

SOME SHORT CROSS QUESTIONS

By JOHN D. BRAND

ONE hundred years ago, there was only one Short Cross Question: to which King Henry all of these coins should be assigned? To Henry II as his second issue or to Henry III as his first issue? The absence of all English coins in the names of Richard I and of John was commented upon with puzzlement, as the records of the period showed references to coining in both of their reigns. It was the Rev. W. H. D. Longstaffe in 1863 who put forward for the first time the almost revolutionary theory that these pennies were actually issued by all four of these monarchs in succession, without change of design or even of the royal name.¹ Longstaffe distinguished virtually all of the varieties that we recognise today, only, unfortunately, reversing the correct order of the earlier issues. Following the discovery of the great Eccles hoard in 1864,² Sir John Evans published his classification of the Short Cross pennies which, though correcting Longstaffe's order, was a much simplified version, grouping together many dissimilar coins in some parts though elsewhere showing as separate issues coins which are virtually identical.³

This Evans classification remained the standard for the next fifty years, until Dr. L. A. Lawrence published the results of his researches and which is the standard system that is in use today.⁴ Lawrence's work has stood the test of time exceedingly well. Though nearly fifty years have passed again, modern enquiry can find fault only in detail. The only notable publications since Lawrence on these coins are the short papers by Mr. F. Elmore Jones, in which he subdivided the last group, class VIII, into four parts,⁵ and by Mr. R. H. M. Dolley on the coinage of the irregular mint at Rhuddlan⁶. No student can, however, afford to ignore the scholarly essay by Mr. G. C. Brooke which appeared in 1910.⁷

One type that has given generations much difficulty is Lawrence's class II. His IIa he described as:

'The contour of the whole head more rounded. The eyes appear to be made of two large pellets. The curls are many on both sides, and creep down towards the beard. Usually there are five pearls in the crown.'⁸

As one of the illustrations to his paper he showed the 'Lichfield' penny. It is just four years ago that Mr. Dolley and Mr. Elmore Jones, in a joint paper, called the authenticity of this 'Lichfield' penny into question.⁹ Their paper has unfortunately never been published, but Mr. Dolley has recorded the arguments in *Cunobelin*.¹⁰ I am in complete agreement with them that this coin has had its reverse legend altered by tooling and is not an emission from a mint at Lichfield, but I am forced to disagree with their choice as to the original reading. FILAIMER.ON.LV fits very nicely, but postulates a new type for this moneyer who is otherwise only known for classes Ia and early Ib. It would indeed be stretching the arm of coincidence if White had chosen an unique coin to alter into another unique coin.

¹ NC 1863, pp. 162-188.

² Thompson's *Inventory* 152.

³ NC 1865, pp. 255-95.

⁴ BNJ XI, pp. 59-100.

⁵ BNJ XXV, pp. 286-290.

⁶ Spink's *Numismatic Circular*, Nov. 1963, pp.

226-7.

⁷ NC 1910, pp. 291-324.

⁸ BNJ XI, p. 63.

⁹ BNJ XXX, p. 203.

¹⁰ *Cunobelin* 1963, pp. 29-36.

If Fil Aimer is rejected as a model, who can be put in his place? Assuming, as is most likely, that the letters ON are original work and that the initial cross was directly above one of the arms of the main voided cross, it must have been a very short moneyer's name with a long mint signature or, *vice versa*, a very long moneyer's name with a very short mint signature. It seems most unlikely that White, having tooled a new mint, would have then gone on to fabricate a new moneyer as well—and a common name at that—unless it was absolutely necessary. He certainly did not do this for the Helis coin of Oxford. The short moneyer and long mint can therefore in all probability be ruled out and the search confined to the long moneyers. Most of these can be eliminated on the grounds of length alone and there are left two principal likely originals: Goldwine of Canterbury and Stivene of London.

The first of these with a legend reading GOLDWINE.ON.CA, could fit, but is, in my opinion, not the original lettering of this strange coin. Stivene in its normal form is just a little too short, but an early variant spelling, Estivene, is exactly the right size. One of the coins in the British Museum, of early class IIa, reads ESTIVENE.ON.LV and, although not the same die, when compared with the 'Lichfield' penny corresponds with it exceedingly well. By rotating the 'Lichfield' coin ninety degrees in a clockwise direction the legends can readily be seen to have very similar spacings—

+ ESTIV ENE · ON · LV
hEFL+IOAN · ON · LI

or by rotating the London coin ninety degrees anti-clockwise

+ IOAN · ON · LIh EFL
IVENE · ON · LV+EST

Moreover, in the two places where the 'fit' is not too good, the 'Lichfield' coin is seen to have a mis-shapen letter, i.e. the 'h', and the 'n' of IOAN. However, it is not the same die and the final answer must remain an open question until a die link is found.

