PORTRAITURE OF THE STUARTS ON THE
ROYALIST BADGES.

By Miss Helen Farquhar.

The indulgence of the Society is requested for one of the most
unlearned of its members, whilst calling attention to a
romantic—one might almost say sentimental—branch of the
numismatic art, i.e., the royalist badges of Charles I. and
Charles II.

It will be said, and it is quite true, that everything which is worth
knowing about the subject is contained in *Medallic Illustrations of
British History* and the beautiful series of plates now being issued to
complete the same. But I will disarm criticism, on this point only, by
beginning with my expression of very great obligation to that book—
to the officials at the British Museum, and above all, of my most
grateful thanks to Mr. Grueber, for the invariable kindness and
patience with which he has greeted all my enquiries and striven to
enlighten my ignorance.

I have, however, thought that this Society might care to consider
a collection of some of the badges of Charles I. and Charles II., whilst
I offer a few remarks about their makers and origin, striving to
elucidate the following questions amongst others:—

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*?

What is the origin of Stuart's portraits of the two Simons?

The object of issuing these badges of the Stuarts was twofold.
Firstly, Charles I. bestowed them on his followers, in acknowledgment
of services rendered to him. Secondly, after his death, they were distributed to keep alive in the hearts of his people any remnants of loyalty to the Stuart cause.

No doubt Charles II.'s badges were designed to revive the interest of the country in his claims, and were mostly issued about the time of the Restoration or shortly after his father's death.

The earliest badges we have, which could have been intended as rewards for services, are those of Elizabeth and James I.; for the medallic art had made so little progress in England in the earlier half of the sixteenth century, that those few portrait medals of Henry VIII., of Philip and Mary, etc., which may be studied in the galleries of the Victoria and Albert Museum, the British Museum or Hertford House, could only have been intended for private distribution, and even they are mostly the work of foreign artists, such as Jacopo da Trezzo, etc.

Elizabeth's beautiful badges—probably of English execution—though they may have been given as presents to her favourites, were most likely intended also for naval decorations, as some of them commemorate the defeat of the Spanish Armada. The most beautiful of these, "Dangers Averted, 1589," Med. Ill., 1, 154-129, must excite our admiration, and though some of those badges, at one time supposed to be Elizabethan, are now declared to be of later date—the authenticity of No. 129 is undoubted, although the name of the artist is not known.

Coming now to the days of the Stuarts, we may say of James I. that his badges, whether naval decorations, or intended for private distribution, are mostly of Dutch origin, though a very interesting example (cast to commemorate the "Attempted Union" between Scotland and England in 1604), which has lately come under my notice, is no doubt of British work. This badge, Med. Ill., 1, 194-17 (of which only two examples in silver are at present known), has a very fine decorative border, and is therefore more beautiful than the copper example in the British Museum.

We do not, however, now propose to tarry with Elizabeth or James—although their decorations are comparatively rare—but we must pass on to the days of Charles I., when badges were so freely
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distributed that they might almost be said to be within the reach of all who cared to possess such a portrait of the King.

It is said that Charles I. is the earliest English monarch of whom it is specially recorded, that he ordered a badge to be made as a military decoration. We read in the Numismatic Chronicle, where an engraving of the badge and a description of the warrant deposited in the Heralds’ College may be found, that the King commanded Rawlins to make for this purpose “a medal in gold for our trusty and well-beloved Sir Robert Welch, knight, with our own figure and that of our dearest sonne Charles; and on the reverse thereof to insculpt ye form of our Royal Banner used at the battail of Edgehill.” Welch had distinguished himself at this great battle, on October 23rd, 1642, where, according to the warrant, “he did us acceptable service, and received the dignity of knighthood from us.” This medal is described in Med. Ill., 1, 302–124, and the “acceptable service” is there defined as the rescue of “the standards of the King’s own regiment” and the capture of “two pieces of cannon and the Earl of Essex’s waggon.” Now we know that no fewer than four guns were taken from the enemy and forty standards, also that “Essex’s own coach” was carried off by a party of horse the day after the battle, but with regard to the rescue of the “royal banner,” a better known story is that of Captain Smith, who also was knighted and received a gold medal bearing this same trophy on the reverse. Sir Edmund Verney, the King’s standard bearer, being mortally wounded, Colonel Middleton of the Parliamentary army, grasped the banner and retreated with it to the secretary of Essex, in whose charge he left it. Captain John Smith and two others, of whom Welch must have been one (though neither Whitelock, Clarendon nor Ludlow give his name), appropriated orange-tawny scarves from the dead adherents of Essex (whose colours they were) and thus disguised, rode through the enemy. Smith, after telling Secretary Chambers that it was not fit a “penman” should bear so honourable a trophy, snatched it from him, the brave cavaliers fighting their way back to the King, at whose feet the gallant Captain

placed the recovered treasure. Sir John Smith was killed at Cheriton-Fight on the 29th of March, 1644, and is said to have fallen wearing his medal suspended round his neck by a green ribbon. Whether the decoration either of Welch or Smith still exists I cannot say, but of that bearing the name of Welch we read in Medallic Illustrations, modern imitations have been made by using for the reverse the engraving shown in the Numismatic Chronicle, vol. xv, p. 80, and for the obverse the portraits of the King and Prince copied from Med. Ill., 1, 302-123. This number 123 was hurriedly executed, and is not at all a good example of Rawlins's work, indeed it would be unfair to judge of his talent therefrom; but certainly as we see it placed in the United Service Exhibition, next to some of Simon's fine works, with their very superior finish, it excites our interest more than our admiration.

Charles, however, issued a really fine badge (one of Rawlins's best efforts, now extremely rare) in the year 1643, as a military reward, "to be worn on the breast of every man, who shall be certified under the hands of their Commanders-in-Chief, to have done us faithful service in a forlorn hope." This, Med. Ill., 1, 301-122, bears a reverse specially interesting, as showing one of the few really good медалlic represen-

![Portrait of Charles I, by Rawlins](med. ill., 1, 368-253)

1 Clarendon, p. 480. Ludlow, vol. i, p. 110. Clarendon says that Sir John Smith was a brother of Lord Carrington.
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ations of Charles II. in his early youth, and a fine portrait of Charles I. on the obverse. The latter portrait reappears in Med. Ill., 1, 368–253, and, by the favour of Mr. Talbot Ready, I am able to reproduce it here.

This is a thin embossed plate in very high relief—more probably intended to decorate some *article-de-vertu* than the person of a warrior. The presentment of the Prince is also to be found unaccompanied by his father’s portrait, Med. Ill., 1, 371–262 and 371–263. But there are other decorations specially designed for the King’s soldiers, such as Med. Ill., 1, 299–118–119 and 302–123 (before mentioned), and yet more medals may have been intended for the same object. I have even seen (at the United Service Exhibition) badges bearing the portraits of the King and Queen placed amongst the military rewards.

It is said that such badges were sometimes cast in lead or pewter, and in the absence of uniform were distributed to the common soldiers, to distinguish them from the king’s enemies, for although in most cases the different regiments wore clothing of one particular colour, the King and Parliament alike had a *red* regiment, etc., and many corps wore buff-coats; it was therefore necessary to assume the colours of the commander, as we have seen was the case in the story of the orange scarf worn by the men under the generalship of Essex. Whitelock indeed tells us, that at that time “any setting up another colour were held malignants.”1 We might suggest that possibly these badges may have been attached by a coloured ribbon—like the “green watered ribbon” of Sir John Smith, or worn in the hat, like the white cockade which distinguished the parliamentary troops at the battle of Marston Moor, where Sir Thomas Fairfax only escaped and passed through the enemy by pulling the tell-tale badge from his hat. If these pewter medals were distributed in any great numbers to the King’s men, we must attribute their excessive rarity to the fact, that the soft metal portraits being easily defaced, they were no doubt, after a time, thrown away as worthless, but a carefully treasured example of Med. Ill., 1, 354–215, now in my hands,

1 Whitelock’s Mem., p. 62.
corroborates this report of their distribution. It was given by Charles II. to Richard Penderel in recognition of the latter’s services, in aiding the poor young King in his escape in 1651, after the battle of Worcester. The tradition in the Penderel family ran, that in presenting this token, Charles said it was one of the badges worn by his father’s soldiers, to distinguish them from the parliamentary troops, and that he, having nothing else about him, gave it to Richard Penderel, that he might present it to the giver, when he came to the throne, and he would remember him or his son, and put him into the army, or give him some post about his person.

