Before describing seriously the further pieces from my collection which are shown on this and the following pages, there are one or two points of general interest which I should like to touch upon.

The collector of pewter has to face difficulties, and one is the cleaning and repair of pieces acquired. If he has not the time or skill to do the work himself he should only trust an expert and decide with him exactly how far to go. For my part—and all collectors are not agreed—I have any cracks or missing parts repaired, and if the original surface is not treated too drastically these repairs show and are no detriment. It is generally possible to leave the underside of a piece with its original patina and this is an advantage, for often the touch-mark is in this position. It is very difficult to clean the oxide from a piece without damaging the marks, and the greatest discretion must be used. I remember my grief when during the cleaning of a spoon an early and rare touch was nearly effaced.

Most collectors will admit they have at some time been deceived into buying spurious pieces. With a soft metal like pewter the faker is thoroughly at home, and knowledge and vigilance are required to combat his wiles. Perhaps the most common deception is to beat up valuable pieces from XVIIth century plates leaving the maker’s marks showing on the underside. A so-called “William & Mary” porringer of beautiful outline was sold at auction with the XIXth century mark of a well-known maker beneath.

The blistered and rough patina given by age has so far not been successfully imitated, and a busy craftsman of wonderful fakes has been content with washing with acid the underside of specimens giving almost the dark grey colour, but not the texture, of the genuine patina. The effect of age was given to the bright parts by countless small dents, scratches and knocks which with practice can be recognised. The dies used by pewterers were probably cut from steel, an expensive process, and this has so far been against the forger. The most recent fakes seem to have these small sought-after circular marks chiselled out and rubbed down—a difficult and expensive process. I recently came across a large would-be XVIIth century circular salt so treated.

No article on pewter would seem complete without reference to the spoons made in that metal from quite the earliest times.

The Romans may have made spoons of pewter, but no specimen has come to my notice, they seem to have preferred bronze as the harder metal.

In the Middle Ages spoons, fingers and per-
haps a hunting knife completed the equipment at the dinner table. Meat was not served in joints but cut up and stewed and brought to the table in bowls. Individuals generally carried about their own spoons, and thus there was a sentimental attachment to such articles.

Pewter spoons had their small maker’s marks stamped upon them, and the position of the marks followed the fashion on silver spoons. The late Mr. Hilton-Price wrote a small and interesting book on base-metal spoons, and he considered that a much-worn pewter spoon in my collection dated from the XIVth century.

The Gothic pewter spoons are of delightful proportion with varying knops and fig-shaped bowls. A common type of spoon of the XVIth and XVIIIth centuries has a rather large circular bowl and is generally of Continental make.

While most of the shapes of silver spoons are found in pewter corresponding in date, there are one or two found in pewter and not in silver. There is the XVIth century maidenhead spoon shewing a lady in the horned head-dress of about 1430; and in later times the spoons of William...
and Mary and Queen Anne had portraits of the Sovereign portrayed upon them.

In the following descriptions of the individual pieces illustrated in this number, I have, as before, referred to the marks or touches which are to be found on many or most of them. The tracings I have made from them are reproduced in a group at the end of this article and I refer to them in these notes under the capital letters written under each tracing. The marks on pieces shown in the first two illustrations (figs. 15 and 16) are, however, amongst those forming the group reproduced in the last number.

Fig. 15. The chalice in the centre is a good example and a similar one in silver is dated 1622. With age the base has sunk and this spoils the outline. The maker’s touch (○) is stamped on the underside of the base. The piece on left

Fig. 19. Three Church Flagons, the first, c. 1720-1723; the second inscribed "Petherstone Parrish, 1702"; the third, c. 1700
Height of centre Flagon, 10½ in.
is a fine example of pewter and beautifully made. The maker’s touch (P) is stamped on the inside of the base with the date 1700, and the owner’s initials are carefully engraved on the flat top of the handle; the design is good and considering its age the specimen is in fine condition. The mark occurs on the touch-plates at Pewterers’ Hall. The pepper pot illustrated is of interesting shape; there is no mark upon it.

