

coin of Aimer in class II was spelt hGIM&R, after a multi-year lapse in his minting activity in classes Ib2 and Ic (53). But Aimer himself, as far we can determine, was an altogether typical moneyer, made atypical only in hindsight by students who felt the need to decode the mysteries surrounding Fil Aimer.

As just stated, the real problems lie with 'Fil Aimer', whose names and persona are intermixed in ways we are still unable to interpret. In the absence of any reasonable alternative, our starting point must be simply that 'Fil Aimer' is a shortened version of 'Philip Aimery'. However, by making such a point, we are acknowledging a rendering on the coins that is unique. For nowhere else do we encounter the seeming abbreviation of each of a moneyer's two names. In all other cases, the most that appears is the full given name plus the first letter (or first two letters) of the surname. Thus, Pieres M and Henri Pi would be typical examples, necessitated by the prior existence of another Pieres and Henri. But the point is that Henri Pi is never rendered on the coins as, say, 'Hen Pine' (for Henri Pineferding), which would have been the functional equivalent of 'Fil Aimer'. Moreover, we are unable to explain why Philip Aimery's name was not simply recorded on the coins as 'Filip', which would have been not only simpler but also entirely in line with regular practice.²² At this time, there were no other Filipos of London to confuse things, with the single active moneyer named Filip a man of Northampton.

And thus 'Fil Aimer', the most famous name(s) on the coins, continues to resist our best efforts to understand him. We are obliged to ponder (and ultimately to reject) several other interpretations. For example, it is difficult to

credit 'Fil Aimer' as not the father but rather the son, even though his coins clearly came second. Similarly, it seems altogether untenable that 'Fil Aimer' could have been a temporary amplification of 'Aimer' on the coins, coming during that moneyer's prolific period in classes Ia4 and Ia5. For even if an unprecedented usage was being claimed by him when he was, inarguably, the dominant moneyer, Philip Aimery stopped issuing coins soon thereafter, and was dismissed from service a few months after that.²³ In other words, we have here an insoluble problem: for if all along there was only one moneyer who now came to be dismissed, who was the Aimer who continued into classes Ib, II, III, and IV?

Indeed, the fact that it is no longer possible to retain Fil Aimer as a moneyer in class Ib serves the useful purpose of separating him from Aimer both before and after. By repositioning, as we have, the traditional opening phase of class Ib to the closing phase of class Ia,²⁴ we are establishing, in effect, a new criterion by which to attribute the names on the coins to two moneyers. To repeat, then, Aimer and Fil Aimer seem not to have been related, with the former a normal moneyer in every way, but with the latter still an enigma despite our best efforts.

Finally, the coins themselves of Fil Aimer are unfortunately no help here, since, with the tiny exception of a variable pellet separating his two names, his coins all read exactly the same way. Thus, 'Fil Aimer' is always FIL[.] AIM&R.ON.I.VN on the coins, a rigidly unchanging pattern that was highly unusual. In the end we are left with but a single recourse – to leave Fil Aimer shrouded in mystery, but to rescue his unlucky namesake from a shadow not in any way of his own making.²⁵

MINT OUTPUT IN THE ENGLISH RECOINAGE OF 1247–1250¹

MARTIN ALLEN

In the 1930s W.C. Wells published some important documentary evidence for mint output during the Long Cross recoinage of 1247–50.² On 28 July 1250 sheriffs were ordered to recover the costs of the die-keepers' fees from the moneyers of ten of the recently closed recoinage mints: Exeter (£8 15s. 3d.), Gloucester (£11), Lincoln (£18), Newcastle-upon-Tyne (£6 12s.), Northampton (£14), Norwich (£12), Oxford (£14), Wilton (£4 13s. 9d.), Winchester (£12 7s. 11d.) and York (£10 10s.). Wells suggested that these sums were payments for the entire

recoinage outputs of the mints, and he calculated the outputs, assuming that the die-keepers were paid 1s. per £100 minted. Wells preferred a second series of calculated outputs, double the size of the first set, using a 6d. per £100 rate. When Christopher Blunt and John Brand published the London and Canterbury mint outputs of the reign of Henry III (1216–72), they noted that the die-keepers were paid 6d. in one period.³ However, there is documentary evidence for the payment of 1s. per 100 pounds of silver minted in the recoinage.⁴ The outputs calculated by Wells

²² Brand, *The English Coinage*, as in n. 5.

