THE collections of medals formed in Great Britain prior to the foundation of the British Numismatic Society in 1903 were most frequently, during the eighteenth century at least, the result of a gentlemanly pursuit and sometimes led to substantial numbers of pieces being held by their owners. Collections such as those formed by Sir Hugh Percy, first Duke of Northumberland (1715–86), and his Duchess, Elizabeth (1716–76), and those later assembled by Hyman Montagu (c.1845–95), J.G. Murdock (d. 1902) and R.W. Cochran-Patrick (1842–97), Permanent Under Secretary for Scotland 1887–92, not only gave pleasure to their owners, but sometimes led to important research and substantial catalogues. The auction catalogues of these collections are frequently used by cataloguers as a quick check on identity, rarity and possible value.

Cochran-Patrick’s *Catalogue of the Medals of Scotland*, published in Edinburgh in 1884, was based on his own collection with additions from other sources such as the national collection at Edinburgh and medals owned by other collectors. As a result, his catalogue is universally quoted as a reference. The significance of this work is that it was the first attempt to catalogue all the medals of Scotland, not only what one might term ‘historical medals’, but also local and miscellaneous pieces. Whilst this work has never been superseded, certain pieces such as the coronation medals or those connected with the Jacobite cause listed therein have been the subject of further research and discussion by members of the British Numismatic Society. Of this, more later.

A work of similar nature but of much wider content is that universally known as ‘MI’, an abbreviation for the catalogue entitled *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland to the Death of George II*, compiled by Edward Hawkins (1780–1867), Keeper of Antiquities at the British Museum (1826–60) and President of the Numismatic Society of London, later the Royal Numismatic Society.

The work undertaken by Hawkins originally concluded with the reign of William III and was partially based on his own collection, acquired by the British Museum in 1860. This catalogue, on being submitted to the Trustees of the British Museum, was rejected by them, and publication was refused owing to a number of views expressed by the author in the historical notes. In 1864 the Trustees, in view of the importance of the work, re-considered the matter and agreed that, subject to the author’s consent to revisions to the text being made by W.S. Vaux (1818–85) and A.W. Franks (1826–97), they would agree to publication. Franks, then assisted by H.A. Grueber (1846–1927) (*Pl. 14b*), brought the work up to the end of the reign of George II.

The labours of Hawkins in compiling the work, whilst being considerable, were somewhat restricted in that the only foreign collection he examined was in the Bibliothèque National at Paris. When Franks perceived this, he obtained the permission of the British Museum Trustees to spend part of his vacations abroad for some years studying other important collections, in the anticipation of locating further medals which should be included in the work. This resulted in a further 446 pieces being added up to the death of William III, where the work as originally conceived by Hawkins was intended to end. There were fewer additions for the reigns of Anne to George II.

The two volumes of text finally saw publication in 1885 and with the subsequent fascicules of plates published in 1911 completed the work, which has never been superseded and is likely to
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3 For a more detailed explanation of the disagreement between Edward Hawkins and the Trustees of the British Museum see: David Pickup, ‘Edward Hawkins and Medallic Illustrations’, *The Medal* No. 16 (Spring 1990), 48–52.
remain the most comprehensive and valuable source of information for British medals of the period. Prior to the dedicated work of Hawkins, Franks and Grueber, no other catalogue of British medals existed over such a wide field, and their research was the forerunner of more detailed enquires later on. Although the authors of both *Catalogue of the Medals of Scotland* and *Medallic Illustrations* published their work earlier than the period under review, their research is of such importance that it would be impossible to consider what followed without taking their findings into account.

When writing the preface to *Medallic Illustrations* Franks noted in the opening sentence: ‘Since 1802 when the second edition of Pinkerton’s *Medallic History of England to the Revolution* was published no general work has appeared on English Medals.’ The publication of *MI* some eighty years later rectified this. In the introduction to the same work the author notes (p. xxii): ‘Subsequent to 1760 there are, besides a large series of historical medals, a vast number of portrait medals, school prizes, medals of learned societies, temperance societies and political and other medalets. Their number is, in fact, so great that they are double those of all previous periods put together.’

