PORTRAITURE OF OUR TUDOR MONARCHS
ON THEIR COINS AND MEDALS.

BY HELEN FARQUHAR.

In limiting the subject of this paper to the artistic series of the medallic portraiture of some of our monarchs, I purpose to confine myself, for the present, to citing examples found upon our coinage and medals during a period of one hundred years, a long enough time, but short as we reckon art. I will begin with the year 1504—speaking of the Tudors only—though I hope to carry my readers into Stuart days in some future volume. My reason for starting with the sixteenth century is, that although in very early times the busts of our sovereigns appeared upon their coins, the excellence of the Roman portraiture was soon lost by our Saxon forefathers, and though perhaps upon the Norman coins a certain likeness may be traced to the seals or effigies of our kings, these rude presentations can hardly be classed as artistic portraits. A portrait to be artistic should be a true, if perhaps a rather flattering likeness. Now many of our writers have contributed much interesting information upon the changes in the busts of our early rulers, also of their personal appearance, but few have ever suggested that the likenesses of these monarchs upon their coins bring any vivid picture of the men before our eyes—although they were in some instances well portrayed upon their seals. George Vertue, it is true, endeavoured to trace portraits in the coins of such kings as he could not find represented more clearly upon their effigies or in early pictures, and he published his engravings in Rapin’s History of England, but his glorified likenesses cannot be said to carry much weight. The pennies of each of our Norman kings, even of Stephen, might possibly be thought to suggest the manner of man portrayed, though not artistically, but it is by the help of other evidence we decide that the bust upon a coin is that of Richard l., or of John,
and not that of their father Henry; it does not really convince us that Richard or John wore more or fewer curls in the arrangement of his hair, or more or fewer pearls in his crown, and it is from other sources that we surmise how handsome was Richard Cœur-de-Lion, how unpleasing was Richard III. The early Edwards differ so little in their busts that portraiture was evidently no longer intended, and the differences between the coinages of Henry IV., Henry V., and Henry VI. present a question for experts to decide.

But with the seventh Henry all is changed: in the nineteenth year of his reign our first Tudor king reverts upon his silver coinage to the profile bust, in disuse in England since the days of Stephen, and portraiture—even artistic portraiture—is established on our coins.

Starting from this point, let me review the causes which contributed to such excellent results as have from time to time been produced. I am, however, with regret obliged to omit many of our most noteworthy specimens because, on such examples as the beautiful gold coinage of Mary I. and of many of our kings, the figure is either too small, or the portrait is not sufficiently definite to give any real idea of the monarch's personal appearance. I must therefore turn my attention to those coins which bear the bust of the ruler upon the obverse, and see how far they give us any notion of the features or characteristics of the man or woman whose peculiarities we wish to study, without consideration of their often far more admirable reverse decoration.

Apart from the wave of artistic feeling, which, sweeping over Europe at the time of the Italian Renaissance, only began to be felt in England under our first Tudor king—apart from this wave of art, it appears to me that the qualities of the ruler, as much mental as physical, have exerted great influence on our coinage. The personal appearance of the man—handsome or the reverse—is, of course, a factor, but not one of primary importance, for everyone has some good points on which a clever artist may seize, vide the magnificent crowns of Charles II. and of Oliver Cromwell. Of far more service is the acumen of the monarch in entrusting the making of his likeness to the best portrait painter of his day. I do not mean that the painters were charged with the making of the dies or even of the designs for
such, but rather that the style of their portraiture influenced that of the contemporary engravers.

To these latter we must give the real responsibility of the effigies upon the coins, but unfortunately little is known about the authors of the Tudor coinage, and we look in vain for a Thomas Simon or a Nicholas Briot whose personal history is fairly recorded, and whose brilliant talents as artist and medallist combined, compel our admiration. However, be they identified or no, the actual makers of the Tudor coins and medals are not to be despised, whilst the dynasty which found England not much accounted of by other nations and in a state of civil war, left her respected and feared by her neighbours, and holding her own in commerce and in the arts.

Reverting, therefore, to the beginning of the sixteenth century, let me endeavour to trace in Henry VII. and his successors such qualities as contributed to the encouragement of the artistic development of the country.

A modern writer has said of Henry VII. that "there was nothing too small for his attention," and he reminds us that Polydore Vergil remarked that he allowed no one to usurp his authority, saying that he wished to rule and not to be ruled, whilst Bacon mentions that almost every leaf of an account book of Empson's was countersigned by the king's hand. Henry, therefore, can hardly be acquitted of the extortions practised in his name by his ministers—by Morton, Fox, Empson and Dudley, and though I admit the various good qualities, the shrewdness and acumen of the king, I cannot unreservedly endorse the unqualified praises lavished upon him by contemporary or early writers. But Henry's personality was impressive, and even Francis Bacon, writing as he did more than a hundred years after the king's death, even this wise statesman was perhaps the greatest of all the

1 Mr. H. Fisher in vol. v of the Political History of England, p. 125.
2 Polydore Vergil came from Urbino. He was born in 1470, and arrived in England in 1501. He became Archdeacon of Wells and wrote his Historia Anglicana at the suggestion of Henry VII. It was published in 1534. See Political History of England, vol. v, pp. 152-155.
3 I have seen at the Record Office a book of receipts of Sir Thos. Lovell from 1489-1495 in which each entry is attested by the sign manual of the King.
panegyrist of our first Tudor monarch, and if we, in the cold light of later centuries, find somewhat to blame, we must admit that in spite of the great difficulties of his position he achieved very remarkable results. Of all people, we, as numismatologists, should read his record with interest. Coming to govern a country devastated by civil war, he himself declared—so said Polydore Vergil,—"that his policy was directed not to the accumulation of treasure, but to the coercion of a fierce people who had been nurtured in faction," and this, perhaps, was one reason for his frequent practice of impoverishing his opponents by heavy fines in preference to following the usual expedient of those times, that of executions. This policy, however, suited well, both with the clemency of Henry's disposition and with the avarice for which he was noted. The king's love of money amounted to a passion, but whether this passion resulted in a positive affection for the coin itself, who shall say? At any rate, it is undoubted that his currency received his careful attention. To our modern ideas it seems absurd that such laws should be passed, as those forbidding foreign merchants to leave the country carrying a larger sum than ten crowns, or to receive payment in money instead of goods. It ministers, no doubt, to our national vanity to think that our coinage was so superior to that of some of our neighbours, that such methods of stopping the export thereof should be deemed necessary, but it is less satisfactory to learn that in 1503 the Irish currency was adjudged so defective, that the influx of the light silver coming from the sister isle had to be checked, and it was rendered penal to export more than six and eightpence in bullion, coin or plate to Ireland, whilst no merchant might carry more than three and fourpence from that country to England. In making or confirming such regulations, Henry was only following the customs of his predecessors at a time when it was thought that all foreign traders should traffic in kind only, exchanging the products of their countries for those of the land visited; and if these laws are not such

as we should now pass, at any rate they were better than the later expedient of Henry VIII., who debased his own currency to such an extent, that there was no danger of aliens even desiring to export our coins.

That Henry VII. had a difficult hand to play is clear, and he played his cards very well. He was a man of keen understanding, a good judge of character, even keeping a notebook in his own handwriting stating "whom to employ, whom to reward, of whom to enquire, of whom to beware," etc., etc. I am almost inclined to say with Bacon that "he was one of the best sort of wonders, a wonder for wise men." That he was a man of education is clear: Bacon states that he read French as well as Latin fluently, and Bishop Fisher in his funeral sermon says that "his speech was gracious in diverse languages." We have proof of his love of architecture in the beauty of his chapel in Westminster Abbey, commenced in 1503, and we hear that listening to music was amongst his few diversions. We are informed of his correspondence with Italian and other foreign courts, and it is possible that intercourse with such patrons of the arts as the Duke of Urbino may have directed his attention to portraiture. It is at least significant that Polydore Vergil, who was in the employment of Henry at the period of his third coinage, was a native of Urbino. Henry created the above-mentioned Duke Guidobaldo a Knight of the Garter in 1504, and as the coinage of Italy at this moment was improving rapidly in point of portraiture, I might perhaps be permitted to suggest that the bust of the Duke of Urbino upon his coins, being a fairly good profile to left, may have fired Henry to emulation. Guidobaldo reigned from 1482 to 1508, but he was, though a great patron of the arts, by no means the pioneer of the portrait coinage in Italy. He was the husband of Elizabeth Gonzaga, whose sisters-in-law, Isabella and Beatrice D'Este, in their respective courts of Mantua and Milan, rivalled one another in their collections of art treasures.

1 Francis Bacon's History of Henry VII., written in 1621, p. 218, of Pitt Press edition of 1876.
2 Ibid., p. 211.
3 Ibid., p. 219.
The court of Milan, with which, however, Henry had less association, took the lead in respect of a portrait coinage, for the magnificent gold ducat of Francesco Visconti, Duke of Milan from 1450 to 1466, presented a splendid model for future generations to follow, and Galeazza Maria (1468-1476), his son Gian Galeazza, and brother Ludovico Moro (1494-1500), the husband of Beatrice, are scarcely less strikingly portrayed upon their coins. The Popes were by no means dilatory from the point of view of art, and I may call attention to the fine profile to left of Sixtus IV., who ruled from 1471 to 1484, and to the equally remarkable presentment of Julius II., Pontiff from 1503 to 1513, although the last mentioned effigy brings the famous Pope less vividly before us, in that we are accustomed to think of him bearded as in Raphael's well known picture. Both these Popes were of the Rovere family and connections of Guidobaldo of Urbino. I can but select some instances from the striking German coinages, such as that of Frederick the Wise of Saxony (1486-1525), whose thaler shows him admirably portrayed on the obverse, whilst the reverse bears the face-to-face busts of his brother John and his cousin George; or again the fine coins of the Empire, as exemplified by the magnificent portraits of Maximilian I., 1493-1519. A very early portrait is that of Sigismund (1439-1496), Arch-Duke of Austria, struck in the Tyrol.

Let us turn to the three countries with which Henry had most intercourse—Spain, France, and Scotland. In Spain, I may say, that his contemporaries, Ferdinand and Isabella (1474-1504) were, as Henry was in England, the pioneers of portraiture. Their face-to-face coinage bears a marked resemblance to their effigies both in wood and stone, and though the father of Ferdinand, Juan II. of Aragon, was portrayed somewhat better upon his coins than were some of his neighbours, his full-faced presentment is not really remarkable. The predecessors of Isabel in Castile did not practise portraiture. The predecessors of Isabel in Castile did not practise portraiture. The predecessors of Isabel in Castile did not practise portraiture. The predecessors of Isabel in Castile did not practise portraiture. The predecessors of Isabel in Castile did not practise portraiture. In France, Louis XII.'s profile (1498-1514) for a moment arrests the attention as being of the same style, though not as good, as Henry VII.'s, and it is curious to find that Scotland, always so much influenced by her French ally, in this instance preceded her and most other countries—that is, if we accept the attributions of Mr. Burns in his Coinage of
Scotland. This author gives reasons for stating that whilst the thistle-head and mullet groats with the bust of a king three-quarter to right were in his opinion of the second coinage of James III., who reigned from 1460 to 1488, the groat three-quarter to left was his last, instead of being the currency instituted by James IV. and continued by James V. He dates the first mentioned groat 1471, and this, indeed, would be an early example of portraiture, but as James IV., the contemporary of our Tudor king (1488-1513), reverted during a portion of his reign to the conventional full-faced type, he can hardly be said to have acted as Henry's guide. Scotland's early coinages, such as that of David II. (1329-1371), are more suggestive of possible likeness than those of his fellow monarchs in England, but we must wait for the reign of James V. (1513-1542) to witness the appearance of the fine profile busts, which gain for the northern kingdom a high place in the numismatic world, and to him, between 1517 and 1524, Mr. Cochran-Patrick, with others, attributes the groat three-quarter to right mentioned above, and he suggests it may be the "Duke's Testoon" issued during the regency of Albany. James IV. was the son-in-law of Henry, and it was but shortly before the time of the latter's new coinage that the relationship between the two kingdoms became most friendly, for the marriage treaty, drawn up in 1499, took effect in 1503, when Margaret arrived in Scotland as the bride of James IV., but, as I have said above, James was no pioneer in the arts.

I fear that in my anxiety to trace the love of portraiture to its origin amongst the contemporary rulers of Europe, I have digressed too far from the position of affairs in our own kingdom, but I wished to prove that we were not far in the rear of other nations in this respect. It may be of interest to numismatologists to learn that in the goldsmith's art, so nearly allied to that of the designer of the

---

1 Burns's Coinage of Scotland, Plate XLIV, Figs. 577-583 of vol. ii, pp. 115, 117.
2 Ibid., Plate XLVII and XLVIII, 636-646, and vol. ii, pp. 134-139.
3 Ibid., vol. ii, p. 112.
4 Records of the Coinage of Scotland, Cochran-Patrick, Plate V, Fig. 8, and vol. i, p. 266.
Portraiture of our Tudor Monarchs

coinage, England was also by no means behindhand, though it is possible that many of the artisans employed were of foreign origin.¹

An Italian traveller, as early as the beginning of Henry's reign, comments on the quantity of wrought silver then to be found in London. "In one single street," this Venetian² remarks, "there are fifty-two goldsmiths' shops so rich and full of silver vessels great and small that in all the shops in Milan, Rome, Venice, and Florence put together, I do not think would be found so many of the magnificence that are to be seen in London."

