THE NORTHAMPTON AND SOUTHAMPTON MINTS.

BY WILLIAM C. WELLS.

It is now thirty years since I first advanced the claims of Northampton to a mint in Anglo-Saxon times, and questioned the general attribution to Southampton of the series of coins reading HAMTVN for their mint-name. Sir John Evans, in 1898, admitted the possibility of a mint at Northampton in Anglo-Saxon times, and also the probability that certain coins reading ON HAMTVN, etc., issued in the reigns of Eadweard the Confessor, William I and William II, were struck at Northampton and not at Southampton. Mr. Andrew wrote in 1902 that it was probable that Earl Waltheof had a joint mint at Northampton and Huntingdon, and Major Carlyon-Britton, in his Numismatic History of the Reign of William I and William II, although he followed the old custom in his classification, also admitted that Northampton might have claims to some of the series in both Anglo-Saxon and Norman times. Mr. Brooke, in the Catalogue of English Coins in the British Museum, accepts a like possibility in the Norman period.

But my claim is not that there is a possibility of selection from the HAMTVN coins of either the Anglo-Saxon or Norman series, or both, in favour of Northampton. It is that the whole series of HAMTVN coins must have been issued from the Northampton mint, and that Southampton was represented only by a comparatively brief issue bearing the mint-name HAMPE, including, of course, its contractions. This appears also to be the opinion of Major Carlyon-Britton, as expressed in The Chronological Sequence of the Types of Eadweard the Martyr and Æthelred II, although he again follows, to some extent, the old classification.¹

The question of the Hamtun mint, or mints, and the correct allocation of the coins issued therefrom, has been approached therefore by several numismatists; but in spite of the attention given to the subject, no serious attempt has hitherto been made to lay down a definite rule by which we can, with any degree of certainty, attribute to their respective mints the coins with readings ranging from HAM to HAMTVNE, and from HAM to HAMPIC. Numismatists in general have been content to leave the matter where it stood more than a century ago, when Ruding wrote his Annals of the Coinage. Consequently it is with considerable diffidence that I approach this question of the correct allocation of the series of coins to their respective mints; but there can be little doubt that every student of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman coins will agree that we should evolve a more satisfactory method of arranging the Hamtun series than the present generally adopted plan of assigning all these coins to Southampton, and leaving to Northampton only those that read Norham, etc., thus ignoring the much stronger claim of Northampton to a large majority of the coins with mint-readings ranging from HAM to HAMTVNE.

Ruding, assuming that all the HAM-HAMTVNE coins emanated from one mint, discusses the relative claims of Northampton and Southampton to the coins so inscribed, and suggests that in Anglo-Saxon times Northampton would be of little importance, merely on account of its inland situation. But, as the capital of a shire, it must from a very early date have been of importance as a centre of trade and commerce for a large surrounding district, as well as the centre of government for the shire; and taking into consideration the town's isolated position, the bad roads, and the difficulties of transport and of communication, a local mint would be a necessary adjunct to supply currency for the district, and to enable traders to carry on their business and to pay tolls, taxes, etc. That Northampton, which was surrendered by the Danes to Eadweard the Elder in A.D. 921, was of considerable importance as a fortress in the reign of Æthelstan, is shown by the fact that when he formed the Mercian shires those of Bedford, Buckingham, Hertford,
Huntingdon and Northampton were of purely military creation—districts assigned to the fortresses which he or his predecessor had raised at those centres.

In or about the year 928,¹ in the reign of Æthelstan, at the synod held at Greatley, near Andover, Hampshire, it was ordered that "there be one [kind of] money over all the king's dominion, and that no man mint except within port."² It was further enacted that Canterbury should have seven moneyers—four for the king, two for the [arch]bishop, and one for the abbot; Rochester, three—two for the king, and one for the bishop; London, eight; Winchester, six; Lewes, two; Hamtune, two; Wareham, two; Exeter, two; Shaftesbury, two; Dorchester, Hastings and Chichester, one each, and "in the other burhs one moneyer."³ This ordinance means that the type of coin was to be the same throughout the whole realm; in addition to the places enumerated, all burhs, or fortresses, should have the privilege of a mint with one moneyer, and no money should be coined except within the gate of a fortified town or burh. In the case of Southampton, which does not appear to have been a fortified town, the mint would be situated within the gate of the tun.

It has been locally claimed⁴ that the Hamtun referred to in Æthelstan's ordinance was the northern town of that name, but it will be observed that all the other towns there specified were in Wessex and southern England, and there can be little doubt that the Hamtun of the ordinance was the southern town, also in Wessex, and not the northern one in Mercia. Numismatists have always accepted this view.

¹ Dr. Liebermann, Die Gesetze Angelsachsen, dates Æthelstan's Laws from 925 to 935.
³ For the full text, in Anglo-Saxon, Latin, and English, of these and other monetary laws passed at Greatley, see Major P. Carlyon-Britton's paper, *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. vi, pp. 14, 15.
In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and in other pre-Norman records, both Northampton and Southampton are generally called Hamtun, and it is necessarily amongst the coins similarly inscribed that we must search for those of the Northampton mint; though that fact does not appear to have been recognised by numismatists in the past. The line of reasoning generally followed is that, in Domesday, Southampton is invariably called Hamtune or Hantone, whilst Northampton is in several instances styled Norhanton, and the fact that it is also styled Hantone is usually ignored; therefore, because Æthelstan’s ordinance assigns two moneyers to Hamtune, etc. to Southampton, and because Northampton is not specifically mentioned, numismatists have followed the line of least resistance by assigning all Hamtun coins to Southampton. This assumption has been carried so far as to assign to Southampton the coins of Eadweard the Confessor, of William I, and of William II, reading SÆPINE ON HAMT, etc., when we have coins of the early part of the Conqueror’s reign which read SÆPINE ON NOB HANT; and a penny of Henry I, Hawkins, 265, by PAIEN : ON : HAMTV[N], is allocated to Southampton, although we have coins of the succeeding type, Hawkins, 262, inscribed PAIEN : ON : NORHAM. There can be very little doubt that all these coins, whether inscribed Hamtun or Norham, were issued at Northampton.

In the British Museum Catalogue, Norman Coins, vol. i, p. clxxxii, it is noted—apparently as an argument in favour of assigning the Hamtun coins to Southampton—that in the Gesta Regum, William of Malmesbury, with one exception only, when the form Southam­tunensis occurs, always uses Hamtuna or Hamtuna for Southampton, and invariably Northantona or Northantuna for Northampton. The Gesta Regum, however, was written about A.D. 1120–1125 when Northanton had become the common form, though, as we shall see, that of Hamtun, or Hanton, was still in use, locally at least, for Northampton; and William of Malmesbury, a West-Saxon, would naturally incline to use Hamtun for Southampton, and the full form for Northampton for the sake of distinction.

Symeon of Durham, a contemporary of William of Malmesbury,
in the *Historia Regum*, under date 939 which should be 941, states that in this year Anlaf came southward from York, and attacked Northampton, where he was repulsed, etc. In this passage Symeon uses the accusative case "Hamptonam."

A coin in my possession provides evidence of the numismatic use of the form Anton or Antonia to designate Northampton in the early part of Stephen's reign. It is of Stephen's first type, Hawkins, 270, and struck from dies which, although made with official irons, appear to be of local workmanship. The reverse is inscribed *PLAEI : ON : ANTIAX*, and the coin therefore purports to have been issued by Paen, who was working at the Northampton mint in the reigns of Henry I and Stephen.

In the charters of Henry II, Southampton is sometimes referred to as Hantonia, a form which is evidently intended on certain irregular coins issued in the reign of Stephen, which are inscribed *SANSUN O ANTOI*, for Antonia, etc., and were probably issued at Southampton. That Northampton also was known in the twelfth century as Hantonia is proved by the previously described coin, the reverse legend of which was evidently intended for Paen on Antonia.

It can, however, be shown that the distinguishing prefix North—or South—was in use so early as in the middle of the tenth century, and again that the earlier form, without the prefix, was in use at Northampton so late as in the latter part of the twelfth century, and at Southampton even in the reign of Edward I. Indeed, Ingram, writing in 1823, in his notes to the *Saxon Chronicle* says of Northampton and Southampton that "the common people in both neighbourhoods generally say 'Hampton' to this day." Until the year 920, when Mercia lost its separate existence as a kingdom, and its Hamtun became subject to the King of Wessex, there was no need to distinguish the South Hamtun of Wessex from the North Hamtun of Mercia; but about the middle of the tenth century we begin to read of Suthamtonia, Suthamtoniensis provincia, and

\[1\] Monasticon, vol. vi, p. 1092.
Suthamtun-scire, although the older form Hamtun-scire, etc., was continued.

Thus, in 962, the Royal dues of Suthamtun were granted by Eadgar, with other possessions, to the Abbey of Abingdon—"Cen­sumque quoque regale ad cenobium præfectum per singulos annos decorandum aet Suthamtune, unius aequae navis piscationem et regale vectigal aet Hevitan Clife, alterius autem aet Portmonna Hythe," etc.¹ From this time onward the name Suthamtun and its Latinised forms become somewhat frequent, though by no means to the exclusion of the earlier ones, which still remained in common use; and in Domesday we find Southampton described as Hamtune and Hantone.

Southampton's earliest existing charter was granted by Henry II, and in it he refers to "my reeves and ministers of Hamtun," and ordains that "my men of Hanton shall have and hold their guild," etc. In 1180, William Briwer was made forester of the forest of Bere, with power to arrest transgressors there between the bars of Hamtun and the gates of Winchester. In 1201 there are notices of the tower or castle of Hamtun, and in the Southampton local ordinances so late as Edward the First's time we find references to the burgesses of Hantone.

At a meeting of the British Numismatic Society, March 23, 1923, Mr. W. J. Andrew exhibited the twelfth-century standard seal, or die, for the leaden matrices of Southampton's earliest seal, the date of which Mr. Andrew considered to be immediately after Henry II's grant of the gild-merchant and other privileges to Southampton. The seal is inscribed SICILLVM • VILLE • SVTHAMTONIE, and thus provides additional evidence that the two forms were in use contemporaneously.

