THE NORTHAMPTON AND SOUTHAMPTON MINTS.
By William C. Wells.

PART IV.

THE NORTHAMPTON MINT AND ITS COINS

In the preceding pages I have discussed those coins which exhibit the mint-reading HAMTVN and its contractions. Hitherto these coins have in all cases been allocated to Southampton, in entire disregard of evidence to the contrary. There is also, as I have previously stated, a series of coins commencing certainly in the reign of Æthelred, and presumably in the reign of Eadwig, and continuing to near the end of the reign of Æthelred II, inscribed with the mint-form HAMPI and its contractions. The locality of this mint has hitherto been a source of speculation to numismatists. Hildebrand, allocates these coins to Harwich; the falsity of that attribution has, however, been demonstrated by Major Carlyon-Britton, who in turn allocated them to an equally unlikely mint at Droitwich, Worcestershire.

I have shown that Hamwic, or Hamwich was, in the eighth century, the name of at least some portion of the old Wessex town of Hamtun, Southampton, if not an alternate name for old Southampton, which was destroyed in or about the year 1014, and afterwards removed to its present site.

I have endeavoured to show by adducing evidence, direct and indirect, that the whole series of Hamtun coins emanated from the Mercian Hamtun, Northampton, and not from the southern Hamtun; and that the Southampton mint is represented by the Hamwic series.

In the following pages I shall endeavour to bring together the various historical records of the Northampton mint and also to give a detailed description of such coins of that mint as have come under my notice, from the reign of Eadweard the Elder to the year 1250, in the reign of Henry III, when the mint was

2 Ibid., vol. xix, p. 88.
3 Anglo-Saxon Coins in the Royal Swedish Cabinet of Medals at Stockholm, 1881.
finally closed. I hope also to give a detailed description of such Hamwic coins as have come under my notice, and to complete the series I will also describe such of the coins of Stephen, struck in the present town of Southampton, as are known to me.

Northampton, the capital of the shire of that name, is situated as nearly as possible in the centre of the Kingdom. The origin of the town is lost in the mists of antiquity, but local tradition ascribes the foundation of the town to Belinus, a legendary British prince who figures conspicuously in Arthurian chronicles. Geoffrey of Monmouth,¹ and Layamon,² record at great length the remarkable exploits of this legendary hero who, according to those chroniclers, was not only king of all Britain but conquered Gaul; after which he marched with his army through Italy, laying waste the towns and cities on his way and, eventually, laid siege to and conquered Rome!

Discoveries within the borough limits show that the district was inhabited in Palæolithic times, and that there was a local population in the late Neolithic or early Bronze Age is proved by the discovery of several polished and other flint axes, also within the limits of the modern borough. Evidence of a similar population in the later Bronze Age is, however, somewhat meagre and consists of one small bronze spear-head said to have been found in Northampton. In the Late-Celtic period, circa 150 years B.C. to A.D. 50, the Britons had a small settlement on the site of Northampton castle, as appears from fragments of pottery, etc. of that period found there in 1879.

![Fig. 1. Uninscribed British Gold Stater, Found in Northampton (W. C. Wells).](image)

The only numismatic evidence of the occupation of the site of Northampton in pre-Roman times consists of an uninscribed gold stater of the first century B.C., type as Evans Coins of the Ancient

¹ The British History, 1718, pp. 65-82.
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Britons, Pl. B, Fig. 8, found in Gold Street, Northampton, in 1889.1 This coin passed into my hands and has been on loan at the Northampton Museum since 1899. The district around Northampton has been productive of many British coins ranging in date from circa 100 years B.C. to A.D. 50. A short distance westward of the town, on the site of the Romanised Celtic settlement in the parish of Duston, were found in 1887 and 1888, a silver coin of Andoc[m]ius, type as Evans, Coins of the Ancient Britons, Pl. V, Fig. 6; a silver coin of Antedrigus, type as Evans, Pl. I, Fig. 8; an uninscribed silver coin, type as Evans, Pl. F, Fig. 9; an ancient counterfeit stater of Cunobelinus, of copper plated with gold, type as Evans, Pl. IX, Fig. 3; four small copper coins of Cunobelinus, types as Evans, Pl. XI, Fig. 5, Pl. XI, Fig. 7, Pl. XII, Fig. 1, and Pl. XII, Fig. 8; and a copper coin apparently of Andocomius. In the suburb of St. James’s End, which lies between Northampton and the Duston settlement, was found a smaller copper coin also of Cunobelinus.2 In the collection of the late Samuel Sharp, a Northamptonshire numismatist, was a gold coin of Addedomaros, type as Evans, Pl. XIV, Figs. 5 and 6, but without inscription, found near Great Houghton and only a short distance outside the borough of Northampton.

Fig. 2. Copper coin of Cunobelinus, found at Irchester (W. C. Wells).3

On the site of the Roman walled town at Irchester, a few miles north-east of Northampton, several copper coins of Cunobelinus have been found, including a very fine specimen as Evans, Pl. XII, Fig. 1; and Kettering has produced three British coins,

Fig. 3. Uninscribed gold stater found at Kettering (W. C. Wells)  
Fig. 4. Gold quarter stater of Cunobelinus, found at Kettering (W. C. Wells).

1 See Fig. 1.  
2 These coins from Duston came into my hands and have for many years been on loan at the Northampton Museum.  
3 Ex. Allen and Bliss collections.
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viz., an uninscribed gold stater of type Evans, Pl. B, Fig. 6, a small silver coin of Tasciovanus, as Evans, Pl. VI, Fig. 2, and a gold quarter stater of Cunobelinus, of type Evans, Pl. IX, Fig. 13, but with the unrecorded inscription CVNA. A similar coin, but with the more usual inscription CVNO, was found near Oundle. The latter locality has also produced other Ancient British coins, including an uninscribed gold stater of type Evans, Pl. B, Fig. 7; another as Evans, Pl. K, Fig. 7; a gold stater of Tasciovanus, type as Evans, Pl. XXI, Fig., 9; a gold quarter stater of type Evans, Pl. V, Fig. 13; a gold stater of Cunobelinus, type as Evans, Pl. IX, Figs. 3-10; a copper coin of Cunobelinus, type as Evans, Pl. XI, Fig. 8; and another copper coin, uninscribed, but probably of Cunobelinus, type as Evans, Pl. XI, Fig. 14. Between Oundle and Gretton was found a remarkably fine gold stater of Cunobelinus, type as Evans, Pl. XXII, Fig. 6, and another coin of similar type was found near Oundle. At Gayton was found a copper coin of Tasciovanus, type as Evans, Pl. VI, Fig. 4. At Ecton was found a gold stater of Andocimius, type as Evans, Pl. V, Fig. 4. A gold stater of Antedrigus, type as Evans, Pl. I, Fig. 7, was found at Brackley. A copper coin of Verulamium, type as Evans, Pl. VII, Fig. 3, was found near Chipping Warden, as were also copper coins of Cunobelinus of types Evans, Pl. XI, Fig. 8, and Pl. XII, Fig. 1. In my collection is a copper coin, similar to the last described, found at Wood Burcote, and also an uninscribed gold quarter
stater, type as *Evans*, Pl. C, Fig. 14, found at Earl's Barton.¹
I have also on loan at Northampton Museum, a gold stater of the Brigantes, type as *Evans*, Pl. XVII, Fig. 8, found at Corby.

![Fig. 7. Gold Stater of the Brigantes, found near Corby (W. C. Wells).](image)

The Romans do not appear to have had a settlement of any kind actually upon the site of Northampton, and the remains of that period found in the town appear to be limited to a small cinerary urn found in the bed of the river near the castle mound, and a few coins consisting of a sestertius of Trajan, a denarius of Severus Alexander and a small brass of Aurelian, found many years ago in Free-School Lane, and now in my possession.

A short distance outside the borough boundaries, in the parish of Duston and on either side of the Celtic or Roman road which passes through Northampton and joins Watling Street a few miles further on, was situated a Roman, or more probably a Romanised Celtic settlement which probably existed there as early as the first century B.C., or it may have existed even at a considerably earlier period, for the site has been productive of a number of finely-worked flint arrow-heads and a pierced stone mace-head of the Bronze-Age. This site has also produced a considerable series of Roman remains, together with a few urns of Late-Celtic type. In my possession is a series of about 400 Roman coins ranging in date from the reign of Augustus to that of Arcadius, all found on the same site. From these discoveries it is evident that although Northampton cannot be claimed as a Roman town the neighbouring Romano-British settlement was occupied during the whole period of Roman occupation, from about A.D. 50 down to the early years of the fifth century. A small population of native Britons continued to inhabit the old site after the departure of the Romans, probably until they were driven out by the Anglian invaders, as appears from the discovery there of small rude fifth-century native imitations of Roman coins.

Late in the same century came the invasion of Britain by the Angles and the Saxons. Of the conquest of Mid-Britain no

¹ See *Evans*, p. 79. Also Fig. 6, *supra.*
record has been left to us, but it was probably before the end of the sixth century that the district around Northampton was conquered and settled by the Angles. The invaders probably made their way southward from the Wash. A dense forest extended from near the edge of the fens to within a few miles of the site of Northampton, a distance of nearly forty miles. Through this forest ran a Celtic or Roman road which crossed the Nene near the site upon which at a later time stood Hamtún, and joined the Watling Street about eight miles further on. Through this forest the Anglian invaders forced their way, and when they reached the neighbourhood of Northampton, they appear to have halted and, shortly afterwards, spreading out in all directions, formed a number of settlements in the neighbourhood.

It is acknowledged on all hands that the Nene valley was settled quite early, certainly in the sixth century or, in some cases, earlier. Yet it has recently been suggested that Northampton was a late settlement, probably of the eighth century or even later.¹ No evidence whatever has been advanced in support of this suggestion, and it is unreasonable to assume that when the Nene Valley was settled in the sixth century the site of Northampton, one of the most inviting positions, at the head of the river, should be overlooked and not occupied until two centuries later. Moreover, the contents of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries discovered in the immediate neighbourhood—one actually within the modern borough and another immediately outside, opposite the site of the Anglo-Saxon tūn and beside the Celtic or Roman road communicating with Watling Street—prove the district to have been occupied in Pagan times.

Northampton, down to about the middle of the tenth century, was known as Hamtūn, the prefix "North" being then added presumably to distinguish it from the southern Hamtūn. The earliest example of the use of the prefix "North" to indicate Northampton appears to be, as I have previously stated,² upon a penny of Eadgar in my possession, inscribed BALDRIČ MONETA • N • AM (= Baldric Moneta[r]ius on (=in) N[orth] A[m(tūn)].

The etymology of "Hampton" or older Hamtūn, a fairly common place-name, has received scant attention, and in the case of Northampton the suggestion generally advanced is that

¹ The Place-Names of Northamptonshire, Introduction, pp. xvi-xviii.
³ On the question of Moneta, or Monetarius, see pp. 23-27 post.
The name is derived from *ham* "home," and *tun* "town" = the Home Town. This explanation, however, is unsatisfactory, for as Professor Mawer states in *The Chief Elements used in English Place-Names* (p. 61), "there is no reason for thinking that in place-names *tun* was ever in early times used with the sense of 'town.'" Nor does the more recently advanced suggestion that it means "home-farm" appear any more satisfactory than the former suggestion, for in each case is ignored the meaning of the second element, *tün*. *Tün* is the commonest of all place-name suffixes and it is clear from its Old English usage generally that it must have a wide range of meaning in place-names. Its primary sense is "enclosed piece of ground." It came afterwards to signify a dwelling, with land about it, enclosed by its *tün*, i.e. a bank of earth surrounded with a hedge, or wooden stockade, the whole surrounded by a ditch; then many dwellings within the enclosure, till it became what we now denominate a town. The actual *tün*, however, was the defensive hedge and ditch.

