



ROME (VATICAN) HOARD II



COINS OF THE HUNTINGDON MINT



NORWICH OR NORTHAMPTON—A 'SHORTCROSS' PROBLEM

By F. ELMORE JONES

THE three early 'Shortcross' pennies of Northampton which are figured on Pl. VII and are described below were unknown either to Lawrence or to Wells and give us a new moneyer for that mint. To the best of my knowledge this is only the second time it has been possible to add a new name to Lawrence's table of moneyers in *BNJ* XI (1915), Rodbert F. B. (as distinct from Rodbert) at Oxford having been the first to be added.

MINT OF NORTHAMPTON

- Class 1a (1) HENRI . . . RE/X
+ WILLELM·ON·NORA Pl. VII Fig 5. (P. Woodhead).
(2) HE . . . ICVSR/EX
+ WILLE[LM·ON·]NORA Same die as No. 1. Pl. VII Fig. 6.
Class 1b (3) HENRICVS·R/EX
+ WILLELM·ON·NORh Pl. VII Fig. 7.

MINT OF NORWICH (OR NORTHAMPTON)

- Class 1b (4) HENRICVS R/EX (An early 1b die).
+ REINALD·ON·NOR Pl. VII Fig. 8
(5) HENRICVS R/EX Same die as No. 4 (Double struck)
+ WILLELM·ON·NOR Pl. VII Fig. 9.

WILLELM should now be recorded as a *Northampton* moneyer in Class 1a and b and the purpose of this article is to consider what effect this discovery has on the age-old problem of which coins, if any, in this Class should be assigned to Norwich; a problem which seemingly is still insoluble¹. For this purpose a brief recapitulation of the general picture may be helpful.

The distinction between the two mints presents no difficulty at all in the case of the later (post 1205) Class 5 coins. It is abundantly clear that both mints took part in the recoinage of that year and that Lawrence's allocation of the three moneyers ADAM, ROBERD and ROBERD.T. to Northampton and the three moneyers GEFREI, IOHAN and RENAUD to Norwich is absolutely right—and this despite the fact that a GEFREI *must* be accepted as a Northampton moneyer in Class 2b (*not* Class 1b as recorded by Lawrence) on the strength of two reverse dies both reading NOHA.

Nor is there any problem in the case of the five early Shortcross moneyers FILIP, HUGO, RAUL, SIMUN and WALTER, all of whom use an unequivocal Northampton mint signature (i.e. one ranging from NORH to NORAMTU) on some of their dies in Class 1, if not actually on all of them. The following analysis of the readings of the 23 coins in the British Museum of Class 1 of these five moneyers is enlightening and it is significant to observe that it is the coins of the only *six* letter name (WALTER) on which the indeterminate NOR mint signature predominates.

¹ The type classification used throughout is that of Lawrence in *BNJ* XI. It is appreciated that this classification defies precise distinction between the

coins of Classes 2, 3 and 4 but this limitation is not of any consequence for the purpose of this paper.

<i>Moneyer</i>	<i>Coins</i>	<i>Reading 'NOR' only</i>	<i>Extended Readings</i>
Filip	3	—	3
Hugo	3	—	3
Raul	7	1	6
Simun	1	—	1
Walter	9	6	3
	—	—	—
	23	7	16

Within these limits all is straightforward but there are still three moneyers to be fitted into place and it is here that the element of uncertainty is very apparent. Two of these are REINALD and WILLELM, all of whose coins, apart from the three 'new' coins of the WILLELM recorded above, read NOR only and could therefore be of either mint. REINALD¹ drops out in Class 1c but a WILLELM, who is presumably, but not necessarily, the same moneyer as that striking in Class 1, continues to strike in Class 4 using the abbreviated mint signatures NO and NOR and in Classes 3 and 4 the third 'indeterminate' moneyer RANDUL, whose coins read N, NI (sic), NO and NOR, appears on the scene and is attributed to Northampton. I know of no evidence against this latter attribution but neither Lawrence nor Wells seem to have published their reasons for it. I find it difficult to believe that this RANDUL, could possibly be identified with the Randulf of Rouen to whom the site of the Northampton mint was assigned on its closure in 1218 or with the RAUL of the Class 1 coins bearing in mind that Lawrence regarded RAUL as being a *later* version of the same name.

As to the NOR coins of REINALD and WILLELM in Class 1 which are undoubtedly the crux of the whole problem, these are at present assigned to Norwich. Norwich has always been assumed to have been a Class 1 mint and the question of the attribution of these 'indeterminate' coins seems to have been settled by Sir John Evans as long ago as 1865,² albeit quite arbitrarily, by the attribution of the coins of REINALD and WILLELM to Norwich and those of RANDUL to NORTHAMPTON. These attributions still prevail; they were accepted by Lawrence (but not by Wells) and Brooke endorses them in *English Coins*. However, I think Lawrence may have been influenced by the assumption (which may be only a coincidence, cf. the coincidence of a GEFREI at both mints) that the Class 5 Norwich moneyer RENAUD, who uses the earlier spelling RENALD on what is probably his earliest die, is to be identified with the REINALD of the Class 1 coins but I think the interval of time between the end of Class 1 (c. 1189) and 1205 is too long for this to be valid. It is clear, however, that the emergence of a WILLELM as a Northampton moneyer reopens the whole problem and poses the question as to whether Norwich was, in fact, a Class 1 mint at all. It is true that Norwich was the seat of one of the nine Exchanges set up on the inception of the Shortcross coinage in 1180³ but so too was Nottingham which, so far as we know, certainly did *not* have a mint at this period and there is no reason to assume that Nottingham was alone in this respect.

