This began as part of a study of the work signed by the moneyer David Ramage, who was active from c. 1640 until his death between the end of July and 12 September 1662. However, the time required to complete the whole, and the length of some of the parts, make it advisable to separate any of the latter which readily stands alone. To this the City of Gloucester Farthings dated 1657 well lend themselves.

As they are among the earliest corporation tokens after Bristol and Oxford, the circumstances in which they were produced possess in themselves considerable interest. Further, although forming a relatively small coinage, they were struck not only in 1657 but also from new dies engraved in 1659 and 1662 with the old date. Detailed study of the dies is therefore required, not only for the information it supplies on production, but also for identification of the issues. Finally, light is thrown on one aspect of seventeenth-century tokens in general. The Farthings are studied under the following heads: Description—The Material—Arrangement of the Dies—The Varieties—History of the Issues—Identification of the Issues—Production—Weight.

DESCRIPTION

The die-ratio is of no help in distinguishing upper and lower dies, but as the R-signed Mayor of Oxford Tokens probably, and private issues with the R signature certainly show, priority in reading should be given to a side bearing arms or other device, viz. the obverse, while the reverse will normally bear initials. This arrangement reverses the treatment of the Gloucester 1657 Farthings by previous cataloguers. It has the advantages, however, of giving precedence to the arms of the city, a more potent and a more distinctive symbol of the issuing authority than the letters c.G.; of relegating the date (doubtless that of issue and not of the mayoralty, which dated from 1656) to the end of

---

1 For the attribution of the R-signed tokens to Ramage in place of Thomas Rawlins see J. G. Milne, Catalogue of Oxfordshire Seventeenth-century Tokens, 1935 [i.e. 1936], p. xiv. I have expressed the view, and I hope in the future to argue, that not only were dies made in London, but tokens also, any dies remaining serviceable being sent to the issuer: Seaby's Coin and Medal Bulletin, no. 650, Oct. 1972, p. 414; Coins, vol. ix (no. 11), Nov. 1972, p. 47.

2 Excepting some Cork and Kinsale issues, which are perhaps more of the nature of the preceding Cork and Kinsale Money, and some Alton pieces if they are in fact currency tokens, the only earlier issue (unless other undated ones) was Northampton in 1653 (W. C. Wells, Seventeenth-century Tokens of Northamptonshire, 1914, p. 74; and in the British Numismatic Journal, (henceforth BNJ), vii, 1910, p. 289). There were other issues in 1657 at least from the Mercers' Company in Kendal, from Newbury, Northampton again, and Wells; of all these only Gloucester followed the large Bristol module.

3 With the exception of the curate of Chavenage: Collectanea Glocestriensia, or a Catalogue of Books, Tracts, Prints, Coins, &c., Relating to the County of Gloucester, in the Possession of John Delafield Phelps, Esq., Chavenage House [compiled by Mr. Panton], 1842, p. 242 (although his treatment of other issues is not consistent); the relevant section being reprinted with some changes as 'Numismata Glocestriensia, 1650-70' in Gloucestershire Notes and Queries, i (1881), 347-52 (No. cccxlvi). Thomas Snelling, A View of the Copper Coin and Coinage of England . . ., 1766, pl. 1, illustrates Gloucester 1657 with the arms first, though not 1660 [i.e. 1659]. Encouragingly, Samuel Rudder took the side bearing the initials to be the reverse, A New History of Gloucestershire . . ., 1779 p. 90; and this was followed by Thomas Rudge, The History and antiquities of Gloucester . . . [1811], p. 46.
the legends; and of constituting ‘Luke Nourse, Maior’ something in the nature of a signature, instead of suggesting, if the legends were read continuously, that the mayor was for necessary change!

The type to which all the 1657 Farthings correspond may therefore be described as follows.

**Obv.** [mullet] FOR-NECESSARY-CHANGE/arms of Gloucester: on a shield, between three chevrons, ten tortureaux, three, three, three, and one, all within a cable-pattern inner circle.

**Rev.** [mullet] LVKE-NOVRSE-MAIORT657/C/G an arabesque ornament above and below the initials, all within a cable-pattern inner circle. When present, -R- appears below the C or G.

In 1657 the c.g. stood for ‘City of Gloucester’, but it is noteworthy that after the Restoration the Corporation minutes, like other areas of life, revert to Latin: *Civit’ Glouc’.*

The arms, with crest and supporters and the motto *FIDES INVICTA TRIUMPHAT*, superseded the ‘Tudor coat’ by a grant of 1652; and at the Restoration all Commonwealth grants of arms were declared null and void.¹ This might seem an additional reason for issuing Farthings in 1662 with an old date. However, the arms themselves (as they appear on the tokens) were in use earlier, and were proved at the Visitation of 1623; it would appear, therefore, that the Commonwealth grant only confirmed the arms, and added crest and supporters. The ‘Commonwealth coat’ continued to be used, for example on the Corporate seal made in 1661. The situation in the following year was more threatening to any show of support for the Commonwealth, but had the consideration of the arms weighed heavily, the design could have been changed to, for example, the unexceptionable c.g. on both sides. Finally, the issue of ante-dated coins also in 1659 points to an explanation in circumstances other than the mere designs.

