THE NORTHAMPTON AND SOUTHAMPTON MINTS.

BY WILLIAM C. WELLS

PART II.

EADWEARDBY THE ELDER, A.D. 901-925.

ÆTHELSTAN, A.D. 925-941.

In Part I (vol. xvii) I have dealt principally with the coins issued in the reign of Æthelred II, and in the present chapter I shall endeavour to show that the Hamtun coins issued from about the year 916 in the reign of Eadweard the Elder, down to the end of the reign of Eadweard the Martyr, afford evidence of even greater value in favour of assigning that series to Northampton than do the coins of Æthelred II; and in a subsequent chapter I shall deal with the coins issued from the Hamtun mint between the early part of Canute's reign and about the year 1142, in the reign of Stephen, when the older form, "Hamtun," etc., disappears from the coins, and "Norham," etc., was finally adopted.

The only recorded coin of Æthelstan inscribed with the mint-name Hamtun is of British Museum Catalogue, type V, with the reverse reading FRIDEBRIHT MO AMTVN. VRB. It is figured in Ruding's Annals of the Coinage, 1840, pl. D, fig. 30. It was then in the Cuff collection and is now in my possession.

The use of the designation urbs, the Latin equivalent of the Anglo-Saxon burh, a walled town, is of rare occurrence upon

1 See footnote i, p. 73 post.
2 See Pl. I, Fig. 2, British Numismatic Journal, vol. xvii.
our coins, and, with the exception of an Oxford coin of Eadred, it is to be found only upon those of the reign of Æthelstan. Apart from coins of the Oxford mint, upon which the form urbs is not unusual, its use is confined to one coin of the Lewes mint, one of the Canterbury mint, two from an uncertain mint which has been tentatively allocated to Dartford,¹ and the coin now under consideration. The use of the designation urbs upon these coins shows that they emanated from burhs, or fortified towns.

Professor Maitland, in *Domesday Book and Beyond*, says:—

"It seems fairly clear that for some long time after the Germanic invasions the word burh meant merely a fastness, a stronghold, and suggested no thick population nor any population at all. . . . A time seems to have come, at latest in the struggle between the Danish invaders and the West-Saxon kings, when the establishment and maintenance of what we might call fortified towns was seen to be a matter of importance. There was to be a cluster of inhabited dwellings which, as a whole, was to be made defensible by a ditch and mound, by palisade or wall. Edward the Elder and the Lady of the Mercians were active in this work. Within the course of a few years burhs were 'wrought' or 'timbered' at Worcester, Chester, Hertford, Witham in Essex, Bridgenorth, Tamworth, Stafford, Warwick, Eddisbury, Warbury, Runcorn, Buckingham, Towcester, Malden, Huntingdon. Whatever may be meant by the duty of repairing burhs when it is mentioned in charters coming from a somewhat earlier time, it must for the future be that of upholding those walls and mounds that the king and the lady are rearing."

During the struggle between the Danes and Eadweard the Elder and his sister Æthelfæd, as the former were driven northward these fortresses were established for the purpose of holding the Danes in
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check, and for the protection of the inhabitants of the neighbourhood in which the burhs were reared. In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, between the years 910 and 924, we find accounts of the raising or building of nearly thirty of these fortresses, to which the term burh (accusative burg) is almost invariably applied.

All authorities agree that the area enclosed within the fortifications was essentially the burh, whether the town extended beyond the fortifications or not, and a careful perusal of these accounts in the Chronicle can leave little doubt that when we read of the raising or building of a burh it means the constructing of a wall or rampart and its accompanying entrenchments.

The consistency with which the chroniclers apply the designation burh to these defensive walls can leave little doubt that they formed an essential feature which entitled a settlement, large or small, to the designation of burh or urbs. Sometimes the burh was raised upon a site previously uninhabited and was a fortress pure and simple; and at other times the fortifications were made adjacent to, or around, an existing wic or tun, thereby elevating it to the status of a burh.

This is clearly shown in the case of Peterborough, which was formerly known as Medeshamstede; but we are told in the Peterborough Anglo-Saxon Chronicle that Aldulf, the first Abbot, after the restoration of the Abbey in the reign of Eadgar, "first made the walls about the monastery; then gave it for name 'Burh,' that was before called Medeshamstede." William of Malmesbury states that Medeshamstede so greatly resembled a fortified town that it was called Burh, "a similitudine urbis Burch vocatus est," thus identifying burh with urbs; as do also Simeon of Durham, who describes Bebbanburh (Bamborough) as Urbs Bebban; and the Venerable Bede who describes Maldelmes-burh, or Maldufes-burh (Malmesbury), as Maildufi urbs. Of Cnobheres-burg (Burh Castle, Suffolk), Bede says: "Castrum quod lingua Anglorum Cnobheres burg, id est urbs Cnobheri, vocatur." Sweet, The Oldest English Texts, gives the forms "Cnofheres-burg," "Cnobheresburrug," and "urbs Cnobheri."
Bath, in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, MS. F, annal 972, is styled "Acemannes beri." In the following annal it is "Ace-mannes ceaster"; and Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum*, No. 1164, records a charter of the year 965 in which we find Bath described as "urbe Acumanensis." In the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* London is usually designated "Lunden-burh," and in the charter of privileges granted by Eadgar to Westminster Abbey, *circa* 970, London is styled "Londoniae urbis," etc.¹ In the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* account of the destruction of Exeter by the Danes in the year 1003, the town is styled a *burh*, which is rendered *urbs* by Henry of Huntingdon and by Florence of Worcester.

