

THE STAMFORD AND PETERBOROUGH MINTS

By WILLIAM C. WELLS

PART I

STAMFORD, the greater part of which now lies in Lincolnshire, originally consisted of two separate towns, one in Northamptonshire, known down to the fifteenth century as Stamford-south-of-the-river and afterwards as Stamford Baron,¹ Stamford-beyond-the-bridge, or Stamford St. Martin's, and the other in Lincolnshire; the two places being separated by the river Welland. By the time of the Domesday Survey, however, they had been united for local assessment purposes, but in other ways they were still distinct "burhs".² There appears to have been considerable jealousy between the two places, and in early documents we frequently read of quarrels and disturbances and even suits at law between the inhabitants of Stamford, Lincolnshire, and those of Stamford Baron, Northamptonshire.³

The place-name Stanford or Stamford is derived from Anglo-Saxon *Stan-ford*, "Stone-ford", denoting the stone paved-ford by which the river Welland was crossed prior to the erection of the bridge connecting the two Stamfords and also connecting the counties of Northampton and Lincoln. The earliest record of Stamford is of the year 449 when,

¹ It received that appellation about the middle of the fifteenth century, when the suffix was added probably on account of its being part of those lands which the Abbot of Burh held *per baroniam*.

² Richard Butcher, Town Clerk of Stamford, in his *Survey and Antiquitie of the Town of Stamford*, 1646, writing of his time says: "The Towne and Parish of Stamford-Baron, in the County of Northampton; a place though not subject to the Mace of Stamford government, yet joyned to the same in all Taxes, Subsidies, Fifteenths and other payments to the State amounting to a fifth part of a full mulct."

³ Madox, *Firma Burgi*, 1726, p. 95, says: "Moreover, sometimes there hath been a Division, and even a suit at Law between one part of a town, and another part of the same town. For example. In the 44th year of K. Henry III, Peter de Wakerlegh and five others who were Prince Edward's men in the town of Stamford, were attached to answer Wm. Davison and Wm. Reynerson who followed for the Abbot of Burgh's men of the same town, for that the Defendants caused the Plaintiff's to contribute with them and others who were the men of Prince Edward in that town, in tallages and other burdens payable by the said town beyond the sixth part of the said tallages and burdens contrary to a concord made before the barons of the Exchequer about that affair in the 27th year of K. Henry III."

according to the Venerable Bede,¹ the Saxons were invited over by Vortigern to defend his country against the Picts and Scots. The first battle after their arrival appears to have been fought in the neighbourhood of this ford across the Welland, and proved an entire defeat for the Picts and Scots. Henry of Huntingdon thus describes the fight: "The enemy advanced as far as Stanford . . . The Picts and Scots fought with spears and lances, but when the Saxons most furiously fell on with their axes and long swords, they immediately fled, unable to resist the weight of so fierce an attack." An almost identical account is given by Ranulf Higden in his *Polychronicon*. Trevisa in his translation of Higden's Chronicle says: "The enemys were come unto Stanford: where when the Pyctes and Scottes used long saftes and speares, the Saxons faughte with long swerdes and axes." Camden assumes from the mention of Stanford in the foregoing account, that a town existed there at the time of the battle, but no evidence is available in support of that assumption, and there can be little doubt that 'Stanford' referred to the ford only. It is, of course, possible that the ford being an important one, a small settlement existed on either side of the stream.

The Stamford mint has received considerable attention from several numismatists and historians, some of whom, including the Rev. Rogers Ruding,² Francis Peck, the Stamford annalist,³ and Samuel Sharp, a Northamptonshire numismatist and antiquary, located the mint at Stamford Baron, Northamptonshire.⁴ On the other hand, Mr. Andrew, in his *Numismatic History of the Reign of Henry I*, published in 1901, maintains that the mint was situated in Stamford, Lincolnshire, and that allocation has been accepted by subsequent writers. The former writers base their allocation upon the assumption that the mint and all its moneymen belonged to the Abbot of Peterborough and upon the further assumption that at the time the mint was established, the abbot owned not only the surrounding land but that he also held all territorial rights within the *burh* of Stamford Baron.

¹ *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, sub anno.

² *Annals of the Coinage of Great Britain*, 1840.

³ *Academia tertia Anglicana, or the Antiquarian Annals of Stamford*, 1727.

⁴ "The Stamford Mint", *Num. Chron.*, 1866.

My claim is that the mint was situated in Stamford Baron, Northamptonshire; that the locality of the mint did not depend upon the assumed territorial rights of the Abbot of Peterborough, within the *burh* of Stamford Baron; that the abbot did not hold territorial rights within Stamford Baron prior to the reign of Canute; that the abbot did not, in Anglo-Saxon times, hold the whole mint, but was granted one moneyer in the king's mint at Stamford Baron in the reign of Eadgar and a second one in the reign of Canute; that from the Norman Conquest onwards, the royal moneyers were withdrawn from the Stamford mint, leaving only the abbot's two moneyers working there; that from the year 1070 the abbot held the privilege of a mint and one moneyer within the abbey precincts at Peterborough,¹ and that he held the further privilege of employing one moneyer alternatively at Stamford or at Peterborough, according to his discretion and convenience. These claims I shall endeavour to sustain by the production of historical and of contemporary documentary evidence, as well as the evidence provided by the coins struck in the Stamford and Peterborough mints.

Those who affirm that the mint was situated in Stamford, Lincolnshire, are probably influenced by the assumption that, as Stamford Baron now forms an addendum or suburb of the Lincolnshire Stamford, similar conditions prevailed in the tenth century when the mint was founded. Such, however, was not the case. Stamford, Northamptonshire, was then the only Saxon *burh* of that name. The Lincolnshire Stamford on the opposite side of the Welland was a Danish town situated in the Danelagh, one of the "Five Burhs", governed by Danish laws and beyond the direct control of the West-Saxon king.² Moreover, a revolt of the

¹ This would be quite in accordance with the law of Æthelstan (see p. 48 *post*), for the Peterborough *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells us that in the reign of Eadgar the abbey was surrounded by a stone wall, thus constituting it a *burh*. See also p. 51 *post*.

² Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, vol. i, p. 64, writing of the recovery of the "Five Burhs" by Eadmund says: "A poetical entry in the *Chronicles* vividly paints the delight of their English inhabitants at their deliverance from the yoke of their heathen masters", and in a footnote he adds: "The words of the *Chronicle* may lead us to think that Eadward accepted the submission of the Confederation and built forts to keep the towns from rebellion, without interfering with their internal administration. A Danish aristocracy may therefore have existed down to the deliverance by Eadmund, holding the former English inhabitants in more or less of subjection."

inhabitants of the Danish Stamford was always a possibility, and that fact alone would be sufficient, apart from other considerations, to induce the West-Saxon authorities to establish the mint in the southern Stamford and not in the Danish town opposite. The latter would, however, enjoy all the advantages accruing from the immediate proximity of a mint, while the mint itself would derive the full benefit afforded by the protection of the English fortified town.



FIG. 1. DANISH IMITATIONS OF ANGLO-SAXON PENNIES, *Temp.* ÆTHELSTAN-EADGAR. (W. C. Wells.)

If coins were struck at all in the Danish town, they would be of the class similar to those struck in other Danish burhs in imitation of pennies issued by the contemporary West-Saxon kings from Æthelstan to Eadgar, but bearing unintelligible inscriptions.

THE BUILDING OF THE BURH AT STAMFORD BARON

Prior to the year 916, Watling Street formed the boundary between the West-Saxon kingdom and the Danelagh. In that year Eadweard the Elder refortified Towcester, and Thurferth, the Danish jarl of Northampton, who held control as far north as the river Welland, fearing an attack upon Northampton, surrendered, together with his "army", to Eadweard. The version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the



16



17



18



19



20



21



22



24



23



25



26



27



29



28



30

Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, describes the incident as follows:

"Thurferth jarl and the holds, and all the army which owed obedience to [North]amtune, north as far as the Welland, submitted to him [Eadweard], and sought him for their lord and protector."¹

In the following year, 917, Eadweard had forced the re-treating Danes across the Welland and had thus established a new boundary line between the West-Saxon kingdom and the Danelagh. The Danes made a stand at their settlement on the north side of the river where they fortified their position. Eadweard did not attempt to follow up his advantage by forcing them farther north but accepted the new frontier line and established a *burh* or fortified town on the south bank of the river, in Northamptonshire, in order to watch the Danish town on the opposite side and to keep the enemy in check. The Corpus Christi College version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* thus describes the building of the *burh* at Stamford Baron and the subsequent surrender of

¹ This account is given in manuscript A, which, as is shown below, is apparently five years out in its dating. Hence the date of Thurferth's submission would be 916, and not 921 as given in the *Chronicle*.

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

the Danes belonging to the *burh* on the north or Lincolnshire side of the river:

"In this year between Rogations [19-21 May] and Midsummer, king Eadweard went with a force to Stamford, and commanded the *burh* to be wrought on the south side of the river [i.e. the Northamptonshire side]; and all the people who belonged to the northern *burh* submitted to him, and sought him for their lord. And while he was there sitting, Æthelflæd his sister died at Tamworth, twelve nights before Midsummer."¹

This outward show of submission to the West-Saxon king lasted until the year 941, the year after the death of Æthelstan and the accession of Eadmund, who appears to have attempted to bring the north under his immediate rule instead of resting content with the bare submission of the people and leaving them to manage their own affairs. The northern people revolted and elected Anlaf Guthfrithson as their king. The revolt spread to the confederacy of the "Five Burhs". Anlaf with his Northumbrian army, which had been reinforced by the fighting men of the "Five Burhs" as he passed through the Danelagh, marched south as far as Northampton, probably anticipating a good reception from the inhabitants of the latter place, many of whom

¹ This account is extracted from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, MS. A. in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where it is recorded under the year 922 but, as I have shown on p. 39, this manuscript is five years out in its reckoning at this period. The actual date of the building of the *burh* at Stamford Baron is further proved by the fact that it coincided with the death of Æthelflæd, which occurred certainly in 917. Matthew of Westminster under the year 914 states that Elflæda, or Æthelflæda, countess of the Mercians, rebuilt Tamworth; afterwards proceeding at Stamford to rebuild the tower on the south side of the river Welland ("Elflæda Merciorum domina burgum Thamewrth appellatum restauravit. Deinde ad Stanfordiam progrediens in aquilonali plaga fluminis Weiloand turrin restauravit"). The *A.-S. Chronicle*, Florence of Worcester, and Simeon of Durham, however, show that Matthew of Westminster was in error, and that it was at Stafford and not at Stamford that Æthelflæd built a *burh*.

