THE word heraldry can be used in two ways. On the one hand it means the activities and functions of heralds, be they armorial, genealogical or ceremonial. On the other hand, it can signify armory itself, and it is in this sense that I propose to use the term heraldry in the course of this paper. Heraldry, with such a meaning, has been defined as: 'the art and science of symbolic identification usually associated with defensive armour'.

Identification is the key word. The essential function, purpose, raison d'être of heraldry is identification of a person – whether a real person, yourself or myself, or of a persona ficta. In other words, of an entity which, at law, is treated as a person. Examples would be universities, banks, cities and so on, each of which is a fictitious person, a persona ficta being, as it is, a body corporate and as such can buy and sell, sue and be sued, make agreements and so forth – in other words it can do everything a natural person can do, except what it obviously cannot do.

Thus Arms – the main expression of heraldry – identify a persona. This can be through a person as a member of a particular family. Yet again, it can be through a persona ficta as a body corporate (and not, as some erroneously think, an acreage, a pile of bricks, a loose association of persons). Finally, Arms can identify authority through a person, as with the spiritual authority of a bishop, or the sovereign authority of a head of state, be it a monarchy or a republic.

Origins

The origin of Arms, of heraldry, was an answer to the need of medieval warriors for identification. That military formation which possibly carried the greatest clout in warfare of the time, that is to say the cavalry, was covering itself with more and more defensive armour. This was to such an extent that even the face of the warrior was covered. The result was that one could not know who to support and who to despatch from the field of conflict unless some means of identification was devised.

As a result, we find in the second quarter of the twelfth century simple devices – a blue lion on a gold background, a plain red cross on a silver background, for example – being painted or embroidered onto the surcoat that covered the body armour of the warrior, hence the literal term 'Coat of Arms'. Arms are the combination of such devices as the blue lion, the red cross and so forth with a particular background colour (or field as it is called) of each Coat of Arms. Gradually, the same design came to be repeated on a warrior's shield, lance pennon, horse bardings and so on (pl. 13, 1). In this way identification was achieved and the persons concerned frequently carried over this means of identification from war to peace. Being men of affairs, they wished to be able to indicate their assent to decisions expressed in documents, and as literacy was not considered a necessary attribute of a gentleman – such was left to the clerks – just as many of us leave computer literacy to others – so the medieval warrior, in peacetime, identified himself on seals and the like by means of the heraldic devices, the Arms,
by which he had become known in war. His children and other descendants followed suit with the same Arms. Thus Arms became hereditary as well as being the insignia of a particular group of society and so became *tesserae gentilitatis*.

With the rise of the concept of *persona ficta*, a corporation, in the thirteenth century especially with the rise of cities, universities and the like, such entities quickly identified themselves with Arms which they used, in particular, upon their corporation seal, that essential instrument for the solemn expression of the will of a body corporate. Indeed, the peace-time development of heraldry was much greater than its war-time origins.

Starting in Western Europe, heraldry has spread throughout almost the entire world, and it has served practically every type of society and political regime. Indeed, there is only one other hereditary system of symbolic identification, other than European heraldry, and that is the Japanese Mon. The Chrysanthemum of the Emperor and its variations for the imperial family are well-known examples. They are simple devices, reproduced in monochrome, and in our terms they would be described as a Badge, as with a Regimental Badge. It is somewhat amusing to recall that the extremely effective device of JAL (Japanese Air Lines) - the Crane's head and neck between two wings, all within a circular presentation - is in fact a Mon purloined from a noble family.

The Elements of an Armorial Achievement

Possibly it would be helpful if we drew out of the recesses of our memory the constituent elements of a complete armorial achievement.

The Shield of Arms is basic, as seen in pl. 13, 2, the Armorial Bearings inherited by William Shakespeare. Above the shield is a Helm. In this case it is steel, with the visor closed which identifies the bearer as an untitled, armigerous gentleman. We shall come to the helms of Peers and or Royal personages later. On top of the helm, and so constituting the uppermost part of the total device, one has the Crest - a particular and not a generic term as some imagine.