Polydore Vergil,³ who first came to England in 1501, expresses also his sense of surprise at the opulence of this kingdom in these respects, saying that in most English houses, however poor, there are silver saltcellars, silver spoons and silver cups. This speaks highly for the development of a country not long since devastated by civil wars, and shows that Henry's oppression of his subjects was not so great as it has sometimes been represented. His character was, however, one which did not improve with years. His minister, Morton, who influenced him mainly for good, died in October, 1500, and after the Archbishop's death, Henry's appetite for gold increased rapidly, but if there is anything in physiognomy, the coinage of 1504 should improve our opinion of the king, for our admiration is excited by the clear cut features, and the intelligent and benign expression of his face as seen on his third coinage.

Polydore Vergil describes Henry thus: "He was graceful, but firm and strong; his stature just above the average; his face beautiful,

¹ In the Political History of England, vol. v, p. 219, Mr. Fisher, speaking of a period only forty years later, says, "The subsidy rolls of 1540, suggest the inference that one-third of the population of London at that date consisted of alien artisans." Dr. Woltmann in his Holbein and His Times, p. 342, says, on the authority of Daniel von Wensin, who wrote in 1613, that "not long ago almost all the goldsmiths in London were Germans, amongst whom at that time the Netherlands and Swiss were of course also reckoned." But we must remember that Henry VIII.'s Protestant proclivities encouraged the influx of foreigners, and he also employed many Italians and Frenchmen. See Jewellery, by H. Clifford Smith, p. 208.
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especially when he was talking gaily; his eyes were grey; he had few teeth; his hair was sparse.¹ Such was the king whose portrait on his coinage was, as Ruding² tells us, quoting Folkes, “a good representation of his other pictures,” but as we shall see presently, authentic con-

temporary pictures of Henry VII. in profile are not very common. Henry Tudor is described by Bacon³ as “a comely personage a little above just stature, well and straight limned, but slender,” and he says of his countenance that it was “reverent and a little like that of a churchman.” We must remember that Bacon, not being a contemporary writer, obtained much of his information from such authors as Polydore Vergil quoted above, but his remarks that the king’s face, “as it was not strange or dark, so neither was it winning or pleasing, but as the face of one well disposed,” is so apt a description of such pictures of our first Tudor king as are known to me, that I cannot forbear to quote it.

There are three contemporary portraits of Henry VII., one, a very remarkable and authentic oil painting on panel, in the rooms of the Society of Antiquaries at Burlington House. I must mention also that in the National Portrait Gallery, painted in 1505 by a Flemish artist for Herman Rinck, commercial agent at the courts of England and Germany; but in common with other portraits of the king, these do not present the profile view with which we could best compare the

² Ruding, vol. i, 299. Folkes’s English Silver and Gold Coins, p. 16. “This king did also about the 18th or 19th year of his reign make a great alteration in the form of his coin, upon which his head is now represented crowned, but in profile, and with a good resemblance of his other pictures, whereas the heads of all our former kings had constantly been drawn in front upon their money since the time of King John.”
coin. There is some curious old painted glass portraying Henry VII. with Elizabeth of York at Stanford Hall, the residence of Lord Braye, which I believe came from the ancient house, but this, again, gives an almost facing picture. The head upon the carved panels at Haddon,\(^1\) which are said to represent the same king and queen, shows the profile view in the case of the man, but it is more probably a portrait of Sir George Vernon, the owner of the hall in 1545, and I understand the evidence points to its origin being as late as the reign of Henry VIII. The east window in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, which was, at one time, erroneously described as representing Henry VII., is now declared in guide books to depict Arthur, Prince of Wales,\(^2\) and on the other hand Sir George Scharf shows excellent reasons for thinking Henry VIII. is the kneeling figure, and with this attribution the second coinage of the younger king agrees.\(^3\)

The practice of painting in oils, already some time in use on the continent, was gradually making headway in England, and miniatures either on panel or in illuminated missals were not unknown, but the best remembered pictures of the king, such as those by Holbein and Hilliard, were, of course, executed in the time of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, though no doubt taken from older originals. Excepting in size and a few details in dress, Hilliard's miniature is almost identical with the panel at the Society of Antiquaries quoted above. However, for a true likeness of Henry VII. I may confidently refer the reader to the effigy in Westminster Abbey, and to this the coins bear a marked resemblance.

It is true that the monument was not finished till nine years after the death of the royal model, but it was projected during his lifetime, and no doubt Pietro Torrigiano made use of a mask taken after death in order to construct his statue, a practice common at that time. Walpole\(^4\) mentions "a stone model of the head of Henry VII. in his

---

1. *Haddon*, by G. Le Blanc-Smith, p. 64, Plate XIV.
2. *History and Description of the Windows of the Parish Church of the House of Commons*, by Mrs. Sinclair.
death agony," by Torrigiano, from which we might infer that the artist had access to the king during his last moments; the date of Torrigiano's first visit to England seems difficult to establish, but is sometimes given as 1509. The cost of the monument was £1,500, for it was Henry VIII.'s special care, and we learn that, "the first draft of it was altered because it was disliked by him." Possibly the "first draft" may allude to the tomb begun in 1501 by Esterfeld, but if the stone head to which I referred above was the design first submitted by the great sculptor, one could hardly wonder that so painful though magnificent a study should not meet with the approval of the son, who would naturally prefer the calm and majestic effigy of his father chosen to typify his rest in peace. The bust, which at one time was at Strawberry Hill, is now in the collection of the Duke of Northumberland, and I understand that the family possess no certain information concerning the identity of the model beyond Walpole's tradition. It is extremely fine, and as far as I could judge from the drawing in Carter's Specimens of Ancient Sculpture, I cannot say that I agree with Mr. Charles Perkins, who says, "it in no wise resembles Henry VII.," but he further states that it has been said to have been made in imitation of the youth in the Laocoön, and to this there is a certain likeness. It would not, however, in any case prove that Torrigiano was present at Henry's deathbed as it might have been an idealised bust by the artist.

Henry VII. was fifty-two years of age when he died—his coinage represents him at the age of forty-seven. Introduced as it was only a

---

1 See Archeological Journal, vol. ii, p. 131, in which Mr. Higgins says, "We have no information of the exact date of his [Torrigiano's] arrival in England; it may well be as early as 1509, the year of the death of Henry VII., and the Lady Margaret, especially if my views are correct, that the Countess's tomb was made before that of the King."

2 The contract between Torrigiano and Henry VII.'s executors for £1,500, was made on 26th October, 1512. The tomb was finished some time before 5th January, 1518-1519. Archeological Journal, vol. ii, p. 141, and Archeologia, vol. xvi, p. 84.

3 Memorials of Westminster Abbey, by Dean Stanley, p. 148, and Vertue MSS., Add. MS. 23,069, f. 52b.

4 Carter's Specimens of Ancient Sculpture, vol. ii, Plate XL, and p. 44.

5 Perkins's Tuscan Sculpture, vol. i, p. 262.
few years before his death, the king's profile portrait was an interesting departure from the perpetually facing busts of his own early days and of his predecessors; it may have been intended to mark an epoch in the improvement of the currency, just as our early monarchs changed the obverse of their coins from full face to profile in order to draw attention to the calling in of the old money. But be the cause what it might, the coin from the point of view of art is singularly beautiful, and the reign of portraiture had begun in England, the profile bust from this time forth playing an important part in the decoration of the currency. It was certainly not always in use, for Henry VIII. and Edward VI. reverted to the less artistic full-faced heads on some of their coins, but even in cases where these were preferred, the effort after portraiture was maintained—indeed the facing busts of Henry VIII. in his later years are painfully like the king.

**Henry VIII.**

The younger Henry at first continued to use his father's effigy upon his coinage instead of substituting his own portrait, replacing it only in his second issue in the eighteenth year of his reign with his own bust, though of doubtful portraiture and still in profile, but his subsequent changes in the silver currency are marked by less and less pleasing presentments of himself full-face, or three-quarter face as the case may be, and these are, without doubt, truly representative of the king. We may, perhaps, partly attribute the ugliness of the later portraits to increasing personal defects in Henry's appearance; for he became in his middle age extremely fat and unwieldy, although in his
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youth he was described as distinctly handsome. We must of course discount the panegyrics of contemporary writers at a time when to flatter was the safest course, but the Venetian Ambassador should be a trustworthy witness when writing to his own government. This Italian, Ludovico Faliero, was by no means lax in his criticism of the king's character, which he epitomises as "given up to idleness," but of his person, even at the age of forty, his praise is unstinted. He writes,¹ "It would not be enough to say that he is handsome, he resembles Cæsar; his look is calm and, contrary to English fashion, he wears his beard, . . . . he rides very well, jousts and handles a lance with great skill; he is a good shot and an excellent tennis player." This foreign envoy, who further describes Henry as having "the face of an angel," must have seen something more attractive in him than I can find in his pictures, even in those by Holbein, which must have satisfied the royal model, since a story is told that one of the courtiers, complaining to the king of an affront, received from the foreign artist, was at once reproved.² "Of seven ploughmen," said Henry, "I might make as many lords, but not one Holbein, and remember if you ever pretend to revenge yourself, I shall look on any injury offered to the painter as to myself."

It is perhaps rather unfair to Hans Holbein³ to attribute the portraits on the silver of Henry's thirty-fourth year to his influence, although the versatility of his talents, as a designer of jewels and ornaments, and a maker of patterns for goldsmith's work, was such as might possibly lead us to suppose that he would be called upon, at any rate, to advise on such an important matter as the new coinage, in spite of the well-known jealousy of foreign interference displayed by the authorities at the mint in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The exact moment at which the full-faced bust was first issued is still undecided, the large amount of bullion set aside, evidently

¹ Albèri letters. See translation in Marion Crawford's *Gleanings from Venetian History*, vol. i, p. 87.
² Walpole's *Anecdotes of Painting*, vol. i, p. 71.
³ Hans Holbein the younger, born according to Dr. Woltmann in 1495 or 1496, died in 1543. See Woltmann's *Holbein und seine Zeit*, Chap. III.
intended for the new coinage, between April, 1542, and 1543, would incline one to suggest an earlier issue than was thought probable, when the date was based\(^1\) on the assumption in England of Henry's new title of King instead of Lord of Ireland in 1543. The subject had been discussed since 1537,\(^2\) and an Act was passed in the Irish Parliament in June, 1541, whereby both Lords and Commons unanimously agreed that His Majesty and his heirs “should from thenceforth be named and called King of Ireland.” The Act was proclaimed in St. Patrick's Church, Dublin, on the 19th of June, and, says Ruding, speaking of the Irish coinage, “On this occasion a new kind of groats was struck, being like his former money as to the shape and stamp, but different in style.”\(^3\) The reverse bore the words **HIBERNIE : ET : HIBERNIE : REX** with the harp crowned between the two letters \(\mathbb{H}-\mathbb{R}\), each beneath a royal crown.

In September\(^4\) Henry wrote to Ireland to his Lord Deputy, saying that he had caused the Act “ to be summe part amended,” and ordering it “ to be newly passed as it is now sent to you, and then to use this style following; Henry the VIIIth by the grace of God, King of England, Fraunce, and Irelande, etc.” The ratification in Parliament of this distinction was not made in England till 1543,\(^5\) but it is possible that Henry, pleased with his new dignity, did not wait for the assent of his English Commons before adopting the **Hibernie Rex** on his coinage in this island, and indeed, Ruding\(^6\) says that his great seal was altered in 1541, whereas that of Ireland was only corrected in 1543, owing to some difficulty having arisen as to the engraving thereof.\(^7\) We may, however, be practically certain that the new English coinage with the full-faced bust did not appear as early as 1541, for there are groats to be found still bearing the profile head, though with the new title, and this title could not have been assumed,


\(^3\) Ruding, vol. i, p. 308.


\(^6\) Ruding, vol. i, p. 312.

\(^7\) Aquilla Smith in *Numismatic Chronicle*, vol. xix, New Series, p. 179.
at the earliest computation until the middle of that year; it is, therefore, almost unsafe to conclude that the change of type did not take place until the thirty-fourth year of Henry's reign. But whether the full-faced coinage be dated from Henry's thirty-fourth year (April, 1542, to April, 1543) or from his thirty-fifth year (April, 1543, to April, 1544), time is still given for the execution of a design before the death of Holbein, which occurred between the 7th of October and the 29th of November, 1543, as is proved from his hastily made will,1 probably executed when he was already attacked by the plague, and by the documentary evidence concerning the administration of his estate after his death. That he was in any way personally responsible for the execution of the design even if drawn by him, I do not think possible, for though he provided sketches for goldsmiths, both in Germany and England, there is no evidence of his practising their craft, and his son Philip,2 who adopted their profession rather than that of his father, was not resident in this country.

But Hans Holbein left behind him pictures of the king, which, though differing in many respects from the coins, might be said to have served as suggestions, rather than as prototypes, for the busts on the silver currency both of the full-faced and three-quarter faced types; I illustrate a testoon of the former type.

