EARLY MEDIEVAL COINAGE, 1066–1279
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Before the end of the nineteenth century a group of numismatic students, later to be among the founders of the British Numismatic Society, had already begun putting the study of post-Conquest coinage onto a more secure footing. It is evident that they had agreed among themselves, despite their wide interests, to avoid duplication of effort by assuming responsibility for specific series. There is no formal proof that such an arrangement existed but it is indicated by major articles published just before and after 1903, and confirmed by a watercolour cartoon preserved in the Department of Coins and Medals of the British Museum. (Pl. 11) Drawn by L.A. Lawrence and sent as a Christmas card to W.J. Andrew in 1900 it shows, in mock-medieval style, two figures being kicked out of a fortress. One arm of a near-by signpost pointing towards the scene is labelled ‘C. Britton hys castle’ while the other pointing away indicates the direction of ‘Cadster’ (Andrew’s home at the time). The explanation in the hand of G.C. Brooke on the reverse is that Lawrence had sent two coins of Stephen to Carlyon-Britton for his opinion but ‘the latter had returned them saying that by arrangement [my italics] all Stephens must be referred to W.J.A. first’.1

Norman Coinage, 1066–1158

The preserve of Major P.W.P. Carlyon-Britton (Pl. 2), the first President of the Society, was the coinage of William I and II. Before its foundation he had already published several articles on the subject,2 and his survey was among the first of the planned series to appear in the Journal.3 Taking Andrew’s recent study of the coinage of Henry I as its model,4 the methodology is recognisably modern, using documentary sources, hoards, typology, mules and style to establish the arrangement. Non-substantive varieties obscuring the order in the previous Hawkins classification5 were eliminated, resulting in the scheme of thirteen types accepted without question ever since. Discussions of production technique and the administration of the coinage were further advanced features. Although it still looked back in some respects to the nineteenth century, for example in its discursive style, his study marked a major advance. The outbreak of the First World War brought its mint and moneymakers chapters to a premature halt after Oxfordshire, but Carlyon-Britton planned to continue with the remainder.6 He never did, probably because, as the war ended and the publication of BNJ resumed after a two year interval, the British Museum Catalogue on the subject had been published. As the latter should be treated as a whole, the state of research on the later Norman coinages before its publication will be outlined first.

The coinage of Henry I had ostensibly been covered by Andrew’s publication,7 to which the hostile reception in some quarters had been the catalyst for the foundation of the Society. The
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justified criticisms of Andrew should not obscure his contribution in placing details of a large corpus of coins on record for future students, and in making many useful points in his introductory discussion. The demolition of his use of historical evidence was unanswerable and the numismatic flaws in his arrangement required time and fresh eyes to put right. No paper of any kind on Henry I appeared in the Journal for a quarter of a century. Instead, Andrew turned to the coinage of Stephen about which he had also been accumulating material for the previous thirty years. The resulting publication was intended as the first serious attempt to survey the reign but never got beyond rather unfocussed introductory chapters. Once again valid points may be sifted out, including his re-attribution of the Pereries, previously given to Roger Earl of Warwick to Matilda. Its enduring value lay in the chapter publishing the neglected 1867 Sheldon, Derbyshire, hoard which closed at the start of type 2. Andrew hoped to complete his study but like Carlyon-Britton abandoned it after the appearance of BMC.

Overlapping with this work on the Norman coinage by founders of the Society was that of G.C. Brooke (Pl. 4c) who had been appointed to the British Museum in 1908. As curator of the English series, the task fell to him to prepare the next in line chronologically of its catalogues of British coins, that devoted to the Norman period. Brooke’s two-volume study was published in 1916. Although he thus had the publications of Andrew and Carlyon-Britton serially before him, and cited their papers, his work had proceeded largely from first principles. In listing the coins he followed the format laid down in earlier British Museum catalogues but gave weights, sources and ultimate provenances as well as distinguishing dies systematically for the first time. The introduction conformed in outline to the previously established methodology but the gathering, presentation and discussion of material was on a different scale and plane from what had gone before. Brooke’s lucid account of the coinage and its background was strictly to the numismatic point with none of the extraneous digressions of the previous writers. He handled the historical evidence judiciously and his conclusions were carefully measured with uncertainties openly acknowledged. Progress was made in most areas but it was in the reign of Stephen that he made the greatest advance. His volumes’ one major defect as far as recent students are concerned is that the sixty-two plates, a generous supply for the time, illustrate only a representative selection of the coins and not every one as current research requires.

