A HOARD OF IRON AGE COINS FROM NEAR WOODBRIDGE, SUFFOLK

PHILIP DE JERSEY AND JOHN NEWMAN

In December 1996 an Iron Age gold stater was discovered during metal detecting in a field in the Deben valley, near Woodbridge in Suffolk. Further intensive searches of the site over the next two years recovered a total of eighteen coins. In 1999 mechanical scraping of the topsoil to expose the subsoil was combined with an intensive metal detector search but this failed to recover any more coins or locate a concentrated source. This indicates that agricultural disturbance has scattered the complete hoard, and that the vast majority of the deposit has now been recovered.

The hoard, which consists primarily of the coins known as British G, or Clacton stater and quarter stater, was probably deposited during the later stages of the Gallic War, or shortly thereafter. Apart from its intrinsic interest, publication provides an excellent opportunity for a brief review of the distribution of the Clacton types.1

I. The hoard

The majority of the coins were scattered over an area of approximately 50 x 60 m, with one outlying coin (no. 3) found some 120 m south-east of the main concentration. The findspot lies near the 20 m contour, just above a small inlet which in the late Iron Age could have formed a landing place for sea or river traffic, and is approximately 1500 m east of the tidal River Deben. Due to the free-draining nature of the local sand and gravel deposits the lower Deben valley is responsive to cropmark formation, and the field in which the coins were found was already recorded on the County Sites and Monuments Record as displaying evidence of field boundaries and droveways of unknown date. The coins were found close to a point where one of these droveways splits to form two tracks.

Fieldwalking and intensive metal detector survey in the area around the findspot of the coins has revealed evidence of probable settlement activity dating from the mid first millennium BC through to the period of the Roman conquest, with activity continuing in the general area evidenced by the discovery of Roman coinage of the first, second and third centuries AD, and by first and second century brooches, including a rare silver type. Several other Iron Age coins are recorded from the site which apparently have no association with the hoard: an uninscribed north Thames bronze unit (CCI 96.2891), a bronze unit of Cunobelin (VA 2107, CCI 96.2964), a worn silver unit of Addedomaros (CCI 97.1407), and a fragment of a Corieltauvian silver unit (CCI 98.2060).

Details of the eighteen Iron Age coins (Pl. 25) forming all or part of the hoard are presented in the accompanying table. The composition of the hoard bears a significant degree of resemblance to the Clacton, Essex (1998) deposit. Apart from the 'new' type of quarter stater (BMC 192), which did not occur in the Clacton hoard, all the dies of the British coins amongst this group are represented in the older hoard. The dies for the four coins of BMC 192 type are also duplicated outside the hoard. The single Gallo-Belgic E stater, part of the massive issue of uniform coins conventionally dated to the Gallic War, does not appear to have any reverse die-links to other coins from Britain recorded in the Celtic Coin Index, but is matched by a stater apparently found at Mons in Belgium in 1990.2

The new quarter stater has been discussed in some detail elsewhere,3 and has more recently appeared in the catalogue of the British Museum collection.4 The reverse is very plainly a reduction in size of the design on the reverse of the stater, while the obverse appears to be derived from the 'three men in a boat' design on the Gallo-Belgic D quarter stater (VA 69-1), and thus joins an extensive list of insular derivatives of that Gallo-Belgic coinage. Stylistically it lies much closer to the British G stater than the old quarter stater (VA 1460), which although also deriving its obverse from Gallo-Belgic D, has a simpler reverse design based on a cross with pellets in each quarter.

The average weights of the two types of quarter stater -1.42 g for 15 examples of VA 1460, and 1.30 g for 36 examples of BMC 192 - suggest that the old type (VA 1460) is likely to be the earlier of the two. No analyses have yet been performed on the BMC 192 type to establish whether its alloy is significantly more base, but it is worth noting that many examples are distinctly coppery in tone, while others have been recorded as base gold; these terms have not been applied to examples of the VA 1460 type.

1 The authors are grateful to the two metal detectorists who discovered the coins and made meticulous records of their location, and to the landowner, who willingly facilitated successive searches of the site. Following the requisite procedures of a Treasure Trove Inquest (for the five coins recovered before September 1997) and a Treasure Act decision for the remainder, two of the quarter staters (nos 15 and 16) have been retained by the British Museum, and the remainder of the coins returned to the landlord.


4 R. Hobbs, British Iron Age coins in the British Museum (London, 1996), p. 55, where it is erroneously placed with the north-east coast staters (British II).
The condition of the coins in both the Clacton and near Woodbridge hoards is much the same, and it is reasonable to assume that both hoards were deposited at a similar period, perhaps during the Gallic War or in the decade or two thereafter.

### Table 1: Coins in the 'near Woodbridge' hoard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>CCI</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>ref.</th>
<th>weight (g)</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>97.0052</td>
<td>G-B-E</td>
<td>VA 52</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>Scheers series 24, class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97.0053</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>dies as no. 4, BMC 152-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>97.1089</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>obv. die as nos 5, 9, 10; dies as BMC 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>98.0685</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>dies as no. 2, BMC 152-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>98.0686</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>obv. die as nos 3, 9, 10; rev. die as no. 10; dies as BMC 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>98.0687</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>dies as no. 11, BMC 164-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>98.0688</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>dies as BMC 175-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>98.0689</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>obv. die as nos 6, 11; dies as BMC 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>98.0690</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>obv. die as nos 3, 5, 10; dies as BMC 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>98.0691</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>obv. die as nos 3, 5, 9; rev. die as no. 5; dies as BMC 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>98.0692</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>dies as no. 6, BMC 164-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>98.0693</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>fragment; obv. die probably as BMC 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>98.0694</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1455</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>fragment; obv. die probably as BMC 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>97.0054</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>VA 1460</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>dies as BMC 180-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>97.0055</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>BMC 192</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>obv. die as BMC 192; rev. die as coin from SW Norfolk hoard (CCI 98.1114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>98.0696</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>BMC 192</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>dies as BMC 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>98.1115</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>BMC 192</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>obv. die as BMC 192; rev. die as Vecchi 12.9.1996, lot 1084 (CCI 96.3125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>98.1116</td>
<td>British G</td>
<td>BMC 192</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>obv. die as coin in private coll. (CCI 98.1091); rev. die as Rudd 1992 list 2, no. 19 (CCI 94.1397)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. The distribution of British G

Until the advent of metal-detecting, the stater and quarter stater which Allen identified as British G were known only from the Clacton hoard, or from coins which though without provenance had almost certainly originated in that hoard. Despite intense metal-detecting activity since the mid-1970s, the number of findspots for the stater is still relatively low, but the same period has seen the discovery of almost fifty examples of the new quarter stater, and a trebling in the number of known examples of the old Clacton quarter stater.

With the increase in recorded numbers of all of these types it is possible for the first time to produce a useful distribution map (Fig. 1). The coins are found predominantly in the territory of the Trinovantes, with a couple of outliers to the west amongst the Catuvellauni, and a few more in the Icenian territory to the north. Despite the problems of applying tribal divisions only formalized in

---


6 Two coins are not plotted on the map: one example each of the stater and the VA 1460 quarter stater, found near Caistor in Lincolnshire.

the early Roman period to earlier patterns of distribution, an attribution to the Trinovantes seems very likely. The clear concentration in their territory makes a nonsense of recent claims that the two north Thames tribes 'cannot be distinguished numismatically'.