Discussion of the 'Lichfield' penny is a digression, though I think it is important to correct the attribution. There is a great variety of design of the head on many pennies that obviously fall on stylistic grounds somewhere between classes I and III. They are all rare, only some have all the characteristics of the Lawrence description, and there remains much work yet to be done on them. The coins that do not fit at all in this place, however, are what Lawrence called his class IIb. He described them as:

'Coarser work of much the same type (as IIa), pearls more numerous, curls fewer, often three on each side. Many of the coins have a colon on each side of the word ON on the reverse, instead of the usual single pellet.¹

The pennies with a colon are easy enough to classify by Lawrence. The similar pennies, but with normal pellet stops, have probably aroused more controversy amongst collectors in the last fifty years as to their exact classification, whether IIb or IV, than any other coins in this whole series. If they are all called IIb they greatly extend Lawrence's lists, not only of moneyers, but also of mints striking in this class. If they are called IV they can be virtually indistinguishable, by inspection of the obverses only, from coins with the colon stops. If the face is weakly struck or badly worn they can hardly be told apart from coins of IIIb.

¹ BNJ XI, p. 63.

It is my opinion that this part of the classification is one of the very few errors that Lawrence made. His IIb, so far from being a sub-variety of class II is a sub-variety of class IV and separated from the former by the whole of class III. Messrs. Dolley and Elmore Jones in their paper four years ago also put forward a similar proposition that the coins of IIb are later than those of IIIa, based largely on the negative evidence of recent finds¹ and Mr. Dolley has since published that in his opinion the order should be: IIa, IIIa, IIb, IIIb, IV, if in fact they do not overlap.²

What are Lawrence's classes III and IV? His descriptions are not a great help in distinguishing them from each other, but the illustrations to his paper are more helpful.³ All coins of class III have the beard composed of small curls: a feature that is otherwise found only on some varieties of IIa. The coins of class IV all have the beard composed of pellets: a feature that, in the whole of the Short Cross issues, is otherwise found only on IIb. This distinction by the beard is the most important difference to be noted and indicates the correct order of the varieties.

Class III is divided into two main groups: (a) with a large head, and (b) with a small head. Both have a pointed beard and to the practised eye there is little difficulty in placing any specimen to one or the other of these groups, even though there is within each a discernible development of style. Class IV exhibits a greater variety not clearly differentiated by Lawrence and I propose a sub-division into three sub-classes, or four if the coins with the colon stops are separated out.

IVa Three or four curls (occasionally more) on either side of the head. Similar to coins of class III apart from the beard. As in most, if not all, of the issues of Short Cross pennies the type is not frozen and a continuing evolution can be seen. In general, though not invariably so, the earlier coins of this group have a small head, similar in size to IIIb, which gradually gets larger. Included in this sub-class are the coins with colon stops on the reverse.

The exact relationship of these colon coins to the ordinary single pellet issues is not readily apparent, for whilst they are early in the sub-class they do not appear to be the earliest. It is a peculiarity which I can only compare with the ornamental letters that appear on some coins of class V and on some of class VI, and which also appear to have no rational explanation in the present state of our knowledge. Rather than give them a separate distinguishing letter, I prefer to denote them by an asterisk as IVa.*

IVb One or two curls either side of the head. The lettering is large and coarse, with the serifs to letters often placed inside the ends of the uprights. The letter s becomes blundered, often taking most unusual shapes.

IVc Lettering very similar in style to those of IVb, particularly in regard to the irregular placing of the serifs, but is noticeably smaller and neater. The letter s is well formed, but reversed, and the body of it appears to be made from a single iron. The outline of the chin is squarer and the pellets of the beard are often irregularly placed.

¹ BNJ XXX, p. 203

² Spink's *Numismatic Circular*, Nov. 1963, pp.

226-27.

³ BNJ XI, pp. 63-64, Plates II and III.

Lawrence mentions coins of class IV with an initial cross pommée on the reverse and quotes them as a pointer to the sequence of type from classes IV to V¹. Unfortunately he does not illustrate an example and I have only seen one coin that could be so described. It is in the Danish National Museum, Copenhagen, and came from the second Short Cross hoard found at Ribe.² It is of my IVb, moneyer Henric of London, and the initial cross is more like four blobs than a cross pommée³.

The chronology of these classes III and IV is based largely on the evidence of the mints at Shrewsbury and Durham. Mr. W. C. Wells published several interesting extracts from the Pipe Rolls referring to the mint at Shrewsbury and to a silver mine at Carreghova.⁴ In the year 1194 the burgesses of Shrewsbury were paid fifty four shillings for the cost of a new building to make pennies from the new mine. In the same year £20 was paid to Joseph the Clerk to sustain the Exchange at Shrewsbury, and a further £20 to purchase the mine. The mine was apparently opened about mid-summer 1194. In 1195 when the Clerk, Joseph Aaron, accounted for the mine, it showed little profit: £18 for the period from 24th June, 1194, to 21st May, 1195, and £2 7s. 8d. from 21st May to 1st August, 1195. After payment of wages for the entire period there was a deficit. In the same year, 1195, Joseph accounted for £2 0s. 2d. being the profit of the Exchange⁵ and also recorded that he had paid out £16 14s. 0d. to Robert of Shrewsbury, custodian of the mine at Carreghova and of the Exchange at Shrewsbury.