This being done, at the Restoration, Penderel was made one of the King’s body guard, and the badge was preserved in the family till 1884, when it passed into the hands of a friend of my own, from whom I acquired it. How Charles came to have the medal about him is not stated, but it is of course possible that he treasured this common badge worn by one of his soldiers, because it bore the portraits of the late King and of the Queen.

But it was not only amongst the followers of Charles that such memorials were found, cast also in various metals; the victory at Edgehill being claimed by both sides, a similar course of decoration was pursued by the parliamentary leaders; indeed Essex actually adopted in *Med. Ill.*, I, 300–120, the reverse of Charles’s Edgehill medal (*Med. Ill.*, I, 299–119) for the obverse of a military reward to be given to the King’s adversaries. Again, Essex at various times bestowed medals with his own portrait, on the troops over whom he had been
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appointed Commander-in-Chief at the commencement of the Civil War, see Med. Ill., 1, 296-113 to 298-117.

By favour of Mr. S. M. Spink, I illustrate a fine example of Med. Ill., 1, 295-113.

These medals were also struck in gold for the superior officers; of course such are rare, but there is one of them in Mr. Spink's collection. There are also portraits of Lord Fairfax, who commanded the forces in the North, of Lord Manchester, Med. Ill., 1, 309-137

BADGE OF THE EARL OF MANCHESTER, PARLIAMENTARY GENERAL.
MED. ILL., 1, 309-137.

(again illustrated from Mr. S. M. Spink's cabinet) and of other officers of the parliamentary army, see 303-125 to 305-128, 310-138 to 311-139, 329-170 and 332-176, etc.

Some of the badges issued by the son of Lord Fairfax—Sir Thomas Fairfax, who succeeded Essex in the chief command in 1645, are of very fine workmanship by Simon, see Med. Ill., 1, 317-149 to 319-153. Amongst these, Mr. Spink has kindly given me the opportunity of illustrating Med. Ill., 1, 317-150.

BADGE OF SIR THOMAS FAIRFAX, PARLIAMENTARY GENERAL.
MED. ILL., 1, 317-150.
Simon and other artists executed many medals for the Parliamentarians, some of them the bitterest opponents of the King, but neither Essex, Fairfax nor Manchester were amongst these personal enemies. It is true that they took up arms against their lawful sovereign, but Essex lost the confidence of his party, and resigned his command the year before his death, which occurred in 1646. Fairfax refused to take part in the King's trial, and afterwards aided in the Restoration, whilst Manchester also actively participated in the arrangements for the recall of Charles II., and even subsequently took office under the Crown. But enough of the parliamentary badges—we cannot study these in any detail now, as I proposed only to treat of the portraiture of the Stuarts.

It is difficult to assign an exact date to other badges of Charles than those specially made to commemorate some battle, or the sad memorials of his death.

It would be interesting if we could trace any of those with portraits of the King on one side, and of the Queen on the other, to the period of their marriage or of the coronation; but this cannot be for several reasons, of which one alone, that they are mostly by Rawlins, may be sufficient. Some authorities indeed place the birth of Rawlins "about 1600," but the National Biography gives the date as 1620 (with a query, it is true), and Rawlins, if born in 1620 (?) was at the time of the King's marriage a small child; but even when the artists responsible for the badges are unknown, the dress worn by the King and Queen, in most instances, almost proves that the work cannot have been executed before 1630, at the earliest—probably not then.

The date selected by most museum authorities is 1649 (the time of the King's death)—the Hertford House catalogue hazards "about 1630"—but for reasons that I will give, I should (though I may be wrong) place most of Charles I.'s badges between the years 1640 and 1650, inclining to the period, specially for Rawlins's work, when the

1 The badges of Essex and Manchester are not now attributed to Simon, though Vertue so attributed them.
Queen was with her husband at Oxford from 1643 to 1644, at which time the medallist was working at the mint in that city. Henrietta left England in February, 1641-42, and excepting for the brief period I have mentioned, she would not have been within the reach of Rawlins as a model, until he himself went to France in 1648, as from 1644 onward her exile continued till after the Restoration. Of course this fact proves nothing, as it is extremely likely that many of the badges were executed from pictures—indeed I shall endeavor to show that Med. III., 1, 357-222, was taken from one of Van Dyck's portraits. But the Henrietta Maria of the well-known signed badge by Rawlins, Med. III., 1, 354-215, and of the rest of the series with the same effigy of the Queen (wearing the fashions of about the years 1640 to 1644) does not bear, as far as I can trace, any marked resemblance to Sir Anthony's pictures, though the portrait of Charles on the obverse reminds us of the fine three-fold presentation of the King, painted by Van Dyck to assist the Italian sculptor Bernini in 1638, in the production of the bust, which was unfortunately lost in the fire at Whitehall in January, 1697-98.

I should be inclined to think from the fashion of the Queen's dress that this series was designed in 1644, or a little earlier. The

---

1 Walpole says this bust was either stolen or consumed. The King gave Bernini a thousand Roman crowns to make it, and it realized £800 at the sale, 1650-53. In 1822, this picture, now in the Royal Collection, was bought for £1,000 by George IV.
National Biography says that Rawlins made a badge of the King and Queen in 1644, but does not say which badge.

With regard to the King's marriage and coronation, the former took place by proxy in Paris, in May, 1625, and Henrietta arrived in England in the June of that year; the rough little marriage medal, *Med. Ill., 1, 239-3*, which I here illustrate, shows the ruff and high collar worn by men and women respectively at that time.

The coronation took place in February, 1626, but the Queen was not crowned with her husband owing to differences of creed, Henrietta,
or her religious advisers, objecting to the Protestant ritual, so there is no special reason why we should expect to find her portrait, issued together with that of the King, in the form of a badge to be worn at, or in commemoration of the ceremony.

The rough cliche of Charles, *Med. Ill.*, 1, 243-11, here shown, was hurriedly executed by Briot, probably for distribution at the coronation:

![Cliche of Charles I., by Briot.](image)

but though two such thin plates were occasionally set back to back in a metal rim, so as to form a badge, and this shell may have been intended to be worn thus, we know of no numismatic portrait of Henrietta Maria in the Medici collars of the time, which would correspond in fashion with her husband’s ruff, except *Med. Ill.*, 1, 240-6, a charming thin cliche, but too big to be mounted with Briot’s shell of the King, though doubtless executed about the same date; and a very rough little copy of the same, which in its turn is too small for the purpose and was possibly meant for a counter. I have seen this little portrait of Charles used as the lid of a box to contain such counters, as is the case with some similar thin medalets of Charles II., and Catherine,¹ made at the time of their marriage—but these are rather

![Jetton of Queen Henrietta Maria.](image)

¹ See *Med. Ill.*, 1, 987–106.
less fragile, and I think the cliché of Charles I. was possibly intended to be mounted in some fashion and worn.

I give an illustration of the jetton of Henrietta Maria; it was in the Montagu collection, and Mr. Montagu, in a note in his own copy of *Medallie Illustrations*, expresses his belief that these thin pieces were not meant for personal adornment, but for use as counters; on the other hand, the well-known series of counters in the style of Passe which portray both King and Queen in the early fashions of the time of their marriage, and again in 1638, were of a more serviceable thickness. To return to the undisputed badges of the royal pair. The only examples in which either Charles or his wife appears in the high collar and ruff, respectively, are (as far as I know) the fairly common, but pleasing little *Med. Ill.*, 1, 358-224, here shown, and the unique (?) *Med. Ill.*, 1, 348-203, with Charles in the radiate oval; but both these reverses have for obverse the well-known head of the King, which is seen on the commonest of all his badges—see *Med. Ill.*, 1, 361-233, with the royal arms as reverse, also *Med. Ill.*, 1, 364-244, with the very rare reverse of three crowns and many other
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reverses, some showing the Queen, after she has discarded the high collar, *Med. Ill.,* 1, 357-223, and others, originally the work of Rawlins, but often roughly copied by inferior artists.