Fig. 16. The candlestick is of the Jacobean period and somewhat like that illustrated in the first article (fig. 16), though differing in detail. The maker’s touch (R) is stamped on the top of the socket rim. The “salt,” a slightly larger example of one in fig. 14 of first article, has a good mark (Q) shewing King Charles’s head on the underside of the well. This type is well designed and most effective in plain polished metal. It may be noticed that the bases of this salt and the adjoining candlestick are almost interchangeable, an economy when the moulds were so costly.

The quart mug was found under the floor of the Red Lion Inn when this building was pulled to make way for a bank near the Mansion House and Royal Exchange. The owner’s initials are stamped on the handle, and there is trace of an illegible mark on the base. The following inscription is round the outside: “Edward Hill at ye Red Lyon in ye Poultery 1670”.

Fig. 17. The Scotch flagon in the centre is 9½
in. high, and in outline and design full of character; it dates from the beginning of the XVIIth century. The initials KS (S) occur on the outside of the base, and in the centre inside there is a maker's touch unreadable. The tankard on the right is an early one dated about 1670; the twist to the end of the handle is unusual. The maker's touch (T) is in the centre inside the base. The owner's initials, D. T., occur rather ominously on the inside of the lid. The left-hand tankard is by a well-known maker whose touch (U) is inside on base and the owner's initials are stamped on the top of the lip. The date is 1720-30.

Fig. 18. These tankards are well proportioned examples of their type, the one on the right being the earlier in date. The maker's touch, a Royal Crown, without initials or name, is stamped inside the base and on the top of the lid is punched a shield with "Rampant Lion" repeated four times: the owner's initials WR—RP are stamped on the lip. The other example

Fig. 21. Dish of the type commonly called a Barber's Bowl by Hillary Priest, early 18th Cent.
Length, 16-in.

Fig. 22. Octagonal Plate, by Townsend and Giffen, mid. 18th Cent.; Tankard, c. 1720. Octagonal Plate by George Bacon, mid. 18th Cent.
Height of Tankard, 6½-in.
is engraved with much spirit with a portrait of William III. surrounded by the Royal emblems, the Lion, Unicorn, Rose & Thistle: the maker’s touch (X) is stamped on the inside of the base, and the date a year later is engraved on the lid with owner’s initials (Y) each with a crown over and "silver marks.”

Fig. 19. These church flagons are often engraved with the name of the church and sometimes with those of the churchwardens. The centre one is the earliest of the three here shown and is inscribed on the outside “Fetherston Parrish 1702”; in character it is of a slightly earlier date than this; on the outside just below the lip are four punched marks (V) each pattern stamped twice. The right-hand example with its domed lid is about 1700 or a little later; the maker’s initials (W) are stamped in a shield at the bottom inside. The left-hand flagon, dating about 1720-30, is of beautiful design and with its spreading base and interesting handle has much charm. There may be the remains of a maker’s mark on the outside of the largest curve of the handle; however, just under the lip are four punches in shields, so-called “silver marks,” consisting of a buckle and the initials I.P. I have seen a similar example in a church and it was dated 1721.

Fig. 20. These are two interesting pieces. The salver has the touch (Z) with date 1680 and the maker’s name “Jacques Taudin.” This Frenchman came to London and was nationalized: he was a member of the Pewterers’ Company. This mark occurs on the touch-plates. The engraved crest in the centre, characteristic of the period, should be noted. The porringer is of beautiful shape devoid of ornament; it probably dates a little before or after 1700; there are no initials or marks upon it, though a scar may be the remains of a touch on the base.

