THE NORTHAMPTON AND SOUTHAMPTON MINTS.

By William C. Wells.

Part III.

Canute, A.D. 1016-1035.

In a previous chapter I suggested the possibility that the Hamwich mint continued down to the commencement of the reign of Canute, but upon further consideration I have no doubt that the mint ceased operations in the reign of Æthelred II, when the old site was abandoned and the town was removed to its present site; when the old name, Hamwich, was superseded by Hamtūn, and later, Southampton. The last coins issued from the Hamwich mint appear to have been those struck by Spileman in type Hildebrand, D (Hawkins, 207). Spileman struck coins at Hamwich in type Hildebrand, D, and at Winchester in types Hildebrand, E and A (Hawkins 203, and 205), and continued there in the reigns of Canute, Harold I, and Eadweard the Confessor.

I have previously shown that certain coins of the last type of Æthelred II, Hildebrand, A (Hawkins, 205), reading ON HEAMT, and ON HEAMTV, must necessarily have been struck at the Mercian Hamtūn, and that other coins struck by the same moneyers, reading ON HAM, ON HAMT, etc., must follow them. All, or nearly all the known Hamtūn coins of this type, struck by at least three different moneyers, exhibit a cross before the king's face, and the dies are obviously the work of the same hand. Consequently none of the

3 Incidentally this proves that type Hildebrand, D (Hawkins, 207), preceded type Hildebrand, E (Hawkins, 203), and not vice versa as has been suggested by several writers on coins of Æthelred II.
4 Vol. xvii, p. 36.
5 See Pl. II, Figs. 15, 16, 17, 18.
recorded coins of type Hildebrand, A (Hawkins, 205), whether reading ON HEAMT, HEAM, HAMTV, HAMT or HAM, could have been struck at the southern town, and as all the moneyers of Canute’s reign, with the possible exception of Cynsige and Lefei, who used the forms HA and HAM, also used the more extended forms HAMT, HAMTV, etc., it is obvious that—so far as the coins show—the mint at Hamwich was not in operation subsequently to Æthelred II, type Hildebrand, D, nor do any coins appear to have been struck in the new town of Hamtún prior to the reign of Stephen.

The moneyers whose names appear on the Hamtún coins of the reign of Canute are Ælfsige, Ælfward, Ælfwine, Eadwine, Leofnoth or Leofnath, Leofwold, Leofwine, Godric, Syboda, Cynsige and Lefei. Of these, Ælfsige, Ælfward, Eadwine, Leofwold and Syboda, struck coins in type Hildebrand, E (Hawkins, 212), only; Leofnoth or Leofnath, in types Hildebrand, E and G (Hawkins, 212 and 213), and Godric in type Hildebrand, G (Hawkins, 213), only. Leofwine commenced in type Hildebrand, E (Hawkins, 212), and continued at Hamtún until well past the middle of Eadweard the Confessor’s reign; and Ælfwine commenced in type Hildebrand, H (Hawkins, 208), and struck coins in no less than thirteen types in the reigns of Canute, Harold I, Harthacnut and Eadweard the Confessor.

Leofwold was working at Hamtún in the reign of Æthelred II.\(^1\)

In my collection is a coin of Canute, type Hildebrand, E (Hawkins, 212), which reads LEOPOLD O HA, and exhibits a pyramid of three pellets before the king’s face.\(^2\) In the British Museum Collection is a Gloucester coin of the same type\(^3\) and in my collection is a similar coin struck at Bristol. In each case the coin exhibits a pyramid of pellets before the king’s face, and comparison of the three coins described can leave little doubt that the dies from which they were produced were the work of one die-sinker. Both Bristol and Gloucester were in Mercia, and it is a fair assumption that the third coin also was struck in Mercia. Thus the Bristol and Gloucester

\(^1\) See Pl. II, Fig. 16.
\(^2\) See Pl. III, Fig. 10.
\(^3\) See British Museum Catalogue, Anglo-Saxon Coins, vol. ii, Pl. XVIII, Fig. I.
coins confirm the attribution of Leofwold’s coin to the Mercian Hamtún, Northampton.

Coins struck by Ælfsige, Ælfwerd, Eadwine, Leofnoth or Leofnath, and Syboda, exhibit the extended form HAMT, etc., thus showing that they belong to the Hamtún or Northampton series. In my collection is a coin of type Hildebrand, E (Hawkins, 212), which on the reverse reads LEOFNAD MO HA; the obverse reads CNVT RE+ ON LEIO (= LEIO). The maker of the obverse die appears to have got half through his task when he got his written instructions confused with similar instructions for the reverse die for a Chester coin,¹ from which it is evident that the die was made at a Mercian die-sinking centre where dies for Chester also were made—probably at Chester itself. This confirms the attribution of Leofnath’s coin to the Mercian Hamtún.

Another interesting coin of type Hildebrand, E, in my collection has the reverse reading LEOFPINE HAMT, and the obverse, instead of exhibiting the usual legend, CNVT REX, etc., is inscribed EAIGLEA ON HEM.:² The reverse exhibits the normal official work of the period, but the obverse is from a die made by a die-sinker who was obviously not well acquainted with his work, a feature quite common to coins of this type struck, inter alia, at Chester, where, in my opinion, was situated a die-sinking centre from which emanated many of the dies for Northampton coins. It is evident that the die-sinker, apparently an illiterate man unacquainted with the meaning of the written instructions before him, got his instructions confused and inadvertently impressed upon the obverse die an inscription intended for a reverse die. This coin, which discloses an entirely new name, as that of a moneyer, is remarkable on account of the use of the ʰ, instead of the usual Roman H. The written instruction before the die-sinker was possibly the Mercian HEAM[TVN],³ but more

¹ A moneyer Leofnoth was working at Chester in type Hildebrand, E; and Hildebrand, Canute, No. 1434, type G (Hawkins 213), describes a Chester coin reading —ON LEIO1.

² See Pl. III, Fig. 7.

³ See vol. xvii, pp. 32–34, and Pl. II, Fig. 17.
probably HÆM[TVN], the Dano-Saxon form of the Mercian dialectal HÆAM[TVN]. The correct O.E. form of the name upon this coin is Ḡegili, which in time became Ḡegila, Ḡegela, Ḡgel, etc. When the final a was retained, and used as a pet-form, mis-spellings such as "Ḡegilea," "Ḡeglea," etc., became possible; but the great number of these presumptive mis-spellings in the eleventh century, calls for explanation. We can only suppose that we have upon the last described coin, a Mercian breaking of a to ea.²

The name Ḡegili is of very rare occurrence. The earliest inscribed example on record occurs upon the Frank’s casket in the British Museum. This carved ivory casket is of Northumbrian work of the eighth century. Of the top, only the central panel remains, representing Ḡegil the archer, brother of Wayland Smith, defending his wife and home against enemies in chain mail, armed with sword, spear, and shield. Above the hero is his name in runes ÆXI (ÆGILI). On the front of the casket Ḡegil is represented catching birds in order to wing his arrows. The Teutonic legend of Wayland probably had its home in the north, where he and his brother Egil were the types of skilled workmen. According to the Wayland and Egil saga they were sons of Wadæ and Greipa, and flourished in the fourth and fifth centuries:

"The giant Wadæ dwelt in peace apart
In Seeland, in the courts his father gave,
Which lay in that part now called Blekingen.²"

"... One day he brought
A maiden home with him to be his wife,
But from whence none knew, till it leaked out
That she was Greipa..."