A head of Charles I.¹ of the same type as that on these badges (but larger), appears on the lid of a box in my collection containing counters said to have been executed about 1636, see *Med. Ill.,* 1, 383-288 and 380-282. Rawlins at that date may only have been about sixteen years old and possibly not a very finished artist. The bust is like that on the memorial medals, *Med. Ill.,* 1, 372-265 to 374-268, and others. Rawlins possibly elaborated it later in his pattern broad and the famous Juxon medal, or again the box and counters may not be quite of the same date (this I consider far more likely), but the portraits on the counters certainly point to about the year 1636, and this head might be the first attempt of Rawlins at portraying the King, the badges and memorial medals being made afterwards as required. Charles wears the plain turned-down collar, not in regular use till 1631, so it is probable that the maker of these badges, whenever designed, modelled his early portraits of their Majesties on these reverses from pictures painted before 1630 to 1632, combining them with an obverse executed after that date, and if they are the work of Rawlins, not before 1636 at the earliest. I say "probable" not "certain," because there is one medalet actually dated 1625 in which Charles appears in a turned-down collar (it is *Med. Ill.,* 1, 239-2), but with this exception, as far as I know, "the

¹ I have seen this head of Charles combined with an early bust of Henrietta (*Med. Ill.,* 1, 358-224) used in the binding of a book dated 1643.
falling band, the new mode succeeding the cumbersome ruff" as Evelyn has it, is first seen, numismatically speaking, on Briot’s Dominion-of-the-Sea medals, of which I give examples, Med. Ill., I, 257–42 and 43, to illustrate my point. These medals were both executed in 1630; one shows the King in the “falling band,” the other in the “cumbersome ruff,” but we must wait for the year 1631 to see the turned-down collar portrayed on the coinage, and though Mytens painted Charles in that year in the “new mode,” there is a picture by Van Dyck as lately painted as 1632, in which the King still wears the earlier fashion, though Henrietta is shown in the more becoming falling lace collar; ergo, we must date the change from ruff to collar from 1630 to 1632. The remaining portraits of the Queen, some of which I exhibited to the Society, and others which I regret to say I do not possess, all portray the fashions in vogue between 1632 (when Van Dyck first painted her), and the time of the King’s death, i.e., either the almost high lace-trimmed bodice, which immediately succeeded the Medici collar, or the very low-necked dress with or without drapery on the shoulders, or falling lace collar as seen in these later pictures. In one of these, Med. Ill., I, 358–226, here shown, of rather poor workman-

BADGE OF CHARLES I. AND HENRIETTA MARIA, AFTER LEMON (?)

MED. ILL., I, 358–226.

ship, the Queen is seen in the very stiff low bodice, which, according to one of Wenceslaus Hollar’s old fashion-books of prints (which I have examined in the British Museum), was in vogue in 1644. This badge has the same obverse (a portrait of Charles) as Med. Ill., I, 363–241, by some attributed to Simon because it bears the initials T. S. It is, however, not at all like Simon’s work, but I have seen, and by permission of Mr. S. M. Spink reproduce, an unpublished little medallion with the same obverse, but no reverse, also signed T. S.,
which is of rather finer workmanship. Might this possibly have been the original, and the others inferior copies? It is unlikely Simon

should have worked for the King at so late a date as 1644, but he might have designed the little medallion earlier, afterwards to be copied in the form of a badge.

Now to return to Med. Ill., 1, 357–222. I cannot help thinking that the resemblance between this representation of the royal pair and Van Dyck’s pictures is too marked to be accidental. Sir Anthony resided almost entirely in England from 1632, when he succeeded...
Mytens as Court-painter, till 1641, in which year he died, and during that time he painted no less than thirty-six portraits of Charles and twenty-five of Henrietta Maria. With some, at least, of these pictures, Rawlins and other medallists must have been familiar.

By a careful examination of the prints after Van Dyck, I have satisfied myself that the reverse of *Med. Ill.*, 1, 357–222, is identical with
one of the most pleasing of Sir Anthony’s portraits of Henrietta Maria, now in the Royal Portrait Gallery at Dresden, see p. 257, 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 at St. Petersburg painted in 1638. It also reminds us of Lord Spencer’s portrait of the King, and is, except in the lace-trimmed collar, even more like the picture in the possession of Lord Pembroke at Wilton, of which there is a copy by old Stone in the National Portrait Gallery.

Now if, as I suggest, Rawlins took these pictures for his models, he most likely designed the badge between 1638—the probable date of their production—and 1649, when on the death of the King, the Council of State decided on the sale of the greater part of Charles I.’s magnificent collection of art treasures. It took more than three years to disperse the contents of nineteen palaces, and the catalogue alone took a year in compilation. When Cromwell came into sole power, wishing to preserve for his own use the furniture and valuables at Whitehall and Hampton Court where he resided, he put an end to further sales, even, as Walpole tells us, refusing to give up to the purchasers some of the goods already sold. Numbers of foreign potentates bought the wonderful works of art collected by Charles; Christina of Sweden, according to Clarendon, became possessed of the best medals, and only 400 of the 1,200 catalogued in 1649 were still to be found in the King’s library in St. James’s at the Restoration, and these unfortunately were lost in the fire at Whitehall, whither Charles II. had caused them to be carried. These coins and medals were from the collection of Prince Henry, Charles’s elder brother, who made the twelve-year-old boy his heir, starting him on his career as a collector.

At the time of Prince Henry’s death, the collection was valued at about £3,000. At the sale the coins fetched on an

1 The Hermitage picture was in the Houghton Collection, sold to the Empress of Russia in 1780.

2 According to some authorities, twenty-four residences.

3 The last sale was in August, 1653.
average one shilling apiece, and the other works of art correspondingly low prices. Van Dyck's magnificent portrait of the Duke of Buckingham and his brother realised only £50, and Raphael's cartoons were bought by Cromwell for £300. Walpole¹ tells us that the whole sale produced no more than the sum of £118,080 10s. 6d., but he says that the catalogue, from which Vertue obtained these figures, had thirty or more missing pages, and may therefore not have comprised all the plate and jewels—some of the latter had been already sold, the Queen had managed to rescue a certain portion, and undoubtedly some precious things were embezzled and concealed—but Richard Symonds, on the authority of the Clerk of the Committee at Somerset House, tells us that all the King's goods were appraised for the sale at £200,000 only, the prices being fixed, and few higher bids being made. Probably the sums were approximately based on the prices paid by the King, but we must remember, that when Van Dyck received no more than £20 or £40 for a picture, he was also in the enjoyment of a salary as Court-painter. The Council of State showed its extraordinary ignorance of the real value of these treasures in thus dispersing them by forced sales, and in consequence, many of them were lost to the country for ever, for though at the Restoration, many of the pictures secured by the adherents of the late King were returned to Charles II. (alas! some of them to perish in the fire at Whitehall²) not one of the foreign Princes—as Clarendon says with regret—"ever restored any of their unlawful purchases to the King after his blessed Restoration."³ But I must not let my interest in Charles I. as a collector in general carry me too far from the works of Rawlins in particular, whose productions we were endeavouring to trace to their original source and date.

In 1641 appears the first badge signed and dated by Rawlins, *Med. Ill.*, 1, 289–103, namely, that of William Wade, but as this medal was not cast for Charles, the politics of Wade being in opposition to the King's, this fact gives no information as to the exact time when

² In January, 1697–98.
³ See Clarendon's *Rebellion*, vol. iii, 203.
Thomas Rawlins began to work for him, though we have mentioned a portrait possibly executed in 1636 by this artist. Again, the badge, *Med. Ill.*, 1, 293–108, cast to commemorate the Declaration of Parliament of May, 1642, proclaims the words of the King’s antagonists, as the legend round the bust of Charles, *Should hear both houses of parliament for true Religion and subjects freedom stand*, was the advice given to the King by his Commons, and not that of Charles to his people; but the legend, which is seen on *Med. Ill.*, 1, 293–109, with almost the same bust, *Pro Religione Lege Rege et Parliamento*, embodies the famous declaration at Wellington, of September, 1642, and is in substance, though not in exact words, the same as the motto used by Charles on his Oxford and other coinage of about 1642, *RELIG. PROT. LEG. ANGL. LIBER. PAR.* When addressing his officers before the battle of Edgehill, the King said to them, “I have written and declared, that I always intended to maintain the Protestant Religion, the Privileges of Parliament and the liberties of the Subject,” and thus these words carry us on to the Edgehill medal (October, 1642), *Med. Ill.*, 1, 299–119, with the same portrait of the King which reappears with the royal arms as reverse in *Med. Ill.*, 1, 360–232, of which I have a fine example, and much more commonly as seen on *Med. Ill.*, 1, 355–216, with reverse the same portrait of Henrietta Maria which
we have discussed on No. 215. This suggests to us that 1642, when Rawlins was working for the King at Oxford, is a possible

date for the series of Med. Ill., 1, 354–215 and 355–216, and similar busts of Henrietta such as 355–217 with Charles in arched crown on obverse, or again 355–218, also amongst my selection, where the King appears laureated; but we must remember that if these badges were indeed executed after February in 1642, it must have been from a picture that Rawlins obtained his bust of the Queen, because of her absence from England already referred to. This obverse of Med. Ill., 1, 354–215, also reappears with many reverses, of which the commonest perhaps is Med. Ill., 1, 360–231, having for reverse the royal arms; of this also I am showing a fine example.

