THE patterns for the proposed currency of 1709 and 1716, intended for the use of the unfortunate James Francis Edward—called by his adherents in England, James III., and in Scotland, James VIII., but contemptuously designated by the upholders of the Protestant succession, the "Pretender"—suggest some problems which the learned appear to have thought unworthy of much attention. May I be pardoned if I remark, that although they may be said to represent a coinage which never was struck for a king who never reigned, they are not uninteresting either historically or numismatically; whilst from the point of view of art, all will readily admit that the crown of 1709 presents an extremely fine portrait of James by a remarkable artist, for Norbert Roettier, if not equal to his father as a medallist, was yet capable of admirable work.

The family of Roettier, father and sons, which had been settled in England since the days of Charles II., continued for a time at the English Mint after the flight of James II.; but one of the charges brought against John and Norbert Roettier in the February of 1696–7, was that dies, bearing the effigy of James, had been abstracted from the Mint with the connivance of the chief engraver, probably in some cases for the use of the exiled king; and we learn from the Stuart Papers that on November 9th, 1695, James had sent a warrant from St. Germains appointing John, James and Norbert Roettier to be Engravers-General to the Mint of England, together with a further

warrant to Joseph and Norbert Roettier to procure tools requisite for their work. On December 18th of the same year, James II. ordered the first three mentioned artists to prepare dies for various coins, no doubt intended for his use in the invasion he had planned for the spring of 1696. At the time James II. made these appointments, Joseph Roettier was Graveur-Général to the French Mint, and he was succeeded in this position in the year 1703 by Norbert, his nephew, who had fled to France to avoid the enquiry of 1696-7 above-mentioned. The warrants issued by James II. were confirmed by his son under the title of James III. in June, 1703, and again in the year 1710, this last appointment being to Norbert alone; James Roettier having died in 1698, and John in 1703 at his house in Red Lion Square,1 whither he had retired on the expression of dissatisfaction by the Parliamentary Committee.

We thus find Norbert Roettier, shortly after the commencement of the titular reign of the younger James, in the position of Graveur-Général to the French Mint, and of Engraver-General to the English Court at St. Germains, the latter title being not wholly illusory—for though James had little use for a coinage, he possessed the love of medals, so characteristic of the Stuarts, and all his early medallic portraits are the work of Norbert Roettier. It may not be uninteresting to trace the connection between some of these medals and the proposed coinage bearing the legends IACOBVS III. and IACOBVS VIII, also at the same time to try to solve the somewhat intricate question of the dates found upon the pattern pieces.

In his Coinage of Scotland, Mr. Edward Burns has mentioned four, and illustrated three patterns for the intended currency of 1709 and 1716.

These coins may be briefly described thus:—

No. 1. English crown.

Obverse: IACOBVS III. DEI GRATIA. Bust of James to right, laureated, in armour and draped with royal mantle.

Reverse: MAG · BRI · FRAN · ET · HIB · REX · 1709. Oval shield, crowned, containing the arms quarterly, first of England, second of Scotland, third of France, fourth of Ireland.

No. 2. Scottish crown, or sixty-shilling piece, Burns 1094.

Obverse: IACOBVS · VIII · DEI · GRATIA. Bust of James from the same puncheon as the last.

Reverse: SCOT · ANGL · FRAN · ET · HIB · REX · 1716. Square shield, crowned, containing the arms of Scotland first and fourth; France and England quarterly, second; Ireland third.

No. 3. Guinea, Burns 1095.

Obverse: IACOBVS · VIII · DEI · GRATIA. Bust of James to right, laureated, in armour and draped in royal mantle.

Reverse: SCO · AN · FRA · ET · HIB · REX · 1716. Arms, cruciformly disposed in four shields, crowned, first Scotland, second Ireland, third England, fourth France; between four sceptres, each bearing the insignia of the several countries and springing from a thistle.

No. 4. Guinea, Burns 1096.

Obverse: IACOBUS · TERTIUS · Youthful bust of James to left, laureated, draped and in armour.

Reverse: Same as that of the guinea, No. 3, described above, but without the thistle in the centre.

It will be noticed that the Scottish reverse of patterns Nos. 2 and 3 is substituted for the English arrangement of the arms upon the shield to suit the Scottish title, but the English crown above the shields was by some oversight not altered. That No. 4 should have the Scottish reverse and the English obverse is remarkable, but this piece presents a riddle in other ways, a solution of which I will endeavour to suggest.

I have always been struck by the fact that some of the dies said to have been prepared for the coinage of 1716 are, in point of portraiture, long antecedent to the proposed date of issue, and I have wondered whether this could be explained by the remark of Mr. J. H. Burn that Norbert Roettier did not execute much work for the Stuarts after 1712. There are, of course, medals as well as coin-patterns

1 Numismatic Chronicle, 1st series, vol. iii, p. 185.
of a later date than 1712 executed for James by Norbert Roettier. We may give as a sample the medal designed in commemoration of the birth of Prince Charles as late as 1720, see *Med. Ill.*, vol. ii, 453–61.

![Medal to Commemorate the Birth of Prince Charles, 1720.]

But this medal, like the crown of 1716, shows an unnaturally youthful portrait of James. On comparing it with the works of Hamerani, of the same date, the obvious explanation is suggested that Roettier and his model had not met for some time, and the artist merely adapted his former designs.

Mr. Burn says, “Roettier was employed by the Stuarts from 1697 to 1712, when Otto Hamerani appears to have been taken into their service.”

Ottone Hamerani, however, was one of a family of Roman medallists, and as James first visited Rome in 1717, this date is, possibly, rather premature. He was born in 1694, and his best known medals, executed for the Stuart family, are the portraits he designed in celebration of the marriage of James with Clementina in April, 1719; the medal commemorating the latter's escape from Innsbruck preceding her wedding, and other medals of a later date portraying their children.

But be this as it may, we learn from the *Calendar of the Stuart Papers* that the dies for the coinage of 1716 were designed for despatch to Scotland after the departure of James for that country, and

---

1 *Calendar of the Stuart Papers*, vol. i, p. 503.
this fact supplies us with a reason for the adoption of the bust of 1709 upon the crown, for Norbert Roettier, as stated above, had not his model at hand—indeed he could have seen very little of him during late years, as James had not been resident in the neighbourhood of Paris since 1712, nor indeed in France since 1713; furthermore, the artist was a very busy man. For these and other reasons he may have been willing, or able, rather to alter designs made for the coinage of 1709 than to make a new portrait of his patron. This, however, does not account for the extremely young head upon the IACOBUS TERTIUS pattern for a guinea, No. 4, of which I, personally, have never seen the exact reproduction in this size upon any medal, though Mr. Edward Burns states that the head is the same portrait which appears on the jetton of 1697,¹ and I am assured by Mr. W. J. Webster that he has seen it upon a medal of 1699 struck from a much worn die. Apart from this information, there is no doubt that the face closely resembles the youthful portrait of James, dated 1697, in which we see him at the age of nine, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 194–503. On the reverse of the specimen here illustrated is the legend OMNIA FACIT IPSE SERENA, but this obverse appears with other reverses.

The bust of the so-called pattern coin is even more like that upon the jettons executed in 1699; a specimen of Med. Ill., vol. ii, 204–519, showing the reverse with legend SOLA • LVCE • FVGAT is here illustrated, this obverse, again, may be seen with varying reverses.

**MEDAL OF PRINCE JAMES, 1699.**

But had Roettier, to save making a fresh portrait of James, wished to adapt a medal to the coinage, surely he would have had recourse by preference, either to that struck in 1704, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 270–71, and said to be the "earliest medal of the Prince giving his regal titles," or, still more probably, to the later and better known bust as seen on the following obverse of the smallest form of the CUIUS • EST • medal issued in 1708, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 313, 134.

