

SOME ENGLISH MEDIEVAL SEAL-ENGRAVERS

By H. S. KINGSFORD

As the medieval side of this enquiry is emphasised in the title it may be as well to clear the ground by stating that for this purpose at all events the Middle Ages are considered as ending with the close of the fifteenth century. This date saw the practical end of Gothic and the birth of the Renaissance, and is as suitable a stopping place as any, although it results in the omission of one or two interesting Tudor artists. On page 180 is printed a table of those engravers whom I have been able to find. There are twenty-eight of them and they cover a period of just over three centuries. But no claim is made that this list is exhaustive. I have been dependent almost entirely on printed sources, and it is practically certain that a systematic search of the records, both public and private, were this possible, would add substantially to the list. But such as it is I offer this paper as a beginning.

It will be convenient to consider each of these engravers in chronological order, and to make an attempt to show what work they did and what some of them at least may have done.

The first engraver of whom I have any knowledge, and for this I am indebted to Mr. Oman,¹ is ANKETIL the monk-goldsmith of St. Albans abbey, who is believed to have been responsible for making the golden shrine to hold the body of the patron saint. In the abbacy of Radulph, 1146-51, an uncut seal was found on Anketil's bench, and the abbot jumped to the conclusion that it was there for no good purpose, in fact it is described as 'sigillum adulterinum ad seditiones commovendas et damna ecclesiae irroganda.'² Beyond this there is nothing known of this

¹ See C. C. Oman, 'The Goldsmiths at St. Albans abbey,' in *Trans. St. Albans and Herts. Arch. Soc.*, 1930-32, p. 215, where there is a full account of his activities.

² *Gesta Abbatum*, Rolls Series, i, p. 109.

seal, or of any others made by Anketil, but we may compare the false seal made at Canterbury by Simon, to be mentioned later (p. 159 below).

The next engraver whose name has survived is LUKE, who signed the silver matrix of the seal of the City of Exeter, which is still in the possession of the Corporation. The signature is on the handle—LVCAS ME FECIT. Round the rim on the back is another inscription recording that William Prudum gave the seal to the city: + WILL'. PRVDVM. ME. DEDIT. CIVITATI. EXONIE CIVIVS. ANIME. PROPICIETVR. DEVS. AM (Pl. i, b).

The design is peculiar and by no means of the first rank. It consists of a shrine of two stages with pennons on the roof, between two tall narrow circular flanking towers, and a curtain wall. In the field on either side are two keys, the symbol of St. Peter, the city's patron, and, above, a star and a crescent. Between these is a circular disc, which may be intended for the sun. In the exergue are two bird-like scrolls or scroll-like birds. The legend reads: + SIGILLVM : CIVITATIS : EXONIE. The type of lettering is peculiar, especially the crossed I and the X (Pl. i, a.)

The date of this seal has generally been put at about 1180, both from its style and also from the fact that Prudum, the donor, was presumed to have been the founder of St. Alexius Hospital, Exeter, in 1170. But Miss Lega-Weekes¹ has now thrown considerable doubt on the presumption that Prudum was the founder of the hospital and she considers that the donor of the seal was more likely to have been a William Prudum, clerk, who flourished about 1200. Miss Lega-Weekes thinks, however, that the matrix may still be of the twelfth century; but as the legend, unless added later, implies that Prudum was dead when the city acquired the seal, and as Prudum was certainly living at the beginning of the thirteenth century, it would seem doubtful if it can be dated quite as early. Anyhow the earliest known impression is on a deed which can be dated 1210-16, while another, now lost, was believed to have been on a deed dated 1208-9. It is therefore apparent that the matrix

¹ *Proc. Devon. Assoc.*, xlvii, pp. 248-56.

cannot be later than 1210-16, and may be as early as 1208-9.

That Luke made this seal is proved by the inscription on the back. It may be presumed, therefore, as was long ago pointed out by Sir William Hope,¹ that he also made the seal of the neighbouring borough of Taunton, which apart from small points of detail is almost identical, the only differences being the substitution of croziers for the keys in the field, and groups of dots for the star, crescent and disc. The birds in the exergue are here clearly peacocks with a fleur-de-lis between them. The lettering also is similar, and although the I's are not crossed, the cross bar of the N in commune is (Pl. ii, *a*).

I have said that this Taunton seal must have been made by Luke. But Mr. Lloyd Parry in his valuable monograph on the Exeter seals² does not agree. He writes (p. 5) : ' It is generally inferred that the Taunton seal must have been made about the same time as the Exeter seal and by the same artificer, Lucas. The absence of his name from the Taunton matrix, the careless workmanship shown by the faulty " N " in the inscription, and the improbability that such a master of his craft would have been content to merely repeat his own design are, however, against such an inference.'

Here I feel that Mr. Parry has allowed civic pride and local patriotism to bias his judgment. The design and workmanship of the Exeter seal to my mind do not indicate a ' master of his craft,' both design and workmanship are crude ; the reversed N (I presume that this is Mr. Parry's ' faulty ' N) is a common phenomenon, whereas the absence of Luke's name counts for nothing. It is very exceptional for a matrix to be signed ; in fact, the Exeter seal is the only early example that I can recall.

Two, and perhaps three, other seals may be ascribed to Luke's hand or to his influence, and all belong to Exeter. The first of these is that of the Exe Bridge (Pl. ii, *b*). Here while the little shrines on the bridge are at least

¹ Jewitt and Hope, *Corporation*
Plate, ii, p. 308.

² *Exeter Civic Seals* (Commin.
Exeter), 1909.

reminiscent of the shrine on the Exeter and Taunton seals, the crossed I and the pointed O in the legend are identical with those on the Exeter seal. Mr. Parry in his book (p. 8) shows that the date of this seal cannot be earlier than the building of the first stone bridge over the river in 1250-1, and he considers that this is the bridge represented on the seal, with its chantry to the Virgin and a shop on either side. He states that an earlier wooden bridge was formerly in existence. For my part I find it difficult to believe that this seal is as late as 1250, and should like to think that the bridge represented is the earlier wooden one. But as it seems clear that the Bridge estates were not acquired until about 1250 and with them the need for a seal, there can be little doubt that this is its date. The matrix is of lead and this may in part account for the crudity of the design. Although therefore the seal can hardly have been made by Luke himself, I have little doubt that its maker was following Luke's tradition, and possibly had the City seal before him. The other two seals which may with some probability be ascribed to Luke's hand are those of the Hospitals of St. Alexius and St. John in Exeter, where the design of the shrines has much in common with those on the Exeter and Taunton Seals (Pl. ii, *c, d*).

Unfortunately no other seals which can even tentatively be ascribed to Luke have been found, but that he was a West Country craftsman probably living in Exeter is more than likely. It would be interesting if other examples of his handicraft could be discovered, as these might establish the existence of a West Country school of seal-engravers at this early date.