In early times the word *tün* did not signify the whole farm or estate, but merely that portion of the farm which was enclosed within a defensive *tün*. The importance of this defensive hedge is shown quite clearly in the *Laws of Æthelberht*, enacted about A.D. 604, where we find it ordained that: "If any one be the first to make an inroad into a man's *tün*, let him make *bót* with 6 shillings; let him who follows, with 3 shillings; after, each, a shilling."¹

A charter of the year 859,² records the grant of a *healf tun*, which suggests that by the middle of the ninth century at least, the strict enclosure meaning of *tün* had become weakened and the meaning of the term had been extended so as to include the whole farm or estate. But Northampton being a sixth-century settlement the "*tün*" in the place-name must signify not "farm," as it possibly would have done two centuries later, but a defensive *tün* around a portion of the farm, which presumably included the house of the local "lord" after whom the *tün* was probably named.

The *tün* at Northampton was probably destroyed several centuries ago, possibly at the time of the building of the castle and the making of its extensive earthworks; but the *tün* at Southampton existed down to at least the latter part of the seventeenth century, probably owing to the fact that when, in the

² Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum*, No. 497.
eleventh century, Old Hamtun was destroyed, the site became farm land and was not again built upon until recent times. 1

Place-names consisting of a personal name prefixed to burh, ham, or tun, are fairly common in nearly all parts of England; and it seems highly probable that Northampton belonged to the latter class and that the first element of the place-name was a personal name in the possessive case. Professor Stenton, Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names, cites "Eadnoths-tún" as an example and says that on the surface that place-name "means that the tun in question belonged to Eadnoth" and also suggests that "There can be little doubt many names of this type originally denoted the tun belonging to the man whose name stands as the prefix. Many medieval villages must have arisen by the gradual accretion of dwellings around some original homestead. ... The name of the first settler may often have remained permanently attached to such communities." Such appears to be the case at Northampton.

Havant, Hampshire, was, in the eleventh century, designated Haman-funtan, Hama-funta, etc., i.e. "Hama’s Spring," and within a few miles of Northampton lies the village of Hanslope, which in Domesday is "Hamsleape." Professors Mawer and Stenton, in The Place-Names of Buckinghamshire, pp. 6-7, writing of Hanslope, say:—"The second element is clearly sleepe." The main part of the village is on the flat with a road leading straight up the hill to the church from the village. The first would appear to be a personal name. The form suggests the name Háma, familiar in Old English poetry, known to be usual in the eighth and ninth centuries and compounded in the place-name Havant, Old English æt Hāman juntan, in which case the full form of the Old English name was Hāmanaslæpe." On the analogy of the foregoing examples, amongst others, it is suggested that an early—possibly the earliest—settler on the site of Northampton was also named Hāma, and that its early name was Hāman-tún, "Hāma’s tun," Hāman being the early possessive form of Hāma.

It is probable that Hamtún was of little importance prior to the Danish conquest. In A.D. 787, as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us, "first came three ships of Northmen from Hæretha land." The descent of those three ships heralded a new conquest of

2 Ibid., vol. xvii, note 1, p. 35.
3 Sleepe, "a slope or slippery place."
England; it was the beginning of a struggle which was to continue unbroken until Canute ascended the throne, or even till the final triumph of the Norman Conqueror.

For nearly a hundred years the shores of England were harried by successors to these Northern pirates till their scattered plunder-raids culminated in the more organized attack of the Danish sea-kings. In 832 they ravaged Sheppey; in 833 they defeated Ecgberht at Charnmouth; in 835 they were defeated by Ecgberht at Hengston; between 851 and 853 they took London and Canterbury, defeated Beorhtwulf, king of Mercia, and were in turn defeated by King Æthelwulf and Æthelbald at Ockley. In 860 they took Winchester and in 868 they wintered at Nottingham and made peace with Mercia.

In 871 the full tide of invasion burst upon Wessex. King Æthelred, supported by his brother, Ælfred, met the invaders in battle after battle with varying success. Æthelred died the same year, in the thick of the struggle with the Danes, and Ælfred succeeded to the throne of Wessex. Within a few months eight or nine pitched battles were fought besides innumerable skirmishes. Then followed the truce of Wilton, by which the Danes evacuated Wessex and returned to Reading. In the following year, 872, as we are told by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, "the army (i.e. the Danes), went from Reading to London, and there took winter quarters; and then the Mercians made peace with the army."; and that in 874, "the army went from Lindsey to Repton, and there took winter quarters and drove King Burhred over seas two and twenty years after he had obtained the kingdom, and they subdued all the land . . . and in the same year they gave the kingdom of Mercia to the custody of Ceolwulf, an unwise king's thane."

About 875-6, the Danes settled in and around Leicester, Nottingham, Derby, Stamford and Lincoln; towns which became linked in a confederation known afterwards as "The Five Burghs." It was probably about this time also that Northampton was occupied and the surrounding district settled by the Danes, who continued to govern the town and neighbourhood until 916, when it was surrendered to Eadward the Elder.

After a further three years' struggle the Danes, after their signal defeat at "Ethandune" in 878, were driven to conclude a peace with Ælfred which, although generally termed the "Treaty of Wedmore," was probably arranged at Chippenham, near the site of the battle of Ethandune. By the terms of this
treaty the Danes were to evacuate Wessex and the part of Mercia south-west of Watling Street; their chiefs were to submit to baptism and they were to govern the whole land north-east of Watling Street as vassals of the King of Wessex. Guthrum, the Danish king, was accordingly baptized by the name of Æthelstan.

By this treaty of peace between Ælfric and Guthrum, a very considerable track of country in the north and east of England was surrendered to the Danes. Ælfric had succeeded in saving his ancestral kingdoms of Wessex and Kent and had become possessed of a valuable part of Mercia south and west of Watling Street. Northampton, however, lay several miles north of Watling Street and thus remained in the hands of the Danes, who had also established themselves throughout the greater part of what is now Northamptonshire, as is shown by the numerous place-names ending in "by" and "thorp," the greater number of which are to be found north-east of Watling Street. Northampton being a frontier town and occupying a strong strategic position on the Nene, would undoubtedly be strongly fortified by the Danes soon after the Treaty of Wedmore; and that probably explains why in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle account of the surrender of Northampton to Eadweard, in 916, we find no record of the fortification of the town; it was already a burh and Eadweard had only to leave a sufficient English garrison to ensure the good faith of the Danish earl, Thurferth, and his followers.

During his war with the Danes, Ælfric built strong burhs or fortresses in the chief strategical spots of Wessex, allocating to each of them a region the warriors of which were to supply the garrison and keep the works in repair. The Chronicle makes it quite clear that this force was distinct from the field army.

The system of maintaining these burhs was, that to each fortress was allocated a certain number of hides of land around it. All the thegns dwelling on these hides were responsible for its defence; apparently they were bound to keep a house within it, and either to reside there in person or to place a competent fighting man there as a substitute. These "burhwaris" are repeatedly mentioned in the Chronicle account of Ælfric's later wars.

The Burghal Hidage, a document of the early part of the tenth century, gives an account of the hides allocated to the burhs in

---

1 The exact boundaries started from the Thames, along the Lea to its source, then right to Bedford and along the Ouse till it meets Watling Street, then along Watling Street to the Welsh border.—Thorpe's Ancient Laws and Institutes, p. 60.
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Wessex. This document was evidently compiled before the reconquest of the Danelaw, and the building of the burhs by Eadweard and his sister Æthelflæd, although an appendix, added at a later date, includes Essex, Worcestershire and Warwickshire. Northampton is not mentioned, but there can be little doubt that after its surrender to Eadweard, in 916, the "burghal" system was adopted there, in common with other burhs, and a certain number of hides allotted for its defence. Indeed, the adoption of the burghal system of organization is probably to be ascribed to Danish influence, for it appears highly probable that the burhs of the eastern Midlands, Lincoln, Stamford, Nottingham, Derby, Leicester, Northampton, Huntingdon, Bedford, Cambridge, Colchester and possibly also Norwich, Ipswich and Thetford acquired their burghal character during the period that they were under Danish government.

The East-Anglian and a portion of the Northumbrian Danes had adopted a monopolial form of government, as we learn from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, but there were in districts independent populations who followed their national jarls or earls and local "kings." Such an one was Northampton, whose "army," prior to the year 916, was led by Earl Thuriferth, whose territory extended south-west as far as Watling Street and in a north-easterly direction to the Welland.

There is considerable difference of opinion as to when the Mercian shires were formed. The counties of Northampton, Huntingdon, Cambridge and Bedford appear to be of Danish origin. In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle all these towns are mentioned apparently as centres to which the inhabitants of the surrounding districts owed allegiance. The district which owed allegiance to Northampton appears to have corresponded to the present county boundaries north-east of Watling Street, for it extended to the Welland, the present north-east boundary of Northamptonshire. The present county boundaries south-west of Watling Street, however, must have been fixed after the reconquest of the district by Eadweard the Elder, probably in the reign of Eadgar.

EADWEARD THE ELDER A.D. 901-924.

King Ælfric died in October 901 and was succeeded in his kingdom of Wessex by his elder son Eadweard, surnamed the

1 Oct. 26, 901, is generally given as the date of Ælfric's death, but W. H. Stevenson, in the English Historical Review, 1898, pp. 71-77, shows that the date of that event was Oct. 26, 899. Sir C. Oman gives the date as 900.
Elder. Eadweard distinguished himself in his father's later wars with the Danes; on Ælfred's death he was chosen by the witan to succeed to the kingdom and was crowned at Kingston-on-Thames on the Whit-Sunday following. His succession was disputed by one of his cousins, the eathing Æthelwald, a son of Æthelred, the fourth son of Æthelwulf, who seized on Wimborne in Dorset, and Twynham (Christchurch) in Hampshire. Eadweard led an army against him. There was no fight, however, and Æthelwald escaped and joined the Northumbrian Danes who received him as king.

In 906 the peace which Ælfred made with Guthrum was renewed, but in 910 Eadweard was again at war with the Danes, who appear to have broken the peace. The Mercians were governed by their own ealdorman, Æthelred, who had married the king's sister, Æthelflæd, and who had, in 907, as a measure of defence against the Danish attacks, restored and fortified Chester. In 910 the West-Saxon and Mercian armies joined forces and ravaged Northumbria. In 911 the combined armies defeated the Danes at Wodensfield in Staffordshire, with the loss of their two kings Halfdan and Ecwils, and many of their principal men. Shortly afterwards Æthelred died and Eadweard gave the full control of Mercia to his widow Æthelflæd.

Shortly after the death of ealdorman Æthelred of Mercia, Eadweard and his sister Æthelflæd, Lady of the Mercians, acting in concert, launched an energetic attack upon the Danes. They continued Ælfred's policy of building burhs, and as they forced the Danes northward or compelled them to submit to Saxon rule, burhs were built and towns fortified for the purpose of holding the enemy in check and for the protection of the inhabitants of the neighbourhood in which the burhs were reared. Between 911 and 921, no less than twenty-five burhs were raised, and in no case did the Danes succeed in capturing one of these fortresses.

It is at this time that Northampton makes its first appearance in documentary history. In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under date 912,\(^1\) appears the following account of a raid by the Danes from Northampton and Leicester:

"In this year the army [i.e. the Danes] rode out after Easter from [North]Hamtūn and from Leicester, and broke the peace and slew many men at Hocneratūn [Hockertun, or

\(^1\) For reasons for adopting this date in preference to 914 or 917, as given by the various versions of the Chronicle, see Brit. Numis. Journ., vol. xix, p. 73."
Hook Norton? and thereabouts. And then, very soon after that, when the one came home, then they raised another troop, which rode out against Lygztún [Leighton]; and then were the country people aware of them, and fought against them and put them to full flight, and rescued all that they had taken, and also a great portion of their horses and their weapons.”

In the following year, 913, King Eadward was in the neighbourhood of Northampton, as is shown by the following passage in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle:

“. . . And then . . . in the same year, before Martinmas [Nov. 11th], king Eadweard went with his force to Buckingham, and then sat there four weeks, and wrought both the burghs on each side of the river, before he went thence. And Thurkytel jarl sought him for his lord, and all the holds, and almost all the chief men belonging to Bedford, and also many belonging to [North]Hamtún.”

And in the following year, 914, the Chronicle records the following, which is, as Sir Charles Oman observes, a duplication of the 913 entry, and it also correctly states that the attack was upon Bedford and not upon Buckingham:

“ . . . In this year king Eadweard went with an army to Bedford, before Martinmas [Nov. 11th], and gained the burh; and almost all the townsmen who had previously dwelt there turned to him, and he remained four weeks, and commanded the burh on the south side of the river to be built, before he went hence.”