Signor de Rossi, in his account of *A Treasure of Anglo-Saxon Money found in the House of the Vestals, Rome*, 1884, describes a penny of Æthelstan, which he reads *EADLILD MO CANTVN VRB*, and attributes to Canterbury. Major Carlyon-Britton, however, has expressed doubt as to the correctness of that reading and the consequent allocation of the coin to Canterbury, and suggests that the coin "cannot in reality be of that city, as the inferior designation *urbs* would not have been used in the case of a place entitled to the superior rank of *civitas*."² That argument, however, appears to lose weight when we consider that in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and in charters, etc., from the middle of the seventh century onward, and upon coins from the time of Eadgar onward, Canterbury is described by the equally inferior designation "Cæntwara-burh," etc.; and, with all deference to the opinion expressed by Major Carlyon-Britton, the present writer is inclined to accept Signor de Rossi's reading of the coin in question, and to regard it as a further instance of the equation of *urbs* with *burh*.

The foregoing examples are sufficient to demonstrate that in the tenth century and later the word *burh* indicated, primarily, a fortified town, and that it was at that period usual to equate the Latin *urbs* with the Anglo-Saxon *burh*.

Ballard, *Domesday Boroughs*, p. 71, draws attention to the

¹ *Cartularium Saxonicum*, No. 1264. *Codex Diplomaticus*, No. 555.
² *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. vii, p. 5.
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fact that in Domesday the terms "burgus" [burh] and "civitas" are sometimes applied to the same place, and that they are not used synonymously. He adds—"the 'burgus' was the fortified area."

At some time prior to the year 912 the Danes had made Northampton their headquarters. In 916, Eadweard the Elder, with his army, appeared near Northampton, with the evident intention of attacking the town; but we learn from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, that:

"Thurferth jarl and the holds, and all the army which owed obedience to Hamtune, north as far as the Welland, submitted to him, and sought him for their lord and protector."  

The Chronicle does not record the fortification of Northampton, but considering its proximity to Watling Street, and its importance

1 The earliest mention we have of Northampton is in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, where we read that "The army rode out after Easter from [North-]Hamtun and from Leicester, and broke the peace and slew many men at Hocneratun [Hockerton?] and thereabouts." The various versions of the Chronicle, however, do not agree as to the date of this, and, consequently, other occurrences at Northampton. MS. A (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge) gives the date as A.D. 917, while MSS. B (Cottonian MS. "Tiberius A, vi"), C (Cottonian MS. "Tiberius B, i"), and D (Cottonian MS. "Tiberius B, iv"), give the date as A.D. 914; and the latter date is given also by Florence of Worcester. Sir Charles Oman, England Before the Norman Invasion, p. 499, says: "The jarls of Northampton and Leicester who, soon after Easter (apparently of 912), broke the peace, etc.," and in a footnote he says: "Though the Wessex version of the A.-S.C. gives the date 917, having no news of King Edward since the time of the fortification of Hertford, in the year which it calls 913, but which is really 911. There are no entries of the king's doings in 914-15-16; and then we get the outbreak of the Northampton and Leicester Danes ascribed to 917. There was really no such pause in King Edward's activity, and the doings ascribed to him in 917-18-19 are really those of 912-13-14. Florence of Worcester and Ethelweard are much more nearly right, but the former is one year out, by counting too late. That Ethelweard correctly gets the Danish raid on the Bristol Channel into 913 is proved by the fact that he casually mentions that Christmas Day in the next year fell on Sunday, which was the fact in 914." The Danish raid on the Bristol Channel occurred the year after the outbreak of the Northampton and Leicester Danes.

2 This account is given in MS. A, which, as shown in the footnote above, is apparently five years out in its dating. Hence the date of Thurferth's submission would be 916, and not 921 as given in the Chronicle.
as a frontier town, there can be little doubt that the place had been fortified by the Danes during their occupation, and that Eadweard only found it necessary to leave a garrison to hold the burh.

The Northampton of the tenth century probably occupied a site of which an open space now called the "Mayorhold" formed the centre; it is almost beyond doubt that the town was surrounded by an earthen rampart, or possibly a stone wall, and the place as a whole evidently occupied a position of considerable military strength and importance, situated as it was upon a Celtic or Roman road connecting directly with Watling Street and nearly in the centre of England.

That Northampton was at that time a place of considerable strength is shown by Simeon of Durham, who records that soon after the death of Æthelstan, Anlaf the Dane invaded Mercia, advanced as far south as Northampton, to which place he laid siege; but failing to seize that stronghold he drew off his forces and proceeded to attack Tamworth, where he was more successful.

Further evidence of the importance of Northampton as a fortress is to be found in the fact that the Mercian shires could not have been formed until after the recovery of that province by Eadweard the Elder. These shires, originally formed in the reign of Æthelstan, and considerably smaller than those of the present day, were of purely military creation. The shires of Bedford, Buckingham, Hertford, Huntingdon, Stafford, Warwick, etc., were limited districts appertaining to the fortresses which Eadweard the Elder and Æthelflaed had raised at those points, and there can be no doubt that the shire of Northampton was similarly created and assigned to that fortress.

Chadwick, *Studies on Anglo-Saxon Institutions*, p. 415, says:—

"The use of the word *Urbs* seems to imply that the town or village itself was fortified . . . though the question is one which can hardly be settled except by archaeological investigation."

The old town of Southampton, however, does not appear to have been at any period of its existence a fortified town—except for the
palisade and ditch which gave it, or some portion of it, the designation tun\(^1\)—and it was not until a new town was built upon a new site and subsequently fortified that Southampton became entitled to the designation burh or urbs.\(^2\) Archaeological investigation has proved that Northampton was from the tenth century onward a fortified town, but in the case of Southampton similar investigation has produced only negative evidence.

In view of the foregoing facts, there can be little doubt that the "Amtun Urb" coin of Æthelstan was struck at Hamtūn, the Mercian burh or urbs, and not at the unfortified tun of that name in Wessex.