**THE MATERIAL**

The coins are well struck in good metal and of good size (21 mm.). On the obverse dies twenty-one separate elements in the legend, and a shield, etc., and on the reverses twenty-three elements in the legend and two large letters, etc., were all individually punched in, so that it is a comparatively easy matter to distinguish the dies. Eight obverse and nine reverse dies have appeared, and the distribution of the dies and of the combinations over the recorded coins is set out in Table I. With no obverse die recorded from less than five specimens, and a single reverse die recorded from one, from two, and from three specimens, it is probable that all of the former have been found, and that not more than one of the latter remains undiscovered.

**ARRANGEMENT OF THE DIES**

The dies are identified by letters and numbers which also indicate the sequence that has been worked out. It is important to give the reasons for this arrangement. Leaving

---

aside the R signature, the most obvious feature distinguishing between dies but common to more than one is the form of the stop in both obverse and reverse legend. On the obverses lettered A–D and the reverses numbered 1–7 it is a cinquefoil, on obverses E–H and reverses 8–9 a small lozenge. The linking brings together dies bearing the same form of stop. Moreover, the lozenge dies are distinguished by an almost completely different set of punches, the only letters and figures in which there is no apparent change of form being the large G and the letter N; yet even here there is a difference, for on all the lozenge dies except rev. 9 the N is punched in upside down. The cinquefoil and lozenge must distinguish different phases of die-sinking, in effect if not by intention.

### TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reverse dies</th>
<th>Obverse dies</th>
<th>Total no. of coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21, 4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14, 10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15, 1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11, 10, 8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total no. of coins:** 35, 24, 15, 20, 11, 10, 8, 5, 128

Note to Table I: Mr. J. N. Taylor, formerly Curator of the Gloucester City Museum and Art Gallery, has kindly told me of an additional specimen of A2 at Cirencester, another of A2 and two of E7 at Cheltenham.

In the case of three combinations, E7, F7, and G7, a lozenge obverse is paired with a cinquefoil reverse. Only one reverse is involved, and this consistently appears in its freshest state with obv. E and with cinquefoil obv. D. When paired with obvs. E–G it was developing a flaw across the left of the ‘arrow head’ in the upper ornament, and with obv. G a slight excrescence on the curve of the large c, making that the last of its obverses. Dies with lozenge stops therefore succeeded those distinguished by cinquefoil stops. The unlinked but only remaining lozenge obverse (H) then follows these lozenge/cinqufoil mules. It pairs with two lozenge reverses (8, 9), the relative order of which is unclear; and the punches for all the lozenge dies appear to have been the same.

Of the cinquefoil dies, obv. D and revs. 5–7 are likely to have been the last since they are linked to the succeeding lozenge dies; and revs. 6–7 have different punches for the letters L, S, M and A from all the other dies (including obv. D), and rev. 7 a different figure 5 and 7 from the remainder. They were probably made in that order. This leaves rev. 5 as the initial ‘true’ pairing for obv. D, which, being recorded from a single specimen, provides an exception to the rule for identifying true pairs from a higher number of

---

1 The superimposition of the reverse ornaments on revs. 8–9 where they and the C G overlap, but of the C G on the cinquefoil reverses, indicates not a different order of punching in the letters and ornaments but only the relative depth to which the different punches were entered in each die.
surviving examples. Nevertheless, every letter common to obverse and reverse appears to be from the same punch on D and 5.

On obvs. C and D appears an almost completely different set of letter punches from obvs. A and B, the only apparent exceptions being N as before, and c. The succession of punches on the reverses is not so clearly defined, but C4, the only exclusive pair, probably preceded D5. Revs. 4 and 5 share a form of L different from that on revs. 1–3. Rev. 3, however, shares with revs. 4–7 a form of v, k, e, o, r, and 6 different from that on revs. 1–2, and with revs. 4–5 a different form of s and A; it has therefore been placed immediately preceding rev. 4. Flaws around the first N on obv. B when paired with rev. 3 support the placing of the latter after revs. 1–2.

The letters on obvs. A–B, and revs. 1–2, appear to be the same with two exceptions. The form of the E varies at the top, even on the same die, but this appears to result from the upper bar of the E having been entered individually in the dies. Secondly, obv. A and rev. 1 have one form of A, obv. B and rev. 2 another. The two related dies have been placed as first or second pair. However, the cross-linking of these dies shows that three of them, and doubtless all four, were in existence at the same time. Flaws on obv. A between the torteaux and the chevrons when paired with rev. 1 and not with rev. 2; on rev. 1 between various letters and the inner circle with obv. B and not always with obv. A; and from the cross-bar of the G on rev. 2 with obv. B and not always with obv. A, indicate an order of striking inconsistent with the association of punches. Ramage must have possessed at that time more than one punch for the letter A at least; if the pressman waited on the diesinker, the punches are more likely than the dies to have been used inconsecutively, though certainty is impossible.