At Buxton with Lammas, in the north-east of the county, another worn quarter stater accompanied sixteen Gallo-Belgic E staters. This hoard is likely to have been deposited at a similar period to the Clacton and near Woodbridge finds, but again it contributes relatively little to our understanding of British G.

Possibly the most curious aspect of the BMC 192 quarter type is its absence from the Clacton hoard. Of course we do not necessarily need to search for a logical reason for this absence, but it seems odd that this type — now three times as common as the VA 1460 quarter, though discovered only in the last twenty years — did not occur alongside the British G staters in that hoard. Leaving aside the possibility that the hoard was not fully recovered, one possible explanation is that this type was deliberately omitted on account of its relatively base metal. Another explanation might be a significant chronological disparity between the stater and the BMC 192 quarter, but this is difficult to reconcile with their typological similarity, and besides the condition of the staters in the Clacton hoard does not suggest that they were deposited very soon after their production. Perhaps this search for a 'meaningful' explanation is ultimately pointless: whoever buried the Clacton hoard may simply not have possessed any of these quarter staters, for whatever reason, and there the matter lies.

ALDATES, GADUTELS AND BADIGILS: IDENTIFICATION OF MONEYERS IN THE NORTHUMBRIAN COINAGE.

VERONICA SMART

At first sight the Northumbrian styca issues are a simple coinage, though further investigation gives this the lie. Most of the personal names, however, are easy enough to read and identify. They are composed of elements well attested in Old English naming of this period. In general the spelling conforms very closely with contemporary Northumbrian orthography, as it is demonstrated in the ninth century entries in the commenoration lists now known as the Durham Liber Vitae. The epigraphy is more eclectic, often mixing runic with roman letters, and there are some unusual letter forms, but this has not to the main thrown up many problems.

Two names, however, have proved obscure. One is usually rendered as ALDATES, the other GADUTELS.2 Gadutels makes no sense as a personal name, corresponding neither whole nor in its parts to any known word in the Old English lexicon nor in items used as name elements. Aldates has some claim to onomastic respectability, with association with the street-name in Oxford, though no Saint Aldate is known to the Christian calendar.

Margaret Gelling, in the English Place-Name Society's Oxfordshire volume, comments that one other instance of this apparent dedication is known in Gloucester, where St Aldates stands by what was the old North Gate of the city. The street now known as St Aldates in Oxford was formerly also known as Old South Gate, and it is possible that in both cases Old Gate has become corrupted and assumed to be the name of a saint. St Aldates is also recorded earlier as St Olds. The name on the coins looks as if it might contain the element Ald-, the Anglo-Saxon and therefore Northumbrian reflex of West Saxon Alde-, but it is difficult to make out a satisfactory case for the second element, even as a genitive form, which would be unique in this series. A candidate might be OE -geat, found in such names as Elfgreat, Wulfgreat, but the change of diphthong and reduction of the consonant to -r would be irregular at any period of Old English, and even more anachronistic in the ninth century.

As long ago as 1956 Stewart Lyon suggested in a table of styca hoards published in BNJ3 that disparate as these legends might seem, they might be forms of the same name. They show similarities in letter-forms, particularly
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1. Edited by H. Sneath in The Oldest English Texts (Early English Text Society 83) (Oxford, 1895); see also H. Müller, Uber die Namen des Northumbriichen Liber Vitae (Pielestru 9) (Berlin, 1901).
2. On coins of Eanred, for examples and photographs see SCBI volumes, indexes in vols 28 and 41 under Aldates and Gadutels. The drawings below are taken from John Adams's plates in his publication of the Hexham hoard, Archæologia XXV, 1833.
3. 'A reappearance of the sceatta and styca coinages of Northumbria', BNJ 28 (1956), 241.
in the T, G used in both names. Lyon further suggested that they might be identified with coins in the name of ‘Thadigils’, but concluded ‘the correct form is uncertain’. In her analysis of the Adamson plates of the Hexham hoard, Elizabeth Pirie also pointed to the possible conflation of Aldates and Gadutels and queried the conventional transcription of the initial letter as G, preferring to read it as Ladutes. Most recently, in the Syllgoke volume for Northern Museums, James Booth takes up Pirie’s suggestion and transcribes the name as LADVCEIS with the ‘celtic’ curved T. Booth and Pirie both accept Aldates as the more correct form and Gadutels etc. as the corruption, but it is clear from these observations that the transcription of these groups of letters is in some doubt, and other interpretations could be permissible.

I would differ from taking Aldates as the lemma, by taking ‘GADVTELS’ or ‘LADVCEIS’ as my starting-point, and looking at the disputed initial. Although the epigraphic font available to the SCBI volumes is useful, it cannot pick up every nuance, and its rectilinear l does not accurately render the pothook letter L G. This is not the L used elsewhere in the names ODOLO and FOLCNOD, where the letter L is known to be appropriate. There is no upper cap to the letter, which would favour L rather than G, and in some cases the foot curves back to the vertical. This is illustrated most clearly in the first of the illustrations below.

Elizabeth Okasha has produced a very valuable table of letter-forms found on Anglo-Saxon inscribed objects, (not including coins) 6, and the closest parallel I find there for this letter is neither L nor G but B, or rather b, as in Okasha’s B3. This, essentially a lower-case b not completely closed, occurs in some otherwise upper-case inscriptions, notably Wensley II, Whitby DCCXXXII and Lindisfarne III. These inscriptions are dated to the eighth or ninth centuries. Searching for this b form on coins, I have found it on the moneyer Cuthberht’s coins for Offa (Blunt 24) – there may be other instances, but there is no register for coin lettering comparable to Okasha’s. The distribution of the inscriptions establishes its use in Northumbrian epigraphy, but the Offa coin suggests it was by no means confined to there.

So far we would have RADVCEIS. The next hurdle is the so-called T. Again, this is not the T which is used in other moneyer’s names, for example HRFRED, in this series. On the other hand, it is very similar to the symbol used to represent G in the legends of the moneyer Leofthegn G, T, S who strikes coins for Ethelfled II of Northumbria. On many of the latter’s coins the stem is more elaborately curved and on some reversed, but it seems quite possible that the ‘Gadu-/Ladutels’ diecutter is attempting this letter. It is true that the curved Celtic or Lombardic G occurs in Okasha’s alphabet three times (Brussels, Crowl and Ruthwell) as a capital T, but it also resembles a G form, her G3. The fact that Lyon was equating these names with a third ‘name’ Thadigils, suggests that he was already accepting the symbol as a possible representation of G.

Aldates would now appear in the new transcription as AbDAGES, or AbDA-, reading the second A as inverted V – i.e. bADV by transposition. + GES. It is noteworthy that this letter, which I propose as an inverted V, is never barred, whereas the A in BADA is invariably barred either medially or above.

If we accept the debatable letters as B and G respectively, we can begin to make sense of the name. Reading it now as AbDAGES or BADAGES, it is not a great leap to the name of a moneyer we know already for Eanred’s reign, namely BADIGILS. In fact, as I pointed out in my earlier paper on the ‘styca’ moneyers, a form in Badu– would be etymologically more correct than the Badi– we know already. The root is a primitive Germanic Badu-, reflected in the non-Anglian poetic beadu, ‘battle’ and Anglian, therefore Northumbrian, Badu-. The Durham Liber Vitae has both forms Badigils and Beadugils. The variation in the composition joint is no doubt due to the weakening of the unstressed vowel in this position in pronunciation, and a mistaken replacement, probably by analogy with names in Sigi-, Wini-, with i.