A die link between the undoubted Northampton coins and those assigned to Norwich would settle the problem once and for all but so far I have been unable to find one. The search for one is a formidable task and it remains to be seen whether this vital piece of evidence, if in fact it

¹ I am convinced Lawrence was in error in recording this moneyer at Norwich in Class 4 in two readings REINALD and REINAUD and am sure the coins do not exist. If they do exist they could well be the key coins for a solution of the problem under discussion but they are not to be found in the British Museum or in the Ashmolean and Fitzwilliam Museums—nor were they in Lawrence's

own collection or the Wells collection. I am convinced that Lawrence's slip stems from a misinterpretation of the type Classification of two Class 1c coins in the Colchester Find and recorded in *Num. Chron.* 1903 as being of Evans Type 2.

² *Num. Chron.* 1865 p. 219 f.

³ D. F. Allen. *B.M.C. Henry II 'Cross & Cross-lets' Type*. Introduction p. xci.

exists, will ever come to light. I have, however, found a die link between REINALD and WILLELM which proves that both coins (Figs. 8, 9, Pl. VII) emanated from the same mint and that these two moneyers stand or fall together.

This is a useful discovery and in the light of the evidence of the unpublished coins only two theories are possible. Firstly that Norwich did not strike in Class 1 at all and did not start up until the recoinage of 1205¹, it being only logical to assume, as indeed is assumed now, that the 'indeterminate' Class 4 coins of WILLELM should be given to the same mint as those of the WILLELM of Class 1, and, secondly, that the existing attributions hold good and that there was a moneyer WILLELM in Class 1 at both mints.

In that case Willelm's tenure of office at Northampton cannot have lasted very long, to judge by the rarity of his coins, but this also applies to two other Northampton moneyers GEFREI and SIMUN whose term of office could well have been even shorter than WILLELM's.

The former theory seems to be the more logical of the two but I have always been somewhat wary of the application of logic to problems of this nature. With reluctance I think I must decide that no firm conclusion is possible without fresh evidence coming to light and consequently that the problem still remains unresolved.

Writing in *Num. Chron.* 1931 Wells' solution of it was to transfer REINALD to Northampton but to retain the Norwich attribution for WILLELM. Two coins of REINALD are illustrated on the plate of Shortcross coins in *BNJ XXXI* 1931 Pl. VIII (nos. 4 and 12) alongside fourteen undoubted coins of the Northampton mint, no. 4 actually being a coin of REINALD in Class 1a, an unpublished sub-type for the moneyer and one not recorded by Lawrence. In point of fact the evidence Wells uses for both these attributions is misleading.

If Norwich was not a Class 1 mint it would be interesting to know why East Anglia, a wealthy part of the country in 1180, should have played no part at all in the recoinage of that year and subsequently such a major part in the recoinage of 1205. Also just why Northampton with as many as seven moneyers in Class 1 (and six in Class 1a in which respect it ranks equal with Winchester and second to London) should have been such a predominant mint in 1180, especially bearing in mind that in the preceding coinage the Northampton mint had been closed for something like fifteen years whereas East Anglia had been particularly active during that period.

However, administrative disruptions of this kind are typical of the reign and as regards the events of 1180 it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the mints which were active previously were closed down and those which had been closed were re-opened. It is against this background that we are faced with the problem under review here.

In conclusion I can only add that I hope some useful purpose has been served by this discussion of it and that such further evidence as I have been able to bring forward may assist its ultimate solution.

It only remains for me to express my gratitude to Mr. P. Woodhead for his excellent photography from which the Plate has been produced and to acknowledge his courtesy in allowing me to record his coin which is Fig. 5 on it. The other four coins on the plate are in the collection of the writer.

¹ We may reject Lawrence's recording of IOHAN in Class 4 at Norwich as having any real bearing on the question of whether that mint was in fact in operation before the recoinage of 1205. The coin on which Lawrence's recording is based is only known from one pair of dies. The reading IOHAN ON NORW is impeccable but the bust is quite unlike that on any other Shortcross coin and it may well

be a continental imitation. It is 'of the period' but it is certainly not from *official* dies. The possibility of REINALD in Class 4 has already been mentioned and I am convinced that the only coins of this Class which can be assigned to Norwich are those of WILLELM—with RANDUL's coins in Classes 3 and 4 still to some extent indeterminate.