The formation of ‘an all-British Society’ out of the Numismatic Society of London had precedents in the proportion of scientific societies (about one sixth) which owe their origin to a budding-off from some existing body. The BNS, indeed, was formed in the most prolific twenty-year period for the foundation of new societies from before 1799 until 1953.¹ Passing over the immediate circumstances of its birth, the consequent advantages have been enhanced recognition of artefacts more available, and of related records more accessible, in their countries of origin. This applies with particular force to locally-issued tokens and other ‘paranumismatica’, i.e. coin-like objects which are nevertheless not coins, produced in a metal or other malleable substance, normally unofficial, and bearing inscriptions which may or may not incorporate a mark of value.² Thus, in BNJ 1 (1903–4) Hamer (PI. 12c) published the first of his classic papers on private tokens;³ and founder members of the Society also included, in the United Kingdom, the token specialists Bowles, Caldecott, Clements, Dalton (PI. 12d), Davis (PI. 13a), Fletcher, Heywood, Macfadyen, Manton, Norman, Sykes, Waters (PI. 13b), and Williamson (PI. 13c), in Australia Chitty, in Canada McLachlan, and in the USA Low. This survey of the advance of knowledge over a century will concentrate on Society publications, on the output of institutions, the scholarship of individual members, and work above the level of the individual coin, and therefore does not pretend to include every contribution on tokens and paranumismatica made during the century. Moreover, it does not cover badges, paper money, seals, or weights.

Besides the BNJ, vehicles for publishing in this area, with the results of much more research than can be mentioned here, continued to be NC and NCirc, to be joined by SCMB (1945–91), the Numismatic Society of Ireland Occasional Papers (1965+), the commercially-published Irish Numismatics (1968–83), the Token Corresponding Society Bulletin from 1971, the British & Irish Tokens Journal in 1980 only, the Pub Check Study Group Bulletin from 1984 until absorbed in TCSB in 1989, and the Yorkshire Numismatist from 1988. Former Seaby employees have published S&B’s Coin & Medal Bulletin since 1991, and other firms have also published relevant publications. Series in which books covering tokens have been published include the British Association of Numismatic Societies Doris Stockwell Memorial Papers (1972+), SCBI from 1973, and the late Steve Cribb’s Local Numismatics (1982–6). The CCNB Newsletter of the Coordinating Committee for Numismatics in Britain had a ‘Focus on Tokens’ in Nos 9 (1995) and 27 (2001).

Much work has straddled several of the headings below. The honour of opening the century goes to Mason on Colchester, with documentation of issuers and photographic illustrations as in the best of the work to be mentioned.⁴ Examples of wide-ranging work by members include Symonds on Dorset tokens of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries,⁵ Grinsell on Bristol,⁶ BNS President Dykes on the Glamorgan tokens of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries,⁷ Whitting on

³ S.H. Hamer, ‘Notes on the private tokens, their issuers and die-sinkers’, BNJ 1 (1903–4), 299–332. 4 pls; 2 (1905), 369–96. 3 pls; 3 (1906), 273–9, 2 pls.
⁴ E.N. Mason, Ancient Tokens of Colchester (Colchester, 1902).
⁶ L.V. Grinsell, A Brief Numismatic History of Bristol (Bristol, 1962).
the East Riding, \textsuperscript{8} Hunter on Sunderland lead tokens and those of the seventeenth to twentieth centuries, \textsuperscript{9} P. Seaby with a catalogue for Ireland, \textsuperscript{10} and Boon on Wales, who perhaps could have explained for non-speakers of Welsh that Thomas Williams’s nickname \textit{Twm Chwarae Teg} means ‘Tom Fairplay’. \textsuperscript{11} The strange volumes by Mitchiner must not be overlooked, although patience is needed to penetrate their many textual infelicities and appreciate the value of their illustrations. \textsuperscript{12} Finally, the end of the century saw the first comprehensive history and theory of small change. \textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Leaden Tokens}

