THE HARTWELL TOKEN.¹

BY WILLIAM C. WELLS.

In the British Numismatic Journal, vol. xviii, p. 221, Mr. J. O. Manton, in the introduction to his "Buckinghamshire Trade Tokens Issued in the Seventeenth Century," says:—

"The combined initials are often useful when searching parish marriage registers to determine the identity of an issuer. An illustration of this is the Hartwell token of William Church, which has the initials and date W·A·C·1666 upon it, and which hitherto has been catalogued in the Northamptonshire series as belonging to Wold Hartwell, with the parish records commencing in 1683, giving the wife's Christian name as Mary, but with the admission that neither the initials W·A·C·nor the dates of the register records quite agree. In December 1923, a specimen of the token was dug up in Bierton Road, Aylesbury, only about a mile and a half from Hartwell, Bucks, and this led to research which disclosed the existence of a William Church and his wife Ann in the neighbourhood, and baptismal records at Aylesbury, showing the continuance of the name Ann in the family contemporaneously with the date upon the token. The evidence proves² that the token belongs to the Hartwell hamlet of Aylesbury; and so to the Bucks series and not to Northants."

In vol. xix, p. 179, Mr. Manton again describes Hartwell as being "in the parish of Aylesbury," and adds "Williamson, following Boyne's list, has placed this token in the Northamptonshire series, and Mr. Wm. C. Wells who has revised Williamson's list continued it as a Northants token, but doubtfully."

My account of the Northamptonshire Seventeenth Century Tokens, which appeared in the British Numismatic Journal, vols. vi, vii, viii, and x, however, was not a revision of Williamson, but an entirely new list taken almost entirely from the tokens

¹ There are two parishes bearing the name of Hartwell, one in Northamptonshire and the other in Buckinghamshire. A distance of about 25 miles separates the two parishes.
² The italics are mine.—W.C.W.
in my own collection, supplemented by personal research in local and national documents in various parts of England; the errors of description in Williamson being so numerous as to render a mere revision almost useless as a work of reference. I must also demur to the suggestion that I included the Hartwell token in the Northamptonshire series, "but doubtfully." To have been just, Mr. Manton would have quoted more of my extracts from the Hartwell, Northants, parish records, but he refrains from quoting my record of the burial of William Church senior, at Hartwell, Northants, in 1687, and also my suggestion that William Church senior was the issuer of the token and that probably his wife's name was Ann. I further implied that the parish register entries which I cited, of William Church and his wife Mary, related to William Church junior, son of the token issuer, and in no way did I suggest that they related to the token issuer himself.

Apparently it was not considered necessary to adduce any evidence in support of the claim to transfer Church's token from Hartwell, Northamptonshire, to Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, unless we except the Aylesbury register entries which Mr. Manton cites and which show that a William Church resided, not at Hartwell, but elsewhere—"in the neighbourhood"! In forty years' experience of parish register searching I have always found that when the person referred to in the register resided away from the place in which the register was kept, his, or her place of residence is definitely stated. For instance, we find the following entries in the register which Mr. Manton cites, *viz.*, that of Aylesbury:

1662, Feb. 9th. "Samuel Robinson, of Wingrave, who lived with Thomas Brookes, was buried, he being killed by Thomas Harris, who lived in Baker's Lane."

1697. "Francis Tyingham, son of Francis Tyingham, of Nether Winchdon, and Mary his wife." (Baptism.)

1714, Nov. 18th. "Mr. Henry Phillips, of London, linen draper." (Burial.)

Even when the person referred to in the register entries resided at a hamlet in the parish in which the register was kept, his place of residence is generally specified. In my "Seventeenth Century Tokens of Northamptonshire" I quote the following examples from the parish register of Kippax, Yorkshire; they relate to residents of Great Preston, a hamlet in Kippax parish.
1665. "Thomas filius Gualteri Widdopp de Preston, baptizatus erat vicesimo septimo die Januarij sepultus erat ultimo die Januarij."

1666. "Johannes Widdopp filius Gualteri Widdop de Purston sepult vicesimo quarto Maij."