The writer is of opinion that the mint at Northampton was established shortly after the recovery of the town from the Danes by Eadweard the Elder in the year 916,\(^3\) for we find coins of that reign by the moneyer Frithebriht,\(^4\) whom we may safely assume to have been identical with the moneyer of the same name who coined at "Amtun Urb" in the reign of Æthelstan. His name appears upon a coin of Eadred,\(^5\) and he presumably coined also in the reign of Eadmund.


Very few coins of Eadmund or of Eadred are inscribed with the name of the mint from which they emanated, and I have failed

\(^1\) See *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. xvii, p. 26. Since that was written I have learned from Wilks's (Woodward's) *History of Hampshire*, vol. 2, p. 235, that in the seventeenth century there existed upon a portion of the site of Old Hamtūn, the ditch which, undoubtedly, in Anglo-Saxon times surrounded the demesne of the local lord. The area enclosed within the ditch was nearly 300 yards in diameter, and although it occupied only a small portion of the entire settlement, the entrenchment undoubtedly represented the full area of the tun. The site of this entrenched position was in St. Mary's Field, so named, as Leland says, "by the chirch of St. Mary stonding hard by it."


\(^3\) See footnote (\(^1\)), p. 73 ante.

\(^4\) *See Pl. I, Fig. 1.*

\(^5\) W. T. Ready sale, lot 97.
to discover any coins of either of these two reigns which bear upon their face an indication that they were struck either at Hamtun or at Hamwic. Ruding, in his list of mints of Eadmund, gives the mint-reading AMTD and assigns it, with a query, to Southampton. Unfortunately Ruding’s lists of mints and moneyers are separate and in no wise helpful, but it appears probable that the reading in question was intended for AMTP[ic], and that the coin from which it was taken was struck at Southampton.

**EADWIG, A.D. 955–959.**

Of the reign of Eadwig, the moneyers whose coins are inscribed with the contracted mint form HAM number at least nine, namely, Mangod, Wærin, Husebald, Baldric, Thurferth, Boia or Boiga, Hildulf, Winemund or Wihtemund, and Dudeman or Dudemun.

In the British Museum Collection is a penny of Eadwig inscribed MANGOD MO HAM, and in the Montagu, Reynolds, and other collections was a similar coin reading MANEOD MO HAM. That these coins were struck at Southampton there can be little doubt, for we find coins of the same reign, and apparently by the same moneyer, issued at Winchester. The name Mangod re-appears in the reign of Æthelred II upon coins issued at Exeter, and in the reign of Canute at Bedford.

The name WÆRIN, WARIN OR PARIN occurs upon coins issued in the reigns of Eadmund, Eadred, and Eadwig, but without any indication of the mint from which they emanated; and a penny I have of Eadwig, inscribed WÆRIN MO HAM, appears to be the only recorded coin by that moneyer inscribed with a mint-name and issued in the tenth century.

The only other recorded occurrence of the name Warin, as that of a moneyer, is at Shrewsbury, in the reign of Henry II. In the Pipe Roll of the sixth year of Henry II, 1159–1160, we find it recorded under “Shropshire” that “Warin the moneyer renders an account of ten marks; he has paid five marks into the treasury and owes five marks”; and in the collection of Mr. L. A. Lawrence is a coin of the first type of Henry II, which reads PARIN: ON: SALOPES.
The Northampton and Southampton Mints.

With the exception of the coins issued in the reigns of Eadmund, Eadred, and Eadwig, I have failed to discover any record of the name Warin in the Anglo-Saxon period, and in the Norman period there appear to be very few instances in which the name occurs. William of Malmesbury gives an account of Wærin, abbot of Malmesbury, 1070–1081; Madox quotes a record of Warin, Sheriff of Somerset in the reign of Henry I; and in the Pipe Roll of the thirty-first year of Henry I, 1129–30, we find several references to Warin, Sheriff of Dorset and Wiltshire. It appears probable that Warin of Somerset was identical with Warin of Dorset and Wiltshire. This name appears to incline to the south rather than the midlands or the north, and it is reasonable to assume that the coins struck by Wærin or Warin, in the reigns of Eadmund, Eadred, and Eadwig, emanated from the southern Hamtun.

In the early part of 1929 the Royal Irish Academy acquired a hoard of Anglo-Saxon coins, 73 in number, ranging in date from the reign of Æthelstan to the reign of Eadgar, which had then recently been discovered in Co. Louth. A printed description of this hoard has not yet appeared, but, by the courtesy of Dr. A. Mahr, Keeper of Irish Antiquities in the Irish National Museum, a selection of the coins was sent for my inspection. The hoard contains at least one coin of interest to this enquiry, namely, a penny of Eadwig reading HVZEBALD M HAM, thus providing an hitherto unrecorded moneyer for either of the mints under discussion. The only other coin bearing this moneyer’s name that has come under my notice is a penny of Eadred, without mint-name, in the British Museum collection. We have no direct evidence to show whether Husebald, Hysebald, was working at Hamtun or at Hamwic. However, the coin of Eadred cited above bears four pellets in the field of the obverse, and, as a majority of Anglo-Saxon coins of this period upon which such symbols occur can be shown to have emanated from Mercian mints, the evidence appears to be

1 Gesla Pontificum Anglorum, Rolls Series, p. 421.
2 History of the Exchequer, vol. i, p. 112.
in favour of assigning Husebald's coin to Northampton rather than Southampton.¹

