PORTRAITURE OF OUR STUART MONARCHS
ON THEIR COINS AND MEDALS.

PART I.

BY HELEN FARQUHAR.

On a former occasion I have had the pleasure of addressing this Society on the subject of the numismatic portraiture of our monarchs, commencing with the founder of our Tudor line of kings, Henry VII., who was the first to be accurately represented upon our coinage. I hope now, with your permission, to trace the further development of this particular branch of art, which under Charles I. and Charles II. attained to a very high point of excellence.

On the death of Elizabeth, James I., the ruler in Scotland of a very poor court where he had been educated under the conflicting supervision of various regencies, was a curious mixture of prodigality and parsimony; slovenly in his own dress, for his vanity was rather of his attainments than of his person, he encouraged extravagance in others and was possessed by a mania for ostentation, which found its vent in an excessive expenditure in jewellery, with which he loaded his family and his favourites.

He was perhaps more remarkable for his pedantry than for any real love of the arts, but his learning was undoubted, and his conversation, especially in argument, was often very shrewd. It is said that his head being opened after his death, the amount of brain contained in the cranium was found to be unusually large. He was most assiduous in the teaching of his sons, and both Henry and Charles profited largely by the very catholic education which he caused them to receive.
With all this he was foolish in manner, and Sir Anthony Weldon remarked concerning him that “he was very liberal of what he had not in his own gripe, and would rather part with £100 he never had in his keeping than one twenty shilling piece within his own custody.”\(^1\) This perhaps is hardly fair, for James was all too generous in his gifts, readily sacrificing jewels,\(^2\) which had long been in his own possession, for the adornment of Charles or of Buckingham. Weldon continues more truly—“He spent much and had much use of his subjects’ purses, which bred some clashing with them in Parliament, yet it would always come off and end with a sweet and plausible close.”

James was thirty-six years of age when he came to the English throne in 1603, and he had occupied that of Scotland from his infancy, being proclaimed king on his mother’s forced abdication in 1567. Weldon describes him as being “of middle stature, more corpulent through his clothes than in his body, yet fat enough”; his clothes being made large and very easy, the doublets quilted for stiletto proof, his breeches in great pleats and full-stuffed; he was naturally of a timorous disposition, which was the reason of his quilted doublets; his eyes large . . . His beard was very thin, his tongue too large for his mouth, . . . his skin soft as taffeta sarsnet, which felt so, because he never washt his hands, only rubb’d his finger ends slightly with the wet end of a napkin . . . his legs were very weak.”\(^3\)

The infantine delicacy of the little King of Scots was, it is recorded, so great that he was unable to stand at seven years old, and in the main Weldon’s portrait of James, though not alluring, appears to have been fairly correct, for even in many cases on his coinage we see the “thin beard” and the “corpulent body,” and the unit illustrated below presents these peculiarities.

\(^1\) Anthony Weldon’s character of King James, printed in Smeeton’s *Historical and Biographical Tracts*, vol. 1, p. 57.

\(^2\) *Jewellery*, by H. Clifford Smith, p. 270.

\(^3\) A letter written by the Spanish Ambassador is quoted by Mr. Gibbs on p. 88 of *The King’s Favorite*. It mentions that James, towards the middle of his reign, “grows too fat to be able to hunt comfortably, and spends much time in reading, especially religious works, and eats and drinks so recklessly, that it is thought he will not be long-lived.”

\(^4\) Anthony Weldon, p. 55.
His coins, as James I. of England and James VI. of Scotland, show forth an unusually extended series of portraits, for we see him from 1582 onward, when in his sixteenth year his effigy appeared upon his coins in his northern kingdom, and with many changes of bust during the twenty-two years of his English rule. Colonel Morrieson has entered so fully and competently into this subject that any further description of mine would be superfluous, and I will therefore turn my attention to the personal influence of James upon the coinage and upon his medals, trying to ascertain what artists were employed by him.