From these entries Wells concluded:

- (a) that it is *manifest* that all the Shrewsbury coins of the Short Cross series were issued between Michaelmas 1194 and Michaelmas 1195; and
- (b) as the Shrewsbury coins are of two classes only, IIIa and IV, the introduction of the latter must have occurred at some time in 1195.

He went on to argue that the mint at Durham which, on the authority of Roger de Hovenden, had been re-opened in 1196, or perhaps, on the strength of a phrase in the Pipe Roll for 1196, a little earlier, must have been re-opened in 1194 as its first coins were of class IIIb which comes between IIIa in issue at Shrewsbury in 1194 and IV which was issued in Shrewsbury in 1195. These assumptions are rather sweeping and are certainly not the only interpretation that can be put upon the few relevant facts available.

It may be considered as certain that the Shrewsbury mint commenced operations in 1194: the mint building was erected and silver was mined. It seems most unlikely, however, that it would only have coined silver obtained from the mine. If this had been the case, there would have been no necessity to have supplied money to sustain the Exchange. It may be assumed, therefore, with some confidence, that like other mints and exchanges it was 'open to all comers'. Accordingly, it would not necessarily have closed down at the same time as the mine closed. It is indeed not certain that the mine closed completely in 1195. Three moneyers in succession would seem to imply that the mint was open for more than just one year or fifteen months. Having acquired a mint and exchange the citizens of Shrewsbury would no doubt have tried to keep it for as long as possible.

¹ It may, or may not, be significant that Dr. Lawrence writing in 1922 (*SNC* Nov.-Dec. 1922) in reply to a criticism of his arrangement of the series, whilst stressing the significance of the reversed letter s as a link between classes IV and Va, did not mention the pommée initial cross.

² Not yet published. I am indebted to Otto Morkholm, the Keeper of Coins, for permission to

examine this hoard which is deposited in the National Museum, Copenhagen.

³ Mr. B. H. I. H. Stewart has since shown me a penny in his cabinet with a similar 'blob' initial cross, moneyer Henri of London.

⁴ *NC* 1932, pp. 215-235.

⁵ Recorded as the Exchange at Carreghova, presumably in error for Shrewsbury.

There is general agreement that the earliest moneyer at this mint was Willelm. The coins of Willelm however are not of class IIIa even though Lawrence himself classified them as such. They are actually of the oft disputed type, I Ib *cum* IV, which I now classify as IVa. The beard on these pennies is composed of very small and very fine pellets, quite unlike the curly beard of class III. The next coins of this mint are also of IVa though a little later in style. They were first published by Wells in his paper and are of the moneyer Reinald. Curiously it did not occur to Wells to re-examine the attribution of the coins of Reinald which use the same obverse die as Ive of Shrewsbury. The single letter of the mint signature on these Reinald pennies is, as pointed out by Mr. Elmore Jones, in fact a blundered s for Shrewsbury and not a c for Canterbury.¹ There are accordingly now known four obverse dies and four reverse dies used at this mint used in a total of five combinations as follows:

| | |
|--------------|------------------------------------|
| IVa Willelm. | one obverse, one reverse. |
| IVa Reinald. | one obverse, one reverse. |
| IVb Reinald. | one obverse, one reverse. |
| IVb Ive. | same obverse as last, one reverse. |
| IVb Ive. | new obverse, same reverse as last. |

From the preceding it may be concluded that IVa was in issue in 1194, and, on stylistic grounds, may even have started in that year. It must be presumed that Durham re-opened a little earlier, in the time of Bishop Hugh Pudsey. Roger of Hovenden's note of 1196 obviously refers only to the grant to the new Bishop, Philip of Poitou, on his appointment to the see in that year. His remark that coins had not been struck for many years would appear to be incorrect as the keepers of the see after Bishop Hugh's death on 3rd March, 1195 accounted for materials for the mint. I do not consider it at all necessary to assume that there is no chronological sequence in these issues, nor that Lawrence I Ib comes between IIIa and IIIb, as has been suggested from the extracts published by Wells.² Hoard evidence is rather negative on the question, but is certainly not inconsistent with my conclusions.

The next question to be considered is in relation to one aspect of the organisation of the mint, and my remarks here are confined to the period in which class V was in issue. This restriction is simply due to the fact that class V is the only group within which I have done any detailed research on this point. It may or may not be relevant at other periods. In the last few years die comparison has become very fashionable among numismatists, but for the very good reason that there can be much to be learnt about coins from use of this technique.

Firstly I examined the one-moneyer mint of Bury St. Edmunds. The names, both of the moneyer, Fvlke, and of the mint itself, show considerable variation and because of this the British Museum collections in particular include a comparatively large number of coins and varieties. The results obtained from comparing these coins for die identity were very encouraging. There are fifteen Bury St. Edmunds coins of this group in the British Museum and these include three pairs of coins struck from the same combinations of dies. The remaining twelve combinations form a broken chain and are made up from five obverses and ten reverses which, by simple arithmetic, is evident to be the classic, but conjectural, ratio of one to two. However, elsewhere there are three coins which slightly alter the position. Though all three fit into the chain, and in fact link up two parts so that there is an unbroken run throughout Vb, they do produce one new obverse die and one new reverse die, making the totals six obverses

¹ *BNJ*. XXVIII, p. 213.