In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle we find many references to Northampton, but prior to the year 1065, in all versions, with one exception, the form Hamtun or Hamtune (locative) is invariably used; the exception occurs in Cotton manuscript, Tiber. B. 1,

¹ Birch, Cartularium Saxoniciun, vol. iii, p. 325; Monasticon, vol. i, p. 382.
where, in annal 1064, the form Northhamtune is used. In the Peterborough version, Bodleian manuscript, Laud, 636, down to 1065, the form Hamtune is used; in 1088 and 1106 we find Northamptun, but in 1140 Hamtun is reverted to, and in 1122 the unusual form Northamtune.

The earliest use of the prefix North that has come under my notice is on a coin of the reign of Eadgar (British Museum Catalogue, type III) which is inscribed BALDRIE MONETA N AM. The N has a mark of contraction above it, and is separated from AM by a pellet, thus indicating two words – N [orth] AM [tun]. Hildebrand describes a coin also of Eadgar’s reign, but of a later type, which reads BALDRIE ON HAMTV, which is evidently by the same moneyer, and of the same mint as that just described, thus providing additional evidence that the form Hamtun was used at the Northampton mint in Anglo-Saxon times.

In Domesday we find Hantone, as well as Northantone, and thence onward the latter name becomes usual, but, as in the case of Southampton, not to the exclusion of the older form, which was in use certainly so late as 1185. Thus, in an interesting document, Descriptio Militum de Abbatia de Burgo,² which Dr. Round dates between 1100 and 1120,³ the form Hamtonascira is invariably used; and in a document entitled De Dominabus et Puellis,⁴ written in 1185, the portion relating to Northamptonshire was originally headed “Hamton’sire,” the prefix “Nor” having been added at a later period.

The foregoing references are sufficient to demonstrate that the old word Hamtun was commonly used to designate Northampton down to a period subsequent to its latest use upon the coinage, and

---

¹ This form occurs again in the reign of William I, when we find coins reading NOD HANT, and it survived until the seventeenth century in NORTH HAMPTON used on the title-page of a tract, and in 1657 the Town Chamberlain’s tokens were inscribed I.S. IN. NORTH HAMPTON.

² Society of Antiquaries’ manuscript, No. 60.


⁴ Public Record Office, Sergeanties Fees, etc., Bundle I, No. 2.
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that Hamtun and Northamtun, and Hamtun and Suthamtun were, so late as the second half of the twelfth century, used indifferently to designate Northampton and Southampton respectively.

There was probably little difference in the date at which mints were instituted at the two Hamtuns, but while the local demands upon the Northampton mint would necessarily increase as time went on, the demands upon the mint at Southampton would decrease.

It would be necessary for Northampton to supply currency to a large district of which it formed the centre. It was the only mint in the shire, with the exception of that which was established at Stamford Baron, on the extreme north-east border of the shire, probably in accordance with Æthelstan's ordinance, by which he granted at least one moneyer to all burhs. Prior to the reign of Eadwig the nearest mints were situated at Warwick and Leicester, each at a distance of more than thirty miles; and at Stamford Baron and Oxford, each at a distance of at least forty miles from Northampton. In the reign of Æthelred II the mints at Aylesbury, thirty-seven miles, and Buckingham, twenty-one miles, commenced operations, and in the early years of the Conqueror's reign—probably in 1070—a mint was established at Peterborough in the extreme north-east of Northamptonshire, and at a distance of forty-two miles from the county town.

At Winchester, the temporary capital of England, situate within twelve miles of Southampton, for several centuries was situated the national Exchequer. This city was the great centre of trade and commerce in the south and west, and Southampton became, to a great extent, an appendage of Winchester numismatically,¹ as well as in other respects.

The demands upon the Southampton mint for local currency would not, at any time, be very great, owing to the close proximity of Winchester with its six or more moneyers; and the ever increasing and, eventually, enormous output from the latter mint would render Southampton superfluous for the supply of currency to the sur-
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rounding district. In late Anglo-Saxon times it was probably only in cases of emergency, such as the payment of large sums of coined money as Danegelt, when many dormant and semi-dormant mints became active, that any demand was made upon Southampton’s resources as a mint, and it probably ceased operations, as a royal mint, in the early part of the reign of Canute.

Southampton appears to have sprung into importance subsequently to the compilation of Domesday, where we find it recorded that:

"In the Borough of Hantune the King has 76 men who pay between them £7 for land-gafel (de gablo terre) as they did in the time of King Edward. 27 of these pay 8d. each, two pay 12d., and the other fifty 6d."

"The land of the following in this borough was quit (quietam), by the King’s action (ab ipso rege), in the days of King Edward: Odo of Winchester; Anschil the priest; Chetel; Fulghel; Testill; the sons of Elric had 16 acres (and) Gerin 18 acres; Cheping had 3 houses quit, which Ralf de Mortemer now holds; Godwine 3 houses, which Bernard Pancevold holds. After King William came into England there settled in Hantone, 65 men of French birth, and 31 English. These pay between them £4 os. 6d. for all dues.

"The following are entitled to (habent) the dues from their houses in Hantone by grant of King William: G(eoffrev) bishop [of Coutances] from 1; the abbot of Cormeilles 1; the abbot of Lire 1; the count of Evreux 2; Ralf de Mortemer 2; Gilbert de Bretvile 2; William son of Stur 2; Ralf de Todeni 1; Durand of Glouucestre 2; Hugh de Port 1; Hugh de

1 It is of interest to note that the greater part of the known “Hamwic” coins have been found in Scandinavia in hoards of Anglo-Saxon coins which probably reached there in the form of Danegelt, and that we have no record of the finding of similar coins in English hoards.
Grentemaisnil 2; the count of Mortain 5; Aiulf the Chamberlain 5; Humfrey his brother; Osbern Gifard 1; Nigel the physician 4; Richer de Andeli 4; Richard Pugnant 1; Stephan Stirman 2; Turstin the engineer (machinator) 2; Anchitil son of Osmund 3; Rainald Croc 1. The abbess of Wherwell has a fishery and a small piece of land; it then paid 100 pence, now 10 shillings.

Wilks, in his *History of Hampshire* (vol. ii, p. 171), after quoting from the Southampton Borough accounts of 1156-8, says:—

"The comparison of these statements with the return in Domesday Book shows very clearly how thorough was the change in constitution and condition which had passed over the king's vill of Southampton. Already has the royal manor become a fortified town; feudalism has made its way into the ancient holdings of the burgesses, and the religious orders are dividing with the king the profits of the burgh. Further, the King of England being lord of Normandy, a constant intercourse with the mainland, unknown whilst England was governed by its own insular sovereigns, brought through and by Southampton a perpetual succession of priests, monks, courtiers, messengers, soldiers, merchants, and artisans, who found in that town the most convenient English port on their way to or return from the mainland."

Southampton was always a favourite port of departure and arrival of our Norman and later kings to and from the Continent, whether in times of peace or when accompanied by their armies in war.

In 1194 Richard I kept Christmas there, and his successor John, who was very partial to Southampton as a residence, conferred upon the burgesses of that town many important privileges. In fact, during Norman and early Plantagenet times, Southampton became a town and port of considerable affluence, and if—even when the town had become so important, and its trade had increased so enormously—
the mint at Winchester could still supply the needs of that part of the country and render a mint at Southampton unnecessary, it is certain that the same influence could have made itself felt to an even greater degree in Anglo-Saxon times.

The enormous output from the Winchester mint in the time of William I may be gauged by the fact that, while the Beaworth hoard disclosed so few as from one to ten specimens each of many mints, those of the Winchester mint numbered no fewer than 1,610. This outnumbers the combined total of the three next highest in point of numbers, namely, London 807, Southwark 469, and Canterbury 287; and if we add the 36 "Hamtune" coins from the same hoard, their total is only 1,599, or 11 less than that of Winchester alone.

The Beaworth hoard was found within six or seven miles of Winchester, from which fact it may be contended that the coins were collected in the vicinity in which they were discovered, which would account for the high percentage of Winchester coins in the hoard; but even so, the same possible circumstance would have governed the Hamtun coins also had they been issued at the neighbouring town of Southampton, and would have considerably increased the number of Hamtun coins in the hoard.

I have already shown that certain moneyers in the reigns of Eadgar, William I, and Henry I used the form Hamtune as well as Northanton, thus demonstrating that the earlier form was, undoubtedly, used on coins issued from the Northampton mint, and it is a reasonable assumption that all coins bearing the mint-name Hamtune emanated from that mint, as it appears highly improbable that Southampton would use the same form upon its coinage.

If further evidence be needed that the coins of William I, by the moneyer Saewine with the mint-name Hamtun, etc., and consequently those of Eadweard the Confessor and William II, by the same moneyer, were struck at Northampton, that evidence lies in the contents of a hoard of coins of that reign found a few years ago in the village of Scaldwell near Northampton. We have no complete record of its contents, as it was dispersed. The major portion
of the find consists of about 260 pennies and cut half-pennies, all of which, with one exception, were of one type, and were issued from 39 different mints, thus giving an average of less than 7 coins to each mint. These included London, of which mint there were 50 or more specimens, but there is very little doubt that this portion of the hoard contained no fewer than 60 coins by the moneyer Sæwine of Hamtun, i.e. Northampton.

The area of collection of such a hoard would necessarily be somewhat restricted, and if the coins were gathered in and around a mint-town we should expect to find a large proportion of coins of local mintage, together with a smaller proportion of coins of other mints which had drifted into the district in the ordinary way of trade; and the unusually high proportion of Hamtun coins in this hoard, together with a high percentage of coins struck at Stamford —also a Northamptonshire mint—affords important evidence that the Hamtun coins were struck at Northampton and not at Southampton.

A somewhat similar result, but in relation to York, was disclosed by a hoard of coins of William I, C.-B. type II, Hawkins, 234, found at York in 1845. This hoard contained 166 coins, issued from 20 different mints—an average of about 8 coins to each mint, but those of York numbered no fewer than 82. It may also be pointed out that, with the exception of the London coins, this hoard consisted almost entirely of the products of Midland, Eastern and Northern mints, and although Winchester was not represented, "Hamtun" appears upon four specimens—a circumstance which again points to the latter coins having emanated from the Northern and not the Southern Hamtun.