The order in which the dies were used is therefore as set out in Figure 1, with lower-case letters designating the relative states of a die where clear.

**THE VARIETIES**

Six combinations, bearing the R signature below the large G, etc., fall into the third 'variety' catalogued by Williamson. Gloucestershire 77 is distinguished from this by having the R below the c (and also, to judge from the entry for 79, by lozenge stops on the obverse, although this criterion excludes D6 and D7 from the catalogue). The R is indeed placed below the c on well over a third of the specimens examined. Only two

---


dies, however, account for this number, and one of these is the much-paired and doubtless long-lived rev. 7. The other, rev. 6, has the extraordinary error of the large G punched in upside down (the 5 being of such a form that it is less noticeably upside down). This may in some way have diverted the engraver’s signature from a position below the G to one below the c, a model he followed when sinking rev. 7. The error die might not have been used to full capacity—D6 could now be over-represented through its very ‘curiosity’, the eight specimens having occurred singly.¹ The coins with R below c seem not so much a substantive variety as an accident.

Williamson also distinguished a variety, Gloucestershire 78, which omits the R altogether. Such coins exist, but (assuming that 78 is not restricted to those with lozenge obverse, which would leave B3 uncatalogued) they probably do not form a homogeneous group. Even on well-preserved impressions of rev. 3 no small R is apparent; there are traces of the large G having been lightly entered lower down on the die, and of a small mark touching the ornament, but this does not seem to have been the upright of an R. Rev. 3 has already been shown to have been made and used before and after reverses bearing the signature. Its omission, therefore, would have been nothing more than an accident. The small R is apparently absent also from rev. 8 and, taking both impressions together, rev. 9. Their punches have placed these dies last, well separated from rev. 3. The coins which lack the R, therefore, also do not form a substantive variety.

The obverse and reverse dies may now be set out with the succession of new punches (Tables II–III).² For ready identification the most obvious features for distinguishing the dies are added, on the obverses the letters in the legend on a radius from the three points of the shield, etc., and on the reverses the punch to which, or the punches between which, the cross-bar of the large G points. All the dies are illustrated (Plate VII).

HISTORY OF THE ISSUES

The Farthings departed from the Bristol formula to the extent of bearing the name of the mayor, which, with the addition of the legend For necessary change, had the effect of identifying the city by nothing more than arms and initials (this was subsequently altered). The mayor thus appears to have initiated and instigated this coinage personally—evidence below is rather against the possibility that he might only have sponsored the initiative of his son—and it is consequently of importance to know what manner of man he was.

Luke Nourse must have been born about 1584, but his origins have not been discovered; he may have been related to a family of landed gentry (see below). He himself by 1656 claimed the rank of esquire,³ owned some land, and was wealthy enough to be able to lend three-figure sums to the corporation; his son Edward was once described as a merchant.⁴

² It should be entered as a caveat that it may be less certain that punches are identical than that they are different.
³ City of Gloucester, Minutes, 1656–1686, p. 1. This volume is hereinafter cited as ‘CGM’. I am grateful to the Gloucestershire Record Office (Gloucester Public Library) for making the corporation records so readily available to me, and to the Chief Executive Officer for permission to publish extracts.
⁴ CGM, p. 63 (1658). See Addendum 1.
TABLE II
Obverse Dies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Stops</th>
<th>Shield, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cinquefoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O-R, A, G. Mullet points down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O, S, N. Mullet points up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O, S-A, G. Mullet points up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O-S, A-N. R-N distant, N upside down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>O, A, N. N upside down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R, A, G. N upside down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note to Tables II and III. 'E' and 'E' may be from the same punch with the upper bar individually entered. 'R' takes the form of a 'R' with the tail added individually.

TABLE III
Reverse Dies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Stops</th>
<th>G bar, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cinquefoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N-O. Mullet points down, r below g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N-O. Mullet points up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-stop. Mullet points up, r below g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N-O. Mullet points up, r below g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>S, g upside down. Mullet points up, r below c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stop. Mullet points up, r below c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lozenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N-O. N upside down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admitted to the Common Council on 28 August 1621, Luke Nourse's financial expertise was drawn upon to audit the accounts in December 1629. On 9 November 1630 he was elected sheriff for the coming year. After twenty-one years of continuous service on the council he was elected, on 17 May 1642, to a vacancy for alderman, and was a member of the committee set up on 5 August, with the onset of civil war, to take care of the defence and welfare of the city. He was indeed active in the Parliamentary cause, journeying to London some time before 30 September 'about the Deputations of Lieutenancy and other busines at Parliament'. Under an Ordinance of 1 June 1643 he was one of divers persons 'fit to further the execution of' the recent Ordinance for the speedy raising and levying of money for the maintenance of the army raised by Parliament, by taxing such as have not contributed or lent at all towards

---

1 City of Gloucester, Minutes, 1565–1632, f. 482v.  
2 Ibid., f. 538r.  
3 Ibid., f. 547r.  
4 City of Gloucester, Minutes, 1486–c. 1600, f. 63r.  
6 Ibid., p. 226.
the maintenance of the said army, or if they have yet not in any reasonable measure answerable to their estates', who had been 'omitted to be therein named to be committees, whereby the service (if it be not remedied) is like to bee much retarded and hindred'; and was nominated to the committee for Gloucester. On 3 August he was a member of the similar committee set up for the speedy raising and levying of money for the maintenance of the army raised by the Parliament, and other great affairs of the Commonwealth. During the famous siege of Gloucester (10 August–5 September), in which the city's defiance of the King formed the psychological turning-point of the Civil War, Luke Nourse was one of thirteen captains in the two parliamentary regiments which lay in garrison.

