THE QUANTITY OF MONEY IN ENGLAND 1180–1247: NEW DATA

MARTIN ALLEN

In a recent article Paul Latimer has published a model of the changing volume of the English currency between 1180 and 1247, with estimates of the quantity of money in circulation, mint output, and losses from the currency.¹ This is a significant contribution to the debate on the economic effects of the growth in the English money supply during a period of exceptional inflation, but some of Latimer’s calculations have been overtaken by estimates published elsewhere.² This short paper will offer a new series of estimates of money supply and mint output, using data not available to Latimer.

Latimer calculates the size of the English silver currency at the beginning of thecoinages of 1158–c.1160, 1180–2, 1247–50 and 1279–81, each of which replaced the silver coins in circulation. The English currency also included a relatively small element of foreign gold coins, not included in the estimates.³ Latimer’s estimate of the currency in 1180 (£20,000–£110,000) is derived from Michael Metcalf’s figures for mint output in 1158–80 (£41,667–£125,000), with arbitrary deductions for losses of coins from circulation between 1158 and 1180.⁴ Latimer was unable to base his estimate upon the more secure foundation of a calculation of mint output in the coinage of 1180–2, but it is now possible to estimate this output, as recent refinements in the classification of the Short Cross coinage of 1180–1247 have distinguished between the coins issued in the coinage (classes Ia1–Ib1) and subsequent output (from class Ib2).⁵ Nicholas Mayhew has used data from published studies of the Carlisle and Lincoln mints to estimate mint output in 1180–91 (c.£300,000) and 1180–1204 (c.£500,000), and his method can be applied to the calculation of new estimates of output during and after the 1180–2 coinage.⁶ Table 1 summarizes data for the Carlisle and Lincoln mints, and unpublished data from Yvonne Harvey’s forthcoming survey of the Winchester mint, estimating the numbers of dies used in classes Ia1–Ib1 (1180–c.1182) and classes Ib2–II (c.1182–90).⁷ The estimates in Table 1 are numbers of ‘equivalent’ reverse dies, calculated in the same manner as Metcalf’s figures for 1158–80.⁸ The die estimates are extrapolated to total figures for all of the English mints, based upon the assumption that the contribution of the studied mints to the total consumption of dies and mint output is approximately represented by their share of the coins of classes Ia1–Ib1 and Ib2–II in the Wainfleet hoard.⁹
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⁸ C.S.S. Lyon, in Mossop, as in n. 9, pp. 15–17, 19, describes the method of calculation. The estimates of ‘equivalent’ dies refer to the total numbers of dies that would have been used if the dies recorded in the mint studies and unrecorded dies had the same average output.
⁹ The published list of the Wainfleet hoard in M.M. Archibald and B.J. Cook, English Medieval Coin Hoards: I. Cross and Crosslets, Short Cross and Long Cross Hoards, BM Occasional Paper 87 (London, 2001), pp. 22–32, and an analysis of photographs of the coins provided by Dr Cook, indicate that 36 (23%) of 155 coins of classes Ia1–Ib2 and 25 (15%) of 163 coins of classes Ib2–II came from the studied mints.
The estimates of 801 equivalent reverse dies in classes Ia1–Ib1 and 1,773 dies in classes Ib2–II indicate estimated mint outputs of about £33,000–£67,000 in 1180–2 and £74,000–£148,000 in 1182–c.1190, assuming an average output of 10,000–20,000 coins per reverse die. The annual averages of the mint output estimates are £16,500–£33,500 in 1180–2 and £9,250–£18,500 in 1182–c.1190. The figures for 1182–c.1190 seem to indicate a substantial increase in normal non-recoinage mint output since the 1170s, as Metcalf’s estimate of the number of reverse dies used in class F of the Cross-and-Crosslets coinage (238) implies an average annual output of only about £1,500–£3,000 from some 40 dies per annum in the period of class F (c.1174–80). The growth in normal mint output probably began after and not before 1180, as Timothy Crafter’s analysis of Metcalf’s estimates of numbers of dies used in 1158–80 suggests that the rate of consumption of dies was at about the same level from c.1167 to 1180. The six-fold increase in the annual output estimate between c.1174–80 and 1182–c.1190 makes it particularly difficult to suggest a figure for normal output in the recoinage of 1180–2 to be deducted from the estimate of total recoinage output (c.£33,000–£67,000), to estimate the volume of the silver currency available for recoinage in 1180. The annual figures of c.1174–80 would indicate an adjusted estimate of about £30,000–£60,000 for output derived from the old currency in the recoinage, but the rate of 1182–c.1190 indicates an estimate of only some £15,000–£30,000. The aggregate range of the two estimates of output combined is c.£15,000–£60,000, which can serve as an estimate of the currency in 1180. Latimer’s estimate of the currency in 1158 (£20,000–£50,000) is within the range of this estimate, but the rise in the underlying estimates of reverse dies from Metcalf’s figure of 559 in Cross-and-Crosslets class A (1158–c.1160) to 801 in 1180–2 suggests that the size of the currency increased between 1158 and 1180. The growth in Henry II’s recorded revenues in the 1160s and 1170s may also indicate that the currency was increasing. It can certainly be suggested that there was a large increase in mint output in the 1180s, which may have initiated the growth of the currency between 1180 and 1247 modelled by Latimer.