The next engraver of whom I have evidence is WALTER DE RIPA, goldsmith, who made the first Great Seal of Henry III in 1218. For the first two years and more of his reign Henry was a minor and the seals of his guardian Walter Marshal, Earl of Pembroke, and of Gualio the Papal Legate had been used. The taking into use of the king's own seal is noted by an entry in the Close Roll of 1219: 'hic inceptit sigillum regis currere.' The payment for the

seal is also noted in the Close Rolls under the dates 7th November and 2nd December, 1218 :—

‘Liberate de thesauro nostro Waltero Aurifabro qui fecit sigillum nostrum v marcas pro argento sigilli nostri ponderante v marcas et pro opere mercedem suam ita reddatis quod de jure contin’ e’e debeat.’

‘Liberate de thesauro nostro Waltero de Ripa Aurifabro, xl solidos in mercedem operis sigilli nostri quod fecit.’

Walter therefore got 5 marks (£3 6s. 8d.) for the cost of the silver and 40 shillings (£2) for his work, or £5 6s. 8d. in all.

The seal is a very beautiful and dignified composition, which in many respects is exceedingly like, although artistically and technically a great advance on, that of Henry’s father John. A particularly noteworthy feature is the walking horse on the reverse (Pl. iii).

In the Accounts of Christ Church, Canterbury, is this entry under the date 1221 : ‘pro quadam domicula paranda ad opus Simonis Aurifabri ad faciendum novum sigillum iiij sol. j d. Pro metallo empto ad novum sigillum, v sol.’¹

What was this seal for which SIMON had to have a shed made and for which the metal cost five shillings ? The seal clearly was not the second seal of the cathedral priory, for impressions of this are found as far back as 1175. Nor was it the third seal, for that is known to have been made, or at least paid for in 1233 (in opere novi sigilli vij l. vj sol. viij den²) ; and although the maker may well have had to wait for his money, twelve years is a long time. Unless, therefore, it was the seal of some prior or some other seal of which no impression survives, it may well have been the seal *ad causas* of the priory, although the small cost of the metal (5s.), if the account represents the whole amount, rather militates against this view as the seal *ad causas* is a large double one. But the account does not say of what metal the seal was made ; if it was of

¹ Hist. MSS. Com. Appendix to 5th Report, p. 441.

² Extracts from documents relating to cathedral . . . of Canterbury, p. 20.

bronze perhaps five shillings is not a very low price. There is also a mysterious entry in another Christchurch account of this year which must be mentioned in this connexion: 'et cum denariis datis pro falso sigillo scilicet lxx marcas.'¹ What this fraudulent seal was I do not know, but forged seals were not unknown at this time.² The fact that Simon did his work on the premises and not in his own workshop, wherever that may have been, rather suggests that secrecy was advisable, and that therefore the false seal may be the one on which he was employed.

Anyhow, whether Simon made the seal *ad causas* or no, it can I think be demonstrated that the engraver of it, or craftsmen deriving their designs from him, in other words his school, made several others.

The obverse of this seal is alone relevant to our present purpose (Pl. iv, *a*). This shows the martyrdom of St. Thomas within a church. The church has gables, those in the transepts being arcaded. In the main gable, western as I take it to be, is a trefoil opening containing a half-figure of Christ, and in the tympanum below are two angels holding a sheet in which is the soul of the martyred archbishop. The perspective of the eastern transepts should be noted. The date of this seal may well be 1221.

Now if this seal be compared with the reverse of the third seal of the cathedral priory, paid for in 1233, many points of similarity will be apparent (Pl. iv, *b*, *c*). The design is more elaborate, but otherwise it is almost identical, and from its general character, especially the rather more developed lettering, it is clearly a later version. The obverse of this seal has a representation of the cathedral church with central and western towers with low spires, in which are quatrefoil openings containing heads, and with censing angels issuing from clouds on either side of the central tower.

With the second seal of Norwich cathedral priory we get another fixed date, as its rim legend, cut where the milling is on a coin, states that it was made in 1258—ANNO DOMINI MILLESIMO DVCENTESIMO QVIN-

¹ *Ibid. loc. cit.*

² Cf. Anketil of St. Albans, above, p. 155.

QVAGESIMO OCTAVO FACTVM EST HOC SIGILLVM. Here there can be no doubt of the influence of the third Canterbury seal. The designs are identical, even to the censuring angels, although the Norwich seal is far more elaborate, and as is to be expected from the date an advance upon the Canterbury one (Pl. iv, *d*, *e*).

Let us now see if these comparisons can be extended further, and take as a start the seal of Milton abbey, Dorset (Pl. v, *a*, *b*). The spires are there although the towers are lower and there are no quatrefoils; there are also the same censuring angels, and on the reverse is the quatrefoil enclosing a head in the gable, exactly like that on the third Canterbury seal. The reverse of the second seal of Faversham abbey, Kent, is again similar; it is smaller than the third Canterbury seal, but in design is almost identical with its obverse. There are the same towers with spires, the same quatrefoils, here enclosing the symbols of the evangelists, and the same censuring angels (Pl. v, *c*). The reverse of another Dorset seal, that of Shaftesbury abbey, although far from being identical yet combines many of the features of the others (Pl. v, *d*).

The famous seal of Southwick priory, Hants (Pl. vi), famous because of the peculiar way in which the impressions were made,¹ again in many ways is almost identical with the Norwich one, the obverse not so much as the reverse; but on the reverse the octofoil opening in the gable, the western doors containing the group of the Annunciation, and the type of lettering are the same. This seal raises the interesting point whether several of those we are considering were not originally made with pierced openings like this seal of Southwick and its companion Boxgrove priory, which also shows the influence of this school. The Canterbury seal is known from impressions² to have had these pierced openings originally (the alterations may have been made by one Thantone, to be referred to later), and it seems at least likely that the seals of Norwich, Faversham and Milton had them too.

The seal of St. Paul's cathedral (Pl. vii, *a*, *b*) has some

¹ See *Archaeologia* xxxiii (1831), pp. 374-9.

² E.g. *Brit. Mus. Catalogue of Seals*, vol. i, no. 1374.

points of similarity with the others in this group, although perhaps too much stress should not be laid upon them, as also have the first seal of the town of Rye, the seal of St. Werburgh's abbey, Chester, and that of Bromholm priory, Norfolk.

The group is completed by the seal of Newenham priory, Bedfordshire (Pl. vii, *c, d*). Here the architecture of the upper part of the central portion of the reverse is identical with the similar part of the Canterbury seal *ad causas*. There are the same trefoil openings in the gables and the same strange perspective of the eastern transepts. And this seal of Newenham brings us back to the point from which we started.