A year later he was elected mayor (1644), and followed it, as usual, with the office of coroner (1645–6). He was named a member of the committee, or a commissioner for Gloucester in Ordinances for an assessment for the relief of Ireland (16 February 1647/8), for settling the Militia in the West (12 May 1648), for settling the Militia nationally (2 December 1648), in the General Assessment Act (7 April 1649), and in the Assessment Acts of 7 December 1649, 26 November 1650, 10 December 1652, 9 June 1657, and 26 January 1659/60. Of the Parliamentary assessments it has been said that they remedied a whole series of ancient grievances by replacing the individual subsidy with an over-all amount due from every county and borough, which the latter distributed equitably according to what they knew each tax-payer to be worth. Under an Act of 26 July 1659 Luke Nourse was to be named a Commissioner of the Militia for Gloucester, and under that of 12 March 1659/60 for Gloucestershire as well.

He was mayor for the second time in 1656–7, after John Disbrowe, brother-in-law to Cromwell and Major-General for Gloucestershire, had purged the corporation of those who were unreliable. Immediately he became mayor there were promulgated Rules for the better Regulation of the Common Council. Another suggestive act was the institution on 21 July 1657 of a weekly 'lecture' to be preached on Tuesday mornings by 'able and honest Ministers well affected to the present Governm[en]t'. On 11 July he ceremoniously proclaimed Cromwell Lord Protector under the Humble Petition and Advice constitution. Richard Cromwell was High Steward of the city, as Henry and Oliver had been before him; and one of the city's two members in the 1656–7 session of parliament was Major-General Disbrowe. The circumstances

---

2 Ibid., p. 230.
3 John Dorney, A Briefe and Exact Relation of the Most Materiall and Remarkeable Passages that Happened in the Late Well-formed and as valiently defended Siege Laid before the City of Glocester, 1643, reprinted in Bibliotheca Gloucestrensis . . . [by John Washbourne], part ii, 1823, pp. 205–32 (p. 229).
9 CGM, p. 32. See Addendum 3.
11 Samuel Rudder, A New History of Gloucestershire . . ., 1779, p. 117; Thomas Dudley Fosbrooke [i.e. Fosbroke], An Original History of the City of Glouces- ter . . ., 1819, p. 211.
surrounding the issue of a corporation token thus suggest that it was not undertaken in opposition to the wishes of the government.

At a meeting of Common Council held on 19 February 1656/7 it was agreed:¹

That Mr Edward Nourse a Member of this house shall take care that farthings may be provided for exchange of moneys at the charge of the Chamber of this City soe as y° same exceed not the summe of Twenty pounds and the benefitt that shall arise thereby to doe to the Chamber of this City.

In the event the cost was to be half that amount, for on 30 April 1657 we find that:²

Whereas there was Twenty pounds to be layd out for Farthings according to a former act It is agreed at this House That the summe of Tenn pounds shalbe layd out for Tokens and to be disposed of according to the said act.

There were, however, some small additional expenses, for among the General Payments of the Stewards and Chamberlains in the year 1656–7 appears the following entry:³

Paid him [sc. Mr Edward Nurse] for the Stampe for the City farthings and for cariedge postage of them and about them . . . 01–17–6.

Two years later, at the Common Council which met on 7 July 1659, during the mayoralty of Robert Tyther, it was agreed:⁴

That Mr Edward Nourse shall take care to lay out Thirty pounds for the procuring of farthings or tokens which are to be made according to the former Act.

There are no City Farthings dated 1659.⁵ Given that the order was fulfilled, the last phrase must include the making of tokens with the same types as in 1657, even as to date. There is little to indicate the reason for this. Salisbury did not find the national situation inhibiting to a new corporation issue a few months earlier, nor did Bideford and Bath about the same time, nor Bristol and Northampton a few months later. The explanation is probably to be found in local circumstances, not so much for the recommendation of Luke Nourse's name above others—for he does not seem to have held so pre-eminent a position—but rather for the self-effacement of Robert Tyther; it may be significant that he was a member of only one Committee of Assessment.⁶ Experience of the seventeenth-century tokens as a whole suggests that the actual occurrence is not unparalleled; what is unusual here is that the occurrence is documented.

On 23 May 1662, during the mayoralty of Thomas Peirce, it was agreed at a meeting of Common Council:⁷

That Thirty pounds shall by [i.e. be] layd out by the Stewards for the makeing of tokens or Farthings according to the Same Stampe or Inscription as formerly And that Mr Edward Nourse shall be desired to effect the same And that notwithstanding the doeing thereof and the Inscription of Luke Nourse Esquire Mayor the said Luke Nourse and Mr Edward Nourse shall be indemnified and saved harmlesse from all damages touching the same.