**FIRST MEDAL CLAIMING REGAL TITLES, 1704.**

1 The medal usually known as the "Succession of Prince James, 1701," Med. Ill., vol. ii, 216–540, cannot have been cast earlier than 1710–1712 as Norbert Roettier made the portrait it bears at about that date. There is a print by Thomassin dated 1702, which apparently represents a medal. This is signed R and, therefore, is probably by Roettier. It bears the legend IACOBUS • III • D • G • BRITANNIARUM • IMPERATOR, 1702. I have been unable to trace any such medal. The picture shows bust to left in armour, mantled, with cravat and star; the face and hair being much the same as upon the medal of 1704, but the costume is elaborate and the figure almost three-quarter length. I found the illustration in Dr. Henderson’s Side-lights of English History, p. 199. Thomassin was engraver to the Court of Louis XIV. and executed drawings of statues, marbles, etc. Hence the print may represent a bas-relief and not a medal.
which closely resembles some designs prepared for the coinage in that year, and which portrait reappeared as late as the year 1712 with the bust of Princess Louisa on the reverse, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 389–243, signed by the artist. Here, at any rate, we have a grown-up portrait of James, but of this more anon. I shall show that one of the larger Cujus Est medals presents almost exactly the same head as that on the crowns, and there is, again, another example bearing the same legend, of a yet larger size, which might have been reduced in its proportions to be made suitable to the currency. This last mentioned medal, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 314–137, with mantled bust in armour to left, is an admirable likeness. It was also produced, probably, about 1712 and bears a portrait of Anne on its reverse, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 382–232. Very similar dies, with varying inscriptions, are those of Princess Louisa, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 388–241; with the jugate busts of James’s parents, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 216–540, and with the map of Great Britain and Ireland as the reverse, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 314–135.

Concerning the IACOBUS TERTIUS coin, Mr. Burns says, “Hawkins states that it is doubtful whether the obverse was ever intended to be used with its present reverse.”1 Herein, I think, lies the solution of the riddle. Mr. Burns gives no reference, but I have been able to trace this statement to the catalogue of medals exhibited at Edinburgh in 1856.2 Mr. Hawkins, however, gives no explanation of his remark.

With the exception of the unique English crown bearing the title

---

2 Published in the Illustrated Catalogue of the Archaeological Museum, Edinburgh, 1856, p. 106.
of IACOVS III., and of which there are no restrikes, we have to rely solely on the authority of Mathew Young for the pairing of these dies, there being no contemporary specimens of the coins known. Everyone has heard that the dies of various medals by John and Norbert Roettier were acquired by Mathew Young from a person named Cox, who had obtained them from the daughters of Norbert Roettier in their extreme old age. Mr. Young, in the year 1828, finding these dies in an advanced state of decay, took great trouble in cleaning and repairing them, and, after striking sixty samples in silver, and a few in gold and white metal of the Scottish crown, and, according to Mr. Hoblyn, only twenty examples in silver of the smaller pieces bearing the Scottish and English titles, which also appeared in gold and bronze, or bronze and copper respectively, he defaced the dies and presented them to the British Museum. We cannot help wondering whether Mr. Hoblyn did not rather understate the case in limiting the output of the smaller pieces to twenty, as they are not infrequently met with in sale-rooms, where they do not command such high prices as the Scottish crown, of which admittedly sixty copies were struck. To the fine sixty-shilling piece of James II., or VII., of which the dies were found in the same collection in the year 1828, Mr. Young applied the same treatment, and this piece also is more prized than the smaller coins, which according to Mr. Hoblyn should be considered the rarer. This coin, again, would be unknown to the public but for the discovery of its dies, for though they were prepared.

in 1688 for the coinage ordered by Act of Parliament in 1686, only the forty-shilling and ten-shilling pieces were issued, and the sixty-shilling, twenty-shilling and five-shilling pieces did not make their appearance, nor is it even known whether dies for the last two mentioned coins were ever made.

With regard to such coins as these, identification was easy enough, but as there were amongst the dies, many for medals. Mr. Young made some mistakes, and occasionally placed the obverse of one medal with the reverse of another, see Med. Ill., vol. ii, 381–230 and 315–138.

All this is common knowledge, but, probably, only those who like myself have, by the kind co-operation of Mr. Grueber, Keeper of the coins and medals at the British Museum, had the opportunity of seeing this collection of dies, are aware of its great extent, and, above all, that the dies are in various states of preparation and duplication; several examples, both of puncheons and dies of the same design, being present in a more or less finished state.

The latter is the case with the reverse of the IACOBVS VIII. guinea, Burns No. 1095, the only difference between this and the reverse used by Mr. Young for the IACOBUS·TERTIUS coin, Burns No. 1096, being that the thistle in the latter instance is omitted from the centre of the design, and it seems to me certain that Mr. Young believed one of the several unfinished dies made before the thistle was inserted, to be the reverse for a second pattern, selecting, in consequence of its suitability as to size, though not as to date, an obverse intended for a much earlier medal. The fact that one of these dies is merely a completed version of the other is proved by a careful comparison of details, such for example, as the very slight defect in the letter O, of the abbreviated word SCO, being equally perceptible on the die ornamented with the thistle and on that bearing the plain centre.

Besides the puncheon which is without the central thistle, this reverse die is found in no fewer than six stages of preparation. The first die is incomplete even so far as the arms are concerned—the sceptres also are missing. The second die, according to my idea, is
the reverse used by Mathew Young in conjunction with the Iacobus Tertius obverse. There is another so much defaced that it is impossible to say whether or no the thistle was inserted; whilst the three remaining dies are just as we see them on the finished reverse of the Iacobus VIII. coin. That the Iacobus Tertius medal has no other possible reverse amongst the dies in this collection need not disturb us, as the beautiful and unique Iacobus III. crown, which was a contemporary coin, is also represented by an obverse die only, the reverse not being found amongst Mr. Young's acquisitions, and this is the case with many of the medals in this collection. Judging from the apparent age of James on the Iacobus Tertius obverse, and comparing this young head with the medals of 1697 and 1699, also with various portraits of James as Prince of Wales, I have come to the conclusion—giving my opinion for what it is worth, and with much diffidence—that this die, the unfinished state of which may be judged from the convexity of the medal, was prepared in the year 1701, when Louis XIV. acknowledged the Prince as James III. on the death of his father James II. If I am right, either the reverse die has been lost, or the intention was to use the reverse of one of the former jettons, such as that bearing the legend Sola Luce Fugat, which exactly fits it. Of this medal there is a reverse die in Mathew Young's collection, but as it bears the date 1699, it cannot be the die intended actually for use with the so-called guinea obverse. Possibly the medalet remained unfinished and was never used; the first known medal asserting the claim of James to the English crown, being, as I have said, the jetton with his portrait at the age of sixteen, executed in the year 1704.

Whether the puncheon with the young bust had already been used for a medal or no, is not of much importance, for, clearly, the particular die used by Mathew Young with the reverse die of the coin, must have been prepared, at the earliest, on the death of James II., as it bears the regal title. I might, however, suggest that for the date 1697, quoted by Mr. Burns,¹ as that of a jetton bearing this bust of the

Prince on its obverse, we might substitute the 1699 of Mr. Webster, taking the former date as a misprint, because the portrait far more nearly resembles the other medals executed of James at the age of eleven, than those showing the younger head of a child of nine.

There is a medal, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 201-515, figured by Cochrane-Patrick, Medals of Scotland, Plate X, No. 10, with a portrait of James II. on the obverse and a head almost exactly of this type of Prince James in 1699: it is not laureated and is a great deal larger than the so-called guinea, but is, probably, the bust to which Mr. Burns referred. It, however, can hardly be called a jetton for it measures 1½.

Possibly Mr. Burns accepted too literally a remark made by Mr. Hawkins in the catalogue of his exhibits at Edinburgh in 1856. Mr. Hawkins wrote of the portrait as being "taken from" the early medalets, four of which he had just described: they are all of the usual type of 1697, and not precisely like the head shown upon the coin.

We do not lack portraits with which to compare the bust, and perhaps the best known are those by Largillière. A picture by this artist may be seen in the National Portrait Gallery, but being painted in 1695, two years previously to the date of the earliest medals here shown, the face is fuller and rounder than that of the little Prince, as we are accustomed to think of him—moreover, the pictures are mostly full-faced, whereas for medallion portraiture, the profile type is usually preferred. Let us therefore turn to the verbal portraits of the boy.

James is described by contemporary writers, as an attractive child with good features, hazel eyes and curly hair; in his youth he resembled his mother, a remarkably pretty woman. Lord Ailesbury describes his features thus:—"From the nose upward all of the Queen and the lower part resembling his uncle, my royal master." This comparison was also made by William III., who, on seeing a miniature of the little prince remarked:—"About the mouth he is most like my uncle Charles, and his eyes most like his mother." This was an unsolicited

---


2 Mary of Modena, by Martin Haile, p. 255, letter of Pietro Venier, Venetian Envoy to Paris; and James Francis Edward the Old Chevalier, by the same author, pp. 23, 42.
testimony to the legitimacy of the child, so often denied by his supplanter on the throne.