The pioneering study of leaden tokens was a brief paper by Caldecott and Yates; they included at least one cloth seal, however, and the preponderance of seventeenth-century pieces on their plate gave insufficient recognition to medieval tokens. \textsuperscript{14} This was remedied in respect of Boy Bishop tokens by Caldecott himself, \textsuperscript{15} by Archibald on a profile type, \textsuperscript{16} and by BNS President Rigold’s important Suffolk study. \textsuperscript{17} On leaden tokens more generally, Dolley and Hocking published a hoard from Huntingdon, \textsuperscript{18} Grierson located in the editions of Erasmus his reference to \textit{nummos ... plumbeos}, \textsuperscript{19} and Archibald published a hoard from the almonry of Evesham Abbey. \textsuperscript{20} In long papers Mitchiner and Skinner catalogued and analysed English lead tokens of c.1200 to 1672, mostly from the Thames; initially there were doubts about the reliability of their stratigraphy, but it seems to have been accepted that nobody knows better; some work has not been assimilated, e.g. a find of series M8 from the Black Prince’s Palace at Kennington has come out as ‘Kensington’; there are linguistic and iconographic deficiencies, but the publication is a revelation of hitherto little known material. \textsuperscript{21} On finds also, Bonser and Thompson published a small number from different sites in Haddenham, Cambridgeshire, \textsuperscript{22} and the latter an exceptional epigraphic piece from the Thames reading \textit{RICARDUS} in the bulletin of the Centre National de Recherche sur les Jetons et les Mereaux du Moyen Age, where it is dated by J. Labrot to the end of the fourteenth century. \textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{Counters, Jettons}

The classic account in English is by Barnard, who superbly documented jettons in the context of manual arithmetic, and catalogued and illustrated more than six hundred on sixty-three plates. \textsuperscript{24} BNS President Crowther-Beynon examined early references to jettons as ‘peny-yard pence’, \textsuperscript{25} but it was left to BNS Vice-President Lawrence to point out that the jettons which Barnard termed ‘Early English or Anglo-Gallic’ are in fact English, with features common to the coinage of
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Edward I–III. Out of Lawrence’s brief paper Berry developed *Medieval English Jetons* [sic], with a catalogue of types and chapters on the Exchequer; note, though, that Pl. 6.1 is a Blanc à la couronne of Charles VII. Rigold developed a chronology as he published finds from excavations, but reference must be made to his bibliography because premature death prevented his bringing together his insights. This work is now being continued by Mernick, with the first fruits jointly with D. Algar in the Salisbury *Medieval Catalogue*. On later pieces, Honorary member Farquhar published papers on silver counters, while Lawrence wrote on those illustrating cries of London. Thompson drew attention to a range of types of jetton which Roach Smith and Hawkins had attributed to Mary Stuart, but many more of this ‘Elizabethan-Jacobean’ series are published in Mitchiner’s Vol. 3.

### Sixteenth-century Tokens

Apart from lead tokens there are only the City farthings from Bristol, which issued the earliest copper coinage in England. In *SCBI* Bristol of 1973 Grinsell included the three types of square farthing, some apparent forgeries in lead, and a token of John Brown, grocer, bearing ‘a bale of provisions’ on the obverse which must, however, be upside-down and an illustration of that widely-used grocer’s sign, a sugar-loaf. One Bristol farthing token is illustrated by BNS President Challis, who also brings together the documentary sources (but note that the Norwich ‘tokens’ must be cloth seals); and he has also published a valuable pamphlet on currency and the economy. Seven square farthings are illustrated in *SCBI* Norweb.

### Seventeenth-century Tokens

The century opened with Searle listing some unpublished types in a little-known collection given to Queens’ College, Cambridge, but recently transferred to the Fitzwilliam Museum. H.L. Roth illustrated some tokens in his book on the Yorkshire coiners. Longman extracted from the Sessions Rolls notes on some Hertfordshire token issuers, but for the paper he read to the Society in November 1918 we must rely on the published Proceedings. Wells contributed important work on the tokens of Northamptonshire which was re-published in book form with an index in 1914; it has four stereoscopic plates and documentation which extends into a 27-page appendix, though he had insufficient grounds to claim for Northamptonshire Thomas Smith of Brampton and John Johnson of Doddington; and his transcripts from the Peterborough town books differ from those in Mellows. In 1913 he published addenda, also a token of John Washington in Petworth.
with his relationship to the first US President, and subsequently a riposte to Manton over the attribution of William Church of Hartwell on which Wells is surely right. Symonds, however, was correct in 1915 in BNJ, and with H. St George Gray in the Somerset Proceedings, to attribute to Langport the tokens of John Browning and John Weech in LAMPORT. Symonds in 1911 had already used the Hearth Tax and other records to arrange the Taunton issuers according to their streets, an achievement so far unmatched elsewhere. In the same year Sheppard began his listing of Lincolnshire Tokens, including an aspirational list of those wanted to complete the known series in the Hull Museum; most of his notes appeared in the Yorkshire Numismatic Society Transactions, but his re-attribution to Lincolnshire of George Beale in Whiton is in the BNS Proceedings. Young re-listed the tokens of Leicestershire and Rutland with some illustrations and documentation, curiously interpolating new types in Williamson’s numbering with the addition of $\frac{3}{2}$.