Like many great works of scholarship, BMC Norman Kings inhibited further work in the series for some time, apart from occasional papers on hoards and stray discoveries. For William I there was the so-called ‘War Area’ hoard of coins of BMC 5, subsequently shown to have been a parcel of a hoard found at Scaldwell, Northamptonshire. A notable advance on Brooke’s understanding was made by Philip Grierson’s study of monetary taxation after the conquest. In it he showed that William I had not simply maintained the Anglo-Saxon monetary system he had inherited but introduced a major reform in the early 1080s under which a new geld de moneta began to be taken from English boroughs. The date of the Paxs type (BMC 8), central to the absolute chronologies of the two reigns, has been reconsidered by several students. Brooke placed it as the last type of William I but others have suggested that it was his penultimate type, was begun by him and continued under his son or was instituted by William II after his father’s death. Conclusive
evidence on this point has not yet been forthcoming. The manuscript and historical context of Pax has also been explored.\textsuperscript{17}

The past century has seen a huge increase in the availability of good editions of a growing range of the public records, chronicles and other written sources of value to the student of coinage and monetary history for the entire period reviewed in this chapter, and more numismatic students are now working from the original unpublished documents. There has also been a rise in academic interest in economic, administrative and social history for which coinage has been acknowledged to provide important evidence. This cross-fertilisation has been evident in publications in both disciplines. A pioneer in this area was Sir Francis Hill, writing about Lincoln.\textsuperscript{18} For the early post-Conquest period two detailed studies may be highlighted. At Winchester, many of the moneys were identified in the Winton Domesday and another survey of c.1110.\textsuperscript{19} They had close family connections, were among the wealthier citizens, and had their separate minting premises in the same part of the city. In London the Deorman moneymen-dynasty and its associates were also traced in the written record from before the Conquest into the reign of Henry I, revealing a similar pattern.\textsuperscript{20} Advances have also been made in understanding the weight standard and the king’s profit from coinage.\textsuperscript{21} A survey paper in the Royal Mint history by Ian Stewart (now Lord Stewartby) (Pl. 6d) traces the development of minting, technology and coinage administration throughout the Norman period.\textsuperscript{22}

For the study of the coinage of Henry I, the fundamental problem has been the unrepresentative nature of the surviving material. This has made the application of classic numismatic techniques, such as noting the arrival and departure of moneys, less secure. The accession of large amounts of new material was therefore particularly welcome, whether from isolated losses, excavation finds, or hoards. The discovery of a round halfpenny vindicated the written sources which mention it,\textsuperscript{23} and others are now recorded from a range of mints.\textsuperscript{24} In recent years, the Journal’s ‘Coin Register’ has delivered its annual crop of discoveries. Excavation finds have included those from Llanarthyl which added previously unknown coins to the poorly represented issues of the central years of the reign.\textsuperscript{25} The contents of early hoards have been re-investigated and made usable for comparative studies,\textsuperscript{26} but the really large infusion of new material was the seven hundred coins from the Lincoln hoard of 1971–2.\textsuperscript{27} It added a considerable number of previously unpublished coins for the types best represented (7, 10, 13–15) and provided much useful data on currency questions, but its deposition at the end of the reign meant that it did not contribute directly to the solution of the chronological problems of Henry I’s middle period. A useful listing of all known
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coins of the regular issues of the Norman coinage under mints was published by Harris. The co-operation of museum curators, collectors and dealers ensured that this corpus contained many unpublished coins including material from recent hoards. Students working on this new material found Brooke’s sequence of types and chronological model unsatisfactory. Dolley, in his booklet celebrating the anniversary of the Conquest demonstrated that Brooke’s type 10 had been preceded by his type 11, and Archibald proposed that type 9 should follow types 5 and 6 to which it was stylistically related. With several different schemes for the order of types current a review was needed. This was undertaken by Mark Blackburn, who made a detailed critique of the evidence and recent views and added many fresh insights of his own. He endorsed the order (in BMC types): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 7, 8, 11, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, which is now accepted as a working hypothesis. Establishing a secure absolute chronology for the reign has proved even more difficult. The crux is where in the sequence of types the reform of 1124–5 is to be placed. This subject has been widely discussed but the arguments are too complex to allow each to be rehearsed here. They are outlined and evaluated in the same paper by Blackburn who accepts the proposals by Walker and Gomm, that the reform took place after type XIV, thus leaving type XV to continue through the final ten years of the reign. Some, including the writer, still have problems with this chronology but no one would claim that finality has been reached.

