WITH few exceptions the medal had fallen into decline since at least the beginning of the present century, and the First World War merely compounded the deficiency. Inspiration came from just a handful of medallists and was insufficient to create a desirable climate in which medallic art could flourish in Britain.

The early 1920s mark the beginning of a period when medal making experienced an important revival, due largely to the initiative and forward-planning of one man, Robert Arthur Johnson (no. 1), who from 1922 until his untimely death in 1938 used his position as deputy master of the Royal Mint to stimulate and sustain medallic art in Britain. This paper focuses not only on the medals and their respective artists with whom Johnson was associated, but also concerns itself with the intrigues and manoeuvres used in obtaining work for the Mint, sometimes to the detriment of private medal manufacturers.

Forty-eight year old Johnson did not come to office without prior experience in public administration. After Winchester and New College, Oxford, he served in the Department of Scottish Education, H.M. Customs and Excise, and in 1919 as Assistant Secretary in the Treasury, and had been called to the Bar in 1913. By merely looking at some of the medallic work being produced in northern Europe, both at various mints as well as privately, he was able to recognize the state of the art in Britain for what it was and wasted little time in attacking the malaise from which medals were suffering. In June 1922 the Royal Mint Advisory Committee of Taste was established by the king to advise on all matters connected with the design of coins, medals, seals and decorations, and no doubt it is this development which gave Johnson the support with which to effect changes in the medal.

In July he wrote to the Treasury suggesting an annual advance for bringing promising artists into medal work. The request was denied on the grounds that such expenditure was unnecessary, even though Johnson did point out that if such a subsidy were to be given, as it was at some Continental mints, a small revenue would eventually accrue.

Later in the same year plans were drawn up for a British Empire Exhibition to encourage trade in the Empire and to pay tribute to our colonial forces, who had fought during the Great War. Johnson saw this as an opportunity to promote interest in the medal, and wrote to Sir James Masterton at the Colonial Office on 2 November 1922:
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I am anxious to make the Royal Mint a centre for the encouragement of medals . . . Public interest in good medal work has sunk to a . . . low level, and the contrast with France, or even Germany, is one to bring a blush to the cheeks of even the most hardened philistine . . . the forthcoming exhibition affords an opportunity . . . of a commemorative medal which would be placed for sale . . . thereby giving employment to an artist . . . and bringing his work to the notice of the public.5

Johnson was anxious to take whatever steps he could for the general improvement in every aspect of coins and medals, including methods of production. In 1923 a process of producing medals by 'cameograph', or photo-sculpture, invented by Henry M. Edmunds, came to his notice. In this process a series of fine parallel lines are engraved upon a sheet of plate glass and projected by a powerful lantern on the face of the sitter, who is then photographed from two points. The negatives show the image of the person and the fine lines across the face, which naturally appear as curved lines where they fall across the features. The plates are then enlarged to a particular size on glass transparencies and placed in a specially constructed carving machine in which several hundred parallel furrows are carved by a revolving drill, controlled by the contour lines registered on the plate. The result is a portrait in relief which shows a remarkable life-like appearance. Johnson, however, reckoned that the process could not usefully be introduced at the Mint, remarking 'if it became universal it would eliminate the artist altogether. Not only would there be no engravers, but there would not be any modellers in plaster'.6 Very few medals were produced by this process, but cameograph portraits of the Prince of Wales and Lord Baden-Powell were made.

In May 1923 medallists from Britain and the colonies submitted designs for both an award medal and a plaquette to be struck by the Mint, commemorating the exhibition at Wembley: a prize of £60 for each was offered by two city livery companies, the Goldsmiths', and Armourers' and Braziers'.7 This competition highlighted a growing controversy between the Mint and private medallists. John Robert Pinches (no. 2), head of the firm of die-sinkers established in the 1820s, complained to the earl of Crawford, a member of the Royal Mint Advisory Committee, that the Mint was entering into direct competition with private firms, and that he resented the possible hardship to his employees.8 This was understandable in the light of the fragile economic climate, and Johnson's somewhat over-zealous methods of obtaining business for the Mint.

Crawford wrote to Johnson about Pinches's letter: 'I do not quite know what is the best line to adopt . . . As this is the kind of question that the firm might bring to public notice it might be preferable if I told him that I was sending the letter to you'.9 Crawford's suspicions proved remarkably prophetic. Two days later the Daily Express published a letter from Pinches, headed 'Medals to be made at the Mint', and accusing the Mint of accepting 'orders for new medals . . . at a price that no private firm could possibly quote'.10 Crawford's annoyance at Pinches can be seen in his subsequent letter to Johnson.11

Johnson's argument in favour of the Mint was outlined in a letter to Sir Lawrence Weaver at the Treasury on 5 December 1923. When the Wyons had joined with the other side of their family, who had already established a private die-sinking business in
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11 PRO. Mint 20/861, 25 November 1923, Crawford to Johnson: 'I do not mean to carry on a correspondence with Pinches - his work is disgraceful, and his name ridiculous. He is one of a type of correspondent common enough, to whom it is impossible to tell the truth - I mean to say to reveal the full facts of the situation. The whole assumption of his letter rests upon his opinion that private medallists divert custom from himself to the Mint. If the Mint scheme does well, private patrons will come into existence who would no more dream of going to Pinches than to the Man in the Moon. He sent me four examples of his medals - I thought them very distressing'.

Birmingham, they had taken with them dies from hereditary commissions which William and Leonard Charles Wyon had originally obtained whilst working in Mint time. The abolition of the post of engraver in 1903 had enabled the Mint to approach outside artists for public work, and the introduction of the reducing machine had further encouraged this trend. King Edward VII had had his royal prize medals struck at the Mint, on cost grounds alone, which was important when it was considered that the Royal Academy was then paying more for their revised annual prize medals struck by Messrs. Pinches than if they had gone to the Mint in the first place. Indeed, Johnson concluded, 'I am not altogether clear that we ought not only to quote for work but . . . let it be known that we can save them (institutions) money if they come to us'.

Messrs. Pinches and Allan Gairdner Wyon had mustered support from public authorities as well as from private medallists. Armed with a petition signed by the London Chamber of Commerce and nine of the leading private die-sinking establishments, they saw Johnson on 4 January 1924 but this proved to be a fruitless exercise.