"What e’er her race she bare him a fair son,
Whom he named Wayland. Others she bore
In their due season, of whom Egil one
And Slagfeder another...."³

¹See vol. xvii, p. 35.
²See vol. xvii, p. 34.
³In South Sweden, then part of Denmark.
When Wayland was a lad of nine Wade wished that he should learn a craft, and having heard of Mimer the famous smith, took Wayland and gave him into Mimer’s hand to teach him smithcraft and to work in ore:

"Later he brought his younger sons to learn something of smithcraft also, but in truth Egil learnt little else save how to shoot as never man shot yet with his long bow."

The saga then goes on to narrate the wonderful adventures and fighting prowess and, eventually, the death of Egil. Aylesford (Egil’s-ford) appears to have been named after this traditional hero, as is shown by the following extract from Hengest’s saga:

"But we will to Eglwys Ford ere it is morn, so smash the Saxons and revenge our dead beneath the shadow of the Church’s Cross. Know mighty Wayland, that thine Anglian kin yet call this ford by thy dead brother’s name, so great is still the Archer Egil’s fame."

The sagas give an account of an earlier Egil, also famed as an archer:

"Of his (Ivalde’s) sons but little tell I here Thjassi one, of whom came Viking’s line, from which descended a right famous man the hero known as Witga, Wayland’s son. . . . From him too Hengest’s and Irung’s races claim descent. The third son was called Avo, archer skilled known too as Egil, once the friend of Thor."

The adventures of another Egil, Egil Skallagrimsson, an Icelandic skald, who flourished circa A.D. 900–980, is to be found in the well-known Icelandic poem, Egil’s Saga. Skallagrim, the father of

1 This, and the foregoing quotations from the sagas, are extracted from The Wayland-Dietrich Saga, by K. M. Buck.
Egil and his brother Thorolf, was forced to emigrate from Norway by Harald Fairhair, and settled in Iceland. As a boy Egil went with Thorolf on a voyage to Norway. But Egil soon provokes the wrath of Eric and Gunhilda; Gunhilda attempts his life; Egil retaliates, and the brothers have to quit Norway. They seek England, serve under King Æthelstan and win a battle for him in Northumberland, in which Thorolf falls. Egil, though promised great honours with Æthelstan, goes to Norway to see after Thorold’s widow; after which he marries her and returns to Iceland. On tidings of his wife’s father’s death he goes to Norway to claim her inheritance, which is unjustly withheld from him. Egil narrowly escapes from Eric’s ships and slays a son of Eric. Hakon, Eric’s brother, foster son of Æthelstan, is recalled to Norway as king, and Eric Bloodaxe is forced to flee. Egil is wrecked at the mouth of the Humber and eventually reaches the court of Æthelstan, where he is well received, but he returns to Iceland. After Æthelstan’s death, Eric is killed in battle. Egil goes harrying in Saxland and Friesland and eventually dies at a great age.


The events which immediately followed the death of Canute are told with much contradiction and confusion. The cause of all these difficulties and contradictions seems to be the division of the kingdom between Harold and Harthacnut, which proved to be a mere ephemeral arrangement and was set aside within two years.

In the year 1017, Canute married Ælfgyfu-Emma, widow of Æthelred II. At some time prior to this, Canute had contracted an irregular union with another Ælfgyfu, who is usually distinguished as “Ælfgyfu of Northampton,” by whom he had two sons, Harold

1 The Worcester Chronicle, Cottonian MS., Tiberius, B. IV, under annal 1035, describes her as “Ælfgyfa pære Hamtunisca.”
and Sweyn. Upon her marriage with Canute, Ælfgyfu-Emma required that any son she might have by Canute should succeed to the English crown in priority to his existing sons, Harold and Sweyn. Canute pledged himself to this and thus Harthacnut was marked out before birth as heir to the English crown.

Ælfgyfu of Northampton was the daughter of Ælfhelm, Ealdorman of some portion of Northumberland, probably of Diera, who in 1006, was murdered at Shrewsbury, at the instigation of Eadric Streona. Eadric is generally understood to have been made Ealdorman of Mercia in 1007, but Florence of Worcester appears to suggest that at the time of Ælfhelm’s murder Eadric was already Ealdorman of Mercia; and Lappenberg refers to Ælfhelm as "Earl of Northampton." If we accept these two statements—and probabilities appear to point to their accuracy—we can readily understand the anxiety of the unscrupulous Eadric to get rid of a possible rival Ealdorman whose territory lay within his own Province of Mercia; and at the same time we have it explained why Ælfgyfu was "of Northampton."

At the time of Canute’s death, Sweyn, his elder son by Ælfgyfu of Northampton, was King of Norway, but for Harold no provision appears to have been made by the late king. Canute’s will in favour of Harthacnut, who was already King of Denmark, was supported by the West Saxons with Godwine their earl at their head. On the other hand, Harold, the son of Ælfgyfu, appeared as a candidate for the crown. He was supported by Leofric, earl of Mercia, by the great body of the thegns north of the Thames, and by the "lithsmen," the seafaring folk, of London. Harold was the candidate of the north, Harthacnut of the south; Harold was the

---


2 The chroniclers constantly speak of Ealdormen, even in Danish districts like Lindsey; but this may be an accommodation to Southern language. In the purely Saxon districts there can be no doubt that the ancient title of Ealdorman went on uninterruptedly, till, under Canute, Eorl supplemented it everywhere.
candidate of the Danes, Harthacnut of the English. This seems to be a division quite contrary to what might have been expected for Harthacnut had no English blood in his veins, while Harold was English, at least on his mother's side. The explanation of this apparently anomalous position is probably to be found in the fact that Canute had lived among his West-Saxon subjects and had identified himself in every way with them. They had flourished greatly during his reign, and it can be understood quite readily that they accepted the wishes of Canute with regard to the succession as a sacred law. On the other hand, it is quite easy to see how Harold's position would appeal to the Danish and half-Danish inhabitants of Mercia and Northumberland. Harold had a local connection with Northumberland as the grandson of Ælfhelm, and with Mercia as the son of Ælfgyfu of Northampton.

At Christmas, 1035, the Witan of all England met in full Gnomot at Oxford, which place was chosen probably on account of its position on the boundary line of the two great divisions of the kingdom. The Witan proceeded to discuss the merits of the two candidates. Godwine, the great earl of Wessex, with all his eloquence, and supported by the full force of his earldom, put forward the claims of the absent Harthacnut; but all in vain. The proposal for a division of the kingdom came from Leofric, earl of all Mercia, a proposal which Godwine and his supporters strongly resisted, but the majority was against them and the Witan decided upon the division of the country between the two candidates; Harold to reign on the north of the Thames and Harthacnut on the south. Thus England had two kings, each apparently more or less independent of the other, but with a probable supremacy of Harold over Harthacnut.