Turning to the coinage of Stephen, a similar hiatus in research followed the publication of BMC Norman Kings except for short articles generally prompted by isolated finds. There was a revival in interest after the Second World War led by F. Elmore-Jones, the most important of whose publications was his paper on type 7. Fifty years on, recent advances were incorporated into a review of the reign by Commander R.P. Mack (Pl. 10d). He regrettably, but perhaps inevitably for reasons of space, treated in only summary fashion the regular coins of types 1, 2, and 7 which (with type 6) he accepted as substantive. Otherwise he published for the first time in the same place a complete corpus of the issues of the period, giving readings of the legends and full details of each one, as far as they were available. He arranged the material in a format which made it easy to use and summarised his views and those of other authorities with great clarity. While not every coin was illustrated, the plates were generous, including several die-duplicates of many types. His paper remains an indispensable research tool, even if its comprehensiveness was soon overtaken by the explosion of new material which followed the advent of the metal-detector.

The principal sources were several spectacular hoards which not only brought to light previously unrecorded coins but prompted renewed investigation of the problems of the reign. Prestwich, Lancashire (1972), closing, like so many, towards the end of type I, was rich in new coins for mint or moneyer and important for currency studies. Wicklewood, Norfolk (1989), extending into the Cross-and-Crosslets issue of Henry II, greatly expanded the representation of types 2 and 6 from Stephen's eastern share of the country and confirmed the existence of a mint at Dunwich. The coinage and currency of the Angevin west was transformed by the 1980 Coed y Wenallt hoard. It brought to light a rich series of coins of Matilda including new types, the first recorded coins from a mint at Swansea and previously unknown issues by minor Norman barons.
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in south Wales. The Box, Wiltshire (1993–4) hoard38 revolutionised the hitherto accepted view of the currency and financial administration in Matilda's western part of the divided kingdom in the mid-1140s by including over sixty representatives of a previously unknown coinage of lion type from several mints for the Angevin leaders Robert Earl of Gloucester and his son Earl William. These hoards brought out the strong element of regionalism in the currency pattern at this time. Successive editions of North's handbooks have kept up with the accessions of new material and changes in interpretation throughout the entire period under review in this chapter.39 George Boon's booklet40 reviewed the coinage of the reign and, although primarily designed for non-specialists, offered many original ideas on problems of attribution and chronology providing, for example, the correct reading of the title on the coins of the Scottish prince Henry as ERL, giving him his English title as Earl of Northumberland.