For fifty years this fact served to deter numismatists from attempting to catalogue British medals from 1760. It was not until 1936 that Colonel M.H. Grant (1872–1962), a member of the British Numismatic Society since 1938, had accumulated sufficient information to begin publishing a list of such pieces, many of which he owned himself. This list, which appeared in various *British Numismatic Journals* between 1936 and 1941 was, as Col. Grant himself acknowledged ‘but a bare catalogue, the mere bones of a corpus. Including as it will some 7,750 medals, any description, let alone illustration, would have swelled the work to unprintable dimensions’. Grant’s work, despite being simply a list, stating subject and medallist (where known) arranged in chronological order, is nevertheless useful in that it enables the numismatist to check whether Grant was aware of the piece, and who he believed the medallist to be. If necessary, research may then be taken further by consulting the Ashmolean Museum, which purchased Grant’s collection in 1953.

A gap of almost forty years now ensued until, in 1980, the author of this present paper was able to bring to the press the first volume of his trilogy *British Historical Medals, 1760–1960*, volume I, *The Accession of George III to the Death of William IV*, published by B.A. Seaby Ltd, London. This work, which attempted to follow the general lines of *Medallic Illustrations*, with descriptions, historical notes, rarities, provenances of medals and medallists, was begun about 1966 and required many hours of labour in museums and thorough checking of private collections. Volumes II and III were published in 1987 and 1995 respectively.

The author was quick to agree with Col. Grant that unfortunately it would be impossible to list each and every medal struck in Britain since 1760 if publication were to be envisaged. Grant listed almost 10,000 medals and some would have to be omitted. The pages in the three volumes entitled ‘Notes on using the Catalogue’ establish the criteria for the nearly 5,000 medals which are included. I leave others to pass judgement on the merit of the work.

A work of a more specialised content comprises the three volumes cataloguing British and foreign naval medals compiled by the Marquess of Milford Haven (1854–1921), published in 1919, 1921 and 1928 respectively, the last being brought to the press by his son after the death of the Marquess. The volumes published in 1921 and 1928 catalogued the foreign portion of the work whilst that published in 1919 dealt with the British medals. The completed work is a very important contribution to the corpus of writings on naval medals and the events which led up to the striking of them. A significant portion of the volume devoted to British medals deals with those commemorating the victories of Admiral Vernon at Portobello and Cartagena; the medals illustrated are of good quality and skillfully chosen, since most examples are found in poor condition.
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Milford Haven, as a devoted collector of naval medals, a Fellow of the Royal Numismatic Society and Honorary Member of the British, was a careful recorder of objects but, of course, errors have crept in and one wonders whether he sometimes accepted the medals and other pieces that he recorded simply at face value. A case in point is, perhaps, the copper (and in one instance, silver) medals which are assumed to have been awarded to those ‘volunteers’ who tended the furnaces that produced the red hot shot at the siege of Gibraltar in 1779–83. An alternative suggestion, made by John Tamplin, is that they were simply souvenirs to be purchased by members of the garrison.6

These medals, crudely made and engraved, are individually named to ten men who supposedly tended the furnaces, but I now raise the unwelcome question of whether they are in fact genuine or a product of the late nineteenth century. I have had an interest in the subject for nearly forty years and have been quite unable to find any contemporary evidence for the existence of the ‘Fire Workers Volunteer Company’; they are not mentioned in any of the accounts of the siege written by officers who were present. Furthermore, a conversation in the 1970s with the curator of the Gibraltar Museum established that he had never heard of them either.

One of the most enthusiastic members and prolific contributors of papers to the Society’s Journal was Miss Helen Farquhar (1859–1953), who was elected to the Society in 1903 and eventually became an Honorary Member. In November 1905 she read a paper to the Royal Numismatic Society on the subject of Nicholas Hilliard, in which she discussed the ‘Peace with Spain’ medal of 1604.7 She would, therefore, have been very interested in a die which, unknown to her, had lain in the Museum of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society at York since 1851, having been presented by a York solicitor, John Seymour. Owing to the ill-health of the curator, the significance of the piece was overlooked, it simply being described as a ‘Seal of Queen Elizabeth’. This piece was the subject of a study by Craig Barclay and Luke Syson in 1993. and has been shown by them to be the obverse die for the medal of Elizabeth, Countess Palatine, c.1613, also by Hilliard.8 It is the earliest known British medal die.

Farquhar’s largest contribution was her scholarly survey of the ‘Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs on their coins and medals’, which appeared over seven volumes of BNJ between 1908 and 1915 and ran to some 515 pages.9 In this work, in which Farquhar drew upon references as diverse as the Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Pepys’s Diaries and the Stuart Papers, we are treated to a fascinating survey of the portraits on coins and medals from the reigns of James I to Queen Anne.

