. Wilfred Seaby of the Ulster Museum for this reference.

<sup>9</sup> Lewis Collection, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Bought by Lewis at Sturmer, Essex, 6. iv. 1881. A double patard of Flanders.



Dunster<sup>1</sup>. In September 1960 two were brought into the British Museum, one found at Croydon, Surrey, the other at Yarmouth, Isle of Wight. In May 1961 another was found at Islington in a lorry load of earth from Hertfordshire<sup>2</sup>, and in October 1961 one was dug up in a garden near Walton, Derbyshire<sup>3</sup>.

It would seem then, from hoard evidence alone, that for some forty-five years at least the double patards of Charles the Rash formed an integral part of the English coinage, and that even in the late 1530's they were still circulating, although in much smaller quantities.

The hoard evidence may be paralleled by documentary evidence of the legal protection accorded to double patards as currency.

There is one reference which can hardly refer to any other pieces than double patards, since they are the only foreign coins actually known from hoard evidence to have circulated. An act of 1487 made it treason to counterfeit foreign coins of gold and silver which were permitted to be current in England, a crime of which 'divers persons had been guilty, because they perceived that the forging them was neither felony nor treason'<sup>4</sup>.

Later references are more explicit. A printed proclamation of 1504, illustrated in the margin with a wood-cut of a double patard, confirms the impression that the double patard had for some time been common currency of the realm, but implies that by this time they were in general becoming considerably worn, which is hardly surprising for they were all by then at least thirty years old. In consequence of their poor condition both double patards and the older English groats were frequently being refused as change. The proclamation provided criteria by which the coins should be judged, and ordered:

*y<sup>t</sup> every double-placke beyng syver which hath his scription appaunt on the one syde, or on the other syde, to goo and to be curraunt, and not to be refused.*<sup>5</sup>

This proclamation, and another the following year<sup>6</sup>, although confirming the double patard as legal currency, also provided for the reminting of those which were excessively clipped and worn. The king had a special exchange set up at 'Leden Hall', London, until Candlemas 1506, at which these were to be exchanged as bullion, at 3s. 2d. an ounce.

Finally a proclamation of 1526 shows that they were still legally current although coming to the end of their useful life, being mostly in rather a decayed state.

The carolus placks of the old coin of the Duke of Burgundy, not being in fineness equal to sterling by twenty pence in the pound troy, it was ordained that they, not being clipped nor notably broken, should still be current at four pence sterling, but all persons who should think it more advantageous to convert them into the new coin, might do so.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. Found at Dunster, given by Margaret Luttrell of Dunster Castle to Spencer George Percival and included in his bequest to the Fitzwilliam Museum in 1922. A double patard of Flanders.

<sup>2</sup> I am indebted to Mr. Michael Dolley for information about these three finds.

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted to Mr. K. F. Stanesby, Borough Librarian of Burton-upon-Trent, for this information.

<sup>4</sup> Ruding, *op. cit.*, i, p. 294. Statute 4 Henry VII Chapter 18 (repealed 1 Edward VI Chapter 12§ 2). Perhaps with this forgery of foreign coin may be associated the die in the Public Record Office of a Double Briquet of Mary of Burgundy for Flanders (E. 29/153). This has been described by Derek Allen, 'Dies in the Public Record Office 1938', *British Numismatic Journal*, xxiii (1938-9), 31-50. If this die is genuine, as it appears to be, it must remain a

puzzle how it came into the British public records, but if it were a seized forger's die its presence would be more explicable.

<sup>5</sup> Proclamation of 5 July 1504, Society of Antiquaries, Proclamations 1 (9), partly printed in Ruding, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 297-8, printed in full and illustrated in P. L. Hughes and J. F. Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*; (Yale, 1964), pp. 60-1 and Plate 1.

<sup>6</sup> Letters Patent of 27 April 1505 to sheriffs ordering proclamation to be made. *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, Henry VII, ii, p. 409, and Hughes and Larkin, *op. cit.*, i, p. 70.

<sup>7</sup> Printed proclamation of 5 November 1526, Ruding, *op. cit.*, i, p. 305, from the copy in the library of the Society of Antiquaries; also in Hughes and Larkin, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 158-163.

The evidence of the Maidstone hoard suggests that the gentle persuasion of the 1526 proclamation was as ineffective as that of the 1504 and 1505 proclamations in totally reminting double patards out of circulation. It was presumably the enormous issues of debased silver after 1544 which finally swept the remaining double patards out of the pockets of the public into the mint's melting pots and so brought their currency to an end.

What may seem somewhat curious is that in the monetary agreement of 1469 the inter-circulation of a whole range of pieces was provided for, but in practice only double patards are found in hoards, and only double patards were protected by proclamation. There is a further limitation to one particular issue of double patards. None of the pieces of the same denomination but of a different type, the briquet or vuurijzer type, issued in pursuance of the ordinance of 27 October 1474, have been found in England.