The period between the World Wars was dominated by two contributions from the Ashmolean Museum. Leeds studied the Oxford tradesmen’s tokens so well that there has been little to add or amend, even amongst the 11 + 4 dies of the Oxford City farthings which he identified. However, additional light was thrown with publication of the accounts of the Oxford Chamberlains and the Key-keepers of the period; and to the stylistic periods he proposed it is difficult even to attach dates, so it is not surprising to learn that in the later years of his life Leeds avoided chronological discussion almost completely. BNS Vice-President Manton in a lengthy contribution revised the published lists for Buckinghamshire, adding genealogical particulars supplied by Edwin Hollis (uncritically in places), though photographs would have saved him from recording some ghosts.

No such criticism can be made of the other Ashmolean contribution, Milne’s catalogue of the Oxfordshire tokens, which systematically covers the county outside Oxford in traditional museum-catalogue form. This has many advantages, though one disadvantage is that full details of any token need to be sought both in the catalogue pages, in the notes, in the documentary ‘index’, and on the plates. These are excellent, allowing the careful observer to correct Milne himself, e.g. a stop is not the only difference between 28 and 29 for the obverse dies are different, 181 is not ‘more sketchy in execution’ than 180 but from the same reverse die, and 191 is not from ‘smaller and rougher’ dies than 190 but from the same dies on a smaller flan. The date of 88 is not 1660 but 1666, cf. the style of 51. In 1945 Milne himself added three varieties and corrected the reading of 143. Unfortunately he omitted the Duns Tew halfpenny through undue reliance on Blundell; and as he suspected Edward Wallington in WOOTTON belongs elsewhere, as shown by I.E. Gray. Milne was the first to classify the borders of tokens, although his borders F and G may be from the same tool used with different pressure. His plates show the same pictorial punches on tokens from different localities, e.g. 47 and 83, and pointed towards London as the source of the dies. His thoughtful introduction illustrated a surviving pair of token dies, and replaced the fiction of Thomas Rawlins with the reality of David Ramage. Not everyone will

14 T. Sheppard, Lincolnshire Tokens (Hull, 1911); id., ‘Two seventeenth-century tokens found at Whitton, Lincolnshire’, BNJ 18 (1925-6), 304-5.
agree that Ramage's dies were so adjusted as to be struck only at 0° and 180° (he pointed out himself that the dies he illustrated had no guide for adjustment to any one position), or that other designers did not appear in the county until 1659, for nos 69, 86, 128–9, and 186 do appear to be by Ramage, and 127 dated 1657 does not. However, it is due to Milne's stimulus to research that a generation later Rigold as President was able to say that seventeenth-century tokens were being studied with fresh eyes.53

During and after World War II Caldecott published on Sussex an illustrated account of the Penfold bequest, and a critical examination of Williamson:54 this was, however, insufficiency critical of his own evidence for attributing to Sussex John Cooper in BORHAM and Edward Edwards in WESTEHAM (cf. Norweb 1420, 5399). From the Ashmolean holdings Milne revised Williamson's Berkshire chapter, although the Edward Stevens lead piece that he attributed to Faringdon has been re-attributed to Henley on Thames; and finally, he extracted notes and unpublished tokens in the Browne Willis cabinet.55 His colleague J. A. Thompson brought his knowledge of naval history to bear on an unpublished token, though the reading at least requires amendment.56 MacDowall placed John Newton in MORTON to Morton in Lincolnshire (Parts of Kesteven)57 Dolley documented a Tring token found locally, and in 1957 recognised punch-links between tokens of the same date, but central striking of the tokens remained for him 'a question that will have to be gone into very thoroughly': he hardly touched on the series again.58