Consequently, had the entries cited by Mr. Manton from the Aylesbury parish register related to William Church the token issuer, even if the assertion that Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, was a hamlet in Aylesbury parish could be substantiated, I should expect to find him described as "of Hartwell," but no such description occurs in this case, which in itself should be sufficient indication that the William Church referred to was a resident of Aylesbury and not of the adjoining parish of Hartwell. Moreover, a search of the Buckinghamshire Subsidies and Hearth Tax returns of the early years of Charles II, now deposited at the Public Record Office, which I carefully examined 25 years ago when my "Seventeenth Century Tokens of Northamptonshire" was in the course of preparation, reveals the fact that the William Church of the Aylesbury parish register, cited by Mr. Manton, was a resident of Aylesbury and not of Hartwell. The Hearth Tax returns show that he was assessed for one hearth in Aylesbury. The same documents also show that no person of the name of Church was assessed in any way in the parish of Hartwell, Buckinghamshire.

To identify William Church of the Hartwell token with William Church of the Aylesbury parish register and to use that as a basis upon which to claim the transference of the token from Northamptonshire to Buckinghamshire, it was necessary to assert that Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, is, or was, a hamlet in Aylesbury parish. Moderate investigation, however, should have elicited the fact that Hartwell is not and, so far as is known, never has been a hamlet to Aylesbury, nor has it ever been "in the parish of Aylesbury" either civil or ecclesiastical, consequently the Buckinghamshire claim to the Hartwell token must necessarily fail.

The attribution of William Church's token to Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, rests entirely upon the assertion that Hartwell is, or was, a hamlet to Aylesbury. If the assertion that Hartwell was "in the parish of Aylesbury" and that it was "the Hartwell hamlet of Aylesbury" could be substantiated, the Aylesbury parish register extracts cited by Mr. Manton would be relative,
but in face of the evidence connecting the token with the Northamptonshire Hartwell, they certainly would not "prove that the token belongs to the Hartwell hamlet of Aylesbury, and so to the Bucks series and not to Northants."

I have had a short correspondence with Mr. Manton concerning the Hartwell token, but he does not advance beyond the *ipse dixit* that the token *was* issued at Hartwell, Buckinghamshire. He refuses to recognize that upon himself rests the onus of producing evidence in support of his assertion that Hartwell was a hamlet in Aylesbury parish and that, consequently, records of Hartwell baptisms, marriages and burials would appear in the Aylesbury parish registers. On the other hand he insists that upon myself rests the onus of refuting his claim to transfer the Hartwell token to Buckinghamshire and challenges me to produce evidence controverting his assertion that Hartwell was in Aylesbury parish—hence this article.

The evidence is necessarily of a negative character. Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, is a small parish of 918 acres, two miles from the old part of the borough of Aylesbury, and consisting for the greater part of Hartwell Park, the home, since about 1620, of the Lee family, one of whom, Dr. John Lee, was the first president of the London (now the Royal) Numismatic Society. It is and, so far as is known, always has been a separate parish and not connected in any way with Aylesbury. The two parishes were not even in the same hundred, Hartwell being in the hundred of Stone, and Aylesbury in the hundred of Aylesbury.¹ Nor were they ecclesiastically in the same deanery, Hartwell being in the deanery of Wendover and Aylesbury in the deanery of Aylesbury. Prior to 1804, when the constituency of Aylesbury was enlarged, the voters of Hartwell did not vote with those of Aylesbury.

Hartwell has had its own parish church from early times, certainly from the thirteenth century, and its parish registers date from 1550; and had William Church the token issuer resided there we should find records of him, or of members of his family, in those registers and not in the Aylesbury registers. But it is now 25 years since I satisfied myself by personal inspection of the Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, registers and other local documents, that no William Church resided there in the seventeenth century.