Johnson's plans seemed to be endangered from a rather more official quarter. Winston Churchill, the chancellor, had written to Austen Chamberlain, foreign secretary, on 25 November 1924 stating clearly that although he had not had 'the opportunity of looking fully into the question of manufacture of medals by the Mint . . . on general principle . . . it is undesirable that the state should enter into commercial competition with private firms'. Fortunately for Johnson, when a copy of Churchill's letter was forwarded to him by somebody at the Treasury, he was told that he might regard his present activities as safe and that if he proceeded cautiously in future there would be 'no further restrictions'.

As deputy master of the Royal Mint, Johnson's position demanded at least a modicum of discretion and, clearly, the present need was never more compelling. He was able, however, to use a journal as his unofficial mouthpiece, telling its editor in January 1925 that he was glad that the 'Spectator' will say something about the struggle with the medal firms, as the matter is now becoming acute, and, between ourselves, the Chancellor is to receive a joint deputation from the Federation of British Industries, the London Chamber of Commerce, the Royal Society of British Sculptors, the Birmingham Jewellers' Association, etc., etc., very shortly.

Meanwhile I send you, for your entirely confidential perusal, the minute on the subject which I wrote to Winston Churchill in November last, shortly after his taking office, as also of some observations made today in reply to the salient points made in a whole budget of letters which have come to him lately from the complainants. You will, of course, understand that whoever is kind enough to write the article will not give it away that he has received these confidential papers from me, or quote them. They are only sent to him to help him to realise what the struggle is all about, and what the case of the opponents is. He is, however, quite entitled to quote anything he likes from the published reports of the Deputy Master for the years 1922 and 23.

The bull point about the whole of this controversy is that the medallic art was as near as possible dead in England and consisted mainly of reproducing annual medals from dies struck many years ago. It is now being revived, thanks to our activities at the Mint and if the trade, instead of opposing these activities, were to take up the challenge and emulate our work they should reap great benefit from the revival. Witness the case of France where the Paris Mint has always done work of this sort, in spite or, as I argue, in consequence of which there are over a dozen firms in Paris and elsewhere in France emulating the achievements of the Mint and achieving reliable high quality. As the result, clients in England requiring good medals, and artists requiring dies, have been going to France for them of recent years.
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So far as regards real medal work. As for the Birmingham jewellery trade, the kind of stuff which they produce is not what we have in view here at the Mint at all, or could possibly undertake at the price, even if we desired to do so. Even here, however, if the trade asked for the views of the Advisory Committee on any designs that they had in contemplation, it would be readily given free of all charge.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that the whole controversy arose because an artist who had rights in certain dies for gold medals came to us for estimates for the striking of these medals. Reckoning in every possible overhead charge and full labour costs, we find that we are able to produce these medals at from 25/- to 30/- apiece (excluding, of course, the cost of the gold), and still make a good profit on our outlay. The trade, however, claims that this work could not be done for less than 45/-, an excellent instance of the sort of profiteering that goes on when traders think they have a monopoly. What is really getting them on the raw is the fact that now that the Mint has entered the market again, even to the very limited extent that we are able to do, they can no longer cheat the artist and force the public to take bad stuff at ruinous prices.16

On 27 March 1925, a deputation which included the Federation of British Industry and the Royal Society of British Sculptors saw the financial secretary and pleaded its case.17 After much negotiation a sort of compromise was reached whereby the Mint agreed not to operate a monopoly in connection with medal work; as far as privately-commissioned work was concerned they agreed to handle annually an average of just eight pairs of dies, up to a maximum of fourteen, and then without an increase in staff.18

The two competitions for the British Empire Exhibition award medal and plaquette,19 each with a first prize of £70, were decided by the Royal Mint Advisory Committee with Lawrence Weaver co-opted as representative of the exhibition authorities. That for the plaquette was won by Edward Carter Preston20 (no. 3), an artist from Liverpool who had hitherto produced a handful of unexciting medals. The design chosen for the award medal was that of twenty-eight year old Percy Metcalfe21 (no. 4), with a representation of his 'Wembley' lion (no. 5). Johnson was delighted with this design writing to Sir Lawrence Weaver, 'Metcalfe's Lion seems to be a triumph'.22 Metcalfe's design in the competition for the keepsake souvenir medal (no. 6) - a low relief florin-sized piece, produced at the Exhibition and capable of being struck with just one blow at the rate of 105 a minute - also won first prize of £50. The medal chosen as the runner-up (no. 7) was by William McMillan.23 At fifteen Metcalfe had won a scholarship to Leeds School of Art, and this had led on to a 'Royal Exhibition' scholarship at the Royal College of Art. Now the Wembley Exhibition marked the turning point of his career.

The Times (souvenir issue, April 1924) was lyrical about Wembley: 'millions of British subjects will ascend the Heights of Empire. Spread before them is the wondrous reality of Britain's might and magnitude . . . the scene is without parallel in the history of mankind'. The central feature of the Mint exhibit was an illustration of minting, including that of a replica King Alfred penny in tin (no. 8), struck by men in Saxon costume and employing traditional methods of production.24 Even this innocent diversion drew Johnson into a squabble when, on 20 May 1924, a question was raised in Parliament by Professor Charles Oman, asking the chancellor whether he realised that those Alfred pennies differed little from the originals.25 On 21 May, Johnson gave a written reply to Oman expressing his sorrow that Oman should have classed him with Becker the forger, and insisting that 'the
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facsimilies [had] received the approval of the British Museum . . . No doubt [he continued] the size of the coin is that of the London silver penny but . . . the metal is tin . . . [and] I can hardly imagine a coin collector who was such a mug as not to look pretty narrowly through a glass at a coin in so fine a condition'.

After further discussions between Johnson, the Treasury and George Brooke at the British Museum, the matter was finally resolved by the preparation of different dies, and a new moneyer, Philip at Wembley, was 'discovered' (no. 9). In the event, this particular gimmick had proved reasonably popular, and more than ten thousand pieces were sold at sixpence each.

Johnson’s uneasiness at the siting of the Mint exhibit, between the Air Ministry and the Department of Tropical Hygiene, was made clear in a letter to one of the organizers:

> I see that their majesties are proposing to visit the British Government Pavilion ... I hope that they do not overlook the Mint exhibit . . . circumstances have decreed that our exhibit is in a secluded spot . . . which might be mistaken for the public lavatories . . . clearly, if their majesties overlook our annexe it is highly probable that everybody else will do so. I should be deeply grateful, therefore, if you could possibly get it arranged that they come round and see the first keepsake tokens struck on the coinage press.