I feel, therefore, that it may be taken at least as probable that all the seals in this group, except possibly St. Paul's and Shaftesbury, are at least from the same school, if not by the same hand. Whether the maker or the founder of the school was Simon can, however, only be a matter for conjecture, for there is no proof that the seal he made at Canterbury in 1221 was the *ad causas* seal of the cathedral priory.

Where his or his school's headquarters were again can only be conjectured. I doubt if it was at Canterbury, in spite, or perhaps because, of the domicula. The seals are distributed in Kent, Norfolk, Hampshire, Sussex, Bedfordshire, Cheshire, Dorset and perhaps London. With such a wide distribution it seems much more likely that the centre was in London itself.

One of the most noteworthy of the band of artist-craftsmen which Henry III gathered round him was Edward son of Odo, generally known as EDWARD OF WESTMINSTER. A goldsmith by trade, he did much work for the king at Westminster and elsewhere, supplying plate, and painting pictures for the abbey. Those who have studied his career consider him one of the most versatile craftsmen of his day and are of opinion that he carried out most of the work, including the paintings, with his own hand. This being so it is not surprising to find him supplying seals, although I must confess that the entries to be quoted make me very doubtful if he added seal-cutting to his other accomplishments.

The first seal with which Edward was concerned was one for Ireland in 1246. The relevant entry in the Liberate Roll, dated 30th August, 30 Henry III (1246), runs as follows :—

‘Allocate Willo Hardel custodi cambii nostri in exitibus ejusdem cambii . . . quinquaginta solidos quos liberavit per preceptum nostrum in puro argento Edwardo filio Odonis ad faciendum inde quoddam sigillum nostrum missum in Hyberniam et quadraginta solidos quos liberavit Ricardo Patricii pro opere ejusdem sigilli.’

The payment to Richard son of Patrick for the work on the seal makes it practically certain that Edward was not the actual engraver. I suppose that it is too much to suggest that an Irishman was employed on an Irish seal, but Richard’s surname is at least suggestive. No specimen of this seal has so far been found.

The other seal with which Edward of Westminster was connected was that for Gascony made in 1254. The entry in the Liberate Roll is as follows :—

‘Liberate de Thesauro nostro Edwardo de Westmonasterio xl solidos pro xl solidos unde sigillum nostrum Wasconie fieri fecit et xxxv s. ad acquietandam operacionem ejusdem sigilli.’

Here again the use of the phrase *fieri fecit* makes it unlikely that Edward was the actual engraver.

Fortunately an example of this seal has survived on an Harleian charter in the British Museum (43C39) dated 1253 (it may therefore be presumed that Edward had to wait a few months before being paid). It has been published by Mr. Jenkinson in *Archaeologia*¹ (Pl. viii, a, b). The impression is unfortunately much damaged, but on the obverse is a representation of the king on horseback and on the reverse a shield of the arms of England. The obverse is in many respects reminiscent of the first seal of Henry III made by Walter de Ripa, but there are several other smaller equestrian seals which are even closer, and may well, I think, be the products of Edward’s shop. Such are the king’s own smaller seal c. 1263, the second seal of the king’s brother Richard Earl of Cornwall, the seal of Richard’s son

¹ Vol. lxxxv, Pl. lxxxix.

Edmund, that of Gilbert of Clare, 9th Lord of Clare, and the Exchequer seal of Edward I (Pls. viii, ix). The reverses of the Exchequer seal and of those of the two earls of Cornwall show a single shield of arms. The Exchequer reverse is almost identical with the Gascony one, a likeness which can hardly, I think, be explained except by direct copying, as Edward's *floruit* did not, I understand, extend into the reign of Edward I. On the other hand it is possible that the seal is that of Henry with the name altered, as is known to have been done with the small seal. The late Professor Lethaby¹ stated that 'WALTER DE CROXON, goldsmith, in 1237 made the Exchequer seal of Henry III,' but unfortunately he gives no reference and cites no authority. The late Mr. C. S. Percival² considered that Edward's Exchequer seal was originally engraved for Henry III. If both these authorities are right it must have been Walter de Croxon and not Edward of Westminster who was responsible for this Exchequer seal of Edward I.

As Edward of Westminster was undoubtedly the chief goldsmith of his day, I like to think that he may have been responsible for the seal of Merton Priory, a house closely connected with the king. The obverse of this is to my thinking the finest seal ever cut. The reverse is not so outstanding, but the design and modelling of the obverse (the highest relief is $\frac{1}{4}$ inch) are incomparable. This seal is known from an entry in the Annals of Waverley³ to have been taken into use on the eve of the feast of St. Lucy (12th December) 1241. The design of the seal of Bruton abbey, Somerset, is in many respects identical, although the relief is not so high. On either side of the figure of the Virgin are pointed oval openings, containing heads, similar to those on the Merton seal, while the canopy work is identical. The two seals must, I feel sure, be by the same hand (Pl. x).

For references to two of the next engravers to be dealt with, I am indebted to Mr. Salzman's *English Industries in the Middle Ages*, where he quotes the relevant extracts from the Exchequer King's Remem-

¹ *Westminster abbey and the King's Craftsmen*, p. 298.

² *Proc. Soc. Antiq.* viii, p. 300.

³ *Rolls Ser.* 36, vol. ii, p. 329.

brancer Rolls. The first is WILLIAM DE KEYLES, who in 1299 made the silver Great Seal of Margaret, the second wife of Edward I, and also her privy seal in gold.

The great seal is a large double one, pointed oval in shape. On the obverse is a standing figure of the queen, crowned, holding a sceptre and wearing gown and mantle. The gown is emblazoned with the arms of England, and on trees on either side are hung shields of the arms of France and Brabant, for her father and mother, Philip III of France and his second wife Marie daughter of Henry III of Brabant. The reverse shows a shield of the arms of England hanging from a tree, with an orle of fleurs-de-lis round the shield (Pl. xi).

This seal follows the traditional type, the design being similar to those of Eleanor of Provence, wife of Henry III and of Eleanor of Castile first wife of Edward I.¹ The standing figure is to be seen on most seals of ladies of this period.

The privy seal may be the one in the British Museum on Add. ch. 18,199 dated 1300, or one on a document in the possession of the Droitwich Corporation, of which a cast is in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries; the design on this consists of a leopard in a circular opening surrounded by a border of fleurs-de-lis. The seal in the British Museum is a little smaller, measuring only one inch in diameter, and shows within a rose-shaped traceried opening a shield of the arms of England dimidiating France, with a letter of the queen's name—MARGARETA—each in one of the outer spaces of the opening. Of these two seals I am inclined to attribute the first to William de Keyles, the border of fleurs-de-lis being very reminiscent, if nothing more, of that on the reverse of the queen's great seal.