There is no longer any doubt about the status and relative order of Stephen's substantive types, but the long-standing dating scheme accepted by Mack has been called into question. The point at issue is the duration of type 1, which also affects the numismatic chronology of the middle period of the reign. It had been received wisdom that type 2 began after Stephen's release from captivity in 1142 but Seaman, after a study of the progressive loss of letters from the obverse inscriptions, proposed that it lasted considerably longer, probably being produced into the later 1140s.41 Although other students have differed in their view of exactly when type 1 came to an end there has been widespread agreement that it lasted into the mid-1140s. Archibald, however, continued to prefer a date in 1142, part of her evidence being that Bristol had been supplied with dies belonging to an advanced stage of type 1 by 1138.42 The recent discoveries of previously unknown and extensive coinages for the Angevin west does, in the writer's view, support her case, but this too is an area where more work remains to be done. Several of the exceptional issues of the period have also been discussed, although rarely conclusively. A significant connection was demonstrated between the die-cutting style of the pictorial and related types and issues from Boulogne, but the proposal that this required the coins to have been struck in the Low Countries rather than at York has not been accepted.43 The erasures on some dies of type 1 were associated in one paper with the Papal Interdict44 but this has also not found favour. Another suggested that they were related to the procedures for the cancellation of obsolete dies which had had to be pressed unexpectedly back into service; only the different type of erasure on the Bristol die was politically motivated.45 Mark Blackburn has evaluated the extensive recent research up to the early 1990s in an important numismatic survey of the reign.46

No dies of Norman coin-types were known until one with an obverse of Stephen type I was published by Andrew in the 1930s, but its status is now regarded as uncertain.47 Recently, dies of William I, Henry I and Stephen were found with another of Cnut in spoil from a Thameside building site in London.48 These were not just of technical interest but, as they were all of different mints, confirmed the centralisation of die-making in London at this time and suggested that the workshop was located somewhere nearby in the Vintry. Metallurgical analysis showed that,
Despite charges of ‘bad money’, the coins of Henry I in the sample tested were, whatever their weight, consistently of fine silver. Relatively few coins of the Stephen period have been analysed, but the results show that, while the king’s coins were of sterling quality, the silver content of the Angevin and other issues was more mixed. Sophisticated statistical methodology was shown to have potential in the study of coin output and survival.

**Cross-and-Crosslets Coinage, 1158–80**

The Cross-and-Crosslets (‘Tealby’) series, despite its interest and importance, has not received as much attention as others with more superficially attractive coins. Its attribution to Henry II was first proved by Sir Henry Ellis, using Pipe Roll evidence, in 1837–8, but no serious attempt at classificiation was made during the remainder of the nineteenth century. A paper by Nathan Heywood in the first *Journal* did little more than list separately the known obverse and reverse legends. A considerable advance was made in the next volume by Carlyon-Britton, who abstracted and analysed references to coinage matters in the published Pipe Rolls which had by then reached 23 Henry II, 1176–7, still three years before the end of the type. Translations of all the cited extracts were given in an appendix, and their evidence collated with that of the coins. The first attempt at classification proper was made by L.A. Lawrence (Pl. 1) in connection with his re-consideration of the 1853 Lark Hill, Worcester, hoard, and a comprehensive treatment dividing the series into seven classes followed immediately in the *Journal* of 1918–20. An important hoard found at Leicester in 1927 was published by Lawrence, and he also contributed to Brooke’s paper grouping the issues into just three major classes.

Any plans Brooke may have had to embark on the next *British Museum Catalogue* on the series was ended by his early death in 1934 and it was left to his successor Derek Allen (Pl. 5a) to take up the challenge. His work was disrupted by the war and was published only in 1951 after he had left the museum. His volume was a model of methodology, analysis and presentation. The introduction began with a keenly-observed ordering of the coins which were divided into six classes. He collated these groups with the mints and moneyers to build up a coherent arrangement of the coinage which he divided into six main classes. In establishing an absolute chronology for the series he re-investigated the Pipe Roll evidence and additional previously-unused sources, but uncertainties remained. In a magisterial chapter on finance and administration of the coinage, he made particularly effective use of the evidence from the *Dialogus de Scaccario* and the documents published by Wells. In listing the coins he had an even more difficult task than Brooke in dealing with particularly badly-struck coins, the minting arrangements for which caused a greater degree of die-linking, but corrections to his attributions have been few.