Despite large sales of the various souvenir pieces, including some 113,000 keepsake medals, the Exhibition had not been the absolute success hoped for by Johnson. All in all, four competitions were held in conjunction with the Empire Exhibition. Apart from the official Exhibition medal, plaquette and keepsake tokens already mentioned, an open competition was held for a series of plaquettes in bronze, illustrative of London as the capital city of the Empire, notice of which appeared in *The Times* of 17 May 1923. £1,000 was allocated for their production, and from a total of eighty-one designs received the work of six artists was selected. First prize of £50 was won by Eric Bradbury with two pieces: National Gallery / St Martin’s in the Fields, and Westminster Abbey / Houses of Parliament. A. Howes and Percy Metcalfe shared the second prize of 50 guineas, and the winners of the third prize were M. Kitchener (to achieve greater fame as the designer of the ‘thrift’ design on the brass threepence), W. H. Doxey and C. L. J. Doman.

Edward Carter Preston, winner of the Wembley plaquette competition, was involved in the preparation of an interesting commission which never came to fruition. In 1924 a competition was held for the design of a medal for the League of Nations, and four artists submitted work: Madge Kitchener, J. Langford Jones, Percy Metcalfe, and Edward Carter Preston. The subject was to be the League’s ideograph – the world drawn on Molveides’s equal area projection – surrounded by fifty-five stars for the member nations. Carter Preston (no. 10) and Langford Jones were joint winners of the competition, but the contractors could not come to terms about its issue with the League and the proposal was dropped altogether.

Langford Jones undertook some fairly uninteresting work for the Mint; his most commonly-seen medal carries the conjoined portrait effigies of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth (no. 11). This die was supplied to private manufacturers by the Mint, and is an example of the help which was sometimes given to them.

Despite public indifference to the Mint exhibit at Wembley, new work was forthcoming. The London, Midland and Scottish Railway Company wished to issue a medal to those who had given service during the General Strike in 1926. The commission was given to Ernest Gillick, a sculptor who had won a scholarship from Nottingham School of Art (and
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whose wife, Margaret, designed the obverse portrait for the coronation coinage of Queen Elizabeth II). His design (no. 12) is a well-balanced composition which hints at Art Deco, whilst the reverse inscription incorporates the railway company's initials. This medal was struck in bronze with an almost black matt toned surface, consisting of a French lacquer. The Royal Mint charge was £52 10s. for the first pair of dies and preparation of punches, while the cost of actual manufacture was 2s. 6d. for the first five thousand, and 2s. 4½d. thereafter; approximately 7,750 were struck.33 One of Gillick's earlier medals, a Great War memorial for members of the Inner Temple (no. 13) can also be singled out as progressive in design.

A particularly interesting medal from this period is that for the armistice anniversary (no. 14) in 1928. The emotional subject used was an allegory of Deliverance, and illustrates the advance of Great Britain supporting a youthful warrior who offers a wreath to the memory of fallen heroes. This stirring medal is singularly unusual in actually having been sponsored by the Royal Mint from where it could be purchased. The designer was Charles Leighfield Doman who, like Ernest Gillick, studied in Nottingham under the sculptor and medallist Oliver Sheppard.

It was Percy Metcalfe who received the lion's share of Mint work at this time. Correspondence between Johnson and Metcalfe hints at a relationship of patron and protégé, and it is difficult to see how Metcalfe's medal of Johnson's father (no. 15), executed in 1924, could not fail to curry a little favour. In correspondence relating to this particular commission Johnson, in fact, reports Metcalfe as having been 'much struck by my father's anatomy, and thinks he should make a very good head'.34 Notwithstanding this, Metcalfe's ability is quite obvious and he was instructed to prepare the official Wembley Exhibition medal for 1925 (no. 16), choosing as its theme Food, Transport and Housing – the main interests upon which the extension of the Exhibition into 1925 were focused. An important commission came his way late in 1924 when on 17 October Johnson asked him to design a medal for the Prince of Wales's visit to Cape Town.35 Metcalfe prepared and presented his design, and on 29 October a slightly perturbed Johnson replied: 'My dear Metcalfe, I showed this rough sketch to the Mint Advisory Committee yesterday. They said that they thought it had merit but wanted me to impress upon you the necessity for guarding yourself against what they call Bolshevik, i.e. German impressionist renderings'.36 Metcalfe's portrait of the prince was done from pictures, and it is clear from what he wrote to Johnson that this was regarded as a particularly important commission, 'I should like to ask your help in getting photographs of the prince. I have been to every press agency in the city and have failed to obtain a decent photo - this seems strange considering that he must be the most photographed person in the country. I am particularly anxious to go all out on this medal'.37 In the event, the medal (no. 17) was a success for the Royal Mint which received over 47,000 orders!

Of all Mint work it was possibly the medal which allowed the most unrestricted freedom of movement for the artist, although rarely commanding the prestige which coinage design brought. If success was to be measured solely in those terms then Metcalfe's greatest triumph came in 1927. An Advisory Committee chaired by the poet William Butler Yeats looked into the question of a coinage for the Irish Free State. A competition was drawn up and Metcalfe's distinctive and enduring designs, featuring a different animal on each of the eight denominations, were chosen.38
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In July 1926 the firm of Joseph Fry wished to have a medal struck for presentation to the workforce on its bicentenary in 1928.39 The Royal Mint Advisory Committee invited three artists to submit designs – Eric Gill, Percy Metcalfe and Harold Youngman – and each was to receive an honorarium of ten guineas. The committee rejected the designs of Metcalfe, who was by now caught up in work for the Irish coinage. Eric Gill made a model in box wood, but was asked to prepare a stone model from his drawing and this was subject to much delay. Ultimately, it was Youngman’s design which was the most acceptable, although asked to revise the obverse, and he received a fee of seventy guineas. Six thousand of these medals (no. 18) were struck in bronze and given a dark toning, similar to that applied to Gillick’s medal for the General Strike, known as Toning No. 1 by the Mint.40

