EVER since Englishmen began to study the money of their own country, ingenious attempts have been made to separate the coins of the three kings who, between 1272 and 1377, bore, in succession, the name of Edward. Yet, but for the identification, by Sainthill and Evans, of the twenty grain issues of Edward III., little or no progress has been made since Bartlett, more than a century ago, sought the key to the enigma in the coins of the Bishops of Durham. The late Mr. Burns did make an almost entirely accurate chronological arrangement, but his work, buried in a supplementary chapter of his great book on the coinage of Scotland, has remained practically unknown to English numismatists. Moreover his article, though showing wonderfully acute observation and sound judgment, is not easy to follow, and the almost total lack of documentary evidence makes it far less convincing than it might have been.

The chief cause of failure has been the fact that investigators have attacked the problem from a wrong standpoint. Instead of trying to put themselves back into the atmosphere of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, they have attributed to the men of those days the ideas and methods of the nineteenth. Instead of allowing the coins to tell their own story they have striven to force them into agreement with an arbitrary system, based on no more substantial foundation than preconceived ideas, and the result has been confusion thrice confounded. Such suggestions as that a king sought to distinguish, or accidentally distinguished, his money by lengthening or shortening the abbreviated...
form of his name, or by exhibiting his royal shoulders clothed or naked, have held the field, and students have been led by these will-o’-the-wisps into a very slough of despond.

A fundamental principle, which must never be lost sight of, is that the coinage was intended to be, first and foremost, an instrument of commerce. Political, sentimental and artistic considerations had, no doubt, a modifying influence, but this was strictly subordinated to the more important objects of profit and convenience.

One of the most serious obstacles to the elucidation of truth has been a tacit assumption that every king, on succeeding to the throne, made haste to proclaim his accession by a modification of the coin. That such was the case when the new sovereign had obtained his title by a violent dynastic upheaval, is beyond dispute, but it was otherwise when son succeeded father. For the investigation of this matter it is necessary to divide English coins into three distinct groups:

1. The Norman period, during which, as has been demonstrated by Mr. Andrew, and by our President, Mr. Carlyon-Britton, the currency was changed at stated intervals for fiscal purposes.

2. The Plantagenet period (with which must be included the first part of the reign of Henry VII.), during which no fundamental change of type was made unless it became necessary, for some cause or another, to call in the money in circulation.

3. The period of actual portraiture, extending from the middle of the reign of Henry VII. down to the present day.

Reasons for Change of Type.

With the first of these periods we are not concerned. It came to an end with the accession of Henry II., whose first type (which bore his own name, for dynastic considerations were involved) remained unchanged until the state of the currency had become so bad that reform was imperative. This type, commonly known as the Tealby
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type, from the fact that an immense hoard of it was found at that place, was superseded by the familiar "short cross" penny, which continued to be struck, with its design practically unmodified, and with the unvarying inscription RENRICUS REX, through the reigns of Richard and John, and half that of Henry III. Its supersession was due to the large amount of clipped and worn coin in circulation. It was thought that clipping would be stopped if the coin gave clear evidence of the outrage to which it had been subjected, and the "long cross" type was the result. This made a great impression at the time, and contemporary chroniclers have left sketches, in the margins of their manuscripts, of the ingenious device which was to checkmate the evil-doers.

But it failed in its object. Thirty years later clipping was more prevalent than ever, and Edward I., who (as will be shown later) continued for some years to issue the "long cross" type, and to place his father's name on the coin, found it necessary to call it in and to create a type of his own. That type, unaffected in its main features by changes of dynasty or by reductions of weight, was retained for more than two hundred years. How long actual coins of Edward I. continued to circulate it is, perhaps, impossible to say, but they have certainly been found mixed with those of Henry VI.

Thus, from the accession of the Plantagenet dynasty to the close of the thirteenth century, changes of type were made only when they were rendered necessary by commercial considerations. There had been but one change of name, that of Henry having appeared on all English coins struck between 1154 and 1279, and that change coincides with a demonetisation due to the state of the currency, and occurs not less than seven years after the accession of the sovereign who made it. It introduced no new tradition, and there was no reason whatever why his successors and namesakes should depart from the methods of their ancestors, or modify the coin simply because the crown had passed from father to son. It is probable that, even had they not inherited, with the throne, the name of Edward, each of them would have gone on striking money like that of his predecessor until the necessity for a modification arose; as it was, there was no motive whatever for making
any alteration. Richard II. did put his own name upon the coin, but there is nothing to show that he did so immediately upon his accession.