![Testoon of the Third Coinage of Henry VIII.](image)

The largest known piece of those bearing the three-quarter face

1 *Archaeologia*, vol. xxxix, p. 2 et seq. Will discovered by Mr. Black in the archives of St. Paul's Cathedral.
2 Dr. Woltmann quotes Isselin, a contemporary of Holbein's children, as saying "Filiis vero habuit Johan, Holbein, aurifabros, pictorem nullum," and there is evidence concerning Philip's apprenticeship to a Parisian goldsmith. *Holbein and his Times*, p. 330.
is the crown pattern in the Bodleian at Oxford, but it is so much worn that, except as an amplification of the smaller pieces, it is difficult to rely upon the portrait; there are modern imitations of this coin (see Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 46, No. 42). It represents Henry in three-quarter length, and is figured by Rud. viii, i, and Folkes, viii, 1. It is ably and fully discussed by Mr. John Loveday in the British Numismatic Journal, vol. i, pp. 139-147, where it is illustrated, together with an example of Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 47, no. 43, thought to be a later and foreign copy with a differing full-faced portrait.

Many pictures at one time attributed to Holbein himself are now declared to be only “of his school,” and it is not for me to enter into a discussion on the origin of these paintings, but it is an undisputed fact that great progress was at this time made in the art of portraiture in England, and whether by Holbein himself or by his colleagues and pupils, we do not lack representations of Henry. We might select from those acknowledged to be by Holbein, the cartoon in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire at Hardwick as the parent picture of many others.

This is the original sketch for the mural painting at Whitehall executed in 1537, but unfortunately destroyed by the fire of 1697. The cartoon contains the figures of Henry VIII. and his father, but their respective wives, Jane Seymour and Elizabeth of York, were also represented with them in the finished picture, and in this the face of Henry must have been more fully turned towards the spectator than the artist had at first intended. The family group in its entirety would have been unknown to us were it not that Charles II. caused Remigius van Leemput, a pupil of Van Dyck, to make a copy of it, which now hangs at Hampton Court and was subsequently engraved by George Vertue. In finishing the head, clearly, Holbein had recourse to his full-faced sketch of the king, now in the Munich Gallery, rather than to the Hardwick cartoon; probably this was in accordance with Henry’s wish, for he seems to have preferred the facing portraits, inasmuch as he far more frequently chose these for reproduction than those giving the three-quarter faced view, excepting in the case of his gems—vide the two fine cameos at Windsor.
Curiously enough there are very few profile portraits to be found of Henry VIII. or his father, though they were much the fashion with their foreign contemporaries. Our frontispiece is taken from Vertue's engraving of the Whitehall painting and, allowing for the substitution of the crown for the hat and the veiling of the rich costume in a mantle, it brings the king before us just as we see him on his full-faced coins.

Perhaps more striking still is the close resemblance between Henry VIII.'s countenance on the testoons and another acknowledged work of Holbein's painted for Anne of Cleves in 1539. Miniatures by this artist are extremely rare, and I am indebted to Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan for the illustration of this celebrated portrait as photographed in its original ivory box.¹

For the prototype of the three-quarter faced issues, I place before

¹ The miniature is reproduced in colour in vol. i, of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan's Private Catalogue, by Dr. Williamson, to whose kindness I owe the permission to illustrate it here; the copyright of these illustrations being strictly reserved by Dr. Williamson on behalf of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan.
the reader, in the accompanying plate, the magnificent little panel from Earl Spencer's collection at Althorp, one of Holbein's rare original paintings of the king; it is undated, but the portrait looks younger than the ordinary full-faced pictures. In it the head is turned to our right, as in the Hardwick cartoon; there is a good example, in oil upon copper, after this painting in the National Portrait Gallery. The actual duration of the German artist's activity in England was short, and we have, as far as I can ascertain, no absolute proof of his executing any painting for the king before 1536 or 1537, but Dr. Woltmann\(^1\) states that he is mentioned in a letter as "the king's painter" in the year 1536, and he received a regular salary of £30 a year from Henry from Lady Day, 1538, apparently for portraiture, for the sergeant painter or artist responsible for the decoration of the palaces was at that time Andrew Wright,\(^2\) who had filled the position since the death of John Brown in 1532, and Wright was succeeded shortly before the death of Holbein by Anthony Toto. The exact date of our artist's first visit to England is uncertain, but it is known that he left Basle\(^3\) for this country by way of Antwerp in August, 1526, and it is said that his earliest English dated pictures are of 1527. It is, however, not thought probable that Henry's attention was called by Sir Thomas More to the painter's powers between the years 1526 and 1529, the latter being the time when he returned for a season to Basle, as no portraits by him of the royal family of those dates are known. Mr. Wornum, in his *Life and Works of Holbein*,\(^4\) gives the following story of the year 1531 on the authority of Carel van Mander, though he does not vouch for its authenticity.

He says that the chancellor invited Henry to a banquet at his house, and showed him some of Hans Holbein's works, offering to present to him both the pictures and their artist, and that the king refused to accept the former gift, saying that "possessing the man

---

\(^1\) *Holbein and his Times*, by Woltmann, p. 383, quoting a letter from Nicholaus Bourbon to Solimarr in 1536.

\(^2\) *Holbein and his Times*, by Woltmann, p. 302, and *Archaeologia*, vol. xxxix, by John Gough Nichols.


\(^4\) *Life and Works of Holbein*, by Wornum, p. 257.
HENRY VIII., BY HOLBEIN, AT ALTHORP.

Photograph by Hanfstaengl.
himself, he would have his pictures at command." There is no certainty that he immediately availed himself of the introduction, though Walpole, in quoting the same story, appears to think that the king did so, giving Holbein lodgings in the palace and two hundred florins a year, besides paying him for his work.

One could wish that we could state with certainty that Holbein had painted Henry during his first visit to England, for to early pictures of the king, whencesoever they can be accurately dated, we might look for information concerning the first portrait coinage. The groats and smaller silver of the year 1526 present a curious problem.

Why should Henry at the age of thirty-five have substituted for his father’s bust one representing himself as a very young and clean-shaven man? The silver coinage does not stand alone, for although the sovereigns, showing no change from the previous type, would not call for remark, the golden bulla, made especially for attachment to the English half of the French treaty of 1527, brings Henry unbearded before us, and the king’s second great seal of 1532 much resembles his first. These are, however, more of a conventional than portrait type, and I will confine the question to the profile groat.

The fact that Henry was bearded in 1526 and earlier, can be proved in diverse manners—witness before all things the miniature at Windsor wearing a light young beard; this miniature is inscribed H.R. VIII. AN. ETATIS. XXXV., that is to say, it must have been painted between the 28th of June, 1525 and the 27th of June, 1526. By the gracious permission of His Majesty the King, I have been permitted to examine and illustrate

---

1 Walpole’s Anecdotes of Painting, Wornum’s ed., vol. i, p. 70.
2 In the Archives Nationales Paris, illustrated, Figs. 103 and 104, Plate XIX.
this and others of his miniatures, and the inscription is absolutely legible and reliable. The beard is soft and silky, the hair light brown and long.

For earlier dates we have the bas-relief catalogued as Torrigiano's at Hampton Court, in which Henry appears with his face adorned with a great deal of hair. This work is neither dated nor signed, and I should be inclined to assign it to a later period, but if Torrigiano was really the artist of the medallion, an attribution suggested by Walpole,¹ but disputed by Sir George Scharf,² it must have been executed before 1522 or at the latest in 1523. According to Vasari, Torrigiano left England in 1519 after the completion of Henry VII.'s chapel, dying in Spain a prisoner of the Inquisition in 1522, and although Mr. Alfred Higgins³ tells us that the sculptor must have survived till 1528, as is proved by a petition addressed by his widow to the Florentine law-courts, he considered it almost certain that he finally left this country in 1522 or 1523, having returned for a time, after but a short absence in 1519, to work upon the high altar in Henry VII.'s chapel, unfortunately destroyed in the Civil Wars.

¹ Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting, vol. i, p. 104.
² Sir George Scharf thinks it might be the work of Nicholas of Modena. Archeologia, vol. xxxix.
The year 1520 supplies us with much information respecting the king's beard, and if pictorial evidence is somewhat unreliable, here at least documentary proof is strong. Too much stress must not be laid upon the "Field of the Cloth of Gold" pictures at Hampton Court, representing the "Departure of Henry for France," and his "Meeting with Francis I.," because in two instances out of three the heads are restorations, whilst the third is so small that it is difficult to be absolutely certain that it is bearded. There are many pictures assigned to this date, mostly the work of French or German artists, such as a miniature in Mr. Pierpont Morgan's collection or the half-length in the National Portrait Gallery, but of these the date cannot be positively stated; with documents, however, we can make no mistake. Sebastian Giustinian, the Venetian Envoy to England, writing in 1519 says "on hearing that Francis I. wore a beard Henry allowed his own to grow, . . . . his beard was of a bright gold colour." In an entry in "The Letters and Papers of Henry VIII.," dated August 14th, 1519, we read, "as a proof of the King's desire [for an interview with Francis] he resolved to wear his beard till the said meeting." To requite this token of his affection, Francis laid his hand on his beard, and said, "surely he would never put it off till he had seen him." Further on, this resolve led to question and the Queen-Mother of France tells our Ambassador, Boleyn, that she had heard a report that Henry had shaved, which he, not knowing the truth, parried by saying "as I suppose it hath been by the Queen's desire—for I told my Lady that I have hereafter-time known when the King's grace hath worn long a beard

1 This picture, as far as the ships are concerned, is said to be by Vincent Volpe, employed by Henry from 1514-1530, whilst the figures are attributed to John Brown, Sergeant Painter, from 1511-1532; the head of Henry was cut out, probably at the time of the Commonwealth, and somewhat badly restored.

2 Illustrated in The Connoisseur, August, 1907.


4 Letter from Sir Thomas Boleyn, our Ambassador to France. Letters and Papers, vol. iii, Entry 416, p. 150.
that the Queen hath daily made him great instance and desired him to
put it off for her sake."

But Catherine had not obtained her will, for Henry is described by a Frenchman at the actual meeting as "a very handsome prince, 'honnette, hault et droit,'—in manner gentle and gracious, rather fat, and with a red beard large and becoming enough."

Whether or no Henry shaved later to please his first wife, we may ask ourselves. Possibly had I the leisure to have more thoroughly examined the large quantity of volumes of the Venetian Calendar or "The Letters and Papers of Henry VIII.," etc., I could have obtained more evidence, but we see that the king was still bearded during a part of the thirty-fifth year of his age, and if he shaved in the middle of 1526, it can scarcely have been to make himself agreeable to his Spanish wife, unless with a view to pacifying her jealousy, for his love for her was a thing of the past—thoughts of divorce were in his mind, and the star of the Boleyns was commencing to rise. Possibly he wished to appear younger and more attractive in Anne's eyes; she had been at court since 1521, and though it was not till towards the end of 1526 or the beginning of 1527 that we have direct evidence of her intercourse with the king, Henry had given her father the title of Lord Rochford in 1525, and had caused the secret betrothal of Anne to Percy to be broken off.

But to return to the monarch's appearance—that he was not consistently bearded is suggested by an entry in Stow's Annals:—On May 8th, 1535, the king commanded all about his court to be polled, and from thenceforth his beard to be knotted and "no more shaven"; clearly, therefore, until 1535 Henry was changeable in his fashions. Were it not that Faliero, see p. 91, speaks of his bearded chin in 1531, we might think that he had been clean shaven from the middle of 1526 onward, till he resumed his beard in 1535.

1 Letters and Papers, vol. iii, Entry 514, p. 177, November 16th, 1519.
4 Stow's Annals, p. 570, ed. 1615.
5 A miniature at Windsor, dated 1536, shows Henry with his beard in short round curls.
Here again the miniatures come to our assistance. Amongst the rare unbearded portraits of Henry VIII., there is one at Windsor Castle which by permission of His Majesty, King Edward, I here illustrate. It is painted on a playing card and is described in Charles I.'s catalogue as by Holbein, but Sir J. C. Robinson attributed it to Hilliard, and in the Windsor catalogue it still remains anonymous, for the attribution of these early works is very uncertain, but it is probably of earlier execution, and may just as likely be by Lavinia Teerlinck or Lucas Hornebaude. This miniature, which was presented to Charles I. by Lord Suffolk, is undated, and is inscribed only REX. HENRICVS. OCTAVVS. There is also in the Royal collection an almost exactly similar portrait bearing the inscription HR. AN°. As this is a late reproduction, at first sight the doubt arises as to the reliability of the date, but Sir George Scharff calls attention to the precise resemblance of this nineteenth century copy to the fine miniature, painted on vellum, in the late Mr. Hollingworth Magniac's collection, and ascribed to Holbein by Sir J. C. Robinson.

1 Lucas Hornebaude and his sister Susannah, were the children of Gerard Hornebaude, also painter to Henry VIII. Lavinia Teerlinck was appointed miniaturist at the salary of £40 a year to Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth.