In the Montagu Collection, lot 698, was a penny of Eadwig inscribed BALDRIC MO HAM. The name Baldric only occurs as that of one moneyer in Anglo-Saxon times. This warrants us in assuming that all the coins bearing that name and issued from the time of Æthelstan to that of Eadgar, were struck by the same moneyer. By this moneyer we have coins of the reigns of Æthelstan, Eadmund,² Eadred, Eadwig, and Eadgar, which fail to disclose a mint-name. It is, however, possible that the reverse inscription of the coin of Æthelstan which reads BALDRIC MOMT, in the British Museum Collection, stands for BALDRIC MO [HA]MT.³

In my possession is a coin of Eadred, by the moneyer Baldric, which exhibits upon the obverse the symbol s, reversed, a symbol peculiar to coins struck at Mercian mints.⁴ In the Royal Cabinet at Stockholm is a coin of Eadgar⁵ inscribed BALDRIC MO HAMTV, which, together with the coin of Eadwig inscribed BALDRIC MO HAM, shows that Baldric was working at Hamtun. The evidence of the s symbol on the coin of Eadred, together with the fact that Baldric, in the reign of Eadweard the Martyr, was working at the neighbouring mint of Bedford, also in Mercia and distant only eighteen miles; and that it is only upon the coins of these two mints that Baldric's name appears, show that it was from the mint of the Mercian Hamtun that Baldric's HAM and HAMTV coins emanated.

If further evidence, amounting to positive proof, be needed, it

¹ There was a bishop named Husa connected with Mercia, in Birch, No. 416, Kemble, No. 237, whose see was either at Dunwich or Elmham, c. A.D. 836. This name is a pet-form of some earlier name. Compare Searle, Onomasticon Anglosaxoniceum, where we get Hyse and Hysebeald named as moneyers under Eadred and Æthelred II; Hysebeorht, an abbot in Worcestershire (A.D. 803); Hysenoth, a priest in Kent and Wessex; and Hysewulf, a priest, in the Liber Vita Dunelmensis.
² See Pl. I, Fig. 4.
³ See Pl. I, Fig. 3; also British Museum Catalogue, vol. ii, Pl. 10, Fig. 13.
⁴ See Pl. I, Fig. 7; also illustrated as lot 1002, Carlyon-Britton sale catalogue. A note on coins bearing the S and M symbols will appear in an appendix.
⁵ British Museum Catalogue, type VI, Hawkins, 200.
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is supplied by a coin of Eadgar, British Museum Catalogue, Type III, also in my collection, which reads BALDRIE-MONETA-N-AM. The N has a well-defined mark of contraction above it, and is separated from AM by a pellet; and, in the writer's opinion, the only possible extension of the inscription is BALDRIE-MONETA-N[or8]-AM[tun]. ¹

The latter coin came from the Shepherd, Montagu, Murdoch, and Carlyon-Britton collections, and in the sale catalogues it is described as "the only known coin of this king which can be attributed with certainty to Northampton."

Baldric, and Balddic (= Baldric), are given by Ruding in his list of moneyers of Æthelred II, but no place of mintage is added; and as similar forms are given in his list of moneyers of Eadward the Martyr, it appears probable that they were repeated in the list of Æthelred's moneyers in error. The name Baldric re-appears upon coins of the reign of William I, and of William II, struck at Worcester—also a Mercian mint.

The name Thurferth makes its first appearance upon our coins in the reign of Eadred, and continued during the reign of Eadwig and the early years of Eadgar. With the exception of one coin of Eadwig, inscribed ÆVRFERD MO HAM, which formed lot 67 at the sale of the Bascom collection, Thurferth's coins fail to present any indication of their place of mintage. As that of a moneyer the name is of rare occurrence—so rare that, as in the case of the moneyer Baldric, we may assume that all the known coins bearing Thurferth's name, and issued in the reigns of Eadred, Eadwig, and Eadgar, were struck by the same moneyer, and that all emanated from one mint.

In my possession are two coins of British Museum Catalogue, Type III, struck by Thurferth in the reign of Eadgar. The obverse of one coin is inscribed EADDAR RE+ M, and the other EADGAR RE+ T M.² These obverse legends evidently stand for EADGAR REX M[erciorum], and EADGAR REX T[otius] M[erciæ] respectively, and there can be little doubt that the coins were struck for Eadgar during his short

¹ See Pl. I, Fig. 19. Also illustrated as lot 1039 in the Carlyon-Britton sale catalogue.
² See Pl. I, Figs. 17 and 18.
reign as King of Mercia, A.D. 957–959, as he would not be described by the inferior title of King of Mercia after he became King of all England. The fabric of these two coins differs materially from that of other coins of the same type. The first described coin appears to have been issued earlier than the second, as the same punches were used in making both obverse and reverse dies for the former coin, while different punches were used in making the obverse die for the latter.

Eadgar's titles, as shown upon these two coins, reflect those in the charters of his short reign as King of Mercia. In a charter of the year 959,\(^1\) he is styled "Rex Merciorum . . . totius Merciae provinciæ necnon et aliorum gentium in circuitu persistentium gubernator et rector."

Thurferth's name appearing upon these coins of Eadgar proves that he was a moneyer in Mercia; and the coin of Eadwig, struck but a short time previously, and inscribed ÆVFERD MO HAM, proves that he was working at Hamtūn—the Mercian Hamtūn—a fact which appears to render the attribution of Thurferth's coins to Northampton beyond question.

Thurferth was a name well known at Northampton at the period under consideration, for, as previously stated on p. 73, we find it recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, that in the year 916\(^2\):—

"Thurferth jarl and the holds, and all the Army which owed obedience to Hamtune, and north as far as the Welland, submitted to King Eadweard and sought him for their lord and protector."

Possibly Thurferth the Hamtūn moneyer was a connection of Thurferth the Hamtūn jarl. Among the names of the "ministri" who witnessed the above-mentioned charter of 959 appears "Thurferth," possibly descended from the Danish jarl of Northampton, who submitted to Eadweard the Elder in 916. Thurferth, who signed charters down to 932, was almost certainly the jarl of Northampton.