In the Northamptonshire *Victoria County History*, vol. ii, p. 522, it is suggested that although Stamford Baron appears to have had five gates (Webster-gate, Burleygate, and Highgate are frequently mentioned in old deeds), it was never walled. Yet it must have been defended by walls of some kind, probably earthen walls, or it would not have been a *burh*, for that appellation indicates that it was originally defended by earthen or other walls. Moreover, the medieval gates would have served little purpose without walls, unless a continuous row of houses or other structures were built close up to the moat and thus supplied the defensive purpose of walls.

were of Danish blood, but they remained loyal to the West-Saxon king, and when the Danish army attacked the town they were driven off with considerable loss. They then proceeded along Watling Street to Tamworth, where they were more successful; after which they proceeded to Leicester, where they were besieged by Eadmund. A peace was arranged and the war brought to an end on nearly the same terms as those that had been made by Ælfred and Guthrum. The kingdom was divided as before, but now the Welland and not Watling Street became the boundary between the West-Saxon kingdom and the Danelagh. The overlordship of the West-Saxon king was acknowledged and Anlaf was baptized, probably at Leicester, Eadmund standing godfather to him as Ælfred had stood to Guthrum.

The revival of the Danelagh did not last long, for Eadmund drove out both the Norse kings and brought the country into subjection. His conquest of Mercia and especially of the "Five Burghs" is celebrated in the following ballad preserved in the Winchester version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*:

“Here Eadmund king,
of Angles lord,
of his kin protector,
Mercia subdued,
dear deed-performer
as the Dore it bounds
and Whitwell’s gate,
and Humber’s river,
broad ocean stream.
Five towns,
Leicester
and Lincoln
and Nottingham,
so Stanford eke,
and Derby,
were erewhile Danish,
under the Northmen,
by need constrain’d
in heathen’s
captive bonds
for a long space,
until again released them,

through his worthiness,
 the warrior's refuge,
 Eadweard's offspring
 Eadmund king."¹

This song is inserted under 941, the year in which the Danish towns appear to have revolted, but the chronology of the war and the sequence of events is uncertain.

We find no further record of Stamford Baron until the year 1086 when, in the Domesday Survey, Stamford, Lincolnshire, and Stamford Baron were assessed together as one borough, and in *Domesday Book* we find the following entry relating thereto:

"The king's borough of Stamford paid tax in King Edward's time for twelve hundreds and half, towards paying the army, navy and Danegeld.

"There are six wards, five in Lincolnshire and the sixth in [North]Hantunshire, which is beyond the bridge. But nevertheless that ward paid all customs or dues with the rest except *gafol* and toll, which the abbot of Burh had and has."²

The abbot does not appear to have owned any houses or to have had any "men" in Stamford Baron at the time of the Great Survey, but forty years later, as we learn from the *Black Book of Peterborough*, the abbot had on his land in Stamford Baron, sixty tenants, forty-three of whom had land adjoining their houses and seventeen had no land adjoining their houses "and those are in Hamtunshire". There were also in Stamford Baron, fifteen undertenants.

THE BURGHAL SYSTEM

The system of building fortresses, or of fortifying existing towns against the invading Dane, commenced in the reign of Ælfred, was continued by Eadweard the Elder and by his warlike sister Æthelflæd as they pushed northward and eastward, capturing Danish towns, and building *burhs* to keep the enemy in check and for the protection of the inhabitants of the newly captured districts. These fortified

¹ In this, as elsewhere, I have followed Benjamin Thorpe's translation.

² It is stated by Bridges in his *History of Northamptonshire*, vol. ii, p. 578, that Stamford Baron is not mentioned in *Domesday*, but this is an error.

towns, having been created, had to be garrisoned and their earthen or stone walls kept in repair. These duties appear to have fallen upon the neighbouring thegns. To each stronghold, whether an old city like Rochester or Winchester, newly fortified, or a new fortress created, like Stamford Baron, for strategical reasons, there was allotted a district consisting of a certain number of hides¹ of land around the *burh* and this district was its shire. Each shire, large or small, had its *burh*, generally in its centre, and the *burh* gave its name to the shire. The thegns whose lands had been allotted for the defence of the *burh* must either reside there themselves or provide a competent fighting man as a substitute. These were the "burhware" of whom we read so much and who, as we are told in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*,² were "those men whose duty it was to defend the burhs" and were distinct from the field army.

Hallam, writing of feudal tenures in Anglo-Saxon England, throws some light on the military service of the bishops and others in pre-Conquest times: "All the freehold lands of England except some of those belonging to the church, were subject to the three great public burdens: military service in the king's expeditions, or at least in defensive war; the repair of bridges, and the maintenance of royal fortresses." The *burg-bot* of which we also read a great deal, another duty from which no landowner was exempt, was the duty of the men of the shire to maintain the fortifications of the *burh*, the one *burh* of the shire. Stamford Baron being a royal fortress, from its institution in 917 down to 972, when Eadgar regranted the old monastic lands to the abbey of Peterborough, the duty of providing a garrison and of keeping the walls of the *burh* in repair, would be borne by the king's tenants residing in the small shire of Stamford Baron, but after the latter date those duties would devolve upon the abbot and his tenants.

From the end of the seventh century onwards we find evidence that rural properties were charged with the liability to repair the walls of *burhs*. From *Domesday* we learn that in the reign of Eadweard the Confessor the rule in Cheshire was:

"To repair the wall of the city . . . the prepositus ordered a man to come from every hide in the county."

¹ *Hide*, see pp. 46-8 *post*.

² *Sub anno* 894.

There exists a remarkably interesting document of the time of Eadweard the Elder, or possibly of Ælfred, known as the "Burghal Hidage", which gives a list of all the lands dependent on the *burhs* of Wessex. It sets forth certain arrangements made early in the tenth century for the defence of Wessex against Danish inroads. It names divers strongholds, and assigns to each a number of hides. These *burhs* range from important places like Winchester, Lewes, Exeter, Oxford, &c., down to small *burhs* like Twynham (Christchurch, Hants). Every place in Wessex mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a fortress between the years 890 and 900 is duly recorded, but no mention is made of any of the towns refortified, or new *burhs* built in Mercia, or in East Anglia, by Eadweard the Elder, which proves that the document was compiled prior to Eadweard's war of conquest against the Danes.

As a result of the building of the *burhs* in Mercia and in East Anglia, there were in the tenth century many small shires, created for the purpose of maintaining the smaller *burhs* and which were afterwards absorbed into the larger shires. For instance, Ranulf Higden, monk of Chester, in his *Polychronicon*, written in the time of Richard I says: "I find there hath been in Lancashire five little shires, Westderbyshire, Salfordshire, Lelandshire, Blacknorshire, and *territorium de Lancaster*; and so likewise there was Richmondshire in Yorkshire and many other such shires which now go under the name of [i.e. they have now been absorbed into] other shires", and in Heming's *Cartulary* we find it related that there was a Winchcombeshire which Eadric Streona arbitrarily annexed to Gloucestershire.¹

Butcher² and Peck³ both state that there was a district known as "Stamfordshire"; neither of those authors, however, give an exact reference but merely quote "the Book of Crowland" and "the Book of Bury" as their authority and, having no clue to guide me, I have failed to verify their references. Butcher,⁴ after quoting from Camden says: "With this in part agrees the Booke of Crowland which makes mention of Stamford and Stamfordshire", and Peck⁵

¹ *Provincias provinciis pro libito adjungeret, nam vicecomitatum de Wincelcumb, quae per se tunc erat, vicecomitatui Gloecestre adjunxit.*

² *Survey and Antiquities of the Town of Stamford*, 1646.

³ See note 3 on p. 36, *ante*.

⁴ p. 7.

⁵ p. 19.

says: "That there was, long before the Norman conquest, such a District as Stamford-shire, the book of Bury puts beyond all contradiction." In the manuscript of a contemplated second edition of Butcher's work which, however, did not appear in print until 1727, when it was printed by Peck as an Addendum to his *Annals of Stamford*, the above passage is rendered: "With this in part agrees the book of Crowland, which makes mention of Stamford-shire being a county before the conquest." In the same connexion is also given a reference to "*Hoveden's Annals*, fol. 249, a. n. 10", but I have not referred to Hoveden's original manuscript and I fail to find this passage in the printed versions.

In an article by Francis Thynne, Lancaster Herald, entitled "Of what Antiquity Shires were in England", printed in *A Collection of Curious Discourses*, published by Thomas Hearne, 1720, the author refers to several small shires which now have become absorbed into other counties, and on p. 40 he says: "Moreover, the book belonging to St. Edmondsbury, dividing the realm, doth in more ample sort set down the shires, expressing how many hides of land be contained in divers of them." He then quotes from the "book belonging to St. Edmondsbury" that in England there were thirty-two shires. In these thirty-two shires were used three sorts of laws; the one called West-Saxon law; another Danish law, and a third Mercian law. He then enumerates the nine shires in which West-Saxon law was used; then those in which Danish law was used, fifteen shires including those of Northampton¹ and Stamford; and lastly he enumerates the Mercian shires and states the number of hides of land in each shire upon which the central *burh* was dependent, viz. Gloucester, 1,300; Worcester, 1,200; Hereford, 1,200; Warwick, 1,200; Oxford, 1,400; Chester, 1,200, and Stamford, 5 hides. From the foregoing extract it is evident that there were two Stamfordshires, one being in the Danelagh and the other in Mercia. The size of the former is not indicated, but the latter must have been a very tiny shire. The Stamford-shire in the Danelagh was undoubtedly the shire which owed obedience to the Danish Stamford and which was subse-

¹ The author includes the shire of Northampton as being under Danish law, but it passed out of the Danelagh in 916, when jarl Thurferth surrendered Northampton to Eadward, and should be included in the shires using Mercian law, although the shire was left in charge of Thurferth, the Danish jarl.

quently absorbed into Lincolnshire, and the Stamfordshire in which Mercian law was used would, of course, be the shire which was obedient to the *burh* of Stamford Baron and upon which it depended for defence and wall maintenance. This small shire was afterwards absorbed into Northamptonshire.