F. Elmore-Jones (Pl. 6a) made his rich collection of ‘Tealbys’ available to Allen, who frequently cited his coins in *BMC* to fill out incomplete readings from museum specimens or to note varieties not present in its trays. Elmore-Jones’s expertise is shown in the sale catalogues of his collection based on the detailed classifications and comments on die-linkages inscribed on his
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tickets in his unmistakable round hand. The opportunity to acknowledge the contribution made by sale catalogues and expert dealers' lists to numismatic studies. Over the past century, lots have been described by their usually unacknowledged compilers with increased and improved numismatic detail; illustration has, vitally, become more generous although the present series has, sadly, often been the exception. Nicholas Mayhew's chapter in the Royal Mint volume for the rest of the period under review in this chapter was a ground-breaking survey of minting history and the administration of the coinage based on the primary sources and a synthesis of recent work by numismatists and historians. The Cross-and-Crosslets obverse die published in the first Journal was accepted by Allen but is now considered to be false.

After the usual interval following the publication of BMC, scholarly interest in the Cross-and-Crosslets coinage has recently enjoyed a revival. Martin Allen, in connection with his study of the Durham mint, raised doubts about the continuing validity of the Derek Allen classification and chronology. New hoards of this issue come to light relatively infrequently, but four found since the end of the seventies provided interesting evidence on currency matters and also raised questions about the Derek Allen scheme. The contents and location of three of them suggested a possible connection with the rebellion of 1173-4, but the Allen chronology required an earlier dating. Tim Crafter provided a detailed critique of earlier classifications and chronology using statistical techniques alongside more traditional methodology, and has arrived at a revised system remarkably similar to that proposed by Brooke in 1927. The same author has undertaken a die study of the coins of the Ipswich mint which demonstrates the very high output of the dies used there in classes B and F.

Short Cross Coinage, 1180–1247

The fundamental break-through in the study of the Short Cross coinage had already been made before the foundation of the Society. In 1863 the Revd W.H.D. Longstaffe had shown that the issue uniformly in the name of 'King Henry' had run continuously from the later years of Henry II through the reigns of Richard I and John into the period of Henry III. His detailed arrangement of the coins was already based on a classic collation of the typology of coins and the contents of hoards with the arrival and departure of moneyers who could be documented and dated in the Pipe Rolls. Two years later John Evans demolished a last ditch attempt to deny any of the issues to Richard I and John and, putting to right some errors in Longstaffe's pioneering study, set out a simplified sequence of just five classes. This scheme survived virtually unchallenged for half a century. Publications as late as that of the massive Short Cross hoard found at Colchester in 1902 followed it uncritically.

In the early years of the Society L.A. Lawrence concentrated his attention elsewhere and it was only in 1915 that his matured views on the Short Cross coinage reached the Journal. In a
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brilliant essay of just forty or so large-print pages Lawrence put forward the evidence for his division of the coinage into eight classes with further sub-groupings which marked a major step forward in its understanding. This classification is, in outline, still valid and in use today. His very conciseness, however, and a less than adequate allowance of plates, meant that students found some of his descriptions of diagnostic features rather difficult to apply. A few students voiced doubts about certain aspects of his arrangement in the following decades but some were unfounded and others not fully explored. Problems certainly remained, particularly in the classification of the beginning and end of the series, in types 2 and 4 and in specific areas such as the Rhuddlan mint.