It should be possible in principle to estimate mint output during the production of Short Cross classes III and IV (c.1190–1204/5) by the same method as that employed for classes I and II (1180–c.1190), but this is difficult in practice. There are no coins of the Lincoln mint in classes III and IV to provide die statistics, and the publication of studies of the Durham and Shrewsbury

### Table 1. Estimates of reverse dies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Recorded dies</th>
<th>Estimated dies</th>
<th>Estimate for all mints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ia1–Ib1</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib2–II</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1,773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The annual averages of the mint output estimates are £16,500–£33,500 in 1180–2 and £9,250–£18,500 in 1182–c.1190. The figures for 1182–c.1190 seem to indicate a substantial increase in normal non-recoinage mint output since the 1170s, as Metcalf’s estimate of the number of reverse dies used in class F of the Cross-and-Crosslets coinage (238) implies an average annual output of only about £1,500–£3,000 from some 40 dies per annum in the period of class F (c.1174–80). The growth in normal mint output probably began after and not before 1180, as Timothy Crafter’s analysis of Metcalf’s estimates of numbers of dies used in 1158–80 suggests that the rate of consumption of dies was at about the same level from c.1167 to 1180. The six-fold increase in the annual output estimate between c.1174–80 and 1182–c.1190 makes it particularly difficult to suggest a figure for normal output in the recoinage of 1180–2 to be deducted from the estimate of total recoinage output (c.£33,000–£67,000), to estimate the volume of the silver currency available for recoinage in 1180. The annual figures of c.1174–80 would indicate an adjusted estimate of about £30,000–£60,000 for output derived from the old currency in the recoinage, but the rate of 1182–c.1190 indicates an estimate of only some £15,000–£30,000. The aggregate range of the two estimates of output combined is c.£15,000–£60,000, which can serve as an estimate of the currency in 1180. Latimer’s estimate of the currency in 1158 (£20,000–£50,000) is within the range of this estimate, but the rise in the underlying estimates of reverse dies from Metcalf’s figure of 559 in Cross-and-Crosslets class A (1158–c.1160) to 801 in 1180–2 suggests that the size of the currency increased between 1158 and 1180. The growth in Henry II’s recorded revenues in the 1160s and 1170s may also indicate that the currency was increasing. It can certainly be suggested that there was a large increase in mint output in the 1180s, which may have initiated the growth of the currency between 1180 and 1247 modelled by Latimer.

It should be possible in principle to estimate mint output during the production of Short Cross classes III and IV (c.1190–1204/5) by the same method as that employed for classes I and II (1180–c.1190), but this is difficult in practice. There are no coins of the Lincoln mint in classes III and IV to provide die statistics, and the publication of studies of the Durham and Shrewsbury

---

10 M. Allen, ‘Medieval English die-output’, *BNJ* 74 (2004), 39–49 at p. 48, calculates average outputs of reverse dies at nine mints in 1249–1327, between 11,010 and 20,000 coins per die.

11 Latimer, as in n. 1, pp. 647–8, estimates an average output of £27,273 in 1180–91, or £17,273–£25,455 if the recoinage is excluded.


13 Crafter, as in n. 12, pp. 55–6.

14 Allen, ‘The volume of the English currency’, as in n. 2, p. 599, estimates a currency of about £70,000–£190,000, remitted by some 800–900 obverse dies of classes Ia1–Ib1. This is based upon an estimate of a total of about 1,000 equivalent obverse dies used in the recoinage of 1180–2, which is extrapolated from data for classes Ia1–Ia4 only, and is more speculative than the estimates presented here.

