FURTHER SOUTHAMPTON/WINCHESTER DIE-LINKS IN THE REIGN OF ÆTHELRÆD II

By R. H. M. DOLLEY

For many years now serious students of the Anglo-Saxon coinage have been exercised by the problem of distinguishing those pennies struck at Northampton—an undoubted mint—from those struck at Southampton—likewise an undoubted mint. In both cases the mint-signature is H(E)AMTVNE or a shortening thereof, and one of the earliest discoveries of the Anglo-Irish team working on the Swedish hoards since 1952 was a die-link which effectively demolished Wells' claim that spellings HEAM- were Mercian. Here the same obverse die was used by one and the same moneyer, Seolca, with reverse dies reading HAMTV, HEAMTV and PINCST(R), and it could be noted further that the quite unusual Continental Germanic name of the moneyer is one that is found on coins only at 'Hamtun' and Winchester. Subsequent research has established that the style of the obverse die in question is one that is peculiar to Wessex, and if anything would seem certain in late Saxon numismatics it is that some of the H(E)AMTVN coins were struck at Southampton.

In this note an evaluation will be made of 66 coins of Æthelræd II which lie in the trays of the Systematic Collection of the Royal Coin Cabinet at Stockholm under the general heading 'Hamtune'. They purport to be by some 18 different moneyers, and their distribution as between the different issues of the reign is shown in summary form in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>First Hand</th>
<th>Second Hand</th>
<th>Crux</th>
<th>Long Cross</th>
<th>Helmet</th>
<th>Agnus Dei</th>
<th>Last Small Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æthelt-noth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brumne, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leof-god</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-stan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-wino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-wold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seolca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spileman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurectel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ulfhi'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulf-noth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-fric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'—ia'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At once there will be noticed the disproportion between the 4 coins of the first two substantive types of the reign, and the 62 coins from the period after the introduction of the *Crux* type c. 991, a disproportion which is not materially reduced when we cut back the second figure by half-a-dozen or so by excluding pieces of doubtful authority. In this connection it is impossible not to bring into consideration the fact that active in the first two types of the reign and closing down apparently very soon after c. 991 there is the mint of 'Hamwic' which is certainly Southampton. In other words there may be thought to exist a distinct possibility that before c. 991 all 'Hamtun' coins are of Northampton, those of Southampton being distinguished by the mint-signature 'Hamwic', whereas after c. 991 the 'Hamtun' mint-signature can embrace coins of both mints, and it is this hypothesis that the present note is designed to test.

For this purpose it seems most convenient to consider the coins of each individual moneyer separately, and to take them in chronological order with observations on each.

**Leofsiges**


Leofsige is also known for the 'Reform' type of Eadgar and for Edward the Martyr. In both cases there has been a feeling that the mint is Northampton, though conclusive proof of this may be thought not to exist. At Winchester he is not known at the material time, and the weight of the evidence must be that under Æthelræd II he is a moneyer of Northampton.

**LifinCs**


There is no evidence to connect this moneyer with Winchester, and, while it cannot be pretended that style is decisive in the *First Hand* issue as between southern Mercia and eastern Wessex, the coins, like that of Leofsige in the same issue, have no markedly West Saxon features. Accordingly there would seem every reason for us to continue to give coins of Lifinc to Northampton, and, though again there is no absolute rule to be erected—indeed there are many exceptions—*Leof*—is a prototheme which is met with more frequently outside than inside Wessex.

**BruninCs**


The name is one that in this reign appears to be peculiar to 'Hamtun'. Later it is found at London, Nottingham and York—the attribution of Hild. Cnut 48 to Bath cannot well be maintained. In the *Crux* type of Æthelræd, Hild. 1247 and 1247A are die-duplicates, and the unusual workmanship, peculiarly blundered legends and anomalous weights (1·74 and 1·65 grammes = 26·8 and 25·4 grains) mean that they can be assigned with confidence to the class of Scandinavian imitations. We are left with a total of 7 obverse dies, and if the mint had been Southampton it would have been indeed remarkable if not one had exhibited the minor varieties of the *Crux* design that are so remarkable a feature of the transition to the *Long Cross* type. The single *Long Cross* obverse is of a style that is found over the whole country, but again early Winchester coins of this issue are often distinguished by stylistic quirks absent from the piece under consideration. There would seem good reason, then, for us to associate with Northampton all the coins of this moneyer, the imitative pieces excepted.
LEOFSTAN

Crux (Hild. 1256/1257)

Leofstan is not otherwise known for the reign at a mint in Wessex, and his absence from Winchester is probably significant. In the Crux type he is recorded by Hildebrand at Aylesbury, Canterbury, Ipswich, London, Southwark and York. All in all, then, Northampton seems the more likely candidate.