Later in life the characteristics of the Stuarts came out so strongly as to convince all except the most prejudiced, of the injustice of the imputations against his birth, epitomised in the disagreeable interpretation put upon the word "Pretender." This expression was originally used by Queen Anne in its foreign sense of "le Pretendant," or "the Claimant," but adopted as a catch-word by his enemies to cling to him through life, and even to his son after him.

Another family resemblance was that to his cousin Louis XIV, which is strongly present upon his medals and coins.

James, during his residence at the French court was naturally an object of interest to English travellers. Rizzini, the Modenese agent in Paris, mentions their eagerness "to have sight of him." They were delighted with him, for he is always pleasant to look upon, but upon horseback he is seen to wonderful advantage, for the grace, lightness and gallant daring, which at his tender age give him a special dignity and charm." This description is well illustrated by the frontispiece to these pages, which is reduced from a contemporary engraving in the possession of Mr. Andrew and presented to him by Mr. W. Sharp Ogden. It is folio in size and unsigned, but the tautological title, *Jacobus Magnæ Britanniae Et Wallicæ Princeps*, and the general treatment of the design suggest the usual continental origin of early portraits of the Prince. This assumption is corroborated by the fact that, on the margin of an example of this rare engraving in the British Museum, are the words *J. A. Le Pooter ex.* Le Pooter was a Flemish artist who flourished about 1703; hence, as the horse is of a Flemish type, and no painting corresponding with this print is known, I may remark that, possibly, he was not only the publisher, but himself the engraver and original artist of the portrait.

---

1 On the 3rd of April, 1708, Queen Anne had informed Parliament of James's embarkation, and had declared all those who joined "the Pretender," on whose head a price was set, guilty of high treason. This was the first occasion on which the term "Pretender" was used. *Mary of Modena*, p. 406; and Burnet, vol. v, p. 369.

2 *Mary of Modena*, p. 334.
We see that James, who was a passionate baby, still possessed as a boy the adventurous spirit which was so strangely absent in his later years; but although dignified and graceful, he lacked the engaging address of his sister, Princess Louisa, and was so cold in his manners that his mother confided to a friend that, "My Lord Perth had often told him when he was a boy, that he ought to obtain by study the affability which his sister had by nature." This coldness and restraint militated much against the success of James in after life, but at the period of which I am now treating, the Prince was unknown to most of his Scottish adherents, and the blind loyalty with which they were willing to lay down their lives to place him upon the throne of his father, was partly owing to their detestation of the English, and partly to the strong feudal feeling in the Highlands, where all the clans were bound to follow the bidding of their chiefs, no matter what that bidding might be.

But I have digressed too far from the subject of the coinage and its possible prototypes in the medals of the young Prince, and must turn to the discussion of the reason why these medalets should be found in such quantities, as to be of comparatively little value to the collector of rarities at the present day, though historically they are interesting, as on them we trace the gradual development of the child, who might have reigned over this kingdom.

Even during the lifetime of his father, the medals of Prince James were struck, mostly in copper, but also, more rarely, in silver, for presentation to the adherents of the exiled family, and were sent to England, many of them to be there hidden away for a more favourable opportunity of distribution, for we find that some fifty years ago, a hoard of three varieties, a whole bushel in quantity, all struck in the year 1697, was discovered during the prosecution of some excavations in Smithfield; and another buried treasure, of similar amount, was unearthed near Lombard Street. Lord Manchester writing to James Vernon in August, 1700, shortly after the death of the young Duke of Gloucester, the most formidable rival to the peaceful

1 Mary of Modena, p. 261.
accession of James, says in his letter: “Some thousand medals of the pretended Prince of Wales are to be stamped by Roettier, who is here, and sent to Captain Cheney, who formerly lived in Hackney, but is now in some part of Kent.”

These and other early medals give us the effigy of the unfortunate Prince, as we might have seen it upon his coins had he been suffered to quietly succeed his father upon the throne; and the pattern guinea, Burns No. 1,096, might have then lawfully taken the place in the currency, which I presume to suggest was mistakenly given to it by Mathew Young at a later date.

James II. died at St. Germains on September 16th, 1701, and at the court of the Jacobites, James Francis Edward, aged 13, was acknowledged King James III. of England and VIII. of Scotland, but he was, or might have been, nearer his enthronement when, on March 8th, 1702, William III. expired.

In August, 1696, prior to the signing of the treaty of Ryswick, which was completed in October, 1697, William had informed the court of France that if no opposition was made to his occupation of the English throne, he would recognise the Prince of Wales as his successor. The Duke of Berwick writes that this proposal was actually made the subject of a secret article of the Peace of Ryswick, but that James II. promptly refused the offer, whilst the Queen exclaimed, “I would rather see my son, dear as he is to me, dead at my feet, than allow him to become a party to his father’s injuries.”

The Abbé Rizzini, in a letter of August 21st, 1696, also tells us that Mary Beatrice remarked “that of two usurpers, she could more willingly suffer the present one than her own son.”

But though not allowed by the will of his parents and the stern decrees of fate to follow this peaceful course to the throne, there was yet another door open to the titular King in the constant discontent of his would-be subjects in Scotland, where as James VIII., he would have been readily received; this again was brought to naught by the timidity and the religious zeal of his mother.

1 Mary of Modena, p. 343.  
2 Ibid., p. 330.  
3 Ibid., p. 344.
Shortly after the death of James II.,\(^1\) Lord Belhaven came over to France as a delegate from a section of the Scottish nation, praying the Queen Regent, as Mary Beatrice was called, to allow her son to embrace the Protestant religion and come to Scotland to be proclaimed king. One of the deputation, Lord Middleton, declared that but for the royal aspirant’s creed he believed Parliament would be ready to recognise him as William III.’s successor, but Mary of Modena replied that she would never be the means of persuading her son to barter his heavenly crown for an earthly one. It is further thought that she entertained an erroneous belief that William III. wished to poison the child. Nor was this the only effort made by the Scots to possess themselves of him whom they wished to make their king, for they actually proclaimed him as such at Inverness\(^2\) on the death of William, and the Duke of Perth urged the advisability of an appeal to arms.

Mary Beatrice, as long as her son remained a minor, refused to sanction this course—thus, through much anxiety and many proposals, we pass to the ill-planned and ill-executed project of the invasion of the Firth of Forth.

The Act of Union was discussed at great length by both nations in 1706, was ratified by the Scottish Parliament in January, 1707, and received the royal assent in England in March of the same year; the great unpopularity of this measure revived the feeling of loyalty towards their ancient Stuart rulers in the breast of the Scots, whatever their creed. Even the Cameronians expressed their willingness to receive James. “God,” said they, “may convert him, or he may have Protestant children, but the Union can never be any good”; and Lockhart tells us there was such unanimity amongst Episcopalians and Presbyterians, that to use a Scot’s proverb, “they were all one man’s bairns.”\(^3\) The disquiet reached boiling point, when on the 1st of May, 1707, the alteration in the excise duties came into

\(^1\) Mary of Modena, p. 358. Information from the St. Germain Mss. in the Bib. Nat.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 363.

operation. These duties were specially obnoxious to the people, who were rendered furious by the appointment of Englishmen to carry out measures of which Scotland, as a nation, disapproved; and certainly the Queen of England was not so careful as she should have been in the choice of her agents. All the riff-raff of the southern kingdom ran to the north, and this fact was acknowledged even amongst English people, for a story is told of a Scottish traveller, who expressed to his landlady at an inn on the southern side of the Border, anxiety for his personal valuables on his journey. "Have no fear," said she, "the highwaymen have all gone to your country; they are gone to get themselves places."

