THE "GOTHABYRIG" MINT.

By P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton, F.S.A., President.

ALTHOUGH this mint is so styled by Hildebrand in his Anglo-Saxon Coins in the Royal Swedish Cabinet of Medals at Stockholm (1881), and by Sir John Evans in his paper on "The Mint of Gothabyrig" (Num. Chron., 3rd series, vol. xv), the proper form of the name in the nominative case is, as we shall see directly, GioSabiturh.

As regards the terminal—"burh," this form appears in the Peterborough Chronicle, while "buruh" occurs in the Evesham Chronicle and "burg" in that of Winchester.

On one of the coins hereinafter described the reading of the mint name is sufficiently full to disclose the form GODABYR = Gothabyri, doubtless for Gothabyrig.

This form, however, is on the coin quite correct, as the word on = at, following the name of the moneyer and preceding that of the place of mintage, governs the locative or dative case, and byrig is the dative of burh.

The A.-S. on, an, is identical in meaning with the High German an. With towns declined in the dative it means "at"; with countries so declined it means "in." It only means "of" when used in such phrases as "biscop on Hrofeceastre," and in these instances our idiom has changed.

In reference to this point Mr. C. F. Keary, in his introduction to vol. ii of the British Museum Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Coins, writes, after quoting the forms Serebyrig or Serebirig for Salisbury:

"These forms are no doubt, properly speaking, those of the oblique case. But it is equally certain that (like the Celtic Kil- in
place-names, which is also an oblique case) this is the form of the word which survived the longest, and that from this termination 'byrig' in Æglesbyrig, Cadanbyrig, and the rest, the modern forms Aylesbury, Cadbury, etc., are derived. The Latin writers nearly always use this form, and we have in them frequently such phrases as 'quod Glastingabyrig nuncupatur,' 'quod Sceftesbyrig nuncupatur,' 'qui Searesbirig nominatur.'"

With deference to Mr. Keary, it is suggested that the Latin writers referred to were not well acquainted with the niceties of Anglo-Saxon inflection, and therefore copied the place-names as they appeared in the Anglo-Saxon originals, without regard to the words there governing their case.

Bæda, in referring to Tilbury in the passage hereafter quoted, writes correctly "quæ Tilaburg cognominatur."

The "bury" is due to the Anglo-Saxon custom of prefixing the prepositions æt or "in" to the place-name which falls into the dative case and sometimes coalesces with the preposition.

In the catalogue itself Mr. Grueber (Mr. Keary's collaborator) has in naming the Anglo-Saxon "burhs" adopted the dative form "byrig" throughout, but in the case of places having the termination "ceaster" he sometimes gives the nominative "ceaster," at others the dative singular "ceastre"; in the case of those ending in "ford," the nominative "ford," or the dative "forda," and so forth.

The following is a list of the readings of the reverses of the coins catalogued by Hildebrand as of "Gothabyrig."

**Æthelræd II.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1131</td>
<td>+GODA ON GODABYRI</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132</td>
<td>+⁺VLFMÆR ON GVDA</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137</td>
<td>+⁺VLFMÆR ON GODA</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1133</td>
<td>+⁺VLFMÆR MFO GEOBA</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1135</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>M'O GODA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Original in the British Museum.
Variants of the Mint Name.

Cnut.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Moneyers</th>
<th>Homogeneous Forms.</th>
<th>Irregular Forms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>999</td>
<td>+ERLA ON GIOÐ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>+VLMÆR O GIOÐ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>+ &quot; ON IOÐA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>+VLMÆR O IOÐA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>+ÆLFWARD ON GODA</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>+LEOMÆR ON GØD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type E. (see figure B.1)

Harold I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Moneyers</th>
<th>Homogeneous Forms.</th>
<th>Irregular Forms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>+LEOFMÆR ON IOÐAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>+LEOMÆR ON IOÐ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>+ &quot; &quot; IOÐA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type A. (see figure B.1)
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The tabular list appended contains an analysis of the forms adopted by the several moneyers to express the place of mintage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moneyers</th>
<th>Homogeneous Forms.</th>
<th>Irregular Forms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goda.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goða</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfward</td>
<td>Ælfward</td>
<td>Goða</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofmær</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goða</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leofmær</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goða</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this list it will be seen that the correct form of the name is Goda, and that the extant coins of the mint are confined to the three successive reigns of Æthelræd II., Cnut, and Harold I., covering a period of sixty-one years, namely, from A.D. 979 to A.D. 1040.