LEOFWINE

Crux (Hild. 1250/1261): Long Cross (Hild 1262/1263): Last Small Cross (Hild. 1258/1258A/1259/1260/1260A)

In the Crux type a Leofwine is recorded by Hildebrand as striking at Dover, Lewes, London, Maldon, Southwark, Tamworth, Thetford, Wallingford and York—the eschewal of mints in Wessex is quite remarkable. In Long Cross the mints are Chester, Lewes, London, Norwich, Romney and Southwark with the odd die at Taunton and Wilton. The Helmet issue, doubtless struck by Leofwine at Northampton though no coin of his was known to Hildebrand, shows a moneyer of the name at Chester, Lewes, London, Winchester and York, and again one would stress the disproportion as between the one mint in Wessex and the eight elsewhere. Reverting to the coins of 'Hamptun', the two Crux pennies are of impeccable style, and the two Long Cross pennies share a reverse die. Neither obverse has the small bust so very characteristic of Wessex and found in the case of the Wilton coins of the type and moneyer. The absence of the moneyer from Winchester when taken against this background cannot be ignored, and already the case for the attribution of the 'Hamptun' coins to Northampton is too cogent lightly to be set aside. In the Last Small Cross issue, Hild. 1258 and 1258A are die-duplicates, as are Hild. 1260 and 1260A. A feature of all three obverse dies is a small cross added to the die before the king's face, and we are probably to accept Wells' suggestion that this was a privy-mark to distinguish coins of Northampton from those of Southampton. What is decisive that the coins are of Northampton, for all that a Leofwine had begun striking at Winchester in the preceding issue, is style. All three obverse dies are of a workmanship virtually never found south of the Thames, and the two reverse dies—Hild. 1259 is from the same reverse die as Hild. 1258 and 1258A—even from the pages of Hildebrand can be distinguished as 'northern' by their retention of the m-0 form of copulative.

THURCETEL

Crux (Hild. 1274/1275)

Earlier in the reign a Thurcetel had struck at Torksey and at the end of the reign was to do so again and also at Lincoln. A 'London' coin (Hild. 2944) is patently Scandinavian. Prima facie, then, Thurcetel would seem to be of Northampton rather than Southampton, but the weights of the two coins appear suspiciously high (1.71 and 1.60 grammes = 26.4 and 24.7 grains). The style, however, is impeccable, and in a Mercian context a tendency for weights to be high has been the subject of informed comment. On balance, therefore,

Thurcetel may be accepted as a moneyer of Northampton, bringing to 5 the number of moneyers there who struck the *Crux* type.

ÆTHELNOETH

*Long Cross* (Hild. 1236/1236A/1237/1238/1239)

Interestingly Hild. 1236 is from the same reverse die as 1237, and 1238 from that of 1239. All five obverse dies are of English work, but none exhibits the bust that is found so frequently in Wessex at the issue’s inception. Æthelnoth is otherwise recorded by Hildebrand for the reign only at Lincoln, but Mr. Elmore Jones has discovered that a die-duplicate of Hild. 1238 provides an obverse die-link with Hild. 2171, a London penny of the moneyer Æthelward. Consequently there would seem little doubt but that Æthelnoth is to be considered a moneyer of Northampton.

EDMUND

*Long Cross* (Hild. 1249)

The coin is a *hapax*, the only occurrence of the moneyer for the mint, and the more worrying because of the unusually and unnecessarily abbreviated mint-signature where the ‘H’ is almost as tall again as the ‘A’. Nor is it even certain that the second letter is ‘A’, and one even wonders if it might not be the lower part of an ‘R’ in which case one might be tempted to read the indeterminate first letter as ‘N’—Eadmund strikes at Norwich in the preceding type. In the same type an Eadmund strikes at Colchester and London, using indeed at the latter mint one die with the ‘Edmund’ spelling. Provisionally, therefore, Edmund must be accepted as a Northampton moneyer, but not without some misgivings.

LEOFGOD

*Long Cross* (Hild. 1248)

Again the coin is a *hapax* for the mint, but mint-signature and style are impeccable. In the same type the moneyer is known at Cricklade, and later at Worcester. The style of the piece is not perhaps decisive, but certainly it would not arouse remark at a mint such as Stamford whereas at Winchester it might be thought discrepant. All in all, then, the coin can be assigned to Northampton with a considerable degree of confidence.