In 1926 and 1927 the British Empire Union, an organization which carried as one of its slogans ‘Britain for the British’, issued a medal (no. 19) for distribution to children throughout the Empire on 24 May, Empire Day. They had gone to a private manufacturer for the medals, which carried a portrait of the Prince of Wales produced by the cameographic process. The quantities distributed ran into tens of thousands; although this was not the top end of the market, it was, none the less, the sort of business which the Mint might profit from. Even Johnson realised that he could not be seen openly touting for the work, but an opportunity arose when, in late 1927, the Union invited submissions from artists for suitable medal designs. The Union approached the Mint to quote for manufacture and were surprised and happy to find them marginally cheaper than the private company they had used; as a further inducement there was to be, as Johnson craftily pointed out, no charge for the designs. The Mint started striking the medals (no. 20) in early 1928 and by 15 May had received orders for more than 29,000 pieces. Metcalfe’s portrait of the Prince of Wales, based on that for his Cape Town medal, was used for the obverse while the reverse, by Thomas Humphrey Paget,41 was after a design by the sculptor Francis Derwent Wood.42 This piece of unbridled nationalism had proved widely popular and by the end of 1928 the number of orders received had gone up to 40,000. The Union went on to request a new reverse, one which would appeal more to children and perhaps ‘fire them with enthusiasm to emulate the deeds of their forefathers’. Six artists were invited to submit designs for the new reverse and that by Charles Leighfield Doman (no. 21) was selected.43

Once again Johnson drew flak from private medal manufacturers, and the Federation of British Industry, at having apparently poached this lucrative business from under their noses, but he remained unmoved. The distribution and striking of these medals, however, was raising a completely different issue. On 13 June 1928 a parliamentary question inquired ‘whether a propaganda organization could get their medals struck at the Royal Mint’,44 and a letter to Johnson on 2 January 1929, from the Liberal party, complained that the medals were being distributed by a local Conservative organization.45 On 18 January 1929 Johnson defended himself in a letter to the secretary of the British Empire Union

You should not be accused of being a party organization. If you could have pointed to a printed circular or catalogue in which you stated that ‘these medals could not be issued to Political Organizations, and must not be used in connection with the activities of any political organization’ that would have definitely clinched the matter, and we should have no more trouble. If individuals do not observe these conditions that is their own risk, but the B.E.U. itself – and, what is more important from my own point of view, The Mint cannot be
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held responsible. If there is no such published statement by the B.E.U. I am quite certain that we should very soon find ourselves instructed by Parliament to refuse to supply these medals to you at all. Remember that there is nothing which Liberals resent so much - or, for that matter, all but the extremists in the Labour Party - than the suggestion that the British Empire is the monopoly of the Tory Party.\(^46\)

In the following March the Union received a letter from Warren Fisher at the Treasury, indicating that the prime minister felt 'bound to take exception to the reproduction on a document containing phrases lending themselves to a politically controversial interpretation of a medal bearing the effigy of H.R.H. The Prince of Wales and struck at the Royal Mint. Mr. Baldwin, therefore, cannot permit the issue of any further supplies of this medal to your association unless the pamphlet in its present form is withdrawn and suitably emended'.\(^47\)

By early 1931 the Mint had struck more than 75,000 medals, but regrettably for Johnson a letter from the Treasury in March 1931 considered that 'in view of the questions raised . . . it would be well to leave this particular order to private contractors in future'.\(^48\) Never was such a politically loaded statement hidden behind such a seemingly innocent medal.

Other medals by Percy Metcalfe from this period include King Fuad's portrait (no. 22), the Henry Carslake memorial (no. 23), and that for the Everest flight in 1933 (no. 24). This last medal was commissioned by The Times which had taken a special interest in this memorable flight, and decided to make a public presentation of medals to the expedition members on their arrival home. This decision was taken only at the last moment; although only about ten medals were required time was precious and the entire work, from its conception to striking, took just two weeks!\(^49\) In order to minimise the risk of damage to the dies the medals were struck in the slightly softer fineness of pure silver instead of the customary sterling. Metcalfe, who was appointed 'Designer for Industry' by the Royal Society of Arts, was also active in other areas of design: shop fronts, environmental public areas and Ashted pottery jugs. During the 1940s he designed an ice ballet which was produced each summer on Blackpool pleasure beach.

Liverpool Cathedral's inauguration was marked by two quite contrasting pieces: Edward Carter Preston's plaque (no. 25) is a purely modernistic representation, whilst Walter Gilbert's\(^50\) contribution (no. 26), although modern in treatment, is a visual embodiment of Milton's *Areopagatican Eagle*, 'kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam, purging and unscaling her sight at the fountain of Heavenly Radiance'.\(^51\)

In November 1932 the king announced his intention of offering an annual medal for poetry in English. The Royal Mint Advisory Committee selected, from a field of ten designs, a composition of Edmund Dulac (no. 27), for which he received £113. The reverse depicts Truth emerging from her well and holding the divine flame of Inspiration. Today, Dulac is best remembered as an illustrator of children's books and as a designer of postage stamps.\(^52\)

In October 1934 Percy Metcalfe and William Goscombe John\(^53\) were given sittings by King George V and Queen Mary, for the commemorative (no. 28) and king's (no. 29) silver jubilee medals. The king's medal had given Johnson some concern, for, as he wrote to Goscombe John 'you are setting us a manufacturing problem which is quite a serious one. 80,000 of your medals are required . . . each requires some six blows, with annealing in between . . . [and a] large amount of hand labour and time and expense'. Johnson went
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on to request that Goscombe John reduce the relief, ‘so it does not stand out too markedly . . . when worn with a row of them on the breast.’\(^{54}\) In late November Goscombe John sent a description of his medal and notice of its issue to various newspapers, and on 26 November *The Times*, *Daily Mail* and *Evening Standard* duly carried these notices. This disclosure, which had pre-empted the official announcement by Buckingham Palace, drew the displeasure of the king,\(^ {55}\) and Johnson wrote to Sir Arthur Ponsonby of the Privy Purse about the indiscretion, complaining that ‘he had, of course, no business whatever to allow the Press to go off at half-cock like that . . . I did not write to Goscombe John myself . . . the whipping had been administered by the headmaster himself. It is unbelievable, however, what even the most eminent among us will do in these days for the sake of a little cheap advertisement’.\(^ {56}\)

On the commemorative medal Metcalfe’s representation of Windsor Castle was intended to symbolize King George V as first monarch of the House of Windsor. The king did not, however, particularly like this idea, preferring something more on the lines of the royal arms and a crown surrounded by shields of the Dominions, or at least a design which was more in keeping with the reverse of Goscombe John’s medal.\(^ {57}\) The Royal Mint Standing Committee (13 June 1934) found that this was not feasible, there being a difficulty in including all the shields of the Dominions, without causing either confusion or jealousy. Johnson, on the other hand, had no misgivings about Metcalfe’s design, commenting in his 1934 Annual Report that ‘the combination of an extract from Virgil . . . adopted as its motto by Harrow School, with a building . . . [which was] so prominent a feature of the Eton landscape’ was an excellent idea. ‘If we add’, he continued, ‘that the official responsible is a Wykehamist, we surely have . . . a union of hearts symbolic of a Crown which is over all parties and causes supreme’.