An agent, named Hooke, was sent over from France in February, 1707, to enquire into the wishes of the Scottish dissentients, and returned in May to say that the Scots were willing to rise for King James, if ten thousand regular troops could be supplied by the French king in or before the following August. Several times did Louis raise the hopes of the Jacobite leaders, always to disappoint them, and so often was this the case, that when the French fleet eventually sailed in March, 1707–8, the Scots were unready to receive their allies. The Duke of Hamilton, who should have been their leader, was, whether by design to avoid his responsibilities, or by accident, on a journey to England, and the signals made by the French admiral on his arrival at the Firth of Forth were left unanswered. On the other hand, the time chosen could not have been more favourable, for the English were totally unprepared to meet an invasion, insomuch that Lockhart says, "all the world save Scotland was amazed." But a fleet consisting of sixteen ships, gradually augmented to forty, was rapidly manned by the help of the merchant navy, with Admiral Sir George Byng in command. This force set forth to watch the much

---

1 Lockhart Papers, vol. i, p. 224.
4 Ibid., vol. i, p. 239.
smaller French armament of twenty-six, or according to Burton, of twenty-eight ships, under Admiral the Comte de Forbin, at Dunkirk; but Louis XIV.'s fleet, with James on board, contrived to make the Firth of Forth with the design of landing near Edinburgh. Byng was in close pursuit, and Forbin was unwilling to risk an engagement, which it is suspected he had secret orders to avoid. He hurriedly retreated on the 13th of March, 1708, in spite of the entreaties of James, who implored the admiral to land him and his troops near Inverness, or, indeed, anywhere upon the coast. Forbin considered himself responsible to Louis for the safety of his royal charge, and therefore brought him back to Dunkirk, although the story is well known that the French king, in bidding his guest good-by, had told him he could wish him no better luck than that of seeing his face no more. The Duke of Berwick blamed the French ministers for this affair, and said that had Forbin been willing to risk his ships, the disembarkation might have been effected. Many writers consider that this expedition was a mere ballon d'essai, sent out by Louis XIV. to distract attention from more important operations on the continent, in the hope of causing the recall of Marlborough for the defence of the British Isles. Although one of the French ships, with about five hundred troops, including some English officers on board, on being overtaken by the British fleet, was captured, and those thus seized were considered to be in active rebellion against Queen Anne, no one seriously suffered. The death sentence of Lord Griffin was postponed until such time as a natural death released him from his imprisonment, and other prominent persons who had been arrested on suspicion of complicity in the intended rising were, after a short imprisonment, acquitted on the Scottish plea of non proven. These acquittals suggested an alteration of the treason laws in Scotland, and this added fuel to the

1 Burton, vol. viii, p. 203.
flame of the discontented feeling in the country, so that in spite of the expedition having been a complete failure, James did not abandon hopes of returning to the charge. Although he shortly left France to fight under the name of "the Chevalier de St. George" in the armies of his French host upon the continent, he kept in touch with his would-be subjects; and we are told that Englishmen, fighting under Marlborough, often displayed a great interest in him. He distinguished himself greatly in the following July at Oudenarde and at Malplaquett in September, 1709, where he charged the enemy no less than twelve times.  

So much were the English officers impressed with his bravery, that when the two armies were encamped in 1710 on opposite sides of the river Scarpe, and various courtesies were exchanged between them, some of the Chevalier's admirers requested that medals bearing his effigy, might be sent to them, and some thirty of these were given, wrapped in a paper on which was written, "The metal is good, for it bore six hours' fire—you know it was hot, for yourselves blew the coals." Probably the medals were those bearing the legend CVIVS.:•: EST •: on the obverse, and on the reverse, the word REDDITE, of which a large number were also distributed at

Lochmaben, in the year 1714, to the Jacobites assembled there under plea of attending the races.  

It has usually been assumed that these medals, of which there are

1 Jesse's Lives of the Pretenders, vol. i, p. 28.  
2 Mary of Modena, p. 413.  
3 See Med. Ill., II, 312 to 314.
examples with three different busts, were struck in anticipation of the French invasion of 1708, and seeing that the larger of the two examples shown in these pages bears a bust of the same type, differing only a little from it in size, as that of the puncheon of the crown of 1709, and that the smaller shows a portrait much resembling the design for the proposed gold coinage of 1708, it may not be uninteresting to follow their history. We read in *Medallic Illustrations of British History*, vol. ii, p. 312, of No. 133—the larger of the two: “This medal was struck for distribution in 1708 among the partisans of the exiled family, when the intrigues of Harley had sown dissensions in the Cabinet, and the unpopularity of the Union had created discontent in Scotland, of which France hoped to avail herself in an invasion which she at this time contemplated.” These medals are, however, undated, and may have been struck later, either in 1709 contemporaneously with the crown, or at any time after May in the year 1708, in which month dies for the crown, and other coins were originally ordered, as I purpose to presently show. There is one variety of the smallest CUIUS EST medal in the British Museum, showing the dates 1709 above and 1716 below the bust (see *Med. Ill.*, vol. ii, 313–134), but these figures are incuse and were probably added later. All we know for certain is, that when the Duchess of Gordon presented one of these medals to the Faculty of Advocates in 1711, it was no new thing. The discussion provoked on the occasion of this presentation is given at some length in an amusing pamphlet kindly lent me by Mr. Webster. The act of receiving the gift was considered treasonable, as the legend Cujus Est above the bust of James, and the answer Reddite, accompanying the map of Great Britain and Ireland upon the reverse, were an avowal of his kingship. The medal was accepted by seventy-five votes against twelve; the action, however, was subsequently disavowed by the Faculty of Advocates, and their apology was accepted, though Sir David Dalrymple was dismissed from his office of Lord Advocate for his

1 See *The Scotch Medal decipher'd*, p. 7, published in 1711, where the author says, “this Medal is not new, for we have an account of it above a year ago, or rare, for 'tis common enough.”
laxity in prosecuting the enquiry into this affair. The arguments used on either side had been most unparliamentary in their language, Robert Frazer saying that "Oliver Cromwell's medal, who deserv'd to be hang'd, had been received, and why not this?" and Duncan Forbes replying, "It was time enough to receive the medal when the Pretender was hang'd."

I have above referred to the fact that we know the date when James ordered his early currency. Since the publication during the last few years, by the permission of His Majesty the King, of a number of the Stuart Papers contained in the Windsor Library, much information has come to light concerning the exiled Court at St. Germains. We see that on October 31st, 1701, James issued a warrant to Norbert Roettier, "for making and engraving the Great Seal for the Kingdom of England," whilst the seals for Scotland and Ireland were ordered on October 15th, 1702; and an entry, which is of great interest in the discussion of the date upon the crown piece of 1709, is that of May 4th, new style, 1708.

On this day, James issued a warrant to his Engraver-General directing him "to prepare and make and send off puncheons and dyes for coining five-pound pieces, forty-shilling pieces, guineas and half guineas of gold with our Royal Arms on one side, and the picture of Our Royal Self on the other side in the manner marked below No. 1 and No. 2. As also puncheons and dies for coining of Crowns and half Crowns, shillings and sixpences with our Royal Arms on the one side, and our Royal Self on the other, in the manner marked here below, No. 3 and No. 4." This warrant and these designs mentioned in the Calendar of the Stuart Papers, vol. i, p. 223, I have been permitted to inspect and to describe. The design for the gold coinage is as follows:

Obverse: IACOBVS · III · DEI · GRATIA. Bust of James to left, laureated and undraped.

1 Minutes of the Advocates at Edinburgh, July 30th, 1711. See The Scotch Medal decipher'd, p. 3, et seq.
Reverse: MAG • BR • FRA • ET • HIB • REX • 1708. Four shields, crowned with the English crown, cruciformly arranged, containing the arms of England first, Ireland second, Scotland third, and France fourth; four sceptres, between, bearing the insignia of the different countries; centre plain.

The design for the silver may be described thus:

Obverse: IACOBVS • III • DEI • GRATIA. Bust of James to left in armour, and draped with royal mantle fastened by a brooch.

Reverse: MAG • BR • FRA • ET • HIB • REX • 1708. Oval shield, crowned with the English crown, containing the arms of England first, of Scotland second, of Ireland third, and of France fourth.

Curiously enough we thus see that the designs are not identical with the coinage either of 1709 or of 1716. The bust on the pieces of those years, with the exception of that upon the IACOBUS • TERTIUS so-called guinea, is to the right—whereas the bust on the designs of 1708, both for gold and for silver, is to the left, and the arms on the reverses are differently arranged. Though the oval shield, surmounted by a large English crown, is represented in the designs for the silver as we see it upon the pattern piece of 1709, the positions of the lys of France which have the third place, and of the harp of Ireland which has the fourth on the pattern, are reversed in the design. The legend on the crown reads BRI • for Britain, and that in the design BR • only, but the drawing which measures 1•2 inch, being of the size for the half-crown, this difference may have only applied to the smaller coins.