The King was fortunate in inheriting from Elizabeth the services of Charles Anthony and Nicholas Hilliard. Not that I wish to suggest that the latter gave designs for the coinage or executed aught in the precious metals save some medals for James, and even of these the attribution is somewhat vague, but as a miniaturist his talents were highly valued at the English court. On his accession the new king found Hilliard installed as "limner carver and goldsmith" at his southern capital, whilst the post of graver of the mint and seals at the Tower had been held at a fee of £30 a year since June 30th, 1599, by Charles Anthony in succession to his father Derick.

The beauty of Queen Elizabeth’s gold coinage and that of James would lead us to believe that the Anthonys, father and son, were no mean craftsmen.

1 The busts of James I. on his silver coinage, British Numismatic Journal, vol. iii, pp. 173 to 179.
2 Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1598–1601, p. 224.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

Although the great seals of James closely resemble one another they do not strike me, in such impressions as I have seen, as comparable with Hilliard’s work in the second great seal executed for Elizabeth, yet they are a decided improvement on the matrix first engraved for her by Derick Anthony. I should therefore be inclined to assume that Charles Anthony was possessed of greater skill than his father.

The design of James I.’s seated figure is very reminiscent of that of Elizabeth. We are, however, informed by Mr. Allan Wyon that Charles Anthony was the engraver thereof, and he quotes a warrant addressed by the monarch on May 8th, 1603, to “Charles Anthony, graver of our mynt and seals,” giving orders to him to engrave “our Great Seale of England and divers other Seales as well.”

There are many notices in the Calendars of Domestic State Papers concerning this official, amongst others, I may select as being interesting that of May 25th, 1603, addressed to Sir Thomas Knyvet, warden of the mint, as follows:—“We are determined to proceed with the moneys wrought by warrant of the late Queen, viz., angels, half-angels and quarter-angels of fine gold; crowns and half-crowns, shillings, and sixpences of silver, also pieces of twopence, pence, and halfpence . . . you are to order Charles Anthony graver of our mint to cause to be graven irons needful for striking of our said moneys, and we authorize you to take up skilful gravers for the said works within our Tower of London.”

The interest attached to this notice is that by no means all these denominations made their appearance at this time. According to Mr. Kenyon the first angel of James is of 1605, the half-angel was not issued before 1610 or 1611, and the quarter-angel is not known, the place of the two last being taken by the crown and half-crown in gold. The half-sovereign which supplied the place of the angel, belonged both to the first issue of James and to the last of Elizabeth, and together

---

1 Allan Wyon’s Great Seals of England, Plates XXIV and XXV.
2 Wyon’s Great Seals, Plate XXIII.
with the sovereign, gold crown and half-crown is not mentioned in the warrants. The sovereign and its parts come naturally into the scope of our present discussion, because the king's portrait appears on these coins; whereas the angel maintained its usual type, and indeed was thus continued in a modified form so long as the touchpiece was an article of veneration.

It still held a place in the currency of James I., but orders are to be found in the Calendar of State Papers, for angels specially pierced for use as touch-pieces only,¹ and this is also the case under Charles I.,² whilst under Charles II. the coin assumed a medallic aspect.

It would be interesting if we could ascertain who were the “skilful gravers” selected to help Anthony in his work, but most of their names remain unchronicled. We learn, however, that one, John Baptist, as under-graver, received the royal command to make some medals in October and November, 1604,³ and on December the 28th of the same year he is again mentioned in connection with Anthony. The directions for making an Irish coinage include “a warrant to Charles Anthony to engrave dies . . . , and for payment to him of customary allowances in his place of under-graver, as lately held by John Ruslinger till John Baptista was appointed to the place.”⁴ In the year 1609 we find the names of various officials at the Tower appended to a recommendation of one John Reynolds as having been “trained ten years in the Mint, and sufficiently informed for the master worker’s place,” and on the advice of “Fras. Goston, Rich. Roger, Alex. King, Pa. Swallow and Charles Anthony” the appointment of “Master Workman of the King’s money”⁵ was accorded to him. At dates varying between 1612 and 1617, I have found Sir Francis Goston mentioned as Auditor of