The silver jubilee medal was available in two sizes: gold at 40 guineas and 12 guineas; silver at 15s. 9d., and 1s. 10d., and for the first time the Royal Mint appointed agents to retail the medals (coin and medal dealers Messrs. Baldwin and Messrs. Spink).\(^ {58}\) On 8 January 1935 Spink offered the silver medal to Selfridges for 18s. and 2s. in quantities, to retail at 21s. and 2s. 6d. ‘We anticipate’, they said, ‘a very great demand for these Medals, and if you agree with us in this, we would like to suggest your making a very special feature of them’.\(^ {59}\) The response from Selfridges on 11 January was not encouraging: ‘we have noted the prices of the Jubilee Medal. We do not know whether you are suggesting this as a commercial proposition, but the margin of profit is absurd’.\(^ {60}\) It was obviously in Johnson’s interest that the medal should reach as wide an audience as possible, and he was able to act as mediator eventually persuading both Selfridges and Boots to stock the medal.\(^ {61}\)

Percy Metcalfe was paid 300 guineas for the work. This medal is a definitive statement of the period, its distinctive formalized design complementing his jubilee crown reverse (no. 30), and is a testimony to his original and uncompromising approach to medal design.

Another medallist whose origins, like those of Metcalfe, lie in the British Empire Exhibition was Thomas Humphrey Paget, a student at the Central School of Art. There is little remarkable about his early work, perhaps because the commissions he received were not very exciting. Correspondence from Robert Johnson, with regard to the securing of one particular medal which Paget executed (no. 31), illustrates the zest with which

\(^{54}\) PRO. Mint 20/1331B, letter from Johnson to W. J. Goscombe John, 12 October 1934.  
\(^{55}\) PRO. Mint 20/1331B, letter from A. Ponsonby of the Privy Purse, Buckingham Palace, to Johnson, 27 November 1934.  
\(^{56}\) PRO. Mint 20/1331B, 28 November 1934.  
\(^{57}\) PRO. Mint 20/1331B, letter from Ponsonby to Johnson, 17 May 1934.  
\(^{58}\) NCirc, Feb. 1935, advertisement.  
\(^{59}\) PRO. Mint 20/1332, letter from Spink to Selfridges, 8 January 1935.  
\(^{60}\) PRO. Mint 20/1332, letter from Selfridges to Spink, 11 January 1935.  
\(^{61}\) PRO. Mint 20/1332, 16 and 17 January 1935.
Johnson would pursue a commission for the Royal Mint and, equally, the scorn he poured on the competition. Writing to the prospective client, Dr Monckton Copeman, on 27 March 1928, he said:

regarding the cost of producing a die it is, I am afraid, the case that our charges are higher than those which would be quoted by a private firm. At the same time, you will of course realize that we give a great deal more care and attention, not only to the actual work of producing and finishing the dies and the medal, but also in advising the client and artist. I am not referring to the client’s fee. In the ordinary trade they employ no artist at all and simply give a version for good or ill, but in our case here we submit everything to the advisory committee with the result that nothing goes out from the Royal Mint which hasn’t been passed as anyway decent by a committee of real experts.

If you are considering Messrs Pinches, some of their work is tolerable but, as a general proposition, I would rather have a bath bun than the modern medal as struck by the British manufacturer, since the former would be much less deleterious to my digestion, delicate as it is, than the latter would be to my sense of taste.62

In 1935 a commission from the Honourable Company of Master Mariners marked the turning point in Paget’s career. On the suggestion of the company’s master, the Prince of Wales, a medal was instituted for award to a cadet who had distinguished himself. The company received designs from a number of artists but the work was given to Paget who produced a portrait (no. 32) of considerable authority, and one which gained the approval of the Prince of Wales. Johnson was impressed with the popularity of this portrait and its success galvanized support from other Establishment bodies, hitherto indifferent to Paget’s work.63 He went on to design the coinage for Edward VIII, prior to abdication, and the definitive coinage portrait of King George VI.64

A near contemporary of Paget at the Central School of Art was Cecil Thomas, an extremely versatile engraver. He worked with gems, seals and cameo portraits and undertook a lot of commissions for the Royal Mint in the preparation of colonial seals;65 the ability to cut directly onto steel dies is reflected on his medal for the Birmingham Assay Office (no. 33). Thomas was also a prolific sculptor and his crowned effigy of Her Majesty the Queen was used for the coins and medals of many commonwealth countries.

Permission to use the sovereign’s portrait was not always forthcoming. In March 1935 the president of the Royal Numismatic Society, Percy Webb, tried to obtain such permission from the lord chamberlain’s office, for its centenary, on the grounds that ‘it proposed that a commemorative medal should be struck and, in view of His Majesty’s gracious patronage of the Society, it is thought that the most appropriate obverse design would be a portrait of The King’.66 On 18 March 1935, however, Johnson made it plain to Sir Frederick Ponsonby of the Privy Purse ‘that permission could not be given to use The King’s effigy on their proposed medal, even though it is a Royal Society’.67 Permission for a society or institution to have its medals bearing the effigy of one monarch did not automatically extend to the succeeding sovereign. Johnson was therefore also obliged to write to the Royal Agricultural Society, which had originally been allowed to have the bust of Queen Victoria on its prize medals, pointing out ‘that H.M.’s permission must be obtained for the use of His Royal Effigy, and this isn’t normally granted on medals not presented by him personally’.68

Gilbert Bayes had trained at the Royal Academy Schools, and in 1899 won a travelling scholarship. He specialised in reliefs and statuettes, but also produced a number of medals.