It is here suggested, for example, that the silver clichés of Stuart sovereigns are by John Roettiers rather than by his son Norbert. This is a subject to which she returned, briefly, when recording in BNJ 16 (1921–2) the discovery of a thin silver portrait of Charles II in a Hampshire country house, thus completing the series of royal clichés.10

The first of Farquhar’s papers appeared in volume 2 (1905) of BNJ and was a forerunner of the series dealt with above. ‘Portraiture of the Stuarts on the royalist badges’ begins with the disclaimer, ‘The indulgence of the Society is requested for one of the most unlearned of its members . . .’. We may think now that this was too modest an assertion but it was doubtless polite at the time. In this work Farquhar seeks to answer the questions, ‘Can we determine the exact date of these badges? Did Rawlins make use of Van Dyck’s and other pictures for his designs? Are any of the badges taken from the frontispiece of Eikon Basilike?’ and ‘What is the origin of Stuart portraits of the two Simons?’ The conclusions arrived at for the first two questions ‘place most of Charles I’s badges between the years 1640 and 1650, inclining to the period, specially for
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Rawlins' work, when the Queen was with her husband at Oxford from 1643 to 1644 . . .

The dates for the attribution of the Charles I badges in general are now placed somewhat later (1649–60) in the catalogue The King’s Head, Charles I: King and Martyr by Jane Roberts, accompanying the exhibition by the Royal Collection in 1999. Regarding the question as to whether Rawlins made use of Anthony van Dyck's portrait, Farquhar notes that after 'careful examination of the prints after Van Dyck, I have satisfied myself that the reverse of Med. III. 1, 357–222, is identical with one of the most pleasing of Sir Anthony’s portraits of Henrietta Maria . . . whilst the obverse, though in a less marked manner, bears a close resemblance in nearly every detail to the full-length picture of Charles I in armour at the Hermitage . . . painted in 1638'.

Among the many badges which were of interest to Helen Farquhar, the 'Forlorn Hope' medal of Charles I was the subject of a paper she read to the Royal Numismatic Society on 16 October 1930. The badge is recorded as having been intended to be awarded to participants in the 'Forlorn Hope', which comprised detachments of men who acted as vanguards or rearguards in royalist skirmishes. Helen Farquhar appears to have been the first numismatist to draw attention to the erroneous identification of this piece in MI. The compilers of Medallic Illustrations had identified the 'Forlorn Hope' medal by Thomas Rawlins as having a portrait of the King on the obverse and of Prince Charles on the reverse (MI.i. 301/122). The subsequent entry (MI.i. 302/123), entitled 'Military Reward', describes a cast oval badge with the conjoined busts of the King and Prince Charles on both obverse and reverse, while adding in the textural note below the description that the museum also possessed a stuck impression from the die, being incuse on the reverse. This is the piece Helen Farquhar identified as the correct 'Forlorn Hope' medal, drawing on her researches in the first volume of Lord Crawford's bibliography of proclamations and at the Bodleian Library. As a result of a study carried out by Edward Besly, published in the journal of the British Art Medal Society in 1991, it has been brought to a wider audience that the original attribution to MI 301/122 was incorrect. Besly has confirmed that an irregularly shaped uniface piece which was offered in a Glendining auction on 16 March 1989 (lot 62) was, as the cataloguer Daniel Fearn proposed, a completely original 'Forlorn Hope' badge. The collection whence the piece came had been formed over many years and included a large number of pieces from the Tudor period onwards. A printed Warrant for the silver badges for the Forlorn Hope with an illustration of the irregularly shaped piece is in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the badge offered in the Glendining sale is now in the National Museum of Wales, thus bringing to a happy conclusion an important piece of research.

In 1916 Farquhar submitted a paper to the Royal Numismatic Society in which she contributed to the debate on the method of manufacture of the plaques and counters of Simon Van de Passe. Here she entered an area which has always been controversial and which only comparatively recently may finally have been settled. It is frequently asserted in auction catalogues etc. that the large (48 mm x 59 mm) beautifully made plaques are 'stamped in the manner of engraving'. This was offered as the method of manufacture by H.A. Grueber in his introduction to Medallic Illustrations of British History. In a paper presented to the Royal Numismatic Society by G.F. Hill, he discussed the two alternative methods of manufacture, i.e. striking or engraving by means of a transfer; he favoured the latter in view of the damage that would occur to the fine lines on the dies during striking. Farquhar agreed with Hill.