A certain sense of humour appeals to the Heralds with the result that puns - cants - often occur in heraldry. Thus we have the spear-like object (a lance) in the Arms as an echo of the family name. Whether the Crest eagle is 'shaking that spear' I am not in a position to assert but knowing the heraldic mind as I do I have my suspicions! Crests came somewhat later than Shields of Arms. They were modelled in the round either in wood or boiled leather. They were not used so much in battle, but were certainly prominent in Tournaments. Indeed, there were even exhibitions devoted to Crests arranged alongside Tournaments, and such were great attractions.

Beneath the Crest is the Crest-Wreath: a piece of silk twisted and placed at the foot of the Crest in order to disguise the rivets or other mechanisms which secured the Crest to the Helm. The colours of such Crest-Wreaths comprise the Livery Colours of the person concerned. Such are usually made up of the principal metal and colour occurring on the Shield of Arms.

The material which flows down from beneath the Crest and on either side of the Helm is called the Mantling. It protected the back of the head and neck of the warrior from the elements, rather like the flaps of a Foreign Legion kepis, or of a fur hat worn in northern climes in winter. In battle the Mantling would become slashed, and such is but an invitation to an artist to arrange it in an elegant manner. The variations as to the shape and flow are almost infinite; but, once again, they usually bear the Livery Colours: metal on the inside, colour on the outside.

Finally, there is frequently a Motto placed on a scroll beneath the Shield - or if you are a Scot above the Crest. This contains a war cry, an aspiration, a sentiment and so on. Although frequently expressed in Latin, they do occur in almost any language. Thus the Queen has hers in French: *DIEU ET MON DROIT*; The Prince of Wales in German: *ICH DIEN*; the Churchills in
There are even examples of bilingual Mottoes as in: ADVANCE OTTAWA EN AVANT; or a play upon the name of the bearer, as for the family of Holebrook: BROOK NOT THE HOLLOW – and so on.

If the armiger is a Knight then the helm will be open, and if a Baronet there will be a similar Helm with, on the shield, a silver inescutcheon charged with a left hand coloured red and known, in heraldry, as the ‘Bloody Hand of Ulster’ (pl. 13, 3). The now rare Baronets of Nova Scotia have a somewhat different augmentation to their Arms.

The Sovereign, members of the Royal Family, Peers, Knights Grand Cross – and their equivalents – and certain other categories of eminently distinguished persons – such as Governors-General – have the privilege of Supporters to their Arms, and so for The Queen the well-known lion and unicorn. The Helm for such Royal personages is gold throughout. An example of Supporters for a Peer are to be seen in the Order of the Bath Stall Plate design for the then Viscount Kitchener of Khartoum (pl. 13, 4). The Camel and the Gnu (Wildebeest) reflect his career in the Sudan and South Africa. As a Knight Grand Cross, Admiral Sir Henry Moore, Commander Home Fleet, 1945–46, whose Order of the Bath Stall Plate is shown in pi. 14, 5 has Supporters for life. Supporters are also permitted for important corporations, as with the celebrated dragons supporting the Arms of the Corporation of London.

Selection of Elements in an Exemplification

A point to be borne in mind is the fact that it is not necessary to have the complete Armorial Achievement shown upon all occasions. At times the shield can be used alone, at others the Crest alone, yet again the Shield and Supporters alone and so on. Such selections are completely legitimate and indeed appropriate, desirable and convenient, bearing in mind the location and area available for the exemplification.

Fashion

Almost everything in life is subject to fashion, and heraldry is no exception. As a result, while keeping all the essentials of the required constituent elements, such as position, attitude, colour and so on with regard to the charges, field and so on of particular Arms, the artistic manner of interpretation can vary greatly. Take for example the Supporters of the Royal Arms as interpreted for James I (pl. 14, 6); Queen Victoria upon her accession (pl. 14, 7) and of George V and so Her present Majesty (pl. 14, 8). All are equally legitimate from the heraldic point of view, but very different artistically.