Two years later, in 916, King Eadward was again in the neighbourhood of Northampton, and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that:

“In this year, before Easter [April 1st], king Eadweard gave orders to proceed to Towcester, and build the burh . . . In the same summer betwixt Lammas [Aug. 1st] and Midsummer,

1 In this and in other extracts from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle I have followed Thorpe’s translation.
2 “Not Buckingham, as four Wessex versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle have it by a stupid slip of the pen. The mention of four weeks’ stay of Edward and the submission of Thurkitel proves that Bedford is meant, as does also the context, and the next annal, that of ’919’ (i.e. 914) where there is clearly duplication. Buckingham, of course, was always English and appears as one of Alfred’s burhs in the Burghal Hidage.” Oman, England before the Norman Conquest, p. 500.
The army broke the peace from [North-]Hamtún and from Leicester, and north from thence, and went to Towcester, and fought against the burh a whole day, and thought that they should take it by storm; but nevertheless, the people who were within defended it, until a greater force arrived; they then abandoned the burh, and went away. ... At the same time the army from Huntingdon and from the East Angles, went and wrought the work at Tempsford, and inhabited it, and built and forsook the other at Huntingdon; and thought that from thence they could, by warfare and hostility, again obtain more of the land. And they went until they arrived at Bedford; and then the men who were there within went out against them, and fought with them, and then put them to flight, and slew a good part of them. ... Then very soon after this, in the same autumn, king Eadweard with a force of West Saxons, went to Passenham, and sat there while they surrounded the burh at Towcester with a stone wall.

"And Thurferth jarl, and the holds, and all the army which belonged to [North-]Hamtún, north as far as the Welland, submitted to him, and sought him for their lord and protector. And when that army corps went home, then went another out, and reduced the burh at Huntingdon, and repaired and renovated it, where it was before in a state of ruin, by order of king Eadweard. And all the folk that were there of the peasantry submitted to king Eadweard and sought his peace and protection."

Thurferth, the Danish jarl of Northampton, who thus submitted to Eadweard in 916, stood loyally by his undertaking and caused no trouble afterwards. He appears to have been thoroughly trusted by Eadweard and by Æthelstan, and was allowed to hold his old position until his death, the town and district south of the Welland, of course, coming under English law and not, as previously, governed by Danish law. It is nearly certain that "Thurferth Dux" who signed charters down to 932 was the Northampton jarl.

With its surrender to Eadweard, Northampton became one of the most important burhs in the re-conquered area of central England; and shortly afterwards the institution of a mint followed as a matter of course. In this reign we find a considerable increase in the number of moneyers employed, but very few coins are inscribed with the name of the town from which they
emanated. We have no coins of this reign inscribed "Hamtun," but there can be little doubt that the coins issued by the moneyer Frithelbiht emanated from the Northampton mint. It is almost certain that the Northampton mint opened with at least two moneyers, but at present we have no means of identifying more than one. The Northampton coins of Eadweard that have come under my notice are as follows:

![Fig. 8]

**Obverse.**—Small cross patée. Around, inscription between two circles.

**Reverse.**—Moneyer’s name, etc., in two lines across field; crosses, pellets, etc., symmetrically arranged in field.

*Hawkins, type iv. British Museum Catalogue, type ii.*
*Ruding, Pl. 16, Fig. 28, and Pl. 17, Figs. 29-30.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EADVYREARD REX</td>
<td>FRIDEB</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RHT MO</td>
<td>[Pl. 1, Fig. 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EADVYREARD REX</td>
<td>FRIDE</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>[Fig. 8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BRHT MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EADVYREARD REX</td>
<td>FRIDE</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BRHT MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ See *Brit. Numis. Journ.*, vol. xix, p. 75
² From the same obverse die as No. 1.
The coins numbered 1 to 6, in the preceding list, came from a hoard of Anglo-Saxon and other coins which appear to have been found in Rome, and which it seems highly probable formed a portion at least of the proceeds of the annual tax called Peter's Pence. This hoard which, however, did not constitute the whole find, as other coins were sent to London from Rome and disposed of privately, was dispersed at Messrs. Glendining's Sale Rooms on May 16, 1929, and November 13, 1930. The coins thus dispersed consisted of 25 pennies of Archbishop Plegmund, A.D. 890–914; 16 of Ælfred the Great, A.D. 871–901; 439 of Eadward the Elder, A.D. 901–925; 32 of Æthelstan, A.D. 925–940; one of St. Eadmund, and 721 Continental deniers. A total of 513 English coins and 721 foreign. As no coins of Eadmund occurred in this hoard, it is evident that these 1,234 coins were collected and buried in the reign of Æthelstan. The find included 10 coins struck by the Northampton moneyer Frithesbeba, all of which came into my hands, and it seems highly probable that these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*EADVVEARD REX</td>
<td>FRIDEBA RHT MO*</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*EADVVEARD REX</td>
<td>FRIDEBA RHT MO*</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*EADVVEARD REX</td>
<td>FRIDEBA RHT MO*</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*EADVVEARD REX</td>
<td>FRIDEBA RHT MO*</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See note (1), p. 11 ante.
actual coins were paid as "Peter's Pence" in Northampton a thousand years ago.

Peter's Pence, Rome Scot or Rom-feoh, was a tax or tribute of a penny on every hearth, paid annually to the popes. The date of its origin is doubtful, but Matthew Paris says the tax was instituted by Offa, king of Mercia (A.D. 757-796), for the upkeep of the English school and hostel at Rome. Layamon states that Ina, king of Wessex (A.D. 688-725), was the originator of the tax; the Laws of Ina, however do not refer to it. The first documentary evidence we have of it is in the Laws of Eadweard the Elder and Guthram, in which we find it enacted that "If any one withhold the Peter's Penny, he shall pay the Danish mulct if a Dane; the English fine if an Englishman."

In the Laws of Eadmund, it is ordered that "every Christian man by his Christianity shall pay his tithe, the church-money, and Peter's Penny. . . . And if any one will not do this let him be excommunicated." In the Laws of Eadgar, it is enacted that "every hearth-penny be given on St. Peter's mass; and if any one has not given it by that day he shall carry the same to Rome and 30 pennies more, and bring thence the proof that he has paid so much. And when he comes home he shall pay the king 120 shillings." The Laws of Æthelred (II), make provision identical with that of Eadgar. By the Laws of Canute, the basis of the tax is altered, for we find that "Every one who shall have 30 pennies-worth of live-stock of his own in his holding, by the English law shall give the St. Peter's Penny; by the Danish half-a-mark." If the tax is not paid by the feast of St. Peter ad Vincula (Aug. 1), "the complaint is to be brought unto the king's court, seeing that this penny is the king's charity; and the king's court shall order the payment of the penny and the fine to the king and bishop" (The Laws of Eadweard the Confessor).

At the Norman Conquest the tax appears to have fallen into arrears for a time, for the Conqueror promised the pope in 1076 that it should be regularly paid. In 1306 Clement V exacted a penny from each household. By a bull of Adrian IV (1154-1159), the tax was extended to Ireland. During the tenth century the

\footnote{Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes, p. 73, § 6. The party to this treaty with Eadweard was apparently a second Guthrum, who, according to John of Wallingford, was living in Eadweard's time (p. 539), and probably succeeded Eohric (Eric), the immediate successor of Guthrum I. Eohric was slain in A.D. 905. In the Appendix to Simeon of Durham, Historia Regum, Rolls Series, vol. ii, p.368, we find a record of a Guthram of East Anglia, who was converted from paganism and baptized in the reign of Æthelstan.}
tax of Peter's Pence was introduced into Poland, Prussia and Scandinavia, and Gregory VII (1073–1080), attempted to exact it from France and Spain. The tax was paid fairly regularly by the English until 1534, when it was abolished by Henry VIII.

Upwards of fifty years ago was discovered also in Rome a similar but smaller hoard of Anglo-Saxon coins of the same period, without doubt also of Peter's Pence, but collected and buried at a somewhat later date than that at which the previously described hoard was secreted. This hoard consisted of three pennies of Ælfred, A.D. 871–901; 2 17 of Eadweard the Elder, A.D. 901–925; 393 of Æthelstan, A.D. 925–940; 195 of Eadmund, A.D. 940–946; six of Anlaf king of Northumbria, A.D. 941–944 and 949–952; one of Sihtric king of Northumbria, A.D. 921(?)–926; four of Plegmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 890–914; ten uncertain, apparently Danish imitations of coins of Æthelstan, four Continental silver coins of the first half of the tenth century, and one gold solidus of the Byzantine emperor Theophilus, A.D. 829–842; a total of 834 coins.

This hoard contained 11 coins of the reign of Eadweard the Elder, struck by the Northampton moneyer Frithelbroht, four being apparently of variety No. 3 in the list of coins on page 15 and seven of either No. 1, 4, or 7; also two specimens of the reign of Æthelstan, by the same moneyer, Frithelbroht, and two of the reign of Eadmund, by the Northampton moneyer Oswald.

ÆTHELSTAN A.D. 925–940.

Upon the death of Eadweard the Elder in 925, his son Æthelstan succeeded to the throne. Born during the lifetime of his grandfather Ælfred, with whom Æthelstan appears to have been a special favourite, his early training appears to have been to a great extent undertaken by Ælhelphæld, the lady of the Mercians and her husband Æthelred. It appears probable that Æthelstan took part in the series of campaigns by which Eadweard and Ælhelphæld extended the power of the West-Saxon dynasty over the whole of northern England. Upon the death of Eadweard, Æthelstan, who was then aged thirty, was at once chosen to succeed him. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, under annal 925, states that "In this year Eadweard died in Mercia at

1 See note (i) p. 11 ante. 2 Numismatic Chronicle, 1884, p. 225.
3 See No. 1 in the list of coins of Æthelstan, on p. 21 post.
4 See Nos. 4–7 in the list of coins of Eadmund, on p. 31 post.
Farndon... and Æthelstan was chosen king by the Mercians' from which it appears that the Mercians still retained their separate national gemot. The West-Saxon election evidently came later, and it was probably after his West-Saxon election that he was crowned at Kingston-on-Thames. He appears to have been statesmanlike and a worthy successor of Ælfred and Eadweard. He definitely pursued an imperial policy by which he aimed to unite all England and Scotland under the over-lordship of a single West-Saxon king. A coalition of the minor kings to resist this policy was crushed by Æthelstan, who in 926 compelled all the under-kings to acknowledge his supremacy and thus he became the first king of all England.

In 934 Constantine, king of the Scots, rebelled and Æthelstan invaded Scotland. In 937 came Æthelstan's final grand campaign and the victory of Brunnenburh, which was described by Henry of Huntingdon as "the greatest of battles," and which has been so ably dealt with by Mr. W. J. Andrew. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle gives very meagre notices of events in this reign, but the song of triumph describing Æthelstan's great victory at Brunnenburh is one of the most striking examples of Anglo-Saxon poetry extant. Three years after his great victory Æthelstan died at Gloucester on October 27, 940, and was buried at Malmesbury.

It is of this reign that we have the earliest recorded ordinance concerning the coinage. At a grand synod held at Greatley near Andover, about the year 928, at which were present Wulfhelm, archbishop of Canterbury, together with all the noble and wise men whom the king had assembled, it was enacted, inter alia,

"There be one [kind of] money over all the king's dominion and that no man mint except within port [i.e. within the walls of a fortified town—large or small]."