After Richard comes the first usurpation. Owing to the rarity of the coins, and the present lack of information from other sources, it is impossible to say what course was followed by Henry IV., but there is every probability that he asserted his more than doubtful title—for he did not stand next to Richard in the line of succession—by placing his own name upon his money without delay. His coinage merges into that of his son without any sharp line of demarcation, and the same thing happens again on the death of Henry V.

The next change was dynastic and it is most instructive to note its effect upon the coinage. Edward, the legitimist claimant, instantly substituted his own name for that of the Lancastrian sovereign, but retained even those privy marks which were in use at the mint at the time of his accession. Exactly the same thing occurred in 1470 during the brief resurrection of the fortunes of the Red Rose. The coins proclaimed that a Henry was again on the throne, but, were the king's name covered over, it would be impossible to separate them from those of Edward IV. How great is the contrast with the long series of coins, perpetuating a single name, but ever varying in style and detail, to be found when no political issue was at stake. It is unnecessary to follow this line of thought further, except to point out that even the introduction of a real portrait of the reigning sovereign, in place of a mere conventional king's head, failed to break down at once the tradition of centuries. Henry VIII. did, indeed, add another I to the Roman numeral in the royal title, but he was content to use his father's likeness for at least eighteen years.

The issuing of coin being, as has been shown, a strictly commercial operation, will be found to be dependent upon circumstances of a commercial character. It was continuous or intermittent, according to whether it was or was not likely to be a source of profit. Hence it was often much restricted or wholly suspended when conditions were adverse, though carried on without intermission when bullion was to be had in large quantities on favourable terms. The needs of the country were
also a factor of primary importance. The enormous output necessitated when a general demonetisation took place usually sufficed to meet all requirements for some years, and feverish activity was not infrequently followed by a period in which the great mints were almost idle and confined themselves to coining the bullion brought in by the merchants, while the minor mints, which had been revived or called into existence to meet the emergency, were allowed to die out.

During the reigns with which this paper is concerned there were two classes of mints—the king's and those of certain privileged ecclesiastical personages; of the former two mints only, those of London and Canterbury, were more or less permanent. They were under the direction of a single authority—the two wardens (later one warden only) of the King's Exchanges of London and Canterbury—and in normal times furnished the bulk of the currency. Other royal mints were opened when occasion required, as in 1280 and 1300, and were closed again as soon as the deficiency of circulating medium had been remedied.

Questions connected with the manufacture and supply of dies must inevitably play an important part in our investigations. In the thirteenth century, as to-day, dies were not engraved directly, as a seal or an intaglio gem is cut. Such a process would have been far too slow to meet the requirements of an output of over £100,000 in pennies in a few months. Separate punches, engraved in relief, were made for each portion of the design, and these were stamped into the prepared piece of metal until the whole—effigy and inscription—was complete. Retouches were made if necessary, and the die, after being tempered, was ready for use. The punches themselves were probably made, by a similar method, from matrices engraved in intaglio. Such a process would be much cheaper and more expeditious than that of cutting them direct, since one matrix would yield many irons at the cost of very little labour, and we know that when there was a general recoinage they were required in enormous numbers. The material evidence points clearly to the same conclusion. Certain accidental peculiarities in the
pellets in the angles of the cross on the reverse are reproduced on every light groat of Henry VI. that we have seen—whether of the London, Bristol or York mint—and on some of the groats of Edward IV. which immediately precede or follow them. That a single iron could have done so much work is beyond belief, but the difficulty vanishes on the assumption that many irons were struck from a single faulty matrix. How many irons were used in making a single die it is not possible to say with certainty, and usage probably varied at different times. The die-sinker apparently began by tracing, with a pair of compasses, the lines to be followed by the two dotted circles which are found on both obverse and reverse at this period. To the little hole made by the leg of the compasses is due the swelling on the bridge of the king’s nose which is so frequently seen on coins of the Edwards. The dots would then be put in with a pointed tool. Whenever another portion of the design overlaps the circle it is the latter which is blotted out, which shows that it was put in first. The king’s portrait is usually made up of the following pieces:

(1) Crown.
(2) Face (in some cases the eyes seem to have been stamped in separately).
(3) Fringe of hair on the forehead (sometimes absent).
(4) Hair (two pieces).
(5) Neck or bust.
(6) Drapery (one or two pieces).