Heralds always encourage individual interpretations, though they frequently encounter the mistaken idea that the artistic rendering of Arms must be a facsimile of the painting as shown on the original Patent. One can readily imagine the excruciating result when such a principle is applied upon a contemporary glass, brick and chromium plate edifice of the local council whose Arms were granted in 1890.

Some Examples of Heraldry in Metal

When considering a design which involves heraldry and metal, especially with numismatics and sphragistics, one needs to keep clearly in mind the basic, fundamental purpose of Arms: identification. The exemplification needs to be of such size as to fulfil this purpose, and not be so small and complicated as to be reduced to a series of almost meaningless dots and scratches. Again, a slavish adherence to the artistic form of previous exemplifications is to be
shunned, especially when it is necessary to fit the Arms within a particular shape – almost always circular – which is not necessarily an easy one with which to deal. While preserving rigorously the essential details, the Arms are best reinterpreted so as to fit clearly and comfortably within the given shape available for display. One must avoid a procrustian battle in which scissors and paste are used as weapons in substitution for artistic skill combined with a knowledge of the Laws of Arms. The end production must always fulfil its functional purpose of identification.

Most of the examples I shall invite you to consider are drawn from this century although I have, from time to time, gone further back to make a point. All opinions expressed are, obviously, my own and you may feel you cannot agree. However, the opinions laid before you are the reactions of one who has worked as a herald for some 33 years, and who ultimately headed the heraldic department of the Royal Household.

The design of the 1983 £1 coin by William Gardiner (pl. 15, 9) is an example for me of trying to include too much on the surface available, though finely drawn with an interesting Jacobean rendering of the Mantling. If it is essential to have on this small surface the complete armorial achievement of the Arms of Dominion and Sovereignty of General Purpose of Her Majesty The Queen in right of the United Kingdom, then the design of Eric Sewell (pl. 15, 10) is more satisfactory. On the other hand, given the area available, I would submit that the basic concept behind the ‘Shield Sovereign’ of Victoria (pl. 15, 11) is preferable. Here the ensigns have been stripped, so to speak, to their bare essentials and comprise simply the shield of the post – 1837 Royal Arms ensign by the Royal Crown in that form generally favoured by Victoria prior to the last quarter of the nineteenth century. By adopting this approach, one is able to identify the details with great clarity. The wreath of laurel on either side of the broadly-based Shield helps to fill in the spaces between the Shield and the Legend. Obviously, the style is à l’epoque and we would do things differently nowadays, but the basic notion of producing an armorial design which fulfils its essential purpose of identification has been well achieved on this Victorian coin.

The 1884 Penny of Jamaica (pl. 15, 12) is inspired by the same desire to achieve clarity. Here the Indian Supporters have, quite legitimately, been left off and only the shield and reptilian Crest employed. The broad-based shield with pinched upper corners – much favoured in the time of the Regency – sets off the Arms with its Cross of St. George charged with Pineapples: a suitable allusion to an English West Indian colony. These Arms were the last assigned for a colony (1661) until Queensland received hers in 1893, prior to the plethora of Arms assigned for dependent territories which occurred in the 20th century.

However, the internal circle between the legend and the heraldic elements of the 1884 Penny cramps, somewhat, the reptilian Crest and also confines the wispy scroll which makes it difficult to read the motto thereon. (INDUS UTERQUE SERVIET UNI). By removing the internal circle on the 1961 Penny (pl. 15, 13) room is provided for the reptilian Crest as well as for a more adequate Motto scroll. The use of the date provides satisfactory stops.