Many of the badges I have described have floral borders, and there are others also—too many to mention—which are very decorative
in themselves, and if publicly worn, could not fail to attract attention; but as a rule, of more modest proportions are the memorials of the King's death.

Under the rule of Cromwell, it was not desirable to advertise the loyalty still felt by Cavaliers for a lost cause, and many tiny badges form a pathetic contrast to those of the King's predecessors: the favours of good Queen Bess had been proudly displayed upon breast or hat; no one was then desirous of concealing his loyalty; thus (with the exception of one very small piece, Med. Ill., 1, 182–185, probably intended for insertion in a ring), all that Queen's badges were of a nature to attract attention. Of course, some of the decorations of King Charles were similarly fine, and were no doubt bravely displayed by a few proud souls, but far more of very small size exist, some even hiding away the portrait as a sacred relic in a little heart-shaped box, which might be worn, without danger of calling attention to the politics of the wearer. Some of these may be seen at the British Museum, and two, the property of Mr. Berney-Ficklin, exhibited at the United Service Museum, and again, those we saw in the Murdoch collection, sold in June, 1904, all bear inscriptions, alike in loyalty, but varying in curious spelling and form of expression, such as, I live and dy in
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loyalty; Prepared bee to follow me; I mourn for monarkey; Ichabod; Quis tempery a lachrimis (sic); and the like mournful mottoes. Many are engraved with the date of the King's death, January 30th, 1648, according to the reckoning then in use, the year 1649 beginning with March 25th.

The portrait contained in all these little boxes is the same as that which I am showing as 249A (as Med. Ill., i, 366–249, but without any reverse), which still bears traces of the black enamel, with which the field of these little memorials was often covered, in sign of mourning. The same obverse appears on my unique silver-gilt example, Med. Ill., i, 366–249,¹ which I showed to this Society in 1904²; it is here illustrated and has now appeared amongst the plates of Medallic Illustrations at the British Museum; it is interesting inasmuch as all traces of a specimen with C.R. uncrowned on the reverse, had been lost sight of for some years before it came into my possession, and it was only known from a drawing by Pinkerton, see Medallic History, Plate XIV, 6. The same type of obverse is seen with reverse C.R. crowned in the gold specimen, Med. Ill. i, 366–248, shown at the same time at the Society's meeting and also reproduced here; and at the British Museum I have seen it with other reverses; it is a beautiful little portrait,

¹ See note to Med. Ill., i, 366–249.
the work of Rawlins. Mr. Berney-Ficklin at Whitehall exhibited a
very fine specimen, enclosed in a heart-shaped crystal locket, the

badge being surrounded by a lock of Charles I.'s hair given by his
son Charles II. to Barbara, Duchess of Cleveland; this I understand
from the owner has no reverse, but the other side, being covered by
a curl cut from the head of Princess Elizabeth, daughter of the
elder Charles, is not available for general inspection.

These are the smallest of all Charles I.'s badges, but there are
others not much more obtrusive, such as Med. Ill., 1, 345–197, here

shown: and others of almost similar type, bearing pathetic emblems
taken from the Eikon Basilike. No. 197 has for reverse a skull
between C.R., above, a celestial crown and GLORIA; and below, an
earthly crown and VANITAS; the legend is BEATAM. ET. ETERNAM
SPLendidam. AT. GRAVEM—"I receive a blessed and eternal crown,
I relinquish one splendid, but burdensome," reminding us of almost the
last words Charles spoke upon the scaffold, "I go from a corruptible
to an incorruptible crown, where no disturbance can be." A note in
Med. Ill., 1, page 345, to badge 196 (which is of the same type as 197,
only with border), gives the following passage from the Eikon Basilike.
"I shall not want the heavy and envied crowns of this world, when
my God hath mercifully Crowned and Consummated His graces with
Glory, and exchanged the shadows of my earthly Kingdomes amongst men, for the substance of that Heavenly Kingdom with Himselfe"; but instead of referring the reader to the Frontispiece of the King's Book, we see "the device of the reverse is well illustrated by an engraved portrait of Charles, by White, published in Burnet's History of the Dukes of Hamilton." Now Burnet, writing in 1677, gives no clue to the origin of this picture (reproduced here as Plate I), merely prefixing it to some verses written by the King during his imprisonment at Carisbrooke Castle; consequently the impression left on the mind is that the picture was
Plate I.

Porcelain engraving of Charles I.

Plate from Burnet's History of the Dukes of Hamilton.
taken from the badge not the badge from the picture, as I venture to suggest. Most likely the reference to the History of the Dukes of Hamilton rather than to the frontispiece of Eikon Basilike was given because Burnet is easily consulted, whereas of the forty-six editions of the latter printed in English, in the year 1649 alone, many have no frontispiece, or have a totally different portrait of the King, and even when this symbolical picture is in place, there are no fewer than seventeen different versions of it—some indeed more like the badge than White's picture, but some which do not suggest it so well, and thus a reference to the King's Book might, if given, only puzzle the reader. The illustration on page 266 is from an edition of 1649, kindly lent me by Mr. Almack; this frontispiece (like that by Marshall, three-quarters face to right, which is probably better known, in that Mr. Edward Scott

![Part of Title-Page of a Rare Edition of Eikon Basilike.]

See Edward Almack's Bibliography of the King's Book.
reproduced it in his edition of 1880), has, clearly shown, the Gloria and Vanitas upon the two crowns rendered in the badge, though they do not appear in White's version, and we might be tempted to refer the skull itself to a rare title-page of an edition with Marshall's frontispiece, which, by the courtesy of a friend, I am able to show. This title-page has a skull below C.R., crowned, beneath the usual motto, Bona Agrere, etc. See p. 267. A similar emblem was occasionally used on the bindings; these bindings are rare and vary according to the art displayed by the individual binder. The plate given and Marshall's larger print (three-quarters to right) also have the rock buffeted by waves and winds, which forms the reverse of the badges (Med. Ill. 1, 341-190 and 342-191), known as Immota Triumphant. This device
PLATE II.

IMMOTA TRIUMPHANS BADGE. MED. III. I. 342-191.

PLATE FROM A RARE EDITION OF EIKON HALIKA HAVING THE PROFILE TO LEFT, LENT BY MR. EDWARD ALMACK.
is well seen in a large engraving (executed in Antwerp by Hertocks from a picture by Fruitiers), now in the Print Room of the British Museum; it has printed in the margin, "Place this figure in Eikon Basilike," and was used for a folio edition. Charles himself is said to have made the original rough drawing for the "emblem" picture, and it was engraved by Hollar and others; paintings were also made, and Pepys mentions having seen such a picture in a church in Bishopsgate¹ in October, 1664, and there is still an example in St. Mary's, Rotherhithe. Of the varying engravings, Mr. Almack tells us in his Bibliography of the King's Book that five are three-quarter face and twelve profile, mostly to right, but he speaks of one, profile to left, the King kneeling on both knees, the crown of thorns in his right hand. This last frontispiece, which by the kindness of Mr. Almack I am able to show as Plate II, might, I think (allowing for the necessary alterations to suit the scope of a badge, and Rawlins's superior knowledge of the King's features), have served the medallist as a model for the obverse of Med. Ill., 1, 342–191, the Immota Triumphans badge. This edition was printed in Paris in 1640, and Rawlins was in France at that time. I am showing an example of Med. Ill., 1, 342–191, on the same plate.

