AN UNPUBLISHED COIN OF STEPHEN FROM THE IPSWICH MINT

An interesting and unpublished coin, illustrated here and magnified 2 x, a variant of type i of Stephen of the mint of Ipswich, recently came into my possession: it is understood to have come from a London junk-dealer, from where it came to the notice of the British Museum. The obverse is of the slightly irregular workmanship typical of many of the coins of this type, possibly having a baronial background and struck during the period of the anarchy. The reverse shows the roundels or bezants, which place it in the group of the very rare coins of this variant emanating from East Anglian mints.

The obverse reads +STIEFNE, and is without the inner circle; the reverse reads +PAGANVS:ON GIP, omitting the colon before the mint name. It has roundels at the end of the limbs of the cross at 3 and 9 o’clock, also a small roundel in place of the lis in the third quarter. The coin weighs 20 grains.

The mint is Ipswich where the moneyer Paien has hitherto been represented by a single coin (formerly in the Carlyon-Britton collection). It is from quite regular dies, reading +STIEFNE: (with inner circle), and +PAIEN:ON:GIP. The latinized form reading PAGANVS is, as far as I know, not met with elsewhere in the Norman coinage.

With regard to the occurrence of roundels on the reverse, it should be mentioned that this variant appears so far to be confined to the East Anglian mints of Bury St. Edmunds, Ipswich, and Sudbury: Brooke did not specifically refer to such coins either in Norman Kings nor in English Coins, whilst Andrew tentatively attributed them, in a cut halfpenny from the Lockett sale, which also has a roundel instead of a lis in one quarter.

Seeking baronial attributions for the coins of this period is seldom a rewarding task, though always an interesting one: in this context it may be recalled that there was a William Paganel, to whom William of Peverel surrendered the castle of Nottingham after the battle of Lincoln in 1141. It is hardly likely that this William Paganel, an adherent of the Empress Matilda, would appear as the moneyer of a Stephen coin of Ipswich: despite the similarity of the name Paganel to that of Paganvs, it is considered that the latinized version of the name Paien is much more probable.

Exhibited at the Society’s meeting on 22 October 1963 were:

1. The Paganvs coin with roundels on the reverse.
2. The Paien coin from regular dies.
3. An Ipswich roundel coin in my collection from a slightly irregular obverse die, and with roundels at the end of the reverse cross at 3 and 9 o’clock: the moneyer is probably OSEBERN.
4. Another roundel coin in my collection, of rough workmanship and uncertain attribution,
with roundels at the ends of the reverse cross at 12 and 6 o'clock: the reverse legend, if it is retrograde as would appear, reads + : AR[ ...] Is. It has been suggested that it might be one of the moneyer Arefin at Bristol, but this is prima facie unlikely in view of the undoubted East Anglian origin of the other coins of this variety. Stylistically, this coin (from the Nottingham find and the Ryan collection) does not belong with the other roundel coins.

5. Photograph of an Ipswich roundel coin from the Lockett sale, which has a ‘home-made’ obverse appearance, and has been attributed to the moneyer Rodgier.

6. Photograph of the cut halfpenny referred to above, the moneyer being uncertain.

My thanks are due to Mr. F. Elmore Jones for his assistance and advice.

N. C. BALLINGAL

NOTES ON SOME SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY CAMBRIDGE TOKENS

Among the fifty-nine tradespeople who are listed by Williamson¹ as issuers of tokens in Cambridge during the seventeenth century, there are two whose identity is disclosed only by their initials. These tokens are inscribed—I.B. VNDER THE ROASE / IN CAMBRIDGE I.E.B. (W. 21) and AT THE MITER IN / CAMBRIDGE 1651 E.E.F. (W. 40).

It is evident from the token that I. B. was a landlord of the Rose Inn which was for many years the leading inn of Cambridge, and Williamson adds the information ‘... A Mr. Bryan died at the Rose Inn in 1652...’ The writer’s search in the register of Gt. St. Mary’s Church, the parish church which stands within a few yards of the site of the ‘Rose’, has produced the following entry: ‘1652, Nov. 28. Joseph Bryan. Buried in ye church’. There seems to be little doubt that this entry applies to the issuer of the token, and accordingly his full names are provided.²

The identity of E.F.—whose token is the earliest dated piece in the Cambridge series—has not proved to be so easy to solve. Apart from the fact that he was a landlord of the Mitre Tavern the only other information shown on the token is that the initial of his wife was E, assuming the third initial to supply this fact, as was frequently the case.

The ‘Mitre’ stood in the parish of St. Edward, and once again the parish register has proved of assistance in providing two entries helpful toward the solution of the identity of E. F. ... These are the marriage of Edward Freeman to Elizabeth Ireland on 7 January 1633, and the baptism of Jone, daughter of Edward Farley and Elizabeth his wife, in 1643. The only other entry traced under the name Edward Freeman is the burial of a son, Thomas, in 1637/8, but several entries would seem to apply to the Farley family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>June 16 (Marriage)</td>
<td>Farley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Oct. 23 (Baptism)</td>
<td>Farley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Aug. 15</td>
<td>Farley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Aug. 24</td>
<td>Farley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Oct. 14</td>
<td>Farley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>April 17 (Burial)</td>
<td>Farley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>July 9 (Baptism)</td>
<td>Farley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Aug. 23 (Burial)</td>
<td>Farley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inn in 1652...’ The writer’s search in the register of Gt. St. Mary’s Church, the parish church which stands within a few yards of the site of the ‘Rose’, has produced the following entry: ‘1652, Nov. 28. Joseph Bryan. Buried in ye church’. There seems to be little doubt that this entry applies to the issuer of the token, and accordingly his full names are provided.²

There appears to be little doubt that these entries all apply to the same family, and some sort of confirmation is provided by the fact that Edward gave the name of his mother, Jone, to his daughter at her baptism.