The art of heraldic selection is well illustrated in the following examples in the use of the Royal Crest alone, that is to say: a royally crowned lion statant guardant upon a Royal Crown. F. Derwent-Wood attempted this good idea for a small surface with this 1926 pattern for a Shilling (pl. 15, 14) which was, in fact, not approved. The concept for such a coin was brought to a masterly expression in the 1925 design (approved in 1927) by Kruger Gray (pl. 15, 15). Here the artist has taken full advantage of the form of the Royal Crown, favoured

---

2 For the codification of the Laws of Arms concerning Arms of Dominion and Sovereignty see C. Swan, York Herald of Arms, Canada: Symbols of Sovereignty, University of Toronto Press 1977, Chapter 1.

3 College of Arms Records, heretofore referred to as CA-CA: Walker 11.5 dated 3 February 1661.
by George V, known as an Imperial Crown. Its name has nothing to do with the Empire and was in existence long before we had one. It simply refers to the form and construction of a crown where the arches rise in a dome-like manner and where the central orb and cross form the highest point. Such is in contrast to what is termed a St. Edward’s Crown, where the arches rise and are then depressed at that point where they intersect – the form favoured by Her present Majesty. In Gray's 1927 Shilling the Crest almost thrusts itself at you, and there is no doubt as to its clarity and dignity. The crown on the lion's head and the end of that beast's tail – one can almost hear it swish(!) – form an effective stop in the legend. Heraldry to be really effective must almost knock you between the eyes, so to speak, and this design does just that.

Ten years later, Kruger Gray's 1937 Half Crown for Edward VIII was a most interesting experiment (pl. 15, 16). Here one finds the Royal Arms in banner form expressed in that very early manner where the hoist is longer than the fly. The spaces on either side are filled with elongated crowned Cyphers of double Es. Here the attempt has been made to fit an essentially upturned parallelogram design onto a circular surface and, master designer though Gray was, I would not rate this as one of his better designs – fascinating though it is.

Following the abdication of Edward VIII the same artist achieved what I consider to be a triumph with his George VI 1937 Half Crown (pl. 15, 17). By curving the upper and lower edges of the Shield, and by cusping its dexter and sinister sides – thus allowing room for much more rounded Royal Cyphers than the Edward VIII design – Gray achieved a beautifully balanced, clear and elegant reverse for this, at the time, most useful coin.

The Crown piece of the same year by Gray (pl. 15, 18) was also a selective design where the Shield, Crown, Supporters and Motto could be displayed to advantage on the larger surface available. By curving the lower edge of the Compartiment – the grassy mound upon which the Supporters stand – by utilizing the tails of the lion and the unicorn Supporters to fill up the potentially awkward spaces on either side of an essentially vertical composition, and by allowing the orb and cross atop the Imperial Crown to supply an added stop to the legend band, one has a clear design of real strength and majesty.

The 1932 Half Crown piece for Southern Rhodesia by Kruger Gray is of particular interest (pl. 15, 19). Here the Arms of Dominion and Sovereignty of particular purpose of George V in right of this Southern African colony are displayed. The shield is ensigned by a Royal Crown in the Imperial form. Its cross and orb make a division within the date shown in the circular inscription. As these Arms had no Supporters, a Royal and Imperial cypher is arranged on either side within elegant scroll designs, all of which help to fill up the otherwise difficult spaces on either side of the shield. The treatment of the field of the shield is unique, in my experience, in numismatics. The blazon, the technical description, in the 1924 Royal Warrant4 laying down the Arms, stipulates that the field is to be argent – absolutely plain silver, which combined with the pick-axe could look rather stark. Accordingly – and I would say cunningly – Gray remembered the use of diaper in heraldry. That is to say, the use of two tones of one colour or metal – as with damask – so as to provide a rich effect. Thus the design called for a delicate, almost floral diaper treatment of the field. The chief – broad band at the top of the shield – includes the lion and thistles to be found in the Arms of Cecil Rhodes.5 This is one of those very rare instances where the Arms of a Subject have inspired the Arms of a Sovereign.