The Peterborough Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, under the year 1036, which should be 1035, records the foregoing incidents as follows:—

"In this year died King Cnut at Shaftesbury . . . And immediately after his decease, there was a great assembly of all the Witan at Oxford; and earl Leofric and almost all the
The Northampton and Southampton Mints.

The thegns north of the Thames, and the lithsmen of London, chose Harold to the government of all England, him an his brother Harthacnut, who was in Denmark. And earl Godwine and all the chief men of Wessex, opposed it as long as they could but they could not prevail aught against it. And it was then resolved that Ælgyfu [-Emma], Harthacnut's mother should dwell at Winchester with the king her son's 'huscarls,' and hold all Wessex under his authority. And earl Godwine was their most devoted man."

Harthacnut's kingdom of Denmark was at that time threatened by Magnus of Norway, and quite naturally he considered his first duty was to stay and provide for its defence rather than come to England to take possession of the West-Saxon kingdom which he held as a vassal of the King of the Mercians and the Northumbrians. Consequently he stayed away in spite of the entreaties of his English subjects to come and take possession of his Wessex kingdom; and they, in 1037, feeling that Harthacnut had slighted them, deposed him and elected Harold as their immediate sovereign. This was probably brought about by the Witan of Wessex and, apparently, confirmed by a vote of the Witan of all England. And thus Harold became King of all England.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,¹ under the year 1037, says:—

"This year men chose Harold King over all, and forsook Harthacnut, because he stayed too long in Denmark; and they then drove out his mother Ælgyfu, the relict of King Cnut, without any pity against the raging winter."

Coinage in the old world was the unquestioned test of kingship, and one of the first acts of Ælgyfu-Emma, and Godwine, in 1036, to emphasize their absent Chief's sovereignty, would be the issue of a coinage bearing his name. Harold would be equally

¹ MS. D, Cottonian MS., Tiberius B. IV.
prompt in issuing a coinage for the northern kingdom, bearing his own name.

The coins of Harold I, of type Hildebrand, A (British Museum Catalogue, type I), and those of Harthacnut of type Hildebrand, A (British Museum Catalogue, type I), are identical in type, the only difference being that one series bears the name of Harold, and the other series that of Harthacnut, and there can be no doubt that the two series were issued contemporaneously during the period of Harthacnut’s short reign as King of Wessex, from 1035 to 1037. This identity of type was probably in accordance with an agreement between Harold, and Ælfgyfu-Emma, acting as Regent on behalf of her son, Harthacnut. The object of this identity of type was probably to enable the coins to pass indiscriminately in each kingdom. To Mr. H. A. Parsons belongs the credit of being the first to suggest, in print, that the two series were issued contemporaneously.¹

All the known coins of type Hildebrand, A, issued in the name of Harthacnut were struck at towns situated upon or south of the Thames—that is, within Harthacnut’s division of the country. No “Hamtun” coins, however, of this type, bearing Harthacnut’s name are known, and it is reasonable to assume that had the Southampton mint been then in existence coins would have been issued from it, but Winchester appears to have been the only mint in operation in Hampshire during the period under consideration. Northampton being situated in Harold’s division of the country, coins issued there would necessarily bear Harold’s name, and, accordingly, we find “Hamtun” coins of Harold, of type Hildebrand, A, which, as I have previously stated, is identical in design with Harthacnut’s coins of type Hildebrand, A.

The moneyers whose names occur upon Hamtúin coins of Harold’s type A, are Ælfwine and Leofwine. Leofwine commenced to work at Hamtúin in type Hildebrand, C (“Crux” type), of Æthelred II, and continued through the reigns of Canute, Harold I, and down to type Hildebrand, H (Hawkins, 228), of Eadweard the

Confessor; Ælfwine commenced working there in type Hildebrand, H (Hawkins, 208), of Canute, and continued through the reigns of Harold I, Harthacnut, and down to type Hildebrand, Ac (Hawkins, 225), of Eadweard the Confessor; and as the coins struck by those two moneyers in the reign of Harold I must be allocated to Northampton, the coins obviously issued by the same moneyers in the reigns of Æthelred II, Canute, Harthacnut and Eadweard the Confessor, must also be assigned to Northampton and not to Southampton.

The reasons which induced an immediate coinage by Harold, and by Harthacnut’s regent, upon the decision of the Witan in 1035, apply with equal force to the time of Harold’s succession to the crown of all England, and Harold’s desire to emphasize his supremacy over Wessex by the issue of coins bearing his name from West-Saxon mints was too urgent to allow of the consideration of the issue of a new type, and dies for coins of type A, bearing Harold’s name and similar to those which had been in issue nearly two years in Harold’s kingdom, north of the Thames, appear to have been sent out immediately to those mints which had formerly issued coins in Harthacnut’s name. Consequently, we find coins of Harold, type A, issued from Wessex mints as well as from mints situated north of the Thames. Harold’s second type, Hildebrand, B (British Museum Catalogue, type V), was probably instituted in 1038 and was in issue until the death of Harold, in 1040. The Northampton moneyers, as in type A, were Leofwine and Ælfwine.

When Harold died at Oxford in March, 1040, his brother Harthacnut was at Bruges. Immediately upon Harold’s burial, the Witan of all England met and unanimously chose Harthacnut as king. An embassy was sent to Bruges to invite Harthacnut to England to take possession of his crown. He and his mother accordingly came to England in the following June, and he was crowned shortly afterwards.

As king of all England Harthacnut appears to have had only one general coinage, viz., Hildebrand, B (British Museum Catalogue, type II). Northampton coins of this type, which are of considerable
rarity, were struck by two moneyers, Ælfwine and Godric, of whom the latter came from the Huntingdon mint to take the place temporarily of Leofwine, who does not appear to have been working at either Northampton or Huntingdon during the issue of this type.\(^1\)

I have previously, in vol. xvii, p. 35, referred to a coin of Harthacnut, type Hildebrand, B, with the reverse reading ÆLFPINE ON HÆMTV[N], the Dano-Saxon rendering of "Ælfwine on Heamtun" the Mercian dialectal form of the West-Saxon "Ælfwine on Hamtun."

---

**EADWEARD THE CONFESSOR, A.D. 1042–1066.**

**Harold II, A.D. 1066.**

The moneyers whose names appear upon Hamtun coins of Eadweard the Confessor are Leofwine, Godric, Ælfwine, Leofric, Wulfnoth, Sæwine and Swetman; and the moneyers who struck for Harold II were Sæwine, Swetman and Leofstan.

The coins struck by Leofwine and Ælfwine have been previously dealt with,\(^2\) and those issued by Godric, Leofric, Sæwine, and Swetman will be dealt with later.\(^3\) Wulfnoth struck coins in types Hildebrand, F, H and G (Hawkins, 227, 228 and 222). The name Wulfnoth occurs on Northampton coins of the reign of Æthelred II,\(^4\) and occurs again on Northampton coins of Henry I, type Andrew XV (British Museum Catalogue, type XV; Hawkins, 255).\(^5\) These three moneyers all bearing the same name probably represent three generations of one family. The moneyer Leofstan appears to have been working at Northampton for only a short period, in the reign of Harold II. A Leofstan of an earlier generation was working at Northampton about the middle of the reign of Æthelred II.