With regard to the reverse of the gold coinage, the thistle is absent from the centre, and the arms are differently arranged from those on the guinea of 1716—being first England, second Ireland, third Scotland, and fourth France; whilst the legend reads MAG • BR • FRA • ET • HIB • REX • 1708. These alterations would, however, naturally take place when the Scottish coinage of 1716 was substituted for the English designs of 1708—just as the entirely new Scottish reverse for the silver replaced that which graces the English crown piece of 1709.
The most puzzling problem is the direction assumed by the face, for we should naturally expect a coinage in England with bust to right to follow upon that of James II, which was to left, and truly enough, when the crown was struck in 1709, we see the head thus disposed, although in the designs it is to the left. Possibly James saw reason on this account to revise the order given in 1708 in favour of the design of 1709, for we have no proof that the dies for the former date were ever executed.

I have sought through the dies and puncheons in Mathew Young's collection, and amongst the latter have found some, the use of which I cannot trace absolutely to any medal, but Norbert Roettier was so much in the habit of making slight alterations and variations in his dies, that it is difficult to build too much on any differences in the puncheons in their original state. I give an illustration of one of these which might be intended for the gold coinage, i.e., for the "forty-shilling-piece" of 1708, but not one of the puncheons is exactly like the design. The face and general appearance are best reproduced by the head here shown, though in other ways the design more nearly resembles a puncheon for the medal of 1704 — this medal I illustrated on page 234, but its portrait is fuller in the face and more youthful; it has, however, the lovelock on the shoulder seen in the drawing. Neither puncheon is laureated, and in this respect again the likeness is incomplete, whereas the small CUIUS EST medal, illustrated on p. 235, bears the laurel crown; and a fair idea of the design for 1708 may be best attained by comparing these two medals with the puncheon given above. One would expect the coinage of 1708 to be laureated, as James went to the French wars immediately after the failure of his
expedition to Scotland, but the design for the silver has, as far as I can see, no such decoration; the drawing is, however, not very clear.

In giving these illustrations, I am in the region of pure conjecture, and I only show this and the following puncheons in the possibility that someone, more enlightened than myself, may trace their intended use. Amongst the puncheons I found several which, by the kindness of those in authority at the British Museum, I am able to portray. I humbly suggest that if in 1709 a complete coinage was planned with the bust to right, as we see it on the crown of that year, the puncheon shown above might be that for the five-guinea piece; and in our next illustration we have that for a possible guinea. These the reader will observe are both laureated. The same remark applies to two more candidates for the position of types for the coinage—these may have
been for the half-crown and the shilling of 1709—the latter, as I shall show later, may, with equal likelihood, have been for a half-guinea or shilling of 1716, so I reserve the illustration. Be it understood, that I do not think there is sufficient resemblance between any of these puncheons and the designs for the coinage to found any real theory upon their discovery, but I am glad to have the opportunity of placing them before the public—whether or no they represent the efforts of Roettier to produce a currency in 1708, 1709 and 1716.

But to return to our definite knowledge of the order to Roettier to engrave the dies in 1708. The fact that the warrant is dated May 4th, new style, nearly six weeks after the French invasion had failed, strengthens the argument I am about to bring forward with regard to the date on the crown of 1709. According to the French reckoning, the year began on the 1st of January, as it does with us now, also the Gregorian calendar or new style had been adopted in France. In Scotland, although the old style was still in use, the new year was counted from January the 1st. In dealing with medals or coins struck in France for circulation abroad or in Scotland, it is well to remember these different reckonings, for a coin dated simply “1709” may have been struck at any time between the 1st of January, 1709, new style, in France, that is, the 21st of December, 1708, old style, in England, and the 24th of March, 1709, old style, in England, which was the 4th of April, new style, 1710, in France, thus giving a range of fifteen months or more.

1 See Bond’s *Handy Book for Verifying Dates*, ed. 1866, p. 17, where is printed a paper formerly in His Majesty’s State Paper Office, but now in the Record Office.

2 The discrepancy of dates upon medals struck in France with the events they were intended to commemorate in England, may be sometimes accounted for by the fact that in England and Ireland, until 1751, the year was reckoned from the 25th of March to the 24th of the March following; the year 1751 was only permitted to last nine months and seven days, i.e., till the 31st of December, the day after the 31st of December being called the 1st of January, 1752. This change in the commencement of the year had already been made at various times in various countries—in Scotland in 1600, by a proclamation of James VI., dated December 17th, 1599, and in France at dates varying from the time when Charles IX. published two edicts in January and August respectively of the year 1563, ordering the change to be made, till the year 1580, when it was adopted at Beauvais—different parts of the country putting the edicts into practice at
In this case, however, these calculations do not much help us, because in the light of our present knowledge, it is not possible to say at what precise moment of the year 1709 the pattern crown was struck, but I may say that there is reason to believe that in the course of that and the previous year James had serious hopes of renewing his efforts towards regaining the throne. The Papal Nuncio, writing to the Pope on May 8th, 1708, says that the French minister "Torcy has confided to me that the King of England during the coming campaign is to make a new attempt toward Scotland. With this view he is going into Flanders in order that His Majesty may be nearer the spot." James also wrote to his Scottish adherents shortly before setting out on May 18th, 1708, to join the French army at Valenciennes, "we propose to come ourselves into the Highlands with money, arms and ammunition, and to put ourselves at the head of our good subjects . . . . . . The Most Christian King has promised to support this undertaking with a sufficient number of troops, as soon as they can be transported with security . . . . . . In the meantime we will stay in the Highlands, unless we be invited or encouraged by our friends in the Lowlands to go to them."

Now it was, as we have seen, in this same May that the warrant was issued to Roettier for the making of puncheons for the coins. Probably before any of these were ready, this project had also failed; for the French, defeated at the battle of Oudenarde in July, 1708, were not in a position to fulfil their promises, and the date, different dates, and the Parliament of Paris agreeing thereto in 1567. Again, medals struck in the Netherlands confront us with this change in the Catholic districts in 1556, whilst the Protestant Netherlands adopted January the first as New Year's Day in 1583, and so on through an endless procession of countries. The change from the Old Style to the New or Gregorian style further complicates dates, as it was only adopted in Great Britain and Ireland in September, 1752, the day after September 2nd being dated September 14th by one of the provisions of 24 George II., 1751, c. 23, whereas in France it came into use in the year 1582, in some towns, and in others at varying dates, whilst all Christian countries (except Greece and Russia, where the Old Style still prevails) adopted the expedient of dropping ten or eleven nominal or calendar days, at such time as suited their convenience.

---

1709, placed on the pattern coin was in anticipation of better times.

Thus, although at the first glance it seems strange that James should have ordered a coinage immediately after his best efforts had failed, we see that he had not abandoned hope, and of this we have ample proof, for though the French court rejected a proposal made by Renaudot in 1708, advocating an invasion of Ireland to be preferred to an attempt upon Scotland, as being “at present safer and more certain,” the friends of James were not easily discouraged. I may call attention to a memoir presented to the court of Versailles in 1709, entitled the “New Scheme,” wherein the French ministry were assured “that the greatest and most considerable part of that Kingdom” (Great Britain) was actually ready to have declared for James the preceding year, if he had only landed, “but,” says Mr. MacFarlane in describing this “scheme” in his history, “though disappointed then, the Scots were still willing, as ever, to join their lawful sovereign, and everything that had happened since, had contributed to increase their hatred of England, and so facilitate his return. There were, for example, fewer regular troops in Scotland now than then.”

“...Ireland was represented on the tiptoe of revolt, a universal rising in Ireland and Scotland would of itself make so powerful a diversion that the great alliance of confederate princes would fall to pieces before it, and France regain her supremacy.”

“But still the most passionate Jacobites in Scotland would hardly rise unless assisted with at least 8,000 men from France, some ammunition and a certain sum of money.” At this time Louis was in straights for the sinews of war, and was seriously turning his attention to thoughts of peace. The Scots were asked whether they would rise if the king were to come among them with 400 or 500 men to be followed by troops from France, but they doubted of success and so rejected the proposal.

1 *Mary of Modena, p. 409, Renaudot Papers, Bib. Nat.*
Early in the year a list of the Highland clans, ready to rise for James, had been sent to the French court, even computing "the number of all the men 12,000, ... . The King might likewise expect from the Low counties of Scotland at least 20,000, for the King hath generally, all the country over, three for him for one against him."