In the May–August 1902 number of The Connoisseur, the magazine published an article entitled 'On portrait medals or plaques in silver by Simon De Passe and Michel LeBlond', contributed by Alfred E. Copp, Honorary Treasurer of the Numismatic Society of London (in 1904 the Royal Numismatic Society). The view is expressed (p. 80) that, 'It is therefore concluded
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that dies were made for the plaques and counters, and that they were actually struck or stamped and not engraved whilst specimens are known which were undoubtedly cast.' A further unsigned article in the same magazine, December 1924, refers to the plaques as having been engraved. Leonard Forrer (Pl. 14a) expressed the view that they were 'engraved, or stamped in imitation of engraving'.

In a paper in the Numismatic Chronicle, Mark Jones records that he made a detailed examination of the gold example of the Simon De Passe plaque of Elizabeth l, previously ex Greta S. Heckett collection, sold at Sotheby's 25 May 1977, lot 210. He compared this with silver examples and reached the conclusion was that the gold example was engraved and the silver piece cast, but not from a mould taken from the gold plaque. An examination of the gold and silver examples of the James I medals in the British Museum revealed that they too were cast, but from the same engraved medal. Other Simon De Passe medals in the museum also proved to have been cast, and as a result the conclusion has been drawn that De Passe engraved models for his medals 'and, on occasion, directly engraved medals not intended for reproduction: the reproductive technique used in his workshop was neither stamping in imitation of engraving nor engraving, whether or not assisted by transfers, but simple casting.' Happily, through the exertions of Mark Jones we now appear to have a definitive answer to the question that began long before the British Numismatic Society was formed.

A subject of particular interest for Helen Farquhar comprised the medals and 'pattern' coins associated with the Jacobite cause. Consequently, when Grant Francis - President of the British Numismatic Society 1922–5, and author of a paper on 'Jacobite drinking glasses and their relation to the Jacobite medals' - suggested to Helen Farquhar that she should write a paper on the medals of the 'Young Pretender', she readily agreed. The result was an interesting and informative survey of these pieces which also touched upon the preparation of an engraved plate for banknotes and a number of prints of portraits of the Pretender.

The work done on Jacobite medals was later continued by Noël Woolf (1911–2001), elected a member of the British Numismatic Society in 1971. He contributed an authoritative paper entitled 'The sovereign remedy: touch pieces and the King's evil' and expanding the work carried out by Helen Farquhar in her paper 'Royal Charities' and in the article by Lt.-Col. Murray (1910–86) (Pl. 12b). Woolf's paper not only examined the circumstances surrounding the issue of touch pieces both in England and in France, but also contained detailed descriptions and weights, die linkages, etc., that appeared in a series of ten appendices. It must certainly be the definitive paper on such objects.

Woolf was, however, to return to the subject of touch pieces and paper money, albeit briefly, when he compiled his Medallic Record of the Jacobite Movement, a work in a somewhat similar style to Medallic Illustrations and British Historical Medals referred to above. The medals are catalogued in due procession with historical notes attached, and thanks to the author's patience and exactness the work is not likely to be superseded.

While dealing in particular with the research and resultant papers contributed to BNJ by members, it would not, perhaps, be inappropriate here to mention those papers submitted by Marvin Lessen, an American member elected in 1964. His work has centred upon seventeenth-century medals by Thomas Simon, in particular those issued during the Commonwealth period. One of these papers, 'The Cromwell Dunbar medals by Simon', is particularly valuable.
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the paper was published in 1982 it was difficult to judge whether an example was original, a later striking or struck from false dies, but now, referring to the detailed descriptions and with the aid of the enlarged photographs, a numismatist is able to identify the piece exactly. This type of information is particularly valuable when, as in this case, some of the dies (there are two sizes of medals) are probably still in existence and may therefore be open to further abuse.

In case it should be thought that too much time is being spent considering those papers that appeared in BNJ, and although this Centenary Volume is something of a celebration of the knowledge that has been propounded there, it is nevertheless appropriate to evaluate the medallic research published elsewhere.