3 Catalogue of Mr. Magniac's collection, by Sir J. C. Robinson, No. 103, published in 1861, at which time it was still thought by some authorities that Holbein was in England rather earlier than is now believed to have been the case. See Hermann Grimm in Kunstler und Kunstwerke, vol. ii, Nos. 7 and 8, 1866, and Jahrbiicher fur Kunstwissenschaft, vol. i, 1868, No. 4. Also Dr. Woltmann, in Nos. 2 and 3 of the last-mentioned work, and in Holbein and His Times, p. 294.
Mr. Magniac's cabinet was dispersed in 1892, and the miniature is now at Montagu House, where I have seen and examined it by the kindness of the Duke of Buccleuch, who also owns a seventeenth century copy thereof made by J. Hoskins, bearing the same inscription and date, but otherwise identical with the Windsor undated portrait, illustrated above. Mr. Magniac exhibited his examples at South Kensington Museum in 1865, and one may refer to the photograph of it there preserved in the Art Library. In all its details it is the same as the Windsor copy.

Holbein, so far as our evidence takes us, was not in England till Henry had completed the thirty-fifth year of his age, although until comparatively recently it was thought that a slightly earlier date was quite probable. It may be possible that it was partly on this account, if the miniature were to be attributed to Holbein, that Sir George Scharf suggested that owing to the signs of age and the fatness of the face, the figures might refer to the year of Henry's reign, i.e., 1543, but this hardly agrees with Stow's "no longer shaven," or with the other portraits of the time. We cannot read the XXXV as meaning 1535 because the initials H. and K. are interlaced in a true lover's knot in the border surrounding the miniature, whereas for that date they should be H. and A. The letter K. must either stand for Katharine of Aragon between June, 1525, and June, 1526, in the thirty-fifth year of Henry's age, or for Katharine Parr between July 12th, 1543, when she married the king, and April, 1544, when the thirty-fifth year of his reign came to a close, also, if the work be that of Holbein, before October, 1543, when, as we have seen, he died. Curiously enough there are some other beardless portraits which may synchronize with the coinage, such as the window at St. Margaret's, Westminster, referred to on page 88 as representing Henry VIII. and Katharine of Aragon. The glass is thus described by Mr. Winston:¹ "It is not likely that it should have been painted after the king's scruples respecting the validity of his marriage had arisen, but I think, judging by the analogy of other examples, that it is as late as 1526 or thereabout." Some authors² have suggested a doubt that the head is original, as parts of

² Westlake's *History of Design on Painted Glass*, vol. iv, p. 54.
the window have been restored, but Sir George Scharf was not amongst them, and he should be a reliable guide.

Again, on the frontispiece and the last page of Higden's *Polychronicon*, from a rare copy of which book I am by the kindness of Messrs. J. and J. Leighton permitted to illustrate the portion which bears upon our subject, we have a curious vignette of Henry. The date of this edition is 1527, and I am unable to hear of any instance of the former appearance of the woodcut, which is of English workmanship, and as such, remarkably good for the period; the origin of the portrait is however uncertain, and I only mention these examples to show that possibly Mr. Magniac's miniature does not stand alone, as a picture of Henry clean shaven about 1526. The vignette in Higden's *Polychronicon* rather reminds us of the medallic portrait (*Med. Ill.,* vol. i, p. 30. 14) in the Marquess of Bath's collection and others resembling this medal in type; but these are bearded and undated.

Without wishing to set up my opinion against that of Sir George Scharf, I cannot forbear saying that to me the face in the miniature does not look older than thirty-four, and we know that Henry was
already fairly fat at that age, furthermore, the new Great Seal, the
coinage of Henry's thirty-fifth year, and the many other pictures of the
time, do not support the theory that in the year 1543 the king was clean
shaven, wore his hair long, a flat cap instead of the large hat usually
portrayed by Holbein, or a very décolleté costume; whereas the coins,
as we have seen, and other evidence suggest that he might have been
so represented in 1526. I fear I have detained you too long on this
question, and you will say, "To what tend these explanations?" only
that if we knew the precise date of the issue of Henry's second coinage
we might find that it corresponded almost exactly with the change in
the king's appearance.

It is, as I have said, difficult to assign a date to the issue of
Henry's second groat, and the question of the possibility of an earlier
appearance to fit the young face of the portrait has been discussed by
abler numismatologists than myself. But though the indentures of June,
1526, for the making of a fresh coinage, and the subsequent
proclamations concerning it give no details as to the type of the
silver, only prescribing a change of weight, it seems impossible to
divide the gold from the silver, as the mint-marks correspond, and in
the absence of quantities of groats of the new type, as heavy as those
bearing Henry VII.'s portrait, we cannot suppose their issue to have
been prior to 1519, as the young beardless bust of the king would
suggest. The proclamation of November 5th, 1526, ordered that the
"new coins should be made sterling like the others, but differing in
weight," as Ruding puts it, or as we read in the Letters and Papers of
Henry VIII. "The silver coinage to pass at the present rates, and
a new issue to be made in which the ounce troy shall be converted into
three shillings and ninepence in groats, half groats, pence, halfpence
and farthings," but the weights of the coins in their present state vary
so greatly that it is not easy to obtain definite calculations. Suppose
therefore the coinage did not appear till the end of the year 1526,

1 The words of the proclamation are . . . "But alsoe other coynes of gold and
silver shall be newly made stricken and coined from henceforth," etc., etc.
2 Ruding, vol. i, p. 304.
3 Entry 2609, p. 1159, of Letters and Papers of Henry VIII., calendared by Brewer.
whilst the dated and bearded miniature in the Royal Collection was painted in the earlier part of Henry’s thirty-fifth year of age, shortly perhaps after June 28th, 1525, there is then ample time for his discarding his beard, in the last months of 1525 or the first half of 1526, and for the dated and unbearded miniature in the Magniac cabinet to have commemorated this change of fashion; whilst the new coinage would follow in due course at the end of the year, and the likeness be correct.

If those more learned in portraiture and in numismatics than myself, are of opinion that this is improbable, I can only apologise for having so long detained you, falling back upon the conclusion that till awakened by Holbein to an appreciation of portraiture, most likely Henry took no interest in the affair, gave no sitting to his artist at the mint, who in his turn, taking as model some stone effigy or not very recent picture, which so far I have been unable to trace, made the required change in the bust to draw the attention of a people, who could not read, to the alteration in the coinage of 1526. The introduction of a beard would be a matter which would probably not occur to him, it would be difficult to give the light silky appearance of the soft hirsute adornment worn by the king, and it would be a great innovation, inasmuch as since the time of Henry III. no bearded coinage had been seen in this kingdom. It is therefore possible that the artist, taking the matter from the conventional point of view, substituted the head of a youthful king for that of his father an elderly king, and thus made the requisite landmark in the currency. I must also mention that Henry’s contemporary, Francis I. of France, who ascended his throne at the age of twenty, remained portrayed upon his coins as young and unbearded throughout his long reign, though he too was wearing a beard at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, and did so till his dying day, and this in a country, which, far more than England, had come under the influence of the Italian Renaissance.

In Germany, the native land of Hans Holbein, where Albrecht Durer

1 I do not purpose to discuss the claims of Albrecht Durer to the position of medallist, but I believe it is generally thought that he made at least three models for portrait plaques, and, as the father of German engraving, may be said to have founded a School of Art. See Forrer's Dictionary of Medallists.
Portraiture of our Tudor Monarchs

(b. 1471, d. 1528) had brought engraving to a perfection hard to equal, the medallic art had not before the time of the latter made such rapid progress as it had in Italy. The Italian medal was the product of portraiture allied to modelling in wax, for the "cire perdue" process was in use, whilst in Germany it was the outcome of carving and goldsmith's work, but the medallists of the land, where Hubert Van Eyck had set the fashion of representing the minutest details in painting, could not fail to portray faithfully when once the idea had taken root. Small carved bas-reliefs in wood, lead or soapstone—together with medals—were well known in Germany by the beginning of the sixteenth century, where the Men of the school of Albrecht Durer—such as Ludwig Krug, who died in 1532, Peter Flötner, whose death took place in 1546, Hans Reinhart, who survived till 1581, and others too numerous to mention—were producing admirable portraits of the various Teutonic

LEADEN MEDALLION OF HENRY VIII; BRITISH MUSEUM.
princes, and specimens of their handiwork occasionally made their way to England. There are portrait plaques of Henry—probably of German execution roughly taken from Holbein's designs—the exact date of which is not known, but they resemble the pictures of the king in his middle age. By kind permission of the British Museum authorities, I am able to illustrate one of these rare leaden medallions, which certainly reminds us strongly of the fine picture in the Gallerie Nazionale in the Palazzo Corsini at Rome, to which the well-known three-quarter length figure at Windsor bears so great a resemblance though varying in details of dress, that it has been suggested the painting now in Italy may have served as the model for this and other reproductions, unless all owe their origin to the Whitehall wall painting. The leaden plaque, which is contemporaneous, probably served as a basis for the German or Dutch medals, one of which Simonis attributes to Stephen of Holland, an obviously mistaken idea. Most of them appear more recent of execution and are, as Mr. G. F. Hill1 has proved, of quite different workmanship.

But whether or no we trace Holbein's influence in the portraits on the coinage of Henry VIII., it is undeniable that the later coins resembled the king. Even the more debased issues in their increasing ugliness must, to judge by contemporary pictures, still have been good likenesses. An engraving by Cornelius Matsys, dated 1548, brings vividly before us a face with pendulous cheeks—much wider below than above—a cunning face with little pig's eyes embedded in fat, and thus most likely was Henry in his last days, a very different man from the dignified, though portly prince immortalised by the great Holbein himself some years earlier.

The later coinage is so debased as to be barely recognisable,

certainly the silver gives us little idea of any lingering beauty; allowance must however be made for the fact that the beard portrayed full-face on a surface but slightly raised, gives a greater breadth to a countenance already too broad, than would be noticed in a picture or in the individual.

From an artistic point of view, the facing coinage is always undesirable, but for reasons which must take precedence of the artistic question, it was no doubt considered necessary to show a marked change in the type on the calling in of the old currency.

Although Henry might appreciate the magnificent truthfulness of Holbein's portraits, he was not the man to give time or thought to a fine coinage. His regrettable prodigality was mixed with a false economy, and the readiness with which he grasped at any method of obtaining money without considering the ultimate result upon the credit of the country, was directly responsible for the debasement of the coinage. He had dissipated the large savings of his father, which Bacon\(^1\) tells us amounted to "near eighteen hundred thousand pounds, a huge mass of money for those times." He undid much that his father had done for the commercial improvement of England, and by his suppression of the monasteries, he dealt a serious blow to art, inasmuch as the monks in their seclusion were the leisured class, who gave up their time to the practice of learning and the painting of missals. Down to this date the majority of portraits were those preserved in devotional books, as it was a favourite custom to depict the recipient or the donor of a missal upon some of its pages.

Had Henry not survived his great minister, Wolsey, in whose hands he very largely left his affairs during his young days; had he reigned over England but twenty years, it might have been possible to endorse the panegyrics pronounced upon him by some contemporary writers. Brought up until the death of his elder brother in 1502 with a view to entering the Church, Henry gave himself to study in his early youth, was a good linguist, a proficient in music, playing the lute, organ and harpsichord, so great an
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admirer of architecture that he is described as "the only Phœnix of his time for fine and curious masonry,"¹ and a patron of learning, saying to Mountjoy, who wrote the same to Erasmus, that without learned men, "we should scarcely exist at all." In the passionate willfulness and self-indulgence of his later years one can see little to admire, but the arts flourished in the kingdom, and that not without Henry's personal superintendence, for we read in a letter of 1540, that he kept the key of his picture gallery² in his own custody, a habit he shared with Francis I. of France, whom Henry always emulated. He was a collector of beautiful armour, and the inventory³ of his pictures, tapestries, etc., may still be read. Vertue tells us, Brit. Mus. Add. MS., 203, 68, f. 27B, that "Henry VIII. would have encouraged Raphael and Titian to come to England but could not obtain it." All that added to his personal grandeur was appreciated by the king, but the steady degeneration in his character is observable from about the time when he first thought of repudiating the virtuous and learned Katharine of Aragon, and the good influence of Wolsey was removed.

The apologists for the king have sought to throw the responsibility for his worst acts upon his later ministers, but a monarch, who does not hesitate to behead his servants the moment their policy ceases to be subservient to his caprices, must be held responsible for his own government. Certainly we have little for which to thank Henry in type, in standard or in art upon his later coins, and his successor had a hard task to bring the coinage again into repute; indeed, under Edward VI. things went at first from bad to worse, some of the shillings degenerating from one-third to one-quarter only of silver mixed with the alloy, whilst many of the base pieces bearing Henry's name, continued to be issued after the death of the father until such time as Edward was able to carry out some of the

² Letter from Wallop to Henry, 17th November, 1540, Letters and Papers, vol. xvi, p. 118, Entry 276. "Afterwards the King (of France) showed him a gallery of which he keeps the key himself as Henry does."
³ Published in Appendix of Wornum's Life of Holbein. See also Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting, vol. i, p. 203, ed. 1888.
improvements, which, had he lived longer, he would no doubt have effected in their entirety.

Edward VI.

In a most interesting article in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, Sir John Evans explains his reasons for believing that much of the base coinage bearing the bust and name of Henry, was really issued in England during the early part of the reign of his son, and in Ireland even in his closing years. In a former paper he had already called attention to the fact that the half-sovereigns, Ruding VI, No. 12,

![Half-Sovereign of Edward VI. bearing Henry's name.](image)

bearing a young portrait and Henry's name, could hardly belong to the later years of the elder monarch, and must rather be said to bear the same effigy of Edward VI., as is seen in Ruding, Plate VII, No. 3, although the late king's legend remained unchanged.