It is also of importance to note that the cessation of the "Hamtun" coins exactly coincides with the commencement of those reading "Norham," and that at least one moneyer used the form "Hamtun" on his coins of Henry I., Andrew, type XIII, Hawkins, 265, and "Norham" on those of the succeeding type, Andrew, XIV, Hawkins, 262.

Mr. Andrew, in *Henry I*, p. 408, refers to the visit of King Henry and his court to Southampton, as recorded in the Pipe Roll for 1129–30, and says: "This was in April, 1130, when he journeyed from Woodstock to Clarendon and from Clarendon to Southampton," thus type 262 (1129–31) is issued at Southampton." Mr. Andrew, however, does not describe any coins of Hawkins, 262, in that relation, nor does he further allude to the question. I have not succeeded in tracing any coins of Hawkins, 262, inscribed Hamtun, nor were any such coins included in the Canterbury hoard; and even if the existence of such coins could be substantiated, unless they were issued by a moneyer other than those who also used the form Norham, it would only go to prove that the definite adoption of the later form did not occur until type 262 was in issue. Nor would the production of such coins be any real evidence in favour of the existence of a mint at Southampton in Norman times. Moreover, it appears extremely unlikely that special dies would be prepared for a temporary coinage to meet the emergency of a visit which was probably of only a few days, possibly of only a few hours, when there was the mint of Winchester in the immediate neighbourhood which was in a position to meet any reasonable demand likely to be made upon it.

In the *British Museum Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Coins*, vol. ii, p. cxv, it is stated that "from Domesday we learn that it (Southampton) possessed two moneyers." I have, however, failed to verify that statement.

That there was a mint at Southampton in Anglo-Saxon times there can be no doubt, and we should not unreasonably expect to find its coins inscribed Hamtun, etc., but, as we have already seen, the only coins so inscribed that we can definitely allocate must be given, not to Southampton but to Northampton, a mint of which we have no documentary evidence prior to the reign of Henry I.

1 A notification of about 1114–16, to Ralph de Watnevill and others, is on record, attested by Matilda the Queen, William de Tankarvill and William de Aubigny, "apud Hamtuna, in transitu regis."—*Calendar of Charter Rolls*, iv, 138; Farrer, *An Outline Itinerary of King Henry I*, 1919, p. 79.
In the circumstances it is a difficult matter to attempt to separate the coins of the Northampton mint from those issued at Southampton; but a key to the solution of the problem appears to be provided by the coins of Eadgar, Eadweard the Martyr and Æthelred II inscribed *Hamwic*, a name by which the ancient site of Southampton appears to have been known from at least the middle of the eighth century down to the reign of Æthelred II, and possibly later.

Symeon of Durham, under date 764, mentions a place *Homwic*, amongst others, as having been damaged by fire: "Anno eodem multæ urbes monasteriaque atque villæ per diversa loca, necnon et regna repentino igne vastatae sunt, verbi gratia, Stretburg, Venta Civitas; Homwich, Londonia Civitas, Eboraca Civitas, Donacester, aliique loca illa plaga concussit ut illud impletur quod scriptum est 'Erit terræ motus.'" Roger of Hoveden, quoting from Symeon, gives the form as *Homunic*, but this is obviously an error of transcription, and should read *Homuuic*. In the *Index Locorum*, vol. iv, p. 218, Homuuic is stated to be Southampton, but no evidence of identification is given.

This identification, however, is confirmed by a passage in the *Life or Itinerary of Saint Willebald*, which is said to have been compiled about 780 by an anonymous relative and contemporary, a nun of his sister Walburge's abbey at Heidenheim, who learnt the particulars she relates of the Saint's travels from his own recital.

Willebald, Bishop of Eichstädt, in Franconia, according to his legend, appears to have been of a Wessex family, born about the year 704, and at the age of five to have been placed in the monastery of "Waltheim," now Bishop's Waltham, nine miles from Southampton. About the year 722 he, with his brother Wynebald, or

---

1 Roger of Hoveden gives the form "Wenta Civitas."

2 Dr. Joseph Wright, *Old English Grammar*, 1925, p. 42, says: "In the oldest O.E. *a* was nearly always written *a*, in the ninth century it was mostly written *o*, but in some parts of Mercia it seems to have become *o* which has been preserved in many of the Midland dialects down to the present day." Bede spells the Hampshire river Hamble "Homelea," in place of "Hamelea," as it appears in the *Vita Wilhelmi*. 
Wunebald, and their father, embarked for the Seine at "Hamel-ea Mutha, near that market-place which is called Hamwich," juxta illud mercimonium quod dicitur Hambich.¹

From Britannia Sancta,² we learn that St. Willebald was born about the year 704, that he was, when but five years old, recommended to Egbold, Abbot of Waltheim, in Hampshire, that he persuaded his father and elder brother Wynebald to join with him in a pilgrimage to Rome, and that in 722 they set out from Hamblemouth, or in another passage "Hamble Haven which belonged to the West-Saxons." According to Butler, in his Lives of the Saints, St. Willebald "was born about the year 704, in the kingdom of the West-Saxons, about the place where Southampton now stands."

The nun of Heidenheim also wrote a biography of Willebald's brother, Wynebald, Abbot of Heidenheim, and in the parallel passage describes the place where negotiations for the voyage were carried out as "the place of business which is the market-place," loca venalìa quod est mercimonium, thus confirming the description of the locality given in the Vita Willebaldi.

Baring-Gould³ states that St. Willibald does not appear in Ancient Martyrologies earlier than the twelfth century. The first to mention him is an Utrecht Martyrology of that century. Enumerating the authorities for the life of Willibald, Gould says:—

"First and by far the most precious authority is the Hodœporicon or Itinerary of S. Willibald, a contemporary document, written by a nun of Heidenheim, of whose name we are ignorant, but who was his kinswoman and took the account of his travels from his own recital. This life, written before his death, became afterwards the foundation of various other lives, but which contain few or no new facts.

¹ Acta Sanctorum, 1867, vol. 29, p. 503; also previously edited by Mabillon. See also Notes by Mr. L. Woosnam in the Numismatic Chronicle for 1921, p. 98.
² Part 2, pp. 18–19.
"S. Willibald, who is said to have been a kinsman of the great S. Boniface, was, like him, a native of the kingdom of Wessex... He was born about the year 700... When he was five years of age his father... placed him in a monastery at Waltheim... under the care of Abbot Egbald... His father sold his possessions and went with his family, consisting of Wunibald, his eldest son, then aged twenty, Willibald, and his daughter Walburga... to settle in Rome. They left England... probably in the year 718, and having taken ship on the southern coast at Hamelea Muth (the mouth of the river Hamble that flows past Waltham), near a port town called Hambich or Hamwich (Southampton), etc." He adds in a footnote: "Hambich is a mistake of the copyist for Hamwich."

Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, 1887, say:—

"In the life of his (Willebald's) brother Wunebald, by the same authoress... there are unmistakable English local names with which Willebald is connected; but it must be remarked that the geographical names of the Odæporicon are frequently much disguised and corrupted... At the age of five he was placed in the monastery of Waltheim which Mabillon says must mean Buswaltham in agro Wintonensi, i.e. Bishop's Waltham in Hampshire. Circa 720... he set out accompanied by his brother Wunebald and their father, whose name the nun does not give, but who in later writers is Richard, and even king Richard.

"The travellers started from places bearing English names easy to be identified. They embarked, for instance, at Hamelea Mutha (the Hamble mouth, and the Hamble flows down from the neighbourhood of Bishop's Waltham) near that mercimonium which is called Hambich (evidently Hamwich or Southampton)."

We might be tempted to assume that "Hambich" or "Hamwich" was a disguised or corrupted form, had we not the coins
inscribed “Hamwic,” ranging in date from the reign of Eadgar to that of Æthelred II, which prove the contrary.

Baring-Gould’s suggestion that Hambich is a mistake of the copyist for Hamwich is not necessarily correct. As that author points out, the Itinerary of St. Willewald, written before his death, formed the foundation of other lives of St. Willewald of a later period, and it was probably from one of these later copies that the printed version was taken—possibly from the twelfth-century Martyrology quoted by Baring-Gould.

The Itinerary was originally written in Germany, as were most of the later copies, and in the manuscript from which the printed copy was taken the place-names disclose German spelling; for instance, Waltham, that is Bishop’s Waltham, Hampshire, is spelt “Waltheim,” and if we turn to Dr. Joseph Wright’s Historical German Grammar, §§ 229, 237, we shall find an explanation of the substitution of b for w in “Hambich.” Dr. Wright says: “Germanic w = English w in wet (generally written uu, uv, vu, vv in Old High German manuscripts) . . . became the labiodental spirant v (written w) = English v in vat . . . w must have become a spirant in Bavarian before the end of the thirteenth century, because in this dialect b (= Germanic ð) . . . and w had the same value, that is w was written for Germanic w and ð and vice versa”¹

. . . “When w was introduced by analogy or levelling into a final position, it became b in N.H.G., as M.H.G. “houwen,” to hew, pl. hewen, from which a new pret. sing. hiew was formed = N.H.G. hieb, cp. also the noun hieb, and wittib beside witten. This sound-change is also common in modern South and Middle Franconian dialects, as leb = literary German löwe, and in some Alemannic dialects as blab = literary German blau.”²

For practical purposes High German may be conveniently divided into three periods: Old from about 750 to 1100, Middle from 1100 to 1500, and New from 1500 onwards; but as Dr. Wright observes, “The division of a language into fixed periods must of

¹ Page 110.
² Page 122.
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necessity be more or less arbitrary. What are given as the characteristics of one period have generally had their beginnings in the previous period, and it is impossible to say with perfect accuracy when one period begins and another ends." Hence, $b$ for $w$, which was correct in the thirteenth century, may have gone back to the beginning of the Middle period, say 1100, or even earlier.