15 Latimer, as in n. 1, pp. 643. Metcalf, as in n. 4, pp. 26–31.


17 Latimer, as in n. 1, pp. 653–4, and *idem*, ‘The English Inflation of 1180–1220 reconsidered’, *Past & Present* 171 (May 2001), 3–29, at p. 21, argues that there was fast growth in the money supply in the 1180s.
mints in class IV does not adequately compensate for this. Only five reverse dies have been recorded for the Shrewsbury mint in class IV, and twelve from the Durham mint, to add to the thirty-three reverse dies known from Winchester coins of classes III and IV.\(^{18}\) Furthermore, the aggregate contribution of these three mints to total output in classes III and IV was relatively small, and impossible to quantify accurately on the basis of the available hoard evidence. The Winchester mint supplied four of the sixty-two coins of classes III and IV in the Wainfleet hoard, but 101 coins of these classes in the Bainton hoard included only two of Winchester. The sixty-two coins in the Wainfleet hoard do not include any coins of the other studied mints, and the Bainton hoard has just one class IVa penny of Carlisle.\(^{19}\) The Gisors hoard, which has provided the largest group of coins of classes III and IV in a published find deposited after the end of class IV in 1204/5, had only one coin of the studied mints in a total of forty-seven (a class IVa penny of Durham).\(^{20}\) The available data will not sustain credible estimates of mint output between c.1190 and 1205, based upon numbers of dies.

The series of documented mint outputs begins in 1220, but there are earlier records of farms and profits, starting in the 1190s, that provide some evidence of the size of outputs. These references have been reviewed by John Brand, who calculated outputs from them, assuming that the profits were derived from seignorage at the customary rate of 6d. per tower pound.\(^{21}\) Farms are particularly questionable evidence of output, as there is no means of knowing whether they were even approximately related to real profits. The chief limitation of actual profits as indicators of output is that they might be net profits after expenses.\(^{22}\) The recorded profits of the London and Canterbury exchanges in 1195–7 and of the London exchange in 1217–18 are gross profits, accompanied by expenses, but the London profit of 1210–12 is net, after expenses (\textit{preter necessarias expenses}).\(^{23}\) Expenses consumed 14.8 per cent of the London and Canterbury profits in 1225–6 and 20.9 per cent in 1226–9, which may provide some indication of the possible difference between gross and net profits in earlier periods.\(^{24}\) An additional complication is that Canterbury profits have to be multiplied by a factor of 8/5, to take account of the archbishop of Canterbury’s three-eighths share of the profits.\(^{25}\) Furthermore, the archbishop’s share cannot be calculated in 1201–2 and 1203–5, when the accounts do not record the Canterbury profits separately. Nevertheless, all of the recorded profits can at least provide minimum estimates of mint output. Table 2 contains a summary of all of the known profits before the beginning of documented mint outputs in 1220, and output estimates calculated from them. The calculations of output assume a seignorage of 6d. per tower pound of silver, and the production of 246d. from each pound, which may have been the standard employed in 1180–1247.\(^{26}\)

The combined annual estimates of London and Canterbury output in 1195–7 (£18,879 in all) can be extrapolated to a figure of about £20,000 for the total output of all of the English mints, as the London and Canterbury mints supplied fifty-eight (87 per cent) of the sixty-seven coins of class IVa (c.1194–1200) in the Bainton hoard.\(^{27}\) This estimate suggests a continued increase in the level of output since the 1180s, as the annual estimate for 1182–c.1190 is only £9,250–£18,500. The much smaller estimates for 1201–2 and 1203–5 seem to indicate a reversal of this trend, although it should be noted that the figures for these periods do not include the archbishop of Canterbury’s share of profits. The increase to an estimated output of £29,144 from the London mint alone in 1205–6 is a measure of the effect of the recoinage of 1205–7. As London supplied


\(^{19}\) Archibald and Cook, as in n. 9, pp. 25–32, 36–40; supplementary information on an unpublished parcel of twelve coins from the Bainton hoard provided by Craig Barclay.


\(^{22}\) Brand, as in n. 21, p. 37.

\(^{23}\) Brand, as in n. 21, pp. 33, 37–8; \textit{Pipe Roll 13 John}, p. 106; \textit{Pipe Roll 17 John}, pp. 20–2.

\(^{24}\) Brand, as in n. 21, p. 41, summarizes the profits and expenses of 1225–6 and 1226–9.


\(^{26}\) M. Allen, ‘The weight standard of the English Coinage 1158–1279’ \textit{NC} 165 (2005), 228–33.