Another member of the Keyles family, Simon, in 1307 made a small seal of absence for Edward II, for use while he was at Boulogne getting married. For this Simon received £5. He also received £14 for

¹ The late Professor Lethaby (*op. cit.*, p. 287) suggested that this seal of Eleanor of Castile was the work of

William Torel, the maker of her effigy; but he cited no evidence except similarity of design.

casting (*fundendo*) and making a new seal for the 'Kingdom of England' and a small seal of one piece for the county of Ponthieu.¹ It is difficult to know what this seal for the Kingdom of England was. It can hardly have been the Great Seal, for that was Edward I's with the addition of the castles, although the word '*fundendo*' possibly suggests that a cast may have been made from Edward I's seal and the castles engraved on that and not on the original matrix. But this reference to casting opens up a large subject which cannot be dealt with here. The seal for Ponthieu was presumably for the queen, but I have not been able to find a specimen.

The other engraver, for a knowledge of whom I am indebted to Mr. Salzman's book, is REYNOLD DE BEREMI, who about 1307 made a privy seal for Edward II at a cost of £4. This is a small seal with a shield of the arms of England. In the Public Record Office² there is an example of what appears to be this seal covered with muslin, the seal being affixed to the face of the document and not pendent from it.

There is nothing distinctive about the design of this little seal. It follows the usual practice and may be compared with many others, for instance with the reverse of Edward I's Exchequer seal already referred to. It would, therefore, be unprofitable to attempt to draw inferences from it as to Beremi's other work.

Those who know the charming Norfolk village of Castle Acre, with its priory, castle and parish church, will be interested to learn that it was the birthplace, (for so I take it it must have been) of a prominent fourteenth-century London goldsmith, for I can hardly believe that JOHN OF CASTLE ACRE, with whom I will now deal, could have come from anywhere else.

In the Issue Roll of Easter 6 Edward III (1332), 2nd June, is this entry³ :—'To a certain goldsmith of London, in money, paid to him by his own hands for making a certain great seal for the Chancery of the lord the King, £5.'

¹ Tout, *Wardrobe and small seals*, v, 132 and n. 5.

³ Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 142.

² Ancient Deed W.S. 342; Blair, *Durham Seals*, Pl. E, fig. 5.

Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte in his book on the Great Seal,¹ to which I am constantly indebted, referring to the K.R. Memoranda Roll, Records m. 107d, says :— 'In February, 1326, John of Castle Acre, a goldsmith of London, brought into the Exchequer a great seal which had been newly made for use in the Chancery. This was found by the Treasurer and barons to weigh £6 10s., according to the weight of the mint (cambii) of London.'

In spite of the difference in dates these two entries can only refer to the same seal, the second seal of Edward III, which was in use from 1326 to 1340 ; the first seal used was that of Edward I, adapted for Edward II and then again for Edward III. John of Castle Acre, therefore, did not receive his full payment for six years, if it may be presumed that the payment of £5 made in 1322 was for the work on the seal, the £6 10s., if a payment, being the cost of the metal.

The seal is a large double one, showing on the obverse the king crowned, holding an orb and sceptre, and seated on a throne with a pinnaced and canopied back ; in the field on either side is a fleur-de-lis, presumably referring to his mother. On the reverse the king is depicted in armour on horseback, with the English leopards on his shield and trappers. The seal is a very fine one and shows that the maker was an expert craftsman, but there is nothing so distinctive about it as to enable other seals to be ascribed to the same hand (Pl. xii, *a*, *b*).

There is, however, one other seal that must almost certainly have been made by John of Castle Acre, and that is his own seal which is on a Harleian charter in the British Museum dated 1319.² It is a small armorial seal, showing within a traceried opening a shield of arms (a fess and 3 triple towered castles) between 3 slipped quatrefoils. The legend except for the initial S of Sigillum is lost. Unfortunately, owing to war conditions, I have been unable to secure a cast or photograph.

Most of the remaining engravers will have to be

¹ *Historical Notes on the use of the Great Seal of England*, p. 313.

² Harl. ch. 45B 34, *B.M. Cat.* 8396.

treated somewhat summarily, chiefly because there is very little material to go upon. HUGH LE SELER, the first to be considered, is of interest both for his name and for the place where he worked. In 1333 he made the seal for the see of Durham *sede vacante*. The entry in the Issue Roll¹ is as follows:—‘20th October. To Hugh le Seler of York for making a new seal for the regulation of the see of Durham now vacant by the death of Lewis of good memory late bishop of the see aforesaid (and now in the hands of the King) weighing £1 17s. 8d. for which the same Hugh received 30s. on 8th October last past, and now on this day the remaining 7s. 8d. for the weight aforesaid and 20s. for the workmanship of the said seal also for the loss in fusing the same £1 17s. 8d.’

Devon would appear to have misread the date, for Beaumont died on 26th September, 1333, and was succeeded by Graystones on 19th December. His appointment was, however, not confirmed by the king and he shortly resigned in favour of Richard of Bury. The employment of a York engraver is interesting, but possibly owing to the irregular election of Graystones speed was necessary, and it will be noticed that Hugh received his first payment on account within a fortnight of the bishop's death. Unfortunately no example of this seal is known to exist.

Among the accounts of Christ Church, Canterbury, is this entry²:—‘1336 (?). Solutum Thantone pro magno sigillo nostro de novo faciendo xli s.’ What this seal was it is a little difficult to say. There is no evidence for or record of a seal of Christ Church between the third made in 1233 and the fourth (the first of the New Foundation) made in 1540, and that the entry refers to the seal of the prior and convent is clear from the use of the words *magnum sigillum*. The entry may perhaps be best explained by rendering ‘de novo faciendo’ as re-fashioning, and referring the entry to the alterations to the seal necessitated by the abandonment of the elaborate arrangement of pierced openings, to which I have already referred. THANTONE is almost

¹ 6 Ed. III, Mich. I use Devon's translation in his *Issues*, p. 143.

² *Extracts*, p. 21.

certainly the John de TAUNTON of London, who in 1346 was paid a final instalment of £5 for making the privy seal for the king provided in 1340.¹

In the Issue Roll of 24 Edward III Easter (1350) is this entry² :—'2nd June. To JOHN DE GRYMSTEDE a goldsmith of London, in part payment of £4 paid to him for engraving a certain seal for the lord the king for Ireland, by order of the Council, £2.' I have not seen an example of this seal and doubt if one exists. The only Irish Great Seals of this reign listed by Mr. Jenkinson³ are on documents dated 1336 and 1337, none of which from the dates is likely to be this one made by Grymstede, and there are no judicial seals known to him of this date.