SPILEMAN

*Long Cross* (Hild. 1273)

At least since the publication of Ekwall’s *Early London Personal Names* (Lund. 1947) serious students of later Anglo-Saxon coinage should have been on their guard against perpetuating Hildebrand’s unfortunate misreading ‘Swileman’, and especially when the engravers were more careful to distinguish ‘r’ from ‘p’ than some modern authorities have supposed. Even so attempts are still being made to resuscitate a form of ‘Swileman’, though solid reasons for persistence in it have still to be offered, while Ekwall’s extraordinarily impressive documentation (pp. 64 & 65) is blandly ignored. The root of OE Spileman is probably OE Spileman, the numismatist being able to observe that the name is found on coins only at Winchester and—to anticipate—Southampton, mints where Continental Germanic names are found in

unusual number. There is, in fact, no doubt that the Spileman whom we are considering here is a Southampton moneyer, and the evidence of other coins is that he subsequently removed to Winchester where his career continued well into the eleventh century.

'ULFHI'

*Long Cross* (Hild. 1276/1276A)
The name of the moneyer is irregular, the mint-signature, anomalous, the flan-size discrepant and the workmanship coarse. It is without hesitation, therefore, that these die-duplicates can be consigned to the limbo of imitations.

**WULFRIC**

*Long Cross* (Hild. 1286/1287/1287A/1288/1289/1290):  
*Helmet* (Hild. 1291):  
*Last Small Cross* (Hild. 1285)

To begin with it should perhaps be noted that Hild. 1286 and 1288 are die-duplicates, and that Hild. 1287A is from the same reverse die as 1287. We have, then, five *Long Cross* obverse dies, and not one exhibits features characteristic of a majority of Winchester dies of this issue. The *Last Small Cross* dies are of Winchester work but it is the style which is associated with dispatch to distant mints ('Southern B') and which belongs very early in the type. Even more significant is Mrs. Smart's discovery of an obverse die-link in *Long Cross* between Hild. 1289 and 1218, the latter a Cambridge coin of the moneyer Sidwine¹. There can be no doubt in fact that Wulfric is a moneyer of Northampton, and the early date of his *Last

---

1 Butler & Dolley, *op. et pag. cit.*

---

*Fig. 1 (see p. 30, ÆLFGET)*
Small Cross coin is of interest because it is one of only two Last Small Cross coins of the mint which are not ‘differenced’ by the addition to the obverse die of a small cross before the king’s face. Presumably it was only when the issue came into full production and the weight standard was reduced that it began to be felt necessary so to distinguish the coins of the two ‘Hamton’ mints.

Ælfget

Helmet (Hild. 1235)
The coin is a hapax of the mint with a not very satisfying mint-signature. Earlier in the reign the moneyer is recorded by Hildebrand at Hereford, London and Stamford. That the coin is regular and of the Southampton mint, however, seems indicated by an unpublished die-link (supra, p. 29, Fig. 1). The coin on the left is Hild. 1235, that on the right Hild. 4229, a Winchester penny of the moneyer Godeman. There can be little doubt, too, that the obverse die was used first at Winchester and then at Southampton, and significantly the Winchester coin at 1.51 grammes or 23.3 grains is heavier than the Southampton coin by 0.27 of a gramme or just over 4 grains.

Æthelsige

Helmet (Hild. 1240/1241)
The two coins are from the same reverse die. Neither obverse die would occasion remark in a Winchester context, and that Æthelsige is a moneyer of Southampton may be thought to be clinched by the following unpublished die-link. The lefthand coin is Hild. 1241, and the righthand Hild. 4155, a Winchester penny of the moneyer Byrhsige.
Again the extent of certain rust-marks suggest that the Winchester striking is the earlier, and at 1.46 grammes or 22.5 grains the Winchester coin tips the scale at 0.35 of a gramme or virtually 5½ grains more than its Southampton counterpart.

**Wulfnoth**


Among the *Last Small Cross* coins, the same obverse was used for Hild. 1278, 1279, 1281 and 1282, the same reverse die for 1278 and 1279. The *Agnus Dei* coin provides a hint that we should look for a mint north of the Thames, and Hild 1277 is of the Winchester work which is associated with mints outside Wessex ('Southern B'). It, too, is a heavy piece, i.e. belongs very early in the issue, and so the omission of the cross from before the king's face is parallel with that of the coin of Wulfhere already discussed. The remaining two obverse dies are decisive that the mint is Northampton. Not only is there the small cross added in the obverse field, but the style ('Northern A') is one that has no place in Wessex. It is notable, too, that three of the four reverse dies preserve the archaic copulative m-o, another sure criterion of a coin struck north of the Thames.

