
Subject: Strap 98

Posted by [afire](#) on Tue, 02 Feb 2016 03:46:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Model name : Strap 98

Type : Strap Watch

Period/date : Late 1920s

Gender : Men's

Case Maker : Wadsworth

Case Material : 14k White Gold Filled

Case Serial : 5334212

Case Style no : Art Deco

Caliber : 179

Movement Maker : Marc Favre

Movement Serial: 1201235 (Best Guess)

Bracelet : Hadley Hadleyite (Base Metal or Chrome, but not WGF)

Other info : Sold on eBay December 14, 2015, for \$310. The bracelet doesn't seem like the best match to me, but all things considered, I'm willing to believe it's original. In any event, it's hard to imagine a better example of what this model must have looked like when brand new.

Pictures posted with seller's permission.

Subject: Re: Strap 98

Posted by [GaryM](#) on Tue, 02 Feb 2016 04:34:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Very nice, brand new indeed! I just found an old Marc Favre 165 stamped "M" in a pile of junk movements. Needs major rebuild but a keeper for the record books.

Subject: Re: Strap 98

Posted by [timeliz](#) on Tue, 02 Feb 2016 08:29:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I was watching that one. I agree its a very nice example; even though I thought \$300 was a bit high.

Although, not half as high the new owner immediately re-listed it for: 331764578874.

You still have a shot at it, John.

Subject: Re: Strap 98

Posted by [afire](#) on Tue, 02 Feb 2016 15:27:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Liz, I was watching the original auction too (just out of curiosity) and thought the same. High for a WGF Strap model, but then again, it's one of the more attractive models, and you only get a handful of chances to get truly mint/NOS examples, so I can see it.

As for the relisting...ugh. I actually almost started a Strickland gripe thread in the chit-chat section but bit my tongue. For some reason, their practice of buying on eBay and then attempting to flip at eight-fold the price while contributing nothing but some old-timey background pictures really irks me, though it's none of my concern. It would be one thing if these were real undervalued finds (blurry pictures, wrong descriptions, misspelled titles), but they aren't. Anyway. That's actually why I included the original selling price in my post, in case somebody noticed it was the same watch.
