

Editor: David Powell

A free newsletter to all who share our interest in these fascinating and often enigmatic pieces. Please send the editor at least one 300 dpi JPEG scan, or a sharply focused photo print, of any interesting leaden token or tally in your collection. Send images as email attachments to mail@leadtokens.org.uk Please note that the old david@powell8041.freeserve.co.uk address advertised on earlier versions of LTT will not be active after 31 May 2017.

Picture Gallery

We begin this month with a group of pieces which are mainly quite small and early, but not exclusively so. Because of the variety, normal magnification has been preserved; location unknown, unless stated.



Figs.1-2 are decidedly the work of a Friday afternoon moneyer who has been getting a bit bored with cross and pellets; the minimalist Fig.2, in particular, is about as bad as it gets. Fig.3-6, by contrast, are nice little pieces of pewter; of a family, plenty going on, with the engraver looking to use up every bit of space he can; to such an extent, in the case, of Fig.6, that you almost can't see what is happening. Which is why I sometimes magnify! I think it depicts a bell.

All six make use of the *gretis*, that outer ring of filler which derives from the end of the mediaeval period and sometimes stays with us considerably beyond. All these look fairly old and probably are, probably late derivatives of the Boy Bishop series, but one or two are not without raising some doubts on the matter. How long did the tax-ship persist as a design, and was it in its latter years always associated with weights, measures and officialdom as it appears to have been early on? Perhaps it was just another case of a known design passing into folklore and being reproduced without knowledge of its origins, like the petals and anchors which, to some, had once been ecclesiastical symbols. Talking of anchors, compare Fig.3 and 4; the bottom of that ship looks remarkably like an anchor, as if its maker started with an anchor in mind and decided to convert it into a ship instead.

Figs.5,7 represent the humorous side of early lead and pewter portraiture; to us at least, although possibly not intended by the original maker. The face on Fig.7 is moderately deadpan, but that on Fig.5 has a decidedly quirky smile.

Now we move to the 17th cent. A pleasant shield piece to start with {Fig.8}, very much in main series style; with, when it was struck, a complete, readable circular inscription!



Luxury of luxury, to us lead folk; but alas, I cannot work it out; I will magnify it, and please write in if you can crack it. The characters above the shield looks like they should be a date., maybe 1453 {establishment date?} or 1653. Provenance unknown, but readers may be able to pick out the word "Sussex" at about 4-5 o'clock. I suspect that it may be a seal.

Some more typical main series reverses to follow, if not as well executed; starting with a crossed keys {Fig.9}, a uniface Thames find, which looks as if has been approached by doing a cross for starters and then, instead of pellets, adding a few loops as an afterthought. Fig.10 is another shield, so poorly drawn and preserved that it is barely recognisable as such; indeed, it could be mistaken for a character from the Chinese alphabet.

Fig.11 is either a pair of pipes or a pair of nails; on the basis that pipes occur more frequently on main series pieces one probably has to favour them. Nails occur but twice in the Williamson series, as he catalogued it in 1889; maybe more will come to light. The case either way could be argued on whether the head is thin enough to be a head, and on whether the shaft meets it centrally or on one side. However, lead token manufacturers did not often draw with sufficient accuracy that arguments could be decided on the appearance of their work! An exception to this is the very fine George and Dragon on Fig.12, which requires considerable skill to get into a 15mm flan using lead. The reverse is a triad P/HH, and it may be from Nottinghamshire. Fig.11's reverse is a simple cross, ringed, without pellets.



Fig.13 has an attempt at a word, something like "Jocit" or "Jecit", with the middle C retrograde, which may be an attempt at Latin rather than a name. The other side, too faint to photograph, looked at first to be a cross in which all the quarters were filled with a fine grid; but the cross is not well marked and on reflection it is two halves, rather than four quarters, with only the lower half filled. In other words, it is the rare type 35 halfbeard {see classification system}, but with a grid rather than vertical lines. It is pity that it is too poor to picture.