1 Original in Mr. Carlyon-Britton's collection.
The "Gothabyrig" Mint.

The comparison of the diphthongs io, eo may here be considered with advantage.

In Beowulf, the unique MS. of which, namely, Vitellius A xv, was written according to Dr. Moritz Steyne in the tenth century, the A.-S. adverb for "formerly" appears as geo, gio, iu, respectively, at lines 1476, 2459, 2521. The hero's name is spelt "Bèowulf" by the first scribe, and "Biowulf" by the second. In various MSS. of "King Alfred's" Old English Version of Boethius's De Consolatione Philosophei, ed. W. J. Sedgefield 1899, the adverb "formerly" appears as geo, gio, gui, iu; and Thorpe in his Analecta Anglo-Saxonica, 1868, p. 236, prints the form gyu.

In the Saxon Menology appended to Mr. Plummer's edition of the Chronicles, vol. i, the word "Yule" appears as "gêola," "iûla," l. 221; and these words show pretty clearly that g and i in gio, geo, and io were pronounced like the modern Y, used as a consonant.

For these reasons it is considered that GioS-, IoS, and GeoS-may be regarded as true forms and the others as irregular forms.

Having now to some extent dealt with the forms of the mint-name, let us consider what information is to be gathered from the names of the moneyers.

Wulfmaer coined for Æthelraed II. and Cnut, and Leofmaer for Cnut and Harold I. Goda occurs under Æthelraed II. only, as do Ælfward and Carla solely under Cnut.

Each of these names occurs also as of London under the respective reigns, save that of Leofmaer, who, under Harold I. appears as of Giosaburh only. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to suppose that Giosaburh looked to London for its supply of moneyers. In any case the existence of all the Giosaburh names contemporaneously at London, apart from this suggestion, removes the chance sometimes available of gathering information as to the locality of a mint from the names of the moneyers who coined at it.

The determination of the geographical position of the Giosaburh, GeoSaburh, GòSaburh, GùSaburh, or IòSaburh of the coins must, therefore, be effected by other means.

Hildebrand identifies it with Jedburgh in Roxburghshire, but
Jedburgh was in Anglo-Saxon times Jedworth. Mr. C. T. Martin in *The Record Interpreter*, gives the Latin form Gedewurd for Jedburgh, and Mr. C. F. Keary, in his introduction to the catalogue above referred to, cites the following Anglo-Saxon forms of the name:

Gedword, Geddewerde, Gedewurth, etc.

Hildebrand appears to have assumed the identity of the Gioðaburh of the coins with Iudanburh, mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and elsewhere, and to have followed Messrs. Raine and Dixon (Archbishops of York, vol. i, p. 116) and Mr. Benjamin Thorpe in, as is thought, wrongly identifying Iudanburh with Jedburgh.

Mr. Keary does not regard the identification of Iudanburh with Jedburgh as satisfactory, and this view is supported by Sir John Evans, who accepts the identification of the Iudanburh of the *Chronicle* with the Gioðaburh of the coins, but rejects the identification with Jedburgh.

With these conclusions, and the arguments adduced in support, the present writer entirely agrees.

The following is the passage in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* making reference to Iudanburh:

```
An. DCCCC. LII. Her on þyssum geare het Eadred cyning gebringan Wulstan arcebiscop in Iudanbyrig on þæm fæstenne forþæm he wæs oft to þam cyninge forwreged.
```

This Mr. Thorpe translates as follows:

```
“An. DCCCC. LII. In this year King Eadred commanded archbishop Wulfstan to be brought into the fastness at Jedburgh, because he had been often accused to the King.”
```

Under the year 954 the state of affairs in Northumbria and the fate of Archbishop Wulfstan are elucidated in a further passage from the *Chronicle*:

```
“An. DCCCC. LIV. In this year the Northumbrians expelled Eric, and Eadred assumed the Kingdom of the Northumbrians. In this year Archbishop Wulfstan again received a bishopric, at Dorchester.”
```
In reference to these passages Sir John Evans remarks with much force:

"Assuming for a moment that Jedburgh, in an outlying northern district of Northumbria, had at some time been within the power of Eadmund and Eadred, can anyone believe that the latter would commit the unruly archbishop for safe custody to a place on the other side of the kingdom of Northumbria, which, moreover, whether under Anlaf or Yric, was in active rebellion against him?"