²³ See Brand, as in n. 5, p. 30, for the dismissal. According to Martin Allen, there is evidence to show that Fil Aimer ceased to be a moneyer in autumn 1180, just as the transition to class Ib was about to occur.

²⁴ That is, the old 'early Ib' is now relabeled 'Ia5'; Mass, as in n. 10.

²⁵ The author wishes to thank Martin Allen, Lord Stewartby, and Peter Woodhead for reading and commenting on this paper. Nos 26, 31 and 43 in the Plates are in the collections of the British Museum. Lord Stewartby and Mr Woodhead, respectively; the remainder are in the collection of the author.

¹ *Acknowledgements.* Dr Mark Blackburn has read a draft of this note, providing many helpful comments. Dr Barrie Cook has supplied invaluable hoard data (see note 8).

² W.C. Wells, 'Notes on the Long-Cross coinage of Henry III, 1247–1250', *BNJ* 22 (1934–7), 79–107, at pp. 93–7.

³ C.E. Blunt and J.D. Brand, 'Mint output of Henry III', *BNJ* 39 (1970), 61–6, at p. 62.

⁴ The payment of 1s per 100 lb. in the recoinage is specified in the *Officia ministrorum cambii* (*Red Book of the Exchequer*, fol. 246), edited by C. Johnson, *The De Moneta of Nicholas Oresme and other Mint Documents* (London, 1956), pp. xxvi, 52.

from a 1s. rate must be slightly increased to take account of the production of 242*d.* instead of 240*d.* from each pound of silver, inferred from mint accounts.⁵ The total of the adjusted calculations for ten mints in Table 1 is £225,756, which is consistent with Marion Archibald's two alternative estimates for all of the seventeen 'provincial' mints (£265,357 and £287,470).⁶

Archibald calculated her estimates of the output of the provincial mints from the combined London and Canterbury outputs, in proportion to the numbers of coins of the first three Long Cross classes in six hoards: Palmer's Green (1911), Steppingley (1912), Slype (1914), Hornchurch (1938), Coventry (1958) and Colchester (1969)⁷ The lower estimate assumed that London and Canterbury produced fifty-two per cent of the coins of classes I-III in 1247-50, based upon the aggregate per-

centage in the hoards (fifty two point three per cent). The higher estimate assumed fifty per cent, allowing for possible bias towards London and Canterbury in the Colchester hoard, which dominates the aggregates. Four hoards have been recorded since the publication of Archibald's calculations: Greywell (1988 and 1993), Welwyn Garden City (1992), Sporle with Palgrave (1995-8) and Thwaite (1998).⁸ These new hoards contained a total of 83 Long Cross coins of classes IIII attributable to a mint.⁹ The Colchester hoard had 5832 relevant coins, and the other hoards had a total of 1437. In Table 1 aggregate numbers of coins in the hoards are compared with the outputs calculated from the die-keepers' fees. This table also includes the Shrewsbury output, calculated from the roll of assays published by R.L. Kenyon and J.D. Brand, and the London and Canterbury outputs of November 1247-July 1250.¹⁰

TABLE 1. Mint outputs and hoard coins, 1247-50

Mint	Output	Output from fees	Coins in hoards	Output per hoard coin
Canterbury	£100,355		1247	c.£80
Exeter		£17,671	200	c.£88
Gloucester		£22,183	271	c.£82
Lincoln		£36,300	424	c.£86
London	£189,511		2591	c.£73
Newcastle		£13,310	167	c.£80
Northampton		£28,233	359	c.£79
Norwich		£24,200	314	c.£77
Oxford		£28,233	286	c.£99
Shrewsbury	£7,227		74	c.£98
Wilton		£9,453	109	c.£87
Winchester		£24,998	306	c.£82
York (Royal) ¹¹		£21,175	278	c.£76
Total	£297,093	£225,756		

⁵ Blunt and Brand, as in n. 3, pp. 62-3. CE. Challis (ed.), *A New History of the Royal Mint* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 673.