Kempson though based in Marlborough published an unillustrated but fully informed and documented study of the tokens of the neighbourhood, including the Chamberlains' Accounts for the borough farthings; also the extraordinary indictments for the coining of tokens from the records of Wiltshire Quarter Sessions; and subsequently he compiled a corrected catalogue of the Wiltshire tokens, again without illustrations.59 In 1961 Dykes documented the two Swansea issuers, in 1963 he demolished a mythical Cardiff token, in 1965 with Jacob a mythical Cambridge token, and in 1966 he published a brief list but wide-ranging introduction to the Glamorgan tokens.60 Jacob in 1963 published notes on Cambridge token-issuers, which he subsequently developed in the Cambridgeshire Local History Council Bulletin; and after moving to Surrey he published a note on the two Cranleigh tradesmen's tokens, one of them die-linked with Fareham.61 In publishing the Royce Collection at Stow on the Wold (which is now at Bristol) Grinsell firmly attributed the Stow issuers, including two whom Manton had moved to Buckinghamshire.62 Thomson published valuable articles in 1966 on the tokens of the British Isles, with a map of predominant denominations, and in 1968 on those of London, with a pie-chart of the denominations.63

Berry made his first substantial contributions with new light on the issuers of Chepping (subsequently High) Wycombe, and of Chesham. He and Preston-Morley then put together their

documentation of the Buckinghamshire issuers and analysis of the tokens, the latter being particularly useful for the numbers of specimens at different die-axes. Berry went on to publish with Wood, who owned the house where it was found, a small hoard from Bushey which may represent local circulation more accurately than the tokens in collections, with an otherwise unknown Bushey token, and lead pieces including a disk squeezed between two struck tokens. His well-illustrated Taverns and Tokens of Pepys’[s] London is restricted to the token-issuing catering establishments frequented by Samuel Pepys, who never actually mentioned tokens in his Diary, but if anyone is to pre-empt the liveliest documentation of the period Berry does it better than most. In 1982 he documented as well as may be a token issued by Edward Lloyd, sutler to the Royal Regiment of Foot Guards, although the issuer’s location remained uncertain. Finally, his Seventeenth-century England: Traders and their Tokens usefully brings together the information he has gathered on the trades of token-issuers, and is so dense that a more detailed contents list would have been welcome. This valuable book precludes the need to refer to the numerous articles that Berry has contributed to Coin News, though mention should be made of an important contribution on tobacco-related tokens.64

Boon was already preparing a corpus of the tokens issued in Wales when he published a 1668 token of Abergele overstruck on a 1669 token of Corwen; he took this to be evidence of local striking on the assumption that the dates refer to different years, but they are likely to be different ways of dating tokens struck centrally at the same time.65 W. Seaby, whose revisions and re-arrangement were incorporated in his nephew’s catalogue for Ireland, in 1971 published a 1657 bond whereby two Youghal merchants acknowledged their obligation to redeem their tokens up to a value of £50.66 However, Boon’s Welsh Tokens of the Seventeenth Century proved the first major advance since Milne’s Oxfordshire, with rich documentation including a mercer’s inventory, and new though disputable thinking about the evidence of manufacture; it is a model catalogue, which first included weights, even though the author thought them unimportant.67

Thompson started to publish his work on Ramage with the City of Gloucester Farthings, which showed that their weights were significant; he avoided the assumption that the Mayor of Gloucester’s son Edward Nourse was the issuer of an extraordinary token in Bishopsgate Street, London, but in 2000 he concluded that it was a reasonable assumption, and that the minimum weight of his ‘farthing’s worth of copper’ would have been one sixty-fourth of a pound.68 His joint paper on Haddenham finds also re-attributes the John Morfield tokens from Buckinghamshire, and with Daines, who was the foreman when it was found, he published a hoard of St Neot’s tokens from Eynesbury.69 The opportunity there taken to bring together records of what were christened ‘issuer hoards’ was extended in publishing the Witham hoard with the local historian Janet Gyford, when analysis of the weights first pointed to the minimum.70