The 1913 Canadian Ten Dollar piece is something of a curiosity (pl. 15, 20). Qua heraldica it is most satisfactory. The broad-based shield shows off clearly the Arms of the four Provinces which in 1867 came together to found the new state – often at the time called Dominion – of Canada. These are arranged: Ontario, upper left; Quebec, upper right; Nova Scotia, lower left, and New Brunswick, lower right – all as laid down by Queen Victoria by

4 CA: I 79/71 dated 11 August 1924.
5 CA: Norfolk 43/29 and Grants 82/27.
Royal Warrant in 1868. The wreath of Maple leaves about the shield helps, along with the inscription, to cover – but not overcrowd – the surface available. The general impression given is, ‘These are the Arms of His Majesty King George V in Right of Canada’. However, in point of fact at that date Canada had no Arms. What is more, the 1868 Royal Warrant, already referred to, assigned the Arms to the Provinces severally, and went on to state specifically that when combined in this manner such was to be the design of the ‘Great Seal of Canada’ – and nothing else. So here one finds a case of arma ambigua – not an unknown phenomenon at this time – which generally came about mainly as the result of enthusiastic and well motivated Civil Servants who, though most knowledgeable in their own fields of work, were, alas, untutored in the Laws of Arms.7

Within a decade of this faux pas heraldique, Arms of Dominion and Sovereignty for Canada were laid down by a Royal Proclamation.8 These were displayed in 1952 by Kruger Gray in his design for a 50 cent piece with the greatest clarity and elegance (pl. 15, 21). The overall effect is completely worthy of a coin of, physically speaking, the largest state in all the Americas. It is interesting to note that France Modern returns to the Royal Ensigns, in the Fourth Quartering and also on the sinister banner, for the first time since 1801.9 Once again, the upper curve of an Imperial Crown follows, with advantage, the curve of the coin.

Among the most satisfactory coins in the last decade, I would single out the Scottish £1 piece of 1994 designed by a Herald-Painter at the College of Arms, Henry Gray (pl. 15, 22). Here one has one of the only five examples of nomenclatural Arms in British heraldry, that is to say a design of Arms identified by a name, thus eliminating the necessity of description by blazon upon each occasion.10 ‘Scotland’, that is to say a Lion rampant within a double Tressure flory counter-flory, appears on this coin. As a Tressure always follows the outline of the available space of display, so on this coin it is shown in a completely circular fashion. The rampant lion fills out, but does not overcrowd, the area within the double Tressure. The result is a clear, simple and direct identification of the northern part of Great Britain.

May we now pass on to consider some heraldic seals, both their impressions as well as their matrices. The work of the celebrated seal engravers, the Wyons, is well displayed in the 1911 Great Seal Depute for British Columbia (pl. 16, 23), where the Supporters – a Wapiti to the dexter and an Ovis Montana ram to the sinister – are used with great effect by Allan Wyon, where he has them spill over, so to speak, onto the legend band, which gives a vigorous three-dimensional character to the total design.11 Oddly enough, whilst the Shield of Arms was completely legitimate – having been laid down by Edward VII in 1906 – the Supporters, highly suitable though they were from the heraldic point of view, were nevertheless completely unauthorized, as was the Crest. As will be seen, the latter is the Royal Crest of Dominion and Sovereignty of general purpose for the United Kingdom. Notwithstanding – though I am sure for the most loyal of motives – it was used as the Crest of Dominion and Sovereignty of particular purpose, and so a solecism of the first order. These additions were the result of the interest of the Reverend Arthur John Beanlands, Rector and Canon Residiatory of Christchurch Cathedral, Victoria, a local heraldic enthusiast. In fact, it was not for another eighty or so years that matters were put right by a Royal Warrant of Her present
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6 CA: 163/125.
9 CA: 136,73–5, Proclamation dated 1 January 1801.
10 By way of complete contrast consider Polish heraldry, which is almost entirely nomenclatural. For further details of this matter see Sir Conrad Swan, KCVO, Garter Principal King of Arms ‘English heraldic art in the 20th century – some thoughts by Garter’, lecture delivered at the Royal Castle, Warsaw 27 September 1995 and to be published in the journal of the Polskie Towarzystwo Heraldyczne (The Polish Heraldry Society).
11 For a full discussion concerning the Arms and Seals of British Columbia see Swan, as in n. 2, pp. 179–89.
Majesty which assigned these Supporters.\textsuperscript{12} The same Crest was added, but suitably differenced with a wreath of Dogwood – the Provincial flower – about the lion’s neck, thus rendering it particular to British Columbia and removing the solecism.