\(^{27}\) Archibald and Cook, as in n. 9, pp. 36–40; information from Craig Barclay. The percentage of London and Canterbury coins in class IVa in the smaller hoard from Canwell, published by Archibald and Cook, pp. 33–5, is also 87% (20 coins in a total of 23).
twenty per cent of the coins of classes Va and Vb (1204/5–c.1206) in the Gisors hoard, and thirty-three per cent in the Ribe hoard of 1911, the total annual output of 1205–6 may have been about £90,000–£150,000. The annual estimate for London and York in 1206 (£18,475) might indicate a reduction in output in the second year of the recoinage, but the reported profit of £200 is a suspiciously round number, unlike the other profits in Table 2, and it may not have been based upon an actual calculation of output. The annual estimate of about £90,000–£150,000 for 1205–6 might be extrapolated to a total estimate of some £250,000–£410,000 for the whole recoinage, as it lasted for about two and three-quarter years from the issue of the assize regulating the recoinage in January 1205 to the summons of mint personnel to Westminster in October 1207. This would probably be an overestimate, as the opening of temporary recoinage mints was not completed until the summer of 1205, and output may well have declined towards the end of the recoinage. With these factors in mind it is only possible to very tentatively suggest that total output in the recoinage may have been about £200,000–£300,000. This figure might be the basis of an even more tentative estimate of the currency in 1205, if hoards gave a clear indication of the extent of the survival of pre-1205 coins after the recoinage. Unfortunately, the hoard data in Table 3, for the pre-recoinage classes (I–IV) and classes Va–Vb (which constituted the bulk of the recoinage), are too variable for valid generalizations, beyond the observation that the pre-1205 silver currency not subject to recoinage probably did not exceed the recoinage output in volume. The available evidence is not sufficient to produce a new estimate of the currency in 1205, to compare with Mayhew’s estimate (c.£250,000), which was based upon the assumption that half of an estimated output of about £500,000 in 1180–1204 was lost through export before the recoinage of 1205–7. Mayhew’s estimate is arguably more precise than the available data will allow, but there does seem to be good reason to believe that the English currency included several hundred thousand pounds in silver coins in 1205, representing a substantial increase since 1180.

### TABLE 2. Profits and estimated outputs, 1195–1218

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Exchanges</th>
<th>Profit</th>
<th>Output estimate</th>
<th>Annual estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.5.1195–6.7.1197</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>£416 6s. 3d.</td>
<td>£17,069</td>
<td>£8,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.5.1195–28.5.1197</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>£330 16s. 0d.</td>
<td>£21,700</td>
<td>£10,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.9.1201–29.9.1202</td>
<td>All royal exchanges</td>
<td>£166 6s. 0d.</td>
<td>&gt;£6,618</td>
<td>&gt;£6,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4.1203–13.1.1205</td>
<td>All royal exchanges</td>
<td>£378</td>
<td>&gt;£15,498</td>
<td>&gt;£8,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.1205–13.1.1206</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>£210 16s. 9d.</td>
<td>£29,144</td>
<td>£29,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.1206–24.6.1206</td>
<td>London and York</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>£8,200</td>
<td>£18,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.6.1208–11.11.1211</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>£18 11s. 0d.</td>
<td>£761</td>
<td>£225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11.1211–11.11.1212</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>£4 1s. 6d.</td>
<td>£166</td>
<td>£166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.11.1210–4.12.1212</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>£1,132 (net)</td>
<td>&gt;£46,412</td>
<td>&gt;£36,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.11.1212–2.2.1215</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>£316 19s. 0d.</td>
<td>£12,995</td>
<td>£10,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3.1214–29.9.1214</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>£92</td>
<td>£6,038</td>
<td>£10,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.11.1217–7.2.1218</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>£73</td>
<td>£2,993</td>
<td>£13,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


29 The contribution of the York mint to total output in 1206 would have been relatively insignificant, as it supplied only 3 of the 75 coins of classes Va and Vb in the Gisors hoard, and 4 of the 100 coins of these classes in the 1911 Ribe hoard.