No really significant advance on Lawrence’s work appeared until F. Elmore-Jones’s paper on the closing class 8 in 1948. The next major step forward was made by John Brand (Pl. 8a) whose discussion of a range of Short Cross questions in 1964, included the key correction of the ordering of Lawrence’s classes 2 and 4. In addition to his formal publications Brand promoted the study of the coinage by listing examples in many public collections and distributing copies to museums and interested individuals. In 1969 his revision of the classification of the series as a whole was published, rather obscurely, in the introduction to the second Ashmolean sylloge covering the period 1066–1279. Nearly 400 Short Cross coins were identified according to the Brand system and every one was illustrated. The volume thus provided students and collectors for the first time with a large detailed corpus, which was of enormous help in identifying their own material to a higher standard. The output records of the London and Canterbury mints in the Short and Long Cross types for the period 1220–70 were made available in print for the first time by Blunt and Brand. These brought precision to the impression from the surviving coins that production at the two mints was high during the later Short Cross period; in fact eight million pennies on average were struck between them annually. The fluctuations in production within a succession of short accounting periods also offered, with sensitive handling, a useful clue to dating.

In the latter part of the century the Short Cross coinage also received heavy and sustained attention from a growing number of other researchers. Many papers were produced on specific types, periods or mints, refining classification particularly in the still problematic areas at either end of the coinage. The material available for research was expanded by new hoards and the reconstruction of inadequately recorded earlier finds. The deposition of the 1864 Eccles hoard, pivotal to the dating of the series, was conclusively placed c. 1230, at least a dozen years earlier than originally thought. Hoards found abroad were increasingly recognised as making a significant contribution to English Short Cross studies and cooperation with overseas colleagues proved fruitful. Important information on the Short Cross coinage was also contained in wider mint studies such as that of Lincoln, where a die-study of the type marked a new departure in large-scale methodology for the series. This approach was also followed in a more extensive die-study
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of the issues of Carlisle and Durham. Such individual studies taken together represented a huge accession of new information, but some areas of the coinage had been subjected to much closer scrutiny than others and, as the century closed, the time had arrived for another overall academic review to bring together and evaluate this research. The non-specialist had meantime been well-served by updated editions of North’s standard handbook. The need for a more detailed guide to identification devoted specifically to the Short Cross coinage was met by a clearly presented booklet in the series by Christopher Wren. For synthesis the specialist had to wait until 2001 when it was provided by Jeffrey Mass in publishing his own rich collection. Produced in sylloge format this volume made available a large corpus of material carefully chosen to be representative across the entire range of the series and listed according to the most up-to-date classification. In the introductory chapters Mass discussed the history of the subject and the evolution of the classification, while Allen contributed a over-view of the chronology, mints and moneyers. This book is an indispensable basis for future study.

Several round halfpennies and farthings, ordered in 1222 but not previously extant, have come to light since 1989. All are of type VII and confined to London moneys precisely as authorised in the official records. Hoards, more plentiful since the advent of metal-detectors, have continued to be the source of much new material as well as contributing to monetary history. Details of thirteen Short Cross hoards mainly from the 1980s and 1990s, but including a neglected mid-nineteenth century find, were published in the recent first volume in the British Museum’s new series of English Medieval Coin Hoards by Archibald and Cook. The authors noted, this represented an important addition to the available data, particularly as several of the hoards were deposited before the partial coinage of 1204/5, a period from which few English finds were previously known and fewer fully recorded. While not large enough to outweigh the massive hoards from late in the type led by Eccles and Colchester 1, these new finds go some way to redressing the previous imbalance of the English evidence.

Site finds from the Short Cross period onwards have not received the same treatment as those from earlier medieval periods, failing for example to qualify for inclusion in the ‘Coin Register’ unless in exceptional cases. Their importance for questions of currency, settlement patterns and other aspects of social history is acknowledged but the cost of listing and publishing the numerous later strays losses on a national basis has hitherto made this impracticable. The record-keeping in this area at present devolves onto local archaeological units and museums, and it is to be hoped that computerisation may soon make it easier for interested students to access these archives. Besly’s study of the stray finds from Llanfaes, Anglesey, which included Short-Cross and later coins, was the exception to the general rule and illustrated the valuable results which can be obtained. Large numbers of coins of this period have been published in excavation reports, where the standard of numismatic reporting has improved greatly and which therefore deserve more attention than they have been given. The illuminating use which can be made of such finds has been demonstrated in a pioneering study by Stuart Rigold (Pl. 6b), and by the 1997 Howard Linecar Lecture delivered to the Society by the historian Christopher Dyer. Stray foreign coins which were lost in England or even escaped the
recoinage net into circulation during the medieval period were surveyed by Cook and reflect
the changing focus of England’s foreign contacts. The more legitimate role of foreign gold
coins in the thirteenth century English currency has been investigated, Muslim obols of Musc
by Grierson and Byzantine 'beasts' by Cook. Continental imitations of Short Cross coins are
relatively rare but have featured in several publications.