¹ Pepys says "went to a church in Bishopsgate, and there saw the picture usually put before the King's Book, up in the church, but very ill painted, though it were a pretty piece to see up in a church." Mr. Almack says this picture at St. Botolph's was afterwards destroyed, but I have ascertained that the example at St. Mary's, Rotherhithe, is still in good condition.
The reverse already referred to, "The Rock buffeted by the Winds," is a type of the King's fortitude, also commemorated on other badges, such as the two now illustrated, namely, the hammer striking a diamond on an anvil (Med. Ill., 1, 340-187), and the salamander amidst flames (Med. Ill., 1, 341-188), which by their inscriptions testify to the veneration in which the late King was held; these vary in size and do not belong to the tiny secret series.

Nearly all the Stuart badges are cast and chased; this naturally was convenient in the troublous times of the Civil War, when the King was no longer in possession of the Tower Mint, seized by the Parliamentarians in 1642. Moulds might easily be made from Rawlins's models, and should these moulds be broken or lost, they would readily be reproduced by making a fresh cast from a badge, though of course, in this case, the new issue would prove a little smaller than the original, from the shrinkage of the metal. It is possible also that Charles, great judge of art as he was, preferred the cast badge, for we must admit that the precision gained by the medals of James I. struck abroad by the mill and screw, was more than counterbalanced by the loss of the individuality imparted by the chasing of the master-hand, and also it was impossible with the limited knowledge of the new process then attained, to strike in very high relief. Successful as Croker was in the days of Anne in producing portraits struck in high
relief, this demanded great care, and each medal had to be struck again and again; even in the present days of accurate machinery, the war medals are struck no less than three times, and the French medallists are reviving the practice of casting, even reverting to the cire perdue process.

In the days of Charles I. it would have been difficult to produce a badge, excepting by casting, in high relief, such as the rare and beautiful Med. Ill., i, 357–222, with obverse, Charles in armour; reverse Henrietta Maria in high lace-trimmed gown. See page 258. A very fine example of this badge, lot 134 at the Murdoch sale, realized the sum of £9 5s. My specimen bears traces of much wear, and the long noses of both King and Queen have suffered in consequence, but we can still appreciate the admirable effect of light and shade given by the depth of the casting.

The art of casting medals was revived from the ancient Romans, or one might almost say, was invented by Pisano in Italy in the fifteenth century. He modelled his portraits in wax, prepared his moulds with the greatest care, and was able to produce those marvellous medals of Malatesta Novello and others, which we see in the galleries of the Victoria and Albert Museum, the British Museum and in the Wallace Collection, etc. In Queen Elizabeth’s time, though her badges were cast, an attempt was made to introduce at the Mint, under the Frenchman Mestrell, the new invention of the mill and screw to supersede the hammered currency, but according to Vertue,¹ “though the Queen and her Council liked well the way of making milled money within her Mint, when she knew that the Monsieur, who coined her money in the Mint, did also at the same time counterfeit and make milled money out of the Mint, all his friends could not save him, though he had many, but according to the strict laws of this nation, he was condemned to death and did suffer execution,” and the hammered coinage was resumed.

The next effort after a milled currency was made by Nicholas Briot, again a Frenchman, who having become acquainted in Germany with an improved method of striking money, and met with no encouragement

¹ Vertue’s Coin Medals, Great Seals, etc., p. 24.
in his own country, left his employment in France, and came to England in 1625. He was appointed chief engraver to the Mint in England in 1633, and Master of the Scottish Mint in 1635, having as early as 1628 been granted a privilege to design “the effigy of the King’s image.” He was most successful, as his fine coinage attests, in the use of his balance, but nearly all his medals were cast, and his unique badge of King Charles (now in the British Museum) with the incuse rose on the reverse, Med. Ill., 1, 364-246, is cast and chased.

Nicholas Briot produced a fine series of medals, and it is difficult to see why he was not more employed on the King’s badges, but little is known of him after the outbreak of the Civil War, subsequently to which calamity, the fashion of wearing such tokens of goodwill to the Royalist cause became general, and Briot, though he followed the King to Oxford, and died there in 1646, is said\(^1\) to have meanwhile returned for a time to France (1642 to 1643), and his place seems to have been supplied by Rawlins, who had studied under him. Walpole mentions a report that, growing old, Briot was made a poor Knight of Windsor, and was superseded unwillingly in his work\(^2\).

The practice of coining by the mill and screw was never thoroughly established till the year 1662, when Blondeau, who during the Commonwealth had, with Simon, endeavoured through much opposition, to produce a milled currency, was with the assistance of Roettier, commanded by Charles II. to prepare money by the improved process, but this referred only to the currency, and Charles II.’s badges, like his father’s, were nearly all cast and chased.

We must, however, note a few exceptions, one certainly in Med. Ill., 1, 453-38, see my specimen, which is struck and composed of two thin shells united by a metal rim; it usually has a ring for suspension, and so should be classed as a badge, though in my example, the ring is absent. It is one of the best portraits of Charles II., and was formerly attributed to Thomas Simon, but now to Rawlins. The reverse has three crowns hanging on the branches of a bare oak tree with the legend TANDEM REVIRESCET. “It

\(^1\) By M. Mazerolle, see Forrer’s Biographical Dictionary of Medallists.

will flourish at last" points to the expected Restoration, and reappears in a smaller size on the little cast badge, *Med. Ill.,* 1, 454-41, with crowned bust of the King for obverse, which I am also showing; it is rough and rather ugly, but rare. This design reminds us of the
dying admonition of Sir Thomas Wyndham to his five sons—"Though the crown should hang upon a bush, I charge you forsake it not." The father's behest was almost literally obeyed by Col. Francis Wyndham, when he helped in effecting the escape of Charles II. shortly after the famous Boscobel Oak incident. Three other of these five sons had done their part in dying, fighting for Charles I. The obverse of this small badge is the same as that seen on *Med. Ill.,* 1, 440-9 and 441-10, attributed by the new edition of *Medallic Illustrations* to Rawlins.

The fine uncrowned portrait of Charles II. on No. 38, may be seen again on *Med. Ill.,* 1, 454-42 with the extremely rare reverse, known as the "Dove and olive branch," of which I reproduce my
example, and also another on which it appears much smaller, *Med. Ill.,* I, 443–15, with the phoenix rising from the flames; reminding us of the perpetuity of the monarchical office, one king succeeding another, as the phoenix rises from the funeral pyre of its parent; this symbol had been already used on a badge of Charles I. in a much more elaborate form. It would be hard to say that any great artist executed the originals of the rougher types such as *Med. Ill.,* I, 454–42 and 440–9 here shown, but Rawlins was a very uneven worker,
Portraits of Charles II.

and no doubt also many inferior copies of his portraits were made for hurried and cheap distribution. A very hasty production of Simon's is the coronation badge Med. III., i, 473-77. I do not possess it, and I therefore show a fine example of the coronation medal, Med. Ill., i, 472-76, of which it is the rough copy.

CORONATION MEDAL OF CHARLES II.

MED. ILL., i, 472-76.

This medal, perhaps the most marvellously finished portrait ever produced by Simon, shows every feature of the King, even in the small figure on the reverse, and is amongst the most beautiful of all coronation memorials. Another fine portrait of Charles II., I should think the work of Simon, is Med. Ill., i, 445-21. My example has

BADGE OF CHARLES II. CROWNED.

MED. ILL., i, 445-21.

a plain reverse, but I have seen a specimen with the same bust on both sides, and again with the royal arms within a garter, or on a square shield crowned.

With few exceptions, there is little to admire in the portraiture of Charles II. on his badges; there are, however, a small number,
probably executed by Rawlins during his residence abroad in the early youth of the King, which are not unpleasing. Amongst these we may mention Med. Ill., 1, 439-6, which I am able to illustrate by kind permission of Mr. Berney-Ficklin, and another in my own possession, Med. Ill., 1, 438-3. These two badges are in high relief and of fairly good workmanship. The latter, though uncommon, is found with several differing reverses, of which one, showing two angels supporting a crown, Med. Ill., 1, 438-5, reappears with another obverse on Med. Ill., 1, 439-7, and again with a well-known bust of Charles on Med. Ill., 1, 444-18.

BADGES OF CHARLES II., CIRCA 1649.

MED. ILL., 1, 439-6.  MED. ILL., 1, 438-5.

BADGES OF CHARLES II. WITH ANGELS SUPPORTING A CROWN.