It was further ordained that Canterbury should have seven moneyers—four for the king, two for the [arch]bishop, and one for the abbot; Rochester, three—two for the king, and one for

1 There were four places named Farndon, all being in Mercia. (1) Farndon in Cheshire, eight miles S. of Chester, (2) Farndon in Nottinghamshire, two miles S.W. of Newark, and two in Northamptonshire, viz. East Farndon, two miles S.W. of Market Harborough, and West Farndon, eight miles S.W. of Daventry. It is doubtful which place is referred to in the Chronicle.

the bishop; London, eight; Winchester, six; Lewes, two; Ham­
tune, two; Wareham, two; Exeter, two; Shaftesbury, two;
Dorchester, Hastings and Chichester, one each, and "in the
other burhs one moneyer." This ordinance, as I have previously
explained,¹ means that the type of coin was to be the same
throughout the whole realm; in addition to the places enumer­
ated, all burhs or fortresses should have the privilege of a mint
with one moneyer, and no money should be coined except within
the gate or walls of a fortified town or burh. This was first
explained by Ruding,² but appears to have been generally over­
looked until Major Carlyon-Britton elaborated it in the British
Numismatic Journal.³ It appears to be generally assumed by
numismatists that the foregoing ordinance relates to England as
a whole, or at least to that portion over which Æthelstan held
control, but it seems fairly obvious that it relates only to Wessex;
and there can be little doubt that about the same time were also
enacted similar laws relating to Mercia, in which the Mercian
mints would be similarly enumerated. If these Mercian laws
could be recovered I have no doubt we should find not less than
three moneyers allocated to the Northampton mint. The original
three moneyers appear to have been Baldric, Hildulf and Frithebriht.

The coins of the reign of Æthelstan which can be definitely
allocated to Northampton are of considerable rarity and only the
following four varieties have come under my notice:—

**Obverse**—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between
two circles.

**Reverse**—Moneyer’s name, etc. in two lines across field;
crosses, pellets, etc. symmetrically arranged in field.

_Hawkins, type 5, British Museum Catalogue, type i._
_Ruding, Pl. 17, Figs. 13-16._

² _Annals of the Coinage, 1840, vol. i, p. 127._
³ _Vol. vi, pp. 13–16._
The Northampton and Southampton Mints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*ÆDELSTAN REX</td>
<td>FRIDE</td>
<td>Rome find, 1884&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BRIHT MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HF MEO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ÆDELSTAN REX</td>
<td>HLAVD</td>
<td>Found in Ireland&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LF MEO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obverse.—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.
Reverse.—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between circles.

Hawkins, type 7, British Museum Catalogue, type v.
Ruding, Pl. 18, Figs. 21-24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*ÆDELSTAN·REX·TOT BRIT</td>
<td>FRIDEBRIHT·MO·AMTVN VRB</td>
<td>W. C. Wells [Pl. 1, Fig. 2&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obverse.—Bust to right, helmeted and crowned. Around, inscription between two circles, divided by bust.
Reverse.—Cross crosslet. Around, inscription between two circles.

Hawkins, type i. British Museum Catalogue, type xiii.
Ruding, Pl. 17, Figs. 1-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*ÆDELSTAN·REX</td>
<td>BALDRIC·NOMT</td>
<td>Brit. Mus. [Pl. 1, Fig. 3&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<sup>1</sup> Numismatic Chronicle, 1884, p. 238. See also p. 18 ante.
<sup>2</sup> "A Hoard of Anglo-Saxon Coins found in Ireland," Numismatic Chronicle, 1863, p. 49.
<sup>3</sup> Ex. Cuff, Allea, and Carlyon-Britton collections. Ruding, Pl. D, Fig. 30.
<sup>4</sup> British Museum Catalogue, A.-S. Coins, vol. ii, pl. x, fig. 13.
The Northampton and Southampton Mints

Of the coins described in the foregoing list, two specimens of No. 1 were found in the Rome hoard discovered in 1884, and described in the Numismatic Chronicle in that year.\(^1\) Nos. 3 and 4 appear to be unique. I have previously shown why coins by the moneyers Frithibriht and Baldric struck in this and in other reigns must be allocated to Northampton and not to Southampton.\(^2\) The coin described as No. 3 is of a type of which we have a considerable series, upon which the king is almost invariably styled "Æthelstan Rex Tot[ius] Brit[anniæ]," and which are generally inscribed with the name of the mint from which the coin emanated. This type with the title of "King of all Britain," was probably first issued immediately after 926 when as I have previously stated, Æthelstan compelled the underkings to acknowledge his supremacy and thus he became king of all the English. This type would therefore be in issue in 928, at the time of the passing of the Edict of Greatley, which granted coining privileges to many additional burhs. The reason for placing the moneyer's name upon the coins was to enable Exchequer officials to correctly allocate the blame for possible fraud on the part of the moneyer. Prior to the reign of Eadward the Elder local mints were few in number, and in most cases it was not considered necessary to indicate upon the coin the name of the mint from which it emanated, but as a result of Eadward's conquests over the Danes, the seizure of many of their towns and the institution of new mints, followed in the succeeding reign by the grant of coining privileges to all burhs, large or small, so greatly increased the number of mints that it became also necessary to record upon the coin the name of the mint from which it was issued.

The name Hildulf (Hildewulf) is of extremely rare occurrence in England, so rare that although the Index Saxonicus, an index to all the names of persons mentioned in the Saxon charters, etc., transcribed in Birch's Cartularium Saxonicum, contains upwards of 5,600 names, that of Hildulf does not occur there. Indeed, apart from the moneyer mentioned above and one, or perhaps two others, previously mentioned,\(^3\) the only other occurrence of the name Hildulf that I can discover is that of St. Hildulf, founder of the monastery of Moyen Moutier (Medianum), in the Vosges, and reputed Archbishop of Treves, in the latter

---

\(^1\) See also p. 18 ante.


part of the seventh century or the first half of the eighth century A.D., and six examples, "Hildulf" (2) and "Hildolf" (4), given by Dr. Paulus Piper in *Libri Confraternitatum S. Galli Augiensis Fabariensis*, 1884.

In the hoard of Anglo-Saxon and other coins, found in Co. Louth, Irish Free State, in 1929, was what appeared to be a Danish imitation of a penny of Æthelstan, *British Museum Catalogue*, type v. It had evidently been struck from two reverse dies, one side of the coin reading *NILDVLF MOE Z* and the other side *NILDVLF MOE S*. This coin is a very interesting piece, for it shows that Hildulf also struck coins in the reign of Æthelstan, of *British Museum Catalogue*, type v. Moreover, it shows that the prototype from which this coin was copied was inscribed with the Mercian symbol *S* or *Z* which, together with the penny of Eadwig inscribed *HILDVLF MO HAN* proves that Hildulf was coining at the Mercian Hamtun, and not at the southern town.

Prior to the reign of Æthelstan our coins, with few exceptions, are inscribed only with the name of the moneyer with or without the addition of *MONETA, MCONE, MOE, MO, etc.* Commencing with the reign of Æthelstan and continuing through the reigns of Eadmund, Eadred, Eadwig, and Eadgar, we have a series of coins which exhibit the moneyer's name in the possessive case. Some are in the Latin possessive and others in the Anglo-Saxon possessive. They also are followed by the word *MONETA* in full or in a contracted form or, more commonly, by the word *MOT*, which also is generally accepted as a contraction of *Moneta*, thus *MO[NE]T[A]*. It is generally accepted that *Moneta*, and its contractions, upon the coins, stands for *Monetarius*. Those coins, however, which exhibit the moneyer's name in the possessive or genitive case have presented a difficult problem. Assuming *Moneta*, etc., to be contracted forms of *Monetarius*, the meaning of the reverse inscription would be "So-and-so's moneyer"; for instance, the coin of Eadwig with reverse reading *BOIGIÆS MOT*, struck at Northampton or possibly at Bedford, would mean that the coin was struck by Boiga's, or Boia's moneyer, which is absurd, for it was, of course, struck by the King's moneyer—Boiga.

In a paper read before the British Numismatic Society, on

---

1 See also *Brit. Numis. Journ.*, vol. xix, p. 77.
2 See *Ibid.*, p. 82; No. 9 in the list of Eadwig's coins on p. 43 *post* and Pl. I, Fig. 16.
3 See No. 5 in the list of Eadwig's coins on p. 42 *post*, and Pl. I, Fig. 15.
January 23, 1929, Mr. A. Anscombe challenged the accuracy of the generally accepted ideas with regard to the meaning of "Moneta," "Mot," etc. He maintained that Moneta and Mot were synonymous in England in the tenth century. He advanced the theory that the stereotyped form "Moneta" with its contractions, which usually followed the moneyer's name upon our successive coinages from about A.D. 800 to 1000, was not the contraction of his title Monetarius, as is generally accepted, but complete in itself as the ablative Monetā = mint, the preposition de being purposely omitted to save space. He explained that Moneta in Latin had three meanings, viz., the officina in which coin was struck—the mint; coin itself; and also the moneyer's die. He pointed out that mot, locative môte, was one of the commonest of Anglo-Saxon official words and could be properly applied to any moot or meeting from witenagemōt, the Anglo-Saxon Parliament, right down to Mæggemōt, "a family gathering" and claimed that the word môt really means, in connection with the moneyer, the money-smithy whereat the moneyer and his artificers met together and carried out their duties. In other words môt means the mint and is thus synonymous with Monetā.

Mr. Anscombe adduced three pairs of Latin and Anglo-Saxon phrases which occur on coins of Eadgar and which he submitted were exactly synonymous in meaning, viz.:

DVRANDI MONETA = DVRANDES MOT
FASTOLFI MONETA = FASTOLFES MOT.
HEROLFI MONETA = HEROLFES MOT.

He pointed out that "the officina which was called moneta on one group of coins was styled mot on the other. . . . It is certain that the customary suggestion that Durandi Moneta, and the like, mean 'the money of Durand the Monetarius' is absurd. It is not possible even to apply it in the numerous cases which present môt after an Anglo-Saxon personal name in the possessive. No king could have consented to such a phrasing or implication.

Mr. Anscombe also cited two coins of Coenwulf with the reverse inscriptions—"Seberhti Moneta" and "Werheardi Moneta," and added "if moneta is short for monetarius, as it follows a possessive they can only mean 'Seberht's Monetarius' and 'Werheard's Monetarius,' which is an impossible meaning. To avoid this some numismatists expand moneta to Monetarii and claim to add 'money' or 'coin' at will. Hence 'Seberhti
Moneta’ is asserted to mean ‘the money of Seberht the minter.’” He quoted from Maurice Prou’s Les Monnaies Merovingiennes, the Merovingian coin inscriptions “‘Abboni Munet’; ‘Tuedomaris Moneta,’” etc., and pointed out that the late Latin word for mint was officina and the meaning of moneta in French is officine, a “workshop.” Hence the meanings of “Serberht Moneta” and “Werheardi Moneta” are “from Seberht’s mint” and “from Werheard’s mint.” In each case the Latin preposition de was understood. Hence, if we can acknowledge that the preposition de was intentionally omitted by the Anglo-Saxon moneyer we can recognize that moneta is in the ablative case used just like de officina in Francia in Merovingian times.

Mr. Anscombe recognized that it would, of course, be objected that the mint was the king’s and not the moneyer’s. But he submitted that there is really less difficulty in accepting “Fastolf’s mint” than there is in accepting the customary rendering “Fastolf’s money.” He asserted that it would be absurd to suppose that every one of the mints in Anglo-Saxon times could be spoken of as “the king’s”; and that it is equally absurd to suppose that the moneyer was permitted to call the coins his own money.

In the British Museum Catalogue of English Coins, Anglo-Saxon series, vol. 2, Grueber and Keary remark (Intro. pp. cv-cvi): “We must note that, though the earlier English coins contain a certain number of different contractions such as MON., MONET., etc., almost from the very beginning of the coinage the form MONETA became the usual one after the name of the moneyer. Later on it becomes, till the appearance of the mint-names, almost the stereotyped form. In some cases, notably for example, in the case of the type introduced by Æthelwulf and continued by his successors and on the contemporary coinage of Mercia, it is obvious that this word ‘moneta’ is no necessary contraction, the exact number of the letters in the inscription being arranged beforehand. The question therefore arises whether at this time ‘moneta’ could really, in the eyes of the coin-engravers, have stood for ‘monetarius.’ If it did so why should they have voluntarily assisted at this unnatural abbreviation? [p. cvi.] It is quite possible that the form ‘moneta’ at first was a contraction, but that afterwards it became a substantive word. In the latter case it could only have signified ‘money,’ ‘coin.’ And in that use of the word a legend such as TORHTVLF MONETA could only signify Torhtulf’s money.
And the supposition that they (the engravers) did so interpret the word 'moneta' receives confirmation by an observable tendency in the later coinage to put the name of the moneyers in the genitive."

