

<i>N^o</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Identification, legend readings, and references</i>	<i>Die-Axis</i>	<i>Wt (g)</i>
6	A2	London, Pieres Me Obv. +hENRIREX[ΛN]GL Rev. +PIRE[S:ME:]ON:LVN Die duplicate <i>BMC</i> 541–2 and <i>FEJ Photographs</i> 28/26.	45°	1.44
7	C	London, moneyer uncertain Obv. [+hE]NRI:R[] Rev. []REI[:ON]:LV The moneyer's name is either Gefferi, Goddefrei or Hunfrei.	225°	1.44
8	C3	Norwich, Ricard Obv. +hENRI:R[:Æ] Rev. +RILÆR[T:ON:]NOR: Die duplicate <i>BMC</i> 650 (listed under Herbert) and <i>FEJ Photographs</i> 31/25.	70°	1.39
9	A2	Thetford, Turstain Obv. +hE]NRIREX[Λ]N[GL] Rev. [+TVRSTEIN:]OVI:T[EFF:] Die duplicate <i>BMC</i> 723 and <i>FEJ Photographs</i> 33/8.	300°	1.44
10	A	York, Godwin Obv. +hENRI[REXΛNGL] Rev. +GODW[IN:ON:EVERW] Die duplicate <i>BMC</i> 785 and <i>FEJ Photographs</i> 34/29.	0°	1.46
11	A	Uncertain mint and moneyer Obv. [+hENRIR]EX[ΛN]GL Rev. <i>Illegible</i> Die-axis uncertain owing to the illegibility of the reverse.	?	1.48
12	A/C3	Uncertain mint and moneyer Obv. +hENRIR[EXΛNGL] Rev. []:ON: []V[]N Die duplicate <i>FEJ Photographs</i> 36/10–11. This coin is discussed in the main text.	340°	1.42

ROBERT VI

LORD STEWARTBY

ALL but one of the London and Canterbury moneyers of Short Cross class VII feature in the official records of Henry III in respect of their connection with the coinage. The sole exception is Robert VI, whose name appears (as ROBERT.VI) on a single Canterbury reverse die of early class VIIc. His coins, which are extremely rare, are of the variety designated VIIcA by North and VIIc1 by Mass, and attributable to the late 1230s.¹ Mass did not himself possess a specimen, and the one illustrated by him (*SCBI* 56, no. 2078) was incorrectly stated to be from the Naxos hoard: its actual pedigree is ex Brand, ex R. Carlyon-Britton.

So far as I am aware no attempt has hitherto been made to identify Robert VI. The purpose of this note is to suggest a possible candidate. In the Close Roll for 1237 is the following entry,² witnessed by the king at Ospringe, near Faversham, on 11 June:

Mandatum est custodi vinorum de Faversham* quod duo dolia vini capta ad opus regis de Roberto vinetario de Cantuaria que sunt in custodia sua eidem Roberto reddi faciat.

(The keeper of wines at Faversham is instructed to procure that the two doles of wine taken from Robert the vintner of Canterbury for the king's use, and which are in his keeping, be returned to the said Robert.)

¹ M.R. Allen suggests c.1236–c.1240 (*SCBI* 56, p. 12).

² *Close Roll 21 Henry III*, p. 452.

The letters Vi might represent a family name, a place-name or an occupational name. Examples of each are found among the Canterbury moneyers at this period when two persons with the same Christian name were in office together: thus Ioan Chic on the coins was John Chiche, a member of a prominent Canterbury family; Roger of R is Roger of Rochester in the records; and Willem Ta is William, the king's tailor. I have not found record of any Robert at this period designated by a suitable Kentish family or place-name beginning Vi, but Robert the Vintner of Canterbury does fit in terms of place, time, status and occupation. It may incidentally be noted that Alain, the Carlisle moneyer in Henry II's recoinage of 1180 and subsequently lessee of the Cumbrian silver mines, is recorded as having sold wine contrary to the assize; and Longstaff wondered whether as a vintner he might have been the same person as the London moneyer Alain V who features early in the recoinage.³

It must remain a mystery why Robert Vi, whoever he was, ceased so soon to exercise his office as moneyer, but this could explain why records do not refer to him in that capacity.

SALARIES OF MINT AND EXCHANGE OFFICIALS IN THE LONG CROSS RECOINAGE OF 1247–1250

MARTIN ALLEN

In the 1930s W.C. Wells published an article on the Long Cross recoinage of 1247–50, which is still the principal source of published documentary evidence on this subject.¹ The material provided by Wells includes the text and a translation of a writ of 28 July 1250, sent to the sheriff of Northamptonshire, ordering him to recover sums of money paid to officials of the Northampton mint and exchange in error.² The exchanger should have been paid 9 marks (£6) per annum, but he had been overpaid by £7 1s. 6d., and the clerk of the exchange had received £4 14s. 6d. more than was due from his salary of 6 marks (£4) per annum. The die-keepers had received £14, which should have been paid by the moneyers. Wells noted that there were similar writs concerning the mints and exchanges of nine other places, and he listed the payments to the die-keepers, but he did not specify the sums paid to the other officials.³ The list of payments in Table 1 is based upon the texts of the writs, which are enrolled in the King's Remembrancer's Memoranda Roll for the Trinity Term of the 34th year of Henry III.⁴ There are no writs for the royal mints and exchanges in Bristol, Carlisle, Hereford, Ilchester, Shrewsbury and Wallingford.

TABLE 1. Reclaimed payments

<i>Mint and exchange</i>	<i>Exchanger</i>	<i>Clerk</i>	<i>Die-keepers</i>
Oxford	£7 14s. 0d.	£5 2s. 8d.	£10 0s. 0d.
Northampton	£7 1s. 6d.	£4 14s. 6d.	£14 0s. 0d.
Newcastle	£4 15s. 6d.	£3 3s. 11d.	£6 12s. 0d.
Lincoln	£7 13s. 11d.	£4 18s. 8d.	£18 0s. 0d.
York	£7 7s. 3d.	£4 18s. 7d.	£10 10s. 0d.
Gloucester	£7 7s. 10d.	£4 18s. 8d.	£11 0s. 0d.
Wilton	£4 4s. 8d.	£2 16s. 8d.	£4 13s. 9d.
Exeter	£7 2s. ½d.	£4 13s. 8d.	£8 15s. 3d.
Norwich	£7 14s. 0d.	£5 2s. 8d.	£12 0s. 0d.
Winchester	£11 11s. 5d.	£7 14s. 3½d.	£12 7s. 11d.

³ *NC*² 3 (1863), pp. 169 and 175.

¹ W.C. Wells, 'Notes on the Long-Cross coinage of Henry III 1247–1250', *BNJ* 22 (1934–7), 79–107.

² Wells, as in n. 1, pp. 93–4, 106.

³ Wells, as in n. 1, pp. 94–5.

⁴ The National Archives, Public Record Office, E 159/25, m. 13–14.