The head of Fig.14, possibly modelled on that of a monarch from a regal coin, is probably that of a squire; large by 17th cent standards and small by 18th, this is typical of some of the better pieces which marked the beginning of the Georgian era. The size could make it earlier, technically anywhere post-1672, but the portraiture probably argues against. Figs.15-16 are oddballs, and not so susceptible to revealing their age. The cock of Fig.15 is very pleasant, standing up proud on his 20mm flan; in England, that is the diameter of the 1660s, but this piece feels heavier and later. Maybe it is not English? Our cock has an intriguing but ultra-shy companion on the reverse; a creature, of rather unusual type, but so poorly drawn that he defies identity. In different lights and at different angles he might be a man, horse or bird. Perhaps the piece is overstruck on something earlier, and our mysterious creature is the remains of an undertype.



So to Fig.16: 1 HOP. Nice to have an easy one, you may think; surely that has got to be Kent or East Sussex, they don't often come that obvious. Wrong! Try North America. Perhaps it is a hop on a bus/train/cart, rather than a hop in a field; or perhaps HOP is short for Heap Of Potatoes. One thing for sure, it doesn't look very old and it doesn't look very much like what we usually expect from the farmers of Kent.

Two really ugly pieces to finish this page with, huge and horrible, and both more or less uniface. Fig.17 is 26.41gm and with a diameter which varies between 37mm and 44mm; not that the latter is really relevant, for it is clearly the remains of something much larger; probably a badge, the pendant of which has been ripped off by force. The themes,



nevertheless, are ones which we regularly meet on tokens; grid in the middle, and the largest and coarsest set of radial dashes in the grenetis that you have ever seen. It is somewhat difficult to date, unlike Fig.18 which is an example of...20th cent lead! Probably too faint to see in the photograph, but someone has taken a 1904 cupro-nickel ten centimes of Albert I of Belgium and sunk it into a piece of lead sheet. With what purpose, if any, one might ask? No-one would use something as soft as lead for a mould for manufacturing forgeries, so one can but assume that it was some sort of badge of recognition. Or maybe just a practice piece, but then why bother with the neat centrally-located hole.

Early English Lead & Pewter Tokens, continued

Type L

{NOTE: All photos magnified 3:2}

Type L opens the second of the BNJ53/54 articles at supposedly around 1425, and bursts on the scene with a refreshing sense of {comparative} modernity after all the deteriorating styles of the preceding types F-H. OK, it is a London type, as is type M alongside, and no doubt the geometrics started by type H continue in the provinces, as is borne out by the continuation of its stock designs for many years, and flan size changes, thereafter; but although the mediaeval era is still with us, just about, the whiff of change is in the air, just as in February, when the lengthening evenings herald that winter is having its last fling and that spring is not too far off.



Two very different features mark the change of numismatic mood, apart from the welcome return to a superior quality of production. The first is the appearance on a few of the reverses of practical items of domestic hardware {Figs.1,5} or of possible shop signs {Figs.6,11} indicating that the commercial world may be starting to exert itself on the tokens coinage for the first time and challenge the hitherto almost exclusive ecclesiastical dominance.

The monasteries had need for everyday items, of course, so the argument for this being the first partly commercial issue is not wholly watertight, but the appearance of items like jugs, tripods and even maybe stills {make of Fig.1 what you will} is encouraging. Fig.5 may depict cutlery, or even narrow upright wineglasses, but may equally be a device for extinguishing a candle. Fig.6 is the sun in splendour; coincidentally or otherwise this was the favourite symbol of Edward IV, which may have been the cause of its selection as a shop sign by the issuer; whilst Fig.11 is one of the first attempts to depict a tree, which may possibly be intended to be an oak. Neither the tree or the sun is wholly immune from being interpreted as a religious symbol, although I favour a secular origin.

There are other intriguing reverses here, too; Fig.2 shows a bell, Fig.3 is possibly the issue of a glover, and Fig.8 shows one of the first crude attempts at trying to depict an issuer's face. How do we judge?