² See *BNJ* XXVIII, p. 214, and Spink's *Numismatic Circular*, Nov. 1963, pp. 226-7.

and eleven reverses. The combinations are also uneven. The first obverse die is found in conjunction with no less than four reverses; the second obverse with two reverses, numbers four and five; the third obverse with three reverses, numbers five, six and seven; the fourth obverse only with reverse number seven; and the fifth obverse with three reverses, numbers seven, eight and nine. The last obverse, that of class Vc, is found with two reverse dies, but does not link at all with the preceding issue. This evidence tends to confirm that dies were used in the rough proportion of one obverse to every two reverses, but that this was more an accident of wear than a specific policy of issue. The sequence of spellings is of some interest. There are two variants from normal of the moneyer who is commonly spelt FVLKE. These are FVKE and FOLKE and both appear in the middle of the die chain, being reverses numbers six and seven respectively. The mint is first spelt SADMV (in one word), then, in order, S.EDM, S.AD, S.ADM, and in Vc reverts to S.AD and also S.AND (the N and D ligated).

At a two-moneyer mint, such as Ipswich, there is a much greater number of dies to contend with. To date I have found fourteen obverse dies in Vb and two in Vc. The moneyer Alisandre has fourteen reverse dies in Vb used with twelve of the relevant obverses, and only one reverse die of Vc used with both of the obverse dies. The other moneyer, Iohan, has only seven dies in Vb used with six obverses, but in Vc has two dies, each of which is used only with one of the obverse dies. No doubt examination of a larger number of coins will bring to light further dies and combinations of dies, and also correct the apparent disparity between the two moneyers which is perhaps due only to the fact that as Alisandre displays a greater variation of legend than Iohan so more of his coins are selected for collections. It is significant to note that both moneyers use the same obverse dies at the very beginning of Vb, later in Vb and also in Vc.

Three-moneyer mints display a similar pattern. At Oxford I have found eight obverse dies of which only one is used by all three moneyers, but a further four are each used by two moneyers: one by Ailwine and Henri, two by Ailwine and Miles, and one by Henri and Miles. At Lynn there are at least eleven obverse dies of which two are used by all three moneyers and a further one by Iohan and Willelm. The coins of this mint are so rare that it is not surprising so few links have yet been found. The coins of Exeter in this class are also rare. Of twelve obverses only one is used by all three moneyers and that is the sole die of class Va. However, a further four are used by Gileberd and Ricard, one by Iohan and Ricard, and one by Gileberd and Iohan. It is noteworthy that each of the moneyers has one reverse die of Va, and all three of these dies are used only with the single obverse die of that sub-class.

There are a further three mints which, according to Lawrence, each had three moneyers in class V. Two of these must be considered together, namely Northampton and Norwich, in view of another paper by W. C. Wells entitled "The Pipe Rolls and "Defalta Monetarium" ".¹ By dint of very special pleading he transferred two of the moneyers from Norwich to Northampton. On examination of the coins, however, those moneyers traditionally ascribed to Norwich prove to be all die-linked, which makes it virtually certain that all three were striking in Norwich and at the same time. I have not been able to find any die links of these three with the other three moneyers normally given to Northampton. But equally I have been unable to find as yet any die linking amongst the Northampton moneyers themselves. As Wells pointed out, Peter de Stokes paid to have four dies at Northampton in 1205 for one year. It does not necessarily and automatically follow that there were also four moneyers. It is not unknown for a single moneyer to have more than one die at the same time and it could be

¹ NC 1931, pp. 261-290.

that each of the Northampton moneyers in class V had four dies, but that they struck in succession. In the absence of die links there is no proof that they were striking at the same time.

At Norwich the moneyers are all die linked. Out of seventeen obverse dies five were used by all three moneyers and a further eight dies by two moneyers. The coins of this mint are more plentiful than those of the other mints previously considered, and by use of a number of reverse die links a complicated pattern can be seen.

NORWICH Class V

| <i>Obverse Dies</i> | | <i>Reverse Dies</i> | | |
|---------------------|------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|
| <i>Type</i> | <i>No.</i> | <i>Gifrei</i> | <i>Iohan</i> | <i>Renald</i> |
| a* | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| a* | 2 | | 2 | 1 |
| bi* | 3 | | 2 | |
| | | | 2 | |
| | | | | <i>Renald</i> |
| bi | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| bi | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| bii* | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| bii* | 7 | | 5 | |
| bii | 8 | 3 | 5 | |
| bii | 9 | 4 | 6 | 4 |
| bii | 10 | 4 | 7 | 4 |
| bii | 11 | 5 | 8 | 4 |
| bii | 12 | | 8 | 5 |
| bii | 13 | | | 6 |
| bii | 14 | 6 | 9 | |
| bii | 15 | 6 | 9 | |
| | | 7 | | |
| c | 16 | | 10 | 7 |
| c | 17 | 8 | | |

The lines denote use of the same die: horizontal and diagonal lines for obverse dies, and vertical lines for reverse dies. The numbers given to each moneyer bear no relationship to the numbers used for the other moneyers.