There is a problem with the second element, in that -gels, -ges for -gils is irregular, e for i cannot be explained as a phonological variation but seems too consistent for a die-cutting error. This second element is from gisel-, a theme with a complicated semantic history in common Germanic 10 where it seems to have developed from ‘shoot, sprig’ to ‘noble offspring’ to the specialised meaning ‘hostage’, which meaning it has in OE as a common noun. In names it appears in first position as Gisl-, as in Gisliheard; Gislihere (though the other instances cited by Searle are very doubtfully English). As a second element it occurs only in the metathesised form -gils, as in the moneyer’s name. It is not a very prolific element in Old English names and does not seem to survive beyond the ninth century. It is possible that the die-cutter had in mind the -gisel form when he cut E in this element. Otherwise the variation in vowel might be explained as a reduction in the definite quality of the vowel owing to its unstressed position.

---

5 SCBI 48.
8 See especially SCBI 3, 21-15.
9 ‘The personal names of the pre-Viking Northumbrian coinages’ in Coinage in Ninth Century Northumbria, as in n. 4, p. 247
Thadigils, i.e. BADIGILS should surely be more correctly transcribed as Badigils. In the BMC illustration the horizontal divides the D but does not cut through the stem and project left of it. It should be remembered that crossed D for the <th> sound is by no means to be accepted without question in the styca series. On the coins, it has been a matter of note that <th> is invariably represented in the OE names in the earliest MSS of Bede, i.e. Moore and Leningrad, but crossed LVD has begun to introduce D along with d, t, and th.12 On the coins crossed D is only found erroneously in HERRE-E, which is only found erroneously in this context.

**METHELTUN NOT MEDESHAMSTEDE: AN ANGLO-SAXON MINT AT MELTON MOWBRAY RATHER THAN PETERBOROUGH ABBEY**

MARK BLACKBURN

In 1954 Michael Dolley published a fragmentary coin of Æthelred II’s First Hand type from the Swedish Barshage, Gotland hoard with a reverse legend: +HIDE M-O ME-EB [ ] (PI. 26a, 2).1 He persuasively argued that this was a coin of Medeshamstede (as Peterborough was called until the late tenth century), and reflected the exercise of minting rights which the abbot was reputed to have enjoyed since 972, through a moneyer either at Peterborough itself or at nearby Stamford. The case was strong, for the moneyer Hilde – a very unusual name – had struck coins at Stamford in the preceding type, and the spelling of the place-name Med... rather than Med... could arguably be explained by a recognition softened of the sound in the Danelaw. A potential problem was that a mid-nineteenth-century account of the hoard from Quendale, Shetland mentioned a coin of Æthelred II of unspecified type, said to read +PIZTAN MO ME-BEL.2 The whereabouts of the coin was unknown, but Dolley argued that since the moneyer’s name looks improbable and arguably misread,3 there may also have been an error in transcribing the mint-name. He proposed that the missing coin perhaps read +PLZTAN (or PIZTAN M-O ME-BEL). The coin has still not surfaced, and while Dolley may well be correct in identifying the moneyer as Wulstan, who was active at Stamford in this period, his correction of the mint name now seems unjustified. A third coin of the mint was identified by Van der Meer in the Berlin collection (PI. 26a, 3).4 It is of Cnut’s Quatrefoil type reading +HEOFRED M-O ME-BEL. The dies are of Lincoln style, and the moneyer’s name is again a rare one which only otherwise occurs on Anglo-Saxon coins of Stamford, first in Æthelred II’s First Hand type and then, representing a second individual, in Cnut’s Short Cross and Harold I’s Jewel Cross types. A second example of the First Hand coin of Hilde (PL 26a, 1), struck from the same dies as the Stockholm specimen, was found in 1999 by Mr A. Steele using a metal detector on farm land at Easton, Hants.5 Fortunately, it enables the inscriptions to be read in full:

Obo: +ÆELREDRED REX ANGO
Rev: +HILE M-O ME-BELTV

It weighs 1.14 g, with a small chip missing and having been broken and repaired, which suggests the metal has corroded, so that the original weight could well have been somewhat higher. It has been acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.6

Before considering the form of the mint name on the new coin, we should see what can be discerned about its origin from the style of die-cutting. Our knowledge of the die-cutting styles of the First Hand issue is still relatively
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1 H. Statham, Old English Personal Names in Bede’s History (Lund studies in English) (Lund, 1939).
2 See note 1.
4 Exhibit by Mr Webster, NC 13 (1849–50), Proceedings pp. 6–7.
5 Stewart Lyon has drawn my attention to a coin of Edgar’s Circumscription Cross type reading +PIZTAN MONETAH, in his own collection. Although this is arguably of the Southampton mint, it shows that the moneyer’s name is no longer ‘without parallel and philologically objectionable’, as Dolley had suggested.
8 CM.428-1999. Purchased with the aid of a matching grant from the MGC/V&A Purchase Grant Fund. I am grateful to Dr Gerald Danger, numismatic advisor to the Hampshire Detective Club, and to the finder and landowner, Mr A. Steele and Mr R. Burge, for offering the coin to the Fitzwilliam.
weak, for although the basic divisions were identified by Dolley and Talvio, their study was based on a limited sample and is poorly illustrated. The dies for the coins of Hilde appear to be in a style associated with the Midlands. Notable features of the obverse are the almond-shaped and pellets and the form of drapery and hair, while the reverse has a carefully delineated hand with a small guiding pellet in the centre, a pellet within the two arcs representing the sky, a distinctive letter M formed with a central ‘v’ and a pelletted O. These features are most closely paralleled on coins of Derby (SCBI Midlands 182) and Tamworth (SCBI Midlands 190), but some of them are also evident at Leicester (SCBI Berlin 204) and Stamford (SCBI Lincolnshire 111, 118). On stylistic grounds, then, an attribution to Peterborough is unobjectionable.

The new coin, however, in allowing us to complete the reverse inscription, shows clearly and unambiguously that the mint-name is not *Medeshamstede*, as Dolley had supposed, but *Medeltun*. This is a linguistic hybrid, combining Old Norse *medal* ('middle', with weakening of the unstressed a), and Old English *tun* ('village' or 'settlement'). Such a form is usually interpreted as reflecting Scandinavian influence on a pre-existing OE place-name *Middeltun*, but it could indeed be a new tenth-century name displaying cross-influence through either Anglo-Scandinavian people adopting OE *tun* or Anglo-Saxons adopting ON *medal*.

We are looking, then, for somewhere known by the tenth century as *Medeltun* or *Middletun*, a common enough place-name which could have developed, according to local dialects, into modern *Middleton*. Melton, Melton, Milan, etc. Curiously, nowhere with such a name has been identified as having had the attributes of a borough in the Middle Ages — the normal status of a mint place. We need to cast around among possible contenders to find the most likely location. The use of Midlands and Lincoln style dies and the sharing of moneyers with Stamford help us to narrow the search. Melton Ross in Lincolnshire has yielded finds of Anglo-Saxon coins and artefacts, but it is at the northern end of the Wolds, some 75 miles from Stamford. Norfolk has Melton Constable, north west of Norwich, and Great and Little Melton, west of Norwich, also each some 75 miles from Stamford. Rather closer would be Milton Malherne, near Northampton, or Middleton, near Corby, also in Northants. But none of these settlements appears to have enjoyed the status of a regional centre. The Norfolk Meltons can also safely be ruled out on stylistic grounds, as the East Anglian mints in First Hand consistently use *Medeltun* coins for the East Anglian mints. But none of these settlements appears to have enjoyed the status of a regional centre. The Norfolk Meltons can also safely be ruled out on stylistic grounds.