I have two coins of the "Hand of Providence" type of Æthelred II, which read $\dagger$ÆDELPERD $M^0$ HAMPI, and $\dagger$ÆDELVEARD $M^0$ HAMVI, respectively, thus showing that $V$ and $W = [r]$, were of equal phonetic value. But the interchangeability of $a$ and $o$, and $b$ and $v$ or $w$, is now so generally accepted by etymologists that I need not further labour the point that Homwic, Hambich and Hamvic are not irregular or corrupted forms of Hamwic, but the true spellings we should expect to find in the manuscripts written at the dates and under the conditions of those I have quoted.

Hamelea Mutha is without doubt the mouth of the river Hamble, and it is but a short distance below Southampton. The harbour, as well as the village of Hamble, which is situated upon its bank, and from which it derived its name, were so late as the thirteenth century known as Hamele; and considering the close proximity of Southampton to the Hamble, no other place can be meant by Hamwich, as it is highly improbable that another market-town and borough existed in the immediate vicinity1 so late as the reign of Æthelred II, but which had entirely disappeared by the time of Domesday, leaving not even its name behind; a town quite unrecorded and of which all trace is lost.

Had such a town been utterly destroyed by flood or fire and not rebuilt, such a calamity would have been recorded by one or more of the chroniclers, and would in all probability have been preserved in local tradition; but no such tradition can be traced in the neighbourhood of Southampton, and the only reasonable

---

1 Since this was written, it has been brought to my notice that an exactly similar opinion is expressed by that eminent authority Dr. Liebermann, in Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, 1915, p. 133.
explanation appears to be that Hamwich was also known by another name—a name under which it is recorded in *Domesday*, and by which, with slight modifications, it is known to-day.

Old Southampton, probably owing to its low-lying and unfortified position, appears to have suffered greatly from the onslaught of two foes—the Danes and floods. In the year 838 the Danes, with a fleet of 33 ships, effected a landing near Southampton, but were defeated and driven off by Wulfheard, governor of the southern part of the county under Æthelwulf. In 860 the Danes penetrated the county and burnt Winchester. In 980, we are told, Southampton was again devastated by Danes, very many of its inhabitants being slain or taken captive, *Suthamtonia a Danicis piratis devastatur, et ejus cives omnes fere vel occisi vel captivi sunt abducti.* In the autumn of 994, Anlaf King of Norway and Sweyn King of Denmark landed here with a considerable force, plundered and burnt the town, massacred the inhabitants and committed terrible depredations in the neighbourhood. They were met near Andover by Æthelred and his army, when a truce was arranged by which the army of the two kings, on payment of 16,000 lbs. of silver, and a promise of supplies from all Wessex, returned to Southampton, where they took up their winter quarters; and we learn from Roger of Hoveden and from other sources that the Danes again plundered the town in the years 998, 1001, 1006, 1009 and 1011.

We have records of severe floods at Southampton during the Anglo-Saxon period; for instance, in the year 935 there were heavy floods there in which many of the inhabitants were drowned. Under the year 1014, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records that—

"On St. Michael's mass eve came the great sea-flood widely throughout this country, and ran so far up as it never before had done, and drowned many towns, and of mankind a countless number."

The South-Hamtun of early Anglo-Saxon times occupied a site in the immediate vicinity of St. Mary's parish church, some half

---

1 Roger of Hoveden; Florence of Worcester.
mile to the north-east of that occupied by the walled town, and nearly the same distance from the river-side, whence its suburbs stretched away towards the river and the site of the Roman Clausentum, on the opposite side, though there appears to be no evidence that Old South-Hamtun embraced any portion of the site of the Roman station, nor does there appear to be evidence that the site of Clausentum was occupied by a settlement of any kind in Anglo-Saxon days. Discoveries made in St. Mary's parish in 1849 and later years provide ample evidence that it was soon after the date of the great flood of 1014, recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, that the old site of South-Hamtun was abandoned and the town removed to the position which the mediæval portion of Southampton occupies to-day. It is suggested that the old town was involved in the great flood of 1014, possibly entirely destroyed, and that this flood, following so closely upon the disastrous Danish attacks of the previous few years, was the culminating point which caused the inhabitants to decide upon the removal of the town to a better defensive position, in which they would be considerably safer from their old enemies, whether Danes or floods.

Leland, writing in the early part of the sixteenth century, says:

"The old Town of Hampton was brent [burnt] in tyme of Warre, spoyled and raiyed by ... pyrates. This was the cause that the inhabitants there translated themselves to a more commodious place and began with the King's Licens and Help to builde New Hampton, and to walle it yn defence of the Enemies."

The Rev. E. Kell, "Observations on the Ancient Site of Southampton," says:

"The removal of the town to the south-west of its original site was probably occasioned by the savage invasions of the Danes, who several times ravaged old Southampton with peculiar fury, wasting it with both fire and sword. A fortified town

would then become necessary, and the inhabitants would select for its site the southern part of the tongue of land on which the fortifications of Southampton stand, from its higher elevation and greater capability of defence."

And in an article "On the Castle and other Ancient Remains at Southampton," Mr. Kell suggests that the attacks to which they were exposed "must have early led the inhabitants to regard the higher elevation on which the keep and castle are located as a more suitable place of defence against such attacks, and to have looked especially to the site of the keep, as a resort for safety, long before the date of the Conquest."

Leland also says:

"The town of Old-Hampton, a celebrated Thing for Fisshar Men and sum Merchautentes, stoode a quarter of a mile or ther above from New-Hampton by North Est and streached to the Haven syde. The Plott wheryn it stoode berith now good corn and gresse, and is namyid S. Maryfeld by the chirch of S. Mary stonding hard by it."

Excavations carried out about ninety years ago on the site indicated by Leland disclosed six or eight intersecting streets, the hard surface of the streets resting on the undisturbed clay. The foundations of many houses were discovered, a considerable variety of antiquities and a number of coins, but none later than the reign of Æthelred II. This probably constituted the business part of the old town, where the houses would be built partly of stone; but of the houses of the poorer people, which were constructed of wood plastered over with clay, all vestiges had perished. The evidence of these discoveries goes to prove the existence of an ancient town to the north and north-east of mediæval Southampton; on the other hand, the absence of such remains within the walls affords negative evidence as to there having been an early settlement on the site of the mediæval town.

Coins and other small objects of the Roman period have been found in sufficient quantity on the site of old Southampton to warrant us in assuming that a Romano-British settlement existed there contemporaneously with the Roman Clausentum on the opposite side of the river, and it is not unreasonable to assume that this settlement had existed from pre-Roman times. In the fifth century the site almost certainly passed into Jutish hands, for in 1849 relics of this period were found at St. Mary's.

On the site of Grove Street, near St. Mary's Church, was discovered an early Saxon cemetery, dating from the sixth century, from the graves of which were recovered a number of objects, including a torque of silvered metal, several glass tumblers, some of which are similar to those figured in Akerman's *Archæological Index*, pl. xiv, figs. 5 and 6; one, found beside a skeleton, is described as "somewhat resembling a cupping-glass"; a green glass vase similar to others found in Jutish graves in Kent; and another resembling one figured in Douglas's *Nenia*. Four sceattas also were found in the graves, including specimens similar to some represented in the *British Museum Catalogue*, vol. i, pl. ii, fig. 7, and pl. iv, fig. 15.

That a populous town existed in the Anglo-Saxon period to the north and north-east of mediæval Southampton, is established beyond a doubt by the discoveries made for the most part in the years 1839, 1849 and onward to 1866. In 1839 a field of about eight acres, in the parish of St. Mary's and lying towards the river, was found to be perforated over all its surface with large pits 6 ft. or 7 ft. in depth, 6 ft. to 10 ft. in diameter, and about 12 ft. apart. Clay had been dug from these pits, probably for the purpose of plastering the walls of the houses in old Southampton, and afterwards filled with kitchen refuse and other rubbish from the town, amongst which were vast quantities of bones of deer, oxen, horses, sheep, pigs, fish and fowl, boars' tusks, oyster shells, etc. Wells also, probably originally made for holding the town's water-supply, were found, and these also had been filled with bones and rubbish.
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The bones were in such quantities that in 1849 it was estimated that not less than 50 tons had been obtained from the pits. Similar discoveries were made at intervals, during building operations, between 1839 and 1866, and it is probable that many unexplored examples of these refuse pits still exist under the gardens of the houses in and near St. Mary's Road. In addition to these vast quantities of bones the pits contained many fragments of pottery, keys of iron and bronze, pins with ornamented heads, metal spoons, implements of bone, etc., ranging in date from the seventh century down to the latter part of the tenth century; also numerous coins, including several sceattas, and pennies of Offa, Coenwulf, Burgred, Cuthred, Plegmund, Ceolnoth, Ecbeorht, Æthelbearht, Ælfred, Eadward the Elder, Æthelstan, Eadmund, Eadred, Eadgar and Æthelred II.1 The deposits then suddenly cease, and of that cessation the most obvious explanation is that the site of the deposit was, after the early part of the eleventh century, no longer occupied by human habitations, and thus indicates very closely the period of the final evacuation of the site of old Southampton.

Further evidence that the old town occupied the site around St. Mary's is found in the fact that in the early part of the thirteenth century a long enquiry was held, after which it was declared that St. Mary's was the mother church of all the churches in Southampton, and Leland, in his quaint language, says:

"St. Marie chirch at thys day, in token of the auncientness of Auld Hampton, is mother chirch to all the chirches in New Hampton; and in testimonie of this the commune sepulture of New Hampton is in the cemiterie of St. Marie church; and there be many fair tumbes of marble of marchauntes of New Hampton buried in the chirch of S. Marie, as in their mother and principal chirch."
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When the new town sprang up on a new site the old local name Hamwich was entirely superseded by Hamtun. The new town was probably in course of erection in the reign of Canute, and it certainly occupied its present site before the end of the eleventh century.

A similar case to that of Hamwich, occurring in later times, is that of Winchelsea. Old Winchelsea, of Anglo-Saxon and Norman times, occupied a site upon low-lying ground between the present town and the sea. It suffered from frequent inundations, and in 1287 the old town was finally destroyed, when

"The sea passed over her accustomed bounds, flowing twice without ebb . . . At Winchelsea . . . besides cottages for salt, fishermen's huts, bridges and mills, above 300 houses by the violent rising of the waves were drowned."