In August, 1351, in a list of goods delivered out of the Wardrobe is the mention of a seal set with a sapphire engraved with a horseman (the chivalrot), delivered to RICHARD OF GRIMSBY. Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte considers that this⁴ presumably refers to the secret seal which was in use in 1330 and that as Grimsby was a goldsmith it may be reasonably conjectured that the seal had been entrusted to him for alteration.⁴

Five years later there was more work done on the privy seals. On 2nd August, 1356, WILLIAM OF MORTON, a goldsmith of London, was paid £3 for making a certain seal for the King's use. Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte⁵ first identified this with a seal measuring 1½ inches in diameter with the legend SECRETVM EDWARDI REGIS FRANCIE ET ANGLIE ET DOMINI HIBERNIE, but he now agrees with Professor Tout that this cannot be the seal in question.⁶

In December, 1356, JOHN OF CHICHESTER, goldsmith, was paid £8 for making a privy seal for the king. This apparently is the seal with the arms of Old France quartering England on a shield with three crowns around it, and with the legend SECRETVM EDWARDI REGIS FRANCIE ET ANGLIE⁷ (Pl. xii, c). Nearly five years later in June, 1361, Chichester was paid

¹ Tout, *op. cit.* v, p. 133, n. 2 and Pl. i, 6.

² Devon, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

³ *Archaeologia* lxxxv, p. 316.

⁴ *op. cit.*, p. 105.

⁵ *op. cit.*, p. 43.

⁶ Tout, *op. cit.*, v, p. 139, n. 3.

⁷ Tout, *op. cit.*, v, pp. 139-40 and Pl. ii, 3.

£7 18s. 8d. for making two silver seals for the privy seal of the king, which Professor Tout suggests shows that at this date it was found necessary to have the privy seal in duplicate. This seal was probably the fifth privy seal of Edward III, which in design is almost identical with the last, except that a head and a rose have been engraved respectively above and below the right and left crowns, and that the legend reads EDWARDVS DEI GRATIA REX ANGLIE DOMINVS HIBERNIE ET AQVITANIE¹ (Pl. xii, *d*). Edward's constant change of title must have meant a small fortune to the seal engravers.

We know rather more of Chichester than we do of most other medieval goldsmiths. In 1360 he was paid £139 7s. 4d. for jewels which the king purchased from him for the wedding of John of Gaunt and Blanche of Lancaster,² and in the same year he supplied a silver-gilt and enamel cup at a cost of £7 16s. as a present from the king to Hawinus van Pannys, a knight of Germany, who had come to England to treat with the king and council.³ He was master of the mint in 1352, 1365 and 1367, sheriff in 1359 and mayor in 1369-70. His shop was in Cheapside at the corner of Friday Street.⁴

On 31st January, 1380-1, the sum of fifty shillings was paid to WILLIAM GEYTON, specifically called the king's engraver in the Tower of London, for alterations made by him on the Great Seal used in the Chancery as well as on the king's seals used in the King's Bench, Exchequer and Common Pleas at the beginning of the king's reign.⁵ That is he received £2 10s. for cutting out the letters Edw on the late king's seals and substituting for them the letters Ric, eight times in all, which seems to be a very fair payment. The great seal altered was Edward III's well-known Bretigny seal, which had already had its legend altered once when Edward resumed the title of King of France. The alterations to the judicial seals must have been the first made to these, which appear to have been the same, with alterations, down to the reign of Henry VIII (see p. 173).

¹ Tout, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-1 and Pl. ii, 4.

² Devon, *Issues*, p. 172.

³ Devon, *Brantingham Roll*, p. 194.

⁴ Chaffers, *Gilda Aurifabrorum*, p. 30.

⁵ Issue Roll 4 Ric. II, Mich.;

Devon, *Issues*, p. 214.

Another engraver of whom very little is known is ADAM OF THORP, a goldsmith of London, who on 25th January, 1390, was paid £1 13s. 4d. for 'engraving a certain brass seal with the arms of the lord the king, ordered by the king's Council for the office of chancellor in the king's lordship within the county of Pembroke.'¹ Unfortunately no impression of this seal appears to be known.

On 4th March, 1391, PETER OF HILLTOFT, the king's engraver residing within the Tower of London, was paid £5 'for the workmanship and engraving of sixteen brass seals, with crowns and letters engraved round them for sealing of cloth sold, deposited in the county of Essex; and for the engraving of a brass seal with two impressions of the king's arms for the office of steward or receiver of the king's lordship of Haverford in Wales, which by the death of John Clannowe has now come into the king's hands.'²

So far as I can discover no impression of this seal for Haverfordwest is known, but I illustrate here a seal for the cloth subsidy for Essex (Pl. xv, a). Although this fairly well answers the description of a seal 'with crowns and letters engraved round,' it can hardly be one of those engraved by Hilltoft; the lettering is in good Lombardic capitals which had gone out of fashion thirty years before. Hilltoft's seals were probably far more like the better engraved of the Labourers Passes seals made in 1388.³

For JOHN EDMOND or ESMOND (the latter seems to be the correct form of his name) we have a great deal more information. He was a citizen and goldsmith of London and was keeper of the mint in 1389. On 14th August, 1400, £13 10s. was paid to him 'of the value or price of ten pounds weight of silver used by him for a great seal for the Chancery and for a white seal for the office of Privy Seal, made for the king's use, according to the form of a certain pattern remaining in possession of the said John.'⁴

¹ Issue Roll 13 Ric. II, Mich.; Devon, *Issues*, p. 242.

³ *Arch. Jour.* xi. (1854) pp. 31, 378.

² Issue Roll 15 Ric. II, Mich.; Devon, *Issues*, p. 246.

⁴ Issue Roll, 1 Hen. IV, Easter;

It is a little difficult to decide exactly what these seals were. Henry used two great seals during his reign: the silver seal, which was the last version of the Bretigny seal with the name of Richard altered to Henry, and the gold seal which will be considered in a moment. He had at least three privy seals or signets, but two of these were of gold. Most of the 10 lb. weight of silver must have been used, I suppose, for making the privy seal, but the two known privy seals are small and cannot well be the one referred to in this entry. As to the great seal the entry can only refer to the alteration in the Bretigny seal, the cost of which cannot have been large. The alternative is that another great seal was made of which nothing is known, which is extremely unlikely; or can it be that we have here another hint that these alterations were made not on the original matrix, but on a duplicate, cast for the purpose, a possibility suggested when considering the work of Simon Keyles (above, p. 166)?