Among the collections of English medals formed during the eighteenth century there would no doubt have been a number, possibly substantial, of medals engraved by John Croker, who in 1697 was appointed to the post of Assistant Engraver to the Mint and in 1705 to that of Chief Engraver on the death of Henry Harris. Croker was the subject of a paper read to the Royal Numismatic Society in 1852 and published in the Numismatic Chronicle that same year. He was also the subject of a paper published in The Medal in 1992, in this instance with regard to his designs for medals when Chief Engraver. The latter paper, by David Pickup, was the result of his study of the “Alchorne Manuscript” purchased by the British Museum in 1851 at the sale of the library of Stanesby Alchorne. Among the designs contained in this manuscript was one for the unsigned medal generally supposed to commemorate the Union of England and Scotland in 1707 (MI. ii, 298/115). Pickup suggests that, because of the position in the manuscript and the fact that it is undated and unsigned (more characteristic of Croker’s earlier work), together with the reverse imagery, it is more likely to commemorate the Accession of Queen Anne in 1702, as proposed by Van Loon writing in the eighteenth century.

There is some conflicting evidence, however, since the drawing for the medal in the Alchorne Manuscript is signed by Isaac Newton, approving the design and dating the MS 20 Feb. 1706/7. Pickup overcomes this by suggesting that a possible reason for the date is that the medal was re-issued along with others at a later date and that it was at this stage that approval was required. The earlier date for the medal proposed by Pickup is an interesting one. Certainly the medal at 70 mm is one of the largest in Croker’s œuvre, and this may lend weight to such a large and imposing piece being struck for an equally important occasion such as the Accession.

When considering British medals of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, four names immediately come to mind: Pinnock, Pingo, Küchler and Wyon. Much has been written about Pinnock, in particular his relationship with the Royal Mint and his delay (until 1849) in producing finished dies for the Waterloo medal, for which he had been asked to submit designs in 1816. His medallic work has been extensively studied by Graham Pollard, and Leonard Forrer’s entry for Pinnock in his Biographical Dictionary of Medallists leaves little to be desired, so it was with keen anticipation that one examined the corpus of Pinnock’s wax models published in 1989. The work included models for the Waterloo medal and for several medals that were never completed. The hope was, as far as the present writer is concerned, that the corpus would shed some light on the so-called Laudatory Medal (my appellation) of 1824 (BHM 1221) with the neo-classical portrait of George IV on the obverse and the trident and dolphins on the reverse. Alas, the author simply follows BHM, so that my contention that the Earl of Sandwich’s title “Greek Independence and naval help from England” is incorrect still appears to be valid. Forrer,
in his *Biographical Dictionary of Medallists*, simply thought that it was an unsuccessful speculation of the manufacturers, Rundell, Bridge and Rundell, and it is possible that the question would only be resolved if their accounts books were to come to light.

In addition to his writings on Pistrueci, Graham Pollard has extensively studied the documents and working relationships between Matthew Boulton and the foreign artists he employed at his manufactory at Birmingham. The first of these papers was published in the *Numismatic Chronicle* in 1968 and dealt with Boulton and J.P. Droz. The study by Pollard was especially important since, although the Boulton papers in the Assay Office, Birmingham, had previously been studied for their value in technical and economic history, their worth as a source of information concerning the striking of coins and medals had been virtually ignored. What emerges from this fascinating study is a tale of acrimonious disagreement between Boulton and Droz over claims made by the latter, particularly in the matter of the multiplication of dies, which had to be settled by arbitration. James Watt, in a letter to Boulton, condemned Droz’s behaviour and ceased to be Droz’s friend. That Droz was an engraver of considerable ability is not in doubt and may be seen in the first medal upon which he worked at Birmingham, to commemorate the return to health of George III in 1789 (*BHM* 311). This occurs in a variety of metals: gold, silver (some with the edge gilt), bronze, bronze gilt, white metal and Barton’s metal (resulting from a process by which one metal is compressed onto another).

Following his study of the work of Droz at Birmingham, Pollard continued his research on the Boulton archive with a paper entitled ‘Matthew Boulton and Conrad Heinrich Küchler’ (fl. 1763–1820). Küchler worked for Boulton from 1793 until 1810 and was buried in the Parish of Handsworth, Birmingham, on 15 July 1810. The paper presents an in-depth study of Küchler’s work for Boulton, and Pollard opines that ‘his thirty-three surviving medals are worthy memorial (and) . . . show Küchler to be comparable with the German rococo engravers like Abramson or Loos’.