⁶ M.M. Archibald, 'Wastage from currency: Long-Cross and the recoinage of 1279', in N.J. Mayhew (ed.), *Edwardian Monetary Affairs (1279-1344): A Symposium held in Oxford, August 1976* (BAR 36, Oxford, 1977), pp. 167-86, at pp. 168-72, 174.

⁷ H.A. Grueber, 'Palmer's Green hoard', *NC* 4th ser. 12 (1912), 70-97. L.A. Lawrence, 'The Steppingley find of English coins', *NC* 4th ser. 14 (1914), 60-76. G.C. Brooke, 'A find of Long-Cross pennies at Slype (West Flanders)', *NC* 4th ser. 14 (1914), 256-9. D. Allen, 'Treasure trove, 1933-9. 2. Hornchurch, Essex, 1938', *BNJ* 23 (1938-40), 274-9. R.H.M. Dolley, 'The 1958 Coventry treasure trove of Long Cross pence of Henry III', *NC* 6th ser. 18 (1958), 109-22. 'The 1969 Colchester hoard: Editorial note', *BNJ* 44 (1974), 39-40.

⁸ I am grateful to Dr Barrie Cook for his provision of data from these hoards and the Colchester hoard in advance of publication.

⁹ The Greywell hoard had three coins not attributed to a mint, and the Welwyn Garden City hoard had two.

¹⁰ R.L. Kenyon, 'The Shrewsbury mint and its officers under Henry III', *NC* 3rd ser. 19 (1899), 112-24, at pp. 115, 117-18. J.D. Brand, 'The Shrewsbury mint, 1249-1250', in R.A.G. Carson (ed.), *Mints, Dies and Currency: Essays Dedicated to the Memory of Albert Baldwin* (London, 1971), pp. 129-50, at pp. 132-3. Challis, as in n. 5, p. 674. Challis adjusted the London and Canterbury outputs published by Blunt and Brand, 'Mint output of Henry III', to take account of the assumed production of 242 pence from each pound of silver. I have applied a similar adjustment to the Shrewsbury output published by Kenyon and Brand (£7,167).

¹¹ The York royal mint hoard totals are for the four king's moneyers named in the list (BM Hargrave MS 313, p. 97) most recently published by Johnson, *The De Moneta*, pp. 100-6, at p. 103. The fifth moneyer, Tomas, must have been the archbishop's moneyer, as suggested by L.A. Lawrence, 'The two mints at York', *NC* 5th ser. 5 (1925), 366-79, at pp. 367-8. I. Dowthwaite, 'Long Cross moneyers of York', *YN3* (1997), 73-83, at p. 77 has noted that the coins of the four king's moneyers begin in Lawrence class II (Davis class IIb), and the earliest coins of Tomas belong to class IIIb, which is consistent with the later start of the archbishop's mint inferred from documentary evidence.

The general similarity of the outputs per hoard coin encourages confidence in the output figures based upon die-keepers' fees. Five of the ten fees are pounds without shillings or pence, which may indicate approximation, but the fees seem to be reasonably accurate indicators of output. Two of the mints have outputs per hoard coin noticeably higher than the rest: one of the mints with a fee expressed in pounds only (Oxford), and the mint with the smallest number of coins and relatively unreliable statis-

tics in consequence (Shrewsbury). The lowest output per coin is for London, which may confirm Archibald's suspicion of a bias towards London in the Colchester hoard. It is also possible that London production of class III continued after the end of the London and Canterbury mint output periods in July 1250. The mean of the outputs per coin is about £84. This figure can be multiplied by the numbers of hoard coins to produce tentative estimates of the undocumented outputs, listed in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Estimated mint outputs, 1247-50

<i>Mint</i>	<i>Coins in hoards</i>	<i>Estimated output</i>
Bristol	148	c.£12,000
Bury St Edmunds	197	c.£17,000
Carlisle	54	c.£5,000
Hereford	83	c.£7,000
Ilchester	55	c.£5,000
Wallingford	54	c.£5,000
York (Archiepiscopal)	135	c.£11,000
Total		c.£62,000