---

\(^1\) See p. 80 post.

\(^2\) See pp. 72–73 ante, and pp. 79–81 post.

\(^3\) See pp. 80–83 post.

\(^4\) See British Numismatic Journal, vol. xvii, pp. 32, 36, 42 and 47.

\(^5\) For coins by Wulfnoth see Pl. IV, Figs. 3, 6, 11 and 12.
Siward the Dane, surnamed the Strong, at some time prior to 1038, became possessed of the earldom of Diera. He is probably the Siward who signed several charters in the reign of Canute, but he does not appear to have attained earl’s rank in that reign. He married a daughter of Ealdred, earl of Bernicia, which appears to have been his only connection with the house of the Northumbrian earls. Ealdred who was murdered about 1038, was succeeded in his earldom of Bernicia by his brother Eadwulf. Eadwulf, who appears to have been prominent in pressing the claims of Harold, in 1035, thus gained the enmity of Harthacnut, who in 1041 appears to have commanded the murder of Eadwulf at the hands of Siward, who was immediately rewarded with the government of the whole of Northumberland, from the Humber to the Tweed.

At the time of Godwine’s rebellion, in 1051, his son Harold, earl of East Anglia, threw in his lot with that of his father. Leofric of Mercia and Siward of Northumbria, with their immense following, gathered round the king clamouring to be led against Godwine and his sons. The two hosts faced each other across the Thames; Godwine and his sons were encamped at Southwark; the King with the Mercian and Northumbrian armies were encamped on the Northern shore. The Witan met and pronounced sentence of outlawry against Godwine, who fled to the court of Flanders. His son Harold, made his way to Bristol and thence to Dublin, in spite of the orders given to Bishop Ealdred of Worcester to seize him ere he set sail from Bristol.

There can be little doubt that it was at this time that the joint earldom of Northamptonshire and Huntingdonshire was created and given to Siward as a reward for the part he had taken in the overthrow of Godwine. Huntingdonshire in 1051, as we are told by Florence of Worcester, under that date, was so closely associated with Cambridgeshire as to have a common Sheriff, detached altogether from Mercia and forming part of Harold’s earldom of East Anglia,
but it was now separated from East Anglia and added to Northamptonshire, which was at the same time separated from Mercia, to form the new earldom for Siward. The linking of the two counties also probably held a political significance in thus forming a barrier between the possessions of Leofric of Mercia and his son Ælfgar, to whom Eadweard had given Harold’s earldom of East Anglia.

Siward died in 1055, but his son Waltheof was only a boy, too young to undertake the government of his father’s vast territories, so he was passed over and the earldom of Northumbria passed into the hands of Tostig, son of Godwine, as did also the joint earldom of Northamptonshire and Huntingdonshire. John of Peterborough states that Waltheof succeeded to Northamptonshire on the death of Siward in 1055, but that is shown to be incorrect by a writ recorded in Codex Diplomaticus, which is addressed to Tostig as “Tosti comiti . . . de comitatu Hamtoniae.”

Tostig was violent and tyrannical, and his government in Northumbria was unpopular. He was neither Dane nor Northumbrian. He was a West-Saxon who had little or no sympathy with the North. He held his earldom by choice of the West-Saxon King and the Witan of the South. His government was maintained by a merciless justice; by the taking of life and the maiming of limb. Englishmen and Danes alike joined in the bitter hostility awakened by Tostig’s rule, and in October, 1065, the Northumbrian thegns, without the presence of king or earl, held a Gemot at York at which they passed a vote of deposition against Tostig, declared him an outlaw and elected in his place Morcere, the younger son of Ælfgar of Mercia. Morcere at once marched southwards. On his march he was joined by the men of Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire and at the head of this force he reached Northampton, which place was probably chosen by the insurgents as their headquarters, as being like Northumberland itself, under the government of Tostig. It was important that the rebels should win over the inhabitants of

---

1 In Codex Diplomaticus, vol. iv, No. 903, p. 239, is recorded a writ of circa 1053, addressed to Siward as “Siwardo comiti . . . de Huntingdonensi scira.”

2 Vol. iv, No. 904, p. 240.
Northampton and Huntingdon to their cause. At Northampton Morcere was met by his brother, Eadwine, at the head of the men of his earldom.

The men of Northampton appear to have been less zealous in their support of the revolt than the Northumbrians had hoped for and Morcere's followers dealt with the country around as if it were the country of an enemy. Harold hastened to Northampton with a message from the king calling upon the insurgents to lay down their arms.

The Northumbrians refused to listen to any proposal which included the possibility of Tostig's return. Harold summoned a Witenagemot of the whole realm which met at Oxford on October 28, 1065, at which the election of Morcere was legalized. At the same time the earldom of Northamptonshire and Huntingdonshire was detached from Northumberland and bestowed upon Seward's young son Waltheof. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, recording these events, says—“Then came earl Harold to meet them, and they laid an errand on him to king Eadward... and prayed that they might have Morcere for their earl and the king granted it and sent Harold again to Northampton, on the eve of St. Simon and St. Jude's Mass (Oct. 27)... And the 'Rythrenan' did great harm about Northampton, while he went on their errand, inasmuch as they slew men, and burned houses, and corn, and took all cattle... that was many thousand, and many hundred men they took, and led north with them; so that the shire, and the other shires that were nigh there, were for many winters the worse.”

Of Waltheof we know very little until he was given the earldom of Northampton and Huntingdon, in 1065. In 1066, when Harold marched southward, to give battle to the Norman invader, the thegns and men of Northamptonshire and Huntingdonshire flocked loyally to his standard, but we have no evidence that Waltheof came.

1 Apparently the "Rutheni" or "Ruteni" of the Northern historians, with whom the name is identical with "Russi" (Russians), though it does not appear on what account or when these people came into Northumbria. See Benjamin Thorpe's edition of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, vol. i, p. 469.
himself and joined Harold's host, nor do we know if he fought at the battle of Hastings. Waltheof submitted to William immediately after the Conquest, and appears to have been shown considerable favour by the Conqueror, who took him, together with the earls Eadwine and Morcere, on his visit to Normandy in 1067. We are expressly told that the three earls were not taken as captives, but they were undoubtedly taken as hostages. William chose the men whose power he dreaded and of whose faithfulness he was doubtful.

In 1069 Waltheof joined the Northern insurrection, and in the fight at York with the garrison of the castle took his stand at one of the gates and as the Norman fugitives issued forth from the blazing city cut them down one by one, for he was of immense stature and strength.

When the revolt was over and the Danish fleet had departed, Waltheof went to William, who was encamped on the bank of the Tees, obtained his forgiveness, was re-granted his former earldom of Northampton and Huntingdon, and the king also gave him his niece Judith in marriage.