62 PRO. Mint 20/1123.
64 Dyer, ‘Paget’, pp. 170-72; Dyer, Edward VIII.
65 PRO. Mint 20/929.
66 PRO. Mint 20/1389, 14 March 1935.
67 PRO. Mint 20/1389.
68 PRO. Mint 20/1389, 19 March 1935.
On 1 April 1935 the Royal Mint librarian sent Bayes a recent French medal by Jean Vernon for the launching of the trans-Atlantic liner Normandie. Bayes suggested the idea of a medal for the commissioning of the Queen Mary to an enthusiastic Johnson, who was already aware of the success of the French medal. This could be purchased by passengers on board and was, reported Johnson no doubt enviously, in October 1935, ‘still selling like hot cakes on every voyage’. Cunard White Star, the owners of the Queen Mary, accepted the proposal of the medal; initially it had been hoped to use the effigy of Queen Mary but Buckingham Palace would not permit the use of any royal head. Gilbert Bayes’s original design (no. 34) contrasted the Santa Maria, Columbus’s ship, with the Queen Mary, but Cunard’s Percy Bates felt that the fate of that ship deemed its use inappropriate.69

Johnson’s proposal of an impressionist view of New York, seen through the Bargate in Southampton, was employed by Bayes for the reverse, and this, coupled with a modified form of his original design, constituted the final medal (no. 35), for which he received £100.70 The precise wording of the Latin inscription had caused some disagreement. Rudyard Kipling, a friend of Percy Bates, proposed ‘A Queen Confided me to the Ocean’, in Latin ‘Regina Me Commisit Pellago’. Johnson, unsure of the accuracy of the Latin translation, consulted three Latin scholars who all preferred ‘Maria Regina Mari Me Commisit’.71 Percy Bates wrote to Kipling for his further comments, who retorted: ‘Medal. All right! If your three Latinists think they can improve on Horace (Bk. 1: Ode 3: Line 11) don’t try to stop ’em. I couldn’t so I stole’.72

The medal was a success and fully captures the mood of the moment. In all 3,000 pieces were struck in bronze, and priced at 15s. each; they were available from the Royal Mint and could also be purchased on the ship. A handful were struck in gold, and examples were presented to the king and queen, the president of the United States and Mrs Roosevelt. Cunard had also wished to issue tokens both for transactions on the ship and at its various offices, but such use was declared illegal.

The unusual occurrence of three kings in 1936 was not enough to inspire new talent in medal-making although the death of George V and, more especially, the prospect of a coronation first for Edward VIII and then for George VI did produce a surfeit of privately-manufactured medals. Two of the less predictable medals anticipating the proposed coronation of Edward VIII were struck in Vienna, and are in honour of his recent visit to Austria. Ludwig’s Hujer’s73 portrait (no. 36) is rather fanciful and undignified while that of fellow-countryman, Johann Joseph Tautenhayn74 (no. 37), although hardly flattering, does at least manage to hint at the portrait of a man recognizable to a later generation as the duke of Windsor.

Soon after the death of King George V Johnson wrote to Metcalfe, on 23 January 1936, ‘My dear Percy, you will, of course, be thinking about the coinage and medal work for the new reign, but there is no immediate hurry, since the coins certainly will not be required till January 1937... Whether or not there will be others invited I could not, of course, say at the moment, but I think you may regard it as pretty safe that you will at least get part of the work’.75 In the event, Metcalfe did make the official medal for the coronation of King George VI in 1937 (no. 38), recalling in the portraits his jubilee medal of George V.

In the autumn of 1937 Robert Johnson attended a conference in Paris to consider various aspects of medal manufature. The result of this landmark conference was the formation of the Fédération Internationale des Éditeurs de Médailles, commonly referred to today by

---

69 PRO. Mint 20/1396A, letter from Johnson, 7 June 1935.
70 PRO. Mint 20/1396A, 31 July 1935.
71 PRO. Mint 20/1396A, letter from Johnson to Bates, 8 October 1935.
72 PRO. Mint 20/1396A, letter from Bates to Johnson relating Kipling’s poem, 14 October 1935.
73 Forrer, II, 572-73; VII, 468.
74 Forrer, VI, 46-41; VIII, 232.
75 PRO. Mint 20/1530.
its acronym Fidem; its principal objectives were the encouragement of public interest in modern medals and their study.

On 2 March 1938 Robert Johnson died quite suddenly. He had given sixteen years of loyal service to the Royal Mint and had been largely responsible for its new-found impetus. He was an industrious and fearless campaigner who had not allowed himself to be compromised or persuaded by arguments which were counter to the good of the Mint. Although he had been knighted in 1935 it is surprising that no initiative was taken to strike a medal as a tribute to his service, by the authorities in the Treasury, his colleagues at the Mint, or by those medallists on whose behalf many of his actions had been fought! Regardless of this, his influence was so far-reaching that this period of medal-making in Britain will surely be remembered as the Johnson years.

THE CATALOGUE

No. 1. Robert Arthur Johnson (1874-1938), photograph (Royal Mint Archives)

No. 2. John Robert Pinches (1884-1968), photograph (Pinches family archives)

No. 3. British Empire Exhibition, Plaquette, 1924
Obv.: An allegory of a peaceful assembly of the Dominions around the Mother Country. BRITISH EMPIRE EXHIBITION 1924 signed near edge E: CR: P
Rev.: Inscription within table MAKE ALL SURE WE ARE ONE (motto of the Armourers' and Braziers' Company). Silver and copper, 78 mm. by 50 mm., rectangular. (Royal Mint 1924 p. 6, Plate B, 1)

No. 4. Percy Metcalfe (1895-1970); photograph (family archives)

No. 5. British Empire Exhibition, Award, 1924
Obv.: Bust of the king, crowned and draped, left. GEORGIVS V BRITT: OMN: REX ET IND: IMP: signed on truncation B.M. (Bertram Mackennal)
Rev.: Stylized lion, seated left, beyond, facade of stadium. Exergue: BRITISH EMPIRE EXHIBITION 1924 signed on ground, PM
Copper, 51 mm. (Royal Mint 1924, p. 6, Plate C, 5, 6)

No. 6. British Empire Exhibition, “Keepsake” souvenir, 1924
Obv.: Stylized lion, seated left, STRUCK AT THE BRITISH EMPIRE EXHIBITION 1924 signed at edge, PM
Rev.: Industrial scene: shipping and factory chimneys. Exergue: INDUSTRY COMMERCE signed at edge, PM
Silver, nickel and copper, 28 mm. (Royal Mint 1924 p. 6, Plate A, 9, 10)

No. 7. British Empire Exhibition, “Keepsake” souvenir, 1924
Obv.: Head of Mercury, left. COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY signed behind head, McM
Rev.: Ship and gantry at quayside. THE BRITISH EMPIRE EXHIBITION 1924 signed at edge, McM
Silver, nickel and copper, 28 mm. (Royal Mint 1924 p. 6, Plate A, 11, 12)

No. 8. British Empire Exhibition, King Alfred souvenir penny, 1924
Obv.: Bust right, AELFREDI • E
Rev.: LOND monogram
Tin, approx. 20 mm. (Royal Mint 1924 p. 10, Plate A, 6-8)

No. 9. British Empire Exhibition, King Alfred souvenir penny, 1924
Obv.: As no. 8.
Rev.: Three line inscription: LOND, monogram, between PHILIP AET WEMBLEY (moneyer named after Philip Snowden, chancellor of the exchequer)
Tin, approx. 20 mm. (Royal Mint 1924 p. 10, Plate A, 6-8)

No. 10. League of Nations, 1924, Pencil design (PRO. Mint 20/933)

No. 11. King George VI and Queen Elizabeth, 1937
Obv.: conjoined busts, crowned, in coronation robes. CORONATION OF KING GEORGE VI & QUEEN ELIZABETH 2 MAY 1937
Rev.: various types.
The obverse was used by many private medal manufacturers, mostly for unofficial coronation issues. Other
occasions for which it was used include a medal issued by Messrs. Spink commemorating the opening of the
Queen’s House, National Maritime Museum, in April 1937.