The inhabitants, foreseeing the probability of Winchelsea's total destruction, petitioned Edward I for ground in order to found another town. The King accordingly allotted 150 acres for the new town, which he surrounded with walls, and the old inhabitants of Winchelsea gradually removed the material from the old town and built the new upon a better defensive site, and far removed from all danger of the aggressive onslaughts of their old enemy—the sea.

A similar grant of land upon which to build the new town appears to have been made by Canute to the inhabitants of Old Southampton, and it is probable that in return for this land and assistance in building the new town, the coining privileges were surrendered to the King, which would account for the closing of the Southampton mint in the early part of the reign of Canute.

Bosworth's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary (ed. T. N. Toller) gives the following definition:—Wic. (I) Dwelling place, habitation, residence. (II) A collection of houses, a village, a (small) town, a street. (III) A camp, station. Kemble, in Codex Diplomaticus, gives the meaning of wic as "A dwelling place of one or more houses," and adds that

1 An early MS. account quoted by Grose.
"from this word is derived a verb, *wician*, to take up a station, probably to run ashore at night, applied to a ship."¹

*Tun* was originally a plot of land enclosed with a hedge. It came afterwards to signify a dwelling, with the land about it, enclosed by its *tun*, that is, a rampart of earth surmounted with a wooden stockade, the whole surrounded by a ditch; then many dwellings within the enclosure, till it became what we now denominate a town. Thus there would be but little difference between the meaning of *Ham-wic* and *Ham-tun*, the latter name, however, indicating that the place was defended by a stockade and ditch.

It is usual to derive *Ham-tun* from "*ham,*" home, and "*tun,*" town—the home town, but the writer is inclined to derive the first syllable from a man's name, *Hama*, thus *Hama's-tun* and *Hama's-wic*. In a charter granted by Eadweard the Elder, A.D. 903 (Kemble, MLXXX), Southampton is called "*Haamtun,*" the duplication of the *a* indicating length.² It is noteworthy that Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Hist. R. B.*, IV, xiii, declares that Southampton, or *Portus Hamonis*, took its name from a Roman general named Leuis Hamo.

The problem of Southampton's dual nomenclature is, however, a difficult one to solve. That the two names were in use contemporaneously is shown by charters, ranging in date from the first half of the ninth century onwards, wherein Southampton is called *Hamtnn*; and the use of the name Hamwich in *Vita Willebaldi*, etc., and ranging from the eighth century down to the latter part of the tenth century, in the reign of Eadgar, of Eadweard the Martyr and of Æthelred II, when we find Southampton's coins inscribed *HAMWIC*, *HAMVIC*, etc.

Chadwick, *Studies on Anglo-Saxon Institutions*, p. 415, says:—
"It is generally supposed that in Wessex before the Danish invasion

¹ We find that one of the significations of the word *wic*, given by Vossius, and also by Du Cange upon the authority of Rhedanus, is *fluminis ostium*, or the entrance of a river, which correctly describes the geographical position of Southampton.

² Wright, *Old English Grammar*, §4, says:—"Vowel length was mostly omitted in writing, but in the case of long vowels it was sometimes represented by doubling the vowel."
The only suggestion which presents itself to the writer in explanation of Southampton's dual nomenclature is that the early settlement consisted of two portions: (I) the residence of the local magnate—probably a thegn, or other person of importance—fortified by its stockade and ditch, the tun, Hama's-tun; (II) the village in which resided the great man's followers or retainers, the wic, Hama's-wic.

The responsible head of this primitive community was the magnate who resided in the tun, to whom all official communications would be addressed, and others would be addressed from the tun; consequently the settlement was known—officially—only as Ham-tun. When the wic had increased in size and importance, and had possibly so far extended its boundaries as to completely envelop the tun, it still retained its old local name, Ham-wic, but in official and legal documents the tun still held the dominant position, until—as I have already suggested—the time of the great flood of 1014, when the old town was destroyed. Then, for greater safety from future floods, as well as being a better defensive position, the town was rebuilt upon its present site, and the old local name, Hamwich, was abandoned with the old site, and Hamtun became the only recognised name for the new town. The old name, however, appears to have clung to the old site, for in the twelfth century the district around St. Mary's was still known as "Wick." 1

We have an analogous instance in the town of Hull. In Norman, and probably in Anglo-Saxon, times, a village or settlement which occupied some portion of the site of modern Hull was known as Wick, or Wyke, and also as Hull. In the reign of Edward I a new town was built near the old village of Wick, or Hull, and was named Kingston, or Kingston-upon-Hull. In the fourteenth century, in the foundation charter of the Charterhouse, the town is referred to both as Kingston and as Hull. In the seventeenth century Holler

1 I am indebted to Mr. W. J. Andrew for this important item of information.
engraved a plan of "Kyngeston-upon-Hull," and also a view of "The Towne of Hull" from the Humber. The official name of the town, however—from the time of Edward I onwards—was Kingston-upon-Hull, and to-day, when the comparatively small mediaeval borough has been swallowed up by the large town which has sprung up around it, and is universally known by the name of Hull, the town is still known—officially—as Kingston-upon-Hull. In other words, from the twelfth century to the present day the local or common name has been Hull, but from the reign of Edward I to the present time the official designation has been Kingston.

The difference in the wording on Holler's prints appears to indicate that in his time, as it is to-day, the seat of government of the town was "Kingston," while the surrounding district retained the name which it originally derived from the River Hull, upon the banks of which it was established in Anglo-Saxon times.

The difference between Southampton and Hull is that in the former town the official designation ousted the local name, while in the latter the local name has nearly succeeded in superseding the official designation; and two centuries hence it is possible that "Kingston" will have been completely superseded by "Hull," and the old official name will be known only to those who, like ourselves, delight to delve into records of the past.

In reference to the writer's suggestion that the name Hamwic was applied to the unfortified portion of old Southampton, it may be pointed out that Northampton, in later times, provided a parallel case.

At Swardsley, or Showesley, seven miles S.S.W. from Northampton, was a small Priory of Cistercian nuns, established in the reign of Henry II. In 1459 the revenues of that Priory had become so impoverished as to be inadequate to the maintenance of the establishment and repairs of the house, and the Bishop of Lincoln, at the petition of Sir Thomas Grene, patron of the Priory of Swardsley, appropriated that Priory to the Abbey of St. Mary de la Prê, immediately south of Northampton.¹

¹ Bishop Chedworth's Memoranda, fol. 53, dorse.
Tanner, *Notitia Monastica*, sub "Sewardsley," gives an account of the possessions of that Priory, which shows that the Northamptonshire possessions all lay to the south or south-west of Northampton, and Tanner's references show that in 1273, the Priory had holdings "in Cotes et Hamwik," which appears to indicate that "Cotes" or Coton, and "Hamwik" were in immediate proximity to each other.

The only recorded Northamptonshire Coton to which Tanner's note can refer is Coton, or Coton End, a hamlet situated immediately south of Northampton and separated from it only by the River Nene.

The Abbey of St. Mary de la Pré was situated a quarter of a mile south of the River Nene, the hamlet of Coton intervening between the Abbey and the river, and for nearly a quarter of a mile northward, between the Nene and the south gate of Northampton, lay a suburb afterwards known as the South Quarter. There can be little doubt that it was this suburb, without the walls and adjoining Coton, that was, in the thirteenth century, known as "Hamwik."

In Coton, about midway between the Nene and the Abbey of St. Mary de la Pré, and on the east side of the London Road, was situated the hospital of St. Leonard for lepers, and in a survey of the demesne lands of the Abbey of St. Mary de la Pré, made in June, 1539, we find it recorded that "John Green occupyeth at will from yere to yere one close of pasture by sent leonards, and payeth by yere V". This John Green was a descendant of Sir Thomas Grene, patron of Sewardsley, at whose petition, in 1459, the Priory of Sewardsley, with its possessions, was appropriated to St. Mary de la Pré, and it appears highly probable that the "close of pasture by sent leonards" constituted a part of the former holding of Sewardsley Priory, and that it had continued in the hands of members of the Green family.

Mr. L. Woosnam, in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1921 and 1922, suggests that "as independent words, wic and tun were often used synonymously, and it is reasonable to suppose that they might also

1 See also *Monasticon*, vol. v, p. 729.
2 The Abbey was surrendered into the King's hands in December, 1538.
be interchangeable as components of a compound place-name." In support of that suggestion a number of analogous passages may be cited from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (see below).

There was evidently a great deal of confusion in the designation of towns. Many places, indeed, may have once been called by the name of wic which afterwards assumed a much more dignified appellation, together with a much more important social condition. A similar confusion appears to have been common in the designation of local officials, and Kemble, Saxons in England, vol. ii, pp. 175-6, speaking of the office of wicgerefa, says:—"There is so much difficulty in making a clear distinction between Port and Wic, that we find wicgerefa applied to the officers who ruled in large and royal cities." For instance, in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, annal 897, we read of the wicgerefa at Winchester ("Beornulf wicgerefa on Wintancestre"). Burhgerefa, portgerefa, tungerefa, or wicgerefa, all appear to denote one officer—the "praepositus civitatis"—irrespective of the status of the town or city in which the official ruled.

The strict meaning of burh appears to be fortified place or stronghold; it can therefore be applied to a single house or castle, or to a fortified mound, as well as to a town. Port strictly means an enclosed place for sale and purchase, a market, but it is commonly used to designate a market-town. Ceaster seems universally derived from Castrum, and denotes a place where there has been a Roman station. The meaning of tun and wic have previously been explained (pp. 24-25).