The course thus followed by the young Edward was the exact opposite to that pursued by his father, and by Charles I., who preserved the likeness of their predecessor upon their first coinage, with a new cognomen. Had these half-sovereigns really belonged to the issues of Henry VIII., under which they are usually still placed in books for purposes of reference, they would present a more curious anomaly than the portrait groat we discussed on page 97 *et seq.* In an exhaustive argument based on the analogy of mint-marks and the evidence of certain issues commanded by Edward, yet not represented by a coinage bearing his own effigy or name, Sir John Evans proves

that the silver coinage previously credited to the later years of Henry VIII., must, with the gold, be attributed to the son, although passing as Henry's.

Amongst other base groats, Sir John assigns that bearing the legend REDDE CVIQVE QVOD SVVM EST to the young king, and considers these unaccountable words as "more in accordance with the changeable taste of Edward VI. and his mint-masters than any of the pieces with the more common and ordinary legends." The late Mr. A. E. Packe, in an article on the origin of such inscriptions, believing the coin to be of the year 1546, explained the inappropriate sentence as a reference to the passing in that year of the Statute 37, Henry VIII., Chap. 9, "which by repealing the laws against usury, and making a rate of ten per cent. lawful, was the first actual recognition of the legality of interest for money lent"; this explanation is ingenious, but does not fit in with the arguments advanced by Sir John Evans.

![REDDE CVIQVE GROAT.](image)

Though not consistent with a base coinage, it seems possible that Edward was striving to hold out hopes of an improvement to come, for there is a pathetic half-promise in the words which conclude an entry in his journal in April, 1551, concerning an order to make 20,000 lbs. weight of coins "for necessity somewhat baser, to get gains of £16,000 clear, by which the debt of the realm might be paid, the country defended from any sudden attempt, and the coin be amended." That Edward, young as he was, realised the disastrous

1 *Numismatic Chronicle*, vol. xii, New Series, p. 198.
3 Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, vol. ii, Part II, p. 36, ed. 1849, where the journal is printed from the original in the Cottonian MS. Nero CX.
condition to which the coinage was reduced by his father, is clear from the constant notices in the journal, kept by him from the year 1550 onward, by the advice of his tutor, Sir John Cheke. How far the young king was himself the sole author of the sixty-eight folio leaves of this diary has been disputed, but if not all of his own composition, it still shows the interest taken by him in the subject of the currency, to which it contains frequent references. He received a special report from Master Thomas (the Clerk of the Council), who supplied him with notes on the coinage, and on the steps contemplated for restoring its purity, and it is said that it was by Edward's own order that this paper was prepared, though probably inspired by Northumberland, whose policy it was to improve the currency.

Sir John Evans tried to account for the continuance of the late king's portrait and name on the base money, by the distaste of Edward to countenancing the issue of such bad silver, and the desire that his portrait should denote the fresh currency when a purer coinage should appear.

We cannot be surprised that so important a reform could not at once be carried into effect. A boy king upon the throne, at first too young to regulate his own affairs—though even then not devoid of intelligence—the short protectorate of Somerset, whose visionary schemes for the improvement of the country and his own advancement led him to the scaffold, the constant quarrels begotten of the religious controversies brought about by the late king's high-handed measures—

![Half-Sovereign of Edward VI., 1549.](image)

1 In *King Edward VI.*, Sir Clement Markham, p. 137, says, "Hallam doubts whether Edward wrote it; Froude thought Thomas might have written part of it. Burnet and Nicholas had no doubts that Edward was the author."
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peculation and dishonesty at the mint, all these things would lead us to expect little from the currency of Edward VI., but towards the end of his reign, after the advent of Northumberland to power, a great improvement is to be found, and some of the coins belonging to the later issues are really fine, whilst the portraits reverting to the profile type, as seen on the half-sovereign, crown, and half-crown, even as early as 1549, whilst Somerset still ruled, must, to judge by comparison with the pictures of that day, have been very like the young king.

It is interesting to compare these coins of Edward, aged eleven, with his profile portraits in the National Portrait Gallery at the age of six and nine years respectively. The first is here illustrated, whilst the latter is a grotesque and elongated panel, which must be viewed in perspective through an aperture designed for the purpose at the side, when the likeness is very well seen. This picture, which was in the collection of Charles I., was probably earlier in the possession of Queen Elizabeth, for Paul Hentzner, who visited England in her reign, speaks of it thus: "The picture of King Edward VI., representing at first sight something quite deformed, till by looking through a small hole in the cover, which is put over it, you see it in its true proportions." Walpole thought the artist was Marc Willems (born in 1525), but it is not so catalogued; it is more curious than beautiful.

In both portraits we see the child's face turned to left instead of to right, but the profile of the coins is very reminiscent of them, as it is also of the most recently executed of the drawings, of which the majority are attributed to Holbein, in the great Windsor collection. There are also two early full-faced sketches of Edward in this fine series of eighty-three portraits of the celebrities of Henry's court: the portfolio containing them was acquired by Charles I., from whose keeping it passed to that of Lord Arundel, finally to return to the

1 There is a good example of this six-year-old portrait in the Jones Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum.
2 W. Loftie's Whitehall, p. 18.
4 See Portraits of Illustrious Personages of the Court of Henry VIII., by Richard Holmes. Second Series; Plate I.
possession of the Crown. These drawings of Edward represent the little prince as Holbein saw him, but at so young an age that the sketches cannot have served as prototypes for the coinage. The German artist died, as I have said, when Edward had barely completed his sixth year, and it is thought that the third and latest of the portraits in this collection may not be by his hand, presenting as it does the profile picture of a fairly grown boy. It is not for me to give my opinion on the matter, but I can only say that the drawing is very beautiful, and sufficiently like the coins, nor do I myself think that the child looks much more than six years old. It is more nearly produced in a large leaden plaque in the British Museum. Med. III., vol. i, p. 56, No. 7, than in any specimen of the coinage.

There are many later portraits of the young king which used to pass as the works of Holbein, who was the only artist permitted to have access to the child in his infancy. These are now attributed to Guillem Stretes and other painters of Holbein's school, and amongst

1 Dr. Woltmann is of opinion that it does not represent Edward. See Holbein and his Times, p. 433.
PICTURE OF EDWARD VI. IN OIL ON PANEL.
on their Coins and Medals.

them I suggest that we should look for the prototypes of the full-faced coinage, bearing in mind that in no case within my knowledge is a coin an absolute reproduction of a picture. I only deem it possible that the general designs of the dies were inspired by contemporary portraits.

I have often been struck by the resemblance between some of the facing busts of Edward VI.—even those of inferior workmanship, and a beautifully finished little oil painting on panel, which hangs immediately above the coin cabinet with which I am best acquainted.

This portrait is probably a miniature version of the three-quarter length at Petworth, at one time thought to be by Holbein, but now perhaps assigned to Guillem Stretes,¹ and is like the well-known Windsor picture. The coins also much resemble, as regards the head, a panel painted by the same artist in 1550, now in the possession of Lord Aldenham, but here the young king is more plainly dressed, and we find a nearer prototype amongst the miniatures in the Royal Collection, where there is one, by Hilliard,² which, Sir Richard Holmes states, is painted from an original by Stretes.

It is known that Guillem Stretes came to England during the last year of Henry VIII.'s reign, and it is noted that he was paid a salary as court painter in 1551 of £62 10s.—this is the year of the full-faced shillings of Edward's third silver issue, and I may be permitted to draw attention to the great similarity between these and the miniature above referred to, if allowance be made for the usual substitution of the crown for the hat.

¹ *Archaeologia*, xxxix, p. 46-56, by Sir George Scharf.

² Reproduced in the *Burlington Magazine*, January, 1906, Plate II, in Sir Richard Holmes's article on Nicholas Hilliard.
The so-called full-faced coins are, like the portrait, a little more than three-quarter to left. The latest pictures of Edward show us an intelligent looking and fairly grown boy, for we learn from Sir John Hayward that "he was in body beautiful, of sweet aspect, especially in his eyes, which seemed to have a starry liveliness and lustre in them."1

We have a fresh type in the fourth gold coinage of Edward VI., a three-quarter length figure reminding us of the young king's coronation medal, the first executed in England; see Med. Ill., vol. 1, p. 53.

No. I.2 I am able to illustrate this fine work from the National Collection.

These sovereigns, half-sovereigns and crowns, possibly served as

1 Quoted in Holbein's Court of Henry VIII., by Edward Lodge, 1828.
2 The reverse of this medal being rather illegible it may be well to state that the inscription thereon is the Hebrew and Greek rendering of the legend on the obverse.
a prototype for some of James I.'s pieces on which the portrait is, however, larger, and more distinct, but as James was thus portrayed in Scotland from his early youth up, I only wish to call attention to the fact, that he revived the type in England from the days of Edward VI.

On Edward's coins, three-quarter length in armour, the face is too small to give much more evidence of the boy's features, than do the sovereigns of the old-fashioned full-length type with the king seated upon the throne; they are, however, of good workmanship and bear careful examination through the magnifying glass, whilst the figure is not ungraceful.

It has been rather usual to cry down the appearance and faculties of the boy-king, but his letters bear evidence of a capacity, which had but too little time to develop, and we may readily concur with Ruding, who tells us that in 1553, when Mary came to the throne, she found the coinage nearly raised "to a perfect standard by the wise and unwearied exertions of the late king," to whom, speaking of as early as September, 1551, he says the credit is due for the reformation of the coinage which "began at that time to be attended to with considerable diligence." We can hardly doubt that had Edward lived, the reforms finally carried out in the days of Elizabeth would have been sooner effected, whereas Mary at first swerved from the straight path, inasmuch as that whilst she issued a proclamation in August, 1553, providing for a pure currency, she contradicted it by an indenture which debased the currency 1 dwt. worse than that of 6 Ed. VI.

I have said that not much is known about the actual makers of the coinage, but for the sixth year of Edward's reign, Ruding gives the name of one cuneator, "Deric Anthonie, said to have succeeded Robert, lately deceased." This is the same engraver of whom Walpole writes, "Now I am mentioning the Mint I shall take notice that among the patent rolls is a grant in the sixth of Edward to

---

1 Ruding's *Annals of the Coinage*, vol. i, 328.
2 Ruding, vol. i, 327.
Anthony Deric of the office of capital sculptor of the monies of the Tower of London, and at the end of the same year John Brown is appointed surveyor of the coins.” Ruding¹ gives the name of Vincentius as engraver to Philip and Mary, but we find that he again mentions Derick Anthony in the second to the eighteenth year of the reign of Elizabeth.² He, in fact, remained longer in the employment of the Queen than Ruding had reason to suppose, for I have found frequent mention of him in the calendars of the State Papers (domestic) as “Graver to the Mint” in 1574³—in 1584, etc., whilst the name of his son, Charles Anthony,⁴ appears amongst these documents in June, 1599, as replacing Derick Anthony, deceased, who lately held the same office of graver of the mint and seals in the Tower—see £30 a year.⁵

There is a great similarity in the workmanship of the beautiful gold pieces, for instance, in the sovereigns of all these three monarchs, and one cannot help wishing one knew more about the cuneator, who may have been the artist, and to whom we owe many excellent portraits of the two sisters and of the brother, the last of whom died all too young for the good of the coinage.

I must pass on to the succession of Mary, but may I be permitted to end this short sketch of Edward’s brief life with some of the words of Latimer—“I will tell you this, I speak what I think, His Majesty hath more godly wit and understanding, more learning and knowledge at this age, than twenty of his progenitors that I could name had any time in their lives.”⁶

Mary 1.

During the reigns of Henry VIII., of Edward VI., and of their immediate successors, portraiture was making steady progress in England, though not necessarily the work of Englishmen. We find

¹ Ruding, vol. i, p. 44, reference to Mr. West’s note-book.
² Ibid., reference to Harl. MS. No. 698, fol. 120.
⁴ Ibid. Green, 1598–1601, p. 224, dated June 30th, 1599.
⁵ Quoted by Sir Clement Markham, p. 130, of his King Edward VI., from a sermon by Latimer.
miniaturists mentioned, such as Lavinia Teerlinck, Susannah Hornebaude, and the brother of the latter, Lucas, from whom, according to Carel van Mander, Holbein learned the art of miniature painting. There are fine portraits painted in great numbers, and even a few medals, the latter being almost exclusively of foreign workmanship. Art was more and more appreciated in England, and such painters as Antonio More and Lucas de Heere visited our country, whilst noted medallists sent over their productions to Mary's court, and contemporaneously with these the portraiture of the queen upon the silver currency improved.