Although the Danes appear to have settled at Stamford, Lincolnshire, about the year 875, it seems probable that as it was not a frontier town (Northampton then being their frontier town), it was only upon the Danes being driven across the Welland that they fortified their position and thus it became, as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* describes it, a *burh*.

THE HIDE

The *hide* was a measure of land which does not appear to have been of uniform size but to have varied according to locality and period. The word was in general use in England in Anglo-Saxon and early English times. Kemble and some other authorities argue that the hide contained 30 or possibly 40 acres, while others assume that it contained 120 acres—not 120 acres of 4,840 square yards each, but 120 times the amount of land which a plough-team of eight oxen could plough in a single day. Consequently the hide would vary according to the kind of land under the plough.

Whatever the hide contained in early times it was not, apparently, until the tenth century that it contained 120 acres. There can be no doubt that at the time of *Domesday* the hide equated with 120 acres. A probable explanation is that, although in early Anglo-Saxon times the hide consisted of 30 acres or thereabouts, it had come before the Norman period to contain 120 acres. Professor Maitland (*Domesday and Beyond*) accepts the view that the hide contained 120 acres. That is, of course, 120 acres of ploughland, and by making a reasonable allowance for pasture and woodland, the hide probably equated with 160 or possibly 170 acres.

The whole subject is so vague that perhaps Selden is wisest when he says "hides were of an uncertain quantity". He gives a very good description of a hide when he says (*Titles of Honor*): "Now a hide of land regularly is and was (as I think) as much land as might be well manured with one plough, together with pasture, meadow, and wood competent

for the maintenance of that plough, and the servants of the family."

The hide as an estimate of measurement was adopted by Æthelred in 991, when he first imposed the Geldum, or Land Tax, of two shillings on each hide of plough-land. The hide was sometimes called the *pound land*, and if it was of the value of 20 shillings or 240 pence, that sum being distributed over 120 acres would give twopence for each acre, or a sterling pound as the value of a hide. It is now a generally accepted fact that in measuring the hide only plough-land was taken into account, to the exclusion of woods, meadows, and commons. Antiquaries' opinions, however, differ so widely that it is impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion as to the actual extent of the hide as a form of measurement. Consequently, taking the hide as a unit, it is impossible to estimate the area of the shire of Stamford Baron, but we can arrive at it in another way.

Oxfordshire, as stated above, contained 1,400 hides or exactly 280 times the number contained in Stamfordshire, and if we assume that the proportion of plough-land to that of meadows, woods, &c., corresponded in those two shires, we must assume that the total area of the latter shire was $\frac{1}{280}$ th that of the former. Prior to recent alterations in the county boundaries, Oxfordshire contained about 474,880 acres.¹ Now, if we divide the 474,880 acres by 280, the result shows 1,696 acres, which should as nearly as possible represent the area of the shire of Stamford Baron. In the *Victoria County History of Northamptonshire* it is stated that: "The ecclesiastical parish of St. Martin Stamford Baron containing the three civil parishes of St. Martin Stamford Baron in the administrative county of Lincoln and municipal borough of Stamford, St. Martin's Without, and Wothorpe, both in the administrative county of the Soke of Peterborough, covers altogether about 1,700 acres", from which it will be seen that the area of the tenth-century shire of Stamford Baron corresponded almost exactly with that of the present-day parish, which appears to leave little room for doubt that the boundaries also of the present-day parish of Stamford Baron are identical with the tenth-century boundaries of its shire—probably the smallest shire in the

¹ Table of poor's rates drawn up in the early years of the nineteenth century, under the inspection of the Rt. Hon. Geo. Rose.

kingdom. There can be little doubt also that the parish of St. Martin's represents the area of the *burh* made and fortified by order of Eadweard the Elder, in the year 917, and that the remainder of the parish represents the area of the shire upon which it depended for defence and wall maintenance. The difference of 4 acres between the area of the modern parish and that of the ancient shire is probably accounted for by the fact that the area of the *burh* was not included in that of the shire, but is included in that of the modern parish. This computation indicates that the shire of Stamford Baron consisted of 600 acres of plough-land and 1,100 acres of woods, meadows, and pasture-land; each hide containing 120 acres of plough-land and 220 acres of pasture-land, &c.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE MINT AT STAMFORD BARON

In or about the year 928, in the reign of Æthelstan, at the synod held at Greatley, near Andover, Hampshire, it was ordered that "there be one [kind of] money over all the king's dominion, and that no man mint except within port". It was further enacted that Canterbury should have seven moneyers—four for the king, two for the [arch]bishop, and one for the abbot; Rochester, three—two for the king and one for the bishop; London, eight; Winchester, six; Lewes, two; [South]Hamtune, two; Wareham, two; Exeter, two; Shaftesbury, two; Dorchester, Hastings, and Chichester, one each, and "in other *burhs* one moneyer".¹ This ordinance means that the type of coin was to be the same throughout the whole realm; in addition to the places enumerated, all *burhs*, or fortified towns, should have the privilege of a mint with at least one moneyer, and that no money should be coined except within the walls of a *burh*. This ordinance obviously relates only to Wessex, but there can be little doubt that a similar ordinance relating to Mercia was enacted about the same time, possibly at the same synod, in which would be enumerated the number of moneyers allocated to the Mercian towns. Stamford Baron, as a *burh*, would be entitled to at least one moneyer. And there can be little doubt that a mint was established in the Saxon *burh* on the

¹ For the full text in Anglo-Saxon, Latin, and English, of these and other monetary laws passed at Greatley, see Major P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton's paper, *Brit. Num. Journ.*, vol. vi, pp. 14-15.

south side of the river and not in the Danish *burh* on the north side. Indeed, it seems highly improbable that Æthelstan's law would apply to the Danish towns. The "Five Burhs" were small Danish republics living under their own laws,¹ and prior to the reign of Eadgar, Saxon coins were struck in them only at intervals when one or other of them fell into the hands of the West-Saxon king.

From the foregoing facts it is quite clear that it was within the southern *burh*, the Saxon town, the Northamptonshire Stamford, that the mint was established and not in the Danish *burh* on the north side of the river. And I think numismatists will agree that where the mint was originally established, there it continued. Indeed, we have contemporary documentary evidence in the form of a bull, or charter, of undoubted authenticity, of the year 1146, in which it is clearly specified that the mint was situated "in Stamford in Northamptonshire".²

Stamford Baron being a royal *burh*, the king could increase or decrease the number of moneyers at will, and the coins of Eadgar show quite clearly a considerable increase in the number of Stamford moneyers about the end of that reign, and a further increase in the reigns of Eadweard the Martyr, Æthelred II, and Canute. Thence onward the number of moneyers was gradually reduced, until the reign of William I, of William II, and of Henry I, when the royal moneyers were withdrawn, leaving only the abbot's two moneyers at work, and the reigns of Stephen, and Henry II, when only a single moneyer was employed.

EADGAR'S GRANT OF A MONEYER TO THE ABBOT OF PETERBOROUGH

The great Mercian abbey of Medeshamstede, afterwards called Burh and eventually Peterborough, was founded, according to the Peterborough *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, in the year 655, by Peada, King of Merica. Peada was slain in the year 656 and was succeeded in his kingdom by his brother Wulphere, who, with the assistance of a monk named Saxulf, continued the building of the monastery, and when, in 664, the building was completed, Saxulf was appointed the first abbot, and Wulphere, in the presence of a large gathering of nobles and bishops, granted a charter by which

¹ See note 2, p. 37 *ante*.

² See p. 64 *post*.

he confirmed to the abbey all that had already been given to it and added considerably of his own lands, lakes, fens, &c., so that the abbey's territory included the whole of what is now the north-eastern part of Northamptonshire, reaching from Wansford right across the shire to Easton, thence northward to Crowland and enclosing all the land lying between the Nene and the Welland, including the site upon which the royal *burh* of Stamford Baron was afterwards built, as well as extensive possessions in the fens of adjoining counties.¹ These possessions, however, did not include any portion of the site of Stamford, Lincolnshire.

In the year 870 the abbey was attacked by the Danes, who murdered Abbot Hedda and his eighty-four monks and utterly destroyed the abbey, which remained in its ruined state for nearly a hundred years, while its lands passed into the hands of Burgred, King of Mercia. In 917, while the abbey still lay in ruins and its lands derelict, Eadweard the Elder built the royal *burh* at Stamford on the south side of the Welland. Military expediency rarely stands upon ceremony, and had it been possible for Eadweard to turn to the abbot for leave to build the *burh* it is highly improbable, in the circumstances, that he would have done so. As a matter of fact there were at that time neither abbot, monks, nor monastery, nor had there been either for about forty-five years. The abbey's lands eventually descended to King Eadgar, who, as we learn from the Peterborough *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, in the year 964 rebuilt the abbey and in 972 he granted a charter by which he restored and confirmed to the abbey such of its former territory as was then in his hands; the *burh* of Stamford Baron, however, as I have previously stated, appears to have remained in the king's possession. On the other hand, Eadgar added many new possessions and privileges, including that of "one moneyer in Stamford for ever" (*unum monetarium in Stanford in perpetuam libertatem concedimus*).

Eadgar is also said to have changed the name of the abbey from Medeshamstede to that of Burh; but, on the other hand, we are told in the Peterborough *Chronicle* that Aldulf, the first abbot after the restoration of the abbey in the reign of Eadgar, "first made the walls about the monastery; then gave it for name 'Burh', that was before called Medesham-

¹ See pp. 59-61 *post*.

stede". The building of the defensive walls, thus creating it a *burh*, was without doubt the reason for the change of appellation; and we are told by William of Malmesbury that Medeshamstede so greatly resembled a fortified town that it was called "Burh".¹

The grant of a moneyer to an abbey still in the early stages of rebuilding and situated as Medeshamstede was, in an uninhabited and desolate region, would be but an empty favour, so Eadgar granted to the abbot the privilege of having one moneyer in the existing mint at Stamford Baron and probably allocated to him one of the royal moneyers working there.

Eadgar's grant to Peterborough Abbey of "one moneyer in Stanford" was exactly on a par with the subsequent grant of Henry I to Reading Abbey of "one moneyer in London", and with the right recorded in *Domesday* of the Bishop of East Anglia—then located at Thetford—to "one moneyer in Norwich" (*In hoc burgo similiter episcopus potest habere unum monetarium*).