In 1075 Waltheof was present at the nuptial festivities of Ralph de Guader, earl of East Anglia, when the earls of Hereford and East Anglia formed a conspiracy against the king, into which both earls strove to draw Waltheof. The object of the conspiracy was to divide the whole country between the three earls, one of whom was to be seated on the throne and the other two to be his principal earls. According to Florence of Worcester, Waltheof agreed to join the conspiracy, but Oderic Vitalis states that he refused to join with them, but swore not to divulge their project. Waltheof, however, after due consideration, decided to reveal to the king all that had taken place. He hastened to Normandy and told the king what he had done and implored forgiveness. The king appeared to think lightly of the matter, and Waltheof remained with him until his return to England and the rebellion was over. During the rebellion the aid of the Danish fleet had been invoked, but they arrived too late to be of service to the rebels. When the Danes
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appeared in the Humber, the king, fearing Waltheof's influence might be thrown on the side of the rebels, caused him to be arrested and imprisoned.

At Christmas he was brought to trial before the king at Winchester, on the charge of having abetted the late rebellion, his wife Judith testifying against him. Sentence was deferred, and he was again committed to prison. On May 15, 1076, he was condemned to death, and early on the morning of the 31st he was removed from the prison and taken to St. Giles's Hill, which overlooks the city, where he was beheaded. His body was ignominiously cast into a ditch, but a fortnight later, at the request of Judith and with the king's permission, it was conveyed to Crowland by Abbot Ulfketel and buried in the chapter-house there. Though his father, Siward, was a Dane, Waltheof was regarded as a champion of English freedom and a national hero.

There can be little doubt that from the date of the creation of the joint earldom of Northampton and Huntingdon, about 1051, down to the death of Waltheof in 1076, the two mints came under the control of the earl, or his reeves, and that the mints were worked in conjunction with each other. The coins show that during this period and down to the third type of William I (Hawkins, 236) a majority of the Northampton moneyers were frequently temporarily transferred to Huntingdon, and Huntingdon moneyers were occasionally temporarily transferred to Northampton. The coins also show that there was a working connection of some kind between these two mints even before the creation of the joint earldom, for this temporary transference of moneyers between Northampton and Huntingdon dates back to the reign of Canute.

Leofwine commenced work at Northampton in type Hildebrand, C ('Crux' type), of Æthelred II, and continued, with few intermissions, down to type Hildebrand, H (Hawkins, 228), of Eadwærd the Confessor. He then went to Huntingdon where he issued "mule" coins connecting types H, and G (Hawkins, 228 and 222), and also coins of the substantive type Hildebrand, G, of Eadwærd the Confessor. He also struck coins of type Hildebrand, G
(Hawkins, 213), of Canute, and type Hildebrand, E (Hawkins, 219), of Eadweard the Confessor at Huntingdon as well as at Northampton.

Godric commenced work at Huntingdon in type Hildebrand, E (Hawkins, 212), of Canute, and in the succeeding type, Hildebrand, G (Hawkins, 213), he was working at Northampton. He does not appear to have been working at Northampton, nor at Huntingdon, in type Hildebrand, H (Hawkins, 208), nor in the reign of Harold I, but in the reign of Harthacnut he appears to have taken the place of Leofwine, whose name does not occur upon Northampton coins of that reign, but re-appears upon Northampton coins of the first type of Eadweard the Confessor, Hildebrand, A (Hawkins, 226). Godric then returned to Huntingdon where he issued coins in types Hildebrand, E, F, G, and Ac (Hawkins, 219, 227, 222, and 225), of Eadweard the Confessor, and in types I and II of William I (Hawkins, 233, and 234). He then appears to have been again transferred to Northampton where he struck coins in type II (Hawkins, 234), after which we lose sight of him. Godwine also was a Huntingdon moneyer. His name occurs upon coins issued from that mint in types Hildebrand, F, H, G, and Ac (Hawkins, 227, 228, 222, and 225), of Eadweard the Confessor, and upon coins of Harold II. Godwine was then transferred to Northampton where he struck coins in type II of William I (Hawkins, 234), and, after a considerable interval, in type III of William II (Hawkins, 250).

Ælfwine commenced work at Northampton in type Hildebrand, H (Hawkins, 208), of Canute, and issued coins there in each successive type through the reigns of Harold I, and Harthacnut, and down to type Hildebrand, Ac (Hawkins, 225), of Eadweard the Confessor. He was also temporarily transferred to Huntingdon during the issue of type Hildebrand, B (British Museum Catalogue, type B), of Harthacnut, and types Hildebrand, C, B, E, and Ac (Hawkins, 220, 221, 222, and 225).

1 For coins by Leofwine, see Pl. III, Figs. 7, 8, 9, 12, 16 and 21.
2 The types of William I and II are numbered according to the arrangement by Major P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton and in the British Museum Catalogue.
3 For coins by Godwine, see Pl. V, Fig. 1, and Pl. VI, Fig. 1.
229, 219, and 225), of Eadweard the Confessor, of which types we have coins issued by Ælfwine at Northampton as well as Huntingdon.¹

Leofric was working at Northampton in types Hildebrand, F and H (Hawkins, 227 and 228), of Eadweard the Confessor, and in the succeeding type, Hildebrand, G (Hawkins, 222), he was transferred to Huntingdon, after which we lose sight of him. Wulfwine issued coins at Huntingdon in the reigns of Harold I and Harthacnut, and in types Hildebrand, A and D (Hawkins, 226 and 221), of Eadweard the Confessor. He then disappears for a time, but re-appears upon Northampton coins of William I type III (Hawkins, 236).

Sæwine was a Northampton moneyer. His coins commence with Eadweard the Confessor, type Hildebrand, G (Hawkins, 222), and continue in each successive type through the reigns of Eadweard the Confessor, Harold II, William I, and down to type II (Hawkins, 246), of William II, with the exception of types I, VI, and VII (Hawkins, 233, 243, and 239), of William I.² During the issue of type Hildebrand, I (Hawkins, 223), of Eadweard the Confessor, Sæwine was working at Northampton, and also at Huntingdon. The evidence connecting Sæwine’s Huntingdon coins with those of the same type struck by him at Northampton is quite conclusive. In my collection is a penny of type Hildebrand, I, of Eadweard the Confessor, which reads SPETMAN ON HA;³ in the British Museum collection is a similar coin inscribed SPETMAN ON HAI;⁴ in my collection is a third coin of the same type which reads SÆPINE ON HAT,⁵ and in the British Museum collection is a fourth specimen which is inscribed SÆPINE ON HVN. In each case the pyramid in one quarter of the reverse terminates in a trefoil of pellets, and it is only upon these coins that this peculiarity is known to occur.