Since 1984 he has been publishing the tokens in the Norweb Collection, with Dickinson from Part III. In Part I (Bedfordshire to Devon) there was an introduction on the collection and Ralph Nott; it is indexed in Part II; additions and corrections to the provenances, and additional


specimens, have been published elsewhere. Part II (Dorset to Gloucestershire) includes an essay on Bristol Farthings 1651–70; corrections to the volume were noted separately. Part III covers Hampshire to Lincolnshire; further information for Hampshire appeared when that Hearth Tax assessment was published. Part IV (Norfolk to Somerset) has an introduction on the legend of the Glastonbury Thorn; the description of 3315 has been revised from a better specimen, and the obverse type of Thomas Burrowes in Nottingham has been reconsidered. Part V (Staffordshire to Westmorland) includes a concordance for Southwark, which is incorporated in a more logical chapter called ‘Surrey II’. In Part VI (Wiltshire to Yorkshire, Ireland to Wales) there is an introduction on Sir William Petty and his views on small change. The assessment of attributions has proved a tightrope to walk between excessive strictness in Part I, which required the restoration of all tokens to the Berkshire Faringdon in Parts II and VI, and the laxer acceptance of traditional attributions with a note ‘Attribution not assured’. A couple of re-attributions have now appeared, and Thompson himself moved 2789/2 from Lancashire to Derbyshire.  

At the International Numismatic Congress in London, 1986, he looked at the multiple use of pictorial punches; at that held in Brussels in 1991 he confirmed that the distribution of token-issuing was related to market towns; and in Berlin in 1997 he studied the representations of guild arms and symbols. Related work was the long-gestated argument that the tokens were made centrally by the moneymen, as well as the dies which might be returned to the issuers; the examination of the token evidence for mechanisation of the rolling of fillets, the cutting of blanks, and striking in a screw press; and the comparison of corporation records with dies known from Norweb tokens for an indication of die output, with illustrations of all the dies known for Marlborough. Smaller contributions were on representations of London’s Royal Exchange, developed into a chapter for a London Topographical Society volume covering also the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; re-attributions involving Yorkshire; the conclusion that there is no general use of a system of hatcheting to show heraldic tinctures; and an inconclusive debate with Oddie on multiple locations, who might first have found his alternative to Enfield.  

West provided a useful updating of Berkshire, although his own illustrations show that John Keen(s) in Bray has an E at the end of CRowE, and that K was the initial of the wife of John Burdon in Kintbury. Greenall found that Dorothy Rippin in Hampstead, 1669, by 1670 appeared on Richard Bazell’s halfpenny as his wife, and he also documented the token-issuers of Highgate. He sought a more logical division than Williamson’s between London and Middlesex, but his boundary was somewhat arbitrary, and it must be admitted that he was looking for a criterion by which he could collect Middlesex tokens unsullied by such hamlets as Shadwell and Wapping; the

---


applied listings by administrative area, if somewhat indigestible, are at least useful. In the only issue so far of the *British & Irish Tokens Journal* Gallagher provided most valuable documentation of tokens issued in Ireland, especially Kinsale and Waterford, with evidence that tokens were made in Waterford and Dublin. Subsequently he documented the Limerick farthing. Preston-Morley with Pegg surveyed the Nottinghamshire material, and first attempted the difficult task of arranging illustrations by maker’s style; their long paper would have benefited from a clearer structure, or simply a contents list. On their work Rice modelled his documentation and description of the tokens of Drogheda, Ardee and Dundalk. Dickinson provided a very convenient summary of Williamson, with references to later work, and the careful avoidance of pitfalls which many have not recognised by transcribing capital letters in capitals; he then gave further details of unpublished Yorkshire tokens, worked on *SCBI* Norweb as mentioned above, and co-operated with Manville on a revision of the latter’s *Encyclopaedia* entries. Heslip published an illustrated account of the Lisburn tokens. Stella Greenall usefully tabulated tokens by date, penny tokens by place and date, and odd-shaped tokens by date and place. Melinda Mays put on record an unpublished York token, studied with Wilde another which bears one of the earliest representations of Punchinello in Britain, and located personal seals and signatures for two issuers. Kleeberg while at the American Numismatic Society made unexpected connections in order to conclude that brass and pewter pieces reading NEW YORKE IN AMERICA were made in England and bear the crest of Francis Lovelace, Governor of New York 1668–73, though he and Michael Hodder would have avoided confusion had they recognised that ‘vert’ is an heraldic tincture, not an abbreviation for ‘vertical’; the other side is surely a rebus of Love and simply a lady in diaphanous clothing to represent ‘lace’. Fleet proposed to identify by statistical means London issuers identified on their tokens by only their initials, but there may be something wrong with his methods since his identifications, where they can be checked, do not work. Robinson has published two unrecorded finds from Wiltshire and Worcestershire. Finally, Everson has published a comprehensive study of the Kingston tokens, though the obverse of his fig. 6 is not the same as fig. 5.