The standout feature which distinguishes type L, however, is the shield. They may not be quite universal, and they have been in occasional evidence in earlier years, but here they burst on the scene in abundance. Every one of Figs.1-12 overleaf has a shield on it, as do the next little batch {Figs.13-19} below. Pages 88-90 of BNJ53, which describe the examples known to the authors, abound in the language of heraldry..... which leads to the next question: are the various shields depicted genuine, simplified genuine, or fictional; i.e. just drawn to create the effect?



Most type L pieces are 11-12mm across and pewter, although a few are lead {Figs.18-19}. In the 15th cent we are fast approaching the time, c.1500, when token flan size reached its absolute minimum, and that is not conducive for the accurate rendering of heraldic devices, many of which can be very detailed. There are quite a few things you can do with shields: you can put something in the middle of them, or you can divide them up into distinct sections by means of lines and bands. You can run said lines and bands horizontally, vertically, diagonally, or you can make chevrons {V-shapes out of them}; then, when you have divided into sections, you have the choice for each section whether you leave it blank, depict something in it, or shade it. If you shade, you can shade with lines running horizontally, vertically, diagonally, or combine them into grids. The scope is endless in theory, if you have enough space to operate. Hats off to type L's engravers for injecting as much variety into their 11mm as they did.

The trade guilds of London, or livery companies as they are known, are currently 110 in number, according to https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Livery_company, which conveniently gives a list in order of precedence; however, only 39 had received their charters by 1515, and most of those in the 14th and 15th centuries. In other words, they were springing up fast, but were still in their relative infancy. The question we have to ask is: do these type L shields represent trade arms in the manner of the main series copper pieces of a couple of centuries later, or are they personal in nature? The Williamson 17th cent series has trade arms in profusion and personal arms present but in lesser proportion; perhaps the answer is, as with that series, sometimes one and sometimes the other.

The door to the world of commercial tokens is open, if only ajar for another century or so. We have come full circle, and you can resume the tale with type M in our earlier series of chronological articles, commencing in LTT_51.

-:-:-:-:-

Readers' Correspondence

My thanks to Alex Kussendrager for identifying the lead piece which I showed on page 5 of LTT_33:

"In the Netherlands we call these Handelslood; "trade lead" or "mark/owners leads". They were used for the export of copper from Sweden. There is an article about them, albeit in Dutch: "Messing uit Holmens mässingsbruk, Norrköping, Zweden"

On my website I have a special page about them:

<http://www.loodjes.nl/Adelaars%20loodjes/Adelaars%20overzicht.htm>".



The latter is well-illustrated and, even if you don't understand Dutch, is well worth a look.

The Issuers of the Lead Tokens of Edinburgh, Part 2

Continuing with our exploration of Dalton & Hamer's lead token issuers from last time. Another lot of my current thoughts about the various issuers, with their various businesses, addresses and dates overleaf; but meanwhile, pause to note how certain pieces {165,174} have been made from moulds which have been manufactured using the regal farthings of the time; specifically, the third issue of George III, dated 1799. We have seen that phenomenon before on other crude lead.

{continued on next page}

		159. O: ALEX ^R GALLOWAY. 107 WEST BOW. R: TEAS SPIRITS WINES & GROCERIES. A. 70			160. O: GREIG. R: EDIN ^R .
		161. O: H. HARDIE EDIN ^R R: L ^M MK ^T			162. O: J. HARDIE GROCER. R: N ^O 101 NICHOLSON STREET. FARTHING.
		163. O: HAVENS. R: 83 SOUTH BRIDGE. A. 77			164. O: S. HOPPORTON. 324 LAWN-MARKET. R: Tea chest & basket of bottles.
		165. O: J. HUNTER & CO EDIN ^R R: BRITANNIA. 1 FARTHING.			166. O: T. HUTCHISON. R: ONE FARTHING.
EDINBURGH.					
		167. O: JOHNSTON, 100 HIGH STREET. R: SNUFF SHOP. A. 84			168. O: J. JOHNSTON MEAL DEALER. R: 54 CROSSCAUSEWAY.
		169. O: PAYABLE AT 183. R: HIGH ST. LAWRIE & CO.			170. O: JOHN LEES TOBACCONIST. LAWN MARKET. R: Two pipes crossed over a roll of tobacco.
		171. O: D M ^C BEATH NO 6 WEST PORT. R: MEAL & BARLEY WHOLESALE & RETAIL.			172. O: MC DOUGAL & C ^O 72 HIGH STREET. R: SPIRIT WAREHOUSE.
		173. O: A. M ^C EWEN. R: WATER OF LEITH 1806. D. 20			174.