² The angel was not issued as currency after 1634 under Charles I. Kenyon, p. 165
⁴ Ibid., p. 179, vol. x, docquet at the Public Record Office. Shillings and sixpences are the coins mentioned in the original MS. document.
⁵ Calendar of State Papers Dom., Green, addenda, 1580 to 1625, pp. 520, vol. xxxix, and in 1603 to 1610, p. 560, vol. xlix.
the Exchequer,¹ Richard Roger as Controller, and Paul Swallow as Surveyor of the Melting.²

That James was desirous of improving his currency is evinced by an order addressed on the 1st of December, 1611, to his Master of the Mint, Sir Thomas Martin, concerning "sundry models, tools and engines thereafter to be made, for the better making of His Majesty's monies, both of gold and silver, more fair than heretofore they have been, and for making of all sorts of small monies with speed, beauty, and fastness."³ Have we in this a foreshadowing of the mill and screw?

We may fairly conclude that during the early years of James I.'s reign, the portraiture on his coins was mostly attributable to Charles Anthony, but the principal alteration to the gold in this particular, presents a problem more difficult to decide; I allude to that made on the introduction of the laurel and its parts in 1619, little more than a year after the appointment of William Hole, or Holle, in 1618, as cuneator of the mint.⁴ It appears to me unlikely that these coins were designed or executed by the chief engraver, for the new coinage of 1619 included some very beautiful rose-ryals, spur-ryals and angels, and these far more probably represent his handiwork. They are superior in finish to the minute productions of Anthony, and the fact that they thus stand alone might be explained by the short duration of Holle's tenure of office.

¹ *Calendar of State Papers Dom.*, 1611-1618, p. 112 in 1612, vol. lxviii.
² Rymer's *Faderna*, tom. xvii, p. 19.
Holle, Gilbert, and Green.

The laurels on the other hand, rough at the best both in design and execution, present such varieties that the dies could scarcely be classed as the work of one artist only. It is known that subordinates were employed by Holle, for a warrant of December 30th, 1619, speaks of "a reasonable allowance to be made to John Holle, Engraver of the Mint, for patterns made by him of the king's gold money, etc., and for the labours of other gravers and workmen employed by him."1

Probably the name of John Holle is a mistake for that of William, for otherwise it would suggest that another member of the family was working at the mint at this time, and that the laurels might be attributed to him. This is, however, unlikely, because the warrants were seldom made payable to the under-gravers, and also because I have been unable to find any other mention of "John" in the State Papers; moreover, such clerical errors as the substitution of one Christian name for another are not unknown.

It seems to me possible that John Gilbert and Edward Green, who as joint chief-gravers succeeded Holle on his death in 1624,2 may have been amongst these "workmen employed by him," and that they may have been responsible for the laurels. I should be the more inclined to attribute the less finished specimens to John Gilbert3 because his work ceases, at latest, with the year 1630, whereas that of Green is carried on throughout the greater part of King Charles I.'s reign, and some of his second and third coinages are better executed than the best of the laurels, whilst there is a distinct affinity between the later busts of James and the earlier of Charles, all of which should probably be attributable to Gilbert.

The marked change in type was no doubt made to call attention to the lowered value of the coin, and it is the first instance of a laureate bust in the English coinage. James had a great liking for classical dress and customs, and had caused himself to be designated Caesar Augustus on his Coronation Medal, but the new design evoked

3 The words applied to Holle are "lately deceased."
comment on the part of the people, who christened the coin the "laurel" in consequence. In Fuller's *Worthies* a story is told of a scoffer of the day, who remarked "that poets being always poor, bays were rather the emblems of wit than wealth, since King James no sooner began to wear them, but presently he fell two shillings in the pound in public valuation." The allusion is to the fact that the value of the preceding unit had been raised by proclamation in 1611 to 22s., whilst the new coins were current at 20s. only. James, it seemed to the wit, set more store by his position as an author than as king, and Fuller also seemed impressed by this condescension, for he explains that "the branches of the laurel in all ages have been accounted honourable, in so much that King James in some sort waived his crown (which was worn on his sovereign) to wear the laurel on his new twenty shilling piece." As a matter of fact, the king was arrogating to himself the wreath of a conqueror or an emperor, but had really no more claim to either title than he had to that of poet. Probably he never thought about the matter from any of these points of view, but the revival of classic art had now become general in statuary and in architecture, and James, in all things a pedant, was in some degree the promoter of this fashion, which continued to increase until our kings, towards the end of the century, were frequently represented as Roman warriors on their medals and even upon the coinage, and the pseudo classic became in time ridiculous.