The advances just outlined have been mainly in the areas of classification and numismatic
chronology achieved by the application of ever more sophisticated analysis and traditional
numismatic techniques. Seldom absent from these studies, but coming into much greater
prominence towards the end of the century, have been investigations into administrative and
technological aspects of coinage and monetary history. Where the administration of the Short
Cross coinage is concerned, much relevant information was contained in the introduction to
Allen’s study of the Cross-and-Crosslets coinage of Henry II. The major contribution was
again made by Brand in his 1981 MA thesis, published posthumously in 1994 as the first in the
Society’s Special Publications series. Basing his investigation on references in the Public
Records, many previously unpublished and noted by him for the first time, he reviewed the
administration and workings of the Short Cross mints, moneyers and exchanges, and also
explained the little-understood standards of fineness and how these were reached and mainte-
tained. The evidence of the ecclesiastical mints of Bury, Durham and York, the archives of
which complement the royal records, are being increasingly and rewarding explored. For
this and the later Angevin period important written evidence for minting in Canterbury, and for
the moneyers and their premises, was published in a history of the city. The contribution of
numismatic evidence has also been recognised in other historical works such as the volume of
the standard Oxford History for the period. On the technological front, the Short Cross type
was the basis of a pioneering account of the technique of die production using punches by
Fox, superseded by Sellwood’s classic general paper. Metallurgical analysis has not been
so prominent as in the earlier medieval series because the Short Cross has been regarded as a
stable coinage of sterling fineness, and so it proved in analyses published by Mayhew and
Walker. The ‘unique’ die of Short Cross type published in the inaugural volume of the
Journal is now no longer accepted as authentic.
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Long Cross Coinage, 1247–79

Long Cross coins with obverses inscribed ‘King Henry the Third’ presented no problem of regal attribution, although the continuation of the issue into the reign of Edward I escaped early students. They also frequently misread the reverses as there was no initial mark to indicate the start of legends whose letters were heavily ligated. Divisions of the coinage were made on the basis of prominent changes in the form of the king’s numeral and the effigy, but no success had been achieved in putting them into the correct order. Evans in 1869 endorsed the view of earlier writers that coins with sceptre had preceded those without and this was still accepted in 1887. The Fox brothers recognised that late Long Cross coins had been struck under Edward I and the rest of the misconceptions were put right by Lawrence in three classic papers in the Journal from 1912. He divided the coinage into eight major classes and defined several sub-classes in each, up to eight in the most complex and long-lasting class 5. This scheme for the coinage still stands today. He accurately transcribed the reverse legends and listed the moneys for each mint, noting dated references to their appointment and replacement in the written sources. The end of the coinage brought problems, as the extant coins from the few remaining mints were rare and probably not fully representative, and the relevant documentary evidence was less helpful. Lawrence did not discuss the basis for dating, which was left for an expected paper by Earle Fox. This did not materialise, although the sources for the end of the coinage had been covered in an earlier publication with his brother. The gold pennies of the Long-Cross type, the first gold coins produced in England since Anglo-Saxon times, excited greater interest. The first notice of the issue appeared in 1763 and, most recently before the Society’s foundation, four coins were the subject of a study by Evans in 1900. Six were known to Lawrence and that is still the total today. The background to their issue in 1257 and their failure to become established were recently discussed by David Carpenter. He showed that although the king was able to purchase some as late as 1270, it was only within a few months of their launch that they were in general circulation.