The conclusion that Keary and Grueber arrived at is expressed as follows: "It seems impossible to explain the occurrence of possessive cases better than on the supposition that when they were engraved at all events 'moneta' had come to stand in popular repute for 'coin,' 'money' only."

Mr. Anscombe suggested that Messrs. Grueber and Keary's conclusion overlooks the philological fact that O.E. mynet, our "mint" has a third meaning, which was expressed in Anglo-Saxon times by "mynetsmithe"—money-smithy or mint. And also the historical ones that the Roman Mint was known as "Sacra Moneta Urbis," and that the use of Moneta became more and more frequent in the late Roman Empire. Consequently, he asserted, the word "moneta" in numismatic inscriptions should stand by itself for what it actually is, viz., the mint.

On March 27, 1929, was read before the British Numismatic Society, a communication from Mr. W. J. Andrew, in which he criticized Mr. Anscombe's paper. Mr. Andrew's communication may be summarized as follows:—In every Anglo-Saxon charter, in Domesday, in the Pipe Rolls, and in every Norman charter, whenever a moneyer is mentioned as such his name is followed by the title monetarius, or its contractions; and de monetâ does not occur. There is no exception to this, and the same rule applied to all other titles, great or small. A Bishop is Episcopus, and a Jester is Jocarius, so why upon his own money should a moneyer abandon his title and describe himself as merely de monetâ? Again, if, as Mr. Anscombe suggests, the preposition de was "omitted to save space," why in the same coinages, with just the same space, do we find a very long, and a very short, moneyer's name followed alike by the word moneta in full and alone? To take an example from Ceolwulf's money; there was room for "Biornfreth moneta" in full, but according to the explanation offered, there was no room for de in "Dun moneta" under the self-same conditions.

It might be asked then, why was not moneta extended to monetarius in the latter instance, and in the many similar cases? The answer is that in early times Latin was usually contracted, and as moneta was the form that was adopted on our earliest standardized coinage, it remained the stereotyped form through-
out, for nothing was ever more conservative of custom than the Mint.

But there are many exceptions to this rule, and more than thirty in the printed Catalogue of the British Museum's Anglo-Saxon coins alone, in which the usual *moneta* is extended into such still-contracted forms as *monetair, monetra, monetar*, etc., which can postulate only *monetarius*. But if extended at all, the contention that *moneta* is complete in itself as meaning the mint must fail. He carried the argument on to Mr. Anscombe's own ground, and called his attention to certain issues from the York mint upon which the Anglo-Saxon language is used. Here we find such legends as "Athelferd Minetre," "Athelferd Minetr," and "Aur Monitre," which are conclusive evidence that the Anglo-Saxon *minetere* or *mynetere* = Moneyer, was the variant used in that language for the usual Latin *monetarius*.

As to the occasional appearance of the moneyer's name in the possessive, or genitive, case Mr. Andrew was less assertive. He had already answered Mr. Anscombe's theory that it meant the moneyer's mint, but he also doubted whether the usual explanation that it implied "the coin of So-and-so, the moneyer" was sound. It was, he thought, generally accepted that a moneyer's office was hereditary, and he inclined to the view that if a moneyer died leaving a minor as his heir, or his heirship in dispute, or if he himself became incapacitated, it was nevertheless in the interests of the State that the use of his die should be continued. He did not strike the subsequent money himself, so legally his name could not appear in the ordinary way upon it and as responsible for it. A custom would therefore very naturally arise to appoint someone to carry on the use of the die meanwhile as his representative. To-day we should call him the Administrator of the moneyer, but when the same difficulty in the ordinary cases of payment of fees, etc., arose in the *Pipe Rolls*, we read that the "heir," or the "man" of So-and-so deceased, rendered the accounts instead of being referred to by name. But an instance of this anonymous representation did, he thought, actually occur on the coinage. Late in the reign of Henry I, Algar, a moneyer of London, whose name occurs on its money, was convicted and mutilated for false coining, and this is followed by the appearance on London coins of Stephen's first type, of the form "Algar: Man" for the moneyer's name, who was, no doubt, the "man" or officer appointed by the Crown to administer Algar's escheated die. The possessive case therefore,
would in earlier times indicate that the money was struck by the representative of the moneyer whose name it bore.

**EADMUND A.D. 940-946.**

Æthelstan leaving no issue, the Crown passed to his half-brother Eadmund who, although he had borne a creditable part at Brunnenburh, was only eighteen years of age at the time of his accession. Taking advantage of the new king’s youth the Danes of Northumbria immediately revolted and chose Anlaf Guthfrithson, King of Dublin, as their king. They burst into Mercia hoping to involve the Danes of the “Five Burhs.” They appear to have been successful for the Danish army got so far as Northampton, which they attacked, probably hoping that on account of a large proportion of the inhabitants being of Danish blood the town would surrender to them and join the insurrection. Northampton, however, remained loyal and beat off the invaders, who then proceeded along the Watling Street to Tamworth, which they attacked. Here they were more successful: the burh was taken with great slaughter of the inhabitants.

Anlaf returned to Leicester, upon which place Eadmund and his army marched, hoping to capture Anlaf but, as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells us, he escaped during the night. Eventually, through the mediation of Archbishop Odo, himself by descent a Dane, a peace between the two armies was arranged and Eadmund agreed to a treaty by which considerable territory, including the “Five Burhs,” was left in the hands of Anlaf. Indeed, Simeon of Durham says that Watling Street formed the boundary between the English and Northumbrian kingdoms. But this is certainly a mistake, possibly a reminiscence of the terms of the Ælfred-Guthrum treaty, for Northampton and Northamptonshire never again came under Danish domination after the surrender of Northampton to Eadweard the Elder in 916 and the Danes’ retreat north of the Welland.

Anlaf appears to have died in 942, and shortly afterwards Eadmund with a great army attacked and re-conquered the “Five Burhs.” The Winchester version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells us in a song of triumph how Leicester, Lincoln,
Nottingham, Stamford and Derby were released by "the offspring of Eadweard, Eadmund the King."

Eadmund met his death in 946. He was celebrating the feast of St. Augustine of Canterbury (May 26th), at Pucklechurch in Gloucestershire, when a robber named Liofa whom he had banished six years before entered the hall and sat down beside one of the ealdormen, near the king himself. Eadmund bade his cup-bearer take the man away but Liofa resisted and attempted to kill him. Eadmund came to his cup-bearer's assistance and threw the robber to the ground; but Liofa stabbed the king and slew him.

The moneyers Baldric and Hildulf appear to have continued at the Northampton Mint throughout the reign of Eadmund, but I have no record of coins struck by Frithebriht during that reign. Nor have I any record of coins struck by Hildulf, but in the list of Eadmund's moneyers which appears in the British Museum Catalogue, I find the name Iedulf, which is apparently a blundered form of Hildulf. In this reign also three new moneyers commenced operations viz., Osterth, Oswald and Warin. These three were certainly working in a Mercian mint, as is shown by the peculiar Mercian symbol S or 2, which occurs upon coins struck by each of those moneyers in the reign of Eadred; and as they were, a short time later, undoubtedly working at the Mercian Hamtun, Northampton, it is a fair assumption that they were working there from the commencement of their activities. Although we have Northampton coins of this reign struck by five different moneyers, it does not follow that all were working simultaneously.

On a previous page I have suggested that Warin's coins emanated from Hamwic, but while that was in the press I acquired a penny of Eadred, by the moneyer Warin, which exhibits upon the obverse the S symbol, thus proving its Mercian origin; and the coin of Eadwig, also in my collection, reading WÆRIN MO HAM, shows that Warin was working at the Mercian Hamtun, Northampton, and not at the West-Saxon Hamwic.

1 Since this was written I find that Lot 92 at the Bruun sale included a coin of æthelstan, said to read WÆREN Q01.
3 Ibid. pp. 76–77.
appear to have been extensive, although the following varieties are recorded:

**Obverse:** Rude bust to right, helmeted and crowned. Around, inscription between two circles, divided by bust.

**Reverse:** Cross crosslet. Around, inscription between two circles.

*Ruding, Pl. XVIII, Fig. 1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*EADMV N *REX</td>
<td>*BALDRE NOIET</td>
<td>Brit. Mus. [Pl. I, Fig. 4]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 9](image)

**Obverse:** Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.

**Reverse:** Moneyer’s name, etc., in two lines across field, crosses, pellets, etc., symmetrically arranged in field.

*Ruding, Pl. XVIII–XIX, Figs. 4–15.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*EADMVN . D REX</td>
<td>OŚFRE₁</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* * * * D MÓN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

₁ ER transposed.
The Northampton and Southampton Mints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3   | [stärst] EADMVND RE[X] | **OSFE**
|     |         | **+++**
|     |         | [RD MO]  | Douglas Museum  |
|     |         | **+**    | (A cut halfpenny) |
| 4   | **EADMVND REX** | **OSPA**
|     |         | **+++**
|     |         | [RD MO]  | Brit. Mus. [Pl. I, Fig. 5] |
| 5   | **EADMVND RE**  | **OSPA**
|     |         | **+++**
|     |         | [RD MO]  | W. C. Wells |
| 6   | **EADMVND D REX**  | **OSPA**
|     |         | **+++**
|     |         | [LD HO]  | Brit. Mus. [Pl. I, Fig. 6] |
| 7   | **EADMVND RET**  | **OSPA**
|     |         | **+++**
| 8   | **EADMVND RET**  | **OSPA**
|     |         | **+++**
|     |         | [MOIE]   | Brit. Mus. (Fig. 9) |
| 9   | **EADMVND RE**  | **OSPA**
|     |         | **+++**
|     |         | [MOIE]   | W. C. Wells |

No. 3 in the foregoing list of coins of Eadmund is a cut half-penny, that is, literally, a half-penny. Prior to the introduction
of round halfpence that denomination was produced by cutting a}
perfect penny into halves, and later farthings (fourthings) were}
produced by cutting the penny into quarters. There is every}
reason to assume that these cut coins were severed officially by}
the moneyer and issued from the Mint as halfpence and farthings,}
although there can be little doubt that frequently pennies were}
severed unofficially and specimens are known which show}
evidence of partial severance, apparently by the aid of a knife.
The genuine officially severed coins invariably show a clean-cut}
peculiar slanting edge. It has been suggested that the moneyers}
used shears for the purpose of severing these coins, but the}
character of the edge proves conclusively that the cut coins were}
produced by the aid of a sharp chisel, similar in character to a}
modern carpenter’s chisel. Uncirculated cut coins show that the}
chisel did not completely sever the coin but left a thin film of}
metal at the lower edge which was afterwards broken. This}
could not have been the case if shears were used, for the opposing}
blades of the shears would cut equally from opposite sides of the}
coin and would meet in the centre. The present writer has}
proved this by experimenting upon small pieces of silver of}
similar thickness to an early penny.

The penny was first introduced by Offa, King of Mercia,}
A.D. 757–796. From that time onward the cross was in one form}
or another an almost integral feature of the reverse design, and}
its arms formed the lines of guidance for the severance of the}
coins. Indeed, on many of the types the cross was especially}
voided for that purpose. The specimens in our cabinets show}
that the custom of severing the penny into halves and quarters}
was continued right through Saxon, Norman and Plantagenet}
times down to the years 1279–1280, when Edward I issued round}
halfpence and farthings, but we do not know positively when it}
commenced.

The earliest documentary reference to the use of the halfpenny}
that has come under my notice is in the Judicia Civitatis}
Lundonie of Æthelstan, where we find it ordained:—“respecting}
our ‘ theowmen ’ whom men might have . . . and that every man}
who had a man, should contribute either a penny or a halfpenny}
(swa þæm swa healfne), according to the number of the fellow-
ship.” 1 Existing specimens carry us back to the commencement}
of the ninth century, and it seems probable that the introduction}
of the cut halfpenny was contemporaneous with that of the

1 Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes, p. 99.
penny. In the collection of Major Carlyon-Britton was a very interesting penny of Ecgberht, King of Wessex, A.D. 802-838, which had clearly been intended to be severed into two half-pennies, but the moneyer’s chisel had cut short and left almost an eighth of an inch of metal untouched upon the outer edge. This was probably one of a number of pennies being reduced to half-pennies by the moneyer at the same time, and he must have omitted to notice that his chisel had cut short. The line of severance exactly bisects the coin and it is a clear-cut incision showing the peculiar slanting edge described above.