¹ CGM, p. 18. Mr. E. G. H. Kempson generously made available to me his transcripts of the passages bearing on the tokens before I was able to examine the records for myself.
² CGM, p. 27. This order of £10 is clearly in execution of the order of 19 Feb., and not in addition to it as supposed by J. R. S. Whiting, Trade Tokens: a Social and Economic History, 1971, p. 17.
⁴ CGM, p. 102. W. H. Stevenson did not point out this entry to John Plyedell Wilton, see the latter's 'Gloucester tokens of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries', in TBGAS, xiii (1888/9), pp. 130–45 (pp. 136–7).
⁵ A piece dated 1659, in addition to one of 1657, was recorded in Collectanea Glocestriensia . . ., 1842, p. 242, and Gloucestershire Notes and Queries, i (1881), p. 348, no. 46. It named Luke Nourse, and must be a mistake.
⁷ CGM, p. 230.
Again there are no Gloucester Farthings dated for this year, and it is specifically ordered that the tokens are to bear the same legend as before. Yet even though the new issue would ostensibly date from 1657, and could hardly be known to be new unless detected in the actual process of production or distribution (the indemnity being concerned only with the 'doeing' of 1662), the Council took great care to protect the interests of the two Nourses. Such nervousness is understandable in the city at that time.

Gloucester had been feeling alarm as early as October 1661 at the Bill which became law as the Act for the well governing and regulating of Corporations. Under this all mayors, aldermen, common councilmen, etc. were required to take the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy; to swear 'that it is not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take arms against the king, and that I do abhor that traitorous position of taking arms by his authority against his person or against those that are commissioned by him'; and to subscribe to a declaration that 'I hold that there lies no obligation upon me or any other person from the oath commonly called the Solemn League and Covenant...' At the first meeting of the Commissioners for Gloucester, on 18 July 1662, Luke Nourse was one of those who attended; as an old Puritan who had borne arms against the king, he refused the oaths and declaration. Three days later, therefore, deeming it 'expedient for the public safety', they ordered that Luke Nourse and others 'shall be and hereby are removed and displaced from all offices'; and their offices were to be void, to all intents and purposes as if they 'were naturally dead'.

The City also had its fortifications demolished, and (by the 1672 Charter) its area reduced from 29,000 acres to 400. Edward Nourse was discharged from the council at his own request (3 June 1662), having removed himself and his family to London; he thereby avoided facing the Commissioners. It has been thought that Edward the councilman was probably a brother of Luke Nourse, but in view of this move he must be old Luke's son, described as citizen and girdler of London on his death, aged sixty-five, in 1689/90. Luke joined his son in London, where he would have found himself at home among the men who had marched in the train-bands to relieve the siege of Gloucester. 'Luke Nourse, late of Gloucester, Gent.' died on 25 April 1673 at the age of eighty-nine, and was buried three days later in the north aisle of the newly rebuilt church of St. Michael, Cornhill; on the nearby wall his memorial may still be seen.
The penultimate meeting of the old council again dealt with the Farthings. On 23 June 1662 it was agreed as follows:

That there shall be a new stampe made for the Farthings lately agreed upon for this City in Mr Maiors name that now is as it was formerly in the name of Mr Alderman Nurse in the time of his Maioralty because the former stamp is lost, And Mr Maior to bee secured for the same by this House.

This somewhat confusing entry should be construed thus: ‘For the farthings lately agreed upon for this City in Mr. Mayor’s name that now is’ [i.e. under his authority] ‘there shall be a new stamp made . . ., as it was formerly, in the name of Mr. Alderman Nourse . . .’ It has been deduced that the council must have contemplated the issuing of more tokens, but the reference to farthings ‘lately agreed upon’ shows that the council was giving consideration not to a new issue but to some problem in the execution of an issue already ordered. No evidence is known for any further issue between that first ordered in May 1662 and those dated 1667 and 1669. Study of the dies makes clear the reason for this unusual attention devoted to a new ‘stamp’.

**IDENTIFICATION OF THE ISSUES**

The die-linking that has been found forms four separate groups (see Fig. 1). It is not to be expected, however, that all dies used in a coinage will necessarily be linked together, nor that a die may not be carried over to a later period of striking. Indeed, it is clear that this did happen.

Although dies made for one coinage need not be sunk from the same punches, there are obviously limits to the holding of multiple punches at any one time. It is a reasonable hypothesis that the over-all replacement of worn or broken punches is normally, on grounds of economy, a gradual process. Therefore, whereas it may be true that too much weight should not be attached to different individual punches, the appearance of a combination of new punches at the same place of minting indicates a different period of coining.