The most plausible candidate is smaller, only some 20 miles from Stamford. Melton Mowbray, Leics., is not mentioned in any pre-Conquest sources, yet it is clear from the references to it in Domesday Book that it was a place of considerable significance in the Anglo-Saxon period. It was the centre of one of the four soke of Leicestershire, and had a set of estates in the region that were dependent upon it. Although the soke of Melton was owned privately by Leofric, son of Leofwine, earlier it may well have been a royal estate as some soke centres were. The church had two priests, and its parish was one of the largest in the county, suggesting it had been an early minster.

Melton Mowbray is the only place in Leicestershire or neighbouring Rutland that is specifically mentioned as having a market, and this returned the considerable sum of 20 sh. annually to the lord. There were, no doubt, other places with markets in the county, for the Domesday entries for Leicestershire are notably concise and inconsistent, but still the size of Melton Mowbray's market and the fact that it was singled out for mention reinforces the town's status as a significant regional centre. In a study of the development of towns, Everitt cites Melton Mowbray as one of ten examples in England of what he calls 'primary towns', that is medieval towns whose significance ante-dates the Norman Conquest. Yet for all that, Melton Mowbray never seems to have gained burghal status, or if it did in the tenth century, this was not maintained. Melton Mowbray would not be the only late Saxon mint that failed subsequently to be recognised as a borough, for the same applies to Crewkerne, Horncastle, Horndon, and Lympne, as well as the temporary hill-top mints of Cadbury and Cissbury.

Where does this leave the mint of Peterborough and the minting rights of the abbey? These have probably been discussed more extensively than those of any other mint, for there is good documentary evidence indicating that, at least in the early twelfth century, the abbey had minting rights in Stamford and perhaps in Peterborough itself. These rights may date back to the tenth century, although the charter of King Edgar of 973, which grants the Abbey various rights including 'a moneyer in Stamford', is a twelfth-century fabrication, and we cannot be sure how accurately it reflected the original grant which had probably been destroyed in the fires of 1070 or 1116. Unfortunately, the removal of the *Med* coins from

---

8 I am grateful to Stewart Lyon for sharing his thoughts on the stylistic features of these coin and discussing the attribution generally.
9 I am grateful to Dr David Parsons for his guidance on the linguistic features of this name.
13 In *Domesday Book* the place-name is *Medeltone*. Mowbray is a thirteenth-century addition.
Peterborough now leaves the attribution of any particular coins to the Abbey rather insecure.

In the Norman period a few coins have tentatively been attributed to Peterborough, by then renamed Burg. The problem has been distinguishing them from coins of the well-attested mint of Barnstaple (B(e)ardastapol), since on Norman coins As and Vs are easily confused as they are both often represented by two uprights (!). Two coins of William I's type 2 of the moneyer Leofwine have the mint-signatures BVR and BIIIR,18 and the clear V on the former is persuasive evidence in favour of a Peterborough attribution.19 However, a coin now in the Conte collection of William I's type 7 by the same moneyer reads BIVR,20 which is a typical mint-signature for Barnstaple but would require special pleading to be understood as standing for Burg or Burh.21 Stewart draws attention to the fact that Leofwine was a moneyer at Stamford in William I's reign, though not known for types 2 and 7 when he may have transferred to Peterborough. But the name is a common one, and a Leofwine was also operating in William's reign at Exeter, the mint most closely associated with Barnstaple. In Henry I's type 2 there are two coins of a moneyer Edward with a mint-signature BIIIR,22 and the inclination has been to attribute these to Barnstaple, though Peterborough would also be a possibility. Finally, a coin of Stephen's type 7 appears to read JONEVR,23 and although the last letter is a little unclear, it is more likely to be an R than a square C indicating BVC for Buckingham, a mint now attested in this type by a coin in the Conte collection. In summary, there are several Norman coins for which an attribution to Peterborough can be argued, but decisive evidence is unfortunately lacking.

A number of scholars have interpreted the addition of an annulet to the normal designs on coins of Stamford as signifying that they were struck for the abbot.24 This principally occurs on a group of coins of Edward the Martyr and Æthelred II's First Small Cross type. The argument has been bolstered since 1954 by the attribution of the Med coins to Peterborough, but as Jonsson has pointed out the pattern of annulet-marked coins at Stamford is to say the least surprising.25 Under Edward the Martyr three of the twenty-three known dies have an annulet or erased annulet, while in Æthelred's First Small Cross seven of the thirteen dies had been so marked involving five of the eight moneyers. From the following 180 years of minting at Stamford there are only a tiny number of coins with an annulet in the design - just an odd specimen of Æthelred's Long Cross type and Henry I's type 14. If the annulet signified minting for the abbot there must have been some very exceptional situation in c.978 that involved his briefly dominating Stamford's production. However, the association of the annulet with abbatial or ecclesiastical minting is purely a hypothesis, though one that has gained credence by being applied in different periods.26 The most influential case has been the Fox brothers' identification of London coins of Edward I's class Id with an annulet on the breast as struck on behalf of the abbot of Reading, but this is doubtful since the Abbey's minting rights seem to have been suspended at this time.27 Annulets are just one of several markings that appear from time to time on late Anglo-Saxon coins and which were evidently intended to distinguish the dies for some administrative purpose, and the Stamford annulets may well fall into the same category.28 Indeed, there is no reason why coins struck at Stamford for the profit of the abbot of Peterborough should have been specially marked in any way. After all, the archbishops of Canterbury had stopped issuing distinctive coins in 923. Without denying that the abbots of Peterborough may well have taken fees from one or more moneyers at Stamford throughout the late Anglo-Saxon and Norman periods, we should admit that without knowing the identity of these moneyers we probably cannot recognise the abbots' coins there today.

---

18 BMC 74 (as Barnstaple) and Elmore Jones Plates, 1.9.
19 Peterborough is not, of course, the only Norman town with -burh in its name, but as we know from documentary evidence it had minting rights it is the most probable attribution for coins with a clear mint signature BVR.
21 I am again grateful to David Parsons for advice on this point.
22 SCBI Estonia 1152 and a similar coin in the Conte collection.
26 For a critical review of the theory see F. Elmore Jones, 'New light on the mint of Peterborough in the Norman period', BNJ 27 (1953), 179-81.
28 See, for example, the discussion of symbols on coins of Huntingdon in R. Eaglen, 'The mint of Huntingdon', BNJ 69 (1999), 47-145, at 56-8, 69-70.
BLACKBURN: METHELTUN NOT MEDESHAMSTEDE

SHARP: SIX O’CLOCK FARthings
Jeffrey North recorded two examples of Class 10-11 with obverse legend commencing at six o'clock but was unable to trace or illustrate either of them. Another example has turned up affording opportunity to illustrate this unusual engraving error (see Pl. 26b).

A PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD OF HALFPENCE OF THE HENRY IV−V PERIOD

E.J. HARRIS AND S. LAIDLAW

The small coins of the start of this period are somewhat more common than the higher denominations. This may be consequent upon Henry IV taking note of a petition by the Commons in 1402 to provide small change and so displace the various foreign coins circulating such as the 'Galley Ha'pence'. According to Walters it was ordained that a third of the small amount of silver being struck should be used for the purpose. At this time the silver was prescribed to be at the rate of 18 gr (close to 1.2 g) to the penny. This valuation had become uneconomic and only some 1400 lb of silver is recorded as being brought to the Mint between 14.10.1399 and 29.9.1408 (quoted by Jeffrey North) recorded two examples of Class 10-11 with the new dies which were used to strike the coins for Henry IV and were prescribed to be distinguished from the heavy issue by addition of marks such as an annulet and a pellet in the field or an annulet on the breast. After Henry IV's death the light issue continued for his son Henry V. It can be seen that a new mark, a mullet, was stamped over the pellet on the old dies for the groat, halfgroat and penny, and pence probably late in the reign of Henry V was the substitution of a trefoil for the annulet accompanying the obverse legend commencing at six o'clock but was unable to trace or illustrate either of them. Another example has turned up affording opportunity to illustrate this unusual engraving error (see Pl. 26b).

We present a series of enlarged photographs of specimens with their weights when these were available and a reference to a source of the original photograph. Several of the rare specimens were described by Walters in the Numismatic Chronicle of 1905 and featured in his Sotheby sale of 1913 (referred to as W. followed by the lot number) and later in the Lockett (RCL) sales at Glendinings and the Norweb sales at Spink. It is notable that the weight is not necessarily a good guide to differentiate the heavy and light issues because of inaccuracy at the Mint when preparing the flan and subsequent clipping and corrosion. This has been discussed by Miss Archibald in relation to her description of the Attenborough hoard which also includes illustrations. The threefold enlargement we have used facilitates distinction of die differences from distortions due to striking mishaps and has allowed the multiple reappearances of the same specimen to be seen. It notable that the excellent quality of the illustrations in old Journals and Sale Catalogues surpasses that of many of the recent examples. In some cases at the time of the early sales bent coins were used to prepare a foil imprint which was then straightened before preparing a plaster cast to be coated and photographed. Readings of some of our examples is difficult or impossible and letter forms may be distorted in the striking. A variable feature is the spacing between the dots of the beading which may distinguish the products of different die cutters.

The first Plate commences with specimens having no added marks in the field. Plate 27, 1 (ex Attenborough Sale) is one of several examples with weights in the range 0.65−0.54 g (p.c. RCL 1374, Attenborough 1005. BM, Westminster School Sale 376). The diameter of the inner beaded circle on these coins is about 8.2 mm. The initial cross is pattée. Plate 27, 2 (Attenborough 1007. 0.65 g, W.257 = BM, RCL 3068) and 3 (Attenborough 1009 = BM, 0.63 g, RCL 3996) are from dies differing in legend endings;

2 F.J. Walters, NC S, Series 4, 1905, 247−305.
Tradesmen's Tokens current in London ... to Bishopsgate Street.1

Obv. EDWARD NOURSE AND A FARTHING'S WORTH OF COPPER

Rev. NEXTITHEVLLINBISHOPS-GATE-STREET.11666

The initial cross is pattee like that on No. 1. The inner circle on the coin is 8.5 mm diameter. These last specimens may all be of the heavy coinage period. Plate 27, 6 (RCL 1372, not illustrated here) has saltires after TAS and DON. On Plate 27, 5 (p.c., 0.54 g) the King's name is written hENRICVS, and there is a saltire after REX. The initial cross is pattee like that on No. 1. The inner circle on the coin is 9 mm diameter. These last specimens may all be of the heavy coinage period. Plate 27, 6 (RCL 1372, 0.54 g) is differentiated by weak annulets beside the hair so it presumably belongs either to the light coinage of Henry IV or to its continuation for Henry V. The initial cross is well pattee like those on Nos 2 and 3. It is marked by a wide letter G in the legend which is seen again on Plate 27, 7 (p.c., 0.44 g) where the same die has now well imprinted annulets at the neck level. The inner circle diameter is 8.2 mm. Plate 28, 8 (RCL 1373 = W.236) is similar with annulets by the neck but has a narrow G and a slightly pattee initial cross and tight packed beading. Plate 28, 9 (p.c. 0.56 g and p.c. 0.51 g, Norweb 1357 0.46 g) is again similar but has the open beading as used on No. 4 and a narrow G. It has a slightly pattee initial cross. A coin apparently from the same dies (RCL 1393, not illustrated here, 0.47 g) shows a die break at the left of the crown with the left lock of hair moved away from the face. Plate 28, 10 (p.c. 0.48 g) has annulets by the hair and double saltires about REX. The inner circle diameter is 8.2 mm. Plate 28, 11 (Norweb 1350) with inner circle diameter 8.0 mm has annulets about the hair, perhaps the one on the right has a mullet over it. This suggestion is supported by the misstruck coin Plate 28, 12 (W. 266) which clearly has the mullet at the right. Plate 28, 13 (p.c., 0.44 g) has annulets at the level of the crown, the inner circle is 8 mm diameter. The next three have the trefoil-annulet combination of marks, Plate 28, 14 (p.c., 0.42 g, BM) has trefoil left and annulet right of the hair. Plate 29, 15 (p.c., 0.51 g) has trefoil right and annulet left of the crown while Plate 29, 16 (p.c., 0.44 g) has trefoil left and annulet right of the hair. The inner circle diameters are about 8.2 mm. Plate 29, 17 (p.c., 0.33 gram) is problematical, the crown lacks the pearls but it might be a late or illegal striking of the dies used for No. 13. It is difficult to identify strikings from a particular reverse die but Plate 27, 3 and 5 are similar, as are the reverses of Plates 27, 6, 7 and 28, 8. We emphasise that the sequence of the photographs is not necessarily that of the issue of the coins and that other types may well exist.

CORRECTION TO 'DIES FOR THE HEAVY AND LIGHT PENCE, 1399-1422'

ERIC HARRIS

In my note in the last Journal (Vol. 69, pp. 215-19) the reference for photograph L3 should read W234, not W264. The photograph labelled Y6 in Plate 19 has the obverse of one of a pair of duplicates and the reverse of the other, less good, specimen. At some stage the photo of the better reverse was lost from the sheet.

EDWARD NOURSE AND A FARTHING'S WORTH OF COPPER

R.H. THOMPSON

An extraordinary token from seventeenth-century London bears no device but a simple six-line legend on either side:

Obv. EDWARD NOURSE AND A FARTHING WORTH OF COPPER

Rev. NEXT ITHE VELL IN BISHOPSGATE STREET.11666

It is extraordinary in particular for the claim to contain a farthing's worth of copper, and for the actual weights of specimens. The Melter at the Mint was allowed 10d. per lb on copper supplied as alloy in 1649; so a farthing's worth of copper should have been 109.4 grains, effectively the same as the first specimen below.

British Museum  
7.10  
109.6
The late Philip Greenall  
8.05  
124.2
Museum of London, NN17584  
8.11  
125.2
t and NN17583  
8.50  
131.2
Norweb Collection  
8.78  
135.4
The late Roger Shuttlewood  
8.91  
137.5
Museum of London, 96.669/173  
11.01  
169.9

This last justifies Burn's claim of seven pennyweights (168 gr), though the mean weight of these seven specimens is 8.64 g = 133.3 gr. However, it looks as though any weight specified would have been the minimum weight, as has been suggested already for base metal tokens at this time. Thus Edward Nourse would have declared that his pieces were a farthing's worth of copper or better, viz. at least 109.4 gr, at the rate of 64 to the Avoirdupois pound of 7000 gr.2

Fig. 1 © The British Museum.