Fig. 21. This fine dish is a beautiful example of the pewterer’s craft: some collectors have called this type a barber’s bowl, influenced by the possible thumb-holes at either end and the curved forms the rim takes at the centre. For
my part I consider this is not correct and that the outline of the dish is the Queen Anne period treatment of tall chair backs and mirrors: it seems far too heavy for a barber's shaving dish. The touch (Ge) is stamped on the base. Hellary Perchard was a Freeman of the Pewterers' Company in 1749. It is uncommon to have the strengthening edge of the rim shewing on the front: it adds greatly to the design. A similar dish just acquired has the projecting edge on the reverse.

Fig. 22. The centre tankard is dated about 1720 and is similar in character to one shown in fig. 17, excepting that the body is engraved with a Goose & Ducks. Letters (As) are stamped on the underside of the lid and on the outside it is usual to consider that letters or marks enclosed in a punch mark with wavy edge are of the XVIth century. The two octagonal plates, though of later date, are pleasing design. The one on the right is possibly a few years earlier, and has a coat-of-arms, possibly that of the "Sharpe" family, engraved on the rim. The maker's touch (Bn) on the back gives the name George Bacon, a Freeman of the Pewterers' Company in 1746. This plate has a simple moulded rim, while the other has a gadrooned edge. The latter dish was one of a dinner service and the touch (Db), interesting as indicating a partnership, give the makers' names: John Townsend and Thomas Giffen. These men were both Masters of the Pewterers' Company in 1753 and 1757 respectively.

Fig. 23. This two-handled bowl with cover is full of interest. Within the bowl there is a fine portrait of William III, on the outside there are portraits of the King and Queen with the Royal cypher and in the centre the Garter and Royal Emblems. The cover has three "Lions Sejant" which act as either handles or feet, for it was customary to stand the bowl in the inverted cover. This piece is, I consider, certainly English, a dish with a handle exactly similar having the mark of Robert Iles, 1666; in this case the maker chose to stamp the underside of the handle, unwisely, for the quality X and small touch, owing to the piercings, are incomplete.

Fig. 24. This bowl with cover is similar in many ways to the preceding example but is more decidedly English in character. The handles are of characteristic design and follow closely the English silver of the period. There are portraits of William III, and Queen Mary both inside the bowl and on the cover, and the Royal cypher occurs on the cover. The maker's touch (Ge) is of John Waite and his touch occurs on
the plates at the Hall: he was later registered as a Freeman of the Company in 1706.
Both these bowls are extremely rare and interesting and I wonder if their original home was the Palace at Hampton Court.

Fig. 25. The punch bowl was bought with the ladle at auction. The inscription on front is “The London Punch House” and the ladle has the initials “J.A.” on the underside. From contemporary advertisements I ascertained that James Ashley was the Proprietor of the London Punch House from, at any rate, 1731 to 1755. This Tavern was situated next to the church on Ludgate Hill on the North side. This bowl differs from the usual treatment of pewter inasmuch as it is beaten from a sheet of metal and not cast. A contemporary historian mentions that the Police advised the owners of Punch Houses to have their bowls made of pewter and not silver as it had become common for thieves to dash in and carry off the silver; it may be therefore that this one was made as an experi-
ment. Unfortunately the maker's touch has been rubbed away but the quality mark is well preserved (EE).

The pair of candlesticks are Dutch and so do not really call for description in this article. I should date them just before or after 1700, and the Dutch Rose & Crown mark (Fr) is interesting to compare with the quality mark just given. The shape and design are very satisfactory and fine without the use of any ornament.

Fig. 26. The spoons illustrated are all of pewter. The first two were dug up in Westminster and belong to the late XVth century: they have both the same touch (Ht). The former has a "writheknop and the latter a "melon" knop. The next one is an early "slipped in the slake" and has a small mark of a star in a circle; it was dug up in Bristol. The fourth, with an "acorn" knop, came from Warwickshire and is early XVth century: the touch (It) is in the bowl. The last two are of the early XVth century and are of an interesting type, having "maidenhead" knops. The right-hand one has a crowned rose (Jr) stamped in the bowl, and the other has a small beaded circle with a key in the centre and maker's initials beside (Kx).