The adjustments are often so accurate as to make it very difficult to detect the joins, especially if the coin be worn or oxidised, but specimens may be found on which members are more or less misplaced; e.g., the crown is sometimes put on at a very rakish angle. Mr. Lawrence has coins on which a careless workman has forgotten to stamp in the king’s hair. Blundered inscriptions, such as GIVI TAT DON DON, GIVI TAT EM St DVR are due to similar inattention.

Letters were usually produced by the use of several irons, but in some cases were apparently made up whole in the matrix, though with the forms produced by loose irons. The use of the latter is clearly
shown by, e.g., the varying slope or distance apart of the down strokes of the two N’s in London. An interesting example is a groat of Edward III. in our collection which reads \(\text{RV3}\), with the down stroke of the B omitted. The importance of the study of irons is two-fold. The survival of a flawed or injured iron will often render it possible to connect two succeeding issues. The employment of irons of unusual form is generally good evidence of irregular origin.

The office of engraver was hereditary in the FitzOtho family, and numerous payments to its members are to be found in the mint accounts. It is probable that the FitzOthos had ceased to be craftsmen themselves and employed skilled labour, of which they derived the main benefit. On the death of the last of them we find the payments made to the husband of his heiress, and their rights seem to have been jealously guarded.

In London, where, at any rate during the reign of Edward I., coining was carried on without intermission, the manufacture of dies must also have been practically continuous, and the question arises, what significance is to be attached to variations, which, though apparent enough to the careful student to-day, certainly passed unnoticed among the people who used the coins? These variations, though of the greatest service in facilitating a chronological arrangement, were certainly in many cases due to nothing more than a renewal of worn out irons, which in periods of great activity must have been an almost daily occurrence. Dies must have worn out with equal rapidity when the output was heavy, and it is unlikely in both cases that those which replaced them would be exactly like their predecessors, even when there was no intention to distinguish between them. Certainly the changes did not coincide with trials of the pyx, for though we have comparatively little information about these at this period, we know that they were held somewhat irregularly, and that in the case of the two most prolific ecclesiastical mints, none took place between 8 Edward I. and 12 Edward II., a period of nearly forty years.

London naturally used up its material much more rapidly than did mints with a smaller output, and consequently provides many types
and sub-types which are found nowhere else. Although the irons were cut by the hereditary engravers, the actual dies appear to have been made in the mint itself. The duration of a type or sub-type was in most cases, dependent upon mere mechanical considerations. In times of special activity two or three will be found in a single year, whereas when the issue of pence was quite insignificant, as between 1323 and 1346, sets of irons lasted for years, and even individual dies had quite a long life. We must not, therefore, expect all the coins of one year to be of the same type, neither must it be assumed that a new type was introduced every year.

The royal provincial mints, which in reality were mere branches of the central mint, may sometimes have received their dies from London—information on this point is lacking as regards the earlier years of Edward I.—but in 1300 they made them on the spot from irons provided by headquarters. Thus Bristol, which was working from May 8th to the end of October, and struck a little under £13,000 during that time, was supplied with 23 dozen irons. Newcastle between June, 1300, and Michaelmas, 1302, used up 43½ dozen in coining a little over £20,000, and the mint accounts contain entries of money expended for sending worn irons to London and bringing back the new. The terms cuneus, ferrum, and ferra cuneorum appear to be used somewhat indiscriminately in documents, but in the case of Newcastle the payment for sculptura et fabricatura ferrorum cuneorum can only refer to irons, for it is incredible that more than 500 dies can have been required to coin only £20,000.

The exact resemblance of the provincial coins to those of the London mint suggests that a model—possibly a pied-fort—must have been supplied with the irons.

Forgeries and Imitations.

Before passing to the ecclesiastical mints, a few words must be said about the numerous coins—downright forgeries or colourable imitations—which were the product of no authorised establishment,

1 The accounts give the amount of bullion coined, in pounds Tower. The pound by weight and the pound by tale were practically identical at this period.
either royal or prelatical. Besides the more or less close copies of the English sterling which were avowedly issued by foreign potentates, there will be found in every collection coins which, though intended to be exact copies of Edward pence, yet differ from them in many minor details. Some are made of copper which, in much worn specimens, shows through the plating, though often a surgical operation is necessary to reveal it. Others are of a white alloy—possibly containing a large proportion of silver. Some, probably of home production, are frankly barbarous and have mere strokes in place of a legend. Others betray themselves by workmanship superior to that of the English mints. In no case will the irons be found to correspond with those of any genuine English issue. This is usually very apparent in the initial cross, often in the crown, and in many of the letters. Those resembling in style the coins issued from 1302 onwards frequently have the crown of a form never used in England after 1300. There can be no doubt as to the continental origin of most of these forgeries, and their irons generally closely resemble those of the sterlings coined by princes of the low countries. A few have, with an obverse copied from the English coin, an openly continental reverse. Those which bear the name of London or some other English mint—for they are found of many mints, though London and Canterbury are naturally the favourites—generally betray their origin by some unintelligent blunder such as THCLt for TCNCL, GENTON or CANTOR for CANTOR. Such blunders rarely, if ever, occur on genuine coins, though the mechanical omission, repetition, or transposition of letters is not infrequent. Finally, although most of these forgeries are of sufficient weight to pass muster individually, for it is quite easy to find genuine sterlings which do not exceed 19 grains when slightly worn, the test of placing a handful of them in one scale of the balance, and an equal number of average specimens of genuine Edwards in the other, will be found quite conclusive.