\(^1\) Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus*, No. 480.
\(^2\) See footnote (\(^1\)) p. 73 ante.
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The only other periods in which the name Thurferth occurs as that of a moneyer are in the reign of Canute, when it appears upon coins of Thetford and Norwich; and in the reign of Eadweard the Confessor, when it appears upon coins of London and Norwich. Probably these coins were, again, the work of one moneyer, who was possibly a descendant of the earlier Thurferth.

In the writer’s possession is a coin of Eadwig, inscribed on the reverse BOIA MO HAM\(^1\); another specimen was in the Lady Buckley collection, lot 89, and a third is described and illustrated in Lindsay’s Remarkable . . . Anglo-Saxon and other Coins, p. 7, Pl. 2, Fig. 18.\(^2\)

Prior to the reign of Eadgar, the name Boia or Boiga, as that of a moneyer, appears to have been confined entirely to Mercian mints. During the reign of Eadgar, and subsequently, the name appears principally upon coins issued in Mercia. Of the reign of Ælfred, and of Eadweard the Elder, we find coins by the moneyer Boga, but without mint-name. Of the reign of Æthelstan, the name Boiga appears upon coins issued at Chester and at Derby; and of the reign of Eadmund and of Eadred we have coins by Boiga, but without mint-name.

In the reign of Eadwig, Boia appears to have been working at Bedford and Hamtun only. There are other coins of that reign upon which appears the name Boia unaccompanied by a mint-name, but probably struck at Bedford or at Hamtun. Some of these coins by Boia exhibit an \(M\) in the field of the obverse, thus proving that they were struck at a Mercian mint.\(^3\)

Of the reign of Eadgar, the name Boia appears upon coins struck at Chester, Derby, Stamford, Canterbury, and Wilton; of the reign of Eadweard the Martyr, at Chester, London, Stamford, and Canterbury; and of the reign of Æthelred II, at Chester, Hereford, Hertford, Lincoln, London, Southwark, Stamford, Thetford, Canterbury, Wilton, and Hamtun. Of the reign of Eadgar, we have

---

\(^1\) See Pl. I, Fig. 14.

\(^2\) Since this was written the specimen illustrated by Lindsay has passed into my possession.

\(^3\) See Pl. I, Fig. 15.
coins upon which appears the name of Boiga, associated with that of Fastolf, and probably struck either at Chester or at Derby.

From the foregoing lists it will be seen that the name Boia, or Boiga, as that of a moneyer, was not confined to Mercia; but as Bedford and Hamtūn are the only mints at which Boia is known to have been working in the reign of Eadwig, there can be little doubt that the contracted mint-name HAM upon coins of that reign represents the Mercian Hamtūn, or Northampton, which is only eighteen miles distant from Bedford.

In my possession is a penny of Eadwig inscribed HILDVLF MO HAN,¹ which appears to be the only known coin of that reign struck by Hildulf, and the only one of any reign, by that moneyer, inscribed with the contracted mint-name Han[tūn] or Ham[tūn].

Coins were issued by Hildulf in the reigns of Æthelstan, Eadmund, Eadred, and Eadgar, but no mint is indicated. Of the latter reign is a halfpenny, in the British Museum collection, struck in the early part of Eadgar's reign, or possibly during his reign as King of Mercia, A.D. 957–959. This coin was described by the late Mr. Grueber in the Numismatic Chronicle, 1900, pp. 367–369, and in the same article he described a coin of Eadgar, without mint-name, but struck by the Northampton moneyer Oswald (pp. 364–367). The reverse type of the latter coin is a conventional tree springing from a rosette of pellets, dividing the moneyer’s name, and is almost identical with a penny of Eadwig by the same moneyer, also in the British Museum collection.² Hildulf's coin has on the reverse a conventional rose bush, and Mr. Grueber suggested that, on account of the similarity of workmanship of this coin with that issued by Oswald, the dies for the two coins were made by the same die-sinker and that both coins emanated from the same mint—a suggestion in which I concur—but Mr. Grueber saw in the design

¹ See Pl. I, Fig. 16.
² See Pl. III, Figs. 1, 2, 3; British Museum Catalogue, vol. ii, Pl. 13, Fig. 4; the woodcuts illustrating Mr. Grueber’s article; and the Carlyon-Britton sale catalogue, Pl. 13, Fig. 463.
of Oswald’s coin a fanciful mitre of unusual form, and he assigned the two coins to York. Apart from my coin of Eadwig, by "Hildulf Mo Han," the only coins by a moneyer of that name which are inscribed with a mint-name, emanated from York and Lincoln, the former in the reigns of Æthelred II and Canute, and the latter in the reign of Harthacnut; and in the circumstances there can be little doubt that the coin of Eadwig emanated from the northern Hamtun. This attribution is confirmed by the close connection of the above-described coins of Eadgar by the moneyers Hildulf and Oswald, both of which can, by reasonable assumption, be definitely assigned to Northampton and not to York.

The conventional rose bush on the reverse of Eadgar’s halfpenny, by Hildulf, is similar to that which appears upon a penny of Æthelstan issued at Northampton’s near neighbour, Warwick, and upon a coin of Eadmund by the moneyer Æthelmod.¹

In addition, it may be stated that Eadwig’s coin by Hildulf and the previously described coin by Boia, in my possession, were acquired together by the late owner. The general appearance of the two coins suggests that they were found together; and the fact that they formed part of a lot of Anglo-Saxon coins, all in a more or less damaged condition, appears to suggest that they were found in a hoard from which the perfect coins were then selected and the damaged specimens set apart.