We find amongst the Stuart Papers, a letter from James to Pope Clement XI.¹ written from St. Germain-en-Laye, later in the year 1709, saying—"It has pleased God to preserve for us still a good number of faithful subjects in our three Kingdoms, who are always ready to receive us with open arms and declare for us. His Most Christian Majesty is also inclined, so far as the bad state of his affairs permits him, to assist us with everything that depends on him to put us in a condition to make another attempt for our restoration, and, if your Holiness would have the goodness to join with him, we are always ready to risk our person, and have every ground to hope that the Divine Mercy will bless so just an undertaking for His glory, and for the good of the holy religion, for which we are suffering." James goes on to explain that "a considerable supply of money is required," that the King of France "is absolutely unable to furnish us with any considerable advance," and ends by asking the Pope "to lend us what you can yourself, and employ your credit and authority to get a good sum of money lent us secretly by other Catholic Princes, or by the clergy of Rome and elsewhere, or by such other way as you shall judge suitable to aid, with the other assistance His Most Christian Majesty will give us, in restoring us, and with us restoring religion in our states."

James, who was himself tolerant of all forms of belief, was still utterly unable to realise that his religion, to which he was consistently loyal, was the great obstacle to his accession to the English throne, and though in the letter² written on March 1st, 1708, for publication had he succeeded in landing in Scotland, he had promised, as he was ever ready to do, on "Our Royal Word to protect, secure and maintain all our Protestant Subjects in the free exercise of their Religion," in all

---

¹ *Calendar of Stuart Papers*, vol. i, p. 235, in French in Entry Book I, p. 65.
² See *Calendar of Stuart Papers*, p. 218, vol. i.
the subsequent correspondence with the English ministers, after the Tory party had come into power, nothing would induce James to declare himself a Protestant, even when this would have facilitated his peaceful succession on the death of Queen Anne.¹

Unfortunately the *Stuart Papers* of this date are not nearly so full as those of later years: this is probably due to the destruction during the French Revolution of a portion of those committed to the keeping of the Scots' College at Paris.² But, if I may be pardoned for advancing the theory that James had ample justification for his hopes of a restoration in 1709, I will now pass on to another extract from the *Stuart Papers*, which bears upon the solitary specimen of the coin at present known.

In the year 1716 General George Hamilton wrote to James from Paris on February 13th, new style, just at the time when the unfortunate exile was retreating from Scotland, "I send a little box I got from M. Roettier—a crown designed for the English coin in 1709, and the impression of the crown piece that's to be now coined in Scotland."³ We do not, of course, know what became of these two specimens; no original of the 1716 crown is known, and as James would have left Scotland before the "little box" could have arrived, they were possibly both lost. If, however, they found their way back to France, which seems probable as another letter written by Hamilton to the Earl of Mar on the same day, is endorsed "Returned and delivered at Paris, March 11th," the first coin mentioned may be the actual example preserved in the British Museum and acquired from the Wigan collection in 1872. Before that date it was shown by Mr. Hawkins at a Meeting of the London Numismatic Society in the year 1851.⁴ It was then understood to be the property of a Major, afterwards General Moore, who was thought to have obtained it abroad. I am enabled to give an illustration of this unique specimen from the National collection.

¹ *Stuart Papers*, vol. i, Introductory, lii.
² *Calendar of Stuart Papers*, vol. i, Introductory, xxv.
The position of affairs in England in the year 1710, owing to the ascendancy of the Tory party, looked more hopeful for the Jacobite cause, and James, fighting against the English abroad, was still intriguing to rule the English at home. From this time forward he passed little time in France, for his ejection was made a stipulation in the Treaty of Utrecht¹ and all preliminaries thereto, and from 1712 onward, we find him the guest of the Duc de Lorraine at Bar, though in active correspondence with Berwick,² who resided in Paris, and through whose means James negotiated in secret with the English ministry. Could he have been present at the deathbed of Queen Anne, there is little doubt that his peaceful accession had been assured. Again in “The ‘Fifteen” all might have been well, had he been able to fulfil the expectations of his adherents by arriving amongst them in person at the concerted time, properly equipped with men and money,³ whether upon the coast of England or of Scotland—for the place of landing remained undecided to the last.⁴ Had he, when he did arrive at the last moment, been able to bring with him the great general, the Duke of Berwick, who had been through twenty-six campaigns by the time he was forty-four years of

¹ The Treaty of Utrecht was signed April 12th, 1713.
² Calendar of the Stuart Papers, vol. i, p. 264 et seq.
³ By the advice of the Scots, the invasion of 1715 had been put off from August 10th, N.S., to September 6th, O.S. See memorial from Mar, July, 1715. Stuart Papers, vol. i, 520, and pp. 375 and 376.
Patterns and Medals bearing

age, and would have brought experience to the field, this again might have compensated for the lack of men and money, and all might have been retrieved. Berwick being a naturalised French subject, was unable to accompany his natural brother without the sanction of the French Court, but his refusal to do so caused a coldness between James and the marshal, which was only healed when both were advanced in years. Again, had James, although arriving almost alone and unsupported as he did, possessed the fire and energy which characterised his more venturous son in "The Forty-Five," something might have been done, but the ill-fortune of the Stuarts followed him throughout; he gave way to depression and even to tears, and as Prince Eugene said of him when he wept on the failure of his hopes—"Weeping is not the way to conquer kingdoms."

The real death-blow to the expedition of 1715 was the demise of Louis XIV. on September 1st, on the very eve of the rising, when the Regent d'Orleans, unwilling to risk anything in defence of the late King's protégé, delayed the promised help; and we may quote Bolingbroke, who, in a letter to Sir William Wyndham, speaking of the dying Louis, said, "My hopes sank as he declined, and died when he expired." The events of the rebellion of 1715 are too well known to need repetition; suffice it to say that Mar had raised the standard of the Chevalier in September, 1715, and the earlier part of the campaign was favourable to the cause of the Stuarts, but Mar was a failure as a general, and there was no unanimity amongst his followers. He himself was one of the late ministers of Anne, whom George on his accession had alienated from his side by the coldness with which he had met his advances. Mar, spurned by the King de facto, turned to the King de jure. I do not insinuate that he did not try his best to conquer for James, but circumstances were against him. The promised diversion in the West of England under Ormonde did not take place, and for some months the awaited leader from France did not

2 Calendar of Stuart Papers, vol. i, Introductory, lxxxi, and pp. 441, 451, 500, 504.
3 Ibid., vol. i, p. 466.
5 Ibid., vol. i, p. 37.
arrive. The expected help from Sweden was not forthcoming, and
the English and Scots were still on doubtful terms. To quote the
words of a writer of the beginning of last century, "In England, it
might be said that the Chevalier had the general feeling in his favour,
but it was not zealous. In Scotland he was supported by a zealous
attachment, but it was not general."
The forces under Argyle grew stronger, and when, after endless
delays—augmented by his illness from an ague after his landing at
Peterhead on December 22nd—James at last made a public entry into
Perth on the 10th of January, 1716, the termination of the affair was a
foregone conclusion.

James executed various acts of sovereignty, calling all men
between the ages of sixteen and sixty to his standard, fixing his
coronation at Scone for the 23rd, and ordering all foreign money to be
current. This last proclamation gave rise to the remark that "there
was only too little of it in the country, and an announcement of
arrivals [thereof] would be more acceptable than the unnecessary
injunction."

Amongst the more recently deciphered of the Stuart Papers is a
proposition from a certain Colonel James Fountaine written to
Bolingbroke on March 18th and April 22nd, 1716—after the failure of
the expedition—to suggest the striking of a million sterling in small
coins, one-half of which should be dispatched to Scotland at the
expense of Fountaine and his associate, if James would authorise,
him to keep the other half for his own use, and obtain the Pope’s
permission that the coins so struck should be current at Avignon.
They were to bear the Papal arms and cipher, and to be of the “same
touch, vollum, collore and consistance of the small actuale coyne of
France.” A thin blank showing the quality of the metal was enclosed.
If the Pope objected, it was suggested that James should promise

1 Charles XII. had promised to assist James with 12,000 men, but owing to the
investment of Stralsund, was unable to fulfil his intention.
5 Letters of Fountaine in the Stuart Papers, MSS., addressed to Lord Bolingbroke.
"when God Almighty enables him, to take up this small coyn and give silver for it and then to put his own stamp upon it, which will serve him for so much money when he returns to his kingdoms." The pieces were to be current for twopence-halfpenny and for five farthings. It does not appear that Bolingbroke or Mar consented to this proposition.