![Fig. 10. Cut Halfpenny of Ælfred (Carlyon-Britton).](image1)

![Fig. 11. Round Halfpenny of Ælfred (Carlyon-Britton).](image2)

Our cabinets contain very few cut half-pence prior to the reign of Ælfred, who was the first king to introduce a round half-penny, and Mr. Andrew has suggested that the issue of the round half-penny was specially intended for its division into farthings. That it was not intended to supersede and replace the cut halfpenny is clear, because cut halfpennies continued in use and even appear as severed halves of pennies of the same types as the round halfpennies. A cut quarter of a penny was a very tiny token of currency, and it was probably thought, when first its demand arose, to be too small for service, and so the round halfpenny was invented which, being thinner than the penny, gave larger sections when severed into farthings, and also sections conforming in shape and design with the recognized cut money. No specimen of farthing of this reign is known to-day, either as a half-halfpenny, or a quarter-penny. A farthing cut from a round halfpenny, together with its fellow, the complete round halfpenny, both of the reign of Eadred, each being the only specimen of its kind known of that reign, and the former being presumably the earliest known farthing of any reign, were formerly in the collection of Major Carlyon-Britton.

Cut halfpence of Eadweard the Elder and of Æthelstan, do not appear to be recorded, but from that time onward to the reign of Edward I, cut halfpennies of each reign are known to collectors. Cut halfpennies issued from the Northampton Mint in several reigns, from Æthelred II to Henry III, are in the present writer’s collection.

Cut farthings—quarter-pennies—of the reign of Eadweard the Confessor are not uncommon and similar specimens of the reign of Canute are known; they are of considerable rarity in the Norman period but are fairly common of the reigns of John and Henry III. The present writer has several cut farthings of the latter reigns issued from the Northampton Mint.

In the eighth and ninth centuries a third denomination of cut coin appears to have been in circulation, viz., a one-third penny, and of certain reigns we find pennies which were evidently designed for the purpose of facilitating the severance of the coin into three equal portions. Of the reign of Coenwulf, King of Mercia, A.D., 796-822; of Cuthred, King of Kent, A.D. 798-806 or 807, and of Æthelheard, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D., 793-805, we have coins which exhibit a tribrach upon either the obverse or the reverse; and certain coins of Ælfred, of British Museum Catalogue, types xiv–xv, have the obverse legend arranged in three sections—\( \text{Æ} \text{E} \text{L} \text{F} \text{R} \text{E} \) thus facilitating the
severance of the coin into three equal portions. Other coins, issued in Northumbria by Sithric Gale, A.D. 921-926 or 927; Regnald, A.D. 943-944, and Anlaf, A.D. 941-944 and 949-952, exhibit upon the obverse an ornamental trefoil, sometimes described as three bucklers, which would afford equal facilities for dividing the coin into three parts.

FIG. 14. TWO-THIRDS PENNY OF ÆLFRED. (W. C. Wells).

I know of no existing specimen of cut one-third-penny, but in my collection is a coin of Ælfred, from the Cuerdale hoard, of British Museum Catalogue, type xiv, which was obviously marked off for the purpose of severance into three equal portions, but from which only one section has been cut, leaving the other two-thirds intact; the incised line marking off the other two sections being plainly visible. This piece, coming from the Cuerdale hoard, had evidently been in circulation and thus constitutes yet a fourth denomination of cut coin, viz., a two-thirds-penny. Until recent years little importance has been attached to cut coins. In many hoards considerable numbers of cut coins have been disclosed, but in most cases they have been cast aside as worthless; thus it seems probable that many specimens of cut one-third-pennies and even two-thirds of pennies have found their way to the melting pot, hence their extreme rarity!

That the one-third-penny was a recognized token of commerce is shown by the Laws of Ælfred, where we find that:—"If a man strike out another's eye, let him pay him 60 shillings, and six shillings and six pennies and a third of a penny (thriddan dæl pæningas), as bót." Again, in the same laws:—"If a man strike out another's eye or his hand or his foot off, there goeth like bót to all; six pennies and six shillings and 60 shillings and a third of a penny."

EADRED A.D. 946-955.

Upon the death of Eadmund, in 946, Eadred, youngest son

1 Bót, "compensation."
2 Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes, pp. 41, 43-44.
of Eadweard the Elder was chosen to succeed his brother; Eadmund’s two sons being too young to succeed their father. Eadred was crowned by Archbishop Oda at Kingston-on-Thames on August 16, 946. He must have been young when he came to the throne for Eadmund, his elder brother, was only 24 at the time of his death. During his whole reign Eadred appears to have been afflicted with a grievous illness and the government appears to have been carried on for the most part by his mother, Eadgifu, and his minister the abbot Dunstan. During this reign no laws appear to have been passed relating to the coinage. In 947 Eadred received the submission of Wulfstan, archbishop of York, and the Northumbrian “Witan,” but they soon revolted from him, and accepted Eric, a northman, as their king. The Northumbrians, however, soon grew tired of Eric, forsook him, and in 949 again submitted to Eadred.

Then, we are told in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Anlaf came to Northumbria, and he appears to have ruled as under-king to Eadred. The Northumbrians, however, again plotted revolt in 952, and Archbishop Wulfstan was caught and imprisoned at Jedburgh. The Northumbrian plot was carried out and Eric Bloodaxe, son of Harold Fairhair, of Norway, landed and was chosen king and reigned until 954. During this time he was at war with Eadred, and at last he was driven from the throne and slain by Anlaf. Eadred then released Wulfstan and gave him the see of Dorchester, fearing to allow him to return to York. The people returned to their allegiance to Eadred and he committed the government of Northumbria to Osulf as an earldom.

This step was the beginning of a new policy, which was afterwards carried out with considerable success by Eadgar and Dunstan: the Danes were allowed to keep their own customs and live under their own earls, and thus being freed from interference became peaceable and good subjects of the West-Saxon king. Eadred died at Frome, Somerset, on November 23, 955, and was buried by Dunstan in the old minster at Winchester. He was succeeded by his nephew Eadwig.

Extremely few coins of Eadred bear the name of the mint from which they emanated. No coins struck at Northampton during this reign are inscribed with the mint-name and, as in the reign of Eadmund, it is only by comparing the moneyers’ names with those upon the coins of Eadwig and of Eadgar which exhibit also the contracted mint-name HAM, etc., that we are in a position to identify the coins issued from the Northampton mint.
If we may draw conclusions from the coins which have survived, the output from the Northampton mint during this reign appears to have been more prolific than in previous reigns. Baldric, Hildulf, Osferth, Oswald and Warin continued their activities, and the name of a new moneyer, Thurferth, makes its appearance upon a Northampton coin. In the sale catalogue of the Ready collection is described a penny of Eadred struck by the moneyer Frithebriht. I overlooked this coin at the time of the sale, and later, when the catalogue description came under my notice I was unable to trace the coin which, if correctly described, was also an emission of the Northampton mint. The following issues of the Northampton mint during the reign of Eadred have come under my notice:

![Figures 15 and 16 showing coins](image)

**Obverse.**—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.

**Reverse.**—Moneyer's name, etc., in two lines across field; crosses, pellets, etc., symmetrically arranged in field.

*Hawkins, 196. British Museum Catalogue, type 1.*
*Ruding, Pl. 19-20, Figs. 5, 8-10, 12, 14-15, 17-23.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EADRED RE</em></td>
<td>BALDR</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* * * * * IC MOE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Lot 97.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>EADRED RE</em></td>
<td>BALDR</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IC MOE</td>
<td>[Pl. I, Fig. 7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety. In field, 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>EADRED REX</em></td>
<td>BALD</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RIC MO</td>
<td>[Pl. I, Fig. 8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>EADRED REX</em></td>
<td>HILDY</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANGLOR—</td>
<td>LF MON</td>
<td>[Fig. 15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>EADRED REX</em></td>
<td>OSFE</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RD MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>EADRED RE</em></td>
<td>OSFE</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RD MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>EADRED RE</em></td>
<td>OSFE</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RD MO</td>
<td>[Fig. 16]¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety. In field, 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>EADRED REX</em></td>
<td>OSFA</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LD MO</td>
<td>[Pl. I, Fig. 10]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Also Ruding, Pl. XX, Fig. 22.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>*EADRED REX</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>Brit. Mus. [Pl. I, Fig. 9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety. In field, S.</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*EADRED REX</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>*EADRED REX</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>W. C. Wells [Pl. I, Fig. 11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*EADRED REX</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>W. C. Wells [Pl. I, Fig. 12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>*EADDED IE</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>W. C. Wells [Pl. I, Fig. 13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>*EADRED REX</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety. In field, S.</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>*EADRED REX</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>*EADRED REX</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The name on the reverse of No. 13 in the foregoing list is obviously a blundered form of "Thurferth." The die from which the coin was struck may have been the work of an incompetent die-sinker, or it may be a Danish imitation of a coin struck by Thurferth.¹


As Eadred had no issue the succession at his death fell in the natural way to Eadwig, eldest son of Eadmund and Ælfgifu, who could have been scarcely more than fifteen years old when he succeeded to the throne in 955. He was crowned at Kingston-on-Thames in January 956. At the instigation of Æthelgifu, who was, it has been suggested, his foster-mother, he drove Dunstan into exile, and in 956 or 957 he married Ælfgifu, the daughter of Æthelgifu.

The government of the country had passed into the hands of the nobles of Wessex, and the Mercians and Northumbrians complained that they had been unjustly treated by the West-Saxons. In 957 they made an insurrection; Archbishop Oda, who disapproved of Eadwig's marriage with Ælfgifu, and Eadgar, the king's younger brother, withdrew from the court and joined the insurgents. Eadgar was chosen king by the Mercians and Northumbrians. Eadwig appears to have advanced to meet the insurgents, and to have retreated before them at Gloucester.

A meeting of the Witan was held, at which it was agreed to divide the kingdom between the brothers, Eadgar to govern on the north of the Thames and Eadwig on the south. In 958 Oda separated Eadwig and Ælfgifu "because they were too near akin" and the archbishop returned to Eadwig's court. The West-Saxon nobles, and especially the members of the royal house, remained faithful to him. Eadwig died on October 1, 959, and was buried at Winchester. He left no children, and was succeeded by his younger brother Eadgar, who was already king of Mercia and Northumbria.

During this reign the moneyers Baldric, Hildulf, Oswald, Thurferth and Warin continued operations at Northampton mint,

¹ See also Brit. Numis. journ., vol. xix, pp. 79-81.
and the names of five new moneyers, viz., Boia or Boiga, Bruninc, Dudman, Huzebald and Wineman or Wihteman, also make their appearance upon Northampton coins. The appointment of Boia, Huzebald and Wineman, or Wihteman, however, appears to have been quite temporary, for their names do not again occur upon coins of the Northampton mint. Indeed, the name Huzebald does not again occur upon coins of any mint, and Wineman, or Wihteman, does not again occur until about seventy years later, in the reign of Canute, when Wineman struck coins at Thetford, and again, in the reign of Eadward the Confessor when the name Wineman occurs upon coins of Salisbury mint.

Boia or Boiga, prior to the reign of Eadwig, appears to have been working at Chester and at Derby, but in the reign of Eadwig he appears to have been working temporarily at Northampton after which he was transferred to the neighbouring mint of Bedford. In the reign of Eadgar, Boia was again working at Chester and at Derby, and it is possible that it was he also who was striking at Stamford late in the same reign.

The following coins, all of which were presumably issued between 955 and 957, have come under my notice:

![Fig. 17.](image1)
![Fig. 18.](image2)

**Obverse.**—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.

**Reverse.**—Moneyer’s name, etc., in two or three lines across field; crosses, pellets, etc., symmetrically arranged in field.