It is probable that the privilege of a moneyer at Norwich was granted to the Bishop of East Anglia when that see was located at Elmham, a village near East Dereham, Norfolk. In the year 1075 an important council assembled in London under the presidency of Lanfranc at which it was enacted that henceforth the English bishops should transfer their residences from villages to cities,² and in obedience to this decree the seat of the bishopric of East Anglia was removed from Elmham to Thetford. A moneyer working at Elmham would have entailed a loss to the bishop instead of a profit, so he was granted the privilege of a moneyer in the existing and prosperous royal mint at Norwich.

In the foundation charter of Reading Abbey granted by Henry I in 1125, after reciting that he had built the new abbey at Reading, Henry grants to its abbot, amongst other privileges, a mint and one moneyer at Reading (*cum moneta et uno monetario apud Radingiam*).³

As in the case of Peterborough, the grant of a mint and moneyer to an abbey in the early stages of erection would be

¹ *Burh*, "a fortified town", or other fortified position.

² William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*. (Rolls Series), p. 66.

³ *Registrum Cartarum Abbatiae de Reading*, Cott. MS. Vesp. E. v, fol. 17; *Monasticon*, vol. iv, p. 40.

an empty favour, and so we find that the precedent of Peterborough was followed, and the king by writ authorized Roger Bishop of Salisbury, as "Chief Justiciary of all England" in his own absence, to allocate one of the royal moneyers in the mint at London who should coin and hold an exchange there for and on behalf of the abbot. The writ, which is of considerable numismatic interest, is as follows:

"Charter of R[oger] Bishop of Salisbury for a moneyer in London. R[oger] Bishop of Salisbury and procurator of the Kingdom of the English under our lord King Henry to A[] the Sheriff and all other the Kings ministers now or to be in London and all England, greeting.

"Know ye that by the precept of our lord King Henry we have given to Hugh the abbot and to the monks of Reading [abbey] a moneyer in London where he may coin money and have an Exchange and all things as have the King's other moneyers, Edgar, to wit, who by concession of the King shall be and remain as free, undisturbed and quit, in his house and staff from all pleas, actions at law and customs [in London], in the power of the abbot and monks of Reading as though he dwelt in Reading. Whosoever, also, may be appointed after Edgar, or in his place, to the mint in London, by the hand of the abbot and monks of Reading, shall in the same way be free, undisturbed and quit in house and staff in London, and shall remain in the power of the abbot and monks of Reading as though he dwelt in Reading.

"The said Edgar, also, and whosoever shall be moneyer after him, shall pay to the abbot and monks of Reading for the money that shall be struck, all those charges and customary payments which all the other moneyers in London pay to the King; and Edgar or he who follows him or acts for him shall hold the Exchange on such land of the abbot of Reading as the abbot shall concede, whether it be Edgar or he who shall follow him or take his place and the abbot and monks of Reading make their moneyer; which right is conceded them for ever."¹

The privilege of coining money has always been considered the especial prerogative of the executive power in every

¹ *Reading Register*, Harleian MS. 1708, folio III; *Monasticon*, vol. iv, p. 41. The Latin of this charter is given by Mr. Andrew in *The Numismatic History of Henry I*, pp. 373-4.

nation, and for this reason, as Blackstone says,¹ as money is the medium of commerce, it is the king's prerogative, as the arbiter of domestic commerce, to give it authority, or to make it current. In the later Anglo-Saxon period and in Norman times, and later, the profits on the coinage formed no inconsiderable portion of the revenues of the crown. We have no precise knowledge as to the profits made on the coinage in late Anglo-Saxon times, but in Norman times the legitimate profit was sixteen pence halfpenny on every 240 pence coined, and it is probable that in pre-Norman times the proportion of profit was about the same. Consequently the privilege of a mint or even one moneyer was a desirable possession, especially at times such as in the reign of Æthelred II, when the imposition of the Danegelt, which necessitated an enormous coinage, rendered a mint, or a moneyer, a most profitable possession, and the church and the abbeys vied with each other in their claims for a share in the profits accruing from striking and issuing the national coinage. Some of the early archbishops of Canterbury and of York placed their own name and portrait upon their coins; in the reign of Æthelstan, as I have previously shown on p. 48, the Archbishop of Canterbury had the privilege of two moneyers and the abbot one, and the Bishop of Rochester had one. At a later time other bishops and abbots were granted coining privileges, and as I have shown elsewhere,² in the reign of Henry III, the Archbishop of York held the privilege of working no less than four pairs of dies.

It is generally understood that no English abbot, mitred or otherwise, ever obtained the privilege of working more than one pair of dies, but I hope to prove that the Abbot of Peterborough held the unique privilege amongst English abbots of having *two* moneyers in Stamford mint from the reign of Canute onwards, and that in Norman times, from 1070, he held the privilege of transferring one of them, if he wished, to his abbey at Peterborough.

THE ABBOT OF PETERBOROUGH'S MONEY EXCHANGES

The grant of a moneyer to the Abbot of Peterborough carried with it a share in the profits of the money exchange at Stamford Baron, and at a later period, in the reign of

¹ *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 1876, vol. i, pp. 247-8.

² *Num. Chron.*, 1931, p. 276.

Henry I, and probably immediately after the Norman Conquest, the abbot possessed the sole privilege of holding an exchange within the limits of his territory. In the reign of Henry I, and probably earlier, the abbot also held an exchange in the markets at Peterborough and at Oundle, as is shown by the following schedule of a part of the abbot's possessions and privileges recorded in the *Liber Niger Monasterii S. Petri de Burgo*, which was compiled about the year 1125:

"In Stamford there are 43 men having houses with land adjoining which is not assessed with their houses, and 17 men holding no land except their houses, and those are in Hamtunshire. There are also in the same shire 15 undertenants (*undersetes*) who are not liable for any service except to the husbandman on whose land they dwell. . . . Moreover, the moneyers pay 20 shillings at Easter for the money exchange at the market[s] of Oundle and [of] Burh and 20 shillings for the change of the money." (. . . *Praeterea reddunt monetarii de cambitione mercati Undele et Burch in Pascha .xx. solidos, et de torno monete .xx. solidos.*)¹

The foregoing passage shows conclusively that in Norman times the abbot had a plurality of moneyers. The moneyers in royal mints were officers of the Crown, but these moneyers were merely servants of their lord—the abbot. The abbot paid certain fees to the king's cuneator for the dies and in return received the profits of the coinage. The word *torno* in the above passage is somewhat puzzling. *Tornus* has a variety of meanings in medieval Latin, none of which, however, make sense in connexion with the above passage. Whatever the scribe had in his mind when he wrote the word *torno*, the passage can only relate to the moneyers' payment of the usual 20 shillings on the change of the money.

In *Domesday*, in the accounts of the various mints we find a constant repetition of the entry that in addition to their rent, the moneyers paid certain fees to the king whenever the money was changed. For instance, under "Worcester" it is stated that:

"In the city of Worcester King Eadweard had this customary due (*consuetudinem*). When the money (*moneta*)

¹ *Appendix to Chronicon Petroburgense*, Camden Society's publication No. 47, p. 166.

was changed [i.e. a new type ordered] each moneyer gave 20 shillings at London for receiving the [new] money dies."

Under "Shrewsbury" it is recorded that:

"Three moneyers the king [i.e. King Eadweard] had there, who after they had purchased their money-dies (*cuneos*), as the other moneyers of the kingdom did, on the fifteenth day paid to the king 20 shillings each, and this was done on any change of the money (*moneta vertente*)."

And under "Hereford" that:

"There were [in the days of King Eadweard] seven moneyers there. One of these was the bishop's moneyer. When the money was renewed each of them gave 18 shillings for receiving the money-dies, and one month from the day on which they returned, each of them gave the king 20 shillings and likewise the bishop had from his moneyer 20 shillings. When the king came into the city the moneyers coined as much as he willed for him, that is of the king's silver."

There are other entries in which is recorded the payment to the king at the change of the money, but in which the receipt of the dies is not recorded; for instance:

"In the borough of Lewes, when the money is renewed, each moneyer gives 20 shillings."¹

"In the borough of Dorchester there were two moneyers each of them rendering to the king one mark of silver and 20 shillings whenever the money should be renewed."

"In Bridport there was one moneyer who rendered to the king one mark of silver, and 20 shillings whenever the money should be renewed."

"In King Edward's time there were in the city of Chester seven moneyers who gave to the king and the earl 7 pounds over and above the farm, when there was a new coinage."

There are also similar entries relating to two moneyers at Wareham and three at Shaftesbury. From these entries in *Domesday* we know that the change of type was made an

¹ Of this two-thirds was the king's and the other third went to Earl Warene.

occasion of a payment to the king by his moneyers and to bishops by their moneyers; and from the above entry in the *Black Book of Peterborough*, we know that each of the abbot of Peterborough's moneyers made him a similar payment of 20 shillings.