Now every one of these conditions may occur in one single place, and we accordingly find much looseness in the use of the terms: thus, in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, we find London designated Lundenwic, -burh, -byrig, etc.:—

Annal 457. "mid micle ege flugon to Lundenbyrg."
Annal 604. "Æselberht gesealde Mellite bispoc setl on Lundewic."
Annal 851. "py ilcan geare cuom feorðe healf hund scipa on Temese mujan ond bræcon Contwaraburg ond Lundenburg."
Annal 886. "py ilcan geare gesette Ælfred cyning Lundenburg."
York is generally called Eoferwic, but in 971, and again in 1050, we find it designated Eoferwicceastre. There appears to have been some doubt as to whether it was a port or a burh, for in 1068 (Cotton manuscript, Tiber., B. iv) we find a reference to the "burhmenn" of Eoferwic, and in a parallel passage in "Bodleian manuscript, Laud 636," they are styled "portmen."

A similar doubt appears to have existed in connection with Hereford, as is shown by the following passages:

**Annal 1055.** "Ræulf eorl gaderade mycele fyrde agean to Hereford port" (Cotton manuscript, Tiber., B. r).

**Annal 1056.** "his lic lie on Herefordport" (Cotton manuscript, Tiber., B. r).

**Annal 1055.** "ealle þa burh Hereford" (Bodleian manuscript, Laud 636).

The coins issued from the two mints under consideration may be divided into three groups—(a) the "Hamtun" coins, which I allocate to Northampton; (b) those inscribed "Hamwic," which I assign to Southampton; and (c) those reading "HA" and "HAM," some of which, by comparison of the moneyer's names, may be allocated to group (a) or (b); while the remainder, owing to the absence of more extended readings, cannot be definitely assigned to either group, but probably the majority should be allocated to Northampton.

It is improbable that Southampton ever exceeded the two moneyers allotted to it in the reign of Æthelstan. Even in the reign of Æthelred II, when so many additional moneyers were employed, the "Hamwic" coins disclose the fact that only two moneyers were working there at one time. The names of only five moneyers appear on the coins of the "Hamwic" group, viz. Æthelman, Æthelweard, Landbriht, Isegel and Godman; and the only types upon which this full mint-name occurs are the "Hand," the "Benediction" and the "Crux" types of Æthelred II.

The original moneyers in the earlier "Hand" type (Hildebrand, B. r) appear to have been Æthelman and Æthelweard; Æthelman
dropped out and his place was taken by Isegel, who, together with Æthelweard, continued to issue type Hildebrand, B. 1; Æthelweard continued into the later "Hand" type (Hildebrand, B. 2), as did probably Isegel, who issued coins of the "Benediction" type, as did probably Æthelweard; Æthelweard then disappeared and was succeeded by Godman, who, together with Isegel, issued the "Crux" type (Hildebrand, C). It is of interest to note that exactly at this time, when the "Hamwic" coins cease, a moneyer, Godman, commences to work at Winchester, where he issued coins in types Hildebrand, C, b, E, D, and A (Hawkins, 204, 203, 207, and 205).

In the sale catalogue of the Wilcox collection (Glendinning, January 29, 1908, lot 28), a "Crux"-type penny of Æthelred II is described as reading GODMAN MO HAMT, a reading which, if it could be verified, would upset my theory that all "Hamtune" coins emanated from Northampton mint; the coin in question, however, is in my possession, and the actual reading is GODMAN M'O HAMPI.

The great increase in the number of moneyers in the reigns of Eadgar, Eadweard the Martyr, and the early years of Æthelred II probably gave rise to abuses, and in the latter reign, by the *Instituta Londonicae*, their numbers were restricted to three moneyers in each principal city, burh, or market-town, and one moneyer in each other burh. Northampton, as the only important town in the shire, would be entitled to three moneyers, but in Hampshire, Southampton, holding a position subordinate to that of Winchester, would be entitled to one moneyer only, subsequently to the making of Æthelred's law.

---

1 This moneyer's name was probably Degel, older Degil, Dægil, and not "Isegel," as it appears upon the coins. A scribal variety of majuscule D was formed thus—IS, and if, in script character, the lower part of a D of this form were not completely closed it would probably be taken to represent "15," hence the die-sinker's error. The name Dægel, or Degel, occurs in "Dægles-ford," the Anglo-Saxon form of Daylesford, Worcestershire, and is to be found in several charters recorded in *Codex Diplomaticus*, cp. No. DCXXIII.

2 "Et ut monetarii pauciores sint quam antea fuerint; in omni summo portu iii, et in omni alio portu sit unus monetarius."—Thorpe, *Ancient Laws and Institutes*. 
The approximate date of Æthelred's law cannot be determined, but probably about the middle of the reign, and a careful examination of such coins of Æthelred, of types later than the "Crux" type, and of those of Canute's first type (Hawkins, 212), as can be tentatively assigned to Southampton, suggests the probability that only one moneyer was working there, while the coins which can be allocated to Northampton show that three moneyers were working there at one time.

That there was a close connection between the Winchester mint and that at Southampton is highly probable, and a comparison of the names of the moneyers working at the former mint with those appearing upon the "Hamtun" coins appears to suggest the possibility that although "Hamwic" was the recognised numismatic form for Southampton in the reign of Æthelred II, and that HA and HAM on coins issued at Southampton in this reign, as well as in earlier reigns, was intended for an abbreviation of that form, it is possible that in one instance the form "Hamtun" was used in error by a Southampton moneyer.

Hildebrand records two coins of Æthelred II, type A, reading SEOLCA ON HAMTV, and SEOLCA ON HAMTV, respectively. He also records Winchester coins of Æthelred II, type A, and of Canute, type E, by a moneyer of the same name, and these appear to be the only recorded coins issued at any time during the Anglo-Saxon and Norman periods by a moneyer bearing that unusual name, and thus we may be tempted to assume that the issuer of the Winchester coins was identical with the Hamtun moneyer; that Hamtun in this instance was Southampton, and that Seolca was transferred from Southampton to Winchester during the period of issue of Hildebrand, type A.

There are, however, in addition to the reasons already adduced for allocating to Northampton the whole of the Hamtun group, sound dialectal reasons for assigning to that mint the coins by the moneyers Seolca, Æthelsige, and Wulfnoth, upon some of whose coins of the reign of Æthelred II we find the form HEAMTV(N), which is a purely Mercian form of the West-Saxon Hamtun.
COINS OF THE NORTHAMPTON MINT

Plate II
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The Cotton manuscript, Vespasianus B. XXIV, contains the register of the charters of the Abbey of Evesham, and below are given extracts from four charters which relate to land in a Warwickshire Hamtun, and in which we find the Mercian dialect form "Heamtune":—

1. Folio 25.—

A charter of King Æthelred, dated March 23, 988, "Ideo ego Æselredus totius Albionis basileus aliquam telluris partem iuris mei fideli ministro meo Noræmanno cum consensu meorum fidelium satrapum libens condonabo, id est, v. manentium in loco illo ubi ab incolis habitatibus Heamtun nominatur." The boundaries run "Istis itaque terminis: Dys sind  ámba londegeamaere to Hamtune."

2. Folio 26.—

King Eadweard the Confessor refers to a donation that Earl Leofric had made of "illam terram de Heamtun in monasterio de Eouesham."

3. Folio 26.—

Earl Leofric refers to a gift of his brother Normannus of "terram quæ vocatur Heamtun ad monasterium de Æuesham."

4. Folio 27.—

Bishop Lifing speaks of himself and says "Testem me esse quod Eadweardus rex consensit donationi illius terræ ad Heamtune quam comes Leofricus principali monasterio Eoueshamio concessit."

These charters are printed in Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus* (DCLXII, vol. 3, p. 234; DCCCCXI, vol. 4, p. 249; DCCCCXXXVIII, vol. 4, p. 272; DCCCCXLI, vol. 4, p. 277), but they are not printed in Birch's *Cartularium Saxonicum*. The form "Heantun," as it appears in the *Index*, is a substitution made by Kemble, and has no actual existence in the Evesham Cartulary.
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The earliest of the above-quoted charters is of considerable value as evidence in connection with the question under consideration, for it not only presents the normal West-Saxon form Hamtun, but it also tells us quite plainly that "Heamtun" was the way the country-folk dwelling at Hamtun pronounced the name of their town.

It is obvious that we have here to do with a question of dialect, and if we turn to Dr. Joseph Wright's Old English Grammar (1914 edition), sec. 78, we shall find the explanation we need: "In Mercian, a becomes ea before single consonants by u- and o/a-umlaut." The difference in spelling and pronunciation of the West-Saxon "Hamtun" and the Mercian "Heamtun" is the result of umlaut, or vowel infection. As Dr. Wright explains (sec. 48): "Guttural umlaut is the modification of an accented vowel (a, e, i), through the influence of a primitive Old English guttural vowel (u, ʌ, a) in the next syllable, whereby a guttural glide was developed after the vowels a, e, i, which then combined with them to form the diphthongs ea, eo, io... When the vowel which caused umlaut was u, it is called u-umlaut, and when ʌ or a, it is called o/a-umlaut; u- and o/a umlaut of a only took place in Mercian, as featu, vats; heafuc, hawk; steapul, pillar; ealu, ale; heafola, head; fearan, to go, travel; feata, of vats; geata, of gates; gleadian, to rejoice; hleadan, to load; leatian, to be slow." The West Saxon forms are fatu, hafuc, stapul, alu, hafola, faran, fata, gata, gladian, hladen, latian. Hence, Heamtun is the Mercian form of the West Saxon Hamtun, and if we assume that the vowel a has dropped out between m and t, the dialectal form is readily explicable.

"Heam" exhibits the Mercian breaking of a when followed by an a in the next syllable. Hence "Heam" postulates Heama, and that in composition indicates the earlier possessive form Heaman. In the Mercian dialect the n of the possessive dropped out just as it did from the Alemannic possessive of weak nouns in o. For instance, Porto: Portin; cp. Portitun, now Portington. Also Canso: Censin; cp. Chenesitun, now Kensington. Hence "Heamtun" of the tenth and eleventh centuries postulates the following
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sequence of dialectal changes: *Hāmantūn, *Hāmantūn, Heamatun, "Heamtūn."