It will be observed that they fall into six groups and that there are only two 'odd' coins. Examination of a larger number of coins should fill in some of the gaps, and no doubt a number of combinations have been irretrievably lost through effluxion of time and by melting down. Evidently Gifrei did not strike in the first emissions from the mint, but came in with the 'second wave'. It may be worthy of note that both of Gifrei's reverse dies in the second group (his first coins) have aberrant spellings, Giefrei and Gieferei, which coincides with the change from Renald to Renavd, though the latter is permanent.

The complexity of the table, incomplete though it is, together with the evidence from the other mints¹ leads to the conclusion that, at least during the period in which class V was issued, the obverse dies in the provincial mints were not appropriated to the exclusive use of any one moneyer. They may indeed have been in a common pool for the use of all as needed. The frequency of the die-linking, bearing in mind the limited number of coins inspected, appears too extensive to be the result of mere borrowing by one moneyer from his fellows in the event of his own obverse die breaking or wearing out, and before he could be supplied with a replacement from the central die-cutting office in London. It is not certain that in a multi-moneyer mint sufficient obverse dies were in fact always issued to give one to each moneyer.²

The last mint to be discussed, and for a slightly different reason, is Rochester. Until 1902 it had only been credited with two moneyers, but in the great Colchester find of that year there were found two coins published as reading ANDREV ON R.³ One of these coins, now in my collection, was so singular that it was the only one, out of over ten thousand coins, to be specially recorded that the obverse was of curious work. Following Lawrence's re-classification of the Short Cross issues it can now be seen to be an obvious copy of an English penny. A few years ago it was submitted to Dr. Peter Berghaus who thought it could be of Westphalian origin. The other coin from Colchester is in the British Museum and closely resembles the coins of class Vb. On scrutiny however, it is also seen to be of irregular work, especially on the reverse. The only other penny I have traced purporting to be by the moneyer Andrev at Rochester is in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, unfortunately without provenance, and is a die duplicate of the British Museum specimen⁴. As there are apparently no known genuine coins of this moneyer, nor have there ever been, Andrev should be deleted from the lists for Rochester and added to Michael Dolley's roll of mythical moneyers. The remaining two moneyers, Alisandre and Hunfrei, are die linked and undoubtedly genuine.

I have often speculated on the question of how many Short Cross pennies in our trays are not of legal English origin. Lawrence outed a number but gave few details⁵. Those with very irregular legends are soon spotted, but there are quite a number which though reading sensibly are nevertheless of unofficial work. Some are very faithful copies of the originals and they range right through to caricatures. One type which Lawrence included in his lists of genuine coins is a variant of the Canterbury moneyer who on his regular coins is variously spelt Hernavd, Ernavd or Arnavd, all ending with AVD. The British Museum has two coins reading Arnold both of which, though from different dies, are of irregular workmanship and have been noted as such on their tickets by Mr. Elmore Jones. They are the only two coins known with this particular spelling of the moneyer's name and so he too should also be consigned to mythology.

On the table of coins of Norwich it will be seen that those of class Vb are differentiated into two parts, Vbi and Vbii, which appear to be of chronological significance. There are two main features by which we distinguish Lawrence's Va and Vb. In the former the letter s is reversed and the initial cross is pommée: in the latter the s is normal and the initial mark reverts to a cross pattée. There are found many so called mules between the two varieties, and there may even occasionally be found on the same reverse die a cross pommée with a normal letter s.

¹ I have not checked the larger mints, but I understand that the Lincoln moneyers are all die linked in class V, and I have noticed occasional links in the mints of Winchester and York.

² See Exeter, *supra* p. 62, and Norwich Table p. 63 groups 2 and 6.

³ Thompson's *Inventory* 94 and *NC* 1902, p. 130.

⁴ A third specimen has since come to light, from an unpublished continental hoard.

⁵ *BNJ* XI, p. 89, but see also *BNJ* XXIII, pp. 201-3.

It is quite evident that the two issues to a certain extent overlap¹. In addition to the letter s all the pennies of Va have the letter r formed in a peculiar way. The top of the letter is made by a flat straight stroke which is joined to the 'tail' by a separate short straight stroke at an acute angle to it. Certain coins of Vb reproduce this flat-topped r, whilst others of Vb and all those of Vc have the normal curved top to the letter. On other stylistic grounds also, many of the flat-topped r coins have affinities with Va, particularly in the addition of extra curls, sometimes minute, on either side of the head. On the few coins where it is found the letter k is also parallel in being of the two forms, flat and round topped, though as the stroke is much smaller it is not so easily determined. It therefore seems convenient to divide Vb into two major parts: the earlier group with the flat-topped r as Vbi, and the later, larger group, those with the round-topped r, as Vbii. There is a discernible development of style within each group and the two groups are also found muled. The change is probably due to nothing more than a renewal of punches, but is useful when establishing die relationships. This may be a convenient place to note that the varieties of Vb which have on the obverse the letter x by itself between the hand and the sceptre head are normally fairly early in the series, but are found in Vbii as well as in Vbi. They are denoted on the table by an asterisk.