About the year 1634 the Mitre Tavern fell down, and this fact was commemorated in a poem by Thomas Randolph (d. March 1634/5). This poem is printed in The Annals of Cambridge (C. H. Cooper, 1845, iii, p. 265) and footnote 2 (ibid.) reads: ‘The Mitre Tavern was subsequently repaired or rebuilt.’ In Randolph’s Aristippus and Conceited Pedlar are several allusions to the Cambridge taverns of this period, the most famous of which appear to have been the ‘Dolphin’, the ‘Rose’, and the ‘Mitre’, kept by...

¹ Trade Tokens issued in the 17th. century in England, Wales, and Ireland, by W. Boyne, revised edn. by G. C. Williamson.

² This suggestion, and others in these notes, appeared first in a recent article by the writer in The Amateur Historian.
Hamon, Wolfe, and Farlowe, who are called 'the three best Tutors in the Universities'. We find mention made of 'the Dolphin Scholes', and 'the ancient foundation of Miter Colledge...'. The Wolfe mentioned was almost certainly the immediate predecessor of Bryan at the 'Rose', and it would appear that the Farlowe was the landlord of the 'Mitre' at the time of its fall and that he was the Samuell Farley (or Farlow) of the St. Edward's Church register. The 1651 entry of the death of Samuell states that at that time he was living in Chesterton, then a village on the outskirts of Cambridge but now engulfed in the city, and it would seem that by then the tavern had passed into the hands of his son, Edward. That the names Farley and Farlow were both used for the same family is evident from the entries of different date and it seems safe to conclude that Edward Farley was the issuer of the token. No entry of his death has been traced in the register of St. Edward's Church, but his place as landlord of the 'Mitre' had been taken by Owen Mayfield by 1658 as is seen by the date of his token (W. 64), and as Edward Farley would have been in middle life it would appear that he might well have taken up residence elsewhere soon after the death of his father.

It is interesting to note that by his will Owen Mayfield left to the University Library of Cambridge a collection of coins. These passed from the library to the Fitzwilliam Museum, with others, in 1856, but unfortunately no record was kept of Mayfield's coins so that it is not possible to ascertain the content of his collection.

A further token with a partly abbreviated name reads ED CLARK HABERDASHER IN CAMBRIDGE 1652 E.A.C. (W. 28). Clark's first name is now believed to have been Edmund. From his token it is clear that his wife's initial was A, and an entry in the register of Gt. St. Mary's Church records the burial of Will, son of Edmund and Ann Clark, 10 July 1664. The register indicates also that Edmund Clark was churchwarden that year and it seems likely that he died on 11 August 1681, as on that day there is recorded in the diary kept by Samuel Newton, Alderman of Cambridge 1662/1717, 'Thirsday morning about 6 of the Clock dyed my Cosin Edmund Clarke'.

The token of William Wells (W. 83) appears to have been mis-read in Williamson, the reading given being WILLIAM WELLS 3 TVNS / TAVERN IN CAMBRIDGE W.S.W. - Wells's wife, Susanna, whose initial appears on the token, died on 11 January 1664/5. She was buried in Gt. St. Mary's Church, and Newton writes in his diary of her funeral 'There was a great funerall but little solemnity, many people but small order...'. On 20 November 1666 Wells married the widow of Richard Allen (W. 11) who was Joseph Bryan's successor at the 'Rose', and the last remains of his tavern have only recently been pulled down. Although Williamson publishes the spelling of Wells's name as WILLIAM, the writer has been unable to trace a specimen spelt in that manner. Clearly struck specimens show the name to be spelt WILLAM. On some pieces the base line of the second L is indistinct but always to be found on close examination, and it would appear that only one die was used. Similarly, all specimens of W. 74 (HENERY RAPER IN H.M.R. / CAMBRIDGE GROCER) examined by the writer have the name CAMBRIDGE spelt in full. A second die may have been used with the name without the final e as published by Williamson, but this appears to be doubtful.

Two cases of possible mis-attribution can be mentioned. The token reading WILL BASSETT MERCER / IN CAMBRIDGE 1669 W.K.B. (W. 15) seems to appear also under Cowbridge (Wales, No. 30), but the writer can confirm that specimens are known definitely reading Cambridge although so far he has found no local references to the issuer. Also, his searches in local records have revealed no references to Richard Hodgkinson (W. 53) and it would seem this adds further to the suggestion that this is not a Cambridge issue.

Finally, although he has made every possible endeavour, the writer has been unable to trace the existence today of the following Williamson numbers: 13, 17, 30, 31, 53, 61, and 70. It is quite possible that specimens of some of these may be found and that their existence will be recorded, but it seems doubtful whether at least three of these were ever issued.

KENNETH A. JACOB