The Bull in Bishopsgate, a large coaching inn also known as the Black Bull,3 was in the parish of St Ethelburga, as were the adjacent properties.4 The St Ethelburga registers to 1700 give only one person with the same surname as the issuer, Martha Nourse, who in 1686 married Robert Pitt;5 she was daughter of John Nourse of Wood Eaton, Oxfordshire.6 The City Archivist, James R. Sewell, kindly reports that no relevant deeds have been indexed for the personal name or for the street in the Corporation of London Records Office. In the absence of a device, named trade, or spouse's initial, it is difficult to identify the token-issuer. Among citizens of London there are two possible candidates, a vintner and a Girdler, i.e. a member of the Girdler's Company, whose members were involved in the making of belts and other accoutrements for the army. They are set out below in order of seniority.

NOURSE, Edward (A), Vintner, of St Alphage London Wall, bachelor, 28, was licensed in 1636 to marry Anne Gent of Steeple Bumpstead in Essex.7 The future Common Councilman John Eaton was apprenticed to him in 1637.8 The latest record of him is in the 1641 Poll Tax at the Boar's Head, Cripplegate.9 There is nothing such as an inn-sign to suggest that the token is that of a vintner.

NOURSE, Edward (B), Girdler. Only son of Luke Nourse, sometime Mayor of Gloucester; baptised at All Saints, Gloucester, 19 August 1624. On 23 August 1649 he married Mary, daughter of Hugh Wells (1589–1674), of the parish of St Michael Cornhill, citizen and Armourer of London. They were married at St Olave Old Jewry, where Mary's brother was died until for nonconformity.10 On 3 July 1651 Edward was made a freeman of Gloucester.11 Luke Nourse was responsible for the City of Gloucester Farthings dated 1657, and Mr Edward Nourse 'a Member of this house' was to take care that the farthings be provided; the same service was required of him for reissues in 1659 and in 1662. On 3 June 1662 at his own request he was discharged from Gloucester Common Council, having removed himself and his family to London.12

Gloucester Cathedral in November 1663 paid Mr Edward Nurse of London13 £23 10s. for the two brass branches (chandeliers) in the choir, and in addition, 4s. for a box to carry the branches from London and portage there. In the previous month payments of 2s. in sack for placing the branches, and 8s. 6d. for carriage of the branches, were paid to Mr Cockerell, probably the Samuel Cockerell mentioned in Edward Nourse's will.14 Hester, daughter of Edward Nurse and Mary his wife, was baptised on 14 May 1665 at St Michael Cornhill, where Mary herself had been baptised on 5 June 1629.15

Thomas Stevens, servant to Mr Edward 'Nuess', brazier, was buried at St Michael Cornhill on 9 November

---


13. There was an Edward Nourse of Gloucester, gent., father of Margaret Selwyn (died 1716 aged 91), whose monument bears the impaled arms Gules a Fess between two Chevronels Argent: R. Bigland, Gloucester Cathedral in November 1663 paid Mr Edward Nurse of London13 £23 10s. for the two brass branches (chandeliers) in the choir, and in addition, 4s. for a box to carry the branches from London and portage there. In the previous month payments of 2s. in sack for placing the branches, and 8s. 6d. for carriage of the branches, were paid to Mr Cockerell, probably the Samuel Cockerell mentioned in Edward Nourse's will.14 Hester, daughter of Edward Nurse and Mary his wife, was baptised on 14 May 1665 at St Michael Cornhill, where Mary herself had been baptised on 5 June 1629.15

Thomas Stevens, servant to Mr Edward 'Nuess', brazier, was buried at St Michael Cornhill on 9 November:

---


brazier. a Girdler by Company (see below), by trade he was this was Edward Nourse, and shows that, whereas he was Fincher Lane, a turning off Cornhill. The parish of St Michael Cornhill, a parish of St Michael Cornhill, 12 December 1667, and on 19 March 1668 in Finch Lane, a turning off Cornhill. The parish of St Michael Cornhill in 1674-5 paid Mr Edward Nourse £12 for the brass branch for candles given by Mrs Anne Bourne. Edward Nourse, citizen and Girdler of London, made his last will and testament on 2 August 1689 (see Appendix), and died at the age of 65 on 12 January following; on 17 January he was buried in the north aisle of St Michael Cornhill next to the chancel, where his father had been buried on 28 April 1673, and where a memorial may still be seen:

On a marble cartouche with scrolls, palms and cherub-heads, an arm above, the following inscription:

Near this Place Lye | the Bodies of | LUKE NOURSE late of I Gloucester Gent | who dyed I y e 25th of April 1673 Aged 89 | HUGH WELLS late of this I Parish, Citizen & Armourer of I London, who dyed I y e 25th of I Feb 1673 Aged 84 | EDWARD NOURSE I Cit. & Girdler of Lond | who married MARY I Daughter of Y & H. W. & I dyed I y e 12th of Jan 1689 | Aged 65.

Below, on a console-bracket, a painted shield of arms:

Gules a Fess between two Chevrons Or impaling Or a Buck’s Head caboshed Gules; in 1708 Or was recorded as Argent, making the arms on the dexter side the same as Nourse of Woodeaton and elsewhere. Mary Nourse, widow of Edward Nourse, was buried in the north aisle on 4 August 1708. It may be added that their son Edward practised as a surgeon in Oxford from 1686; he is presumably the Edward Nourse, gent., son of a gent., late of Gloucester’ who became a freeman of Gloucester in 1690. As Edward Nourse of West Hart (for which see the Appendix), gent., bachelor, about 32, he was licensed on 27 April 1693 to marry Elizabeth, about 18, daughter of Richard Hutchinson of Low Leyton; they were married at St Michael Cornhill on 3 May. He was father of another Edward Nourse (1701–61), who distinguished himself as surgeon to St Bartholomew’s Hospital, and lecturer.

It is noteworthy that Edward Nourse (B) was in the parish of St Michael Cornhill by 1665, and in 1667 and later, that is, before and after the date of the token from St Ethelburga parish. This might seem to show that he was not, as assumed by Burn and his copyists, the same as the token-issuer. Yet in the interim occurred the disruption of the Great Fire, and, as already seen, Edward Nourse (B) was burned out from Cornhill, Bishopsgate (street) lay just beyond the area of conflagration, and is close to Cornhill. No evidence has been found to connect him with the Bull in Bishopsgate, but it does not appear from the parish registers that there was an established Nourse family in St Ethelburga parish.

The involvement of Edward Nourse (B) with municipal tokens which were to be ‘of the full weight of a Bristol farthing’ shows that he shared the Puritan concern for good weight. As a brazier he could have had access to the relevant trades, and may have supplied the copper blanks, to judge from their rough cutting out. The token is extraordinary, and the family of Edward Nourse (B) formed an extraordinary knot of nonconformity tying London to Gloucester. These factors prove nothing, but would make it satisfying to establish that a ‘farthing worth of copper’ was issued by Edward Nourse (d. 1690), baptised in Gloucester in 1624, Citizen & Girdler of London, and brazier.

To conclude: the attribution of the token by Burn, Wilton, and others, to the Edward Nourse buried at St Michael Cornhill, was an assumption. It has not been possible either to prove or to disprove this. In the light of all the evidence found, of the Great Fire in particular, the assumption may be seen as reasonable. In that case the farthing’s worth of copper could have been in the nature of a ticket to advertise that Edward Nourse, who had been at the George on Cornhill, since the late conflagration was to be found in Bishopsgate Street next to the Bull.26

APPENDIX


To Mary his wife an annuity of £150.