The portraiture of James on his coins is not as reminiscent of his pictures as are his medals, though, as demonstrated by Colonel Morrieson, the changed fashion of his beard or hair is clearly delineated in the various issues. I have not been able to trace the likenesses on the coinage to any particular picture; whereas the medals and the engraved plaques of Simon van de Passe represent the contemporary modes so distinctly, that the portraits might almost be dated accordingly. So far as I have been able to compare the coins with paintings, Colonel Morrieson's deductions with regard to the gradual improvement

---

1 Quoted by Allan Fea in *James II. and his Wives*, p. 46.
The high and mighty prince James by the grace of god King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith.

James I., from a rare print in the collection of Mr. W. Sharp Ogden.
in the shape of the beard and the lengthening and more artistic arrangement of the hair of his head, appear to be corroborated by the pictures of the day. I have, of course, been unable to find dated portraits corresponding to all the types, but a very rare print by Laurence Johnson, kindly lent to me by Mr. W. Sharp Ogden, shows James in 1603 appearing as he is seen upon the early coins.¹

Van Somer and Janssen as painters in oils, Isaac Oliver and Nicholas Hilliard as miniaturists, give us excellent portraits of the king. Oliver died in 1617, Hilliard in 1619, whilst Van Somer survived until 1621.² Janssen, as is usually stated, did not paint in England before 1618, so that his pictures are amongst the latest of the king. All four artists generally represent James more or less as we see him in the silver assigned by Colonel Morrieson to the period between 1608 and 1625, that is, on his fifth and sixth types.

Amongst the smaller paintings, the pleasantest I have ever seen are by Hilliard. A specially good likeness is to be found at Montagu House, and another much resembling it at Windsor; in these the hair appears under the hat upon the forehead, just as it does beneath the crown in Colonel Morrieson's type 4, which he dates 1605; the miniatures are undated but vividly recall a medal of 1604.³ A very fine painting by Isaac Oliver in Mr. Currie's collection at Minley Manor, dated 1609, represents type 5 of 1608 to 1619. There is a charming portrait of James, usually said to be by Hilliard, enclosed in the Lyte Jewel, which forms part of the Waddesdon bequest to the

¹ An impression of this print sold for 40 guineas at the Mark Sykes sale in 1824, but it was at that time believed to be unique, which is not quite the case.

² The portrait of James at Hampton Court, painted in his coronation robes, though undated, must be assigned to the last years of the artist's life, for he has introduced in the background a view of the banqueting hall at Whitehall, a building only commenced in 1619, and finished in 1622, after Van Somer's death. See Hampton Court Catalogue, by E. Law, No. 521. It is often possible to determine in this manner the date of a picture otherwise unrecorded. The king is here portrayed with a very thin, square-cut beard.

³ In the Rutland MS., part iv, p. 444, Historical MSS. Commission, there is a mention of a portrait of James by Hilliard in 1603. It figures in the household accounts "Item, to Hyldiard for a picture of the Kinges Majesty iiij. 6d," but unfortunately this miniature cannot now be identified. See Dr. George Williamson in the Connoisseur Dec., 1906, "Note on Fees paid to old Miniature Painters."
British Museum. This splendid specimen of early seventeenth century jewellery was presented to the courtly Thomas Lyte in recognition of a pedigree compiled by him, which traced the ancestry of the king into the remote past.\(^1\) The gem realised the sum of £2,835 at the Hamilton Palace sale, when it was acquired by Baron Ferdinand Rothschild, and whatever the pedigree of the king may have been, that of the jewel is undoubted. It has been thought by some that throughout it is the work of Hilliard, in his capacity of jeweller as well as painter, but it has also been attributed to George Heriot, who was more constantly at work for the court,\(^3\) and again, even the miniature was according to some authors\(^3\) painted by Isaac Oliver; this, however, I think is a mistake. It is neither signed nor dated, but I learn from Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte that it was presented to his ancestor between the 10th of July, 1610, and the 14th of April, 1611, and that a contemporary portrait of Thomas Lyte of 1611, in the possession of Sir Henry, shows the jewel suspended by a brown ribbon round the owner’s neck. Personally, though I give my opinion only for what it is worth, I think the miniature is by Hilliard, although there is more modelling and shadow in the face than is found in many of this artist’s works. We here see James I. with hair and beard arranged as on the coinage in Colonel Morrieson’s type 5, of 1608 to 1619.