Far more information about Esmond's work is to be found in a petition which his widow Emote made to Parliament in 1425 praying that certain moneys due to her late husband from the Crown might be paid to her. The relevant part of the petition is as follows¹ :—

A toutz les Seign̄rs Espirituelx & Tempelx en cest psent Parlement esteauntz, Supplie humblement v̄re simple & pōve Oratrice Emote, qe fuist la fem̄e John Esmond, Orfēve de Londres, qe come au dit John sont dues certains som̄es de Moneye, pur la facion & mutacion diṽses Sealx del t̄s noble Roy Henry Quarte, qe Dieu assoile, aiel n̄re dit S̄r le Roy q'or est, qe Dieu garde, par son comandement demesne en sa Chambre; c'est assavoir, pur la facion d'un grant pierre Sealx d'or, L li. Item, pur l'amendement & mutacion des none dez Grant Sealx Patents d'argent, c̄s. Item, pur la faisure d'un Prive Seal d'or, ove un cheine & ridell' de longure deux vergez, x li. Item, pur l'amendement & mutacion trois peire Sealx Patents d'argent; c'est assavoir un pur le Bank le Roy, l'aut' pur le

¹ *Rot. Parl.* iv., p. 312.

Cœ bank, & le tierce pur l'Eschequer du Roy, IIII li.
 Item, pur l'amendement & mutacion deux Sealx
 pur Caleis, & un pur Guynes, vi li. Item, pur la
 faisure d'un Signet d'or pur le Secretaire, xiii s.
 iiii d.

The sum total was £75 13s. 4d., and it will be observed that the greater part of the debt had been running for a quarter of a century, for certainly the gold great seal and the alteration in the patent seals were made at the beginning of Henry IV's reign. The sum owing was a large one and must represent, I suppose, at least £1,500 of our money; the gold great seal would have cost, therefore, about £1,000 to-day.

This golden seal is a very large one, measuring $4\frac{3}{4}$ inches in diameter (Pl. xiii). Technically it is a very fine production, although artistically it may be thought to be rather overloaded with detail and therefore not so satisfactory as some of the earlier seals. But there can be no doubt that the engraver was a very skilled craftsman. This seal was used by all three Lancastrian kings. What the nine seals patent of silver were I do not know, the alterations must have been in the name of the king; nor is a specimen of the gold privy seal known. (Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte¹ thinks that the chain attached to it suggests that it was worn round the neck as a badge of office.) The three judicial seals present many problems, which cannot be considered here; they have been fully dealt with by Mr. Jenkinson in his paper to which I have already referred. Suffice it to say that the matrices of two of these seals seem to have served with alterations for something like 150 years. What Esmond must have done, therefore, was to make the second of these alterations. The earliest impressions of the seal for the Common Pleas are from matrices made in 1344, which we have just seen were altered by Geyton for Richard II, and what Esmond did was to make the correction of Richard's name to Henry's. The design of the Exchequer seal shows the king on horseback on the obverse and a shield of the arms of England on the reverse; those for the King's Bench and Common Pleas are identical

¹ *op. cit.*, p. 45.

in design and show the king enthroned on one side and the royal arms—the quartered arms of Old France and England—on the other. The correction of the shield to show the arms of France modern was never made either by Esmond or by anybody else, and in fact the arms of Old France continued on these seals till the reign of Henry VIII.

Of seals for Calais only three examples are known to exist, one of Edward III and two of Henry VIII. Whether the seal of Edward III was altered for Richard II, and this again for Henry IV, I do not know, but Edward's seal shows the king on horseback on the obverse and a much smaller counterseal as the reverse with the device of a castle gateway (Pl. xiv, *a, b*). So far as I am aware, no example of the seal for Guynes is known. The gold signet for the secretary is possibly a small oval signet with the device of an ostrich feather within a collar of SS, or a slightly larger one with a shield of the royal arms also within a collar of SS.¹

In 1403 JOHN DOMEGOOD, lapidary of London, was paid 3s. 4d. 'for making and engraving a metal seal ordered by the advice of the king's Council for the subsidies of 3s. a ton and 12d. for the pound in the port of Plymouth.'² This may be the seal for the subsidy of Cornwall and Plymouth, the bronze matrix of which is now in the possession of Lord St. Levan at St. Michael's Mount. It shows a shield of the arms of England with the legend *Sigillum subs cornubie et Plymouth*. It is not a great work of art, and on the whole would seem to be of a later date than 1403, and therefore probably is not the work of Domegood (Pl. xv, *b*).

On 4th July, 1413, JOHN BERNES, citizen and goldsmith of London, engraved two pair of duplicate seals (by which is probably meant two double seals) for the principality of North and South Wales, for which he received in all £10.³ I have not been able certainly to identify these seals, but that for North Wales may be one showing the king on horseback on the obverse, his

¹ Lyte, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

³ Issue Roll, 1 Hen. V, Easter;

² Issue Roll, 4 Hen. IV, Mich.; Devon, *Issues*, p. 322.
Devon, *Issues*, p. 297.

shield and trappers charged with the three coward lions, with on the reverse a like shield of arms, surmounted by the prince's coronet and supported by two dragons each holding an ostrich feather (Pl. xiv, c, d).

Ten years later Bernes was employed on another and smaller job. On 18th October, 1423, there was paid to him £1 'in discharge of 20s. which the present king (Henry VI) with the advice of his Council commanded to be paid to the said John for his labour, costs and workmanship in lately riding to the king's castle at Windsor, at his own costs, and there engraving the Great Seal of the said lord the king with a secret sign and also for newly engraving an inscription round the King's privy seal.'¹ It is a homely picture of the worthy goldsmith hacking down to Windsor, and then charging up his travelling expenses like any modern civil servant putting in for his cab fares.

The secret sign was the small quatrefoil engraved in the cusing below the horse on the silver seal of Henry IV and V to differentiate it for the use of Henry VI. The other alteration was presumably to the privy seal of Henry V to suit it for his successor, but what it was I cannot tell, as the only example of Henry V's seal known has but one letter of the legend remaining and no impression of Henry VI's privy seal appears to be in existence.

Besides making seals, Bernes was also a moneyer, for in 1422 he was appointed to make the money weights for the noble, the half and quarter, and to stamp them according to the form of the statute of 9 Henry V.²

MATHEW PHELIP or PHILIP, who on 21st October, 1450, was paid £7 13s. 4d. for engraving a seal for the king's earldom of Pembroke,³ was a man of some little importance. A citizen and goldsmith of London, of which he was mayor in 1463-4, he was warden of the Goldsmiths' Company in 1474, when he subscribed 6s. 8d. towards St. Dunstan's feast, the total cost of which amounted to £15 5s. 2d.⁴ He was knighted

¹ Issue Roll, 2 Hen. VI, Mich.; Devon, *Issues*, p. 382, corrected by Wyon, *Great Seals of England*, p. 49.

² *Gild. Aur.*, p. 33.

³ Issue Roll, 29 Hen. VI, Mich.; Devon, *Issues*, p. 468.