Tables II–III reveal two occasions after the commencement of the coinage when a combination of new punches appeared on the obverse dies, and two notable occasions on the reverse dies. With documentary evidence for three distinct issues, A–B can be identified with confidence as the obverse dies made for the 1657 issue, C–D for the 1659 issue, and E–H for the 1662 issue. Revs. 1–2 were therefore made in 1657. Rev. 3 introduces a combination of new punches, and has punches in common with obv. C, although it pairs with obv. B; the latter therefore survived to be paired with a reverse made in 1659. Revs. 4–5 were sunk for the 1659 issue, and so also, in view of the size of the order and the apparently low output of rev. 5, must have been revs. 6–7. Revs. 8–9 were then made in 1662.

---

3. Sic, not ‘Nurse’s’ as printed by J. P. Wilton, loc. cit.
5. Williamson, *Gloucestershire* 80–81, no. 80 being misdated 1669.
Rev. 7, however, was also used in 1662, when it paired with a further three obverses. It is at this point that the document of June 1662 falls into place. The mention of a 'stamp' could mean one set (pair) of dies, or even more, as may be seen in the 1656-7 accounts; but the combined evidence here of dies and of documents referring to 'a new stamp ... in the name of Mr. Alderman Nourse' makes clear that what was under consideration was a reverse die (which bore the name of Luke Nourse). After so much use it is not surprising that rev. 7 became worn out, or 'lost'. The die-sinker must then have asked for guidance from the council as to the legend that the new reverse die(s) should bear. At that threatening time Thomas Peirce preferred that they should carry the name of Luke Nourse again.

Two consequences of this identification of the issues may cause concern. Whereas an expenditure of £10 was ordered in 1657, and £30 both in 1659 and in 1662, only 3+5 dies need have been used in 1659 and 4+3 in 1662 (more dies might have survived from the previous issue, but if so there is no means of knowing it), as against 2+2 in 1657; and secondly, the relative numbers of coins recorded for the three issues likewise do not bear a ratio of 1:3:3. However, coin survival is not necessarily a reliable indicator of the proportions that originally existed. More coins of the first issue might easily have survived because they appeared first on the scene, being retained as a sample of a new currency type, or even as a novelty. In any case, it cannot be assumed that the size of the second and third issues was as much as three times that of the first, since we do not know in their case whether the expenditure included the cost of dies and postage, nor do we know that minting charges in the interim remained the same. Confirmation that the issues have been correctly identified is to be found in the punches. Obvs. C–D and revs. 3–5 appear to be from the same punches as those which were used for dies of the R-signed Bideford Farthing dated 1659, which in terms of Gloucester (see Tables II–III) bore the following:

**Obv.** T2H4E3A2R1M3E2O2F1R2ID3EFO2RD

**Rev.** 3A2B1IDF1EO2RD F3A2RT1H1NG / B1C / 126E15 (= 26)

and most of the punches for obvs. E–H and revs. 8–9 appear to have been the same as for a group of dies of the R-signed Bristol Farthing dated 1662:

**Obv.** T1H4E3A2R1M3E3O3F1R2ST1OLL

**Rev.** 3A2B1RT1ST1OLL F3A2RT1F1NG / CB / 126E62

The die combinations can now be catalogued according to the orders from which they appear to have resulted (Table IV, the 1662 issue being more precisely dated by two orders), with the differences of detail which seem to have significance in the nature of a privy mark.1 The numbers of recorded specimens are given, with weights correct to the nearest 0.005 grammes, and locations in the following collections.

A Ashmolean Museum, Oxford
B British Museum
C City Museum and Art Gallery, Gloucester

1 In view of the somewhat irregular alignment of letters, etc., it is prima facie difficult to believe that the mere position of a punch relative to the radius of the die could have constituted a privy mark; yet it is extraordinary that on obvs. A–B and revs. 1–2 the mullet initial-mark points downwards, whereas it points upwards on obvs. C–D and revs. 3–7.

2 Mr. J. N. Taylor has capped many acts of kindness by obtaining accurate weights of all the specimens in the Gloucester City Museum, after I had struggled to use an old beam balance with a makeshift pan. The remainder were weighed in the Department of Coins and Medals of the British Museum.
I am very grateful to the respective owners and curators for permitting me to examine their collections, and also to the firms of dealers and auctioneers who have made specimens available to me.

**TABLE IV**

GLOUCESTER. Corporation, 1657[-62] (Luke Nourse, Mayor). [Farthing.] Williamson, Gloucestershire 77-79. All have mullet i.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dies</th>
<th>Axis</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Locations and weights (in grammes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 1657 [April 30]. Cinquefoil stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A, B (2-84), C (3:33, 3:275, 2:865, 2:395), F, N, T (2:56), W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>A, C (3:095, 2:90, 2:85, 2:81, 2:715), N, T (3:04), W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A, C (2:975), N, T (2:69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. [1659 July 7]. Cinquefoil stops

| D5   | ↓    | 1    | C (2:80) |
| D6   | ↓    | 8    | B (2:77), C (2:53, 2:19, 2:17), N, T (2:46) |

IIIa. [1662 May 23]. Lozenge/Cinquefoil stops

| E7   | ↓    | 13   | A, C (3:695, 3:345, 2:62), T (2:585) |
| F7   | ↓    | 10   | B (2:725), C (3:425), N, T (3:635, 2:905) |
| G7   | ↓    | 8    | A, C (3:02, 2:945, 2:84), T (3:48), W |

IIIb. [1662 June 23]. Lozenge stops

| H8   | ↓    | 3    | A, C (2:11), T (3:18) |
| H9   | ↓    | 2    | T (2:85, 2:40) |

**PRODUCTION**

The Farthings were ordered by cost, but except for carriage and postage we have no accounts to show how much they actually did cost. The costs in 1657 should have been £11. 17s. 6d., in 1659, £30, and in 1662, £30. No record has been found of the quantities received; if the expectation of profit was realized, the nominal value would have exceeded £71. 17s. 6d.