As the penultimate seal example, may I draw to your attention one which I feel sure you will agree merits special attention (pl. 16, 24). This is the Great Seal of the Commonwealth of Australia of Her Majesty as Queen of Australia – a seal brought into use upon the advice of Her Australian Ministers. It has been engraved in an extremely clear manner both as to the armorial as well as its literal details. However, when viewed from strictly heraldic and constitutional points of view it is indeed an enigma.

In the centre one notes the Arms of Dominion and Sovereignty of general purpose of Her Majesty in right of the United Kingdom, ensignied by a Royal Crown in its Imperial form (incidentally, not favoured as a matter of personal choice by the present Queen). Such Arms are borne not only in respect of the United Kingdom, but also of all dependent territories which do not have Arms of their own. This inclusion is despite the fact, on the one hand, of the Statute of Westminster, 1931\textsuperscript{13} which recognised Australia (among others) as a sovereign, independent state, and on the other hand the existence of Arms for the Commonwealth of Australia since 1912.\textsuperscript{14} Possibly the central Arms on the seal were advised upon the affectionate and loyal, yet mistaken, assumption that such are the hereditary, familial and so personal Arms of the Sovereign, whereas they are, in point of fact, essentially Arms ex officio.

Yet again, the six shields, representing the six States and placed behind the central Royal Arms, are somewhat confusing. Starting at 1 o’clock, so to speak, they are: New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania, South Australia and Victoria, respectively. The Shield of Arms of New South Wales is absolutely correct as laid down by Royal Warrant.\textsuperscript{15} That for Queensland (at ‘2 o’clock’) ignores the historic Arms of this State\textsuperscript{16} and has placed part of its Crest onto a shield which is an excruciating solecism. Indeed, it is analogous to showing a head and labelling it ‘the torso’. Western Australia, represented by shield number 3 at ‘5 o’clock’, had no authorized Arms at this time, although the use of the Cygnus atratus, the Black Swan, was a long-used device representative of this area. In point of fact Arms for this State were not established until much later (1969).\textsuperscript{17} Shield number 4 at ‘7 o’clock’ for Tasmania is devoid of the Arms already officially assigned of that State,\textsuperscript{18} and the design shown on the seal comprises an unauthorized extraction of one of the charges from the official flag of the Governor. South Australia, at ‘9 o’clock’, does have its Arms\textsuperscript{19} displayed, but in a most curious manner: the shield of Arms upon a roundel and this in turn upon another shield. The normal way would have been to display the Arms throughout the larger shield available, as in the design for New South Wales at ‘1 o’clock’. Victoria, at ‘11 o’clock’, fares little better. Its duly authorized Arms,\textsuperscript{20} ensignied by a Crown, are cramped within a second shield. Once again, the treatment should have followed that employed for New South Wales. So one can only say about this Great Seal, one is surprised, and that if cataloguing it would be tempted to place it in the section marked, \textit{collectanea heraldica et curiosa} (!)