¹ For coins by Ælfwine, see Pl. III, Figs. 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19 and 20; and Pl. IV, Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 13, and 14.
² For coins by Sæwine, see Pl. IV, Figs. 8, 9, 10, 15, 17, 19 and 21.
³ See Pl. IV, Fig. 18.
⁴ See Pl. IV, Fig. 16.
⁵ See Pl. IV, Fig. 17.
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thus so closely connecting the Huntingdon and the Hamtún coins struck by Sæwine and Swetman, as to leave no doubt that the latter emanated from Northampton and not from Southampton.\(^1\)

**WILLIAM I, A.D. 1066–1089. WILLIAM II, A.D. 1089–1100.**

There can be little doubt that earl Waltheof, like his predecessors in the earldom, held control of a joint mint, or mints, at Northampton and at Huntingdon. In the Domesday account of Northampton we find no reference to the mint, from which circumstance we may infer that the mint, in 1086, had been leased to the burgesses and that the *firma* of the mint was included in the *firma* of the burg. The Huntingdon record in Domesday, that “in this burg there were three moneyers paying 40s. between the King and Earl, but now they are not [there]” shows that the Saxon earl formerly had the *tertius denarius* of the mint. He held the mint therefore by the same tenure as he held the burg, and both were under his direct control. There can be little doubt that during Waltheof’s time, and earlier, Northampton was held on terms similar to those of Huntingdon. We also learn from Domesday that the burg of Huntingdon formerly “paid geld for fifty hides, as a fourth part of Hurstingstone hundred, but not since the King set a geld of money on the burg,” i.e. not since the king levied the tax of the mint on the burg. The record in Domesday states that the moneyers were not there, yet we have the evidence of the Huntingdon coins that at that time the mint was in operation. The explanation lies in the latter extract from Domesday which shows that the king had farmed the mint to the burgesses and had included its rent in the *firma* of their burg. There can be little doubt that the Northampton mint was similarly farmed to the burgesses.

During the reigns of William I, and William II, five moneyers were working at Northampton, viz., Sæwine, Swetman, Godric, Godwine, and Wulfwine. By the moneyer Sæwine we have coins

\(^1\) See also vol. xvii, pp. 11–12.
of William I in types II, III, IV, V, and VIII (Hawkins, 234, 236, 237, 238, and 241–2); and of William II in types I and II (Hawkins, 244 and 246). Nearly all the known coins of William I and William II struck by this moneyer read HAMT, AMT, HAMTV, HAMTVN, etc., but in my possession are two coins of William I type II (Hawkins, 234) from the same dies which read SÆPINE ON NØD HANT,¹ thus proving beyond doubt that Sæwine’s coins were struck at Northampton and not at Southampton.² Major Carlyon-Britton, in his Numismatic History of William I and William II, although he cites the coins reading “Noth Hant” allocates those reading HAMTVN, etc., to Southampton, and Dr. Brooke, in the British Museum Catalogue, Norman Coins, also attributes them to Southampton, but in his recently published work English Coins, he transfers them to Northampton, but he fails to transfer to Northampton the coins of Eadweard the Confessor and Harold II, which are obviously the work of the same moneyer. The moneyer Swetman commenced work at Northampton in the reign of Eadweard the Confessor and struck coins in the last two types of that reign.³ He also struck coins at Northampton in the reign of Harold II, and in type II of William I. The coins struck by Godric, Godwine and Wulfwine, have previously been dealt with.⁴

HENRY I, A.D. 1100–1135.

In early times nothing stimulated the trade of a town so much as a visit from the king, and we know that in several instances a dormant mint was re-opened to meet the increased demand for currency occasioned by the king’s visit. This appears to have been the case at Northampton when Henry I visited the town in 1106.

In the British Museum collection is a penny of Andrew, type IV (British Museum Catalogue, type VII, Hawkins, 252), inscribed

¹ See Pl. V, Fig. 3.
² See also pp. 81–82 ante.
³ See also p. 81 ante.
⁴ See pp. 80–81 ante.
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**Dort on HAMTO.**¹ That this coin was struck at Northampton on the occasion of the king’s visit in the early part of 1106 there can be no reasonable doubt. Mr. Andrew dates this type, Michaelmas, 1106—Michaelmas, 1108. Mr. Andrew’s dates, however, in most cases, are necessarily only approximate, for, as he states elsewhere “the change in the coinage . . . was once in three, four or five years,”² and this type which was evidently in issue in the early part of 1106, probably commenced about the previous Michaelmas.

When the king was at Northampton, there his brother Robert came to petition for the restoration of the lands in Normandy which Henry had taken from him. His request was not granted and he returned to Normandy threatening reprisals.

The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, under the year 1106, says:

“Hereafter before Lent was the king at Northampton; and the earl Robert his brother came thither from Normandy to him; and because the king would not give him back that which he had taken from him in Normandy, they parted in hostility; and the earl soon went over sea back again.”

Various writs, etc., dated from Northampton during this visit are recorded in Farrer’s *Outline Itinerary of King Henry I*, p. 34.

After the king’s visit in 1106, the Northampton mint appears to have again lain dormant until 1122, when Henry again visited Northampton. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, under date 1122, says:

“In this year was King Henry . . . at Easter at Northampton.”

On this occasion, undoubtedly, was issued the penny of Andrew, type XI (*British Museum Catalogue*, type X, Hawkins, IV) in the British Museum collection, which reads **VLF ON HAM[T]V**.³

¹ See Pl. VI, Fig. 2.

² *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. x, p. 49.

³ See Pl. VI, Fig. 3. This coin, which has previously been attributed to Southampton, is described in the *British Museum Catalogue*, vol. ii, p. 288, and in Mr. Andrew’s *Henry I*, p. 410. The name **VLF** also occurs upon Lincoln coins of William I and William II, and upon York coins of Stephen. The name **VLFETEL** and **VLCETEL**, of which **VLF** may be a contracted form, occurs upon coins of William I struck at Cambridge, Norwich and York.
Mr. Andrew dates this type II21-II23, which coincides with the date of Henry's visit. That this was considered an important event in the town's history is evident.

Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, says:—

"The system of Royal progresses, of holding assemblies in various parts of the land, is a marked feature of the reign of Henry . . .

"We hear of Henry at places which had never before been heard of as seats of national assemblies, places which, except through the necessities of warfare, had seldom been visited by Kings since England had had one sovereign. He shows himself in all parts of the kingdom, and the solemn ceremony of wearing the crown is no longer confined to Winchester, Westminster, and Gloucester. It takes place especially in the latter years of his reign, at St. Albans, at Dunstable, at Brampton, at Northampton and at Norwich."

Several charters, etc., granted by the king during his stay at Northampton in II22 are recorded in Farrer's *Outline Itinerary of King Henry I*, pp. 98–99.

We have no Northampton coins of Mr. Andrew's type XII (*British Museum Catalogue*, type XI, Hawkins, 258), which he dates II23—Christmas, II25, but with the succeeding type, Andrew XIII (*British Museum Catalogue*, type XIII, Hawkins, 265), the mint is again in operation, this time with two moneyers, Paien and Stiefne. Only one coin each by these two moneyers are recorded of Andrew type XIII, which Mr. Andrew dates January, II26—Michaelmas, II28.