The last question to be considered is the chronology of classes V, VI and VII. Class V was certainly in issue in the year 1205. To support the statements of the Chroniclers there are many entries in the Pipe Rolls and Fine Rolls, some of which could indicate that production of the new issue commenced late in 1204. The year 1218 was proposed for the introduction of class VI largely on the authority of two writs dated 21st February in that year placing William Marshall junior in charge of the six mints striking in this group. Wells corrected the translation of these entries to exchanges, not mints, and published further references in the Memoranda Rolls in support of the dating.² Actually, however, this new evidence gave the first clue that 1218 saw the ending and not the beginning of this issue. Additional entries in the Memoranda Rolls give the proof that class VII was, in fact, issued in that year³. These Rolls give lists of moneyers and other mint officials, in the year 1218, and again in 1221-22, for five of the six mints. The one missing, Durham, is also referred to in the earlier of these years. The evidence may best be examined by taking the mints in two groups of three: firstly London, Canterbury and Bury St. Edmunds; then Winchester, York and Durham.

In 1217-18 there are several entries relating to the mints and moneyers. The Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer's Memoranda Roll gives a list of London moneyers as Abel, Elis, Iger and Ravf.⁴ This list must have been made up after 9th July, 1218 because it was on that date that Elis was presented.⁵ The King's Remembrancer's Memoranda Roll lists the Canterbury moneyers as Ioan, Tomas, Simon, Henri, Samuel, Eudo Chic, Roger (of Ipswich) and Walter, the last three being moneyers of the archbishop.⁶ Similar lists appear in the Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer's Memoranda Roll. One, for the archbishop's moneyers only, repeats the names already mentioned and is dated 6th December, 1217.⁷ Another, dated 20th January,

¹ More than one writer in the last fifty years has suggested that they were issued simultaneously and merely represent the work of two die-cutters working together. My present view is that only one cutter would be needed to produce the whole of the country's requirements, and is based largely on the practical experiments carried out by Mr. D. G. Sellwood—*BNJ XXXI*, pp. 57-65.

² *NC* 1911, pp. 277-78.

³ These Rolls were brought to my notice by an

unpublished manuscript in the British Museum Coin Room written by the Rev. Mr. Tibbo.

⁴ *LTR* 2 H.III m.5. For convenience I express all these and subsequent names in the form in which they are found on the coins.

⁵ *LTR* 2 H.III m.3.

⁶ *KR* 2 H.III m.2, and archbishop's moneyers only on m.3.

⁷ *LTR* 2 H.III m.5 margin.

1218 repeats the names of all the moneyers with two exceptions: Roger of Rochester is recorded as an archbishop's moneyer 'in the place of Walter who retired to take the cross', and Saloman fitz Samuel replaces Samuel as a king's moneyer.¹ The sole moneyer at Bury St. Edmunds is recorded in the King's Remembrancer's Memoranda Roll as Willelm,² but on the Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer's Memoranda Roll the name Willelm has been crossed through and Norman inserted above it.³ Four years later lists of moneyers are again given and which are basically the same as the latest lists of 1218 but with the significant differences that at London Terri had replaced Abel, and at Canterbury Eudo Chic became Ioan Chic⁴.

If the names on the Rolls are compared with those on the coins it is seen that most of them struck in both classes VI and VII, but a few struck in class VII only. At London Abel, Ilger and Ravf are known for both, whilst Elis and Terri are only found in VII. The class VII coins of Abel are all early in the series and he is the moneyer replaced by Terri. I was a little worried at one time as the coins of Elis are not very early, but have since found a reference in 1220-21 that Abel, Ilger and Rauf had, at that time, refused to admit him into their company.⁵ At Canterbury Ioan, Tomas, Simon/Simvn⁶, Henri, Roger, Samuel and Walter are all known for both classes. Ioan Chic is a signature used on pennies, but not until well on into the evolution of class VII. The earlier lists give the name Eudo Chic, and my present theory, on numismatic grounds alone, is that perhaps his earliest signature was Ivn or Hivn. Saloman is found only on class VII and he replaced Samuel whose coins in this group are all very early. Roger of Rochester, who must surely be the prolific Roger of R on the coins distinguishing him from Roger of Ipswich, is also only found in class VII and again the coins of Walter whom he replaced are all very early. At Bury St. Edmunds the order of the moneyers on stylistic grounds has long been thought to be: Ravf in VI and very early VII, then Willelm in early VII, followed by Norman in fairly early VII. The Rolls show Willelm to be a moneyer in December 1217 and supplanted by Norman in the following year. Accordingly, at all three of these mints there are moneyers who first struck coins in class VII recorded as moneyers by 1218, i.e., London—Elis, Canterbury—Saloman and Roger of R, and Bury St. Edmunds—Willelm and Norman. In addition, the class VII coins of the moneyers who dropped out of the lists: Samuel and Walter at Canterbury and Willelm at Bury St. Edmunds all in 1218, and Abel at London before 1222, are all of the styles generally agreed to be early in the group. This clearly indicates that class VII was being issued at some time in the year 1217-18.