**Ecclesiastical Mints.**

Unlike the provincial establishments, at which multiplication of dies and consequent increase of output meant increased profit for the
king, the ecclesiastical mints were in direct competition with those of the sovereign. It was therefore to his interest to limit their productive power so far as possible, and the number of dies granted to each is specified in their respective charters. The restriction was rigidly enforced and any evasion of it was rendered impossible by the fact that the dies were supplied by the keeper of the King’s Exchange, on the mandate of the Treasurer and Barons of the Exchequer. Moreover, it was strictly laid down that, when renewals were necessary, no new dies were to be delivered until the worn out dies had been given up. Many such returned dies of the Durham and York mints (chiefly of the reigns of Edward III. and Henry VI.) are preserved at the Record Office, and photographs of several of them accompany this paper. The condition of the trussels explains the frequency of “jumped, or double-struck,” coins. It must have been almost impossible to strike cleanly with tools so much bent out of shape as some of these are.

During the period 1272–1351 we are concerned with five prelates, namely, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of Durham and the Abbots of St. Edmundsbury and Reading. Of these the most important, from the numismatic point of view, are the Bishop of Durham and the Abbot of St. Edmundsbury.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, who claimed three dies under the charter granted by King John, had no establishment of his own, but received the profits of three of the dies in the royal mint, and there are consequently no coins of this period which bear any mark showing them to have been issued by his authority. In 2–3 Edward I., the only year in which the Canterbury mint was really active between 1272 and 1280, the Keepers of the Exchange account for £1 16s. 11d. besides the archbishop’s portion, profit on the mintage of £1,065 7s. 6d.” At the great recoinage in June, 1279, the Keepers were ordered to allow him “to deliver to them his own pennies (that is to say, the pennies struck by the three dies assigned to him) and to receive the emolument of his own pennies so far as the emolument of the three dies which he claims to pertain to him is concerned.” Two

1 See Appendix i.
months later Archbishop Peckham wrote to Stephen de Penecester complaining that, in spite of the king’s grant, he was being kept out of his profits. The doors of the mint building had been sealed by de Penecester, in his capacity of Justice for hearing pleas connected with the coinage, and Gregory de Rokesley, Mayor of London, and Orlandino de Podio, Keepers of the King’s Exchange, who controlled the Canterbury mint as well as that of London, dared not enter them. The archbishop therefore begged de Penecester to come to Canterbury in person, as soon as he conveniently could, and deliver over the premises to the said Keepers or their attorneys, as the delay was most injurious to him — *mora est nobis multum damnosa*. The result of this petition does not appear to be recorded, but no coins are forthcoming of earlier date than the following January, when Master William de Turnemire took charge of the mint under an indenture which provided that he should work and maintain eight furnaces with those three which pertain to the Archbishop of Canterbury (*ubi faciet operari et sustinebit octo furnesias cum illis tribus que sunt archiepiscopi cantuarensis*). For London, Bristol, and York the form used is “shall have” so many furnaces (*ubi habebit*).