In the British Museum collection is a penny of type XIII, inscribed *PAIEN: ON: HAMT[V]*,¹ and in my collection is another specimen which reads *STIEFNE: ON: N[OR]BA* ² That the former

¹ See Pl. VI, Fig. 4.
² See Pl. VI, Fig. 5.
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coin was struck at Northampton and not at Southampton is proved by the fact that we have coins by the same moneyer in Andrew types XIV, and XV (British Museum Catalogue, types XIV and XV, Hawkins, 262 and 255), of Henry I, reading PAIEN: ON: NORDAX:,
PAIEN: ON: NORDAX:, etc.¹

There are also coins of the first type of Stephen (British Museum Catalogue, type I, Hawkins, 270), reading PAEN: ON: NORDAX:, etc.,² and in my cabinet is a coin of British Museum Catalogue, type III (Hawkins, 276), inscribed PAEN: ON: NORDAX:.³ The remaining coins of Henry I read NORDAM, etc., thus bearing upon their face undeniable evidence that they emanated from Northampton, consequently they do not call for discussion in the present chapter.

In the British Museum collection is a penny of Andrew, type IV (British Museum Catalogue, type VII, Hawkins, 252), reading [S[E]RLIG] ON DAX, and struck at Hastings. It was formerly in the Rostron and Marsham collections, where it was mis-read [S[E]RLIG] ON DAX, and wrongly attributed to Southampton. It is illustrated in the British Museum Catalogue, Pl. XL, Fig. 10.

STEPHEN, A.D. 1135–1154.

In my collection is the penny of Stephen’s first type, Hawkins, 270 (British Museum Catalogue, type I), which is inscribed PAEN: ON: ANTIA:⁴ and which I previously referred to in vol. xvii, p. 5. The reading, as I then suggested, is obviously a contracted form of PAEN: ON: ANT[ION]IA, a Latinized form of the local name “Anton.” The moneyer Paen or Paen, as I stated near the end of the last chapter, coined at Northampton in the last three types of Henry I, and continued into the first type of Stephen. He also struck coins at Northampton in at least two later types of Stephen’s reign, and there can be no doubt that he was also the issuer of the above coin

¹ See Pl. VI, Figs. 8, 9, 13 and 14.
² See Pl. VI, Figs. 16, 17, 18, and 19.
³ See Pl. VI, Fig. 20.
⁴ See Pl. VI, Fig. 19. The obverse is slightly double-struck.
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inscribed ΡΑΕΙ:ΟΙ:ΛΙΤΙΑ. This coin, though not base, is not of the usual standard of silver, yet equal in quality to many coins issued in Stephen’s reign. The dies from which the coin was struck, though made with official irons, were obviously of local workmanship.

There can be little doubt that the coin of type Hawkins, 270, inscribed ΡΑΕΙ:ΟΙ:ΛΙΤΙΑ, was struck in or about April, 1142. The king was taken prisoner at the battle of Lincoln, February 2nd, 1141; he was imprisoned in Bristol Castle, and on November 1st, of the same year, he was released in exchange for the earl of Gloucester, who had fallen into the hands of Stephen’s party. Ger­vase of Canterbury, John of Hexham and William of Malmesbury all emphasize the fact that the king, eager for revenge, was bent upon renewing the strife, and in the early part of 1142, we find him engaged upon a “progress” through the eastern counties on his way to the north for the purpose of conciliating some of his former enemies, and probably also, of collecting an army with which he intended to renew the war with Matilda. At Stamford, as we learn from the Peterborough Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, “the king and earl Randolf agreed and swore oaths and plighted troth that neither of them should prove traitor to the other.” About Easter, the king was at York, after which he turned southward and about the end of April reached Northampton, the home town of his staunch supporter, earl Simon, having collected upon his journey a considerable military force, with the probable intention of marching from Northampton to attack Oxford, which had again become the headquarters of the Empress Matilda.

Earl Simon, who had fought beside Stephen at the battle of Lincoln and was one of the three earls who remained faithful to Stephen and to the queen during the king’s captivity, appears to have accompanied the king to the north, while his representatives had probably been busy collecting further forces in his earldom, but upon reaching Northampton Stephen was suddenly stricken down with a serious illness which put an end to the projected advance upon Oxford, for so serious was the king’s illness that his death was rumoured and
the forces which he had collected were disbanded and dismissed to their homes.¹

As previously pointed out, nothing in early times stimulated local trade and increased the demand for currency so much as a visit from the king and his court, and probably the reeve of Northampton, foreseeing this increased demand, had decided to re-open the Northampton mint, which appears to have been temporarily closed. Owing, however, to the disorganization of the Exchequer and to the fact that although a new coinage had been ordered, the dies for it would not be ready—for, as Mr. Andrew has pointed out,² although the projected coinage was probably ordered at Christmas, 1141, several months would elapse before the dies would be ready to be sent out to the mints—the reeve, therefore, would be unable to obtain dies from the usual source, though he would probably be able to obtain, or was already in possession of official irons for making dies. As the new coinage then was not yet in issue, the local die-sinker could only make dies for the type of coin which had been in circulation several years and with which both he and the general public were familiar; and the somewhat crude appearance of the coin in question, together with the Latinized form of the local name "Anton," clearly indicates that the dies from which the coin was struck were of local workmanship. Probably there was a considerable issue of coins from these locally made dies, but the specimen described above appears to be the only one that has survived the vicissitudes of time.

In the twelfth century the form Hamtonia, Hantonia or Antonia was not uncommonly used to designate not only Northampton and Southampton, but other Hamptons also.

¹ William of Malmesbury writes concerning the illness of Stephen: "Non multo post, in ipsis pene Paschalibus feris, regem, quaedam, ut aiunt, dura meditantem, gravis incommunum morbi apud Norhamtonam detinuit, adeo ut in tota prope modum Anglia sicut mortuus conclamaretur. Duravit imperospera valitudo usque post Pentecostem; tunc enim sensim refusus salutis vigor eum in pedes erexit" (Historia Novella, Rolls Series, p. 591). Symeon of Durham, also, writes: Præventus vero infirmitate copias militum quas contraxerat remisit ad propria."

A Southampton charter of temp. Henry II reads—"Henricus rex Anglorum et dux Normannorum et comes Andegavorum, pro­positio et ministris suis de Hantonia, salutem. Precipio quod homines mei de Hantonia, etc."¹ In a confirmation charter in favour of the prior and convent of St. Denis, Southampton, temp. Stephen, we read of Warino de Hantonia, and in another confirmation charter in favour of the same convent, temp. Henry II, we also read of Warino de Hamtonia.² In a charter of Henry II, confirming to the Abbey of Lire, in Normandy, certain possessions, principally in Hampshire, we find the following reference to Southampton—"In Hantonia, ix et xv et unum burgensem et ecclesiam Sancti Johannis."³ In the Patent Roll of 17 Edward II, 1323, is recorded the confirmation of a grant "by William and Henry, sometime Kings of England, afterwards confirmed by a charter of Henry III, to the Nuns of Holy Trinity, Caen, of the manors of Hamtonia, Avelingues, etc." In this case "Hamtonia" is Minchin Hampton, Gloucestershire. In a confirmation charter of 11 Henry III, we read of the gift of William son of Stephen de Hamtonia, of his mill at Hampton (Gay), Oxfordshire.⁴ Other examples could be cited if necessary, but the foregoing are sufficient to illustrate my point.