In the *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. v, Major Carlyon-Britton describes forty-one Anglo-Saxon coins ranging in date from the reign of Eadweard the Elder to that of Eadgar, and found in the Isle of Man. A few of the coins bear the name of the mint at which they were struck, namely, York, Derby, Chester, Bedford; and one of Eadwig, upon which the mint was indicated by the contracted form HAM. The greater number of the coins, however, bear no indication of the mints from which they were issued.

¹ *British Museum Catalogue*, vol. ii, Pl. 10, Fig. 8, and Pl. 11, Fig. 9. In the reign of Æthelred II the name Æthelnoth re-appears, but only upon coins of Northampton and Lincoln mints; and in the reign of Canute upon those of Lincoln mint.
A careful analysis of the moneyers’ names appearing upon the latter pieces indicates that such coins as we can with any degree of certainty, or even probability, allocate to their respective mints were struck either at York, or in the northern half of Mercia; and, apart from the coin inscribed “Ham,” the southernmost mints represented by these coins are those of Bedford and Huntingdon.

Of the coins described in Major Carlyon-Britton’s article, that of most interest to this enquiry is the coin of Eadwig, the reverse of which is inscribed PIHEMVN MO HAM. Unfortunately Winemund is a hitherto unrecorded moneyer, and can render us no assistance in allocating the coin; but, taking into consideration that all the other coins appear to have been struck at York, or in Mercia, north-east of a line drawn from Bedford to Chester, there can be little doubt that Winemund’s coin was struck at the Mercian Hamtun, and the presence of coins issued at the neighbouring mints of Bedford and Huntingdon appears to place this attribution beyond question.

Major Carlyon-Britton suggests Winemund as the probable name of the moneyer who issued the above-described coin, but the actual form of the name inscribed upon the coin is PIHEMVN, and it appears equally probable that the moneyer’s name was Wih[t]emun[d], a name which appears upon coins of the reign of Æthelstan, struck at Stamford, also a Mercian mint.

In the Carlyon-Britton collection was a penny of Eadwig inscribed DVDEMV MO HAM, which appears to be the only recorded coin of any reign upon which the name Dudemun or Dudeman is associated with a mint-name. The name Dudeman is of rare occurrence, especially as that of a moneyer, and almost

---

1 In Anglo-Saxon records the name Dudeman appears only twice: (i) At the Council of Clofesho, in the reign of Beornwulf, King of Mercia, when the settlement of the dispute between Headberht, Bishop of Worcester, and the “familia” at Berkely, concerning the monastery of Westburh, Gloucestershire, A.D. 824, was witnessed by “Dudeman presbiter” (Kemble, Codex Diplomaticus, No. 218; Birch, Cartularium Saxonum, No. 379). (ii) Grant by Coenwulf, King of the Mercians, and Cuthred, King of Kent, to Ulfhard, priest of the late Archbishop Æthelheard, of land at “Sueordhlincas” (Swarling, Kent), etc., A.D. 805. Witnessed by “Dudemon abbas” (Birch, Cartularium Saxonum, No. 321).
invariably the name appears to be associated with Mercia, and probably with the north-eastern rather than the western portion of that province. Prior to the reign of Eadwig, the only occurrence of Dudemun as the name of a moneyer is upon coins of Burgred, King of Mercia, A.D. 852–874.

Subsequent to the reign of Eadwig, the only coins by Dudeman are of the reign of Eadgar, and of one type only—British Museum Catalogue, type III. A coin of this type by Dudeman, in the British Museum collection, is inscribed on the obverse EADLAR REX T 1. The I undoubtedly represents the first stroke of an M, thus equalling T. M., which, as I have shown in the case of certain coins by the moneyer Thurferth, evidently stands for T[otius] M[erciae], and the coin was issued for Eadgar during his short reign as King of Mercia, A.D. 957–959. This, as in the case of Thurferth, demonstrates that Dudeman was a Mercian moneyer, and that the Eadwig coin was struck at the Mercian Hamtun.

A coin of Eadgar, by Dudeman, in my collection, is inscribed on the obverse EADLAR REX 0. A careful analysis of the names of the moneyers upon whose coins the 0 occurs in the reigns of Eadred, Eadwig, and Eadgar, appears to indicate that the symbol 0 is confined to the coins issued from Mercian mints, as were also those bearing the M, and S, or = symbol (frequently reversed), whether the symbol follows REX, or is to be found in the field of the coin. A Bedford coin of Eadwig, by the moneyer Frothgar, in the British Museum collection, has the 0 symbol after REX, and we find a similar occurrence upon coins issued by several known Mercian moneyers, upon some of whose coins occur the Mercian symbols M and S. This 0 may stand for Onglorum. The change of a to o before n is a frequent dialectical one in Mercian; cp. Wright’s Old English Grammar, § 59.

That there is a close connection between the coins which exhibit an M in the field of the obverse, and those reading REX M, and others which read REX = (or Z), is proved by coins of the reign of Eadred, issued by the moneyer DEODMAER, a majority of which disclose one or other of those symbols.
Certain coins of *British Museum Catalogue*, type III, are of smaller module than others of the same type,\(^1\) and it is amongst the former that we find the coins by Dudeman. So far as we can learn from the moneyers’ names which we find upon this variety of type III, their issue appears to have been confined to the northern half of Mercia, with the possibility that a few were issued at York. The moneyers’ names as recorded upon these coins are Dudemun, Boiga, Leofinc, Leofnel (= Leofhelm), Wulstan or Wulfstan, Ingolferth, Lurand, Rafn (= Rafen or Raven), Grid (= Grind), Fastolf, Oda, Herolf, and Fioduan (= Fodwine). Boiga, Leofinc, Leofhelm and Wulfstan were undoubtedly Mercian moneyers, because the symbol \(\text{M}\) is found in the field of certain of their coins. Boiga coined at Chester and Derby in the reign of Eadgar and in the previous reign at Northampton and Bedford. A coin of Eadgar, by the moneyer Leofhelm, in the British Museum collection, exhibits \(\text{M} \cdot \tau = \tau[\text{otius}] \text{M}[\text{erciae}]\) after REX, and was struck for Eadgar as King of Mercia, A.D. 957–959. A coin of that reign, by Wulfstan, also in the British Museum collection, exhibits \(\tau[\text{otius}] \text{I} = \text{M}[\text{erciae}]\) after REX. The name Leofhelm appears upon coins of several reigns, ranging from Æthelstan to Canute, and invariably upon coins issued from Mercian mints, including that of Hamtun.