One of the medals that Küchler prepared for striking by Boulton was the piece commemorating the birthday celebrations for Queen Charlotte, celebrated at Frognmore House on 19 May 1795. This piece is unsigned, but Küchler’s accounts for 1796 state that on 10 May 1795 he delivered the dies for ‘a small medal of the Queen with reverse Frognmore’. The reverse of this piece is sometimes found muled with the obverse bearing the head of George III by Droz, and perfectly illustrates the value of the research carried out by Pollard in that he notes, ‘In common with coins from the Soho Mint, the medals were restruck after the death of Küchler. The restrikes were produced both before and after the date of the auction sale of the Mint in 1850 . . . and the only Küchler medal which cannot have been restruck is that for the Radnor Jubilee (No. 34) for the documents show that the dies were cancelled on completion of the order.’ Although the restriking of coins at the Soho mint has long been appreciated and is examined in detailed form in Peck’s *magnum opus* it is, I believe, the first time that this has been specifically noted for the Boulton medals, even though some numismatists were aware of the fact for many years. It seems a pity that more is not made of this when some of the Küchler medals are offered for sale.

The Royal Society of Arts, founded in 1754, has always been interested in medallic design and awarded medals as prizes for medal design and production between 1758 and 1765 and again from 1807 to 1847. The Society had always been concerned that the prizes that they offered were well designed and manufactured, and to this end they awarded premiums to various members of
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the Pingo family when wishing to commemorate British victories overseas. The medallic work of the Pingo family has long been appreciated, particularly so since three of them, Lewis, John and Thomas Jr, variously held positions as engravers at the Royal Mint and produced coinage dies, a much more prestigious task than engraving medals. One of them, Lewis Pingo, held the office of Chief Engraver from 1780 until 1815.

It had long been supposed that the Pingo family were perhaps of Italian origin and came to England circa 1742—5. A study of the Pingos by Christopher Eimer, in the form of a University of Leeds Master's thesis entitled The Pingo Family & Medal Making in 18th Century Britain, has shown by diligent work that the family probably came from Devon and the extent to which they dominated medall production in Britain. It is also noted that in the 1740s Thomas Pingo Jr established his own medal manufactory in London. The corpus of the Pingo work listed by Eimer encompasses not only coins and medals but also seals, gems, waxes, plasters, drawings and sketches and amounts to 236 entries. The resultant work, which must surely be definitive, can truly be said to be indispensable to the collector of British eighteenth-century medals.

It may be of value to record here that the Royal Society of Arts again entered the field in wishing to encourage medal design when in 1974 they agreed to include a medal design section in their Industrial Design Bursaries Competition. This was at the instigation of Peter Seaby, Chairman of B.A. Seaby Ltd., who were the sponsors of the award in the form of a travel bursary to the value of £1,000 p.a. The announcement of the prize was made in the pages of Seaby's Coin and Medal Bulletin.

Some work has been done on the subject of medals awarded as premiums. It has been carried out by several numismatists upon such disparate subjects as medals for the Royal Society of Arts, Royal Prize medals (i.e. medals paid for by the Privy Purse) and School Prize medals. Research on the latter subject carried out by Miss M.E. Grimshaw (1905—90) cast much new light upon the subject, not least upon the silversmiths who frequently produced items of great charm and delicacy. The slim volumes which were produced as a result of this work were published at Miss Grimshaw's own expense. Although this is possibly indicative of the difficulty of finding a publisher for works of such limited interest they are, nevertheless, of great value to numismatists.

Other numismatists had, of course, been interested in the subject of prize medals and included them in the corpus of their work or their collections. Montague Guest (1839—1909), for example, had some in his collection, which he presented to the British Museum in 1907 on the condition that a catalogue of it was published. His wishes were carried out and the result came to press in 1930.

More or less contemporary with Montague Guest was a collaboration between W.J. Davis (1848—1933) and A.W. Waters (1869—1962) who, in about 1898, began to catalogue the tickets and passes issued in Great Britain. This work was published in 1922 and included many prize medals, 582 of them being for schools.

Prize medals featured – if only as a relatively small part – in the catalogues of medals relating to medicine. Very little research has been carried out in Britain on this subject, generally entitled Medicina in Nummis. However, it has been extensively and thoroughly detailed by Dr Eduard Holzmair (1902—71) in his catalogue of the Brettauer collection, and by Dr Malcolm Storer (1862—1935), who completed and published in 1931 the work begun by his father, Dr H.R. Storer.
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The latter’s collection comprised some 4,000 medals and the final catalogue contained nearly 8,000 entries. Between them Holzmair and Storer have very well covered the subject, and references to their works are made wherever and whenever medical medals are examined.