32 Dr Barrie Cook has provided unpublished data from the Leconfield hoard.


34 Allen, ‘The volume of the English currency’, as in n. 2, pp. 599–600, tentatively estimates that the size of the currency was about £200,000–300,000 in c.1210. This figure was based upon estimates of numbers of dies used in Short Cross class V and the survival of coins of pre-recoinage classes. I.E.A. Jolliffe, ‘The chamber and the castle treasuries under King John’, in Studies in Medieval History presented to F.M. Powicke, edited by R.W. Hunt et al. (Oxford, 1948), pp. 117–42, at pp. 130–5, estimates that King John accumulated about 200,000 marks (£133,333) in provincial treasuries between 1207 and 1213, and Bolton, as in n. 33, pp. 33–4, argues that this may have taken about half of the English currency out of circulation, temporarily.
TABLE 3. Short Cross classes I-Vb in hoards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Classes I-IV</th>
<th>Classes Va-Vb</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gisors</td>
<td>83 (52.5%)</td>
<td>75 (47.5%)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribe 1911</td>
<td>34 (25.4%)</td>
<td>100 (74.6%)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leconfield</td>
<td>14 (35.0%)</td>
<td>26 (65.0%)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The annual minimum output estimate for the London mint in 1210–12 and the Durham estimates of 1208–12 in Table 2 indicate a total output of at least £40,000 per annum in 1210–12, at a time when these two mints produced all of the English coinage. This suggests that there had been significant growth in normal levels of output since the 1190s, and that annual output was now greater than it had been in the recoinage of 1180–2 (when it is estimated to have been only c. £16,500–£33,500). However, the London and Canterbury estimates of 1213–15 and 1214 indicate a total annual output of only about £20,000 in 1214, which is half of the 1210–12 estimate. John Brand argued that there may have been a temporary decline in the London mint’s output in 1213–15, as a consequence of the onset of the civil war of 1215–17. The recorded profit of the London exchange for a brief period of twelve weeks in 1217–18, shortly after the end of the civil war, might be a relatively unreliable source of an annual output estimate.

The records of mint output start in 1220, with annual averages of £34,544 in 1220–2, £11,631 in 1225–9, £40,368 in 1234–40, and £47,650 in 1240–7, assuming the striking of 246d. per tower pound. These figures can be increased to about £36,000, £12,000, £42,000 and £50,000 respectively, to take account of the production of about four or five per cent of total English mint output at the Bury St Edmunds mint, which is not included in the mint accounts. The adjusted figures seem to indicate that the level of output achieved in 1210–12 (at least £40,000) was generally sustained after 1220, with a temporary decline in 1225–29, but that it did not significantly increase until the 1240s.

I have estimated that total mint output in the recoinage of 1247–50 was about £585,000, or approximately £425,000–£450,000 after deduction of normal output not attributable to the reminting of the silver coins in circulation in 1247. The estimation of the monetary value of the currency reminted in 1247–50 must include an assessment of the difference in weight between the old and new coins, as before. Three relatively substantial hoards deposited shortly before the recoinage of 1247–50 can provide data to measure the deficiency in weight of the old coinage. Only one of these hoards is from England (Leconfield), but the continental hoards from Gisors and Ribe seem to have contained consignments of coins derived from the English currency.

The average weights of 448 pennies or penny equivalents in the Leconfield hoard and of 813 English pennies in the Gisors hoard are 1.38 g in both cases, but the average for 174 coins in the Ribe hoard is lower at 1.35 g. The higher of these two averages is about 95 per cent of the probable standard weight of new coins in the Long Cross recoinage of 1247–50 (1.45 g or 22.3 grains), and the lower average is about 93 per cent of the Long Cross standard. If these figures are representative of the overall state of the English coinage in 1247, a recoinage output of some £425,000–£450,000 may have been derived from old coins with a face value of about £450,000–£480,000. Table 4 summarizes all of the final estimates of annual output and the volume of the currency presented in this article.

35. Allen, ‘The chronology, mints, and moneyers’, as in n. 5, p. 7, discusses the activity of mints between the end of the recoinage of 1205–7 and 1215.
36. Brand, as in n. 21, p. 13.
37. The records of mint output in 1220–47 are published by Blunt and Brand, as in n. 25. Brand, as in n. 21, pp. 39–48, discusses the mint accounts in greater detail. A New History of the Royal Mint, edited by C.E. Challis (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 673–4, converts the weights of coins struck to actual totals of coins, assuming the striking of 242d. per tower pound.
38. Brand, as in n. 21, p. 10 n. 23, suggests that the Bury St Edmunds mint provided about 5% of total output in 1220–47. It supplied 28 (5.3%) of the 525 coins of classes VII and VIII (1217/18–47) in the Gisors hoard, and 36 (4.2%) of the 858 coins of these classes in the 1911 Ribe hoard.
40. Dumas and Brand, as in n. 20, pp. 26–30; Stewart and Brand, as in n. 28, p. 44.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Annual output</th>
<th>Volume of the currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1174–80</td>
<td>c.£1,500–£3,000</td>
<td>c.£15,000–£60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180</td>
<td>c.£16,500–£33,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180–2</td>
<td>c.£9,250–£18,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1195–7</td>
<td>c.£20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205–6</td>
<td>c.£90,000–£150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210–12</td>
<td>c.£40,000+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>c.£20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220–2</td>
<td>c.£36,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225–9</td>
<td>c.£12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234–40</td>
<td>c.£42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240–7</td>
<td>c.£50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.£450,000–£480,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>