Hildebrand describes a coin of Harthacnut, which reads ÆLFPINE ON HÆMTUV. This form appears to present a dialectal difficulty, but if we turn to Bosworth's Elements of Anglo-Saxon Grammar, we find that "The Anglo-Saxon writers often confounded some letters, and used them indifferently for each other. This is the case to a most surprising extent with the vowels and diphthongs." He also points out that in Dano-Saxon ae is commonly used for ea. Thus "Hēmtūn" is the Dano-Saxon form of the Mercian "Heamtūn," and a Danish cuneator, having before him the script copy "Heamtūn," would probably render it "Hæmtūn."

The Mercian ea was pronounced yā; thus "Heamtūn" was pronounced Hyāmtūn, and in the neighbourhood of Banbury may still be heard an old rhyme which runs—

"Aynho on the hill,
Clifton in the clay,
Drunken Deddington,
And Yām highway."

Aynho is in Northamptonshire, and Deddington, with its hamlets Clifton and Hampton, or Hempton, is in Oxfordshire. The "Yām" of the rhyme is Hampton, and thus preserves the Mercian pronunciation of the eleventh century. This rhyme probably dates from the time when the Mercian dialect was commonly spoken in the district, and Hampton was Yāmtūn. This pronunciation is preserved in other place-names—for instance, Yarnton, Oxfordshire, was originally

1 In the days of Æthelred II, the name of Havant in Hampshire was "Hamanfunta," the spring of Hama. This is about twenty miles to the east of Southampton, or "Portus Hamonis." Near the church of Havant is a spring called "Homewell," and this name presents the modern form of Hāmanwyll, with long 0 for long a, according to rule. Cp. Charter of Æthelstan, A.D. 935 (Birch, Cart. Sax., No. 707; Kemble, Cod. Dipl., No. 1111), and of Æthelred II, A.D. 980 (Kemble, Cod. Dipl., No. 624), where Havant, Hampshire, is described as "Hamanfuntan," "Hamanfunta," and "Hamafuntan."
Eardington, and in post-Saxon times Yardington and Yarnington; and Yardley, Worcestershire, was, in the tenth century, Eardleah. 1

The Mercian form Heamtun also occurs as the name of other Hamptons in Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Gloucestershire, Oxfordshire and in other parts of Mercia; we also find Heamtunninga as the name of Hampton Gay, Oxfordshire (Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus*; Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum*).

That coins inscribed "Hamtun" emanated from the same mint, and were struck by the same moneyer as those inscribed "Heamtun," is proved by two pennies of Æthelred II, type Hildebrand, A (Hawkins, 205) in the writer's possession. The two coins were struck from the same obverse die, but one reverse is inscribed PVLFNOD M-O HAM, and the other reads PVLFNOD ON HEAMT; and a careful comparison of two coins of the same type, by the moneyer Seolca, described by Hildebrand (Nos. 1270 and 1271), and reading S:EOLCA ON HAMTV and S:EOLCA ON HEAMTV, respectively, would probably disclose a corresponding result.

That the reverse dies were inscribed according to the instructions of the person under whose immediate jurisdiction the mint came is shown by a writ dated November 17, 1338, in which John de Flete is commanded to make certain dies at the expense of the Abbot of Reading for the making of money at Reading, "with such impression and circumscription as the Abbot should appoint" ("facienda de impressione et circumpscripitione quas dictus abbas vobis declarabit"). 2 And in the Close Roll, under date December 4, 1338, it is recorded that the king had caused such dies "of impression and circumscription declared by them" (the Abbot and monks) to be made, etc.

In Anglo-Saxon times the local mints appear to have been under the immediate jurisdiction of the Bursgerefa, or Borough Reeve, for in the Laws of Æthelred II, and of Canute, it is provided that if any moneyer accused of false coining pleaded that the false money

---

1 Grant by Bishop Oswald, with the consent of King Eadgar, and Ælfgod, Ealdorman of Mercia, A.D. 963.—Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus*, No. 495.

2 Harleian MS., 1708, fol. 44; *Monasticon*, vol. iv, pp. 34, 46.
had been made by permission of the Reeve, that officer was to undergo the triple ordeal, and, if guilty, to suffer the same penalty as a guilty moneyer. The Reeve of Northampton would issue his own written instructions to the cuneator for such reverse legends as he desired upon his dies, and he, being a local man—a Mercian—it is reasonable to assume that such instructions would, occasionally at least, be written in the Mercian dialect; hence the form "Heamtun" upon the coins.

The rulers of the great Anglo-Saxon ealdormanries were to all intents and purposes petty princes. Æthelstan, Ealdorman of East Anglia, was called "semi-rex" or "half-king," and Ætheired, Ealdorman of Mercia, appears to have enjoyed the power, and sometimes even the title, of an under-king. Florence of Worcester calls him "subregulus." In an undated charter recorded by Kemble, two Æthelred is described as "ealdorman," and in a charter of the year 884 he describes himself as "Principatu et dominio gentis Merciorum subjultus"—"gentis Merciorum ducatum gubernans."

Of Ulfcytel, the thegn or ealdorman of East Anglia, Green says: "His position seems to have been one of as great independence as that of the earlier ealdormen. The Danes knew the land as 'Ulfcytel's land,' and now that Swein appeared off the coast the thegn and his Witan made their own treaties and fought their own fights as if East Anglia were again a separate kingdom. The Witan saw at first no course left save to buy off the invaders... Ulfcytel summoned the fyrd in haste," etc. This convention of the Witan by Ulfcytel for the purpose of discussing terms of peace with the Danish king Swein, as recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, under the year 1004, was little short of a regal act.

The ealdormen, in fact, retained many royal prerogatives, which doubtless included that of the control of the coinage within their own government, and we know that the Ealdorman Æthelred of

---

1 Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes.
2 Codex Diplomaticus, No. 1075.
3 Ibid., No. 1066.
Mercia issued a coinage upon which he placed his own name in the position usually occupied by that of the King.\(^1\)

In the reign of Æthelred II the most powerful of the ealdormen was the ambitious and unscrupulous Eadric, who was always the second man in the country, let who might be first, and there can be little doubt that Eadric would jealously guard his prerogatives; including that of control of the coinage issued in his ealdormanry of Mercia.

The control of the coinage being vested in the ealdormen governing the various provinces, it is fair to assume that in a general way the activities of the moneyers, from generation to generation, although they would probably move from town to town, would be confined to their own province, and that fact must be taken into consideration in our endeavour to correctly allocate certain of the coins under consideration.

As previously stated, we have coins of the reign of Æthelred II by several moneyers which fail to exhibit readings more extended than HAM, an abbreviation which would serve equally well for either Hamtun or Hamwic.

In the reign of Æthelred II the moneyers whose coins fail to exhibit readings more extended than HAM are Leofric (the early variety of Hildebrand, A, Hawkins, 205); Thurcytel (Hildebrand, C); Ælfgut (Hildebrand, E, Hawkins, 203); Ulfni, Æthelnoth, Edmund, Leofgod, Manei (=Manet), and Spileman or Swileman (Hildebrand D, Hawkins, 207).

With regard to the moneyer VLFNI, apart from the above-mentioned coin the name appears to be quite unknown, and unrecorded in the recognised works of reference. It is evidently an abbreviated form of VLFNOE (=PVLFNOE), the “O” having been omitted and the “I” representing an incomplete “θ,” and I assign it, with other coins by Wulfnoth, to the Hamtun or Northampton series.

The name Thurcytel does not appear upon coins issued in the reigns of Eadgar and Eadweard the Martyr. In the reign of Æthelred II

a moneyer, or moneyers, of that name issued coins at Lincoln and Torksey; in the reign of Canute, at London, Lincoln and Torksey; in the reign of Harold I, at Stamford; and in the reigns of Harthacanute and Eadward the Confessor, at London. The name Ælfget, as that of a moneyer, appears first in the reign of Æthelred II, and is to be found on coins issued at Hereford, London and Stamford; in the reign of Canute, at London; and in the reigns of Eadward the Confessor and Harold II, at Lincoln. The name Æthelnoth is found on coins of Æthelstan, issued at Derby and Nottingham; on those of Eadred it appears, unaccompanied by that of a mint-town; it does not appear upon coins of either Eadgar or Eadward the Martyr, but reappears, at Lincoln, in the reign of Æthelred II and of Canute, and at Chester (or Leicester) in the reign of Æthelred II.

Derby, Chester, Hereford, Leicester, Lincoln, Torksey, London, Nottingham and Stamford were all situated within the boundaries of the Mercian ealdormanry—a fact which, together with the total absence of coins of Wessex mints by the moneyers Thurcytel, Ælfget and Æthelnoth, appears to be evidence sufficiently strong to warrant us in allocating to Northampton the coins inscribed HAM, and issued by those three moneyers.

In the reign of Æthelstan the name Edmund appears upon coins issued at Chester and Shrewsbury; of the reigns of Eadmund and Eadred we have coins by the moneyer Edmund, but without mint-name; of the reign of Eadwig we have coins by Edmund issued at York; of the reign of Eadgar, at Chester; of Eadward the Martyr none are recorded; of Æthelred II, at Cambridge, Colchester, Lincoln, London and Norwich; of Canute, at London and Norwich; and of Eadward the Confessor, at London. All the mints, with the exception of York, are situated in Mercia, or in the eastern counties, and, as before, none in Wessex. Again the evidence appears to warrant us in allocating to Northampton the coins by the moneyer Edmund.

By the moneyer Leofric we have coins of the reigns of Eadmund, Eadred and Eadgar, but without mint-name; of the reign of
Æthelred II we have coins issued at Canterbury, Dover, Exeter, Lymne, Ilchester, Rochester, Wallingford, Huntingdon, Lincoln, London, Tamworth, Ipswich, Norwich, Thetford and "Ham"; of the reign of Canute, at Canterbury, Chichester, Buckingham, Hertford, Lincoln, London, Southwark, Stamford, Dunwich, Ipswich, Norwich and Thetford; of the reign of Harold I, at Chichester, Lincoln, London, Southwark and Stamford; of Harthacnut, at Canterbury and York; of Eadweard the Confessor, at Romney, Huntingdon, Leicester, London, Hamtun, Stamford, Warwick, Worcester, Norwich and Thetford; of Harold II, at Worcester; of William I, at Dorchester, Dover, Leicester, London, Stamford, Warwick and Worcester; of William II, at Dover and Warwick; of Henry I, at Lincoln; and of Stephen, at Warwick. Of these 27 mints, 16 are Mercian and East Anglian, 6 are in Kent and Sussex, and only 4 in Wessex, none being in either Hampshire or Wiltshire. The evidence of the mints appears to leave little doubt that the "Ham" coins struck by Leofric should be assigned to the Mercian Hamtun.