It is true that the bust upon the groats still issued after the queen's marriage was but a reproduction of her earlier coinage, but Ruding accounts for this by saying that these "were probably struck before a new die could be prepared." This head, though pretty, is weak as to likeness, and is far less suggestive of the angular and austere looking woman than her effigy, as it appears on the shillings and sixpences facing Philip. On these one may trace the foreign influence of such artists as More, whilst the medals of the royal pair are very striking, reminding us of both pictures and coins. The best of these medals are by Italian artists, and it was in Italy that medallic portraiture first became fashionable. Vittore Pisano, commonly called Pisanello, who was born in Veronese territory about 1390, and died not later than 1455, had combined the profession of painter with that of the medallist. It has been said of him that he was "great in portraiture, great in composition, great in design," and his services were eagerly solicited

1 Holbein and his Times, p. 370.
3 See Mr. G. F. Hill's Pisanello, p. 1.
by the rulers of Mantua, Milan, Naples and Ferrara. The d'Este family could not bear to be outdone in their patronage of the fine arts, and the rivalry between the various Italian petty states became as great in the acquisition of curios as of territory. One of the ladies of the house of d'Este, Isabella, wife of Francesco, Marquis of Mantua, (1474–1539), whose voluminous correspondence with a much-loved sister was closed only by the death of the latter, was almost as much excited by the possibility of obtaining some of the art treasures belonging to the deceased as grieved at her loss. The passion for portraiture was perhaps carried almost too far, and the Medici were depicted in classic myths as gods and goddesses, or the donor of an altar-piece designed for a church was represented in company with the early Fathers of the Church. The medallic portraits were, of course, of the greatest utility from their portable nature, and Pisano had many followers, some of whom, such as Jacopo da Trezzo and Leone Leoni, have left us excellent likenesses of the celebrities of their day.

A fine medal of Philip is attributed to Leone Leoni, Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 75, 26, but of greater interest to English collectors are the magnificent medallic portraits of the wedded pair, by Jacopo da Trezzo, for the similarity presented to the silver currency from 1554 to 1557 is so marked that, were it not that one of these medals is dated in 1555, we might have thought that it had served for a model for the coinage. It is true that there are undated medals with the same portrait of Mary, but with differing reverses, one of which is thought to refer to the period of her marriage, and though the corresponding bust of Philip is dated 1555, there is a smaller medal which bears no dates. It shows less of the Prince's figure than we see upon the coin, but like the latter portrays him in the order of the Golden Fleece, omitted from the larger medal, and in this more nearly resembles it. However, it is usually stated that the larger preceded the smaller example.

The finer work of Jacopo da Trezzo bears the legend round Philip's bust, PHILIPPUS·REX·PRINC. HISP.ÆT·S.·AN.·XXVIII, and below, IAC.·TREZZO.·F. 1555. It must, therefore, have probably been executed in the earlier months of 1555, as Philip completed his twenty-
eighth year on the 21st of May. If we assume the medal was cast in Madrid, we must reckon the year 1555 as commencing with the 25th of December, 1554, as we should call it, for the Castilians so computed the year from 1383 until 1556, thus giving a period of nearly five months, in which time the medal must have been executed.

According to Ruding the coins made their appearance immediately after the queen's marriage, though, he says, that "no indenture of these pieces has ever been discovered." The shillings dated 1554 cannot therefore have been copied from Trezzo's larger design, but it is quite probable that both specimens of the medallic art owe their origin to one self-same picture of the queen, inasmuch as it is thought that Philip must have supplied the Italian artist with an authentic portrait, there being no reason for supposing Jacopo ever visited England. He lived at Madrid, where the splendid painting of Mary, by Antonio More, is one of the glories of the Prado, but as this fine picture does not present a profile view, it could not have been the only guide provided for the medallist. Jacopo da Trezzo executed much work for Philip, and died at Madrid in 1589. The magnificent cameos of this king in the Royal Collection and in the Victoria and Albert Museum are attributed to him.

The portraits of Mary, medallic or pictorial, which bring her most vividly before our eyes, as we conceive her to have been at the time she married Philip, are those of a depressed and rather haggard woman, grown old before her time with the disappointment caused by the blighting of all her affections in constant family quarrels, the suppression of her religion, and her questionable title to the

---

1 The custom of beginning the year on January 1st was observed in Spain from very early times until December 16th, 1350, when Peter IV., King of Aragon, commanded that the year should commence on Christmas Day in his dominions. In 1383, John 1., King of Castile, made the same enactment. The use of the year of the Nativity continued in those kingdoms and their dependencies and conquests until 1556, when the earlier custom of beginning the new year on January 1st was resumed. Pp. 25-31, and 39, of Professor Rühl's *Chronologie des Mittelalters.*


Mary had but two passions in her life, her devotion to her faith, and her unreciprocated love for her husband, and both these passions increased her unpopularity with her Protestant subjects, who dreaded her severity in the persecution of those who did not agree with her, and looked with distrust upon the Spanish policy, which they feared would be introduced by Philip to the detriment of this kingdom.

The reign of Mary was short, and the haughty Spaniard, frequently absent on his own affairs, had not time to exert any important or permanent influence upon this country. But to numismatologists it is of interest that he, for a season, left his mark upon the currency, inasmuch as the face-to-face type, introduced in the year 1554, was a great innovation, and an assertion of equal rights in the government hardly warranted by his position. Mary’s love for him may be said to be typified by the fact that, not content with placing his name as king upon the coins, she, in some cases, joined his effigy to her own, whilst the crown, which she was unable to bequeath to him, was poised in mid-air between her consort and herself.

The fashion of these coins came directly from Spain, being derived from the escudos or gold double ducats of Ferdinand and Isabella. The design was no doubt chosen as especially applicable to Mary and her husband, for both were directly descended from the Spanish king and queen, Mary being their granddaughter, and Philip their great-grandson; moreover, Isabella, like Mary, was a reigning sovereign in her own right, and as such, when the Salic law was almost universal, a precedent for Mary’s accession.

We might, of course, carry back the face-to-face type to our early Anglo-Saxon sceattas, such as Ruding, Plate 26, No. 8, or to its possible prototype in Roman times, to 12 B.C., when two busts of the goddess Fortuna faced one another on the coinage, or to later examples, citing amongst others Nero with his mother Agrippina,
A.D. 54-68, or Marcus Aurelius with Commodus and Lucius Verus, A.D. 161-169, who, reigning conjointly, are placed face to face. Again, the reader will remember the rude facing busts of the Visigoths, A.D. 701-709, but the immediate Spanish prototypes suffice.

It was not strange that Philip should have imported this fashion into England, as it was still in use in some of the Spanish dominions in his own time, and such a coin I am here able to illustrate.

ESCUDO OF FERDINAND AND ISABELLA OF SPAIN.

This type was first used in Spain in June, 1497, by Ferdinand and Isabella, and continued to be copied in the Netherlands for a considerable period. The portrait of these monarchs remained upon their escudos during the reign of mad Joanna, wife of Philip the Fair, and the minority of their son, Charles I. of Spain, afterwards the Emperor Charles V., whilst some examples even exist bearing the name of Philip II. In the Low Countries, the workmanship of the Dutch imitations is rougher than that of the gold originally coined in Spain, but they are often confused with one another, even by experts. The daughter of Philip II., Isabella, Duchess of Brabant, in conjunction with her husband, Albert of Austria, struck escudos of the face-to-face type as late as 1598-1611 in the Netherlands, then governed by them as a fief of Spain, and the same fashion is occasionally to be met with in other foreign countries, especially upon medals.

There are such coins of Antoine de Bourbon and Jeanne d’Albret in Navarre, 1552-1562; of Henry IV. and Margaret in France, 1589-1604 and others; but, to come nearer home, Scotland shows some rare examples of this practice in the coinage of her Queen Mary. We find the Queen of Scots in gold, together with her French husband, Francois II., in 1558, and in silver, conjointly with Darnley,
in 1565, but, excepting occasionally upon a medal, this fashion took no hold upon the English people, and when the opportunity occurred for its reappearance during a dual occupation of the throne, namely, in the joint reigns of William III. and Mary II. the classical jugate bust asserted its sway. The Spanish type of the new silver was no doubt agreeable to Mary Tudor; half a Spaniard by birth and more than half a Spaniard at heart, anything that reminded her of her much-loved and persecuted mother, or of her adored husband, would specially appeal to her; I even suggest that possibly on this account the type of the half-crown for the second issue of silver after Mary's marriage did not meet with her approval. The busts of the two monarchs appear on the opposite sides of this coin instead of face to face as on the shillings. There are only three specimens known of the half-crown of 1554; it was, therefore, perhaps a pattern, and as in the orders during Mary's reign for shillings and sixpences, no mention of this coin is made, the non-issue thereof might be due to the fact that half-crowns were not required, or, and I think more probably, because its design was rejected.

The placing of a bust on the reverse as well as on the obverse of a coin was unusual in mediaeval times, but it occurs upon some of the currency of Saxony for A.D. 1525, and Ludovico Sforza1 (Il Moro), Duke of Milan, and his wife, Beatrice d'Este, were thus portrayed between 1494 and 1500, even after the death of the wife, whilst their predecessors, Bona of Savoy2 and Galeazza Maria made use of the same fashion; the younger3 Galeazza (Gian) also appears so pictured with his uncle, Ludovico, as regent.4 If we go back to earlier times, on Byzantine and Roman coins there were many examples of its use, and though rare amongst the Greeks it was seen in Egypt: there was therefore ample precedent for the type.

Whether or not, as I suggest, the preference for the Spanish fashion influenced Mary in the choice of her representation on the

1 Monete di Milano, Gnechi, Plate XVII, 7.
2 Ibid., Plate XV, 1.
3 Ibid., Plate XVI, 1.
4 To the excellency of these portraits I have already referred on p. 84.
coinage and caused her to reject the half-crown, it is clear that the custom of placing a bust on both sides of a coin found no favour in England, though in use at all times upon medals, and the only instances of its reappearance lie in patterns of the reign of William and Mary, which were again in their turn rejected, such as the farthing, Montagu 15, which although by no means unpleasing, was not selected for use.

As far as Philip and Mary were concerned, the personal appearance of the wedded pair did not conduce to a handsome coinage. Philip was eleven years younger than his sickly, middle-aged and—must we say it?—plain wife, whose only vanity was shown in the endeavour, by adorning herself with the jewels he had given her, and with fine clothes, to make herself beautiful in his sight, though she was naturally of a repellent, retiring and cold disposition, more given to reading and the practices of piety than to pomps and vanities. A modern writer\(^1\) has described her as "a faded little woman with a pinched white face, no eyebrows and russet hair," and this is just as her pictures bring her before us. Mary\(^2\) was extremely small, but this does not affect her portraiture upon her coins; in this respect she resembled Margaret of Beaufort, the mother of Henry VII., rather than any of her immediate forbears, for Henry VIII. was tall, and Katharine of Aragon above the middle height, whilst the parents of Katharine also were well proportioned.

Philip is always represented by contemporary writers as handsome, fair of complexion, as became his Austrian descent, and wearing a light curly beard, but his heavy underhanging jaw with its ugly lower lip, so characteristic of the Hapsburg family in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was a great disfigurement, and on medals and coins, where the beauty of colouring is not seen, there is little to attract the beholder. The exhibition, held at Bruges in the summer of 1907, of all things that concerned the Order of the Golden Fleece, afforded a great opportunity to anyone interested in portraiture, for comparing the medals of Philip with his painted presentments, and in none of these, in my humble opinion, can his face account for the

\(^1\) Martin Hume's *Queens of Old Spain*, p. 212.
\(^2\) *Pageant of London*, vol. ii, p. 97.
attraction he appears to have exercised over women. Already once a widower at the time of his marriage to Mary, he again sought and obtained a bride within a year of the death of his English queen, to whom his union had been actuated by motives of policy only.

His third wife was a young and beautiful woman, who ensured his affection, but he had always treated Mary with nothing more than a grave and stately courtesy, and she was by no means free from incentives to jealousy. His interest in her kingdom was only that taken by an astute foreigner, who deemed it a possible, though it proved a very disappointing, ally against France, and he thought it almost as important, when hopes failed him of having an heir by Mary, to establish friendly terms with Elizabeth, whom he would have been willing to marry on her sister’s death, as it had been to preserve the devoted affection of his unfortunate queen.

It cannot be said of Mary that she was unappreciative of art. She was painted not only by Antonio More but by Lucas de Heere, and her exquisite jewelry and handsome raiment, though criticised by the Spanish followers of her husband, show that her taste was better than that of Elizabeth, whose vanity led her into indiscretion in these matters. But the portraiture of the elder woman is rather dispiriting; we pity her sad countenance, thin lipped and peevish; and she strikes us as looking more like the mother than the wife of her fair-haired, blue-eyed husband. She was beloved by few of her subjects, for she displayed none of the brilliant qualities which endeared her far less conscientious sister to her people.