⁴ *Gild. Aur.*, p. 37.

either in 1465 at the coronation of Elizabeth Woodville or six years later for his bravery in routing Falconbridge and the Kentish rebels.¹ Like many a modern city merchant he appears to have retired into the country towards the end of his life; at all events his wife Christine, who died in 1474, has a fine brass at Herne church in Kent.

No impression of this seal for the earldom of Pembroke is known to exist, but it must have been made for the interval between the death of William de la Pole in 1446 and the creation of Jasper Tudor in 1453.

Another instance of a privy seal with a chain attached is to be found in an entry in the Issue Roll of 6th May, 1450,² where THOMAS WYTHIALE, the king's engraver, is paid £3 6s. 8d. for newly engraving the privy seal and making a silver chain attached thereto. The chain cost 40s., its weight being 15 ounces at 2s. 8d. the ounce. For making the seal and chain Wythiale received £1 6s. 8d. The seal would appear to be one measuring $2\frac{1}{8}$ inches in diameter with a shield of the royal arms. I have only seen a photograph of this in Mr. Hunter Blair's book; the only word of the legend remaining is the first: 'secretum.'³

Another provincial seal-maker was a man named Joss or JOYCE, goldsmith, who in 1456-7 was paid 21s. 8d. for making the seals for the prior of Durham.⁴ The prior was John Burnaby, 1456-64. The impressions of this seal in the Durham Treasury, Mr. Blair informs me, are imperfect, but enough remains to show that it is a seal $2\frac{5}{8}$ inches long, representing St. Cuthbert seated, holding his crozier and St. Oswald's head, between two shields of arms, one of the priory and the other bearing a cross engrailed and four cinquefoils, presumably for Burnaby. In the base the prior kneels wearing mass vestments and holding a crozier.

That Joss was a local goldsmith is fairly certain from an entry in the Durham Feretrar's Roll of 1453-4,⁵ where a Joyce, goldsmith, is paid 4d. for

¹ Metcalfe, *Book of Knights*, p. 219; .
Gild Aur., p. 37.

³ *op. cit.*, no. 3041, and Pl. F, 7.

⁴ Durham (Rott. Burs.) Acct. Rolls (Surtees Soc.) iii, p. 634.

² Issue Roll, 28 Hen. VI, Easter; Devon, *Issues*, p. 466; Lyte, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

⁵ *Ibid.* ii, p. 475.



A



B

CITY OF EXETER

A. IMPRESSION ($\frac{1}{1}$)

B. MATRIX, BACK VIEW ($\frac{1}{1}$)

By permission of Mr. H. Lloyd Parry and Messrs. Commis

PLATE I.

To face page 176.



A. BOROUGH OF TAUNTON ($\frac{1}{4}$)



3. EXE BRIDGE, EXETER ($\frac{1}{4}$)



C. ST. ALEXIUS HOSPITAL, EXETER ($\frac{1}{4}$)



D. ST. JOHN'S HOSPITAL, EXETER,
1ST SEAL ($\frac{1}{4}$)



Obverse

1ST GREAT SEAL OF HENRY III (†)



Reverse

PLATE IV.



A. CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL: SEAL AD CAUSAS, OBVERSE, ($\frac{2}{3}$)



B



C

CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL: 3RD SEAL, OBVERSE AND REVERSE, ($\frac{1}{2}$)



D



E

NORWICH CATHEDRAL: 2ND SEAL, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{1}{2}$)



A
MILTON ABBEY : OBTVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{1}{2}$)



C. FAVERSHAM ABBEY, 2ND SEAL,
REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)

D. SHAFTESBURY ABBEY, REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)



Obverse



Reverse

SOUTHWICK PRIORY ($\frac{1}{1}$)



A



B

ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)



C



D

NEWENHAM PRIORY, BEDFORDSHIRE, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{1}{2}$)

PLATE VIII.



A
SEAL FOR GASCONY, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)

By permission of the Society of Antiquaries



C
HENRY III : SMALLER SEAL, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)



E
RICHARD, EARL OF CORNWALL, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)



A



B

EDMUND, EARL OF CORNWALL, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)



C



D

GILBERT OF CLARE, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)



E



F

EDWARD I, EXCHEQUER SEAL, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)

By permission of the Society of Antiquaries



B. BRUTON ABBEY ($\frac{1}{2}$)



A. MERTON PRIORY ($\frac{1}{2}$)



Obverse

GREAT SEAL OF MARGARET,



Reverse

2ND QUEEN OF EDWARD I (1)

PLATE XII.



A



B

SECOND GREAT SEAL OF EDWARD III, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{1}{3}$)



C

PRIVY SEAL OF EDWARD III ($\frac{1}{1}$)



D

PRIVY SEAL OF EDWARD III ($\frac{1}{1}$)



Obverse

GOLD GREAT SEAL OF HENRY IV ($\frac{2}{3}$)



Reverse

PLATE XIV.



A. SEAL FOR CALAIS ($\frac{2}{3}$)



B. COUNTERSEAL FOR CALAIS ($\frac{2}{3}$)

By permission of the Society of Antiquaries



C
SEAL FOR NORTH WALES, OBVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)



D
By permission of the Society of Antiquaries



A. SEAL OF CLOTH SUBSIDY FOR ESSEX ($\frac{1}{4}$)



B. SEAL OF SUBSIDY FOR CORNWALL
AND PLYMOUTH ($\frac{1}{4}$)



C
SEAL FOR IRELAND, OBTVERSE AND REVERSE ($\frac{2}{3}$)

By permission of the Society of Antiquaries

mending a bottle or cruet (*fiola*), which is hardly a job that would have been done by anyone but a man on the spot.

In 1461 JOHN ORWELL, goldsmith of London, made various privy seals and signets for Edward IV, one of laton, current for only a few months, for which he received 40s. for the making and engraving, and another of silver. This cost 21s. 4d. for the silver at 2s. 8d. the ounce, the same price as eleven years earlier, and 40s. for the making and engraving. I have not been able to see impressions of either of these, but Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte states¹ that the latter bore a shield of the royal arms between two upright feathers, a device that persisted for four hundred years or so. At the same time Orwell was paid 3s. 4d. for engraving the privy signet of gold and 6s. 8d. for making and engraving 'our last privy signet.' Sir Henry states² that at the beginning of the reign a signet measuring $\frac{7}{8}$ inch. in diameter was in use, and that in his third year Edward adopted a larger signet measuring about $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches in diameter, but from the date this can hardly be the second signet made by Orwell.