Numerous mint accounts throughout the reign mention the archbishop’s portion. Emericus Friscobaldi, who was appointed Keeper of the Exchange on the accession of Edward II., refused to admit the archbishop’s rights, but was ordered, by writ dated May 22nd, 1308, to cease impeding the exercise of them, and to restore the profits of the three dies from the time of the impediment. Again, in 1314, a writ dated June 13th orders that the archbishop is to have his dies and that the issues of the same since the previous October 21st, from which date the king had granted the issues to him, are to be restored to him. During the earlier years of Edward III. the mint was for the most part inactive and worked only when bullion was brought in by the merchants, but in 3 Edward III. (1329), eight dies, whereof the king was to have the profits of five and the archbishop of three, were sent to Canterbury. There was a small issue of pennies in 1344–5, but henceforward no coins of this mint are known until the reign of Edward IV., although a writ ordering dies to be supplied was issued in 1351.
THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK claimed, in 1279, that he and his predecessors had had seisin of two dies from time immemorial, and when his claim was contested on behalf of the king the jury returned a verdict in his favour. The result was a grant of two dies, "of the king's special grace," but some restriction would seem to have been attached to the privilege, for it was exercised only twice, in 1280 and 1300, in the reign of Edward I., and not at all in that of Edward II. On each of these occasions the archiepiscopal mint must have remained open for but a short time, as the coins, distinguished by an open quatrefoil in the centre of the cross on the reverse, were in each case of one type only. An application by Archbishop Melton in 1331 was opposed by the Exchequer authorities on the ground that there was no royal mint in the city at the time, as had been the case when the last grant had been made in 1300, but the king nevertheless allowed the archbishop to have his dies, which were worked for several years. The evidence of the coins proves that dies must have been supplied again in 1344, though no record of this is to be found in the Close Rolls. The extraordinary development of this mint after 1351 will be dealt with later. It may be mentioned here that, although all the coins bear the open quatrefoil, which it has been suggested represents, with the limb of the cross, the Key of St. Peter, no personal mark of any archbishop appears on them until the reign of Edward IV.

The mint of the BISHOPS OF DURHAM, who claimed quasi-royal rights within the palatinate, was open almost continuously throughout the three reigns, and furnishes a more complete series of types than any other save that of London. The grant of three dies was renewed on the accession of each new bishop, also on the occasion of any great change in the coinage, as in 1279–80 and 1344. During the long vacancy of the see, between Bishops Richard de Kellawe and Louis de Beaumont, which extended from October, 1316, to June, 1317, a grant of dies was made to the king's receiver of the temporalities. Long cross coins of one of the types attributable to Edward I. are found of the Durham mint, and in 1279 the bishop was the first prelate to receive a grant of dies. Before that year the episcopal coin would be sufficiently distinguished by the names of the mint
and moneyer. Subsequently, if there was no royal mint at Durham—a point which will be discussed later—the name of the mint would suffice. Antony Bek was the first bishop who placed a personal mark on his coins—a proceeding quite in keeping with his character, irrespective of any necessity for such a distinction—and, once the precedent had been set, it was naturally followed by his successors.

The first grant of a moneyer at St. Edmundsbury was made by St. Edward, King and Confessor, to Abbot Baldwin. The mint was fairly active from 1280 to 1340, but only one die was allowed. This was apparently vested in the community, for we find no renewal on a change of Abbot, though precedents were most carefully verified by the Exchequer authorities whenever a new moneyer was sworn in. How and when the privilege lapsed remain to be ascertained, but no coins have come to light of the issue of 1344 or of any subsequent date. St. Edmundsbury coins bear no distinguishing mark beyond the mint name, and there is no evidence of the existence of a royal mint.

In his charter of foundation, Henry I. granted to the abbot and monks of Reading one moneyer, who, according to a subsequent arrangement, was to work in London. The grant was renewed in the following reigns, but John's confirmation provides that the moneyer shall be at Reading. That of Henry III. mentions neither mint nor moneyer, and the charter of Edward I. is missing. Edward II. expressly excepted the clause relating to the mint. Mr. Andrew has shown that certain coins of Henry I., signed by EADGAR ON LVNDE, were struck by the abbot's authority, but during the period under consideration none can be identified with the abbey until the reign of Edward III., who in 1338 not only granted the right to strike pence, but added the exceptional privilege of coining halfpennies and farthings. No coins are known of later date than 1351. Reading coins of Edward III. show a scallop shell taken from the arms of the abbey, but no mark of a nature personal to the abbot.

As the upper dies (trusses or puncheons), which imprinted the reverse type, were apt to split under the blows of the hammer, and thus become unfit for use more rapidly than the lower (staples, piles, or
standards), it was usual to supply to the ecclesiastical mints two of the former with each of the latter. This would not injuriously affect the king's interests, since the output would be limited by the number of obverse dies. It is possible that prelates were sometimes allowed to renew their own trussels, for the mint accounts of 9–11 Edward I. mention payments received for three and a-half and three and a-quarter dozen irons delivered to the Bishop of Durham and the Abbot of St. Edmundsbury respectively. This, however, must have been exceptional, for the writs for the delivery of dies to St. Edmundsbury nearly always specify \textit{unum cuneum novum videlicet unum stapellum et duo punzones}.\footnote{See Appendix i.} Moreover in 11 Edward II., Bishop Beaumont, who complained that he had received only one trussel for each puncheon, had his request for duplicates granted under the explicit reservation that this was not to be made a precedent.