The combined total of the provincial mint outputs in Tables 1 and 2 is c. £295,000, and the total for all mints is c. £585,000. Archibald estimated that the output of the recoinage was between £552,827 and £574,940, but she had to use London and Canterbury output figures without the increases required by the production of more than 240d. from each pound of silver.¹² If Archibald's estimates are adjusted for the minting of 242d. per pound, they increase to £557,434 and £579,731, bringing the higher estimate closer to my estimate (c. £585,000). Nicholas Mayhew has calculated that about £400,000 in Short Cross coins was available for recoinage, deducting £150,000 from Archibald's original lower estimate.¹³ Mayhew assumed that the normal output of the English mints from supplies of silver unconnected with recoinage was about £50,000 per year, and deducted three years of

normal output at this rate. The London and Canterbury outputs in Table 3 support an assumption that normal annual output in the period of the recoinage was c. £50,000-£60,000. The table does not include the provincial mints, but London and Canterbury had a near-monopoly of mint output immediately before and after the recoinage.¹⁴ Mayhew's estimation of the volume of the English coinage recoinage can be refined by deducting two years and eight months of normal output at £50,000 and £60,000 per year from my estimate of the output of November 1247-July 1250 (c. £585,000), with c. £425,000-£450,000 as the result.¹⁵ This is based upon a series of assumptions and approximations, but it can be stated with some confidence that the total value of the English silver currency in 1247, including a small percentage of foreign coins, was nearly half a million pounds.¹⁶

¹² Archibald, as in n. 6, p. 172.

¹³ N.J. Mayhew, 'Money and prices in England from Henry II to Edward III', *Agricultural History Review* 35 (1987), 121-32, at p. 125.

¹⁴ Lord Stewartby, 'The "Naxos" hoard of thirteenth-century sterling', *NC* 154 (1994), 147-66, recorded 263 coins of Short Cross class VIII attributable to a mint, including 247 (93.9%) from London or Canterbury. Archibald, 'Wastage from currency', p. 174 found that the London and Canterbury mints supplied between 94.7% and 98.0% of the post-recoinage Long Cross coins in the six hoards analysed.

¹⁵ Mayhew, as in n. 13, p. 125 suggested that more than £400,000 in Short Cross coins may have been needed to produce that amount of new coinage, due to loss of weight in circulation. F. Dumas and J.D. Brand, 'The British coins in the Gisors (1970) hoard', *BNJ* 40 (1971), 22-43, at p. 30 found that the mean weight of the English pence in this hoard deposited in the mid 1240s was 1.38 g or 21.3 gr., no more than about 5% below standard weight.

¹⁶ H.A. Grueber, 'A find of silver coins at Colchester', *NC* 4th ser. 3 (1903), 111-76 recorded 351 Irish, Scottish and Continental coins in a hoard of 10,926 coins and fragments, constituting only 3.2 per cent of the total. This hoard was deposited in 1237, a decade before the recoinage of 1247-1250, but it may provide some indication of the contribution of foreign silver coins to English money supply at the time of the recoinage. B.J. Cook, 'The bezant in Angevin England', *NC* 159 (1999), 255-75 discusses the use of foreign gold coins in England between 1154 and 1259.

TABLE 3. London and Canterbury mint outputs, 1244–56

<i>Period</i>	<i>London</i>	<i>Canterbury</i>	<i>Total output</i>	<i>Output per year</i>
Feb. 1244–Feb. 1245	£29,497	£19,025	£48,522	c. £49,000
Feb. 1245–Apr. 1246	£24,920	£28,600	£53,520	c. £49,000
Apr. 1246–Nov. 1247	£38,985	£28,200	£67,185	c. £47,000
Nov. 1247–Nov. 1248	£73,013	£40,258	£113,271	c. £113,000
Nov. 1248–Nov. 1249	£80,559	£41,703	£122,262	c. £122,000
Nov. 1249–July 1250	£35,939	£18,394	£54,333	c. £81,000
July 1250–May 1252	£69,569	£37,519	£107,088	c. £58,000
May 1252–Nov. 1254	£84,526	£90,159	£174,685	c. £70,000
Nov. 1254–July 1256	£51,689	£66,408	£118,097	c. £71,000

Source: C.E. Challis, *A New History of the Royal Mint*, p. 674.