That Ingolferth was a Mercian moneyer is proved by a coin of Eadgar, formerly in the Carlyon-Britton collection, lot 1044, which had the symbol \(\text{S}\) on the reverse; and a coin by Ingolf(erth) in my possession exhibits a Mercian \(\tau\) after REX. Another coin of the same reign, formerly in the Carlyon-Britton collection, lot 1714, appears to indicate that Ingolf(erth) was coinage at Huntingdon. Another coin of Eadgar, also in the Carlyon-Britton collection, lot 1035, shows that Durand was a Chester moneyer. Grind and Rafen were coining at Lincoln; the former in the reigns of Eadweard the Martyr and Æthelred II, and the latter in the reign of Æthelred II.

That Fastolf was a Mercian moneyer there can be little doubt, for some of his coins exhibit the \(\text{S}\) symbol after REX, and we find

\(^1\) *British Museum Catalogue*, vol. ii, Pl. 14, Fig. 8.
coins of the small variety of British Museum Catalogue, type III, bearing his name, associated with those of Boiga, Rafen, and Oda. This appears to suggest that in the reign of Eadgar, Fastolf worked at Chester or Derby, and at Lincoln. Oda probably worked at Lincoln in Eadgar’s reign, and we know that he was working at York near the end of that reign, and that he continued there through the reign of Eadweard the Martyr, and in the early part of the reign of Æthelred II.

Moneyers frequently migrated from Lincoln to York and vice versa, and the suggested migration of Oda from Lincoln to York appears to be confirmed by a coin of Eadgar in the Chester hoard,¹ which reads ODA[ ]LI, the full reading of which was probably ODA M‘O LIN[CI]. Dr. Hill allocates this coin to York, but a Lincoln coin of Æthelred II, in the same hoard, presents the mint-form LIN[DEI], which appears to confirm the allocation of Oda’s coin to Lincoln.

The coins struck by Fodwine appear to be connected with the Fastolf-Boiga coins, as the former exhibit the symbol L at the end of the reverse legend, and the latter exhibit the L at the end of the obverse legend. This points to Fodwine’s coins being of Mercian origin, and the only other recorded coins by a moneyer of that name were struck at Stamford—a Mercian mint—in the reign of Eadweard the Confessor.

Some coins by the moneyer Herolf are inscribed REX I, which—as in the case of certain coins by Wulfstan—probably stands for REX M[erciorum], while others have REX followed by the symbol O, which, as I have previously stated, appears to have a purely Mercian significance: cp. p. 85, supra.

Upon his election by the Mercians in A.D. 957, the Danelaw, with Mercia, was organized into a single political body under the rule of Eadgar, “King of the Mercians,” or “of the Engle.” In Eadgar’s first charter of his short Mercian reign, dated 958,² witnessed by the bishops of Dorchester, Litchfield, Hereford, Lindsey, and Worcester,

¹ Numismatic Chronicle, 1920, p. 147.
² Kemble, Codex Diplomaticus, No. 471.
he styles himself "Rex Anglorum," and in the second, of 959,\(^1\) he is styled "Rex Merciorum." We find each of these titles reflected upon the coins of this period, and amongst those which bear the former title—variously contracted from "A" to "Anglo"—we find many issued by the moneyers Ingolferth, Leofinc, Durand, Fastolf, and Herolf, a circumstance which again points to the Mercian origin of the coins. At a later period of Eadgar's reign we find the names of the moneyers Fastolf and Herolf upon the coins of York, whence they probably migrated from Lincoln, a mint which appears to have frequently exchanged moneyers with York.

**Eadgar, King of Mercia, A.D. 957–959; King of all England, A.D. 959–975.**

**Eadweard the Martyr, A.D. 975–978.**

In the reigns of Eadgar and Eadweard the Martyr, the moneyers whose names appear upon coins issued at Hamwic or at Hamtūn are Lanbinit or Lanbriht, Eadmer, Mantat, Hancrent or Nancrent, Ginand, Baldric, Oswald or Oswold, Cylm, Leofsiige, Eadnoth, Cytel, Leofælm, and probably Brunic and Osferth.

In the Carlyon-Britton collection, lot 1728, was a coin of Eadweard the Martyr, reading LANBINIT M̅O H̅AM. There can be little doubt that the moneyer's name upon this coin is a blundered rendering of LANBRIHT (our Lambert), and that it was struck at Southampton by the same moneyer as a penny of Eadgar (British Museum Catalogue, type VI) in my possession, which reads LANBRIHT M̅O H̅AP, and is obviously intended for LANBRIHT M̅O H̅A[M]P[I].

In the British Museum collection is a penny of Eadgar (British Museum Catalogue, type V), reading EADMER MONETA H. That this coin was struck at Southampton there can be little doubt, for we find coins by the moneyer Eadmer or Eadmaer issued at Exeter in the reigns of Æthelred II, Canute, Harold I, Harthacnut, and Eadweard the Confessor; and, with the exception of certain coins

\(^1\) Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus*, No. 480.
The Northampton and Southampton Mints.

struck at Romney in the reign of Harold I, the name, as that of a moneyer, does not occur elsewhere.