No. 12. Service in the National Emergency, 1926
*Obv.:* Helmeted figure of Britannia, seated left, hand resting on shield, holds out a laurel. FOR SERVICE IN THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY MAY 1926
*Rev.:* Three female figures, standing, their backs to each other, hold two locomotives in their outstretched arms. LARGITAS MVNERIS SALVS REIPVBLICAES signed near edge, E. GILICK
Gold and copper, 51 mm. (Royal Mint 1926, p. 46)

No. 13. Members of the Inner Temple, Great War tribute, 1918
*Obv.:* Cross upon a wreath of oak leaves, inscribed THE INNER TEMPLE TO MEMBERS OF THE INN WHO FOUGHT FOR THEIR COUNTRY 1914 1918
*Rev.:* A winged horse, left. MCMXIV - MCMXVIII signed at edge, E.G. Copper, 51 mm.

No. 14. Signing of the Armistice, Tenth Anniversary 1928
*Obv.:* Standing figure of Great Britain supports a youthful warrior, his shackles broken and head bandaged, who offers a wreath to the memory of fallen heroes; beyond, an open landscape. Signed in field, C.L.D.
*Rev.:* The Cenotaph monument, Whitehall. THEIR NAME LIVETH FOR EVERMORE. Exergue: NOVEMBER 11TH MCMXVIII
Gold, silver and copper, 76 mm. and 32 mm. (Royal Mint 1928 p. 7, Plate A, 1, 2)

No. 15. Rev. A. H. Johnson, 80th Birthday Presentation by Fellows of All Souls College, Oxford, 1925
*Obv.:* Bust left, draped. A. IT. JOHNSON. AN. AETAT. SVAE. LXXX.; signed near edge, PM
*Rev.:* Interior view of building seen through a portico, OVI. SOCIIS. SENIOR. SPARGIS. CÆLESTIA. FESTA. / XANKEA. SIGIL. ACCIP. DONA. DIE. Exergue: MCMXXV signed near edge. PM
Silver and copper, 51 mm. (Royal Mint 1925 p. 12, Plate A, 4, 5)

No. 16. British Empire Exhibition, 1925
*Obv.:* As no. 5
*Rev.:* Three figures standing right, holding objects symbolizing food, transport and housing. BRITISH EMPIRE EXHIBITION 1925 signed at edge, PM
Copper, 51 mm. (Royal Mint 1925 p. 11, Plate B, 6)

No. 17. Visit of the Prince of Wales to Cape Town, 1925
*Obv.:* Draped bust, left. EDWARD . PRINCE OF WALES signed at edge, PM
*Rev.:* Van Riebeck’s ship, C D G HOOP, CAPE TOWN. 1925. KAAPSTAD signed at edge, PM
Silver and copper, 32 mm. (Royal Mint 1925 p. 11, Plate A, 1, 2)

No. 18. Bicentenary of the Birth of Joseph Fry, 1928
*Obv.:* Draped bust, left. JOSEPH FRY 1728-1787 signed below bust, H.Y.
Silver and copper, 51 mm. (Royal Mint 1927 p. 9, Plate C 2, 3)

No. 19. British Empire Union
*Obv.:* Draped bust of the Prince of Wales, left. OUR . EMPIRE . PRINCE 24 MAY 1926
*Rev.:* Antique galley seen through the archway of a decorative stone bridge; above, radiate sun. FOR GOD . KING AND . EMPIRE
Copper and aluminum. 39 mm. with an integral suspension clasp at edge, through which is found a red, white and blue striped ribbon. This privately-manufactured piece occurs with four different dates, 1926-29

No. 20. British Empire Union, 1928
*Obv.:* Draped bust (sim. to no. 17) of the Prince of Wales, left. FOR GOD KING AND EMPIRE
*Rev.:* Female figure seated, right, holds a caduceus and laurel; her helmet on the ground. EMPIRE DAY MAY 24TH Exergue: BRITISH EMPIRE UNION
Gold, silver and copper, 33 mm. often found pierced, with suspension ring attached (Royal Mint p. 8, 54)

No. 21. British Empire Union, 1929
*Obv.:* As no. 20.
*Rev.:* Female figure of the Mother Country, seated right, encourages two children by her side to go forth and perform great deeds. EMPIRE DAY MAY 24TH Exergue: BRITISH EMPIRE UNION signed at edge, C.L.D.
Gold, silver and copper, diameter 33 mm. often found pierced with suspension ring attached. (Royal Mint 1928 p. 9)

No. 22. Visit of King Fuad I to England, 1927
*Obv.:* Uniformed bust of the king, wearing a fez, left. Arabic inscription around [= King Fuad I Egypt].
Signed behind head, METCALFE.

Rev.: Shoulder-length busts of Britannia and Egypt, their heads left. Below, inscription in compartment OFFICIAL VISIT OF HIS MAJESTY FUAD I KING OF EGYPT TO BRITAIN JULY MCMXXVII signed at edge, C.L.D.

Silver and copper, 72 mm. (Royal Mint 1930 p. 8, Plate B, 1)

No. 23. Henry Carslake memorial, 1926

Obv.: Three bi-planes in flight. Signed near edge, PM

Rev.: IN MEMORY OF HENRY LEIGH CARSLAKE LIEUTENANT R.N. LATE OF H.M.S. EAGLE, NAVAL OBSERVER. FLEET AIR ARM. KILLED IN AN AEROPLANE CRASH AT SEA OFF MALTA 21 OCT. 1926

Silver and copper, 51 mm. (Royal Mint 1928 p. 6, Plate C, 2, 3; PRO. Mint 24/37)

No. 24. Everest Flight Expedition, 1933

Obv.: A bi-plane in flight; a mountain range beyond. APRIL 1933 signed at edge, PM

Rev.: PRESENTED BY THE TIMES TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSTON MOUNT EVEREST FLIGHT EXPEDITION OF 1933 IN COMMEMORATION OF THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS

Silver, 51 mm. (Royal Mint 1932 pp. 17-18, Plate B, 1, 2)

No. 25. Opening of Liverpool Cathedral, 1930

Obv.: Two stylized figures in praise; beyond, facade of cathedral signed at edge, E.C.R.P.