¹ The hundred of Aylesbury in the modern division of Buckinghamshire is formed of the union of the three ancient hundreds of Ailesberie, Risberge, and Stone, and still retains formally the appellation of the "three hundreds of Aylesbury."
In the early part of the eighteenth century Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, contained seventeen families consisting of sixty persons, the average annual number of births being three, and of burials two. In 1813, the parish contained Hartwell House, the Rectory, four farmhouses, and thirteen cottages inhabited by labourers and others employed at Hartwell Park and on the farms. In 1730, the population numbered 76; in 1813, 124; in 1841 and in 1850, 146. The Poll Book of the election of the Knights of the Shire for the County of Buckingham, 1722, shows that Hartwell contained only three resident voters, including the rector, none of whom was named Church. In accordance with the foregoing figures, at the time of the issue of the Hartwell token the residents of Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, would number about forty persons, men, women and children, including the residents of Hartwell House, and their servants and retainers! Hence it is almost certain that Hartwell at that time contained no tradesman who would find it necessary to issue a token. There was nothing in the parish that could be termed a village, for the few cottages would be scattered about on the farms, and the same conditions must have prevailed in later times. Indeed, even to-day, in spite of the population having trebled or quadrupled since the seventeenth century, there is no village of Hartwell, the nearest approach to a village being a group of a few small cottages on the north-west boundary of the Park, known as Lower Hartwell.

The history and records of Hartwell manor go back to the twelfth century. In the archives at Hartwell House are preserved many charters, manor rolls, etc., dating back to the thirteenth century, which contain records of connection between the manor of Hartwell and the neighbouring manors of Great Kimble, Stone, Whitchurch, Long Crendon, etc., but in no case does there appear to have been any connection between the manors of Hartwell and Aylesbury.

Bierton and Quarendon at one time formed integral parts of Aylesbury parish. Buckland is ecclesiastically appended to Bierton, and Stoke Mandeville, which adjoins Aylesbury and Hartwell, was one of the manors of the bishop of Lincoln at the time of the Norman survey: being held with Bierton, as ecclesiastically connected with Quarendon. The parishes of Aylesbury, Bierton, Stoke Mandeville and Quarendon, were, until 1837, in

1 Since this was written I find that a similar statement is made in the *Victoria County History of Buckinghamshire*, vol. ii, p. 293, thus confirming my personal observations.
The peculiar ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln. Hartwell, however, was not included in that peculiar jurisdiction; but, had Hartwell formed a portion of Aylesbury parish, it also would have been included in the above peculiar jurisdiction.

Leland, writing in the sixteenth century, refers by name to several places which then were, or formerly had been, hamlets to Aylesbury, but Hartwell is not amongst them. Many other authorities have dealt with Aylesbury and its locality, but no historian or topographer of Buckinghamshire, from the sixteenth century to the present time, has suggested that Hartwell has at any time formed a part of Aylesbury parish.

Aylesbury's first charter of incorporation was granted on January 1st, 1553-4. The limits of the borough, as recited in the charter were from Glassyer's Bridge (in Walton), to Stannebridge (i.e. Stonebridge, on the Bicester road), and from Holman's Bridge (on the Buckingham road), to Wallbridge (on the road to Thame). The latter bridge spans a stream which still forms the boundary between Aylesbury and the separate parish of Hartwell.

Lipscomb, History and Antiquities of the County of Buckingham, 1847, vol. ii, p. 300, referring to this stream, says: "Hartwell... is bounded on the north and east by Aylesbury; on the south by Stoke-Mandeville; and on the west by Stone, and Eythorpe in Waddesdon... A small stream from a spring near Wendover enters Hartwell on the east, runs north-west and joins a brook which separates Aylesbury from this parish." In the foregoing quotation Lipscomb refers to "Eythorpe in Waddesdon," i.e. Eythorpe in the parish of Waddesdon, but no similar description is applied to Hartwell, viz. "Hartwell in Aylesbury."

In neither "An Act for Dividing and Inclosing the Open and Common Fields within the Township and Liberties of Aylesbury in the County of Bucks, 1771," nor in "An Act for Dividing

1 "Peculiars.—Those parishes and places are called peculiars, which are exempted from the jurisdiction of the proper Ordinary of the diocese where they lie. These exempt jurisdictions are so called, not because they are under no Ordinary, but because they are not under the Ordinary of the diocese, but have one of their own. They are a remnant of Popery. The Pope, before the Reformation, by a usurped authority, and in defiance of the Canons of the Church, exempted them from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the diocese. At the Reformation, by an oversight, they were not restored to the jurisdiction of the diocesan, but remained under the Sovereign or under such person as by custom or purchase obtained the right of superintendence.—Church Dictionary.