Finally, it occurred to me that you might care to see the original design for my own official seal as Garter Principal King of Arms, designed in 1992 by John Bainbridge, one of the senior herald-painters retained by Officers at the College of Arms (pl. 16, 25). To the dexter are the Arms of Office marshalled, to the sinister, with my family Arms. The shield is ensignied by the

\textsuperscript{12} Royal Warrant was signed by H.M. The Queen at the Law Courts, Vancouver, 15 October 1987, with Dr. Conrad Swan, York Herald of Arms, in attendance.
\textsuperscript{13} 22 Geo. V. c. 4.
\textsuperscript{14} CA: 1 76.270 dated 19 September 1912.
\textsuperscript{15} CA: 1 75.61 dated 11 October 1906.
\textsuperscript{16} CA: 1 71.62 dated 29 April 1893.
\textsuperscript{17} CA: 1 83.172 dated 17 March 1969.
\textsuperscript{18} CA: 1 77/293 dated 21 May 1917.
\textsuperscript{19} CA: 1 80/232 dated 20 November 1936.
\textsuperscript{20} CA: 1 76.30 dated 10 June 1910.
crown of a King of Arms traditionally composed, it is thought, of Acanthus leaves. The crown is actually worn at the Coronation of a Sovereign – however, just to keep the Kings of Arms humble the rim is inscribed: MISERERE MEI DEUS SECUNDUM MAGNAM MISERECORDIAM TUAM (!) In order to fill up what might otherwise have been awkward spaces on either side of the shield, Bainbridge proposed my own Crest which, as a Sparrowhawk, displays itself easily to dexter and sinister. The artist has added a simple, straightforward legend. John Bainbridge started life in the Department of Inland Revenue, but then discovered that he had a soul, and proceeded to become, slowly but surely, a first-class heraldic artist. The matrix (illustrated in reverse, pl. 16, 26) shows how this heraldic design was realised in metal – the touch of wax remaining in the wing of the hawk gives, you may agree, being the devotees of the sphragistic that you are, the sting of the existential, as Jean Paul Sartre would say, to this final illustration.

There then Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen are a few thoughts on ARS HERALDICA IN METALLO, especially with regard to numismatics and sphragistics; of the requirements of heraldry, and of how best these may be met if the functional purposes of heraldry, that is to say **identification**, is to be met – noting some disasters on the way – in various cases, mostly of the 20th century.

**KEY TO THE PLATES**

1. The Bretigny Seal of Edward III (1360).
2. The complete armorial achievement of an untitled, armigerous gentleman, comprising: Shield of Arms, Crest, Helm, Mantling and Motto (Author’s Collection).
3. The Armorial Bearings of a Baronet with the augmentation of the ‘Bloody Hand of Ulster’ on an inescutcheon, and with the visor of the helm open (Author’s Collection).
4. The Arms of a Peer, showing Supporters to which such are entitled – a design for a Stall Plate.
5. The Arms of a Knight Grand Cross with the entitlement of Supporters for life – an Order of the Bath Stall Plate.
6. James VI and I (College of Arms Record M7 folio 46v).
7. Victoria upon Her accession (College of Arms Record: 151, 131).
8. George V (Order of the Bath Stall Plate).
9. 1983 £1 coin design by William Gardiner (Royal Mint).
10. 1983 £1 coin designed by Eric Sewell (Royal Mint).
11. Victoria ‘Shield Sovereign’ (Royal Mint).
12. Jamaica 1884 Penny (Royal Mint).
15. Pattern Shilling 1925, approved 1927 by Kruger Gray (Royal Mint).
18. George VI Crown, 1937 by Kruger Gray (Royal Mint).
20. Canada 1913 Ten Dollar piece (Royal Mint).
22. 1994 Scottish £1 (Royal Mint).
23. 1911 Great Seal Depute for British Columbia (Author’s Collection).
24. Elizabeth II Great Seal of the Commonwealth of Australia (Royal Mint).
25. Design by John Bainbridge for the seal ex officio of Sir Conrad Swan, KCVO, as Garter Principal King of Arms (Author’s Collection).
26. The Matrix (shown in reverse) of the seal ex officio of Sir Conrad Swan, KCVO, as Garter Principal King of Arms (Author’s Collection).
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SWAN: ARS HERALDICA (3)