Rev.: Group of stylized figures; beyond, facade of cathedral. CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF CHRIST. Platform below, inscribed LIVERPOOL.

Silver and copper, 38 mm. by 72 mm., upright rectangle.

No. 26. Presentation for the building of Liverpool Cathedral, 1934

Obv.: A huge eagle and radiate sun above cathedral building. Exergue: LIVERPOOL CATHEDRAL signed below exergual line, G

Rev.: Inscription FOR FELLOW WORKERS F.M.R. 1901-1934 divided by a branch in the centre. NOT UNTO US O LORD BUT UNTO THY NAME BE THE GLORY

Silver, 37 mm. Sir Frederick Morton Radcliffe, treasurer and chairman of the Liverpool Cathedral committee.

No. 27. King’s Medal for Poetry, 1934

Obv.: Bust of the king, crowned and draped, left. PRESENTED BY HIS MAJESTY KING GEORGE V (By B. Mackennal, modified)

Rev.: Representation of Truth emerging from her well, holding the divine flame of inspiration. FOR POETRY signed at edge, EDMUND DULAC

Gold and copper, 51 mm. (Royal Mint 1933 Plate C, 1; 1934 p. 9)

No. 28. Silver Jubilee of King George V: Commemorative medal 1935

Obv.: Crowned busts, conjoined of King George V and Queen Mary, left. VI.MAIH MCMX MCMXXXV signed behind head, PM

Rev.: Formalized view of Windsor Castle. STET FORTUNA DOMUS signed in field, PM

Gold and silver, 57 mm. and 32 mm. The smaller size was also struck at the branch mints of Calcutta and Pretoria, and can be identified, respectively, by the mint-marks i and p in the lower field of the reverse. (Royal Mint 1934 p. 2, Plate A, 3, 4)

No. 29. Silver Jubilee of King George V: King’s medal, 1935

Obv.: Conjoined busts, crowned, left. GEORGE V AND QUEEN MARY MAY VI. MCMXXXV signed in field, W.O.J.

Rev.: Royal cipher. MAY 1910 – MAY 1935

Silver, 31 mm., with suspension loop for wear. (Royal Mint 1934 p. 1. Plate A, 1, 2)

No. 30. Silver Jubilee crown, 1935

Obv.: Head of the king, left. GEORGIUS V D G BRIT. OMN. REX. F.D. IND: IMP: signed on truncation, BM

Rev.: A formalized view of St. George and the Dragon. CROWN 1935 signed near edge, PM

Edge: DECUS ET TUTAMEN ANNO REGNI XXV (incuse)

Gold and silver, 39 mm. (Royal Mint 1934 p. 5, Plate B, 4)

No. 31. Dr S. Monckton Copeman: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 1929

Obv.: Shields of Copeman and the College, divided by the staff of Aesculapius. THE COPEMAN MEDAL FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH FOUNDED 1929

Rev.: View of the College seen through a portico. COLL. CORPS. CHR. ET. B.M.V. CANTAB. Exergue: MCCLII signed in exergue, HP

Silver and copper, 70 mm. (Royal Mint 1928 p. 8, Plate B, 3, 4; Dyer (Paget) 168. Plate 21, 4)

No. 32. Honourable Company of Master Mariners, 1935

Obv.: Head left. H.R.H THE PRINCE OF WALES MASTER. signed on truncation, HP
Rev.: Arms, supporters, motto and crest, STIRLING, signed in field, H.P. Silver and copper, 50 mm. (Royal Mint 1934 p. 11, Plate C, 1, 2; Dyer (Edward VIII) 169, Plate 22, 7; PRO. Mint 24/141)

No. 33. Birmingham Assay Office, c. 1920

Obv.: Arms, supporters, motto and crest, THE ASSAY OFFICE, BIRMINGHAM, signed below motto, C.T.

Rev.: Exterior view of building, ribbon around (blank, for recipient’s name), IN RECOGNITION OF TWENTY-FIVE YEARS LOYAL SERVICE.

Silver and copper, 44 mm.

No. 34. S.S. Queen Mary: preliminary design, 1935, by Gilbert Bayes. (PRO. Mint 20/142)

No. 35. S.S. Queen Mary Commissioned, 1936

Obv.: The steamship, QUEEN MARY, cutting through water. Exergue: MARIA REGINA MARI ME COMMISIT signed with monogram below waterline, GB

Rev.: Naturalistic view of New York seen through the old Bargate of Southampton. A ribbon across, inscribed COMMISSIONED 1936 Below, shield with the arms of Cunard White Star, Ltd. On either side of the Bargate are the arms of Southampton and those of New York. QUEEN MARY

Gold, silver and copper, 70 mm. (Royal Mint 1935/36 p. 11, Plate C 1, 2)

No. 36. Coronation of King Edward VIII, 1937

Obv.: Head left, draped. EDWARD VIII signed below bust, L.HUJER

Rev.: IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE CORONATION 1937 in centre. VIVAT. CRESCAT. FLOREAT. AD. MULTOS ANNOS

Edge: Sometimes inscribed MADE IN AUSTRIA

Silver and copper, 81 mm. (Spink N.C. 1937 p. 55)

No. 37. Coronation of King Edward VIII, 1937

Obv.: Head left. EDWARDVS VIII D: G: BRITT: OMN: REX signed below bust, J. TAUTENHAYN FEC.

Rev.: Crown and date, 1937, within beaded circle. FID: DEF: IND: IMP: DIADEMA: ACCEPIT:

Silver and copper, 60 mm.

No. 38. Coronation of King George VI, 1937

Obv.: Crowned bust left, in coronation robes. GEORGE VI CROWNED 12 MAY 1937 signed near edge, PM

Rev.: Crowned bust left, in coronation robes. QUEEN ELIZABETH 12 MAY 1937 signed near edge. PM

Gold, silver and copper, 57 mm. (not in copper) and 30 mm. (Royal Mint 1937, p. 9)

Note: Seven medals without Royal Mint report references were privately manufactured.
PLATE 7