MED. ILL., 1, 439-7.  REVERSE OF 438-5,  MED. ILL., 1, 444-18.
439-7 AND 444-18.

I illustrate No. 7 from my collection, and No. 18 from Mr. Berney-Ficklin's. The reverse of the three last-mentioned badges has been described as reminding us of Blondeau's Common-wealth pattern halfcrown; this pattern I cannot trace. The date of the Restoration is given as that of most of Charles II.'s

1 Ramage's pattern has one angel guarding two shields, but this can hardly be meant.
badges. The fact that the King usually appears to be wearing his own very fine head of hair, instead of a heavy and graceless periwig, points to their having been executed at the latest before the year 1663 or 1664, at which time, according to Pepys,\(^1\) it was (on his hair turning grey) that the King adopted the already prevailing fashion. He says in 1663, "I heard the Duke of York say, he was going to wear a periwig and the king as well; I never till this day observed how grey the king was"; and again in 1664,\(^2\) "I saw the King in his periwig; but altered not at all." Nevertheless the fashion was very unbecoming, and Pepys says of James, "The Duke first put on a periwig to-day, but methought his hair cut short in order thereto, did look very prettily of itself, before he put on his periwig." This senseless custom was much liked by the "Round-heads" (so christened by Henrietta Maria) who were glad to escape from the sneers of the Cavaliers by covering their short locks, whilst their enemies in time, according to Miss Strickland,\(^3\) cut off their own envied lovelocks to put on the imitation "devised by rivals," and even women fell victims to this fashion. The custom of wearing periwigs was however popularized by the elderly courtiers of Louis XIV. of France, in admiration of the boy-king's beautiful flowing curls, and was probably brought to England by our exiles, who had taken refuge at the French Court, and adopted rather than "devised" by the Roundheads.

I have a little cliché, probably intended for insertion in a badge, which must be of later execution than 1663, as the periwig clearly appears in it; although very ugly, it is of some interest, as it is possibly

\[\text{Cliché of Charles II., Circa 1664.} \]

\[\text{MED. ILL., 1, 448–293.} \]

unique. It is from the Montagu collection, and I have followed Mr. Montagu’s example in numbering it, Med. Ill., i, 448-29A.

The badges distributed in celebration of Charles II.’s marriage, solemnized in 1662, are mostly so unpleasing and badly executed, that excepting for their historical interest, no one could wish to possess one, and I think the specimen here shown (Med. Ill., i, 483-96) is perhaps the ugliest of all, as the Queen appears in the hideous Portuguese fashions, which she discarded soon after her arrival in England.

Catherine’s one beauty, her magnificent mass of chestnut hair, was arranged in a sort of pyramid quite awry above her face, and spread out at the sides in wings—enclosed behind in a net—so that Evelyn on her landing says: “The Queen arrived with a train of Portuguese ladies in their monstrous fardingales, their complexions olivader and sufficiently unagreeable; her Majesty in the same habit, her foretop long and turned aside very strangely—she was yet the handsomest countenance of all the rest, tho’ low of stature, prettily shaped with languishing and excellent eyes, her teeth wronging her mouth by sticking a little far out—for the rest lovely enough.”¹ I fear the “handsomest countenance” was not much to boast of as the ladies to whom Evelyn preferred her are described by De Gramont,² as “six frights—her duenna another monster,” and he says, “the new Queen gave but little additional brilliancy to the Court.” Lord Dartmouth

speaks of her as short and broad, of a swarthy complexion, and having a front tooth which stood out and held up her upper lip, and Charles himself before he married her, told Colonel Legge that he thought "they had brought him a bat instead of a woman, but it was too late to find fault, and he must make the best of a bad matter."

So plain was Catherine, that such slight consideration as Charles showed her was matter of comment amongst his courtiers; but with all his faults the "Merry Monarch" was, as Burnet says, "the best bred man of his age," and treated his wife with a certain measure of courtesy, if not with any constancy. We must perhaps except the matter of Lady Castlemaine's appointment as Lady-in-Waiting when he pretended to think his marital authority was called in question. Poor Catherine was so anxious to obtain and retain her husband's favour, that she shortly adopted the English fashions, and appeared with her hair unbound, to Pepys' admiration: "the Queen looked, her hair dressed à la negligence, mighty pretty," donning the extremely low gowns with which Sir Peter Lely has made us familiar; to this period we owe some slightly better marriage badges, but they are mostly of poor workmanship. The little heart-shaped boxes remind us by their form of Charles I.'s memorials, but they proudly display on the outside the portraits of the King and Queen, as they appeared in 1662, in all their ugliness, for neither was Charles II. handsome. As a baby he was so plain, that his mother, writing to a friend, refuses to send his picture because he is "so dark and ugly"; and grown to manhood, on being shown a portrait of himself, he exclaimed, "Oddsfish! I am an ugly fellow!" whilst Sheffield, Duke of Buckinghamshire, speaks of his "most saturnine harsh countenance" as being a curious contrast to his "merry and merciful disposition." The limits of a badge are such as not to be affected by figure, otherwise we must admit that in this particular, Charles II. was better looking than his father; the first Charles was not above middle height, and a weakness in the legs from which he suffered as a child, was still perceptible in his manhood in a slightly crooked knee, whereas Charles II. was 6 feet 2 inches in height—the proclamation for his arrest after the battle of Worcester,

1 Note in Burnet, vol. i, p. 315, 1833 ed.
when £1,000 was offered for his apprehension, describing him as "over 2 yards high" and "la Grande Mdlle." when he was first in France, speaks of his good figure and carriage.

Although we cannot therefore entirely attribute the marked superiority of the majority of the badges cast for Charles I. over those of Charles II. to the more pleasing appearance of the former King, we must admit that Rawlins in the father had a better model than in the son. We cannot perhaps suppose, that Charles I. and Henrietta Maria were as handsome as Van Dyck, with his idealizing brush, would give us to understand, but the remarkable beauty of the King's expression is perceptible on all his coins and medals; indeed Evelyn in Med. Ill. 1, 346–199 by Norbert Roettier, says, that of all the portraits of Charles this medal is "incomparably the most resembling his serene countenance, when in his princely vigour," though I need hardly call attention to the fact that this representation of Charles I. executed by the Dutch artist during his residence in England after the Restoration, does not bear the same stamp of evidence as to the King's appearance, as would a portrait for which he had himself posed as model.

Henrietta, though far less amiable than her plainer daughter-in-law, created a very much more favourable impression on her arrival in England. Holland had written to Charles from Paris, before her marriage, describing her as the sweetest creature in France, and calls her "that young lady, that is for beauty and goodness an angel," and though the vivacity of her temper was well known, it did but add brilliancy to her appearance. At the time of her marriage she was only fifteen, and the smallness of her stature made her look still younger. On her landing she seemed to Charles taller than had been reported, and the story is told that, he scanning her from head to foot, she guessed that he suspected her of wearing high heels, and exclaimed, "Sir, I stand upon mine own feet, I have no help by art, thus high I am, and neither higher, nor lower." Her great beauty lay in her large expressive eyes. Howel writes of her, "She hath eyes that sparkle like stars, and for her physiognomy she may be said to be a mirror of perfection," and another writer in a private letter says, "I went
to Whitehall purposely to see the Queen, and perceived her to be a most absolute delicate lady—all the features of her face much enlivened by her radiant and sparkling black eyes."

But apart from the question of the appearance of the respective royal models, may I suggest that the fact of the usual superiority of the badges cast for the first Charles is probably due to the interest taken by the King himself in the numismatic art. We know that he had a fine collection of coins—even corresponding concerning them with the keeper of his medals during the time of his captivity in Carisbrooke Castle—that he was in the habit of carrying certain medals in his pocket at all times, see note to Med. III., 1, 265-59 on the Scottish Coronation medal, "much worn in his Majesty's pocket" (Harl. MS. 4718, f. 23) and two rival gold pieces have been put forward as the last gift of the King to Bishop Juxon on the scaffold. According to some old authorities, the parting present sent by Charles to his son was the "George," containing his mother's portrait. Again Charles II. once spoke of having lost the engraved diamond in the signet ring, which, when the deceased King was on the scaffold, he gave to the Bishop of London "to be delivered to my hands," but be this as it may, the belief that the King's last gift was actually the Five-Broad Piece, generally called the "Juxton Medal" (now in the Gem Room in the British Museum), brought about the fact that this fine specimen of Rawlins's work realized the sum of £770 at the Montagu sale in 1896.