In the same year John Orwell (he is called Ordell but it must be the same man) received £10 'for the purchase of 2 lb. Troy of silver to make a seal for the lord the king for Ireland and for making same.'³ No impression of this seal has so far been found, but there is every reason to believe that Henry VIII's seal for Ireland was this seal of Edward IV with the name altered. It shows on the obverse the king enthroned between two lions holding banners of the royal arms and of the arms of Ireland, while on the reverse is a shield of the royal arms surmounted by a crown and supported by two lions (Pl. xv, c, d).

It should be noted that a John Orwell was engraver to the mint in 1432-40,⁴ but it is rather unlikely that it was the Orwell whom we are considering; it was more probably his father or an older relative.

Last of all, in 1485-6 HUGH BRICE, knight, was

¹ *op. cit.*, pp. 46-7.

³ Devon, *Issues*, Brantingham Roll, p. lvi.

² *op. cit.*, p. 126.

⁴ *Gild. Aur.*, p. 34.

paid £10 10s. for the silver of the great seal and £10 for engraving it and for altering the privy seal.¹ These should have been, therefore, the great and privy seals of Henry VII, but unfortunately the expenses were disallowed for want of a sufficient warrant. So either Henry got his seals for nothing, which, knowing his character for parsimony is perhaps not unlikely, or Brice had to make the best of a bad job, and possibly melt them down and use the silver for something else.

Brice was master of the mint in 1480, mayor in 1485, and was knighted in the Tower either at the Coronation on 28th October, 1485, or on Twelfth Day, 6th January, 1485-6.²

There is perhaps one question that arises in concluding this paper. Were the craftsmen we have been considering the actual engravers of the seals credited to them, or were they only the shopkeepers who supplied them? Some certainly must have been the actual makers. Such were Luke who signed the Exeter seal, Simon who had a shed made for him at Canterbury, Richard Patricii who is expressly named as the maker of Henry III's Irish seal, Hugh le Seler for he would hardly otherwise have had such a surname, William Geyton, Peter of Hilltoft and Thomas Wythiale, all described as the king's engraver, and John Bernes who rode down to Windsor to add the secret sign to the great seal. There is presumptive evidence that all these were the actual engravers. But of the rest, although they were in many instances paid for engraving, it is, I think, more likely that they only supplied the seals. They were all goldsmiths, and many of them are known to have supplied plate to the king. It is even, I think, doubtful if that versatile man Edward of Westminster was an actual engraver, for in the two entries dealing with him, in one he is associated with Richard Patricii as engraver, and in the other he is paid for getting a seal made (*fieri fecit*). Therefore I am very much afraid that at least half of the craftsmen with whom I have been able to deal were not seal-engravers at all.

¹ Lyte, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

² *Gild. Aur.*, p. 37; Metcalfe, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

I am indebted to various friends for help in giving me references and in various other ways, particularly to Mr. Hunter Blair, Mr. Hilary Jenkinson, Mr. J. G. Noppen and Mr. C. C. Oman. For permission to reproduce illustrations thanks are due to Mr. Lloyd Parry and Messrs. Commin (Pls. i and ii), and to the Society of Antiquaries (Pls. viii, *a*, *b*, ix, *e*, *f*, xiv, xv, *c*, *d*).

ENGLISH MEDIEVAL SEAL ENGRAVERS

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Seal.</i>	<i>Cost.</i>	<i>Authority.</i>
ANKETIL	c. 1150	An uncut seal found on his bench at St. Albans	—	<i>Gesta Abbatum</i> i, 108-9.
LURE	c. 1200	City of Exeter	—	Matrix signed.
WALTER DE RIPA	1218	1st Great Seal of Henry III	£5 6 8	Close Roll.
SIMON	1221	A seal for Christ Church, Canterbury	5 0	Accounts.
WALTER DE CROXON	1237	Exchequer Seal	—	Lethaby, <i>King's Craftsmen</i> .
EDWARD OF WESTMINSTER with	1246	Seal for Ireland	£4 10 0	Liberate Roll.
RICHARD PATRICII EDWARD OF WESTMINSTER (alone)	1254	Seal for Gascony	£3 15 0	Liberate Roll.
WILLIAM DE KEYLES	1299	Great and privy seals for Queen Margaret	—	Exch. K.R. ; Salzman, <i>Industries</i> .
SIMON DE KEYLES	1307	Edward II seal of absence	£5 0 0	Tout, v. 132.
"	"	Seals for ' Kingdom of England ' and County of Ponthieu	£14 0 0	
REYNOLD DE BEREMI	1307	Privy seal of Edward II	£4 0 0	Exch. K.R. ; Salzman, <i>Industries</i> .
JOHN OF CASTLE ACRE	1326	2nd Great Seal of Edward III	£11 10 0	Issue Roll.
HUGH LE SELER	1333	See of Durham, sede vacante	£3 7 8	Issue Roll.
' THANTONE '	1336(?)	Refashioning seal of Christ Church, Canterbury	£2 1 0	Accounts.
same man probably as				
JOHN OF TAUNTON	1340	Privy seal of Edward III	£5 0 0	Tout, v. 133.
JOHN DE GRYMSTEDE	1350	Seal for Ireland	£4 0 0	Issue Roll.
RICHARD OF GRIMSBY	1351	Altering Seal of Edward III	—	Wardrobe Accounts.
WILLIAM OF MORTON	1356	Secret seal of Edward III	£3 0 0	Issue Roll.
JOHN OF CHICHESTER	1361	Two privy seals of Edward III	£7 18 8	Issue Roll.
WILLIAM GEYTON	1380-1	Altering Great and Judicial Seals	£2 10 0	Issue Roll.
ADAM DE THORP	1390	Chancellor of Pembroke	£1 13 4	Issue Roll.
PETER OF HILLTOFT	1391	16 seals for cloth in Essex, and King's Steward for Haverfordwest	£5 0 0	Issue Roll.
JOHN ESMOND	1400	Great and privy seals	£13 10 0	Issue Roll.
"	"	Gold Great Seal, etc.	£75 13 4	Rot. Parl.
JOHN DOMEGOOD	1403	Subsidy seal for Plymouth	3 4	Issue Roll.
JOHN BERNES	1413	Seal for Wales	£10 0 0	Issue Roll.
"	1423	Correcting Great and Privy Seals	£1 0 0	Issue Roll.
MATTHEW PHELIP	1450	Seal for Earldom of Pembroke	£7 13 4	Issue Roll.
THOMAS WYTHIALE	1450	Altering privy seal	£3 6 8	Issue Roll.
JOSS	1456	Prior of Durham	£1 1 8	Durham Accounts.
JOHN ORWELL	1461	Edward IV, privy seals, etc.	£5 14 0	Issue Roll.
"	"	Seal for Ireland	£10 0 0	Issue Roll.
HUGH BRICE	1485-6	Great and Privy Seals	£20 10 0	Exchequer Account.