To return to the adventures of the unfortunate aspirant to the throne. All chance of success was at an end, and much against his own wishes James was persuaded to re-embark for France, retreating before the advancing Argyle. Taking with him Mar and such of his followers as he could convey, he embarked on 4th February, old style, in a small boat, and landed near Graveline seven days later.

James was no coward, as his retreat would lead us to suspect, but he was possessed with the idea that his people would make better terms without him, as he himself states in his letter of farewell to his Scottish subjects, February 4th–15th, 1716: but the portrait given of him by one of his adherents is not inspiring:

His person was tall and thin, seeming to incline to be lean rather than to fill as he grows in years. His countenance was pale, but perhaps looked more so than usual, by reason he had three fits of an ague, which took him two days after his coming on shore. Yet he seems to be sanguine in his constitution, and there was something of a vivacity in his eye, that perhaps would have been more visible, if he had not been under dejected circumstances, and surrounded with discouragement. His speech was grave, and not very clearly expressive of his thoughts, but his words were few, and his temper and behaviour seemed always composed. What he was in his diversions we know not; here was no room for such things. It was no time for mirth. Neither can I say I ever saw him smile.

1 That is, to countermark it.
2 "As I look'd on my remaining among you not only as useless, but even destructive to you, convinced as I am that you would never abandon me, and that therefore my stay could only serve to involve you in greater difficulties—I took the partie to repass the seas." "Letter of adieu to the Scotch." Calendar of Stuart Papers, vol. i, p. 506, see also p. 508, letter from Mar.
3 Constable's Miscellaneous, vol. xiii, p. 296, from a true account of the Proceedings of Perth by a Rebel, but Mr. Martin Haile in James Francis Edward suggests that it was not written by an adherent of the Stuarts, but to throw discredit on their cause.
When we saw the man whom they called our king, we found ourselves not at all animated by his presence, and if he was disappointed in us, we were tenfold more so by him . . . . Some said the circumstances he found us in dejected him. I am sure the figure he made dejected us; and had he sent us but five thousand men of good troops, and never himself come among us, we had done other things than we have now done. At the approach of that crisis when he was to defend his pretensions, and either lose his life or gain a crown, I think, as his affairs were situated, no man can say that his appearing grave and composed was a token of his want of thought, but rather of a significant anxiety, grounded upon the prospect of his inevitable ruin, which he could not be so void of sense as not to see plainly before him, at least when he came to see how inconsistent his measures were, how unsteady the resolutions of his guides, and how impossible it was to make them agree with one another.

In speaking of the rising of 1715-16, Mr. Hoblyn says,¹ that on the failure of the expedition, "James fled to France taking the dies for the coinage, excepting that of the 1709 crown with him." One cannot help thinking that such dies as are now in the British Museum, including the obverse die of this crown, never left the hands of the Roettiers, in whose possession they were found on the death of Norbert Roettier in 1727, and at which time correspondence passed between his widow and James on the subject of her claim to the retention of the same—she refused to give them up without compensation. This correspondence is, I believe, amongst the Stuart Papers, but I have not seen it. In the light of entries in the Stuart Papers, published subsequently to the date of Mr. Hoblyn's article, we know that the dies for the greater part of the coinage were not ready to be sent to James at the time of his exodus from Scotland. In the letter² before mentioned, from General Hamilton, dated Paris, February 13th, we read, "The guineas, shillings and sixpences are not yet finished, but the whole punches for stamping will be ready to be sent in eight days." That the coins were intended to be struck in Scotland from Norbert Roettier's dies is clear, as I have already quoted from this letter that General Hamilton sent one "impression of the crown-piece that's to be

² Calendar of the Stuart Papers, vol. i, p. 503.
now coined in Scotland,” but James was himself in France within the
specified “eight days,” clearly therefore the dies would not be sent.

CROWN, JACOBVS VIII., 1716.

The “crown-piece” is, as we have seen, a reproduction so far as
regards the obverse, of the former crown, with the substitution of the
Scottish for the English title, and with a new reverse specially designed
for Scotland, whilst the guinea bears a head which I have so far been
unable to trace to any former design, though among the puncheons in
Mathew Young’s collection, there is a smaller bust of more or less the
same type. May I say that, possibly, this was one of the unfinished
designs for the shilling, unless, as I suggested on page 251, it might
be for the coinage for 1709. I have found no trace of the sixpence
specified as “not yet finished.”

GUINEA, JACOBVS VIII., 1716.

PUNCHEON FOR SHILLING OF 1709 OR 1716. (?)
We must notice that for the guinea just illustrated, the draped bust is used and not the bare neck of the design for gold made in 1708, so this punchcon may have been intended for a half-guinea, if Mr. Young was right in placing this obverse and reverse together, and there is no evidence to the contrary. Of the other example supposed by Mathew Young to be a guinea I have presumed to question the intended use.

The Stuart Papers for the year 1716 contain another notice of the activity displayed by Norbert Roettier as engraver to the English Mint in France, for on April 8th, n.s., Mar writes to him, telling him to make seals, one “the Signet for Scotland,” another for the private use of the king. Careful instructions are given as to the arrangement on the former of the Scottish titles, the Scottish arms and of the Scottish as opposed to the English crown, “the flower de luce ought to be with the crosses betwixt, which is just the reverse of that of the English, tho’ commonly this is not minded as it ought by those who cut the seals for Scotland.” The Seals were to be made in steel as, “Seals cut in silver, though they appear well at first, soon wear out.” Roettier sent designs for the two seals on April 23rd, saying he would make them as soon as possible. The notice concerning the Scottish crown is interesting, because the alterations in the sixty-shilling-piece did not include this change, though the shield and titles were substituted for those of England.

Disheartened though James appeared to his Scottish adherents, he had not given up all hope, and during the immediately succeeding years, he was constantly planning to retrieve his failure. Help was expected first from Sweden, but the death of Charles XII. put a stop to the romantic crusade against the Hanoverians projected by that monarch. Spain next came to the rescue, but the elements fought against the Stuarts, and of the large Spanish fleet laden with men and money, only two frigates, having on board three Scottish leaders with a few hundred men, succeeded in reaching the appointed rendezvous in the Island of Lewis. These men, when defeated at the battle of

---

2 Charles had purposed to place 10,000 troops under the orders of James, but the Swedish King died at Frederickshall on December 11th, 1718.
Glenshiel in 1719, were compelled to surrender, and the rising provoked fresh reprisals by the English court upon the unfortunate Jacobites—but we must not enter at length upon a discussion of the Chevalier's schemes, for, so far as we know, no intended coinage was prepared for this event. The Stuart Papers for that year are not yet published, but Mr. Blackburne Daniell, to whose kindness I owe many thanks, informs me that he has not come across any designs for a coinage amongst the papers he has so far sifted, which extend to March, 1718. We may, however, give an illustration of one of the medals of the date 1719, for we here see the portrait of James as he might have been presented to us on his coins, had this last invasion been crowned with success. See Med. Ill., vol. ii, 446-52.

This medal is the work of Ottone Hamerani, before mentioned as a noted medallist of the Papal Court. It gives us a good idea of James as he appeared in his 31st year, and as it no doubt more nearly resembled him at that time, it would have been more suitable to a coinage than the proposed patterns of 1716, which as we have seen bear the portrait of a man hardly twenty years old. Inasmuch as the history of the unfortunate exile's later days remains, as far as present discoveries tell us, unsupported by numismatic evidence, it is not for me to enter into his fluctuating hopes of restoration, to tell of his plans for risings in Scotland in various years, of his hurried preparations on hearing of the death of George I. in 1727,¹ or of his

¹ Lochhart Papers, vol. ii, p. 359 et seq.
incessant correspondence with his adherents in both kingdoms, for ever forming fresh projects—always to meet with disappointment. He travelled from place to place, but resided mostly in the Papal dominions, almost the only domicile open to him, and from the date of his marriage onward, lived principally in the city of Rome.