**Hawkins, type 2-3. British Museum Catalogue, types i-ii. Ruding, Pl. 20, Figs. 2-8.**

1 See also *Brit. Numis. Journ.*, vol. xix, pp. 77-78, 81-82, 84-88 and 91.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✳ EADVIG REX</td>
<td>BALD</td>
<td>J. S. Henderson¹ [Fig. 17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✳ H<em>A H</em></td>
<td>RIC MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✳ EADVIG REX</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✳ H<em>A H</em></td>
<td>RIC HO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✳ EADVIG REX</td>
<td>BOI*</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✳ H<em>A M</em></td>
<td>A MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✳ EADVIG REX</td>
<td>BOI*</td>
<td>W. C. Wells     [Pl. I, Fig. 14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✳ H<em>A H</em></td>
<td>A MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✳ EADPIG REX</td>
<td>BOIGA</td>
<td>W. C. Wells     [Pl. I, Fig. 15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>ES MOT²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✳ EADVIG REX</td>
<td>BONGA*</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* * *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOIETA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Ex Montagu collection. Bequeathed by the late Mr. Henderson to the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

² For the meaning of mot, see pp. 23f. ante. The meaning of M in the field of the obverse still awaits explanation. The M occurs only upon coins issued from Mercian mints.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>EADVVI RE</em></td>
<td>BRIY</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>EADVVI RE</em></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>EADVVI RE</em></td>
<td>DVDE</td>
<td>Carlyon-Britton Coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>HA</em> <em>M</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HVNO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>EADVVI REX</em></td>
<td>HILDV</td>
<td>W. C. Wells [Pl. I, Fig. 16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N * VH * ²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LF MÔ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>EADVVI RE</em></td>
<td>HÄZE</td>
<td>Nat. Mus., Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA * M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BALD M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>EADVVI RE</em></td>
<td>DVRF</td>
<td>R. C. Lockett [Fig. 18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>HA</em> <em>M</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ERD MÔ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>EADVVI RE</em></td>
<td>VVÆR</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA * M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN MÔ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>*EADVVI REX</td>
<td>VVÆR</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN MÔ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ MA inverted. ² HAM inverted and retrograde.
No. | Obverse | Reverse | Provenance, etc.
---|---|---|---
14 | ✠EADWIG REX✠ | ✠PIHEM✠ | Douglas Museum
| ✠HÅ†H✠ | ✠YN MO✠ | W. C. Wells
| (♀ inverted) | | |

**Obverse.**—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.

**Reverse.**—Moneyer’s name in one line across field, divided by the stem of a conventional tree; below, T.

Hawkins, 198. British Museum Catalogue, type IV. Ruding, Pl. 20, Fig. 10.

My specimen of Eadwig, No. 14 in the foregoing list, although struck from official dies, is of a base white metal, apparently largely composed of tin, washed with silver. It is obviously an example of debasement of the coinage by an official moneyer. These base coins, which rarely turn up, are of considerable interest in illustrating the entries in the laws of our Anglo-Saxon and later kings relating to fraudulent moneyers and the punishment to be meted out to them when their fraud was detected. The moneyer who was responsible for this coin ran considerable risk in striking it and issuing it for currency.

In the Laws of Æthelstan we find it ordained that:—“If the moneyer be guilty [of striking base coin], let the hand be struck off with which he wrought that offence, and be set on the money-smithy: but if it be an accusation, and he is willing to clear himself; then let him go to the hot-iron, and clear the hand therewith which he is charged that fraud to have wrought. And if at the ordeal he should be guilty, let the like be done as is here before ordained.”1 And in the Laws of Æthelred II, it is ordained that:—“Every moneyer who is accused of striking

1 Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes, p. 88.
false money since it was forbidden shall go to the threefold ordeal; and if he be foul, let him be slain.""

The meaning of "the three-fold ordeal" is explained in the Laws of Æthelstan, where he says: — "We have ordained ... that the ordeal-iron be increased so that it weigh three pounds; and that the man himself who is accused should go thereto." And in the Laws of Eadgar we find it enacted that "the iron that is for the threefold ordeal [shall] weigh three pounds; and for the single, one pound."  

Trial by ordeal was in use among the Franks before A.D. 500 and was introduced into England by the Saxons. It is first mentioned in the Laws of Ina, King of Wessex, A.D. 686—127. It was formally abolished by Order in Council of Henry III, in the year 1218.

Ordeals, or God's judgments, are of great antiquity. The most ancient species of trial was that by ordeal which was peculiarly distinguished by the appellation of Judicium Dei, and sometimes Vulgaris Purgatio to distinguish it from canonical purgation, which was by oath of the person accused. The trial by ordeal in England was of two sorts, either fire ordeal or water ordeal. Ordeal by fire, such as was imposed upon alleged fraudulent moneyers, was performed by taking up in the hand a piece of red-hot iron, of one, two or three pounds weight; the accused was compelled to carry the red-hot iron usually for a distance of nine feet, and if he escaped being burned by it he was adjudged innocent; but if it happened otherwise, as without collusion or trickery it always did, he was condemned as "foul," or guilty.

In the Laws of Æthelstan, we find a description of the method employed at a trial by fire ordeal, which is as follows:—

"And concerning the ordeal we enjoin by command of God, and of the archbishop, and of all bishops: that no man come within the church after the fire is borne in with which the ordeal shall be heated, except the mass-priest and him who shall go thereto: and let there be measured nine feet from the stake to the mark by the man's feet who goes thereto. ... And when the ordeal is ready, then let two men go in of either side; and be they agreed that it is so hot as we have before said. And let go in of equal number of men of either side, and stand on both sides of the ordeal along the church; and let these all

---

1 Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes, p. 126.
2 Ibid., p. 95.
3 Ibid., p. 110.
be fasting, and abstinent from their wives that night; and let
the mass-priest sprinkle holy water over them all, and let each
of them taste of the holy water, and give them all the book
and image of Christ’s rood to kiss: and let no man mend the
fire any longer when the hallowing is begun; but let the iron
lie upon the hot embers till the last collect: after that let it be
laid upon the ‘stapela’; and let there be no other speaking
within, except that they earnestly pray to Almighty God that
he make what is soothest. And then let him go thereto; and
let his hand be enveloped, and be it postponed till after the
third day whether it be foul or clean within the envelope.”

About this time the falsification of the coinage appears to
have increased to an alarming extent and Eadmer, in the
Life of St. Dunstan, relates a curious and interesting story. It
appears that three moneyers who had been convicted of false
coining, had been condemned to the usual punishment for
that crime, viz., the loss of the right hand. The execution
of this sentence appears, however, to have been deferred
on account of the sacredness of the day—Pentecost. The
condemned men were brought under Dunstan’s notice and
he, having delivered a homily upon the enormity of the crime
of false coining in general and of their offence in particular,
insisted that the sentence upon the three moneyers should be
carried out immediately and refused to celebrate mass until their
right hands had been struck off. These men are described by
Eadmer as veri in potestate, which, according to Du Cange,
means that they were men subject to the power of their lord,
i.e., villeins. It seems difficult to believe that moneyers should
be of no higher status than that of villeins.

EADGAR KING OF MERCIA AND NORTHUMBRIA.

Eadgar, the youngest son of Eadmund and Ælfgifu, succeeded
his brother Eadwig in 956. After his brother’s accession he
resided at his court and was there in May 957, when the northern
insurrection broke out. He left the court and joined the Mercian
and Northumbrian insurgents, and before the close of the year
he was chosen king by them. Early in 958 at a meeting of the

1 Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes, p. 96.
COINS OF THE NORTHAMPTON MINT

Plate VIII
"Witan" it was decreed that Eadgar should rule over the country north of the Thames, thus leaving to Eadwig only that portion which lay to the south of the river. For this promotion Eadgar had probably to thank Æthelwold, Ealdorman of East Anglia, who had just succeeded his father, Æthelstan the "Half-King." He began to issue charters as king the same year, 958, in one of which\(^1\) he styles himself "King of the Angles and ruler of the rest of the people dwelling round," and in a charter of the next year "King of Mercia" with a like addition.\(^2\) In a charter granted about the same time he is styled "King of the Mercians, Northumbrians and Britons."

Eadgar was only fourteen years old at the time of his accession to the kingdom of Mercia and Northumbria, and one of the first acts of those who ruled in his name was to recall Dunstan, whom the Mercian "Witan" in a council held at Brentford immediately appointed to the vacant see of Worcester, and from that time Dunstan became his chief minister and adviser.

At the death of Eadwig, Eadgar, at the age of sixteen, already king of the Mercians and Northumbrians, succeeded to the kingdom of the West-Saxons, but for some unknown cause he was not crowned till the year 973. The seventeen years of Eadgar's reign was a period of unprecedented peace and prosperity and gained for him the title of Pacificus. Much of the prosperity of the reign should certainly be attributed to the wisdom and influence of Dunstan. English and Danes lived side by side in perfect amity, and there can be little doubt that Eadgar's praiseworthy attempts to conciliate the Danes cost him some popularity among his own subjects.

He forebore from interfering with the customs and internal affairs of the Danish district. He declares in his laws—"I will that secular rights stand among the Danes with as good laws as best they may choose. But with the English let that stand which I and my Witan have added to the dooms of my forefathers." This self-government was granted, Eadgar tells the Danes, as a reward "for the fidelity which ye have ever shown me."\(^3\)

After Eadgar's coronation ceremony at Bath, in May 973, the king with his fleet sailed round to Chester, and there eight princes met him and swore to be faithful to him and to be "his fellow workers by land and by sea." They were kings of the Scots, of Cumberland, and of the Isles, and five Welsh princes,
and it is said that they signified their vassalage by rowing Eadgar in a boat which he himself steered at the head of a great procession from his palace to the minster of St. John the Baptist and then returning in the same manner.¹

All contemporary writers save one speak of Eadgar in terms of unmixed praise; the one exception, the Peterborough Chronicler, while dwelling on his piety, his glory, and his might, laments his love of foreigners and of foreign fashions and evil ways. He was, however, a generous patron of Peterborough Abbey. He died on July 8, 975, and was buried at Glastonbury.

During this reign the moneyers Baldric, Bruninc, Hildulf, Osferth, Oswald, and Thurferth continued to strike coins at the Northampton mint, and a new moneyer, Dudeman or Dudemon, makes his appearance in the early part of the reign, when Eadgar was king of Mercia and Northumbria only. A coin in the Royal Cabinet at Stockholm shows that Baldric continued his work at Northampton until, apparently, the last year of the reign, when his name disappears from the Northampton coinage. Thurferth probably did not continue at the Northampton mint after Eadgar became king of all England. Dudeman, Hildulf and Osferth disappear before the institution of Eadgar's last type. Bruninc's name does not appear on coins of the last type of Eadgar's reign, nor upon those of Eadward the Martyr, but it reappears upon Northampton coins of the early issues of Æthelred II. Upon the Northampton coins of the last type of Eadgar's reign we find the names of three new moneyers, viz., Cylm or Culm, Eadnoth, and Leofsige, in addition to those of the old moneyers Baldric and Oswald.

When I previously referred to the coin by the moneyer Ginand, No. 16 in the following list of coins of Eadgar, I suggested that as there is no evidence to warrant its allocation to Northampton, it should be assigned, provisionally at least, to the Southampton mint,² but upon reconsideration, as there is an equal lack of evidence to warrant the allocation of the coin to the latter mint I have included it, provisionally, in the list of Northampton coins.

The various types of Eadgar's coins, as of those of earlier kings, cannot be satisfactorily arranged in chronological order. At least two types appear to have been in issue simultaneously. The type described last in the following list of coins was, how-

¹ Florence of Worcester.
ever, the last to be issued. This type appears to have been initiated only a short time before Eadgar’s death, in July 975, for it undoubtedly constituted the new coinage referred to under the year 975, by Matthew of Westminster, who says: “... after this he ordered a new coinage to be struck throughout England, because the old one was so impaired in value by the dishonesty of clippers, that a piece of gold scarcely weighed an obol in the scale.” The chronicler is, of course, in error in referring to “a piece of gold” for the silver penny was the only English coin then in circulation.