Hilliard enjoyed special favour at the hands of the king, and was given a monopoly by him in the year 1617, which restricted the rights of all other artists and engravers. Rymer prints it in full, but the following extract suffices us: “Whereas our well-beloved servant Nicholas Hilliard, gentleman, our principal Drawer of the small Portraits and Imbosser of our medallies of gold in respect to his extraordinary skill in Drawing, Graving and Imprinting of Pictures—

\(^1\) “The Lytes of Lytescary,” by Sir Henry Maxwell Lyte, Part II, of the year 1892; *Somersetshire Archaeological Journal*.

\(^2\) Catalogue of the Collection of Plate, Jewels, etc., bequeathed to the British Museum by Baron F. Rothschild, p. vii, Introduction. George Heriot was court jeweller to James VI. in Scotland, and followed his master to England; he became rich and founded the hospital in Edinburgh which bears his name. He died in 1624. *See Cal. State Papers Dom.*, 1623–25, p. 422, vol. ccxxvii.

\(^3\) Jewellery, by H. Clifford Smith, p. 303.
and Representations of us and others, etc., etc., we have granted unto Nicholas Hilliard, his Executors, Administrators, Deputies, Servants and Assigns for twelve years to Invent grave and Ymprint any pictures of our Image or other Representation of our Person,” etc., etc.¹ Hilliard did not live long to enjoy this grant, but he appears to have passed on his privilege to Simon van de Passe and others, or to have employed them to engrave the royal effigy as exemplified in the various oval plaques and counters made in 1616 and in the immediately ensuing years.

The monopoly was exercised by his son Laurence until the expiration of its term, but though he succeeded his father as the king's limner, there is no evidence that he engraved aught. The medallions of Simon van de Passe often give us a very pleasing rendering of the royal features, but James was not an easy person to portray, and though Van Somer and his brother craftsmen produced fine paintings of him, is well-known that he objected strongly to giving the artists the sittings necessary for the purpose.²

A rather peculiar and original portrait of James I.³ presents itself to our notice on a silver-gilt box in my collection. It is of the school of Passe, though by a less practised hand. The casket, strange in shape and in design, offers a puzzle which I have failed to solve, for the arms which decorate one of the panels are not those of any of the persons portrayed on the other facets, and the shields which bear them

¹ Rymer's *Foedera*, xvii, p. 15, quoted also by Vertue, *Add. MS.*, British Museum, 23069, f. 45B.
³ The portrait of James is not unlike an oil painting by Van Somer, but I have been unable to trace it precisely to any prototype.
suggest difficulties of date; they are perhaps the additions of a more recent possessor.¹

The original owner or donor should, to judge by the rest of the evidence, have been either Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham and Lord High Admiral of England, whose portrait by Zucchero is well-known, or Francis Bacon. For these two form the subject of engraved subdivisions, whilst a third compartment represents Sir Walter Raleigh, whose picture is taken from a print by Passe, which figures in 1617 as the frontispiece to his History of the World. It appears, however,

more likely that the box was not made, at the earliest, till the year 1618²—that of Raleigh’s death—for Francis Bacon wears his robes as chancellor, a dignity to which he attained at that time, when Van Somer³ painted him and Simon van de Passe engraved his portrait.