'—IA'

*Agnus Dei* (Hild. 1293)

The coin is not of Northampton. The IA goes with the HAM to give the mint-signature (SNOT)IAHAM, and the fragment is in fact from the same dies as a coin of the Nottingham moneyer Oswold in the Royal Collection at Copenhagen (*Sylloge* 1107).

**Leofwold**

*Last Small Cross* (Hild. 1264/1265/1266)

The coins are from two obverse and three reverse dies. In each case there is a small cross before the king's face on the obverse, and it is becoming increasingly clear that c. 1010, perhaps already at the end of 1009, a decision had been taken so to privy-mark coins of the Northampton mint. One of the two obverse dies is of normal 'Northern' work, and both the reverse dies with which it is employed eschew the ox copulative in favour of the now anachronistic m-o. In the case of Hild. 1264, however, the style is somewhat irregular but broadly corresponds to 'Northwestern', in which case the ox copulative found is what we should expect. There can be no doubt then that in this type Leofwold is a Northampton moneyer.

**Seolca**

*Last Small Cross* (Hild. 1270/1271/1272)

Two obverse dies are found, and two reverses, Hild. 1271 crossing them. In neither case does the obverse field incorporate a small cross in the type, and both reverses eschew the archaic m-o copulative. The style is purely West Saxon ('Southern A'), and the moneyer Seolca is otherwise recorded only at Winchester and at precisely this juncture. The name, incidentally, is again Continental Germanic. There would have been, then, every reason for us to associate these three coins with Southampton, even if there had not existed the obverse die-link with Winchester to which attention was once again drawn at the very outset of this paper.

The conclusions reached in this note may be summarized in tabular form as follows, there being included under Southampton the coins of 'Hamwic'. Under Southampton a 'w' before
the moneyer's name indicates that he is known also at Winchester, though not necessarily in the same type, while a † after the name denotes a recorded die-link in the same type with the West Saxon capital. It should be stressed that the tables are confined to coins in the Systematic Collection at Stockholm.

### NORTHAMPTON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Hand</th>
<th>Second Hand</th>
<th>Crux</th>
<th>Long Cross</th>
<th>Helmet</th>
<th>Agnus Dei</th>
<th>Last Small Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leofsige</td>
<td>Leofsige</td>
<td>Bruninc</td>
<td>Bruninc</td>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>Leofgod</td>
<td>Leofwine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifinc</td>
<td>Lifinc</td>
<td>Thornetel</td>
<td>Wulfnoth</td>
<td>Wulfnoth</td>
<td>Wulfnoth</td>
<td>Wulfnoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wulfnoth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOUTHAMPTON

(Names of Hamwic moneyers are italicized)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Hand</th>
<th>Second Hand</th>
<th>Crux</th>
<th>Long Cross</th>
<th>Helmet</th>
<th>Last Small Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Æthelman</td>
<td>Æthelward</td>
<td>Æthelward</td>
<td>Æthelsige†</td>
<td>Ælfget†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Æthelward</td>
<td>W Æthelward</td>
<td>Godman</td>
<td>Isegel</td>
<td></td>
<td>W Seolca†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isegel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the sake of completeness this paper ends with illustrations of the Southampton/Winchester die-links recorded in the 1955 *Numismatic Circular* but not there illustrated. The first comprises the two 'Hamtun' coins of Seolca (Hild. 1270 & 1271) and a Winchester coin of the same moneyer (Hild. 4297), and the identity of the obverse die seems in each case incontrovertible. The second die-link is in some ways even more interesting. The coin on the left is a *Last Small Cross* coin from one of the unpublished hoards, and it will be noticed that the reverse legend reads *Ælfsige On Hamtic*, the very first time that the 'Hamwic' mint-signature has been recorded in a type later than *Crux*. On stylistic grounds one would not have hesitated to assign this coin, of 'Southern B' style, to Southampton, and especially since the moneyer Ælfsige is well-attested in the selfsame type at Winchester (Hild. 4037–4045 etc.). Any lingering doubt must surely be resolved by the obverse die-link with the coin on the right, a penny still of the selfsame moneyer struck at Winchester (Hild. 4038).

---

1 SHM Inv. 14379 = Stenberger SG 414, a hoard discovered in 1911 at Barshaga in the Gotland parish of Othem.
Fig. 3

Fig. 4