For these reasons Sir John Evans thinks that it is evident that Iudanburh should be sought for farther south and, after very properly dismissing his own first idea, that of Dewsbury, as "valueless," and subsequently showing Mr. W. H. St. John Hope's suggestion of Udeberge, Udesberg, or Udeburg of Domesday (now Woodborough, in Nottinghamshire) to be "impossible," he selects Idbury in Oxfordshire as the only existing modern name most likely to represent the GioSaburh of the coins. His concluding words are:

"On the whole I am inclined to accept Idbury provisionally as the modern representative of Giothabyrig, and thus to add another mint to those which are already known to have existed in Oxfordshire."

It will be seen that Sir John Evans does not appear to be very firmly satisfied with the attribution of GioSaburh to Idbury, and it must be admitted that this circumstance has encouraged the present writer to seek for another attribution.

In Domesday Idbury is written Ideberie, and in view of the fact that there are less than fifty years between the last issue of GioSaburh coins and the preparation of that record the I of the Domesday form of Idbury must be regarded as organic until it has been proved to be otherwise. Consequently Sir John Evans's identification of Id = Êod, with Êod, Iud-, Iuth- may safely be rejected.

In the Laud MS. of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which was written about 1120, forms in ëo are retained.

The examples are very numerous, but the following five instances are sufficient to illustrate the user.
Annal:
1091, à-béodan, to order.
1123, déorfald, a deer-fold.
1118, féond, enemy.
1081, gefréode, made free.
1093, léofstan, dearest.

It therefore seems to be clear that iud (an) of A.D. 952 and Géð(an) of 1040 could not have been represented in 1087 by Id (é).

If not at Jedburgh, Dewsbury, Woodborough, or Idbury where then is GioSaburh?

For the reasons hereafter given, it is confidently thought that GioSaburh or Iudanburh is no other than the lost city of Ythanceaster.

The earliest mention of the Anglo-Saxon form of the name of this place occurs in Bæda’s Historiae Ecclesiasticae printed in Monumenta Historica Britannica, 1848. Bæda, or, as he is generally called, the Venerable Bede, was born in 673 and died in A.D. 735.

At p. 195 this passage (Lib. III, cap. xxii) occurs:—

"Cedd . . . . fecit per loca ecclesias, presbyteros et diaconos ordinavit, qui se in verbo fidei et ministerio baptizandi adjuvarent, maxime in civitate que lingua Saxonum ‘Ythancaestir’ appellatur. Sed et in illa quæ Tilaburg cognominatur; quorum prior locus est in ripa Pentæ annis, secundus in ripa Tamensis: etc."

Against the name Ythancaestir is a reference to a note taken from Smith’s edition of Bæda’s works which, translated, reads “which was called Othona” by the Romans, now “St. Peter’s on the Wall situate at the extreme point of Dengy Hundred.”

Another note identifies the river Penta with the present Froshwell and states that one of its sources retains the genuine or real name “Pante,” although to-day both stream and city have been absorbed.

Similar information is to be gathered from Camden’s Britannia, the first edition of which, in Latin, appeared in 1586, another edition, translated into English by Philémon Holland, was produced in 1637, and yet another edition by Richard Gough was issued, with his own additions, in 1789.

From the 1789 Edition, vol. ii, p. 43, is the following extract:—
"Higher up the north shore [of the Hundred of Dengy], was anciently a considerable city called Ithancestre, Radulphus Niger after Bede (Hist. Eccl. III, c. 22) writes that 'bishop Ceada baptized the East Saxons near Maldon in the City Ithancester on the banks of the Pant which runs by Maldon in the province of Dengy; but now that city is overflowed by the Pant.' The exact place I [Wm. Camden] cannot point out; but I have no doubts that the present river Froshwell was formerly called Pant, one of its sources being called Pantswell, and the monks of Coggeshall have said the same. Some will have it that Ithancester was in the extremity of this hundred [Dengy] where now is St. Peter's upon the wall or bank; the shore hereabouts being with difficulty fenced against the encroachments of the sea by banks. However I am apt to think that this Ithancester was OTHONA, where the Numerus Fortensium, with their commander, was stationed in the decline of the Roman empire under the Comes Littoris Saxonici, or Count of the Saxon shore, against the Saxon pirates. The alteration from Othona to Ithana is easy, and its situation on a bay where many rivers empty themselves was very proper for this purpose."

At page 53, amongst the additions of Mr. Gough, we find the following:—

"In support of Mr. Camden's opinion that Ithancester was near Bradwell we must observe that the Domesday name of this place is Effecestra. Holland [the editor of the 1637 edition of Camden] tells us that there yet remaineth a large ruin of a thick wall whereby many Roman coins have been found."