16 His supplying of brass chandeliers confirms that this was Edward Nourse, and shows that, whereas he was a Girdler by Company (see below), by trade he was a brazier.
17 The Fire Court: Calendar to the Judgments and Decrees of the Court of Judicature appointed to determine differences between Landlords and Tenants as to rebuilding after the Great Fire, edited by P.E. Jones (London, 1966–), i. 175, Fire Decree B-673; P. Mills and J. Oliver, The Survey of Building Sites in the City of London after the Great Fire of 1666 (London, 1962–7), i. 28, 33.
18 Sherlock (above, n. 14), p. 131.
19 The date on the monument is given incorrectly by Burn and his copyists as 12th June, 1689.
20 Harl. Registers 7 (above, n. 15), p. 259.
22 Harl. Registers 7 (above, n. 15), pp. 271, 280.
24 DNB.
26 Work by Mr John Rhodes on the Gloucestershire token issuers will further document the Nourse family.
To his daughter Hester the messuage called Stowhall al's Heralds, parish of St Mary Stoke near Ipswich; Hester and others to pay to Mrs Alice Winter, widow, £7 p.a.

To his son Edward his messuage in Cornhill, parish of St Michael Cornhill, called by the name or sign of the George: his farm in the parish of Stanstead Mountfitchett, Essex; a messuage called Nutts, parish of Lambourn, Essex, and copyhold tenements held of the manor of Wolhampton al's Woolston Hull, Essex; messuages in the parish of Chigwell: three messuages in Stratford Langthorne, parish of West Ham; lands in parish of St Bride, Monmouthshire; and all other messuages in the City of London and counties of Essex and Monmouth or elsewhere in England; his wife to have possession of that part of the messuage at Chigwell called Bentincks.

Personal estate: to Mary his wife £100. To Mary and Hester, children of his late son Hugh, £500 apiece; his executor to pay £30 p.a. for their maintenance until the house in parish of St Clement Danes, Middlesex, be let and tenanted.

His wife to have use of all household goods, implements and furniture in his dwelling houses at Chigwell and Mile End. To his wife, son Edward, and daughter Hester all his plate and rings equally.

To Edward (already paid £1100) messuages beside St Augustine’s Gate, parish of St Faith, London, for remainder of the terms.

His executor to pay in two yearly sums to his sister Christian Cockerell, wife of Samuel Cockerell, £16 p.a. according to the bequest of his father Luke Nourse; to his sister-in-law Elizabeth Bryers £8 according to the bequest of his father-in-law Hugh Wells, also £15 p.a.; to his son Edward £500 to enable him to pay the above sums.

To his daughter-in-law Elizabeth Bryers £10.

To his in-law Thomas Humfries and his now wife £10 apiece.

To his daughter Sarah £100 at 21 or marriage.

To his sister Elizabeth Bryers £20.

To his cousin Stephen Cooke £100.

To his brother Cockerell and wife £5 apiece.

To his brother Singleton £5.

To his cousin Sarah Cooke of Gloucester, widow, £5.

To his cousin Dennis Wise £5.

To his cousin Elizabeth Cockerell £5.

To his cousin Eleanor Wise £5.

To his cousin Stephen Cooke £10.

To his friends £10 as his executor thinks convenient.

To his daughter-in-law Elizabeth Nourse, widow, £10.

To his now maidservants 40s. apiece.

To the poor in the City of Gloucester £10, also to friends and relations in Gloucester.

For mourning: to his wife £20, daughter Nourse and children £20, son Edward £10, daughter Hester £10, son Humfries for himself, wife and daughter £25, sister Humfries £10, sister Bryers £10, Stephen Cooke £10, maidservants £3 apiece, and to others as thought fit. The residue to his son Edward, who was to be sole executor; his wife and Stephen Cooke to be overseers.


STATISTICAL METHODS FOR IDENTIFYING POSSIBLE ISSUERS’ NAMES FOR LONDON SEVENTEENTH CENTURY TOKENS DISPLAYING ONLY INITIALS

R.J. FLEET

The International Genealogical Index (IGI), compiled by the Mormons, contains lists of the precise dates of baptisms and marriages from the sixteenth to the late nineteenth century. Many millions of names are available, between about a third and half of the population being covered for England. The IGI was used to see if there was evidence of a place of baptism of a son or child of a London vintner apprentice. The latter was a London Vintners’ Company apprentice who became ‘free’ of the Company. Names were obtained from the Guildhall Library using documents of reference numbers 15211/1–2, and 15212/1–2. Those selected gained ‘freedom admission’ between 1630 and 1671. The son’s first name chosen was that of the father so this increased the chances of getting a ‘match’ (see later). Many first born sons had the same first name as the father. No apprentices were found who gained ‘freedom’ before 1630 and who issued tokens. Only a few searches were done with all possible children of the vintner owing to the immense amount of time this took.

Lists were made up using the Williamson London, Southwark, or Middlesex reference number of all suitable Tavern etc. tokens showing initials only, the wife’s included, but names of issuers not shown.

The parishes at which the tokens were issued were also in the lists and the IGI data was noted where there was a ‘match’ between the wife’s initial and the mother’s name, and also between the place of origin of the token and the parish of baptism, or parishes where the origin could not be assigned to just one parish. The source for the latter information was ‘Atlas and Index of Parish Registers’, published by Phillimore. Where a ‘match’ occurred it was assumed that the name was that of the token issuer, the latter being assumed to reside in the same place for several years.

Place of marriage of the vintner was not found to be fruitful in the identification process as it was often quite distant from the abode of the couple after marriage. This is why searches were made for baptisms of children and not for marriages of the vintner.

The fact that only a fraction of the population was
Thus during the twenty five year token issuing period tokens of vintners etc. were struck per year through the apprentice name chosen from the Guildhall lists for a assumed to have been married, who didn't issue tokens, that could act as substitutions and be exchanged for the happening is given by C as follows;

\[ P = ced \]

where, \( e \) = the number of entries in the IGI for a baptism with the appropriate name of the father and son over the correct period for the token,
\( c \) = the probability of a random match with the wife's initial (which can be found from a survey of initials on the tokens) and
\( d \) = the probability of a random match with the parish or parishes, which can be found by doing a survey of parish provenance for the appropriate token series.

However another error depends on the existence of London vintners who did not issue tokens. This is explained in the next paragraphs.

George Berry, in his book *Seventeenth Century England: Traders and their tokens* (Scachy, London, 1988), states that for London tokens of vintners, tavern-keepers etc., there were 'more than 1000 for London alone' (p. 10), and that 'in 1613 over 1000 alehouses were in the city' (p. 23). Accounting for the increase in numbers up to 1672, this suggests there were probably about 2,000 vintners, innskeepers etc. operating at any time in London, Middlesex, and Southwark during the token period. Allowing for the fact that some issued more than one token, of all those operating over the whole 25 year token period, about 1,200 are known to have issued tokens. Guildhall records show about 2,500 brewer and innkeeper etc. London based apprentices became available for the trade from 1630–72. It may be estimated that an additional 700 apprentices were trained who are not in the Guildhall lists. The latter number can be approximately found by making up tables giving the relative rarity of the two letter initials of the issuers using the appropriate token series.