		174. O: M ^C KAY HIGH STREET GROCER. R: BRITANNIA. 1 FARTHING.		
		174 Bis. O: M ^C KAY GROCER. R: EDIN ^R A. 130		
		175. O: H. MACFARLANE. LAWN MARKET. R: Tankard.		
		176. O: J. MARSHALL TOBAC ST R: FOUNTAIN WELL.		
		177. O: MENELAWS. WEST BOW. 1805. R: TEA & SPIRIT WAREHOUSE. Tea chest between two sugar loaves. D. 6		
		178. O: JAS. MILL & CO. R: GRASS MARKET.		
		179. O: V MIONE. R: 328 LAWNMARKET.		
		180. O: WILL ^M MORRISON HIGH STREET. R: EDIN ^R		
		181. O: A. PINKERTON & CO. GROCER. R: NO 88 HIGH STREET EDIN ^R A. 131		
		182. O: D. PURDIE WEIGH HOUSE. R: EDIN ^R 1806. D. 7. A. 132		
		183. O: REITH'S TEA WAREHOUSE. R: NO. 1 BOWHEAD EDIN ^R		

<u>D+H</u>			<u>Nature of trade</u>	<u>Token Address</u>	<u>Earliest</u>	<u>Latest</u>
159	Alexander	Galloway	Grocer	107, West Bow	1806/07	1821/22+
160	(i) Andrew or (ii) Thomas	Greig	(i) Grocer or (ii) Baker	{several} or {several}	1794/95-	1812/13 1821/22+
161	Henry	Hardie	Baker	495 Lawnmarket	1805/06	1815/16
162	John	Hardie	Grocer	101, Nicholson Street	1804/05	1809/10
163	Robert	Havens	Tea & spirit dealer	83, South Bridge	1810/11	1814/15
164	Samuel	Hopperton	Grocer	324, Lawnmarket	1804/05	1817/18
165	James or John	Hunter	{4+ candidates, all either grocers or bakers}	??	??
166	Thomas	Hutchison	Baker	High Street	1805/06	1811/12
167	James	Johnston	Tobacconist	100, High Street	1811/12	1818/19
168	J.	Johnston	Meal dealer	54, Crosscauseway	1806/07	1821/22+
169	John	Lawrie	Spirit dealer	182, High Street	1813/14	1817/18
170	John	Lees	Tobacconist	509, Lawnmarket	1814/15	1821/22+
171	David ?	McBeath	Victual dealer	6, West Port	1811/12	1816/17
172	Alexander	McDougal	Spirit dealer	72, High Street	1811/12	1823/24+
173	Arthur	McEwen	Grocer	Water of Leith	1809/10	1814/15
174		McKay	Grocer	High Street
175	Henry	Macfarlane	Spirit dealer	238, Lawnmarket	1809/10	1813/14
176	James	Marshall	Tobacconist	Fountain Well	1808/09	1809/10
177	James	Menelaws	Grocer	West Bow	1799/00	1805/06
178	James	Mill	Grocer & spirit dealer	Grass Market	1807/08	1808/09
179	Vincent	Moinet {sic}	Grocer	328, Lawnmarket	1800/01	1816/17
180	William	Morrison	Merchant	High Street	1804	1807/08
181	Alexander	Pinkerton	Grocer	88, High Street	1812/13	1812/13
182	David	Purdie	Merchant	Weigh House	1805/06	1816/17
183	James	Reith	Merchant	1, Bowhead	1814/15	1817/18