Further documentary sources for the Long Cross period were published by Wells, including important evidence on the date of the opening and closing of the provincial mints in class 3, fundamental to the early chronology of the series. Lawrence himself returned briefly to the Long Cross in 1938–9 to publish some additions to his list for Durham. At its centre was a coin believed to be the sole evidence for the mint in class 3, but this contradicted the documentary evidence showing that the Durham mint was closed at this time, and the coin had in fact been misread. So definitive was Lawrence’s scheme that changes over the years have been confined to further sub-division of his classes into smaller discrete groups and additions to moneys representations. Roger Davis developed a more detailed classification based on his work over many years on the massive English element from the 1908 Brussels hoard, purchased by Messrs Baldwin and still largely intact. He has published relatively little but distributed a privately-produced booklet setting out his results which he also made available for inclusion in later...
editions of North’s handbook. A useful guide to the identification of Long Cross coins incorporating the work of Davis and his successors was published in the Wren series in 1993. Bob Thomas and Ron Churchill have now taken over work on the Brussels parcel.

While the publication of Brussels is awaited, a number of hoards have added coins which have filled out the representations and contributed to overall currency patterns. The most important was undoubtedly Colchester 2, found in 1969, the 14,000 coins from which provided the best statistical evidence available in print for the relative output of the various mints and moneymen until the closure of its first part with class 5c in 1256. The closure of its second part involved a re-examination of the date of class 6, but it cannot be securely dated any more closely than 1268–78. The Foxes’ attempt to narrow this bracket is now seen as unacceptable because the dates of the appointment of Durham moneymen, on which they relied, are not certain. It is thus still not possible to say which coins of Long Cross type were struck after the accession of Edward I.

Mint organisation and administration have been of growing interest. The chance survival of a document recording the daily output at the Shrewsbury mint during its short life in the Long-Cross period provided unparalleled evidence of working practice and how closely it was monitored. The Colchester 2 hoard showed recurring proportions of production-share for the moneymen participating in successive types at their mint. At London, incoming business appears to have been shared among the moneymen in different ratios of the eight ‘dies’ (established at least as far back as Athelstan) on the basis of their number and seniority. Different methods have been used to estimate the total English currency at the recoinage in 1247 of nearly half a million pounds. Continental imitations of English coins were more common in the Long Cross period and students have become more skilled at differentiating the direct copies from their prototypes. Some examples have been published individually and others have been noted in hoards, including a particularly important group from the first part of Colchester 2. A major survey by North, which distinguished die-linked and stylistically associated groups, marks the start of a classification system.

Eighteenth and nineteenth-century forgeries of early medieval coins were included in a series of classic papers by Lawrence and a few were identified by Pagan as the work of Emery. While new forgeries of post-Conquest coins have continued to appear, they have not been so numerous recently as those of Anglo-Saxon issues. Several groups of reproductions, although not made with the intention to deceive, have caused problems for non-specialists as they have not been clearly identified as copies.

---

119 As n. 39.
123 As in n. 65, pp. 67–142.
124 J.D. Brand in Archibald and Cook, as in n. 65, pp. 85–6.
125 As n. 56, p. 96, n. 12.
127 As in n. 65, pp. 73–5.
129 As in n. 65, pp. 78–89 and 141–2.
Conclusions

Since the foundation of the Society, great advances have been made in the knowledge and understanding of the English coinage from 1066 to 1279. Building on a good foundation in some cases, and from virtually a standing start in others, the basic classification of most of the regular series has now been established, although no one would claim finality. Precision in internal dating, however, is often still elusive. The many grey areas which remain are largely in periods where the surviving material is sparse and probably unrepresentative. The potential of contemporary written records has been appreciated from the beginning but these are now more fully exploited and used with greater rigour. Monetary history in all its aspects is an increasingly important part of numismatic study, and the growing participation of academic historians and scientists is particularly welcome. In all aspects of the subject much remains to be done, and the health of the Society is evident in the younger members now coming forward to tackle them.