An identification was only accepted where the error for the 'match' was less than 5%. Other criteria also had to be satisfied before the identification was confirmed. Where the token has a date, this had to tally with the marriage date, earlier where known, or the baptism date. Most apprentices gained 'freedom' at the age of twenty one, and the date of this, obtained from the Guildhall library, must tally with the baptism, marriage, and token dates, where these are known.

Examples of error calculations:

1/W1731: John Rose and wife Alice had a son John baptised in the parish of St. Leonard Eastcheap in 1674. John gained 'freedom' in 1661. Analysing the available data, \( f = 12.78 \), the likely number of people in the 'pool' with initials JR, \( e = 3 \), \( c = 0.18 \), the probability of the wife's first name starting with A, and \( d = 0.0066 \), the chance of their abode being in the parish of St. Leonard Eastcheap. Thus the chance of the identification being incorrect, the error = 4.55% (acceptable).

2/W1243: William Chamberlain and wife Martha had a son William baptised in the parish of Holborn St. Andrew in 1663. William gained 'freedom' in 1653. As above, \( f = 18.02 \), the likely number of people in the 'pool' with initials WC, \( e = 7 \), \( c = 0.214 \), the probability of the wife's first name starting with A, and \( d = 0.081 \), the chance of their abode being in the parish of Holborn, St. Andrew Thus the chance of the identification being incorrect, the error = 100.0% (unacceptable).

New attributions achieved so far by this method (% error and 'freedom' date in () are;

1/W1731, JOHN ROSE (1.9, 61) – married to Alice – had son John baptised in 1674.

2/W243, JOSEPH MOORE (4.4, 59) – married to Catherine – had son Joseph baptised in 1663.
3/W3116A. WILLIAM PAGE (3.09-'59) - married to Mary - had son William baptised in 1663.

Some cases arise where two tokens issued by the same person exist in Williamson close together, one token having the three initials and no issuer's name, corresponding numbers close, the token with no issuer shown can have him confidently linked to the other token issuer unless inscriptions or designs on the tokens indicate otherwise. Where they come from the same locality, and have Williamson numbers close, the token with no issuer shown can have him confidently linked to the other token issuer unless inscriptions or designs on the tokens indicate otherwise. For example, pubs with different names or issuers with different trades are rejected. New confident attributions have been found in the following cases (% error given in brackets-explained below):

4/W1426A/1417. TOM HUSSEY (0.521) at 'The Three Tuns'.
5/W1435A/1419. TOM MASON (1.30) at 'The Three Tuns'.

The probability of these occurring by chance (V) is given by:

\[ V = abchj \text{ or } V = abhj \text{ and } \% \text{error} = 100V, \]

where; \( a = \) the probability of the first name having the correct first letter, \( b = \) the probability of the surname having the correct first letter (survey as above), \( c = \) the probability of the wife's initial being correct (if the same on both), \( h = \) the number of available entries in Williamson for the locality, and \( j = \) the probability of the pubs having the same name (using Lillywhite’s book on London signs).

For the two examples above the mean value of \( V \) was 0.91 %, suggesting the attributions to be very likely.

Example of error calculation for the second method:

10/Tom Hussey: \( a = \) the probability of the first name having the correct first letter \( = 0.127, \)

\( b = \) the probability of the surname having the correct first letter \( = 0.108, \)

\( c = \) the probability of the wife’s initial being correct \( = 0.215 \) (initial E), \( h = \) the number of available entries in Williamson for the locality \( = 147, \)

and \( j = \) the probability of the pubs having the same name \( = 0.0120. \) Thus error \( \% = 0.127 \times 0.108 \times 0.215 \times 147 \times 0.0120 \times 100 = 0.521 \)

It is anticipated that further identifications will be made using these methods. For apprentices with very unusual names it might be possible to do searches to identify unmarried vintners.

### TWO FINDS OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY TOKENS

**PAUL ROBINSON**

Recorded finds of groups or hoards of seventeenth-century 'tradesmen's tokens' are still relatively few in number. This note draws attention to two such finds from the West of England, which illustrate their interest and importance. Neither appears in Michael Dolley and I.D. Brown, *A bibliography of Coin Hoards of Great Britain and Ireland 1500-1967* (RNS, London, 1971).

**Wootton Bassett, Wiltshire (before 1892)**

In 1893 Frederick Milne Willis' *Catalogue of the Collection of Wiltshire Trade Tokens in the Museum of the Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society at Devizes* was published. In the years immediately following he helped to expand that collection through gifts from his own collection and by purchases both at auction and from the London coin dealers, Spink's, Baldwins and Lincoln. In 1899 he prepared a grangerised copy of his catalogue of the tokens in the Society's collections: the two volumes are preserved in the library of the Society. They include handwritten information on the provenances of the Society's tokens, notes on the issuer's and their families' information on the designs of the tokens and records of find spots, particularly when Willis believed – quite correctly of course – that these might be crucial evidence for where a token was issued in instances where this was in question.

Williamson (Wiltshire) 6 is a farthing token issued in 1666 by Edward Witts of Aldbourne, which is spelled 'Auborne' on the token. In the past it had been attributed to Lincolnshire. In his notes on the token in his grangerised catalogue, Willis refuted this stating that the example in the Society's collection had been found at Wootton Bassett, which like Aldbourne is also in North Wiltshire together with several other local tokens including one of Clack (Williamson (Wils) 52). The only county ones being Gloucester, Bristol and Maidenhead.

Unfortunately no other details are given of this find, which must have been made before 1893 as the Society's two examples of the Aldbourne token appear in the *Catalogue* published in that year. The Gloucester and Bristol tokens are both likely to have been 'city' tokens, which other recorded finds show circulated widely in Wiltshire. We do not know the issuers of the Maidenhead token or the other Wiltshire tokens in the find.

**Pershore, Worcestershire (1758)**

The *Universal Magazine* vol. 23 for 1758 carries a letter on pages 179f recording the discovery of two tokens and a royal farthing of Charles I in a cellar in Pershore in Worcestershire. The tokens, which like the royal farthing, are illustrated in the letter are a halfpenny token of Phillip Ballard of Evesham, Worcestershire dated 1664 (Williamson 47 – published from this example) and an undated farthing token of Thomas Palmer of Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire (Williamson 197). The third coin is a type I or Richmond 'round' farthing struck between 1625 and 1634. Unfortunately the detail of the illustration prevents us from identifying it in greater detail.

It is the apparent association of the Charles I farthing with the two tradesmen's tokens which is of particular
interest. From the discussion of the later history of the royal farthings of Charles I in C.W. Peck’s *English Copper, Tin and Bronze Coins in the British Museum 1558–1958* (2nd edn, 1970), it is apparent that they were not officially demonetised until the Royal Proclamation of Charles II in 1672, with the subsequent Proclamations of 1673 and 1674. In principle then, royal farthings might have either continued in circulation until the reign of Charles II or, perhaps after a temporary cessation of use, may have resumed circulation after the Commonwealth in the reign of Charles II, until perhaps 1672–74. In this respect an additional comment in the account of the find in *Universal Magazine* may be relevant. Writing less than one hundred years after the issue of the tokens, the writer favourably contrasts the good metal of the Charles I farthing with the poor quality metal of the two tradesmen’s tokens.

An alternative possibility is that whereas the royal farthings may have ceased circulating in London and the main cities and towns in Britain in the 1640s, in rural areas, particularly on the fringes of England, they may have continued in use. Obviously the recording of finds such as this helps to clarify possible variations in the type of currency in circulation in different parts of England at any time in the past.