Lawrence's lists show a number of other early class VII moneyers and these must be examined to see how they affect the proposition. For London he shows four. Adam whose coins are not of the earliest types of this group and in respect of whom there is some documentary evidence that he was not appointed until 1229-30, at the same time as Ricard de Neketon for whom Lawrence only noted coins of VIIc.⁷ Gefrei, or from the coins Giffrei, shown as VIIa only is actually of VIIc only. Nichole is also only found in the later emissions, and I have yet to find a class VII coin of Walter from this mint though he is well known at Canterbury. There are only two additional moneyers to account for at Canterbury. One is Osmund(e) of whom there are in fact no early coins, and the only documentary evidence I

¹ LTR 2 H.III m.5.

² KR 2 H.III m.3.

³ LTR 2 H.III m.5. The entry continues 'received one die on 7th December', but it is not clear to which moneyer this relates.

⁴ LTR 6 H.III m.4d. The London officials are also repeated on m.3d with the oft quoted reference to

delivery of dies for round halfpence and farthings.

⁵ LTR 5 H.III m.3(2)d.

⁶ These two spellings would seem to be used on the coins as alternatives for the same man and not to distinguish two separate moneyers.

⁷ Tibbo refers—LTR 14 H.III m.6d.

know is that in 1226 an Osmund was not to have a die that had been given to him.¹ The other is Roberd, or Robert, who was a class VI moneyer and is also found extremely early in class VII from a few rare coins. There is then a very obvious gap before this moneyer reappears and the records show a Robert of Canterbury appointed as a moneyer in November 1235 succeeding Tomas.² The explanation is, no doubt, that the original Robert ceased to be a moneyer shortly before the earliest list in the Memoranda Rolls was prepared.

The second group of mints at first sight seems to present quite contradictory evidence to the foregoing. Lists of moneyers, and other officials, for Winchester and York are given for both the years 1217-18 and 1221-22.³ At York there were four royal moneyers and two archiepiscopal moneyers. At Winchester there are two moneyers only. In the earlier year, 1218, the Archbishop of York was commanded to receive the oath of the moneyer and die-keepers of the Bishop of Durham and to notify their names to the Exchequer.⁴

At both Winchester and York the only coins of class VI are very late in the group and are of Lawrence VIc. The two moneyers of Winchester from the Rolls are Henri and Brien(?), and on the coins are Henri and Iohan, though I have been unable to confirm the latter. But for York there are only known coins of four moneyers—their names tally with the regal appointments—and apparently the archbishop's moneyers did not strike. This is even more curious as the Close Roll for 9th May, 1218 records that the king instructed the Sheriff of Yorkshire and the Mayor of York to let the archbishop 'have well and freely his dies of our money'.⁵ As the moneyers of class VIc are recorded for 1217 and for 1222 it seems to imply that they were striking in both of those years. However, if Lawrence's chronology is to be accepted, there should be extant coins of VIa and VIb also. At Durham, apart from some very rare and rather curious coins of VIa which will be discussed later, there is a long gap in the issues to rare coins of early VIIa.

There is only one plausible explanation of these apparent anomalies which occurs to me. Winchester and York both received their dies in December 1217—Winchester on the 1st and York on the 3rd December⁶—which were of the then current type VIc.⁷ The name of the Durham moneyer had to be notified to the die-cutter at London by the Archbishop of York and it is logical that his dies would be prepared a little later, by which time VIIa had been evolved. Therefore class VI came to an end and class VII was introduced at some time in that year 1217-18. For some reason all three of these mints were in operation for a very short time only. In 1222, although the names of the moneyers were listed, it does not necessarily prove that they were active, but may merely mean that if those mints were allowed to strike coins then they would be the officials responsible. In this connection it may be significant that Durham is not mentioned in the later year. It is quite a different case from the evidence at Canterbury and Bury St. Edmunds, where moneyers were listed in 1217-18 who had replaced others who had already struck in class VII, but leads to the same result. It is axiomatic that if a man is appointed to an office, although he may not be active, his predecessor certainly would not be.

If it is accepted that the close of class VI must have occurred in 1217 then, of necessity, the evidence for the dates of Vc and VIa must be re-examined. Lawrence chose the year 1210 for the introduction of Vc as the shape of the letter x is an St. Andrew's cross similar to that

¹ Tibbo refers—R. fin 1226, 145.

² Tibbo refers—KR 19 H.III m.5.

³ KR 2 H.III m.3 (York only); LTR 2 H.III m.5; LTR 6 H.III m.4d.

⁴ LTR 2 H.III m.1d.

⁵ NC 1931, p. 279.