To continue the series of quotations from recognised authorities we find in the new Victoria History of Essex, vol. i, p. 391, the remark by Dr. J. Horace Round, in his account of the Domesday Survey:

"I have identified the two portions of which 'Effecestre' was composed in 1086 as the manors of Battaills and of East Hall. The latter was in the eastern portion of the parish towards the chapel of 'St. Peter-on-the-Wall' which marks the site of 'Ithancester.' The test of 'pasture for sheep' applies here again; for we read that 'Effecestre' had 'pasture for 500,' and the marshes of Bradwell lie on its eastern side."

In the same modern work, p. 316, in treating of "Anglo-Saxon Remains," Mr. Reginald A. Smith remarks:
"Ythancaestir" the Roman "Othona."

"Facing the mouth of the Colne and guarding the estuary of the Blackwater was the fortress of Othona or Ithanceaster, now located with general approval at Bradwell-on-Sea."

Bæda speaks of Cedd, not his brother Ceadda, afterwards canonised as St. Chad, in connection with the city which in the Saxon tongue is called "Ythancaestir," and is situate on the bank of the River Pant.

Radulphus Niger, quoted by Camden, adds that this city was near Maldon, but then was overflowed by the Pant.

Camden suggests that Ythancaestir, which he terms Ithancester, was Othona, and gives as reasons that "the alteration from Othona to Ithana is easy, and its situation on a bay where many rivers empty themselves was very proper for this purpose," viz., the station of the Count of the Saxon shore.

We do not know the quantity of the vowels in the name Othona. If derived from Ótho, the pronunciation should be Óthōna, which would make the change to Íthāna a very difficult one. Some reliable Essex antiquaries, including Mr. Henry Laver, F.S.A., pronounce the word Óthōna, and, if this be correct, the alteration to Ýthān is easy, even as Camden remarks.

Although later in date than the first edition of Camden's Britannia, the following lines from Michael Drayton's Poly-Olbion, taken from the folio edition of 1622, are of interest as identifying the Pant (the "Penta amnis" of Bæda) with the Blackwater:

"When Chelmer scarce arrives in her most wished bay,
But Blackwater comes in through many a crooked way,
Which Pant was call'd of yore, but that by time exil'd,
The Froshwell after hight, then Blackwater instill'd."

The manor of East Hall, the "Effecestre" of Domesday, wherein are the remains of the Roman camp and the chapel built on one of its walls, is on the extreme eastern coast of Essex, close to the North Sea, and practically on the southern shore of the estuary of the Blackwater River.

Dr. Round and Mr. R. A. Smith appear to have accepted the statements of Camden and Gough without question.
The Rev. Dr. Cox, in a very pleasing article contributed to The Builder of September 15th, 1906, sees in the chapel of St. Peter the very church erected by Bishop Cedd at Ythanceaster, and he, too, does not question the identity of Ythanceaster with Othona.

Although, as is usual in all antiquarian subjects, opinions widely differ as to the date of this building, it is possible that it was erected by Cedd's instructions, although structures of this period would, in ordinary circumstances, probably have been of wood rather than of stone; the undoubted fact that stone and brick would have been readily obtainable from the materials composing a Roman station is a point greatly in favour of Dr. Cox's view of the age of the edifice, a view which is shared by Mr. Laver and Mr. W. H. St. John Hope.

It is probable that the Iudanburh mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under the year A.D. 952 is identical with Ythanceaster. Apart from the terminations "ceaster" or "burh," the names are practically the same. "Ceaster" has a Roman derivation, but "burh" is the Saxon equivalent, each meaning a fortified place.

A convincing example of such a change of appellation is afforded by the case of the city of the Primate of All England, called by Bede "Dor-uernis Civitas," in the Peterborough Chronicle both "Dor-wic-ceaster" and "Cantwara-burh," and now Canterbury. Again, Bath is called "Acemannes-ceaster" in the Winchester Chronicle, "Acemannes-burh" in the Canterbury Chronicle, and the words "æt Baðum tune" occur in the Evesham Chronicle. Similarly, Gaimar, in his History of the English, calls Grantebrycg "Grantecestre"; and Henry of Blois, Abbot of Glastonbury and Bishop of Winchester, speaks of Ilchester as "Givelcestriburg." The Saxon "burh" in all likelihood replaced the Roman "ceaster" in connection with Ythanceaster at the time of the adoption of the name Cantwara-burh for the Kentish city, a time well in advance of the reign of Æthelræd II. when our first known Gioðaburh coins occur.