These fees were payable on the change of tender and the institution of a new type. In Norman times this occurred once in about two and a half or three years. In pre-Norman times it occurred more often, for during the twenty-five years of Eadweard the Confessor's reign there were eleven distinct types issued. The king derived a considerable income, directly and indirectly, from this frequent change in the type of the current coin. As Mr. Andrew observes,¹ to proclaim a new coinage without placing some restriction upon the old would have been quite useless. The moneyers would have continued to use their old dies rather than pay for new ones, and it would have been no hardship to the people, as we are expressly told it was, unless they were periodically compelled to change their old money for new, thus contributing large fees to the moneyers and exchanges, who in turn contributed to the Exchequer. How little mere surmise there is in this may be shown by reference to any of the hoards of the period, which never contain more than four or five different types at the most. Mr. Andrew also propounds the following theory in regard to the *Monetagium* tax:

"This system of constant change in the tender appears to have been carried to excess in late Anglo-Saxon times, and was naturally a great hardship to the people, who were put to the cost of renewing their money so often, and therefore, at some time subsequent to the Conquest, the tax of *Monetagium* was introduced. This was in effect, a compact between King and people, that in return for a hearth tax of twelve pence, payable every third year, the money should not be changed more often than once in that period. The *Monetagium* tax, however, soon became more unpopular than the old custom which it was intended to ameliorate. If it was instituted immediately after the Conquest, it certainly did not restrict the number of new coinages to one in every three years, for we have

¹ *Henry I*, p. 13.

no less than thirteen distinct types issued during the thirty-four years of the reign of the two Williams. But if we accept it as referring to the changes in legal tender for the time being, then, as the finds prove that two or three types, consecutive issues, were always retained in currency at the same time, the period exactly suffices for a change every third year. Henry I at once abolished this tax by his Coronation Charter, in which he says: 'The usual Monetagium which was being taken in cities and in counties, which was not done in the time of King Edward, I altogether forbid this being done henceforth.' (*Monetagium commune quod capiebatur per civitates et per comitatus, quod non fuit tempore Regis Edwardi, hoc ne amodo fiat omnino defendo.*)¹

"This, however, was a doubtful benefit to the people, as it left the king a free hand to change the tender as often as he wished, and as his hold of the crown strengthened he seems to have more frequently exercised the privilege, for during his reign of thirty-five years, he issued no fewer than fifteen distinct coinages, and it is little to be wondered at that the moneyers, who thus had so many extra fees to pay, should have endeavoured to recoup themselves from the public by debasing and lightening the coinage."²

From the above-cited record in the Peterborough *Black Book*, it seems that the exchanges at Burh and at Oundle were not permanent but were set up temporarily in the market-place on market days for the convenience of merchants and others attending those markets. These exchanges were farmed for 20 shillings per year to the two moneyers, but the exchange at Stamford Baron, the most remunerative of the abbot's exchanges, appears to have been retained in the abbot's own hand. An exchange (*cambium*) was attached to every mint (*moneta*); the special function of the exchange was to purchase bullion for the use of the mint to which it was attached, and to issue new coin to the public. It was the only source through which the moneyer could put his coins into circulation. The exchanger was in charge of the

¹ Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, Rolls Series, vol. ii, p. 116; *Historia Minor*, Rolls Series, vol. i, p. 179; *Statutes of the Realm*, Record Commission, 1810, vol. i, p. 1.

² Henry I, pp. 13-15. See also "Monetagium", by Dr. G. C. Brooke, *Num. Chron.*, 1912.

mint as well as the exchange. The moneyers were subordinate to him, and one of his duties was to check the weight and standard of the coins as they came from the moneyers and before they passed into the hands of the public. Away from the chief exchange the moneyers appear to have been the recognized purchasers of bullion, as is shown below and also in the case of the abbot's moneyers in the market at Burh and at Oundle.

About 1118, or a little earlier, was issued a writ in which it was forbidden that any moneyer should exchange money except in his own county and in the presence of two credible witnesses of the same county, and if he should be taken exchanging money in any other county, he should be punished as a false coiner. It was likewise commanded that no person except he were a moneyer should presume to exchange money. In the case of the abbot's exchange this writ would apply not to the county but to the abbot's liberty which, as I have previously stated on p. 50, was somewhat extensive.

Rymer, *Foedera*, vol. v, p. 416, writing of a somewhat later period, states that when the royal exchanges gave silver coins for gold nobles, for example, they gave one silver penny less for each noble than its current value, and when they gave gold nobles for silver coins they took one penny more, or 6s. 9d. for each noble, by which in every transaction they made a profit of $1\frac{1}{5}$ per cent. The exchangers had also the exclusive privilege of giving the current coins of the kingdom in exchange for foreign coins to accommodate merchant strangers, and the exchange or purchase of obsolete English or other money for the use of the mints. By these various operations the royal exchanges made considerable profits, of which the king had a certain share. The above extract from the Peterborough *Liber Niger* shows that the abbot's moneyers paid 20 shillings per year for the privilege of working the abbot's monopoly of an exchange at certain places within his liberty. Probably the abbot received, in addition, a proportion of the profits equal to that which the king received from those to whom he farmed the royal exchanges. It was at the change of the money, when a new type was introduced, which occurred about every three years, and the obsolete coins were brought in, that the exchangers made their principal profits. As is shown above, they held a monopoly of the privilege of exchanging coin and they were

entitled to deduct sixteen pence halfpenny from the price of every pound weight of coins or other silver that they bought.

As we have already seen, the moneyer at a small provincial mint is frequently also the exchanger. From this union, probably sprang the use of the term *cambium* for either the mint or exchange, which renders it impossible to discover, in some instances, which of the two offices is intended. This ambiguity is noticed by William of Malmesbury, in his history, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, where he speaks of the severities practised by order of Henry I "against the trapezitae whom they commonly call moneyers" (*contra trapezitas quos vulgo monetarios vocant*).¹ The word trapezita is the Greek *τραπέζιτης*, which is derived from *τράπεζα*, "a money-changer's table". Hence, by "trapezita", William of Malmesbury means a money-changer.

THE PETERBOROUGH CHARTERS OF WULFHHERE AND EADGAR

In the year 1070 the Danes, assisted by Hereward and his followers, attacked Peterborough Abbey, plundered the church, destroyed the buildings of the abbey except the church itself, and laid waste the town with fire. Hereward spared the church but soon after his departure a fire seized upon the church and the remaining buildings, from which the monks rescued a few relics and little else. In August 1116 the abbey church was again accidentally burnt. The Peterborough *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records that "the whole of the monastery was burnt, with all the houses, except the chapter-house and the dormitory; and the greater part of the town was burnt also". There can be no doubt that the library also with the charters and other records were consumed in the general conflagration.

The charters of Wulfhere and Eadgar cited on pp. 50 and 51, in the form in which we know them, are undoubtedly of early twelfth-century date, and there can be little doubt that it was after the disastrous fire of 1116 that they were written. As they are frequently described as "spurious" it may not be out of place to quote the following from the Introduction to Birch's *Cartularium Saxonicum*:

"Much might be written upon the obscure question of the genuineness of certain documents included in the

¹ *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, Rolls Series, vol. ii, p. 476.

following pages. . . . Setting aside for the moment those which are glaringly fictitious, there are many which in their present form, are not true texts of original documents, for these originals have no doubt perished in some of the frequent calamities which are so graphically described in many an ancient chronicle. But looking on them with the light which many other genuine deeds of this period afford, we cannot but be led to the conclusion that, although they are not copies, they are reconstructions of genuine documents, couched in terms differing for the most part widely from the language of the original. It is not unlikely that these late and spurious forms were set up when necessity arose for the existence and production of the muniments and charters which alone could confer upon the cathedral, the abbey, or the private person, the rights of possession and privileges long and usefully, as well as legally and unquestionably, enjoyed by such corporations or individuals. Accepting this view, that these apparently false charters are neither originals nor copies of originals, but mere substitutes for originals; not fictitious in the sense of being false representations; nevertheless, recording real transactions, yet not in the terms in which the grants were originally made, we can easily understand how it is that they contain so many errors of language, history, and topography, and are so full of anachronisms.

"A charter formerly in the Ashburnham Library, now in the British Museum (Stowe Charter, No. 21), illustrates the practice of rewriting charters from memory if they had been destroyed. This deed is dated A.D. 903, and recites how Aethelfrith, the Duke, had lost all his hereditary charters by fire, and therefore he desires permission of King Edward, and Æthelred and Æthelfleda, rulers of the Mercians, to prepare other charters, 'eodem modo quo et priores scripti erant in quantum eos memoriter recordari potuisset'."

After this, the wonder is that the observed errors in Anglo-Saxon diplomatics are not much more numerous than is really the case.

Ingulph describes the destruction of Crowland Abbey in the year 1091. He describes his own visit to the muniment room of the abbey, and the discovery that all their charters

had been destroyed. Then follows a most reasonable account of how they were replaced. Copies of some of the charters had been in use in the cloisters by the juniors for instruction in the art of writing, and from these and memory a new set was prepared. It is highly probable that such precious documents as charters would be committed to memory, so that if destroyed in those turbulent times they could be easily replaced; and we have here the undoubted cause of the errors and anachronisms. The main objection to the Peterborough charters is that the place-names, &c., are of the Norman period, and not such as were in use in Anglo-Saxon times; but the scribe working from memory or dictation would reproduce ancient ideas in Norman phraseology, and can there be any wonder that errors, especially of detail, should creep in?

There was in the reign of Henry I, resident in Peterborough Abbey, a Norman monk named Hugo, called Albus, or Candidus. He witnessed the fire of 1116, when the church and the library, with the charters, &c., were consumed, and of which event he has left us a vivid account. Hugo, who on account of his delicate health, was unable to take part in the more strenuous work of the monastery, in course of time became the monastery scribe. About 1120 he commenced to write a history of the Abbey of Peterborough, which he carried down to the election of Abbot Waterville, in 1155, about which time it is probable that Hugo's death took place. The Peterborough *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* was written after the destruction of the library, in 1116, and it appears probable that Hugo wrote the concluding portions, as well as the interpolations concerning Peterborough Abbey, for the *Chronicle*, like his history of Peterborough, comes abruptly to an end with the election of Abbot Waterville.

Thomas Wright¹ suggests that Hugo used the *Chronicle* in compiling his history, and that he mistranslates some of the English words in a way that shows little familiarity with the English tongue, and it has been pointed out by several other authorities, including the late Sir Henry Howorth,² that while the greater part of the Peterborough *Chronicle*—where it has been copied from an earlier manuscript—is

¹ *Biographia Britannica Literaria*, Anglo-Norman period, p. 177.

² "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, its Origin and History", *Archaeological Journal*, 1908.

written in good English, the concluding portions and the interpolations relating to Peterborough are written in the Mercian dialect and show evidence of having been written by a person also imperfectly acquainted with the English tongue. Sir Henry Howorth says: "The Peterborough Chronicle, which was compiled in 1122, and was almost immediately followed by the history of the Monastery by Hugo Candidus, are the only documents of the kind we know anything directly about, and both of them were products of the twelfth century. Nor are there, so far as I know, any manuscripts extant of an earlier date than this which came directly from its library."

Hugo's history of Peterborough Abbey is preserved at Peterborough, and is known by the title of *Liber de Swaffham*. Swaffham, another monk of Burh, however, was merely a continuator of Hugo's work down to the year 1245. Hugo's work, *Coenobii Historia Burgensis*, is printed in Sparke's *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores Varii*, 1723, book iii, pp. 1-94.