Again we know that to whatever straits Charles I. was reduced, he refused to debase the currency, and the coins of some of his local mints were extremely fine. We must admit that by command of Buckingham, £60,000 worth of debased shillings were issued in 1626, but Sir Robert Cotton presented a paper to the King which at once convinced him that the scheme was ruinous, and he caused the money

---

1 The Dominion-of-the-Sea-Medal is the other.
2 Amongst others, Whitelocke, p. 370, Memorial of the English affair.
3 See Charles II., by Osmond Airy, but Whitelocke says that when Princess Elizabeth came to bid the King goodbye at Whitehall, he gave her two seals with diamonds; it might be one of these Charles meant.
4 See Disraeli's Commentaries on Charles I., vol. i, p. 194.
to be recalled. The suggestion was again made in 1640, but negatived by the Privy Council, and it is greatly to the credit of the King that he should not have followed the bad example set him by some of his predecessors. Another proof of his love of numismatics is that to him we must attribute the custom of distributing badges, which died out in the reign of his son. He encouraged the arts in every way—unlike George II., who exclaimed, when Hogarth asked for permission to dedicate to him a Shakesperian picture he had just engraved, "No, I hate painting and poetry too, neither the one nor the other ever did anybody any good." Foreign artists flocked to the Court of Charles—Mytens, Van Dyck, Rubens were amongst his eminent painters; the last when coming to England to negotiate a treaty between this country and Spain, declared in a private letter, that his chief inducement in accepting the mission and visiting England, lay in the fact that he had been "credibly informed that the prince of that country is the best judge of art in Europe." Charles wished to complete the magnificence of the banqueting hall at Whitehall, the ceiling of which had been painted by Rubens, and asked Sir Anthony Van Dyck to decorate the walls, but the fee required was too large. According to Walpole, the latter asked the sum of £80,000, but a later note by Dallaway suggests that for eighty we should read eight, inasmuch as Rubens only received £3,000 for executing his portion of the work.

The rivalry between Charles I. of England and Philip IV. of Spain as collectors of curios became so great, that, it is affirmed, the price of paintings rose to double their former value in consequence of the competition amongst their agents in obtaining rare works of art for their royal masters.

It might be a matter of surprise that so great a lover of the arts as Charles I. should not have given more encouragement to the brothers Simon, but Abraham Simon passed a good deal of time out

of England in the service of Christina, Queen of Sweden; and Thomas Simon (though according to Vertue, he studied under Nicholas Briot at the Mint) took the Parliamentary side when the Civil War began, whereas Rawlins, also a good artist, though lacking in the masterly finish seen in the portraiture of Simon—followed his royal master to the local mints and remained faithful to the Stuart cause. Thomas Rawlins, best known by his Oxford Crown and the Five-Broad Pattern piece—before referred to—was appointed engraver to the Mint in 1643. He was a many-sided man, playwright, poet, engraver of gems and intaglios, and according to Evelyn, "an excellent artist, but a debased fellow"; but as the engraver had endeavoured to borrow money of the virtuoso, possibly Evelyn may have taken a prejudiced view of the conduct of Rawlins.¹

Thomas Rawlins was born, the National Biography tells us (with a query), about 1620, and in the course of fifty years, life showed him, as was the case with most Royalists, much of its seamy side. His Oxford Crown was produced in 1644; of his Forlorn Hope medal in 1643 we have already spoken, and on a series of badges we know that he was employed both before and after the King's death. He had been made chief engraver of the Mint in the year 1647, but about 1648, he seems to have taken refuge in France till 1652. After his return from the Continent, he tried without success to keep out of a debtor's prison by making tradesmen's tokens in various parts of England, till the Restoration brought him relief, and he again became chief engraver in the place of Simon, who was compensated with the position of "Engraver of His Majesty's Seals," Rawlins retaining his office till his death in 1670. The story of the brothers Simon has been given us in some detail by Vertue.² He tells us on tradition only, that he believes them to have been born in Yorkshire, and leaves the dates of their birth uncertain—if those given in the National

¹ A curious letter dated February 27, 1657-8, from Rawlins to Evelyn, written from "The Hole in St. Martin's," where the former was imprisoned for debt, is printed in the Numismatic Chronicle, vol. iv, p. 124.
² Vertue's Medals, Coins, Great Seal, and Impressions from the works of Thomas Simon, 1753.
Biography with a query for the brothers respectively, as 1622 for Abraham, and 1623 for Thomas are correct, the latter must have been very young when in about 1635 he began his connection with the Mint. If born in 1623, Thomas Simon would be but sixteen when he made his Scottish Rebellion medal, but Proustuici was no older when his cameos were already sold as antiques by fraudulent dealers. Vertue tells us that Briot is said to have taken Thomas Simon under his tuition on his return through Yorkshire from Scotland, whither he had gone to engrave some medal-dies and coin-dies in 1633, and that afterwards under Sir Edward Harley, the master of the Mint, "he was preferred to be one of the engravers thereof." In the year 1645 he was appointed by the Parliament as joint-engraver with Edward Wade, and subsequently became chief engraver to the Mint, but he "incurred His Majesty's displeasure by imitating the Royal Seal for the use of the Parliament," and whilst Charles employed the services of Rawlins at Oxford and at his local mints, Simon engraved the great seal of the Parliament at the Tower and the dies for many medals for Fairfax, Cromwell, and others. He made the dies for the milled coinage of the Lord Protector, in 1656 to 1658, and on the death of Cromwell, he continued for a time in his office, making at the Restoration some remarkably fine medals and badges (those discussed here and many others), and was employed on Charles II.'s hammered coinage for the first years of his reign; but in 1662 the Roettiers coming over to England from Flanders, the contest arose concerning the milled coinage between Jan Roettier and Simon, which resulted in the production of the magnificent "Petition Crown." This work of art, if it failed in its object of convincing Charles of the superiority of the English artist to the Dutchman, has certainly obtained the verdict of this generation—witness the fact that when three examples of this very rare pattern came into the market (curiously enough within a few months of each other), in 1903, they realized respectively the

1 The National Biography says A. and T. Simon were the sons of Peter and Anne Simon of Guernsey, married in London in 1611.

2 Bergne on November 22, 1853 (Numismatic Chronicle, vol. xvi, p. 133), noted fifteen known specimens (thirteen silver, two pewter).
large sums of £420, £365, and £310. Even in 1832 before the fancy prices given for curios in these days were reached, one of these crowns fetched over £225, but in 1889 the maximum price of £500 was bid. It is probable that Charles II., who was not so good a judge of the arts as his father, was more actuated in his decision, by questions of religion and politics than by the merits of the case; not that I wish to disparage the fine work of Roettier, of whom Evelyn says, "that excellent graver belonging to the Mint who emulates even the ancients in both metal and stone."1 Charles II. naturally reinstated Rawlins, his father's faithful servant, in his old employment, but the making of the new coinage he entrusted to Jan Roettier, whilst Simon, retained in the capacity of medallist, did some fine work for the King up to the year 1665.