Nos. 1 and 2 in the following list of coins were undoubtedly issued early in Eadgar’s reign as king of Mercia, A.D. 957-959. This type appears to have been struck only at the Northampton mint. These coins are similar in type to that of Eadwig numbered 15 in the list of coins of that reign on page 44. The dies were probably in use at the Northampton mint when Eadgar became king of Mercia, and Oswald continued to make use of his old reverse die to which a new obverse die, bearing Eadgar’s name, was made. The coins struck by Dudeman, and by Thurferth, Nos. 10, 11, 12 and 13 in the list, were certainly struck during Eadgar’s short reign as king of Mercia. Nos. 14, 15 and 16, although of the same general type as the coins by Dudeman, and Thurferth, were undoubtedly struck after Eadgar’s accession to the throne of Wessex in 959, for we have similar coins struck at Exeter, Bath, Wallingford, Winchester, etc., which could only have been issued after that event.

Of the coins of Eadgar, struck at the Northampton mint, the following have been noted:

**Obverse.**—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.

**Reverse.**—Moneyer’s name in one line across field, divided by the stem of a conventional tree; below, 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>EADGAR RE</em></td>
<td>OZP ALD</td>
<td>Brit. Mus. [Pl. III, Fig. 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>EADGAR RE</em></td>
<td>OZP ALD</td>
<td>Carlyon-Britton Coll.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 *Obol,* halfpenny.
The Northampton and Southampton Mints

Obverse.—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.

Reverse.—Moneyer’s name in one line across field; above, a conventional rose bush; below, a rosette of pellets. Under the branches of the rose bush are what appear to be the characters $\alpha$—$\lambda$, the meaning of which is at present unexplained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*EADGAR REX</td>
<td>HILDVLF (Halfpenny)</td>
<td>Brit. Mus. [Pl. III, Fig. 3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obverse.—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.

Reverse.—Moneyer’s name, etc., in two lines across field; crosses, annulets, rosettes, pellets, etc., symmetrically arranged in field.

Hawkins, type 3. British Museum Catalogue, type i, var. e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>EADGAR R</em></td>
<td>DVRF</td>
<td>Brit. Mus. [Pl. I, Fig. 20]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obverse.—Rosette of pellets. Around, inscription between two circles.

Reverse.—Moneyer’s name, etc., in two lines across field; rosettes and crosses symmetrically arranged in field.

British Museum Catalogue, type i, var. g. Hildebrand, type A, var. c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*EADGAR RE</td>
<td>000 ERD MO</td>
<td>Hildebrand, Pl. I, Fig. 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ruding, App. Pl. XXX, Fig. 23
The Northampton and Southampton Mints

**Obverse.**—Bust to right, crowned. Around, inscription between two circles, divided by bust.

**Reverse.**—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.

**Hawkins, 199. British Museum Catalogue, type v.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[Unascertained]</td>
<td>*BRVNINE MONETA N</td>
<td>Montagu collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*EADGAR REX</td>
<td>*BRVNINC MOHETAE</td>
<td>Brit. Mus. [Fig. 19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[Unascertained]</td>
<td>*OSFERD MONETA IN N</td>
<td>Bliss collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>*EADGAR REXX</td>
<td>*OSFERD NONETA</td>
<td>Montagu collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 19.**

**Obverse.**—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.

**Reverse.**—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.

**Hawkins, 201. British Museum Catalogue, type iii.**

1 Sir Chas. Oman, *The Coinage of England*, p. 62, observes: "One moneyer, Bruninc, succeeded in producing the most dehumanized face that had been seen since the days of Wiglaf."
The Northampton and Southampton Mints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+ EADGAR RE + T I</td>
<td>* DVDEMV NOETII</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ EADGAR • R • REX TO</td>
<td>* DYDEMON + ES MO</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+ EADGAR RE + M</td>
<td>+ * DURFERD MOETA</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ EADGAR RE + T II</td>
<td>+ * DURFERD MOETA</td>
<td>W. C. Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+ EADGAR REX ANGLORVM</td>
<td>* BALDRIE MONETA</td>
<td>Allen collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+ EADGAR REX ANGLORVM</td>
<td>* OSPA • D MONETA</td>
<td>[Fig. 20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+ EADGAR REX ANGLORVM</td>
<td>* LINANDI, MONETA</td>
<td>Douglas Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 21.

Obverse.—Bust to left, diademed. Around, inscription between two circles.

Reverse.—Small cross pattée. Around, inscription between two circles.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+ EADGAR REX ANGLOX</td>
<td>+ BALDRIE M • O HAMTV</td>
<td>Hildebrand, No. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+ EADGAR REX ANGLOX</td>
<td>+ CYLH M • O HANTVN.</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+ EADGAR REX ANGLOX</td>
<td>+ EADNOD M • O HAMTV.</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 From the same reverse die as No. 12.
In "The Douglas Find of Anglo-Saxon Coins and Ornaments," *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1913, p. 333, the late H. A. Grueber describes a fragment, or possibly a cut halfpenny of Eadgar, *British Museum Catalogue*, type i, by the moneyer HILDO[LF]. This coin was undoubtedly struck at Northampton, but Mr. Grueber does not fully describe it, and my efforts to obtain a full description of the coin, or even a "rubbing" of it, from the Douglas Museum officials have proved fruitless.

Upon the obverse of the last type of Eadgar we find a new character, viz., O₂X, which is really OR ligulated, with a cross bar on the tail of the R which indicates the contraction VM, the complete word thus being ANGLORVM. Upon the reverse is another innovation. Following the moneyer's name and placed before the mint-name, is the contracted form M-O. This form of contraction continued in use down to the end of Canute's reign. In the interval this contraction had assumed various forms, e.g., M₀, M₁, M₂0, M₃0, M₄0, M₅0, M₆0, M₇0, M₈0, M₉0, M₀0, M₁0, M₂0, M₃0, etc.; also M⁰ON, M¹ON, M²ON, M₃ON, M₄ON, M₅ON, etc. We unquestionably have here the Old English preposition on following an M which is marked in one form or other (⁻, -, −, Ω etc.), to indicate that it (M) is an abbreviation. About the middle of the reign of Æthelred II, in many cases the M dropped out leaving only the preposition ON connecting the name of the moneyer with that of the mint. The two forms, however, continued in use alongside each other until, as stated above, near the end of Canute's reign, after which, down to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obverse</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Provenance, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>✶ EADGAR REX ANGL0X</td>
<td>✶ LEOSIGE M-O HAMT</td>
<td>W. C. Wells [Pl. II, Fig. 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>✶ EADGAR REX ANGL0X</td>
<td>✶ LEOSIG M-O HAMT</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>✶ EADGAR REX ANGL0X</td>
<td>✶ LEOSIGI N-O NANT</td>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>✶ EADGAR REX ANGL0X</td>
<td>✶ LEOSIGI N-O HAHT</td>
<td>R. C. Lockett [Pl. II, Fig. 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>✶ EADGAR REX ANGL0X</td>
<td>✶ OSIOLD M-O HAMTV</td>
<td>Brit. Mus. [Pl. II, Fig. 3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
early years of Edward I, the monosyllable on was, with few rare exceptions, the only form in use.

Whatever the meaning of Mon or Moneta may have been on earlier issues there can be no doubt that the M now stands for Old English Mynetere, or Latin Monetarius, and when we find, for instance, a coin reading "Baldric M-O Hamt," it means Baldric Mynetere (or Monetarius) on Hamtune, "Baldric Minter (or Moneyer) in [North]Hamtune."

The Old English preposition on, as it appears on the coins, means "at", "in". Some numismatists have contended that this word is another form of the preposition of, and Shakespeare has been quoted in support of the suggestion that in his day on for of was a survival from Anglo-Saxon times:—

"A thriving gamester has but a poor trade on't" To which may be added others, for instance:—

"Be not jealous on me." J. Caesar, I, i.
"Such stuff as dreams are made on." Tempest, IV, i.
"i the very throat on me." Macbeth, II, iii.

On for of, however, appears to have been merely a colloquialism and, according to C. T. Onions, dates only from Elizabethan times. The confusion of on and of, by the common people in Shakespeare's own county of Warwickshire was probably as common in his time as it is to-day. On as meaning "of" is not to be found in the works of Chaucer and of other Middle English writers. It does not so appear in Bradley's edition of Strathmann's Middle English Dictionary, 1891, nor in Skeat's Glossary of Tudor and Stuart Words.

In the later portions of the Peterborough Anglo-Saxon Chronicle "of" frequently appears in place of on, and Plummer, describing the fragment of a now lost MS. of the Chronicle, which was discovered by Dr. Zupitza in the Cottonian MS. Domitian A, ix, says:—"The purity of the diction and grammar is in striking contrast with the corruption of MS. E. [the Peterborough MS.]... On maintains its place against the tendency, in MS. E, to the use of 'of.'" Sir Henry Howorth, to account for the corruption of the Peterborough MS. suggests that "the language

---

2 Shakespeare Glossary, 1911.
used by the compiler of MS. E, in his translations and in the continuations of that *Chronicle*, was not the normal speech of the folk at Peterborough when it was written, but was the English of foreign monks who had not learnt the language properly, and only wrote and spoke it incorrectly”; and H. S. English, in his *Dissection of the Saxon Chronicle*, 1830, says:—“We are not to take the last years of the *Chronicle* as a sample of the English of the time, but as a specimen of the broken English of a French Monk.”

Old English *of* equated with the modern word “from,” as is shown in the following extracts from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*:

1014. “& aefne aelcne Denisie cyning utlah of Engla­lande gecwaedon.” (And every Danish king they proclaimed an outlaw *from* England.)

1066. “Harold cyninge of Norwegan & Tostig eorl & heora gefylce waron afaren of scipe begendon Eoferwic to Stanford-bryce.” (King Harold *from* Norway and earl Tostig, with their forces, were gone *from* York to Stamford-bridge.)

1083. “swa th thet blod com of tham weofode up­pon tham gradan, and of tham gradan on tha flore.” (so that the blood came *from* the altar upon the steps, and *from* the steps on the floor.)

1085. “he ferde into Engla­lande mid swa myc­clan here ridendra manna & gangendra, of Francrice & of Brytlande.” (He [William] went into England with so large an army of horse and foot, *from* France and *from* Brittany.)

The following sentences taken from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* will at once illustrate the common use of the preposition *on*:

“He ricsade xvii gear & tha geendode *on* Eoferwic.” (He [Severus], reigned seventeen years and then ended [his days] *at* York.)
925. "Eadweard cyning gefór on Myrcum & Ælfweard his sunu, swithe hræthe thaes gefór on Oxanforda & heora lic-ligath on Wintancaestre."

King Eadweard died in Mercia and very shortly Ælfweard his son died at Oxford and their bodies lie at Winchester.)

1051. "On anum scipe." (In a ship.)

1051: "On Gleawcestre sit-tende." (Sitting at Gloucester.)

1051. "& Sparhafoc abb' wearth tha adrifén ut of tham bispoc-ripe on Lunden." (And abbot Sparrowhawk was driven from his bishopric at London.)

1052. "Her hergode Griffin se Wylisca cyng on Hereforescire." (At this time Griffin the Welsh king plundered in Herefordshire.)

Here we have, only at full length, the ON EOFER, ON P'INT, ON OXENFO, ON LVNDE, ON HEREF, and ON GELEAP, with which we have been so long familiar upon the coins.

As will be seen from the foregoing extracts, the preposition on was used indifferently for either "in" or "at," and a similar usage appears to have prevailed upon the coins, for their inscriptions show that "in" and "at" were considered synonymous and were used indifferently; for instance:

Æthelstan. MERRA MOT IN DERABI = Derby.

Eadgar. DEORVLF IN TOMPRI = Tamworth.

Æthelred II. SPYRELINC MO IN BIO = Thetford.

Ælfred the Great. ET GELEAP = Gloucester.

Eadweard the Confessor. ALMVND A SNO = Nottingham.
The foregoing extracts from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, together with the coin inscriptions, constitute, I submit, conclusive evidence that upon the Anglo-Saxon coinage the word *on* means "in" or "at" and not "of." No State department was more conservative than the mint, and this word *on* as it stands on a Norman or Plantagenet penny, is an example of the persistent use of an Old English form in the legend, some time after Old English had ceased to be the language of the State.