2 The italics are mine.—W.C.W.
and Inclosing the Open and Common Fields in the Parishes of Hartwell and Stone, in the County of Bucks, 1776," do we find any indication that Hartwell, or any portion of it was in the parish of Aylesbury. Nor do we find in the latter Act any indication that Hartwell was other than a separate and independent parish. Amongst other indications to the contrary we find reference to "The Turnpike Road leading from Aylesbury, in the said County of Bucks through the respective parishes of Hartwell and Stone aforesaid, for Thame in the County of Oxford."

Many other authorities could be cited to the same effect—if it were necessary; but the foregoing citations appear to be quite sufficient to establish the fact that Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, was not in the parish of Aylesbury, but was, and is, a separate and independent parish.

Mr. Manton appears to attach considerable importance to the discovery of a specimen of William Church’s token in Aylesbury. The discovery of this token, however, need cause no surprise when we consider that Hartwell, Northamptonshire, is situated upon the confines of Buckinghamshire and at a distance of not more than 23 miles from Aylesbury.

I have previously shown that at no time has there been a village in the parish of Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, and also that the surname "Church" appears to have been unknown in that parish, unless by an importation in recent times. Hartwell, Northamptonshire, on the contrary, was a fairly large village at the period when the token was issued. John Bridges, the Northamptonshire historian, who commenced the compilation of his History of Northamptonshire in the latter years of the seventeenth century, describes Hartwell, Northamptonshire, as: "a village of about eighty houses, and from its situation had formerly the name of Wold-Hartwell."

The Church family have been resident there certainly since the sixteenth century and representatives of the family are still to be found in the village. The village records, both local and national, Parish Registers, Marriage Licences at Peterborough, Subsidy Rolls, Wills in the Archdeaconry of Northampton, Hearth Tax returns, Poll Books, etc., show several generations of William Churches. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries

1Mr. Manton makes a point of describing the Northamptonshire Hartwell as Wold-Hartwell, the implication apparently being that a token issued at this village should be inscribed: "Wold-Hartwell" and not merely "Hartwell." Bridges' statement, however, shows that the prefix "Wold" was obsolete in the 17th century.
the Churches were evidently people of some importance in Hartwell; tradesmen, property owners, freeholders, and some of them took part in the public life of the parish.

Unfortunately the Parish Register commences only in 1683, but at Peterborough is a marriage licence, dated January 19, 1610-11 of "William Church of Hartwell, widower, and Mary, daughter of John Valentyne of Hackleton." These were presumably the parents of the token issuer. Of William Church, the issuer of the token, we have but few records. He appears to have been a man of substance and to have inhabited a fairly large house, for in the Hearth Tax returns of Charles II, he is assessed for no less than ten hearths.²

And in Hartwell Parish Register, under the year 1687, we find that "William Church senior was buried February 11th, fees 10d." There can be little doubt that William Church senior, who was buried in 1687, was the issuer of the token. From the year 1684 onwards, the Hartwell parish registers contain many entries recording baptisms, marriages and burials of the descendants of the above-mentioned William Church senior.

In conclusion, with all due respect to the author of "The Seventeenth Century Trade Tokens of Buckinghamshire," I submit that I have conclusively proved that Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, is not and never has been, a hamlet of Aylesbury; that "Church" was not a Hartwell, Buckinghamshire, name in the seventeenth century; that it was the name of a considerable family at Hartwell, Northamptonshire, in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, and, finally, that William Church's token was issued at Hartwell, Northamptonshire, and not at Hartwell, Buckinghamshire.

¹ Hackleton, in the parish of Piddington, Northamptonshire.

² Hearth-Money, Hearth-Tax, or Chimney Money, was a tax imposed in England on all houses except cottages at a rate of two shillings per annum for every hearth. It was first levied in 1662, but owing to its unpopularity it was repealed in 1689, although it was producing £170,000 a year. The principle of the tax was not new in the history of taxation, for in pre-Norman times the king derived part of his revenue from a tax of "smoke farthings," levied on all hearths except those of the poor. It appears also in the "hearth-penny" or tax of a penny on every hearth which as early as the tenth century was paid annually to the Pope, i.e., "Peter's Pence."
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