Until 1996 relatively little work had been done on City Livery Company badges, although in May 1933 Alan Garnett read a paper on them to the British Numismatic Society. The information that was forthcoming here was duly published and has since served as a useful source of information on this interesting if obscure subject. Some sixty years later Livery Medals were the subject of a paper given to the British Art Medal Society and published in their journal in 1997. These pieces, which were issued to all liverymen upon election, are of a wide variety of styles but always bear the arms of the Company and, most frequently, the liverman’s name. They were issued to identify the liverman as he entered the Hall, and it seems that the Vintners Company was probably the first to adopt this practice. Many of them are attractive pieces. Not all Companies issued badges, and it probably came as some surprise to the audience present at the meeting that there are some sixty-two Companies that have distributed these medals and thirty-eight that have not. This is probably a subject which would benefit from further research and, perhaps, the production of a corpus.

When considering the Wyon family and the research that has been carried out on them, it is worth remembering that this was an extensive family both in this country and abroad and that many of them were very talented engravers. The Wyon family in England could boast of having in the family as employees of the Royal Mint two Chief Engravers, two Chief Engravers of Seals and two Engravers. Of all these, William Wyon (1795–1851) was arguably the most talented and was the subject of a book by the antiquary Nicholas Carlisle (1771–1847).

A survey of the Wyons in a chapter entitled ‘The Wyons and the age of New Classicism’ is to be found in Mark Jones’s The Art of the Medal. The same author also contributed a paper on William Wyon at an international congress in Italy in 1981. The author of these works has been closely connected with the numismatic world since his years in the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum and is a founder member of the British Art Medal Society, the principal activity of which is to encourage, develop and support the practice and study of medallic art. It is good to see that Mark Jones, despite his work-load latterly as Director of the National Museums of Scotland and now as Director of the Victoria and Albert Museum, can still find enough time and energy to continue his close interest in medals.

It is occasionally stated of some books that they are ‘monumental’ and that the author has made ‘a real and lasting contribution’ to knowledge of the subject dealt with in their pages. This appellation could hardly be more apposite than when it is given to the massive work undertaken by Leonard Forrer (1869–1953) entitled Biographical Dictionary of Medallists, Coin- and Seal-Engravers, Mint-Masters &c. ancient and modern with references to their works B.C.500–A.D.1900.

This began life as a series of articles in Spink’s Numismatic Circular in May 1898 and continued regularly for the next thirty years. The eight volumes published between 1902 (with a
revised volume one in 1904) and 1930 have since proved an extremely valuable source of information, many of the entries contained therein being scholarly assessments of the work of engravers or medallists. One can only be astonished at the diligence required to produce such a work and to contemplate how difficult the work of a numismatist would be without it.

This work, which was undertaken during a distinguished career as a professional numismatist, was in addition to the other papers that he wrote on a variety of subjects, and a measure of its value is that it has been reprinted several times. Despite its undoubted excellence, Forrer’s work suffered from the drawback of having no subject index. This was recognised by Mrs Joan Martin (d. 1985), who for some ten years worked on compiling such an index in addition to her other duties at the British Museum. During the six months or so that I spent at the BM on the preliminary work for British Historical Medals, Joan and I worked at the same desk, which was already overflowing with her index cards. She later helped considerably by providing information for the textual notes for BHM, and it would have been much the poorer without her contribution. The subject index to Forrer’s work that Joan Martin produced was modified during typesetting, and the resultant work was published in 1987 as a joint Special Publication of the Royal Numismatic Society and the British Art Medal Society, thus enormously increasing the usefulness of Forrer’s work and its value to numismatists.\(^58\)

It is appropriate to mention here another extensive work of a somewhat similar nature to Forrer’s Biographical Dictionary of Medallists. In 1960 through the pages of Seaby’s Coin and Medal Bulletin there began a series of articles which were to last until 1976 and which subsequently saw publication in book form.\(^59\) This study, the life’s work of Roy Hawkins, sought to list all the British makers of metallic tickets, checks, medalets, tallies and counters manufactured between 1788 and 1910 and, where possible, to give a history of the maker. The painstaking and detailed research required to produce such a veritable mine of information on a scale something akin to Forrer’s work, and then to have it in a form suitable for publication in SCMB over a period of sixteen years, was enormous. The result, especially in its final book form, provides numismatists with information which is not readily available elsewhere and which, with Hawkins’s passion for detail, is likely to be entirely accurate.