⁶ KR 2 H.III m.3; LTR 2 H.III m.5.

⁷ It is of course possible that none of these dies were used, as apparently the archbishop's, at least, were not.

found on the Irish coins of John as King.¹ The authorities for the date of 1210 for the Irish coinage are being questioned however, and Mr. Dolley is coming to the conclusion that they were in fact issued as part of the great recoinage of c. 1205.² Even if it were true that the Irish coins were not issued until 1210, how relevant is it to the English pennies? The Irish letter x varies in shape, all having the basic form of a St. Andrew's cross, but none that I have seen bears more than the most superficial resemblance to that on the Short Cross coins. Brooke surmised that the Durham mint might again give the clue.³ Bishop Philip of Poitiers died 22nd April, 1208 and his successor Bishop Richard Marsh was not appointed to the see until June 1217, but it does not necessarily follow, as was seen earlier for the period 1195-96, that the mint would cease operations when there was a period *sede vacante*.

Several of the provincial mints, including Durham, are mentioned in the Pipe Rolls, usually where they were farmed to private individuals. The position is somewhat complicated as it is not always clear from the Rolls whether the entries relate to the current or to a prior year. Although the latest Pipe Roll published is for the year 1214⁴ the entries therein in respect of the provincial mints, with the exception of Durham, all appear to relate back to at least 1208 as do also all entries in the intervening Rolls. Several mints are not mentioned at all, but there is nevertheless a presumption that the provincial mints in general were closed in 1208 whilst Vc was in issue and, judging from the small number of dies used, not long after that type had been introduced. The much quoted conference of moneyers and their staffs in January 1208⁵ is sufficiently close to arouse suspicion that the subtle new characteristics of Vc could have resulted from it. The imposition of the interdict in March 1208, and the consequent disruption in some aspects of life generally, may have a bearing on why the provincial mints ceased operations—and why the rents for certain mints were a long time in being collected from their farmers—or again their closure may possibly be an outcome of the January meeting, especially as the number of mints is reduced drastically in Vc itself.

Of the two main mints only London appears to have a continuity of striking. Canterbury seems to have closed for a period. VIa coins of this latter mint are very rare and the only specimens I have noticed are very late in the sub-class, if indeed they should not be described as VIb. The abbatial mint of Bury St. Edmunds also closed in Vc and did not reopen until VIc was in issue. Durham is the only one apart from London which appears to have struck at all in VIa, but even there the coins are of a much neater style than is normally found at London though there are some fairly similar. I hazard that the introduction of class VI was probably round about the year 1210. I am quite unable to give any datings for the stages in this group which covers the barons' revolt, the civil war, and the invasion of Louis of France, and can only wonder at the apparent absence of any significant trace of these events on the coinage.

The chronology of the later parts of the Short Cross coinage would now appear to be as follows:

| | | |
|---------|----------|---|
| c. 1194 | Class IV | |
| c. 1205 | Va & Vb | (1) Opening with ten mints in Va: London, Canterbury, Chichester, Durham, Exeter, Ipswich, Lincoln, Norwich, Winchester and York; |
| | | (2) Closely followed by six further mints: Bury St. Edmunds, Carlisle, Lynn, Northampton, Oxford and Rochester. |

¹ *BNJ* XI, p. 71.

² *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* XCV, p. 245, and *Cunobelin* 1964, pp. 26-29.

³ *English Coins* 1st Edn. p. 105.

⁴ Pipe Roll Society LXXIII, 1959. The Pipe Roll

for 17 John has since been published (Pipe Roll Society LXXV, 1961) but does not affect the arguments.

⁵ The fullest discussion is by Brooke in *NC* 1910, pp. 315-18.

| | | |
|---------|------|--|
| c. 1208 | Vc | London, Canterbury and Durham, with, for this year only?, Bury St. Edmunds, Ipswich, Lincoln, Northampton, Norwich, Winchester and York. |
| c. 1210 | VIa | Restricted to London at first, apart from a small issue at Durham. |
| ? | VIb | London and Canterbury. |
| c 1217 | VIc | London, Canterbury, Bury St. Edmunds, Winchester and York. |
| 1217-18 | VII | London, Canterbury and Bury St. Edmunds, plus Durham (in this year only?). |
| 1242 | VIII | London, Canterbury and Bury St. Edmunds. |

I have finished the list with the introduction of class VIII for in that year 1242 Otto fitz William, the hereditary die-maker, presented a Richard Abel to the Exchequer to be cutter of the dies.¹ A change of engraver is a much more logical reason for the change in style than a change in mint administration by Nicholas of St. Albans.

I cannot close without acknowledging the help I have been given in my studies. The great museums have, as always, given generously of assistance and facilities, but I would in particular like to thank three individuals—Messrs. Michael Dolley, Elmore Jones and Peter Woodhead—who have all taught me so much, and also Roy Trett who has translated from the Latin for me. My greatest debt is due to the man who converted me from coin collecting to coin study, and who has constantly encouraged me in my endeavours—Albert Baldwin.

¹ Tibbo refers—LTR 1242 m.4