In the Carlyon-Britton collection, lot 454, was a penny of Eadgar (British Museum Catalogue, type III) reading MANTAT MONETA HAM; in the British Museum collection is another of the same reign (British Museum Catalogue, type VI), which reads MANTAT M°O HAM,¹ and Hildebrand records a penny of Eadweard the Martyr with the reading MANTAT M°O [H]A[M]. By the moneyer Hancrent or Nancrent, the only specimen that has come under my notice is one of Eadweard the Martyr, of rough workmanship, in the British Museum collection, reading MANCRENT IAM; and by the moneyer Ginand, the only recorded specimen is of the reign of Eadgar, and is in the Douglas Museum. It is of British Museum Catalogue, type III, and reads DINAND MONETA HAM.² No recorded coin by one of these three moneyers—Mantat, Hancrent and Ginand, exhibits a mint-reading more extended than HAM, which would stand equally well for either Hamtun or Hamwic. In neither case can we find other coins struck by moneyers bearing similar names to assist us in allocating those reading HAM,³ and in the absence of such evidence as would serve to indicate the mint from which the coins emanated, I am inclined to allocate them— provisionally, at least—to Southampton. Coins issued by the remaining moneyers, with the exception of Brunic and Osferth, exhibit readings sufficiently extended to show that they emanated from Hamtun, i.e. Northampton.

On p. 78 I have already dealt with the coins struck by Baldric, which range from the reign of Æthelstan to that of Eadgar.⁴ On p. 82 I have described certain coins issued by Oswald in the reigns of Eadwig and Eadgar. Coins by this moneyer were issued in the reigns of Eadmund, Eadred, and Eadwig, without any indication

¹ This coin is described in the British Museum Catalogue as reading MANSAT M°O HAM.
³ The British Museum Catalogue gives “Hancrent, Mancrent or Nancrent” in the list of moneyers of Æthelred II, but no mint is indicated.
⁴ See Pl. I, Figs. 3, 4, 7, 8 and 19.
of their place of mintage. In the British Museum collection is a coin struck by Oswald in the reign of Eadred, which exhibits upon the obverse the symbol $s$, which, as I have already stated, is found only upon coins issued from Mercian mints. In the Allen collection, lot 236, was a coin of British Museum Catalogue, type III, reading OSFALD MONETA HAT (= HA[M]T), and coins by this moneyer issued in the latter part of the reign of Eadgar and in the reign of Eadweard the Martyr read OSFALD M[O] HAMTV, etc., and it is only upon coins of the Hamtun or Northampton mint that this moneyer's name appears prior to the reign of Æthelred II.

Coins by the moneyer Culm or Cylm occur only in the last type of Eadgar, Eadweard the Martyr, and the first type of Æthelred II, and of the Hamtun mint only. Of the first two reigns, the coins which have come under my notice read CVLM M[O] HAMTVN, and of the latter reign, CVLM M[O] HAMTV. By the moneyer Leofsige we have coins of Eadgar, Eadweard the Martyr, and the early types of Æthelred II, and the mint-form usually presents HAMT.

The Chester hoard disclosed three unrecorded Hamtun moneyers for this period, namely, Eadnoth for the reign of Eadgar; and Cytel, and Leofælm for the reign of Eadweard the Martyr. The coins of Eadnoth and Cytel exhibit the mint-form HAMTVN, and Leofælm's coin reads HANT. Cytel's coin is of unusually fine workmanship.

In the Bliss collection, lot 100, was a penny of Eadgar, British Museum Catalogue, type V, reading OSFERT MONETA IN N, and in the Montagu collection, lot 723, Nov. 23, 1895, was another of the same reign and type, inscribed BRVNVNC MONETA N. Whether the final letter on these two coins was intended for N or for H, there can be little doubt that the coins were struck at the Northampton mint. We have coins by the moneyer Osferth issued in the reigns

1 See Pl. I, Fig. 9.
2 See p. 78, note 4.
3 See Pl. II, Figs. 3 and 5.
4 See Pl. II, Fig. 6.
5 See Pl. II, Figs. 1, 2 and 11.
7 See Pl. II, Fig. 4.
of Eadmund and Eadred, but no mint-town is indicated. That Osferth was, however, working at a Mercian mint is proved by a penny of Eadred in the British Museum collection, upon the obverse of which appears the S symbol,1 which, as is stated above, is to be found only upon coins issued from Mercian mints. No other coin of Eadgar by the moneyer Osferth has come under my notice, and in the reign of Æthelred II the name appears upon coins issued at Dover, Leicester, Lincoln, London, Rochester, and Thetford, and in the reigns of Canute, Harold I, Harthacnut, and Eadweard the Confessor, the name appears upon Lincoln coins only.

The penny of Eadgar, by Bruninc, Bruning or Bryning, cited above, is the earliest recorded coin by that moneyer. The name re-appears upon Hamtun coins of Æthelred II, Hildebrand types B.1., C and D, and upon Hamtun coins only. Hence we may reasonably assume that Eadgar's coin was struck by the same moneyer and at the same mint as those issued in the reign of Æthelred II. In the British Museum collection is a coin of Eadgar, similar to that previously cited, but reading BRUNINE MONETAE, and probably struck also by the same moneyer and at Northampton mint. In the reign of Canute the name Bruninc, etc., is to be found upon coins struck at Bath, London, Malmesbury, Nottingham, and York; and in the reign of Eadweard the Confessor upon coins issued at Chester, Ipswich, Lincoln, London, and Tamworth, all, with the exception of Bath and Malmesbury, being either Mercian, East Anglian or Northumbrian mints.

1 See also Ruding, Pl. xx, Fig. 22.