By the moneyer Leofgod the only recorded coins are of the reign of Æthelred II, and were issued at Worcester and Cricklade. Worcester was in Mercia, and Cricklade but a short distance over the Mercian border, in Wessex. In this instance the evidence is insufficient to warrant us in definitely allocating the "Ham" coins to Northampton or to Southampton.

By the moneyer Manei, or Manet, no coins of the late Anglo-Saxon kings are recorded in the lists of moneyers given in the recognised works of reference, and the only specimen with which I am acquainted is of type Hawkins, 207, and is in my possession. The reverse is inscribed MANET MO. The contracted form AM is unusual, the only other instances of the omission of the initial H, upon coins of the reign of Æthelred II, issued from either of the

1 Since this was written I have ascertained that a penny of the reign of Eadgar, with the reverse inscribed MANNET MO, appeared in the Douglas find. See Numismatic Chronicle, 1913, p. 334.
mints under consideration, that have come under my notice, being three which I assign to Northampton. One of these coins is by the moneyer Lifing, and is recorded by Hildebrand; another, also recorded by Hildebrand, is by the moneyer Wulfnoth, and the third is by the moneyer Bryning, and is in my possession. Two of these coins are inscribed AMTVN, and the third is inscribed AMTV, which suggests that the coin by Manet also was issued at Northampton.

Maneta appears in the list of moneyers of the reign of Eadmund, given in the British Museum Catalogue, but no mint is indicated, nor does the National Collection include a coin by that moneyer.

In addition to the above-mentioned coins of Æthelred II, we have others of Æthelstan, inscribed AMTVN, and of William I, by the moneyers Sæwine and Swetman inscribed AMT, AMT and AMTV, all of which I assign to Northampton.

With regard to the moneyer Spileman, or Swileman, there appears to be sufficient evidence to warrant us in allocating his coins to Southampton, as Winchester was the only other mint from which his coins appear to have been issued. Spileman issued coins at Southampton in type Hildebrand, D (Hawkins, 207), and at Winchester in types Hildebrand, E and A (Hawkins, 203 and 205), and continued there during the reigns of Canute, Harold I and Eadweard the Confessor.

In the list of moneyers of Æthelred II, given in the British Museum Catalogue, appears the name Brihtnoth, as a Hamtun moneyer. The present writer has no information as to the type, or types, upon which this moneyer’s name appears, nor of the reverse readings of his coins. Probably his mint-form does not extend beyond HAM, and his coins were issued at Southampton, for, in addition, in the reign of Æthelred II, the name Brihtnoth appears upon coins issued at Winchester, London and York; in the reign of Canute, at Winchester, Chichester, Malmesbury, Hastings, London, Thetford and York; and in the reigns of Eadward the Confessor and Harold II, at Gloucester.

Probably Brihtnoth was first employed at Southampton in the
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reign of Æthelred II, and subsequently transferred to Winchester, where he continued to work in the same or a later type, and thence into the reign of Canute, as did Spileman.

The coins of Æthelred II, generally known as the Agnus Dei type (Hildebrand, G, Hawkins, type 7), add further evidence of the correctness of the writer's allocation of the Hamtun coins to Northampton. Coins of the Agnus Dei type are known of Derby, Hereford, Nottingham, Stafford, Stamford, "Hamtun" and Malmesbury. The first five mints were situated in the ealdormanry of Mercia, and, apart from other evidence, it appears to be a fair assumption that the Hamtun mint also was situated in Mercia; and the fact that, with one exception, all the known coins of this type emanated from Mercian mints, suggests that the whole issue was confined to that province. The only recorded complete Hamtun coin of this type was issued by the moneyer Wulfnoth, who, as we have previously seen, was one of those moneyers who used the Mercian dialect form Heamtown upon certain of their coins.

Green,¹ referring to the ealdormanry of Mercia in the reign of Eadwig, says: "In extent, in population, in wealth, the Mercian ealdormanry, stretching as it did from Bristol to Manchester and from the Watling Street to Offa's Dyke, was little inferior to the region south of the Thames which was left to the king," etc. Freeman² says: "When as in the fourfold division made by Canute, Wessex, Northumberland, East Anglia and Mercia are spoken of as an exhaustive division of England, there can be no doubt that Mercia is taken in the widest sense, meaning the whole land from Bristol on the Avon to Barton on the Humber." This reputed division of England by Canute was, however, merely a recognition of accepted facts, and Eadric's ealdormanry extended as far westward as Bristol long before 1017.

Malmesbury being situated near the border of Gloucestershire, and several miles north-east of Bristol, would thus be upon the
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threshold of the ealdormanry of Mercia; and as the *Agnus Dei* coins were evidently issued but a short time before the defection of Eadric, in 1015, when Hampshire and the southern portion of Wiltshire was held by Canute, and the northern portion of Wiltshire, including Malmesbury, was held by Eadric for Æthelred, and was thus temporarily in the ealdormanry of Mercia, it is reasonable to assume that Eadric would exercise his privilege of issuing coins at Malmesbury.

Be that as it may, there can be little doubt that about the time when the *Agnus Dei* coins were issued, Æthelred was in possession of Northampton and not of Southampton, which is, I submit, conclusive evidence that the Hamtun coins of this type were issued at Northampton and not at Southampton.

It is difficult to accurately define the exact boundary of any ealdorman’s territory at a time like this when their spheres of influence fluctuated so often.

The moneyers of Æthelred II, upon whose coins the mint-form extends to *HAMT, HAMTV, HAMTVN* and *HAMTVNE*, and in some cases the Mercian *HEAM, HEAMT* and *HEAMTV*, are Æthelsige, Bruning, Boia, Cylm, Leofsige, Leofstan, Leofwine, Leofwold, Lifing, Seolca, Wulfnoth and Wulfric. Coins struck by these moneyers I assign to Northampton. Some of the foregoing names occur principally upon coins issued from Mercian or East Anglian mints, and are of service in allocating the Hamtun coins, but others of these names are very common and occur upon coins struck at mints situated in all parts of England, from York to Exeter and from Norwich to Chester, thus rendering them practically useless for deductive purposes in assigning coins of the Hamtun series. For reference purposes I append a schedule of moneyers, kings, and mints illustrating the foregoing remarks:

Æthelsige:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eadgar</td>
<td>London and Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelred II</td>
<td>Hamtun, London, Bath and Cricklade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harthacanute</td>
<td>Chester and Gloucester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bruning:

Æthelred II .. Hamtun.

Canute .. London, Nottingham, York, Bath and Malmesbury.

Eadweard the Confessor Chester, Lincoln, London, Tamworth and Ipswich.

Boia:

Æthelstan .. Chester and Derby.

Eadwig .. Hamtun and Bedford.

Eadgar .. Chester, Derby, Stamford, Canterbury and Wilton.

Eadweard the Martyr .. Chester, London, Stamford and Canterbury.


Cylm:

Eadgar, Eadweard the Martyr and Æthelred II .. Hamtun.

Leofsige:

Eadgar .. Hamtun, Oxford and Wilton.

Æthelred II .. Hamtun, Gloucester, Shrewsbury, Cambridge, Ipswich and Ilchester.


Eadweard the Confessor London and Nottingham.
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**Leofstan:**


Harthacanute .. .. London and Worcester.


**Leofwine:**

Eadgar .. .. Tempsford.


Leofwine (continued)—

Hrathaconute . . . Chester, Stamford, Warwick, Norwich, Thetford, Canterbury, Dover and Chichester.


Harold II . . . Bristol, Stamford, Rochester and Exeter.

Leofwold:

Eadgar . . . Wilton.


Eadweard the Confessor Lincoln, Ipswich, Lewes and Winchester.

Harold II . . . Guildford and Winchester.

Lifing:

Eadweard the Martyr . . . Lincoln.

LIFING (continued)—


SEOLCA:

Æthelred II .. Hamtun and Winchester.

Canute .. Winchester.

WULFNOTH:

Æthelred II .. Hamtun, Hertford, Leicester, London, Colchester, Thetford, Romney, Dorchester and Winchester.

Canute .. Chester, Gloucester, Leicester, Lincoln, London, Stamford, York, Romney, Shaftesbury and Winchester.

Harold I .. Bristol, Chester, Leicester, Canterbury, Romney, Exeter and Winchester.

Harthacanute .. Gloucester, Nottingham and Exeter.

Eadweard the Confessor Hamtun, Chester, Leicester, Nottingham and Stamford.

1 The Hamtun moneyers Wulfnoth, of the reigns of Æthelred II and Eadweard the Confessor, were probably father and son. The name occurs again upon Northampton coins of Henry I, type: Andrew, XV, Hawkins, 255.
WULFRIC:

_Eadgar_ .. .. York.


_Canute_ .. .. Hertford, Lincoln, London, Southwark, Warwick, York, Exeter and Winchester,

_Harold I_ .. .. Lincoln and Shaftesbury.


To complete the reference and for comparison with the foregoing schedule, I append a similar schedule, in tabular form, of the Hamwic series.

In addition to the following moneyers, whose coins read _HAM, HAMPI, HAMVI_ and _HAMPIC_, are Leofgod and Spileman, or Swileman, whose coins disclose the mint-form _HAM_, which I assign to the Hamwic series.¹

¹ See ante, pp. 40-41.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethelred II</th>
<th>Ethelward</th>
<th>Godwin</th>
<th>Ethelred II</th>
<th>Godwin</th>
<th>Ethelward</th>
<th>Ethelred II</th>
<th>Ethelward</th>
<th>Ethelred II</th>
<th>Ethelward</th>
<th>Ethelred II</th>
<th>Ethelward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wareham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallesbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricklade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchcombe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamwic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A HOARD OF COINS OF ÆTHELRÆD II FOUND IN IRELAND