One of the courtiers who attended Philip to England describes Mary thus: “Although she is not at all handsome, being short of stature and rather thin than fat, she has a very clear red and white complexion, she has no eyebrows, is a perfect saint and dresses very badly.” This last remark was probably called forth by shocked

1 Elizabeth of Valois, or Isabel of the Peace, as the Spaniards called her. See Queens of Old Spain, p. 263.
2 One of the most pleasing pictures of Mary is by Lucas de Heere, in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries, painted 1554.
3 Narrative of Pietro Enriques quoted by Martin Hume in The Year after the Armada, p. 157.
feeling engendered in the stiff Spanish hidalgo by the independent
ways of the English women, who wore "short petticoats, the
farthingales making them often shew their black stockings on
horseback," which he considered "quite indelicate, when they are
seated riding." The great offence, however, was their habit of
directing their own horses, for "whoever elsewhere saw a woman on
horseback alone, and even riding their own steeds well, and as much
at home on their backs as if they were experienced horsemen." Anoher member of Philip's suit describes Mary as speaking of
herself to her husband as "an old and ugly wife." The magnificent
jewels presented by the bridegroom to his mature bride on his arrival
were much treasured by Mary, and a great pearl pendant which he
gave her is noticeable in most of her portraits. But we must leave
this rather pathetic figure, admitting that the coinage of her successor,
with its infinite variety, offers a more interesting study, and whilst to
do Mary justice, I must say that at any rate the beautiful gold
currency was maintained at a proper standard in her reign, we must
wait for the days of Elizabeth to see the silver put upon a satisfactory
footing, the bad money all called in, the base shillings of Edward VI.
countermarked with a portcullis or a greyhound, and ordered to pass
respectively for fourpence halfpenny and twopence farthing each; "the worst sort . . . . not to be current at all, nor received for
any value, the groat to be current for twopence."

ELIZABETH.

At the time Elizabeth succeeded Mary, Pisano had but recently
died, and the medallion art abroad was, as I have said, in a flourishing
condition; the clever crayon sketches by Holbein in Germany and
England, by Francois Clouet and his school in France, or the highly
finished small paintings for which they served as the basis—all were in

1 Narrative of Pietro Enriqueis, etc., p. 171.
2 Narrative of Giovanni Car, who in Italian calls her "brutta e vechia." Martin
Hume. Ibid., p. 136.
3 Folkes's English Silver and Gold Coins, p. 50, quoting Holinshed, "with which,"
as he says, "also John Stow and Mr. Camden do perfectly agree."
great demand. We have seen that the miniature painted on vellum or on the back of a playing card had come into prominence, and this form of portrait to some extent superseded the less portable drawings, could not be used so easily for personal adornment. The miniatures executed for Elizabeth by Nicholas Hilliard, "the Queen's goldsmith, carver, and limner," were in high favour, and he is often cited as our first great English miniaturist. The days of the illuminated missal were past; the miniature was to take its place in the realm of art as the sixteenth century progressed.

Although there still exists a book of prayers written by Elizabeth and adorned for her use by Hilliard with her portrait and that of Alençon, she did not, as a rule, approve of a decorated prayer-book, so long the medium and preserver of likenesses. In this she differed from Catherine de Medici, Queen-Dowager of France, whose "livre d'heures," illuminated with miniatures of her entire family, including her daughter-in-law, Mary, Queen of Scots, presents valuable examples of the portraiture of the day. But the English queen, though she angrily rejected an illuminated service-book offered to her by one of her clergy, was usually ready to accept gifts, especially works of art, and in return she often permitted her courtiers to wear her presentment, whether medallic or in the form of a cameo or miniature set in a "picture box," as the ornamental pendant was then called, and there are many instances of her causing such portraits to be painted for the purpose.

A foreign traveller, Paul Hentzner, who visited her court in 1598, speaks of a cabinet beside her bed, which contained miniatures of her favourite of the moment and her other adorers, as amongst Elizabeth's greatest treasures.

She was a curious compound of the extravagance and vanity of her parents, and of the shrewdness of her grandfather, Henry VII. She loved splendour at the expense of others, she would accept any sacrifice at their hands, and though too clever a woman to be really deceived, she would swallow any amount of flattery. To her excessive

1 Knight's London, vol. i, p. 344.
vanity rather than to her love of art, one may attribute the great variety, and in some cases the great beauty, of her coins. There is a well-known but apocryphal story told of Walpole's hideous hook-nosed fragment of a gold coin, and of the similar half-crown. Elizabeth is said, when the coin was presented to her as a pattern, to have cut it up in a rage with a pair of shears, a feat no woman could perform! Walpole has it that the coin was broken by her command, and some workman cut out and preserved the morsel which contained the face. The coins, which have the appearance of having been made far more recently, like the story, are not above suspicion, but though the latter be an allegory, "se non è vero è ben trovato," for Raleigh, in the preface to his History of the World, says that her "pictures made by unskilful and common painters were, by her owne commandment, knocked to pieces and cast into the fire." For my part, I believe that had she ever really seen that presentment of herself, she would not have left so much of the face intact.

In her early youth, though not beautiful, she was eminently graceful. According to her own description of herself her stature was "neither high nor low," in spite of which fact she had the vanity to wear monstrous heels when in full dress, and this accounts for the discrepancies of historians on the point of her height. Her hair has been variously called "auburn" and "yellow," whilst in her youth, as Sir James Melville tells us, she delighted in showing her golden curly locks. In her old age she undoubtedly wore a red wig, many of these appearing in the inventory of her wardrobe at her death. She hated growing old, and when the Bishop of St. David's preached before her, choosing as his text, "Lord, teach us to number our clays that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom," instead of complimenting him in one of her graceful speeches, as was usual, she told him "to keep his arithmetic to himself," and implied that "wisdom" did not always come

---

2 Raleigh's History of the World, p. 10, ed. 1634.
3 Sir James Melville's Memoirs, 1683.
with years, "for I see that the greatest clerks are not always the wisest men."\(^1\)

In few of her portraits, except perhaps in those by Gheeraedts, do the signs of age appear, and it is written by Hilliard\(^2\) himself that when he painted her he was commanded to place her in the garden that no shadow should fall upon her face. "Her Mat, therefore, chose her place to set in for that porposse in the open ally of a goodly garden where no tree was neare nor any shadowe at all, save that the Heaven is lighter than the earthe, so must that little shadowe that was from the earthe; this her Majestie's curious demand hath greatly bettered my judgement."

To the habit thus acquired some have attributed the flat and shadowless appearance of some of Hilliard's miniatures, especially noticeable in those portraying Elizabeth. Isaac Oliver also noted in his pocket-book that the queen "would not allow him to give any shade to her features, telling him shade was an accident and not naturally existing in the face." Sir Robert Maunton\(^3\) says of her, "She was of personage tall, of hair and complexion fair therewith well favoured, but high nosed," whilst Hentzner describes her at the age of 65 as covered with jewels—just as we see her on her more ornate coins—wearing a red periwig, having a wrinkled face, a hooked nose, shining little eyes, and black teeth. This "hooked nose" is very apparent in the monument of Elizabeth carved by Colt (Maximilian Poultrain) at a cost of £600. It was begun in 1605 and finished in

---

\(^1\) Creighton's Queen Elizabeth, p. 185.

\(^2\) "A Treatise concerning the Arte of Limning, f. 8. Writ by N. Hilliard at the Request of R. Haydocke." The original MS. is in the Edinburgh University, but a transcript was kindly lent me by Mr. Philip Norman. This treatise must not be confused with Harl. MSS. No. 6,000, at one time thought to be by Nicholas Hilliard, and still known as "Limning by Hilliard," because it bears his name on the fly-leaf and largely quotes the above, though not verbatim. No. 6,000 Harl. is now thought to be by Edward Norgate, Windsor herald to Charles I. Both MSS. passed through the hands of Walpole and Vertue, and the latter in his MS. (Add. MS. 23,070, f. 68) speaks of a paper on the Art of Limning, "Writ by Hillyard according to a promise made to Dr. Richard Haydocke who published Lomatius from Italian to English r598, four years before the death of Queen Elizabeth, whom he mentions to have drawn."

\(^3\) Side Lights of English History, by Henderson, p. 1, from Fragmenta Regalia.
the following year, being modelled from a mask taken after the Queen's death, which would account for the slight exaggeration of the more prominent features. Mr. Richard Davey tells us¹ that, according to a letter in the Hatfield Papers, there is reason to believe that Hilliard had a hand in the details of the dress in this tomb, but it does not specially recall any miniature by that artist to my recollection. I have compared the fine crowns of 1601 and 1602 with the effigy on the monument, and the likeness is exact, although the coins give the impression of a handsomer woman than does Colt's presentment of her. We must remember that the crowns were executed five years after the above unflattering description was written by her foreign visitor, so that credit is due to the artist, probably Charles Anthony, who produced at once a true and striking numismatic portrait of the queen.

ELIZABETH'S CROWN OF 1601.

It is sometimes stated that Elizabeth, in consequence of the personal defect of "a yellow neck," preferred high dresses in her old age, and this tradition is borne out by her pictures by Gheeraedts, and by the beautiful cameo portrait, in a chin ruff at Windsor, and at the Bibliothèque Nationale. These gems, if their attribution to Julien de Fontenay² be correct, must portray her in her later years, as it is said he was sent over by Henry IV. from France for the purpose of making her portrait, and this king only ascended the throne in 1589. It has been suggested that these cameos might be the work of Atsyl³ quoted

² Handbook of Engraved Gems, by C. W. King, p. 127.
³ Archaeologia XLV, The Queen's Gems, by C. Drury-Fortnum; Connoisseur, April, 1903, The King's Gems, by Mr. H. Clifford-Smith; Walpole's Anecdotes, vol. i, pp. 101 and 108.
by Walpole as engraver of stones to Henry VIII., and if so they might be of earlier origin. It is very difficult to date pictures by costume, as the open and close ruffs, as also the low and high-necked bodices seem to have been contemporaneous, and it is noticeable that the coins of the queen, be she young or old, are always in the "partlet" or high chemisette, whether in a large or small ruff. We find, however, that Elizabeth had no invariable rule as to her fashions, for Hentzner describes her at the age of sixty-five as having "her bosom uncovered as all English ladies have till they marry," and the jettons or so-called patterns for 1601 (Rud. XV., 9 and 10) show the queen full face, the open bodice (formerly preferred by her) being seen, as well as in some of the beautiful medals cast to commemorate the saving of England from the Spanish Armada which give a portrait in an open ruff (Med. Ill., vol. i, pp. 154 and 155, Nos. 129 to 131). These medals are thought to be of English workmanship, and though some of them are of more recent production, the portrait on them may be traced back to an interesting contemporaneous silver shell or thin embossed plate. (Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 183, No. 186.)

Possibly by far the most beautiful of the Armada medals is by the same hand as this cliché, though of infinitely finer execution. It is numbered 129 in Medallic Illustrations of British History, and an illustration appears on the following page.

This is undoubtedly a production of the period, but it did not serve as a model for the coinage, on which, unless in very high relief, Elizabeth preferred the profile type, as better suited to medallic portraiture.

1 Portraits of Elizabeth, by Mr. F. M. O'Donoghue, Preface, xiv.
It is unfortunate that such medallions as No. 129 and others of similar workmanship of the days of James I. remain anonymous, and it is not for me to make suggestions as to their possible origin, but it has often struck me that in default of many signed examples of goldsmith’s work by Nicholas Hilliard with which to compare them, one may be allowed to wonder whether as “an embosser of medals of gold” he might be responsible for them.

Sir Richard Holmes,1 in describing the artist’s antecedents, says, “His mother was Laurence, daughter of John Wall, a goldsmith of London. It is probable that he was initiated in his early years in the mysteries of this craft by his grandfather. The art of the goldsmith was intimately associated with that of the enameller, and though no specimen of his work in this manner is known to exist, yet the description of the jewel which he executed, representing the battle of Bosworth Field, gives an idea of the excellence to which he must have attained.” The enamel to which Sir Richard refers was catalogued by


Portraiture of our Tudor Monarchs

Vanderdort in the collection of Charles I., that monarch having purchased it from Laurence Hilliard, the son of Nicholas. Although the ornament has disappeared, the miniatures with which it was embellished are still in the Royal Collection at Windsor, and have already been referred to in this paper. See ante pp. 88 and 115.

There is another remarkable pendant in Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan's collection known as "The Armada Jewel," on account of its reverse decoration, which may have been the work of Nicholas Hilliard as the maker of the queen's jewels. It was sold at Christie's in July, 1902, for no less a sum than £5,250. It was then believed that it was given by Elizabeth to Sir Francis Drake on his return from his famous voyage in 1580, but the magnificent Drake Jewel is still in the possession of a member of that family, Sir F. Fuller-Eliott Drake, and later investigation has led Dr. Williamson, the author of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan's splendidly illustrated catalogue, to decide in favour of the claims of Sir Francis Walsingham, to whom it is known that such a jewel was presented, because he rendered special service in hindering the Spanish preparations for the outfit of the Armada in 1588. It forms the frontispiece of the first volume of Dr. Williamson's work, and by his kind permission I am able to reproduce it, the copyright being strictly reserved by him on behalf of Mr. Pierpont Morgan.