Although ever ready to assert his rights for the sake of his children, James was shattered in health by the many reverses he had sustained, and he at length desisted from his personal efforts to regain the throne. He would have been more than willing to relinquish his claims in favour of his son—saying no less to the King of France when asking his aid for the enterprise of 1745, and, typical of the entire death of his individual ambition, is his calm and resigned though affectionate answer to an ardent speech of his son on the eve of his departure, eager for conquest. Charles said, "I trust I shall soon be able to lay three crowns at your feet." "Be careful, my dear boy," returned the father, "for I would not lose you for all the crowns in the world." It was said of James that he was more fitted to be a cardinal than a king, nor was this far wrong, as, in him, austere loyalty to his religion was foremost of all things, and his contemporaries might have said to him, as Richelieu said to Henry, Cardinal York, when he kept a council of war waiting that he might attend mass, "You may gain the kingdom of Heaven by your prayers, but never the kingdom of England." We may perhaps be permitted to glance at the verbal portraiture of James as he appeared to two travellers who saw him in the year 1740, not long before the time when, had fortune favoured Prince Charles, the efforts of the latter might have placed the elder Chevalier on the throne, for we have none of the medallic type to bring him before us at that date. Gray, the poet, writing to his mother, describes him thus: "He is a thin, ill-made man, extremely tall and awkward, of a most unpromising countenance, a good deal resembling King James the Second, and has extremely the air and

1 *The Last of the Royal Stuarts*, p. 31. Letter from James to Louis XV., August 11th, 1745.

2 Jesse, vol. i, p. 74.

3 *The Last of the Royal Stuarts*, by Vaughan, p. 38.
look of an idiot, particularly when he laughs or prays; the first he does not do often, the latter continually." This is manifestly an unfair description, as, far from being "an idiot," James was ill-fitted for the path of an adventurer by the very fact that he had too much common-sense to give way to enthusiasm, and we look back with pleasure to the remark of Gordon of Glenbucket, who interviewed James at Perth in 1716:—"He was the only modest man there; he hearkened to reason." But Gray was an adverse critic, and we would rather quote the less prejudiced President, Charles des Brosses,¹ who though he speaks of James as "dévot à l'excès," says, "His behaviour was dignified"—"he speaks seldom, but always courteously and pleasantly. It is easy to recognise him for a Stuart, of which family he has every trait, for he is tall and lean, and in face strongly resembles the portraits we have in France of his father, James II. He is also very like the Duke of Berwick, his natural brother, except that the Marshal's face was sad and severe, while that of the Pretender is sad and feeble . . . his dignity of manners is extraordinary. I never beheld any Prince preside over an assembly so well and so gracefully." This last sentence of des Brosses is corroborated by the description given by Lord Blandford of his reception by James, when his "salute was returned with a smile which changed the sedateness of his former aspect into a very graceful countenance."

Leslie, the chaplain to the Protestant members of his household at Bar-le-Duc, depicts his royal master as "tall, straight and clean-limbed, slender, yet his bones pretty large; he has a very graceful mien, walks fast and his gait has great resemblance to his uncle Charles II. He is always cheerful but seldom merry, thoughtful but not dejected, and bears his misfortunes with a visible magnanimity of spirit." Leslie continues with a panegyric on his abilities, toleration—a matter of certain knowledge to the Protestant divine—his application to business, sweetness of temper and the like. This was at the age of thirty-six.

But to return to his personal appearance in later life. Horace

¹ Lettres sur l'Italie given in The Last of the Royal Stuarts, p. 17.
Walpole draws a parallel between Charles I. and his grandson, and writing in 1752, when the latter was an old man, he finally says—“Without the particular features of any Stuart, the Chevalier has the strong lines and fatality of air peculiar to them all.” In his youth, Mar, who called him “the finest gentleman I ever saw,” had compared him, as had Ailesbury and others, to Charles the Second; we thus see him likened to all his royal predecessors, and, alas! to him, more than to any other member of that unfortunate family, applies the remark of one of the biographers of Charles I.: “It is possible the English people did not understand the Stuarts; it is certain that the Stuarts did not understand the English people.”

May I suggest that the marked melancholy of James’s aspect, commented on by all contemporary writers as so characteristic of the Stuarts, somewhat concealed from the casual observer the very real intelligence which, had he been understood, would have endeared him to his subjects. Of his mental powers there is no doubt. Mar, in the letter quoted above, says:—“He has fine parts and despatches all his business himself with the greatest exactness. I never saw anyone write so finely; . . . . in a word, he is fitted to make a happy people were his subjects more worthy of him.” But what need have we of further evidence as to his industry, or his other good and royal qualities when the mass of the Stuart Papers lies open before us?

Pious, generous, honourable, his letters written with quiet tact and common-sense, and in good English notwithstanding his foreign education—he lived out the remaining years of his life in dignified seclusion, the honoured guest of the Papal States, where, almost alone, his regal title was acknowledged.

At his death his funeral was conducted with all the formalities due to a king. It may interest the numismatist to hear that in an account in the Stuart Papers, written in Italian, of the ceremonies observed on this occasion, it is stated that three large medals—gold, silver and

1 Letter from Mar, dated Glames, January 5th, 1716.
2 Sir John Skelton’s Charles 1., p. 176.
bronze respectively—bearing his effigy on one side and a view of the city of London on the reverse, were thrown at the last moment into his coffin. As I conclude that this description must apply to Hamerani's last medal of James, executed in 1721,1 I illustrate it here; for, as far as I know, there is no other medallic representation of him with a view of London on the reverse.

![Medal, called "The Appeal Against the House of Hanover"](image)

It seems strange that no more recent medallic portrait of the titular king should have been forthcoming, for in the poverty of the Jacobite court, medals were freely distributed as the only reward at the disposal of the royal family, in requital of small services rendered to them.

According to most authorities2 this medal is the work of Ottone Hamerani, but Nagler3 in his Künstler-Lexicon distinctly states on the word of Lochner4 that this and several others of the medallic portraits of James, usually attributed to Otto, are to be assigned to his elder brother Ermenegildo—a list of whose productions he appends. In this list he figures the jugate busts of James and Clementina, Med. Ill., vol. ii, 445–51, and as this last medal is signed with the monogram H.E. for the initial letter of HEAMERANI instead of, as usually printed, HAMERANI, and the workmanship of the two medals bears a close

2 Dictionary of Medallists, by L. Forrer, etc.
4 Quoting Lochner's Sammlung Merkwürdiger Medaillen, vol. v, Vorrede, 1741.
relationship the one to the other, we may perhaps be permitted to accept his dictum with regard to the above illustrated medal called in *Medallic Illustrations of British History*, vol. ii, 454–63, "Appeal against the House of Hanover."

On the other hand it is fair to state that I find on referring to Lochner's lectures, that he includes in the list a medal which is signed by Otto, and which he himself had ascribed to that artist in a former article.1 I allude to the marriage medal I illustrated on page 264. Lochner, writing during the lifetime of the artists, should be a reliable authority, but in this instance he appears to contradict himself. Nagler states that Ermenegildo Hamerani and his brother Ottone both worked for the exiled Stuarts, and amongst the *Stuart Papers*2 we find a warrant appointing Otto Emerano Hamerani engraver to James III. This warrant is dated October 25th, 1720, and is followed on May 16th, 1761,3 by a grant of a similar appointment to Ferdinand Hamerani.4 Some confusion arises from the fact that in this latter document Otto Hamerani is referred to as deceased, whereas the usually received date5 of his death is the year 1768. But this is not the place to enter into a discussion on the various members of the Hamerani family—as many and as puzzling to the numismatist as our talented Wyons; I have already too long occupied the time of my readers, and must close with a final reference to the titular King James. He died in January in 1766, having during his *de jure* reign seen upon the throne of his ancestors, five of his supplanters; had he peacefully succeeded his father in 1701, his reign would have been rather more than six months longer than that even of Queen Victoria, and had circumstances favoured him, who shall say that he might not have made a good king? At any rate we would rather respect his misfortunes, so patiently borne to the end of a career of adversity, than compare the far sadder death of his rival George I.,

---

2 *Stuart Papers, MSS.*, Entry Book, 6, p. 11.
4 See *Stuart Papers, MSS.*, Entry Book, 6, p. 28.
5 See Forrer's *Dictionary of Medallists* and Bolzenthal's *Skizzen zur Kunstgeschichte der Modernen Medaillen Arbeit*.
who died unloved by the English people to the last, as much an
exile from his beloved Hanover during his enforced residence in
England, as was James from the land of his birth and the throne of
the Stuarts.

I have now only to express my humble gratitude to His Majesty
the King for allowing me to examine some of the *Stuart Papers*; and
to specially thank Mr. Grueber, Mr. Martin Haile, and others, who
have assisted me in my researches, also our Editors and many members
of this Society, whose constant help has made my task very pleasant,
and to beg kindly indulgence in that I have written so long a paper on
so limited a subject as that of the patterns and medals bearing the
legend *Iacobvs III. or Iacobvs VIII.*