Apart from the ample documentary evidence that the dies of the ecclesiastical mints were supplied from London, material confirmation is afforded by the coins themselves. In two separate instances we have traced the use of identical irons for producing the King's hair in London dies and Durham dies of Bishop Antony Bek. In the Montrave hoard were four mules having the obverse of Bishop Beaumont, with his lion rampant, combined with a London reverse, an accident which would have been impossible unless the Beaumont dies were made in London. Obverse dies for St. Edmundsbury, which differed in no way from those of London, may have been simply taken out of stock when required in a hurry. Durham obverse dies usually bore some special mark, and it is interesting to note that Bishop Bek's cross moline is sometimes found punched over an ordinary cross pattée, which suggests that a ready-made die was modified for his use.

\textit{Mules.}

Mules, that is to say, coins struck from obverse and reverse dies which were not engraved at the same time or intended to be used together, are of frequent occurrence throughout the whole of the
Mules.

mediaeval period, and are of the highest value as aids to classification. Under the Norman régime, when frequent changes of type were the rule, they are sufficiently obvious, and this is again the case in later times, when the use of varying mint marks, or privy marks, had become customary. Under the three Edwards they are usually to be detected only by slight modifications in the form of the lettering, and are therefore easily overlooked, but they are none the less frequent and significant. Theoretically the trussel, or reverse die, which has been shown to have had a shorter life than the pile, should be the later member of the combination, but in practice a type is very commonly found muled both ways, that is to say, with its predecessor and its successor. Mules are naturally most plentiful of the London mint, where large numbers of dies must always have been in stock, and where partial or complete renewals were frequent, but they are also to be found in the provinces.

Their existence at an ecclesiastical mint—several have been noted of Durham—is rather puzzling, since we know that worn out dies had to be delivered up before new dies could be received. Two possible explanations may be suggested. The Bishop of Durham, who had a right to three dies, may sometimes have found it convenient to renew one or two of them while the third was still in good order, or it may have been necessary to obtain new trusses before the piles were worn out; and the new dies would be according to the latest London pattern. Again the London authorities may have made a practice of keeping one or two prelatical dies ready to hand and, when confronted with a demand for three, supplied those which they had in stock, with the addition of so many more as were necessary to complete the set. If there had been a change of irons in London, subsequently to the production of the former, the latter would be of a new type, or variety. Admitting that there might be some hesitation to do this in the case of obverses, the reverse types differed so little that it is unlikely that any importance would be attached to the matter. On either of these hypotheses the bishop’s moneyer would become possessed of mixed dies, and mules would result.
APPENDIX.

The following documents and extracts are printed in illustration of this section:

(i.)

Postea ix° die Iulii anno xv huius Regis [Edw. II.] incipiente mandatum fuit Willelmo de Hausted custodi Cambii Londinie quod liberaret Abbati de Sancto Edmundo unum cuneum nouum videlicet i stapellum et duo punzones ad monetam ibi fabricandam quociens etc sicut continetur in memorandis anni xiiij huius Regis inter breuia irrotulata de termino sancte Trinitatis ubi scribitur:

Breuis Regis

Rex dilecto clerico suo W de Hausted custodi cambii sui Londinie salutem constat nobis per inspectionem rotulorum de seacarío nostro quod dilectus nobis in Christo Abbas de sancto Edmundo ex concessione progenitorum nostrorum quondam Regum Anglie habere debet unum cuneum videlicet unum stapellum et duo punzones pro moneta apud sanctum Edmundum fabricanda et ideo vobis mandamus quod eadem Abbati vel suo certo attornato in hac parte unum nouum cuneum selectum unum stapellum et duo punzones ad monetam ibidem fabricandam quociens necesser fuerit liberari faciatis prout temporibus retroactis fieri consuevit prouiso quod idem Abbas veterem cuneum usitatum restituat in cambio nostro predicto qui quam nouus cuneus sibi liberetur Teste venerabili patre W Episcopo Exoniensi Thesaurio nostro apud Westmonasterium ix° die Iulii anno regni nostri xv° per Rotul. Memorand. de anno iij Regis nunc inter recordia termino sancte Trinitatis.—(Abbot Kempe’s Register, Harl. MS. 645, fo. 153.)
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