In the absence of better information, an attempt to assess the size of production must be made on the basis of die output. The number of dies for Gloucester 1657 would have been too small to give a reliable average had the necessary figures been known. However, the Bristol Farthings of 1652, which are of similar size and signed by the same die-sinker, were struck from sufficient dies to produce a meaningful average; and a figure has been found for the amount received. The die-ratio is approximately 1:1, so that calculations both on obverse and on reverse dies provide each a check on the other. The reverse dies that have been identified produced an average of 11,077 farthings each, or £11. 10s. 9½d., and the obverse dies, which are more likely to be complete, 10,827 pieces, or £10. 14s. 3½d.
The Gloucester coinage is spread over three different issues, but since dies survived from one issue to the next an average should be applicable to all dies together. If the metal of the dies in 1657–62 had comparable properties to that of 1652, the nine reverse dies would have produced at the Bristol rate about £100-worth of farthings, and the eight obverse dies about £85-worth. It should be noted, however, that these figures give a very much higher cost in relation to nominal value than that which apparently obtained in Bristol. This underlines the fact that the calculations can only be tentative. On present information, the best estimate of the size of the coinage of Gloucester Farthings dated 1657, and struck in 1657, 1659, and 1662, is between £85 and £100.

WEIGHT

Beyond generalizations about their smallness and thinness, little attention has been devoted to the metrology of seventeenth-century tokens. Weights have been published for a few individual specimens, e.g. 21, 34-5, and 63-5 gr. for three Irish pieces. Individual issues have been stated to be of a certain weight, but the information is probably based on too few specimens; one extraordinary issue has been given variously as 7 dwt. (168 gr.), ‘about the size and weight of a halfpenny of Charles II, struck ten years later’ (nominally 159 gr., range 154–187-4 gr.), and as one-third of the weight of the regal farthings (i.e. 25–34 gr.). Maxima have been published for a few corporation issues, but the number of specimens has been too small. Weighings have been generalized by denomination to produce one statement that farthings may weigh about 13, 14, or 15 gr. each, and halfpence about 26, 28, or 30 gr., and another that a farthing averaged 15 gr., a halfpenny 35 gr., and a penny 45 gr. The true state of affairs is no doubt more correctly (if more confusingly) represented by ranges of 7–15 gr. for farthings and 18–46 gr. for halfpennies, of 14–70 gr. for town pieces, and the wide ranges published in the only catalogue of seventeenth-century tokens that has included weights as a matter of course, which led its author to conclude that it was hardly worth speaking of actual weights. Certainly, if the aim in recording weights has been to hit on a standard, and discover to what extent the issued coins maintained that standard, it has not succeeded.

Yet it is evident that the weights of the tokens had importance for contemporaries.

1 Herbert A. Grueber, *Handbook of the Coins of Great Britain and Ireland in the British Museum*, 1899, p. 238; he omits the weight of the English token (p. 126).
7 Snelling, loc. cit.
8 George C. Boon, *Welsh Tokens of the Seventeenth Century ...*, 1973, p. 23. It is to be regretted that the individual weights are not published.
9 A possible exception should be made for the Mayor of Oxford token, averaging 17 gr. with a range of 15–19 gr. according to E. Thurlow Leeds, 'Oxford Tradesmen's Tokens', in *Surveys and Tokens ...*, edited by H. E. Salter, 1923 (Oxford Historical Society, vol. lxxv), pp. 355–453, plates (pp. 360–1); and for the average of 23 gr. for specimens of a private issue in brass (which had been taken for gold) recorded by J. G. Milne, *Catalogue of Oxfordshire Seventeenth-century Tokens*, 1935 [i.e. 1936], p. xviii.
In Wiltshire some issuers were indicted on charges which included the striking of tokens worth less than their nominal value; but this would have been a fact used to prosecute the issuers, and need not have any bearing on their intentions. For Gloucester, however, there is a very important piece of evidence which firmly places weight among the intentions of a token issuer. In 1669 the City ordered Farthings which were to be ‘of the full weight of a Bristol farthing’. The impression that Bristol set a standard for a large farthing is thus confirmed and brought down to the particular detail of weight. It is not now known what the nominal weight of a Bristol Farthing was, and the actual weights range so widely that the standard can hardly have been essayed for the individual coin, but must have resided in the number of pieces to be minted from a quantity of copper, doubtless a pound. A large number of specimens have therefore to be weighed in order to discover the weight standard for any particular issue.