We now come to the series of coins which are a variety of Stephen’s first type (Hawkins, 270), on the obverse of which the collar of the king’s robe is represented by annulets instead of pellets, and on the reverse the cross moline is voided and has an annulet in the centre and at the end of each limb. The reverse readings are SANSON: ON ANT, SANSON: ON: AN, SANSONI O AN, SANSON ON AMT, SANSON O ANTOI, etc. There are also coins, obviously of the same series, which read W[......]N ANT, the full legend of which would presumably be WILLELM ON ANT. These coins, like the Northampton coin reading PAEN ON ANTIA, are of a lower standard of silver than a majority of those issued from the royal

² Ibid., vol. iii, pp. 336, 338.
mints; and are obviously an emergency or an irregular issue. Although of the same type as Stephen's first coinage, they were not issued contemporaneously with that type, but appear to have been in issue at the same time as Stephen's second type (Hawkins, 269), and to have continued in circulation until the reign of Henry II. These coins, which must have been in issue for a considerable period, have never been found in a hoard which had been buried in or prior to 1141. The Watford,¹ Nottingham,² Dartford,³ South Kyme,⁴ and Sheldon⁵ hoards, all of which were composed principally of coins of Stephen's first type (Hawkins, 270), and contained none of a later type, failed to disclose a single specimen of Sanson's coins. On the other hand, the Linton find, which contained at least 32 pennies of type Hawkins, 270, and 24 of Stephen's second type (Hawkins, 269), disclosed no less than four pennies and two cut half-pennies struck by Sanson.⁶ In the Awbridge find⁷ in which were at least 31 coins of Stephen's last type (Hawkins, 268), and 110 of Henry II, "Tealby" type, there were also three pennies struck by Sanson, thus showing that the coins under discussion were in circulation from the latter part of 1141, or the early part of 1142, till possibly about 1170.

Mr. (now Dr.) Brooke, discussing these coins,⁸ says—"The natural attribution of the coins is to Southampton, which is invariably spelt 'Hamtune' or 'Amtune,' but the occurrence of so many dies on which the first three letters of the mint read invariably ANT, causes considerable doubt whether so unusual a form as 'Anton' for Southampton can really be intended.

² Numismatic Chronicle, 1881, pp. 37-41.
³ Ibid., 1851, pp. 186-190.
⁴ Ibid., 1922, pp. 49-83.
⁶ Numismatic Chronicle, 1883, pp. 108-116. Only one coin by Sanson is described in the publication of the find, but Mr. Andrew states that the hoard actually contained four pennies and two half-pennies.
⁸ British Museum Catalogue, Norman Kings, pp. xcii-xciv.
⁹ See pp. 88-89 ante.
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... One can only conjecture that these coins are the work of one of the magnates who was powerful at the time of Stephen's captivity, and held his power down to the end of the reign; but in face of the difficulty of determining the mint at which they were struck, it is impossible to hazard even a guess at the issuer of this money.... They were issued of base metal and light weight, the dies being worked by an engraver who was not a very skilful workman, and evidently was not in possession of the instruments used by the officials of the royal mint. Having originated his type, he continued to employ it, even after the original ceased to be issued and was superseded in currency by later types."

There can, however, be little doubt that the mint-form ANTON, etc., on the reverse of these coins is, like the coin inscribed PLAEI: ON: LATIA, a contraction of ANTONIA, and that the coins were issued at Hamtún, i.e. either Northampton or Southampton. On their merits and in view of the coin inscribed "Paen on Ant(on)ia," one would be inclined to allocate Sanson's coins to Northampton, especially when we consider that reading "Sanson o Anto(n)i(a)," but there can be little or no doubt that the coins struck by Sanson and also those of the same type struck by W(illiam), were issued at Southampton by authority of Henry, Bishop of Winchester and brother to Stephen.

In the civil war between Stephen and Matilda, Henry, Bishop of Winchester, from March to June, 1141, sided with Matilda. The Bishops of Winchester had always held Taunton with its mint. Bishop Henry was already Abbot of Glastonbury, and Matilda confirmed to him the Church of Glastonbury and the privilege of a mint and moneyers (cum moneta et monetariis). But the locality of the mint was not stated in the Charter, and no coins of Glastonbury are known; and Mr. Andrew, who has paid considerable

---

1 Since this was written, Dr. Brooke, in his recently published work English Coins, p. 99, accepts the attribution of the coins struck by Sanson, and William, to Southampton.
2 See pp. 86–89 ante.
3 Monasticon, vol. i, p. 44, No. LXXI.
attention to this series, is of opinion that it referred to Taunton mint. When, however, the Bishop revolted and went over to Stephen, his town and mint at Taunton would be confiscated by Matilda's party in the West, and just coincidentally with that date, 1141, coinage at Taunton ceased permanently.

Being shut out from his mint at Taunton, and Winchester having been almost completely destroyed by fire during its siege in the autumn of 1141, it seems probable that the Bishop transferred his mint to Southampton. The new town of Southampton, however, had never issued coins, and presumably the coining rights granted by Æthelstan to Old Hamtúin (Hamwich), could only be transferred to New Hamtúin by Charter, and that transference does not appear to have been effected, for, as I have previously stated, we have no coins issued from the old town after the latter part of Æthelred II's reign, and, as I have previously suggested, the coining rights were probably surrendered to Canute in return for land on which to build the new town. Consequently, it would be necessary for the Bishop to obtain a Charter from his brother the king, to enable him to establish a mint at Southampton. This, as Mr. Andrew has suggested, would be granted possibly whilst Stephen was on his way from Bristol to Canterbury, after his release from captivity in November, 1141.

With regard to the moneyer Sanson, Mr. Andrew's evidence appears to be fairly conclusive. In 1148, whilst Sanson's coins were probably being issued, or were at least still in circulation, his name frequently occurs in Bishop Henry's terrier of his lands and rents in Winchester, as "Sansonus Monetarius," and he lived in a house belonging to the Bishop in High Street. He was therefore a wealthy citizen and tenant of the Bishop's, and as it is only upon these coins that the name Sanson occurs, there can be little doubt that "Sansonus Monetarius" was identical with "Sanson" the monetarius the Southampton coins.

There was also about the same time a "Sanson Wascelin," or

---

1 See vol. xvii, p. 24.
The Gascon, who appears to have been one of the principal shipowners of Southampton, and who owned the ship that used to carry Bishop Henry to Normandy from that port at a fee of "35s., by the King's writ." He is also described as "Sanson Wascelini' de Hanton." It is not open to proof, but it appears highly probable that Sanson the Gascon was identical with Sanson the Moneyer.

With regard to W(illiam), who struck "On Ant," Mr. Andrew identifies him with William the Christchurch moneyer in Stephen's reign, and also with William who was coining at Winchester in Henry II, "Tealby" type, when Bishop Henry's mint at Southampton was closed. But as Mr. Andrew has not yet dealt with this question and published his evidence, and I do not wish to forestall him, I will not deal further with the matter beyond stating that the evidence which Mr. Andrew has brought under my notice appears to be fairly conclusive that William of Christchurch, William of Hanton and William of Winchester, were one and the same person.