In reference to the matter of place-name formation the discredited Jedburgh is of use to us. In early times it was Jedworth, weorðig and worð signifying "a field, farm or estate," while later, it was
promoted to Jedburgh, the “burgh” signifying a fortified place, and therefore a more secure and, consequently, more important site. This is evidently a case of a town’s rise, but as has been said, the change from “ceaster” to “burh” may well be referred solely to a change of race ownership. The Roman was forgotten in the then present importance of the Saxon. As already stated the tale of the destruction of Ythanceaster is preserved to us by the mediæval writer, Ralph Niger. The fate of Ythanceaster is illuminated by that of Dunwich and many another place on the eastern coast. To-day Cromer is threatened with a like destiny—absorption by the grim and ever-advancing German Ocean. Possibly some attempt was made to keep the town’s head above water, and that a gradual retreat of its inhabitants inland took place. Mr. Laver testifies that many years ago, when he made a journey of investigation to St. Peter’s flats or sands, to the east of the chapel of St. Peter, he found abundant evidence of the existence of ancient foundations of buildings by probing the mud now covered, except at low tide, by the sea. These probably constituted the Saxon city of Ythanceaster, of which even the original Roman fortress is in great part destroyed by the advancing sea.

A similar case to that of Ythanceaster, occurring in Plantagenet times, is that of Winchelsea.

As to when the sea-flood that overwhelmed Ythanceaster took place there is no evidence, except that the coinage there ceased in the reign of Harold I. No coins thence emanating are known of his successor, Harthacnut, and, what is more significant, there are none of Edward the Confessor.

The significance lies in the facts that Harthacnut reigned for a short time only, and that his coins have not been preserved to us in large quantities, whilst those issued in the substantially longer reign of his successor have been discovered in considerable bulk. These hoards were buried in the troubled times of the invasion and conquest of England by William, Duke of Normandy.

Ythanceaster was, therefore, probably destroyed by its foe, the sea, or reduced to no importance, prior to the middle of the eleventh century.
Under the year A.D. 1014 the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records that—

> "on St. Michael's mass eve (Sept. 28) came the great sea-flood widely throughout this country, and ran so far up as it never before had done, and drowned many vills, and of mankind a countless number."

It is highly probable that so exposed a place as Ythanceaster suffered from this calamity, but as its coinage was continued under Cnut and Harold I., say for a quarter of a century subsequently to this event, the destruction was not total, or a retreat, and partial reconstruction, took place. The advance of the sea was doubtless slow and sure, an advance hastened by an exceptionally high tide or violent storm. Such a storm occurred at a date which synchronises exactly with the cesser of the GioSaburh coinage, as the Chronicle relates under the year 1039, and as the opening sentence of the record, "In this year was the great wind." If this were from the north-east or east its effect on GioSaburh can be appreciated by the modern inhabitants of our east-coast seaports.

To revert for one moment to the scene of Archbishop Wulfstan's captivity in the year 952, Sir John Evans, in his oft-quoted paper, writes, in support of his attribution of GioSaburh or Iudanburh to Idbury:

> "Moreover, if the scene of Wulfstan's captivity were at Idbury, there would appear to have been some reason for his being, on his release, restored to episcopal honours at Dorchester, instead of in the cathedral town of some more northern diocese. For Dorchester, the centre in Saxon times of an important bishopric, is less than thirty miles from Idbury, and is situate within the same county of Oxford."

This, to speak moderately, is at least as specious an argument as any that has been employed in this present paper, and it can be met by the alternative suggestion that it would have been much easier for King Eadred to remove his disaffected prelate from York to Ythanceaster by sea than to transport him overland to so out-of-the-way and obscure a place as Idbury.

Should it be thought that the facts adduced in this paper are sufficient to establish the transfer of the site of GioSaburh from Idbury in Oxfordshire to the formerly well-known and important Ythanburh
or Ythaneaster of Essex, Oxford may be to some extent mollified by the circumstance that the present writer has essayed to preserve to the great University city its cherished coins of Alfred the Great and to prevent their transference by one of its citizens to some unlocated northern mint.¹

It only remains for the writer to record a sense of his indebtedness to his colleague, Mr. Alfred Anscombe, for valuable help most kindly accorded in connection with philological and other questions arising during the composition of this paper.

THE BEDFORD MINT.
WILLIAM I. FIGURES 1 to 7.
WILLIAM II. FIGURES 8 to 12.

Pl. V.