**TABLE V**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-6-3-799</td>
<td>YYZZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4-3-599</td>
<td>YZZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2-3-399</td>
<td>XXYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-0-3-199</td>
<td>XXXXXXYYZZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8-2-999</td>
<td>XXXXXXYYYYYYZZZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6-2-799</td>
<td>XXXYYYYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-2-599</td>
<td>XYYYYYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2-2-399</td>
<td>XY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-0-2-199</td>
<td>XYYYZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The weights of the sixty-one Gloucester 1657 Farthings in the collections designated B, C, and T (Table IV), none of them unduly worn or damaged, range from 2-075 to 3-705 grammes = approximately 32 to 57-2 grains. Their frequency distribution has been set out in Table V, with the three issues of 1657, 1659, and 1662 identified as X, Y, and Z respectively. It may be seen that they rise to a peak at 2-8-2-999 g. = 43-2-46-2 gr., and the nominal weight can hardly have been lower than 2-6 g. = 40-1 gr., nor higher than 3-199 g. = 49-3 gr. The analogy of the regal copper halfpennies struck later in the century in Ireland would place the nominal weight somewhat above the peak, the difference being attributed to wear. This is not the place to discuss the nominal weight of the Bristol Farthings, but if 3-11 g. = 48 gr., or just two pennyweights, were to be suggested, the weights of the Gloucester Farthings of 1657-62 would not appear inconsistent with the standard which was specified for the 1669 Farthings, and (there being nothing to suggest that the specification was new) was presumptively that for 1657.

The conclusion of greatest interest, however, is that weight was significant for some at least of the seventeenth-century tokens. This induces respect for them as a well-organized coinage.

---

2 CGM, p. 411. This was quoted by Irvine E. Gray in *TBGAS* lxxxiv (1965), p. 108.
3 For conversion of grammes into grains I have used Earle R. Caley, *Metrological Tables*, 1965 (Numismatic notes and monographs, no. 154).
5 In addition to those already mentioned, my colleague Jean Wait, B.A., Dip. Arch. Admin., and Messrs. John Brand and Stewart Lyon have helpfully discussed individual points, and Mr. John Parry has helped to search for Luke Nourse’s origins.
SOURCES OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Ashmolean Museum: obv. A, revs. 1–2
British Museum: obv. C
City Museum and Art Gallery, Gloucester: obvs. E, G, revs. 3 (the second), 4, and 5
R. H. Thompson: the remainder

For the photographs of the Ashmolean specimens I am indebted to that museum’s photographic department; for all others, to Mr. Ray Gardner of the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum.

ADDENDA

1. It has now been possible to discover something of Luke Nourse’s early life. He was the son of Walter Nourse of Gloucester, and, in a somewhat unorthodox arrangement, in 1599 was apprenticed to his parents for seven years in the ‘mercer’s craft’ (City of Gloucester, Apprentice Register, 1595–1647, p. 51). In 1607 he was indeed described as a mercer (V. A. Woodman, Supplement to ‘Calendar of the Records of the Corporation of Gloucester’ compiled by W. H. Stevenson (1893), 1966, p. 27, 1953A). It is even recorded that he was ‘of the tallest stature, fit to make a pykeman’, an ironic assessment in view of his later history (John Smith, steward to the Berkeley family, The Names and Surnames of all the able and Sufficient Men in body fit for His Majesty’s Service in the wars, within the County of Gloucester . . . 1608 . . ., edited from the original ms. . . ., 1902, p. 2).

A formative influence on Luke Nourse would have been the career of his father, who was Sheriff of Gloucester in 1586 and 1592, but never mayor, and who was removed from the position of alderman in 1605 by reason of his poverty (Thomas Dudley Fosbrooke [i.e. Fosbroke], An Original History of the City of Gloucester . . ., 1819, p. 416; City of Gloucester, Minutes, 1486–c. 1600, f. 39v; 1565–1632, f. 213v).

2. One may add to the list of offices held by Luke Nourse those of President (1645–6), Surveyor (1646–7, 1655–6), and Treasurer (1650–1, 1654–5) of the Hospital of St. Bartholomew and the rest of the hospitals for the poor belonging to the City (Minutes, 1632–1656, pp. 355, 387, 585, 793, 844).

3. The regular sermon was not a new institution in 1657, for, in 1649, a weekly ‘lecture sermon’ was decided upon, to be preached in St. Michael’s Church (Minutes, 1632–1656, p. 504); in 1653 it was moved to the college church (ibid., p. 733); and from 1657 it was to be preached in St. Michael’s or some other convenient church.

4. The politics of Robert Tyther, mayor in 1658–9, are further suggested in an admittedly hearsay report by one Captain Titus to the future Charles II, concerning the possibility of restoring the monarchy, and dated 1 July 1659: ‘At my last meeting with the major general [Massey] . . . he told me . . . that the mayor of the town [of Gloucester] himself had expressed much inclination to act in such a business’ (Bibliotheca Gloucestrensis . . ., [by John Washbourn], [part i], 1825, Historical Introduction, p. cxxx).