It is possible that the name of G.F. Hill (1867–1948) will occur in other papers in this volume. However, it is relevant to mention here that, in parallel with his other interests, he was fascinated by mediaeval and Renaissance Italy. As a result he was the author of a number of works on Renaissance and other aspects of numismatics, of which his Corpus of Italian medals of the Renaissance before Cellini could be said to be his most indispensable.\(^60\) In 1912 Hill was appointed Keeper of the Department of Coins and Medals, and in 1931 he was appointed Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum. He was knighted in 1933, the culmination of a distinguished career. It was during his office as Keeper that Hill was called upon to serve as a member of a committee to judge the designs for the First World War Memorial Plaque. Some of his views on the venture, especially the dealings of the War Office with the inventor of the means by which the names of the casualties had to be shown individually on some 800,000 cast plaques, make interesting reading and expose bureaucratic muddle. No doubt Hill was thoroughly exasperated by it all. Present day numismatists are grateful to the editors of The Medal for publishing an extract from Hill’s fragmentary autobiography.\(^61\) This subject was enlarged upon by Philip Dutton in his paper ‘The Dead Man’s Penny’.\(^62\)

The series of medals that were presented to North American Indian Chiefs have received little attention from numismatists in this country, although a paper by Charles Winter appeared in BNJ


\(^{60}\) British Museum, London, 1930 (2 vols).

\(^{61}\) Vol. 8 (Summer 1986), 25.

in 1929.63 Subsequently, further papers by M.A. Jamieson appeared in *Spink's Numismatic Circular*, and these were published in book form in 1936.64 The medals bear the portrait of a British monarch and were officially presented to those Chiefs whom the government deemed worthy. The medals appear to have been first issued during the reign of George I, and the last were presented to Chiefs who concluded Treaty No. 11, the Treaty of the River Mackenzie in Canada, in the reign of George V. Jamieson’s work on this subject has since served as an adequate list of such pieces.

However, the Indian peace medals of George III have in recent years been researched in more depth by John W. Adams, an American collector of part North American Indian descent.65 Much new material has come to light and Adams has tackled his subject, not unreasonably given his ancestry, from the Indian point of view. His chapter dealing with the ‘historical context’ and the people concerned on both sides of the Atlantic makes fascinating reading, especially for some of the views expressed. He notes that these ‘enduring silver symbols ... were awarded with greater or lesser ardor [sic] depending upon British perception of their own needs’. His research shows that these pieces are probably much commoner than would appear to be the case and he believes, therefore, that there are still many medals awaiting discovery. The results of Adams’s research were published in a handsome octavo book with deckle-edged, mould-made, watermarked paper. Here he enters into much greater detail than Jamieson and is able to differentiate between several reverse die varieties of a particular medal. Fortunately for the user, Adams gives a concordance with Jamieson’s work. Diameters and weights of the known medals are quoted together with a register of the pieces. One hopes that, in view of the exhaustive manner in which Adams has treated his subject, he will pursue his studies further and in due course deal with the Indian Chief medals issued prior to the reign of George III.

In concluding this review of the advancement of knowledge in the Society’s field of interest – in this case medals – since the foundation of the Society, one must pose the question, ‘Who were the numismatists who contributed the most in this field?’ The answer is, to a certain extent, subjective. If one allows the fact that it was Franks and Grueber who finally saw publication of the plates of *Medallic Illustrations* in 1911, these forming an intrinsic part of the text published in 1885, then Hawkins, Franks and Grueber must qualify as having made some of the greatest contributions. Without their combined efforts our knowledge of British medals up to 1760 would be very incomplete, and they provided the foundations for extensive further research. One should also include Helen Farquhar. The depth of her knowledge, particularly of the badges and medals of the Stuart period, must make her an obvious candidate. It would be impossible to produce a paper on subjects within her sphere of interest without reference to her scholarly work. And then there is Leonard Forrer, the author of the comprehensive eight volumes of *Biographical Dictionary of Medallists* which have enabled numismatists to check on engravers, medallists, die-sinkers, mintmasters and the like, ancient or modern. Forrer’s devotion to his subject has made research very easy for his successors, and we must be grateful to him as we are to all the other numismatists who have contributed so much to present day knowledge.

---

65 John W. Adams, *The Indian Peace Medals of George III or His Majesty's Sometime Allies* (California, 1999).