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE FOR THE OUTPUT, PROFITS AND EXPENDITURE OF THE BURY ST EDMUNDS MINT¹

MARTIN ALLEN

THE surviving registers and cartularies of the abbey of Bury St Edmunds form the largest collection of such documents from an English monastery.² The 'Kempe' register (British Library Harley MS 645), compiled from various sources in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,³ is a particularly rich source of documentary evidence relating to the Bury St Edmunds mint. It was extensively cited by Ruding, and the Fox brothers published transcripts, but it has never been published in its entirety.⁴ Two mint accounts in the Kempe register, which may be the only surviving accounts of the Bury St Edmunds mint, have not been mentioned in a numismatic publication until now.⁵ The Latin text of the second account is transcribed in an appendix of this article, as it is particularly important. It

records transactions with customers, showing that the royal mint system of charging was not universal in thirteenth-century English mints. An ecclesiastical mint could charge less than the king's mints, calculating the seignorage in a previously unsuspected way.

The first account is for the period from 11 April 1256 to 19 April 1258, rendered on 17 May 1258.⁶ The sacrist (who supervised the mint), the sub-sacrist and the moneyer, Randulf le Blund, accounted for a profit of £47 9s. The sacrist had also received an extra profit of unspecified size, at the rate of 2d. from each pound of silver minted (*iijd. de qualibet libra quos percepit de monetario*), demonstrating that the Bury St Edmunds mint was striking 242d. per pound, in accordance with the practice of

¹ *Acknowledgements*: I have greatly benefited from the help and advice of Dr Antonia Gransden, whose knowledge of Bury St Edmunds documentary evidence is unrivalled. Dr Mark Blackburn, Mr Nicholas Mayhew and the Rt. Hon. Lord Stewartby have read drafts of this note and offered many useful comments. The staff of the Manuscripts Reading Room at the British Library have been unfailingly helpful.

² *The Archives of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds*, edited by R.M. Thomson (Suffolk Records Society 21, 1980), p. 5. The Bury St Edmunds registers are listed and described by Thomson, pp. 119–62; W. Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, edited by J. Caley, H. Ellis and B. Bandinal (6 vols, London, 1817–30), iii, 117–31; *The Victoria History of the County of Suffolk*, edited by W. Page (2 vols, London, 1907–11), ii, 56–7 note 2.

³ Thomson, as in n. 2, pp. 127–9 analyses the contents and history of the Kempe register (no. 12).

⁴ R. Ruding, *Annals of the Coinage of Great Britain and its Dependencies from the Earliest Period of Authentic History to the Reign of Victoria* (3rd edn., 3 vols, London, 1840), i, 38–9, 206, ii, 218–20; H.B.E. Fox and S. Fox, 'Numismatic history of the reigns of Edward I, II, and III [part 2]', *BNJ* 7 (1910), 91–142, at pp. 138–9; idem, 'Numismatic history of the reigns of Edward I, II, and III [part 3]', *BNJ* 8 (1911), 137–48, at p. 147.

⁵ P.D.A. Harvey, 'Mid-13th-century accounts from Bury St Edmunds Abbey', in *Bury St Edmunds: Medieval Art, Architecture, Archaeology and Economy*, edited by A. Gransden (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 20, 1998), pp. 128–38, at p. 137 lists two mint accounts in the Kempe register: an account of 29 January–20 December 1250, and one of 1256–8. The text of 1250 (BL Harley MS 645, fol. 260v.) only states that the moneyer received nothing from the sacrist during the period of account. The account of 1256–8 and another account discussed in this article will receive further discussion in the revised and extended publication of Dr R.J. Eaglen's Ph.D. thesis, 'The Mint of Bury St Edmunds to 1279' (University of London, 1989).

⁶ BL Harley MS 645, fol. 261v. Eaglen, as in n. 5, pp. 274–6 argues that the mint was closed in the vacancy between the death of Abbot Edmund de Walpole on 31 December 1256 and the restoration of temporalities to the new abbot, Simon de Luton, on 12 January 1258. The payment of the moneyer's annual fee for two years, recorded in the account, seems to indicate that the mint remained open. *The Letter-Book of William of Hoo Sacrist of Bury St Edmunds 1280–1294*, edited by A. Gransden (Suffolk Records Society 5, 1963), p. 10 discusses a division of property and rights between the abbot and convent in 1281 (Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, iii, 156–8; *Calendar of Charter Rolls 1257–1300*, p. 259), which acknowledged the right of the prior and convent to operate the mint in a vacancy.