George Vertue, the biographer of the Simons, informs us that although he took great pains to ascertain the exact date and place of Thomas Simon's death, he was unsuccessful, "having searched many wills and places of burial." He, however, tells us tradition affirms that the great artist died "in the year of the great sickness," i.e., the plague—and as we know the date on which his will was proved at the Consistory Court of Canterbury, namely, in the month of August, 1655, besides learning from Pepys that cases of plague were in June already to be found in the vicinity of St. Clements in the City of London—the parish where Simon resided—we may assume that the tradition is correct and that Thomas Simon died of "the great sickness" soon after the outbreak thereof, though not before June 30th. a claim for payment of work done by him up to that date being still extant.2

It is difficult to say exactly how much Thomas Simon was indebted to the eccentric and clever Abraham for the designs of some of his medals and coins; although the signature T.S. appears on pieces which may have been the joint work of the two brothers, this might be because of Thomas's official position; that either was capable of

working alone is abundantly proved.\footnote{Evelyn speaks of \textquotedblleft a virtuoso fantastical Symons who had the talent of embossing so to ye life.\textquotedblright{} \textit{Evelyn's Diary}, 8 June, 1653.} but it is said that Abraham often made the original wax sketch, Thomas the finished portrait from it, Abraham excelling in portraiture, Thomas above all men in diesinking, engraving, and chasing. We know that Abraham was in the habit of carrying in his pocket a small piece of wax-covered glass, and whenever a face struck his fancy, he hastily modelled a sketch. The story is told by Vertue of his placing himself in a prominent position in the royal chapel during a visit he made to France whilst in the train of Christina of Sweden, in order to sketch Louis XIII., when his curious occupation and appearance (for, contrary to the fashion of that Court, he always wore a beard and rough travelling dress) so excited the King, that he had the artist arrested. On being questioned by Louis, he said, \textquoteleft{}Sire, what are you afraid of, to see a man with his own hair and beard, which the king, your father, would have been ashamed to have been seen without, for fear of being thought a boy, and no wise man?\textquoteright{} The curious personality of Abraham Simon, more striking in those days than it would be now, is presented to us on \textit{Med. Ill.}, 1, 512-154 by Stuart. See Plate III. This portrait is engraved by Vertue on Plate XXXV of \textit{Medals, Coins, etc.}, together with one of Thomas Simon, \textit{Med. Ill.}, 1, 513-155; see Plate III. They are of interest as showing the appearance of the brothers, though Stuart was not a contemporary artist. Vertue tells us that \textquoteleft{}many eminent artists drew Abraham's picture in his lifetime\textquoteright{}—he does not give their names, but Peter Lely and Godfrey Kneller were of the number. Vertue says, \textquoteleft{}this medal of his own portrait is engraved from a model of his own making in wax, amongst the collections of Sir Hans Sloane.\textquoteright{} This model is now in the British Museum, where I have examined it, and it is reproduced on Plate III. In it is clearly seen the medal and chain always worn by Abraham Simon—given to him by Christina of Sweden; it is a rough sketch, very spirited, probably very like, much more characteristic, older-looking and less formal than Stuart's medallion, and though Vertue's plate has a line engraving on the field, the latter is in
PLATE III.

ABRAHAM SIMON'S WAX MEDALLION OF HIMSELF, BRITISH MUSEUM.

PLATE XXXV OF GEORGE VERTUE'S MEDALS, COINS, ETC., FROM THE WORKS OF SIMON.

ABRAHAM SIMON, BY STUART.
MED. Ill., i. 312-154.

THOMAS SIMON, BY STUART.
MED. Ill., i. 314-158.
other respects far more like Stuart’s production than Simon’s original sketch. Vertue gives no clue as to the origin of Thomas’s picture, but writes under the two engravings, *The Ingenious Artists Brothers Abraham and Thomas Simon*. An° 1663. Now whence did Vertue get this date? Stuart’s medallions are not dated, and it has hitherto remained an open question whether Stuart saw and copied Vertue’s plate, that being taken from a dated medal unknown, or whether Vertue merely gave the portraits of both brothers by Stuart, possibly under the impression that they were actually executed in 1663 (for Stuart’s work deceived many), or whether both had access to the same contemporary medals of the brothers Simon. Little is known of Stuart, but it is said that he has been identified with an artist, who did some good work for the Society for Promoting Arts and Commerce in the year 1759, which inclined us to the belief that probably—the plate being dated 1751, and the book printed in 1753—Vertue executed his engraving before Stuart made the medals—consequently that originals must have been known to Geo. Vertue.

In the *Numismatic Chronicle*, vol. iv, p. 221, Mr. Nightingale describes and illustrates these medallions from the collection of Mr. W. D. Haggard, stating that the owner had traced their existence in “the possession of one family for about a century back.” Seeing from the illustration and description that these specimens appeared infinitely superior to those usually met with and probably antecedent to Stuart, I endeavoured to follow them, and, through the kind cooperation of Mr. Grueber, have had the pleasure of examining them in the British Museum. They are thin silver plates of repoussé work, and though not dated, appear to be of about the time of Simon. May we suppose these to be the originals copied by Vertue and Stuart? Illustrations of these finer works will be found on Plate L of *Medallic Illustrations*, shortly to be issued.

The life of Abraham Simon was full of vicissitudes; he was trained for the Church, but gave up the prospect and went to Sweden, with what intention is not known, but by his wax portraiture he obtained the notice of Christina, the Queen, who was herself a

1 See *Med. Ill.*, 2, p. 741, and Hollis’s *Memoirs*, vol. i, p. 87.
connoisseur, and he became her agent, collecting works of art in various parts of Europe. He went in her retinue, as gentleman-in-waiting, to France, but finding little employment after the Queen left Sweden, he removed to Holland for a time. At the Restoration he returned to England and worked for the King, for whose portrait, made for the medal of the "Royal Oak," he received £100, but on asking the same sum shortly afterwards for a model of the Duke of York, and only £50 being offered him, Vertue tells us that "pretending something further to be done for improvement thereof, he got the model into his own hands again, and squeezing it together entirely defaced it." This hasty action deprived him of Court employment; he fell into poverty, and little more is heard of him till his death in 1692.

Having told what little I know of the makers of the Stuart badges, it now remains to me only to call attention to the fact, that the Restoration once accomplished, the need to excite the sympathies of the nation having passed temporarily away, the fashion of distributing these memorials also ceased, and though the custom of striking medals was ever on the ascendant, strange to say, neither James II. after the Revolution—nor his son "James III." as his adherents proudly called him—issued badges in any quantities. They continued the practice of touching for the "King's Evil," a custom which began with Edward the Confessor, and was pursued uninteruptedly by all monarchs, with the exceptions of William and Mary, until the end of Anne's reign. The piece of money used for suspension round the neck of the sufferer was the angel, but from the days of Charles II., this gold coin being no longer current, a special medalet was struck, the example I illustrate Med. Ill., 1, 477-86, being the first type.

Those of James II. are smaller, and he was the first king who substituted silver for gold; this he did in 1685. The practice was continued by the Stuarts to the third generation, Charles Edward in the name of Charles III. and Cardinal York as Henry IX. exercising

1 A warrant issued in the reign of James I. for the special coining of angels as touch pieces shows that, although they were current coin, they were also made ready pierced for the purpose of suspension.
the Royal privilege; it is even said that during the life of his father, the younger Chevalier performed cures at Edinburgh, and a story is told that an ardent supporter of the Hanoverian dynasty, on bringing his son to George the First, in hopes that the King might touch him—received the contemptuous answer—"Go to,—the Pretender." The result of a visit to Prince James in his exile being, we are told, satisfactory, the believer in the royal touch changed his politics. These little touch pieces being made for a special purpose and not bearing the "King’s effigy," should not really come into our present discussion; they are, however, so far as I know with few exceptions, the only medalets made for suspension, putting forth claims to royalty, issued by the exiled Stuarts, though there are, as I have said, many very fine medals struck for them by the Roettiers and others.

There is in the collection of Mr. Berney Ficklin, a rude badge made to commemorate the marriage of James Francis Edward and Clementina Sobieske, at the same time bearing a memorial of the death of Charles I. It has on one side the engraved portrait of King Charles and "Remember," and on the other, two hands joined and the date 1719. This badge was illustrated in the Connoisseur of August, 1903. Again there is a representation of Queen Anne with a reverse of Charles I., probably issued to excite interest in the cause of James after the death of the Queen, and two curious and rough metal badges have been successively illustrated in the Numismatic Circular of September, 1899, and October, 1905, differing from each other, but both portraying the young Chevalier, and evidently intended for distribution in the rising of 1745. Apart from the danger, in those days, of preserving such relics, we can hardly wonder that
anything so ugly should only have survived in these solitary specimens; though they may at the time have been distributed in large numbers, the loyalty which might have treasured them was a dangerous luxury, and the love of art would have led to their destruction rather than to their preservation.

It now only remains to me to tender my thanks to Mr. Berney Ficklin, Mr. Thorn Drury, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Andrew, Mr. S. M. Spink, Mr. Talbot Ready, and the other exhibitors, who have so largely contributed to the interest of our discussion on the Stuart portraits—specially to those who have kindly lent me their badges or pictures for illustration. When not otherwise specified, I have had recourse to my own collection. Last, but not least, may I express my warmest thanks very specially to the President, to the Secretary, and also to several other members of the Society for the kindness and patience with which they have constantly helped me in my difficulties, and the courtesy with which I have been received by them, as the first lady member admitted within their ranks.