Hugo, as the monastery scribe, was probably the writer of the "spurious" charters of Wulfhere and Eadgar, which were probably produced under conditions similar to those described by Ingulph. In the latter part of 1145 Abbot Martin went to Rome, so that Pope Eugenius III might grant to him and his abbey a confirmation of the charters which had been granted to the abbey in earlier times. Walter of Whittlesea records Martin's journey, and adds that he took with him to Rome the charter granted to the abbey by Æthelred, brother and successor of Wulfhere. It is possible that this was the only early charter saved from the fire of 1116, but although Whittlesea fails to mention other charters, it is evident that Abbot Martin also took with him the "spurious" charters of Wulfhere and Eadgar; and possibly others, of which we have no record.

We are also told that "in the consistory there arose a debate about the form of the charter which had hitherto gone current for the space of almost five hundred years, and one of the Cardinals present besought the Pope that he would not give the honour of his name to another's grant; whereupon a new charter was granted to Abbot Martin in the name of Eugenius", wherein he grants and confirms to the abbot and his successors all the tenements and possessions of the abbey, the fees of knights, the liberties of the church, &c.

THE BULL OF POPE EUGENIUS III AND THE STAMFORD
AND PETERBOROUGH MINTS

A full transcript of the charter, or Bull, of Pope Eugenius is given in Hugo's history of Burh, from which it is copied into Gunton's *History of The Church of Peterborough*, 1686, and thence into Dugdale's *Monasticon*. Gunton was not aware that the actual charter of Eugenius was still in existence, but between the time of the compilation of his history and the date of its publication, the original charter came to light in the following curious manner, as related by Dean Patrick, the editor of Gunton's work:

"The very original, signed by Pope Eugenius by his own hand, and attested by the Cardinal of St. George and another whose name is eaten out, came to light about 13 years ago, upon this occasion. Some Workmen employed about mending the Roof of the Church, in the upper Ceiling, taking up a board (fast nailed down just over the High Altar) which it was necessary to remove, found this Bull under it: much defaced indeed by time, and worm-eaten in many places, but with a very fair seal to it, which I have caused to be represented in this Figure of it."

The seal represented is of the type of leaden seal, or bulla, commonly attached to Papal Bulls, having on one side two heads representing SS. Paul and Peter, and the other side inscribed "EUGENIVS PP. III". Dean Patrick continues:

"How it came there; hath been the enquiry of several persons ever since it was found. My conjecture is that in the Insurrection of Jack Straw, and his partakers, some Monk, fearing all their Records might be destroyed, resolved to secure this, which was of great value, by hiding it on the top of the Church; where by his sudden death perhaps, or by forgetfulness it ever after remained."

This charter, which was substituted for, and in which was embodied in a more convenient form, the contents of the various charters previously granted to Peterborough, including those granted by Wulfhere and by Eadgar, sets forth that:—

"Eugenius the servant of God's servants, to Martin the Burh Abbot, and his brethren the monks professed

present and future. . . . Therefore son Martin . . . thou hast visited with due devotion the threshold of the Apostles and art present before us, we kindly consent to thy petition and thy brethren's demands and take under our protection and St. Peter's the church of St. Peter . . . at Burh . . . and we now arm you with the authority of this present rescript.

"We will that whatever possessions and goods the church now justly and canonically has or hereafter may have by pontifical concession, by royal and princely grants or by offerings of the faithful, or may be acquired by other just means . . . shall be yours and your successors. Imprimis we think it right to specify in words as follows."

Then follows a concise account of the various possessions and privileges belonging to the abbey, clearly scheduled under counties and commencing as follows:

"In Northamptonshire, Burh, which anciently was called Medeshamstede, where the Monastery is situated, with Sanctuary, Market, Tolls, and *Money Die*, together with marshes, woods &c. appertaining thereto."

After which follows a detailed account of the abbey's possessions in many places in Northamptonshire; and to prevent the before-mentioned money die from being confused with that granted by Eadgar, in Stamford, it may be pointed out that when the schedule reaches Stamford (still in Northamptonshire), we find the following account of the abbey's possessions and privileges:

"In Stamford, fifty-nine mansuras of land, with lands, Mills, Churches, Tolls and *Money Die*."

And to emphasize the fact that the foregoing were in Northamptonshire, it adds:

"In the same town *in Lincolnshire*, seven mansuras."

Thus showing beyond question that the abbot's mint was situated at Stamford, Northamptonshire, and not in Stamford, Lincolnshire. It is not so specified in the bull, but it is evident that the abbot had the privilege of using one pair of dies alternatively at Peterborough or at Stamford, according to his discretion and convenience.

This original record and confirmation of the abbot's

privilege of a mint and moneyer at Peterborough, raises three questions: (1) when and in what circumstances was this privilege first granted, (2) what coins were struck under this grant, and (3) have any of the coins so issued been preserved to us?

To consider the first question we must return to the reign of Eadweard the Confessor. Leofric, Abbot of Peterborough and nephew of the powerful Leofric, Ealdorman of Mercia, stood so high in the favour of Eadward that he held five abbeys at once: Burton, Coventry, Crowland, and Thorney, besides Peterborough. When the Norman invaded England Leofric, preferring the cause of his country to that of his own house, exchanged the monk's gown for the hauberk of the soldier and took part in defending his country against the invader. He fought at Hastings and, after the heavy defeat of the English, made his way home, sick and weary, to die amongst his brethren in his own abbey of Peterborough.

To succeed Leofric in the abbacy the monks elected one of their own number, Brand, a Saxon, said to have been uncle to Hereward, the Saxon patriot. After his election, Brand, esteeming William of Normandy lightly, and looking upon him as an unanointed ruler, went to Eadgar Ætheling, and applied to him for confirmation of his election as Abbot of Peterborough. The sequel is best told in the words of the Peterborough chronicler:

“The monks then chose for Abbot provost Brand . . . and sent him to Eadgar Ætheling, for that the land-folk supposed that he should be king: and the Ætheling received him gladly. When king William heard say that, he was very wroth, and said that the Abbot had renounced him: but good men went between them, and reconciled them; because the Abbot was a good man. He gave the king forty marks of gold for his reconciliation; and he lived but a little while after—only three years. Afterwards came every tribulation and every evil to the minster.”

Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, says:

“Two of the greatest monasteries in England lay specially open to his (the Conqueror's) wrath. We have seen how the Abbots of Peterborough and New Minster, Leofric the nephew of Earl Leofric and Aelfwig the brother of Earl Godwine, had given their lives in the cause of

England. And the brotherhood of either house was in William's eyes as guilty as its chief. Twelve monks of the New Minster had been found among the slain at Senlac, and the convent of the Golden Burh had done a deed of treason well nigh as dark in William's eyes by sending the Abbot chosen in Leofric's place to seek the royal confirmation at the hands of the English Aetheling. There seems to have been something specially galling to William in this quiet ignoring of his claims. The monks of Peterborough had not even waited to see what would be the final end of the strife. They had shut their eyes to the presence of the Conqueror in the land, and had dealt with the uncrowned Eadgar as already King."

Abbot Brand was a Saxon, and his and his monks' Saxon sympathies were well known. Consequently the Conqueror held some little ill will towards them, increased no doubt as a result of his dispute with them at the time of Brand's election; and when, upon Brand's death in November 1069, the monks again claimed to elect their own abbot, William brushed aside their claim, and in April 1070 appointed as Brand's successor Tuold, a Norman, who is described by the local chronicler as a very stern man, and the known details of his earlier history fully bear out the character.

Tuold, a monk of Fécamp, is said to have fought at Hastings, and the Conqueror rewarded him by bestowing upon him the abbacy of Malmesbury. He had been famed on the other side of the Channel for his acts of violence, also for a habit he had of calling in some of his armed retainers whenever he was not instantly obeyed, who at once suppressed by force the slightest resistance on the part of the brotherhood. His exploits in wielding his sword against unarmed monks became notorious, and as he conducted himself more as a soldier than an abbot, the king sent him to rule in the abbey of Peterborough, a post of some danger from its vicinity to the Saxon camp of refuge, with the intention probably of making Peterborough a military centre.

Tuold's ill fame having preceded him to Mercia, the monks hesitated as to how to receive their new abbot. They were justified in their hesitation, for Tuold's rule as Abbot of Peterborough proved to be one of terror rather than of

legitimate discipline, and he treated the monks as slaves rather than as brethren. When he temporarily retired from Peterborough he obtained the abbacy of Beauvais, and the monks of Peterborough trusted they had seen the last of him, but owing to his tyrannical character he was expelled from his French abbacy after a rule of only three or four days, and he gave a large sum of money to the Conqueror to be reinstated in the abbacy of Peterborough. Hugo Candidus says that Turolde was a mischief to the church of Peterborough eight and twenty years, that being the length of his rule.

Hereward, however, did not hesitate, but, with the assistance of his allies, the Danes, attacked the abbey. Hereward was, as is stated by Hugo Candidus, "a man of the Abbot of Burh", his holdings being situated at Witham on the Hill, and possibly Rippingdale and Laughton, all near Bourne; and it is evident that "Hereward and his gang", as they are termed in the *Peterborough Chronicle*, were the rebellious tenants of the abbey, as distinct from the Danes, and that they, as well as the monks, bitterly resented the imposition upon them of a Norman abbot.

As Dr. Round observes (*Feudal England*), "Hereward's plea for bringing the Danes to Peterborough was that he honestly believed that they would overthrow the Normans, and that the treasures of the church would, therefore, be safer in their hands. He may perfectly well have been hostile to the Normans and yet faithful to the Abbey so long as Brand held it; but the news that Turolde and his knights were coming to make the Abbey a centre of Norman rule against him would drive him to extreme courses. . . . Living on the edge of the fenland, he may well have been a leader among 'that English folk of the fenlands' who rose, says the *Peterborough Chronicle*, in the spring of 1070, to join the Danish fleet and throw off the Norman yoke. And the prospect of being ousted from his Peterborough lands by a follower of the new French Abbot would have added a personal zest to his patriotic zeal."

Turolde appears to have been afraid to go near Hereward's haunts, and to take possession of Peterborough without a troop of 160 French soldiers, all well armed. Late in May 1070 Turolde reached Stamford Baron with these soldiers, the greater part of whom must have been furnished by the

king to guard him on the road and put him in possession. When Turolde reached Peterborough a few days later, he found everything, except the church, burnt. Meanwhile the Danes, having notice of his coming, had got away.