The question arises as to how so many came into England. I can find no evidence either for or against the suggestion that the bulk of them came into England as part of a subsidy paid directly by Charles the Rash to Edward IV. It is not clear in what currency the subsidy, amounting to twenty five thousand *andriesgulden*, was paid to assist Edward's restoration in 1471. Since only one *andriesgulden* has been found in England<sup>1</sup> as yet, it would seem unlikely that the subsidy was actually paid in gold *andriesgulden*. On the other hand double patards would have been very convenient for use in hiring soldiers, the immediate object of the subsidy. There are cases of double patards being used for pay, both of Burgundian troops and of the Calais garrison. Edward IV remained a pensioner of Burgundy from his restoration until his reversal of alliances in 1475, but there is no means of telling in what currency the pension was paid. The fact that Burgundy became a hostile power in 1475 might well account for the unacceptableness in England of the new type of double patard introduced late in 1474.

It is not impossible, however, that the whole quantity came into England in the course of trade, for, from the restoration of Edward IV, English cloth exports to the Low Countries began to increase very rapidly and there was probably an increasing balance of trade in England's favour. Examples from 1479, 1481, 1482 and 1484 in the Cely correspondence illustrate some portion of such a favourable trade balance returning to England in the form of double patards. These show the Celys sending home from the Low Countries sums of £10, £12, £23 and even £40 or £50 in what they called 'carolus', 'carowlles', 'carolles', 'carlys', 'carlyche' or 'carleche' groats. They show that sometimes, as in 1479, they were not well received, but that on other occasions, as in 1481, they were particularly sought for and were used by Richard Cely in making wool purchases in the Cotswolds<sup>2</sup>.

Whether the bulk of the double patards which entered the English currency did so as a result of subsidy or favourable balance of trade cannot now be disentangled, but it seems unlikely that merchants, such as the Celys, should have been able to introduce small, if frequent, quantities of double patards into the currency unless there was already a considerable quantity in circulation to make them acceptable to the public. I would suggest therefore that there was at least one large payment at a governmental level in double patards, and that made in 1471 seems to me the most likely.

It is, nevertheless, astonishing that, whether relatively calmly in 1469 or in the heat of the struggle for the throne in 1471, an English government should allow itself to think in

<sup>1</sup> At Wiston, Suffolk, in 1854. *Archaeologia*, xlvii (1881), 270 footnote. I am indebted to Dr. Michael Metcalf for this reference.

<sup>2</sup> *Cely Papers*, ed. H. E. Maldon (Camden Society, 1900), pp. 15-17, 73, 81, 84 and 149.

terms of permitting the circulation of foreign coin in England, a thought that no previous English government appears to have entertained.

Thus in the later middle ages the currency of England not only suffered from the continual plague of Scottish pieces and the relatively minor incursions of imitative continental sterlings, Flemish nobles and two waves of Venetian soldini, but was also deliberately diluted with Burgundian double patards. Whereas the presence of these last was a direct result of government action, all the others had come into England despite the strenuous opposition of both crown and parliament. It is a tribute to the efficient deployment of the limited administrative machinery at the disposal of the government that so few foreign pieces were able to enter the country and survive in circulation whilst contemporary Europe witnessed greater chaos and heterogeneity in its currency than perhaps at any other time.

Even if England escaped this chaos, Scotland and Ireland were by no means immune. Currency regulations there legitimated the circulation not only of English as well as native pieces, but also French saluts and crowns, Burgundian nobles, riders and lions, Italian ducats, Portuguese crusados and the gulden issued by the Rhineland electors<sup>1</sup>.

In the sixteenth century England to a certain extent fell into line with Scotland and Ireland and with the rest of Europe. By 1522 ducats, crowns of the sun, other crowns, carolus florins, and various sorts of base florins were all catered for in a proclamation as having currency<sup>2</sup>. Proclamation in 1525 lengthened the list of current pieces by the addition of 'Perpynes'<sup>3</sup> and in 1526 of double ducats<sup>4</sup>. Of these the crowns of the sun, French écus au soleil, were the most frequently in use, as may be gauged by the fact that in 1526 Henry VIII issued his crown of the rose on the same standard<sup>5</sup>. By the 1530's foreign coin is not being seized when imported, but only when exported—crowns of the sun in 1535<sup>6</sup>, double ducats in 1538<sup>7</sup>, crowns of the sun in 1539<sup>8</sup>, and both crowns of the sun and double ducats in 1541<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Ruding, *op. cit.*, i, p. 287 and R. W. Cochran-Patrick, *Records of the Coinage of Scotland*, i (1876), p. xci.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar of State Papers*, Henry VIII, iii, 2283 and 2685 v.

<sup>3</sup> *Calendar of State Papers*, Henry VIII, iv, 1481.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, 2423.

<sup>5</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>6</sup> P.R.O., Exchequer Warrants of Issue, E. 404/100.

<sup>7</sup> P.R.O., E. 404/101.

<sup>8</sup> P.R.O., Exchequer K. R. Memoranda Rolls, E. 159/318.

<sup>9</sup> P.R.O., E. 159/319.

I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Alwyn Riddock for the last four references.