On opening the enamelled back a miniature of Elizabeth is disclosed, which is dated 1580; though unsigned it is attributed to Hilliard. The obverse of this case presents a gold profile bust of Elizabeth on an enamelled background. The golden portrait is most elaborate and was compared at Christie's to the obverse of the fine ornament in the British Museum known, on account of the legendary bird portrayed on the reverse, as the Phoenix Jewel or Badge (Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 125, No. 71), but I should not feel justified in suggesting that

---

1 Forrer's Dictionary of Medallists, under Hilliard.
2 Elizabeth knighted Drake on the 4th of April, 1581; on his first arrival the legality of his conduct had been questioned, and an enquiry held on the subject, was finally decided in his favour.
3 The illustrated catalogue of Mr. Pierpont Morgan's collection is for private circulation, but has been presented to various museums.
ARMADA JEWEL IN THE COLLECTION OF MR. J. PIERPONT MORGAN.
they are by the same hand, and the portrait is not identical. A medallion exists (Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 124, No. 70), bearing a similar presentment of Elizabeth to the Phoenix Badge above mentioned—of this there is a modern imitation which is sometimes signed Nicholls, but the original work is unsigned. Contrary to his usual practice, Evelyn (93), in illustrating this medallion, drew the head looking in an inverse direction, a mistake constantly made by engravers copying a design on the plates or die instead of reversing it, but presumably he intended to describe this example of the Phoenix Badge though his drawing is far from good. He dates it 1574, but gives no reason for so doing. A specimen in the British Museum has the same figures roughly incised, but these, though old in character, appear to have been subsequently scratched in with a sharp instrument. The portrait on the obverse of Mr. Pierpont Morgan’s pendant far more nearly resembles another medallion of Elizabeth of rougher workmanship, (Med. Ill., i, p. 132, No. 85), known as the Garter or Personal Badge, whilst the design of the reverse, an ark upon the waters, is similar to that of one of the Armada Naval Rewards of 1588 (Med. Ill., i, p. 148, No. 119), again by a different, and I should say, though I may be wrong, a later hand. At the British Museum there is a contemporary leaden medallion bearing the same obverse bust as 119, but it has no reverse, probably therefore there were complete pieces of this date.

But, if I am not mistaken, and I speak with all diffidence, we have in the fine enamelled “Armada Jewel,” which contains Elizabeth’s portrait attributed to Hilliard; and in the no less beautifully elaborated Armada Badge with its contemporary chain (Med. Ill., vol. i, 154, No. 129, illustrated on p. 133), a similarity of portraiture and lettering which makes me wonder whether, if the one be the work of Nicholas Hilliard, the others should not also represent the handiwork of the Court “embosser of medals and gold.” Of course, though I have seen and handled both pendant and badge, and have been able to compare the illuminated presentment of the former with the original of the latter, I could not have the opportunity of placing the pieces actually side by

1 Possibly Evelyn may have based his date upon this particular specimen.
side, and as the golden profile in the "Jewel" is covered by a convex glass, it is difficult to examine the workmanship, so that it is not easy to speak with confidence.

The question then arises—with what work known with certainty to be by Hilliard, can we compare these treasures of the goldsmith's art? The answer is, that in 1587, a grant was made to the carver and limner of the queen of the lease of the manor of Poyle, Stanmore, for twenty-one years, "in consideration of his pains in engraving the great seal of England." This was the second great seal of Elizabeth, that of 1586, of which an illustration will be found on Plate XXIII, of Wyon's *Great Seals of England*, Nos. 113 and 114, and fine impressions are to be seen in the British Museum. There is a beautiful design for a seal of Hilliard's illustrated by the Vasari Society, Part III, No. 32, which Mr. Campbell-Dodgson shows reason for thinking must have been the sketch for the great seal of Ireland; this drawing reminds me in treatment, and especially in the queen's face and open ruff, of the Armada Badge, which presents even slighter differences to the English great seal, No. 113 on Wyon's plate, where the head is turned to left just as it is in the badge, though the dress is different. It is, of course, difficult to judge accurately from an old wax impression, but very specially in lettering and in the design, the obverse of Elizabeth's second seal, by Hilliard, suggests to me the same hand as the Armada Badge, whilst the counter-seal, No. 114 on Wyon's plate, is equally reminiscent of Mr. Pierpont Morgan's Armada Jewel, especially in the elaboration of the dress and position of the shoulder. I leave this question in the hope that others, better qualified than myself to judge the matter, will compare the specimens and weigh the possibilities, remembering that if we quit the region of hypothesis for that of history,

1 See *Notes and Queries*, Series III, vol. iv, p. 207.

2 Drawing belonging to Mr. Peter Gellatly. The head in this sketch faces the spectator; the queen wears her ruff open and shows her neck and bust, whereas the ruff in the English great seal is closed round the throat, whilst the face is three-quarter to left as in the Armada Badge. On the counter-seal, though the head is still in the same position, the figure is in profile and assumes the pose of the Armada Jewel. The lettering on the Irish sketch is no longer legible, but that on the great seal of England is of the same rather peculiar style as we find it on both jewel and badge.
we know positively that Hilliard engraved the second great seal for Elizabeth, and that he designed it as early as 1584, when an order was directed to him and to Derick Anthony at the mint, "to emboss in lead, wax or other fit stuff the pattern for a new one (great seal) made upon parchment by you, Hildyard, and allowed by us." As an artist he had constant opportunities of studying Queen Elizabeth, and his works as a miniaturist, portraying her, whether signed or unsigned, are almost unmistakable. He painted her in various ways—with flowing hair, as in the specimen at the Victoria and Albert Museum, or crowned, and with orb and sceptre as seen in the miniature at Welbeck—there are specimens of his handiwork, at Windsor, concealed in a jewelled pendant so minute as to require a magnifying glass to enable one to judge of the likeness. There are dated portraits, such as that at the National Portrait Gallery, here illustrated, where we see her at the age of thirty-eight; at times he represented her young and fair, and again in her bewigged and over-dressed later years. But I cannot stay to

1 State Papers Domestic, 1584, p. 125, calendared by Green. Addenda, 1580 to 1625.
describe the works of her portrait painters, though I must not omit a reference to the drawing at Windsor, executed by Isaac Oliver, as she appeared in all her splendour, in the magnificent pearl-embroidered dress in which she attended the thanksgiving service at St. Paul's, after disaster had befallen her enemies, for it served as the basis for a medallion, by Simon de Passe (Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 183, No. 187), which I am able to reproduce, and which gives a good idea of the plethora of ornamentation with which she loved to adorn herself.

William Rogers¹ and Crispin de Passe engraved Isaac Oliver's drawing, and it was also later reproduced by George Vertue as it is seen in our illustration. Vertue, like Rogers and Oliver, represented the queen turned to left, whereas the medallion by Simon, following the example of his father, Crispin, shows us the portrait looking towards our right. Crispin de Passe was never in England, and it seems doubtful whether Rogers copied Oliver and was in turn imitated by Crispin, or whether all three had access to some original now unknown. There are slight variations in all the prints, but Simon de Passe in his medallion certainly keeps more closely to his father's version than he does to the Windsor drawing.

The words of the inscription on the medallion of Elizabeth,

¹ Early Engravings and Engravers of England, Sidney Colvin, Plate IV.
VERTUE'S PRINT AFTER ISAAC OLIVER'S DRAWING OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.
QVI • LEO • DE • IVDA • EST • ET • FLOS • DE • JESSE • LEONES • PRO-
TEGAT • ET • FLORES • ELIZABETHA • TVOS', are said to have been
the lines of a Westminster schoolboy, the queen's arms being the
theme. Classical sentiments such as this appealed to Elizabeth, who
prided herself upon her learning no less than upon her appearance;
but the medallion, of course, was made after the death of the queen,
as were all the works of Simon de Passe.¹

When the Armada was about to invade England, in 1588, the
queen rode at the head of her troops, reviewing them at Tilbury, and
wearing a bright breastplate above her monstrous farthingale, her
head bare, her helmet borne by a page.² There is a print by Cecill of
Elizabeth riding in armour, with the Armada in the background, but
as it is allegorical in all its details, this engraving does not prove that
she had any special desire to be portrayed as an Amazon: we need,
therefore, not be surprised that the coins of the queen's later days
should tend rather to this magnificence than to the plainer bodices
occasionally described as "armour" which prevail, though not
exclusively, with mint-mark star 1562–1566 (see Kenyon, p. 126).
Whether Mr. Kenyon had any special reason for thinking the queen
wore armour in 1562–1566, I cannot discover, the silver coins of a
similar type not being usually so described, but I must admit that the

1 Simon de Passe was born in 1595 (?) and died in Copenhagen in 1647. His
earliest dated portrait is that of Henry, Prince of Wales, engraved in 1612, probably before
his advent in this country. He is thought to have resided here only five or six years, and
was employed by Nicholas Hilliard in 1617 to engrave counters representing the royal
family (see Med. Ill., i, p. 376). The majority of the larger plaques by Simon de Passe
were designed between 1616 and 1620. A medallion of Charles, as Prince of Wales,
bears the former date, and the others would appear to be fairly contemporaneous.

2 Creighton's Queen Elizabeth, p. 157: "Mounted on a war-horse, Bellona-like, a
general's truncheon in her hand, wearing a breastplate of burnished steel, and attended by
a page who bore her helmet, she rode through the ranks."
sixpence shown above was so catalogued when I acquired it. There is in the British Museum a base metal pattern for a pound—sovereign with mint-mark star, of which I give an illustration, and which is undoubtedly in armour, the lion’s head on the shoulder being clearly seen in the original. This is suggestive of the “armour” of Mr. Kenyon’s gold coinage, if armour it be, being commemorative of some event between the years 1562 and 1566.

The introduction by Eloye Mestrell of the mill and screw in Elizabeth’s time contributed largely to the perfection of her coins, but according to Vertue, jealousy of foreigners in general, and the dishonesty of this foreigner in particular, led to the execution of the innovator, and the hammered pieces, which had continued in use concurrently with the milled, for a time resumed their sway. Vertue¹ tells the story thus: “Though the Queen and her Council liked very 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 . . . but according to the strict laws of this nation, he was condemned to death and suffered execution.” Folkes,² however, states that the man executed

¹ Vertue’s Coins, Medals, etc., p. 24.
² Folkes’s English Gold and Silver Coins, p. 55, perhaps taking his information, though not very accurately, from Shaw, who says, “1569—The 17th January, Philip Mestrell, a Frenchman and two Englishmen were drawn from Newgate to Tiborne and there hanged, the Frenchman quartered, who had coined gold counterfeit.” P. 662 of ed. of 1615, the date should therefore read 1569-70.
was named Philip Mestrelle, and that he died on January 27th, 1569. The milled coins were struck from 1561 to 1572, and, with great rarity afterwards, till the reign of Charles II.

The coins of Elizabeth offer us endless variety, for she issued twenty denominations, the highest number ever reached by our currency. Apart from the fact of the general superiority of their material and execution, their most noticeable characteristic in many cases lies in the extreme elaboration of her dress. Holbein, in the reign of Henry VIII., had been noted for the fineness of his portrayal of gold and enamelled ornaments or jewels, which he painted with such precision that each gem is recognisable. Hilliard also, in Elizabeth's time, is known to have introduced a real stone into a miniature, and the rubies in the beautiful little portrait of her by this artist in the Jones Bequest stand out in high relief, while in the Treatise on Limning before mentioned, careful and special directions are given for the way in which the light on the ruby or diamond was to be produced. The coins of Henry and Edward, like their pictures, show the kings in jewelled collars or richly decorated armour, but Mary's coins were very simple, her principal embellishment in the way of ornament being merely a string of pearls. During the lifetime of her sister, Elizabeth thought it expedient to pretend a love of simplicity, but as years advanced, her passion for dress, no doubt inherited from her father, steadily increased, as may be seen on her coins, and she is described in her later years as absolutely loaded with jewels, amongst others with pear-shaped hanging pearls. These pearls are clearly seen in the crown and half-crown of 1601 before alluded to, and on many of her coins one can trace the "aglets" or ornamental gold and enamel loops which were so made that they could be sewn on to her different dresses as required. Indeed, as Walpole said about her, "A pale


2 "Treatise on the Art of Limning," by Nicholas Hilliard, referred to on p. 130.

Roman nose, a head of hair loaded with crowns and powdered with diamonds, a vast ruff, a vaster farthingale and a bushel of pearls are the features by which everybody knows at once the pictures of Elizabeth.\textsuperscript{1}

This queen was so fond of being portrayed, that it has been computed\textsuperscript{2} that there are no fewer than eighty paintings and twenty-four cameos representing her, still in existence. But to this very vanity of the queen we owe the great diversity of a singularly interesting coinage.

Taken as a whole from the point of view of art, the coinage of the Tudor family may be said to be the most beautiful for which our country has been distinguished. In the realm of portraiture a new element was introduced into the interesting study of our currency and very ably sustained, and the dynasty which did perhaps the most to raise the prestige of England in the eyes of foreign powers, also deserves our gratitude in the persons of several of its members as the promoters of artistic numismatic portraiture.

If I have not fatigued my readers too much already with this subject, I may, perhaps, be permitted, at some future time, to turn to the unfortunate family of the Stuarts, for during the occupancy of the throne by these successors to the Tudors, possibly the highest

\textsuperscript{1} Strickland, vol. iv, p. 186.
\textsuperscript{2} Connoisseur, vol. v, p. 241; The King's Gems, by Mr. H. Clifford-Smith.
\textsuperscript{3} Ruding, vol. ii, p. 69.
point of artistic numismatic portraiture was reached by Briot, by Simon and the Roettiers.

I have now only to offer my sincere thanks to our editors, also to many members of this Society, especially to Mr. H. Earle Fox, Mr. L. Forrer and Dr. George Williamson, also to Mr. Herbert Grueber, to Mr. John Fortescue, to Mr. Ernest Law, to Mr. Lionel Cust, to Mr. St. John Hope and others who have given me their kind assistance, and to apologise for the length of this paper, humbly craving your indulgence as a very unlearned participator in your researches.