Hereward grew every day more formidable to Turolde, who, as the Chronicle of John, Abbot of Peterborough, observes, granted threescore and two whole hides of land belonging to Peterborough Abbey to certain stipendiary knights to protect him against Hereward. Hugo Candidus says "Turolde gave lands amounting to sixty-two knights fees to these tenants and their heirs." This considerable military force, however, did not prevent Turolde from falling into Hereward's hands, from which captivity he is said to have redeemed himself by the payment of three thousand marks of silver (*Gesta Herewardi*), which was so large a sum in those days that the statement appears somewhat incredible, but whatever the amount of his ransom may have been there can be little doubt that it was paid in coined money, of which a considerable proportion was probably struck in the abbot's mint at Peterborough.

Turolde set his soldiers to work at Peterborough to strengthen the defences of the abbey and to erect, within the defensive wall, a castle or keep, of which the mound still exists; for centuries it was known as "Mount Turolde", and to-day it is known as "Tout Hill". The tower was demolished by Abbot Martin in the reign of Henry I or of Stephen.

The maintenance of Turolde's small army of knights and their followers necessitated a considerable outlay, and there can be little doubt that the Conqueror, foreseeing the necessity for a considerable sum in coined money, and anticipating that Turolde would probably be compelled by Hereward to remain within the precincts of his abbey, and thus be unable to procure a supply of coin from his mint at Stamford, granted to Turolde the privilege of coining within the abbey, and provided him with dies for that purpose.

We will now consider if we have in our cabinets any coins struck under this grant, and if it is possible to identify them. In the Beaworth hoard, found in 1833, were a few coins which were then read **SEPORD ON BVRDI**, &c., and were attributed to Burh Abbey, but there can be little doubt that Mr. L. A. Lawrence is correct in reading these coins



31



32



33



34



35



40



36



37



38



39



41



42



45



44



46

COINS OF THE STAMFORD MINT

ÆTHELRÆD II

Plate III

SEPORD ON BARDI, &c., and also in allocating them to Barnstaple, which, in Anglo-Saxon and Norman times, was spelt "Bardestapla", &c.¹

In the abbot's mint at Stamford, in the reigns of Eadweard the Confessor, Harold II, and William I, was a moneyer named Leofwine or Lefwine. His name first appears upon Stamford coins of Eadweard the Confessor, of type C.-B.² III (*Hks.*³ 220; *Hild.*⁴ C.), which Major Carlyon-Britton considers to have been issued from 1045 to 1048, and his name appears upon each succeeding type down to the end of the Confessor's reign, and also upon coins of Harold II. In the reign of William I Leofwine's name appears upon Stamford coins of types C.-B.⁵ I, mule I-II,⁶ III, IV, V, and VI (*Hks.* 233, 235, 236, 237, 238, and 243). In other words, Leofwine's name appears upon every type from about 1045-8 to about 1080-3, with the single exception of William I type C.-B. II (*Hks.* 234), which, according to Major Carlyon-Britton's theory, was authorized at Michaelmas 1068, and remained in issue until Michaelmas 1071.

Stamford being a private mint, it is probable that Leofwine did not receive his new reverse die for type II until the early part of 1069, during the first half of which year the mule coins of type I-II, were issued, and it is reasonable to assume that the illness and death of Abbot Brand, in the same year, followed by the interregnum prior to the appointment of Brand's successor, would interfere with the routine supply of the new obverse die; and that Leofwine, if he struck coins at all between the middle of 1069 and June 1070, would continue to issue the mule coins of type I-II. This may account for the fact that, although we have only nine coins of this mule type, representing six mints, we have no less than three specimens by Leofwine, issued at Stamford.

The presence of the mule coins, and the absence of Stamford coins of the substantive type II, is explained by the

¹ *Num. Chron.*, 1897, pp. 302-8.

² Major Carlyon-Britton, "Eadward the Confessor and His Coins," *Num. Chron.*, 1905, pp. 179-205.

³ Hawkins, *Silver Coins of England*, 1887.

⁴ Hildebrand, *Anglo-Saxon Coins in the Royal Swedish Cabinet*, 1881.

⁵ Major Carlyon-Britton, "A Numismatic History of the Reigns of William I and II," *Brit. Num. Journ.*, vol. ii, pp. 130-81.

⁶ A "mule" coin is one which combines the obverse of one substantive type with the reverse of another, generally of consecutive issues, the obverse being of the earlier type.

highly probable suggestion that Leofwine, before he received his new obverse die for type II, joined the retinue of Abbot Turolde, when he passed through Stamford Baron, and proceeded with him to Burh, on the 2nd of June 1070.

After the attack upon the abbey, in June 1070, we hear nothing of Hereward until the following year, though there can be little doubt that he continued to hold out in his stronghold in the Isle of Ely, and to harass the Normans at Burh; but in 1071 the Conqueror himself led an expedition against Hereward and his followers, which is thus described in the *Peterborough Chronicle*:

“Then came bishop Aylwine, and Siwart Barn, and many hundred men with them into Ely. When King William heard tell that, then ordered he out a naval force and land force, and beset the land all about, and wrought a bridge, and went in; and the naval force at the same time on the sea side. And the outlaws then all surrendered . . . except Hereward alone, and all those that would join him, whom he led out triumphantly. And the king took their ships, and weapons, and ‘many sceattæ’; and all the men he disposed of as he thought proper.”

Leofwine probably remained at Peterborough until the trouble with Hereward was at an end and the neighbourhood had become free of the roving bands of Saxons. The greater part of Turolde's knights had by this time dispersed to take possession of the abbey's lands which Turolde had granted to them and, Leofwine's presence as moneyer at Peterborough being no longer necessary, he returned to resume his duties at Stamford, where he issued coins of types C.-B. III, IV, V, and VI. According to Major Carlyon-Britton's theory, the Conqueror's third type was in issue during the years 1072-3-4, and, as Leofwine probably returned to Stamford in 1072, that date would exactly coincide with the issue of type III.

With regard to the coins struck at Peterborough Abbey, the series appears to be now represented by three specimens only, viz. two of William I type C.-B. II, struck by Leofwine during his stay there, commencing in June 1070, and ending probably in 1072, and one specimen of Stephen's third type, *Hks.* 268, which unfortunately fails to disclose a moneyer's name.¹

¹ These coins will be fully described and illustrated later.

Stephen's second type (*Hks.* 269; *Brit. Mus. Cat.* II) had been in issue about four years when Abbot Martin returned from Rome in 1146, and had nearly run its course, which would account for its apparent non-issue from either Peterborough or Stamford mints. The only other general issue of Stephen's coins was *Hks.* 268 (*Brit. Mus. Cat.* VII), in which type we find the Peterborough coin referred to above.

The issue of Stephen's last type (*Hks.* 268), of which we have none struck at Stamford, probably commenced only a short time before Stephen's death and continued in issue during the first two years of Henry II's reign, and with the possible exception of certain coins of the latter king's first issue, inscribed *WILLEM ON STA*, &c., the Peterborough coins of *Hks.* 268, were the last to be issued by the authority of the abbots of Peterborough.

The right of coining appears to have been withdrawn from, or surrendered by, the abbot in or before the reign of John, when a charter was granted to the abbot and convent of Peterborough, as is shown by a record on the Charter Roll of 16 March, 11 Henry III, 1227, of a "Grant to the abbot and convent of Peterborough of all their lands and possessions, pursuant to a charter of King John", and on the same roll, under date of the day following, 17 March, we find a full transcript of the confirmation charter in which are enumerated the lands and possessions of the monastery, but in which we find no mention of either mint or moneys. It seems probable that the abbot's coining privileges ceased at the time of the great recoinage of 1180, when the ecclesiastical coining privileges were restricted to the Archbishops of Canterbury and of York, and to certain of the bishops. On the same roll as the last-mentioned record is entered, and under the same date, we find a further record of a "Grant to the abbot and monks of Peterborough of a weekly market on Friday at their manor of Kettering, and a yearly fair at Peterborough on the second Sunday in Lent and the seven days following". It seems possible that the privilege of a market at Kettering and of a fair at Peterborough was granted to the abbot in recompense for the surrender of his coining privileges, for it is difficult to imagine that the abbot would willingly relinquish so remunerative a possession as a mint and two moneys without obtaining some adequate compensation.

THE ABBOT'S SECOND MONEYER

When did the abbot originally receive the grant of a second moneyer? In Hugo's *History of Burh*, under the heading "Nomina eorum, qui dederint tenementa et possessiones Sancto Petro antiquitus", we find it recorded that:

"Thurkil Hoche gave to [the Burh of] St. Peter, Colingham [Nottinghamshire], and a moneyer in Stanford and land there on this side of the water." (*Turkilus Hoche dedit Sancto Petro Colingham & monetarium in Stanford & terram ibidem ex ista parte aquae.*)¹

There can be little doubt that the passage cited above, which was probably extracted from Thurkil's charter, before the fire of 1116, in which the charter was probably burnt, records the grant of a second moneyer to the abbot, the possession of which privilege is confirmed by the bull of Pope Eugenius III,² and by the entry in the Peterborough *Black Book* cited on p. 54. Hugo's words prove conclusively that this moneyer, together with certain land, was granted in Stamford Baron, and not as Mr. Andrew claims, in Stamford, Lincolnshire,³ for Hugo was writing at Peterborough Abbey, or possibly at the abbey's important branch establishment situated in the parish of Stamford Baron, but outside the *burh*, and he says "on this side of the water", i.e. the Peterborough or Northamptonshire side of the Welland, thus adding still further confirmation of the accuracy of my claim that the mint was situated in Stamford Baron and not in Stamford, Lincolnshire.

This appears to be the earliest grant to the monastery of land within the fortified boundaries of Stamford Baron, subsequent to the building of the *burh* in 917. Hugo's record is that Thurkil gave to the monastery of St. Peter at Burh a moneyer in Stamford "and land there". He does not in any way suggest that the whole town was granted to the monastery, but merely "land there". Mr. Andrew, however, in his endeavour to show that the mint was situated in Stamford, Lincolnshire, assumes that the grant, if it referred to Stamford Baron, would necessarily include the whole

¹ "Historia Coenobii Burgensis", printed in Sparke's *Historiae Anglicanae scriptores Varii*, 1732, Book III, p. 44.

² See p. 64 *ante*.

³ *Numismatic History of the Reign of Henry I*, p. 363.

town as well as the mint and all its moneyers, providing the mint was situated there; and he argues accordingly that as the grant was of one moneyer only and not the mint with all its moneyers, it must refer to Stamford on the Lincolnshire side of the river.¹ But it is overlooked that if the above assumption holds good in regard to Stamford Baron, it applies equally well to Stamford, Lincolnshire. But we know that the monastery's holding in the latter town was quite small even upwards of a century later.² It was at some period between 1155 and 1175 that the whole of the land within the *burh* of Stamford Baron again came into the monastery's possession, for Gunton, *History of the Church of Peterborough*, 1686, p. 283, records that Abbot William de Waterville (1155-75), "purchased all the Village on this side [i.e. the Peterborough side] the bridge of Stamford". This record controverts the opinion of nearly all previous writers on this subject, viz. that Stamford Baron remained uninterruptedly in the monastery's possession from the time of Eadgar onward, or in the case of Mr. Andrew, from the time of Canute.

Richard Butcher, in his *Survey and Antiquitie of the Town of Stamford*, 1646, refers to an inquisition taken for the Wapentake of Nesse. This inquisition is undated, but according to Peck,³ it was taken in the fifth year of Henry III (1221). In this inquisition it is stated that: "In the town of Stamford beyond the Bridge, in the county of Northampton, the Abbot of Burh holds ten yard lands and half⁴ of the king, with part of the town of Stamford. But the inquisition cannot find by what service the said Abbot holds the said lands; and they say the said Abbot hath not given or

¹ *Numismatic History of the Reign of Henry I*, p. 363. ² See p. 64 *ante*.

³ *Academia Tertia Anglicana, or the Antiquarian Annals of Stamford*, 1727.

⁴ A yard-land or virgate was an uncertain quantity of land which varied, according to locality, from 24 to 40 acres. The term yard-land was also applied to a much smaller quantity of land, as is shown by Robert Recorde in *The Ground of Artes teaching the Worke and Practice of Arithmetike*, 1543, where we read of "a rodde of londe which some call a roode, some a yardlonde, and some a farthendale . . . 4 farthendales make an acre", and from Jeake's *Λογιστικηλογία*, 1696, we learn that "a Rood is sometimes called a farthendale and sometimes a Yardland". The 10½ yard-lands referred to in the Stamford inquisition of 1221, were obviously the smaller quantity of land. At that time the rood or the smaller yard-land was a strip of land one perch (5½ yards) in width and 40 perches (220 yards) or one furlong in length, so that 10½ yard-lands would be 12,705 square yards or 2⅘ acres. From this it would appear that Abbot Waterville's actual purchase (see above) was about 1⅘ acres.

alienated the same or any part thereof." It seems fairly obvious that this "ten yard lands and half", are identical with the "land there" of Thurkil's grant; the "43 men having houses with land adjoining" recorded in the *Black Book of Peterborough*,¹ and the "fifty-nine mansuras of land &c." scheduled in the bull or charter granted by Eugenius III.² The reason for the inquisition's inability to discover by what service the abbot held the "ten yard lands and half" of the king was, in all probability, that Thurkil's Charter, by which the land was granted, was consumed in the fire of 1116 and had not been replaced, nor had confirmatory charters been applied for, and the terms upon which the land was held is not stated in either the *Black Book of Peterborough*, or in the bull of Eugenius III.

Mr. Andrew, after citing Hugo's record, says: "On his accession, Canute had granted East Anglia to Thurkil the Earl. Hence it was Thurkil's duty to confirm the rights of the monastery", &c. But why should it be Thurkil's duty as Earl of East Anglia to confirm the rights of the Abbey of Peterborough? Neither Peterborough nor Stamford formed any part of the East Anglian earldom. Both Peterborough and the two Stamfords were in Mercia and would thus come under the control of Eadric Streona, who was not the type of man likely to brook interference in his earldom.

A statement that Canute added Stamford to East Anglia is made by Peck in his *Annals of Stamford*, but he fails to adduce evidence in support of that statement, nor does such evidence appear to be forthcoming from other quarters, and it appears probable that Peck, knowing of Thurkil's grant of a moneyer and certain land in Stamford, and being unable to account otherwise for Thurkil's authority to make such grant, assumed that Stamford, i.e. Stamford Baron, had been added by Canute to Thurkil's earldom of East Anglia. Moreover, a glance at the map shows the extreme improbability of such transference of a small isolated piece of land from Mercia to East Anglia, to be almost immediately re-transferred to Mercia.

Thurkil the tall was a Dane of noble birth, the son of Harold who was earl in Scania. He was a typical Viking, tall, strong and valorous, and must have been a masterly

¹ See p. 54 *ante*.

² See p. 64 *ante*.

man, one in whom warriors readily recognized the qualities of chieftainship. It is evident that the English, too, were impressed by the eminence of the tall earl. According to the sagas Thurkil was Canute's foster-father. Such information as we possess concerning Canute's childhood is somewhat obscure. It is merely that he was not brought up at the Danish court, but was fostered by Thurkil the tall, one of the chiefs at Jomburg and brother of Earl Sigvaldi. When the young prince became king of England, Thurkil was exalted to a position next to that of Canute himself.

In the first year of Canute's reign there stood about the throne three prominent leaders, three military chiefs, to whom in a great measure the king owed his crown. There was the sly and jealous Eadric Streona, Earl of Mercia, Eric, for fifteen years earl and viceroy in Norway, now the ruler of Northumbria, and Thurkil the tall. Canute gave his confidence to the lordly Viking, for a stay of nearly ten years in England as Viking invader, as chief of Æthelred's mercenaries, and as Canute's chief assistant in his campaign against the English, had given Thurkil a wide acquaintance among the magnates of the land and considerable insight into English affairs. We have sufficient evidence to allow the conclusion that for some years Thurkil held a position in the kingdom second only to that of the king himself. Whenever his name appears in Canute's charters among the earls who witness royal grants, it holds first place.

In 1019 Canute went to Denmark and stayed until the following year. During his absence Thurkil appears to have acted as regent, for in a royal proclamation that was issued in 1020, before the king's return, he seems to act on the king's behalf in the general administration of justice whenever royal interference should become necessary:

"Should any one prove so rash, clerk or layman, Dane or Angle, as to violate the laws of the Church or the rights of my kingship or any secular statute, and refuse to do penance according to the instructions of my bishops, or to desist from this evil, then I request Thurkil the Earl, yea, even command him, to bend the offender to right, if he is able to do so."¹

In case the earl is unable to manage the business alone,

¹ Liebermann, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, vol. i, p. 274.

Canute promises to assist. There is something in this procedure that reminds one of the later Norman official, the justiciar, who was chief of the administrative forces when the king was in England and governed as the king's lieutenant when the ruler was abroad. That Thurkil's dignity was not a new creation at the time of the proclamation is evident from the preamble, in which Canute sends "greetings to his archbishops and bishops, and Thurkil earl, and all his earls and all his subjects". The language of the preamble also suggests that Thurkil acted as the king's deputy during Canute's absence in Denmark.¹

Thurkil, in his official capacity as earl, could not make grants of lands, &c., outside his earldom. The only period during which he had the power to dispose of royal possessions was in 1019-20, when he acted as Canute's regent, and there can be little doubt that it was at that time, as Canute's deputy, and possibly acting on the king's instructions, that he granted to Peterborough Abbey the moneyer and certain land in Stamford Baron, as is recorded by Hugo Candidus.²

In November 1021 Thurkil was outlawed. The reason for this act is not clear, but it was possibly prompted by Canute's fear of Thurkil's popularity and influence. The banishment of the earl does not appear to have been wholly the result of royal disfavour, for a few months later Canute and Thurkil were reconciled, and the old earl was given a position in Denmark analogous to the one that he held in England, or a position still higher, for in 1023 Canute made him viceroy in Denmark. Thurkil did not regain his English earldom but, contrary to the opinion expressed by a majority of historians, Thurkil appears to have returned to England, temporarily at least, for Kemble prints a charter of 1024, which is signed by "Thurcyl Hoga",³ as "minister". Mr. Andrew,⁴ in quoting Hugo Candidus's record of Thurkil "Hoche's" grant suggests that "Hoche" means "the Hold". Such, however, does not appear to be the case. The word "Hoche" appears to be quite unknown in any other recorded document and was probably an error on Hugo's part owing to his imperfect knowledge of the English tongue.⁵ The

¹ Larson, *Canute the Great*.

² See p. 72 *ante*.

³ *Codex Diplomaticus*, vol. iv, p. 31, No. 741.

⁴ *Numismatic History of Henry I*, p. 362.

⁵ See pp. 61-2 *ante*.

word should presumably be *Hoga-*, *hoh-*, "prudent", "careful", "anxious", "thoughtful". Moreover, Thurkil, acting as Canute's regent and holding the rank of earl, would not be described by the inferior rank of "Hold".¹

In conclusion I beg to tender my best thanks to the officials of the Coin Department at the British Museum, and to the officials at other museums for their unfailing courtesy and assistance in enabling me to obtain particulars of coins in their charge and for providing me with casts of coins for the purpose of illustration. My thanks are also due to those of my fellow collectors who have so kindly supplied me with particulars of coins in their cabinets, and I am even more indebted to those who have allowed me to acquire specimens from their collections and who have thus materially assisted me in compiling the following record of the coins issued at Stamford Baron, the most prolific of the Northamptonshire mints. Owing to the long period over which my study of the Stamford mint has extended, many of my numismatic friends from whom I have received the above favours have "gone beyond", but my gratitude is none the less sincere.

During the past forty-five years I have availed myself of every opportunity of acquiring coins struck at Stamford mint and I now have a series of nearly 400 pennies issued from that mint between the reign of Æthelstan and that of Henry II. In addition, I have carefully noted all other Stamford coins that have come under my notice during that period, and in the following descriptive lists of coins of the Stamford and Peterborough mints I beg to present to my readers the results of my labour in that direction which, I may add, has been a labour of love.

¹ "Thurferth Jarl and the holds" (see p. 39 *ante*). "Hold" would probably correspond with the modern "Colonel".

(To be continued.)