¹ From the style of engraving, apart from other questions, this seems probable. I have consulted various experts, learned in heraldry as well as in works of art, with the result that it has been suggested to me by more than one connoisseur that the box is strictly contemporary, and that the shields have been added in the second half of the eighteenth century in a space originally left vacant for some such purpose, and this indeed appears to be the only possible solution if this box was really engraved in the time of James I., as the rest of the decoration would lead us to suppose.

² Raleigh was executed on October 29th, 1618. Bacon had been appointed Lord Chancellor on January 7th of that year.

³ The picture is now in the National Portrait Gallery.
also. Of this date there is other evidence such as the falling band worn by James, substituted *circa* 1616 for the quilled ruff, which had been popular till the inventor of a certain yellow starch lately used to stiffen these uncomfortable collars, a Mrs. Anne Turner, was executed towards the end of the year 1615 for the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury; she was hanged in a ruff, and it is said that the taste in fashion almost immediately changed.¹

The curious shape of the casket, and the nautical emblems with which it is decorated, suggest that it held an astrolabe or some such mariner's instrument, whilst the ark and the dove, so much used by both Elizabeth and James on their naval rewards, play a prominent part in the ornamentation, so that we might think it had been a presentation to some one who had taken part in Raleigh's expedition, which terminated in 1618, but though the style and appearance of the engraving are so entirely such as we should expect upon a piece of contemporary origin, I am not prepared, in view of the heraldic question, to make definite assertions as to the date of execution; the alternative being that we

¹ Mrs. Turner was convicted on November 7th, 1615, and on the 11th was reprieved for a few days only, in the hope of extorting a confession; she duly confessed, but obtained no pardon, and was hanged in a yellow ruff, a fashion also followed by the executioner. See *The King's Favorite*, by P. Gibbs, p. 315.
have before us the work of an exceedingly clever eighteenth century imitator of early seventeenth century engraving, either by copying an almost identical piece of a former date or taking his models in the smallest details from old prints and drawings supplemented by the Houbrakens and Vertues of his own time. I am, however, inclined to believe with nearly all of those who have critically examined the box, that had this been the case, it is unlikely the copyist would have been so successful in reproducing the style of the older engravings, the portraits, the groups, the ships and emblems, and yet have introduced so meagre a design as that of the coat-of-arms. Also, I may mention that these shields are less gracefully engraved than the earlier portions of the work, so that the likelihood of their being by another hand is great, although the gilding hardly looks as though it had been recently disturbed. The box remains a riddle—with a query after the date 1618.

Often in his pictures we find James wearing a hat, high-crowned or broad-brimmed, as the case may be; sometimes on his medals the crown is superimposed on the hat, and even upon one of the coins of Scotland a very remarkable dome-shaped erection covers the head of the king.

The hat-piece, as it was called, was a gold coin of the value of 80s. Scots. It represents James in the peculiar headgear, much as we see him in his portrait as James VI. of Scotland, from the Brühl-Finckenstein collection now shown in the National Portrait Gallery. The coin

1 Old prints representing the conspirators of the Gunpowder Plot, i.e., of 1605 and 1606, portray extremely high-crowned, but broad-brimmed hats. Much the same shape with jewelled hat bands was worn by women in the lifetime of Anne of Denmark, who is often represented thus adorned; Anne died in 1619.
is of the years 1591-93, but I have seen a print engraved after his accession to the English throne, in which an almost similar high-crowned and brimless hat surmounts the king’s face. This picture corroborates the tradition that he, as is so often stated, was very slow in adopting a new fashion. The hat in the original plaque by Simon van de Passe, here shown from the National Collection, is of a more becoming shape, wide-brimmed and graceful, and though it is said that James detested the broad Spanish sombrero, remarking that “he neither loved the Spaniards nor their fashions,” there are some interesting medals, Med. III., vol. i, p. 193, Nos. 14 and 15, to which I would gladly call attention, as portraying the king in the Spanish mode. They were specially made to commemorate the peace with Spain, concluded on the 19th of August, 1604, and to these I have just referred as combining the broad-brimmed hat with the crown. They are, of course, some twelve or more years earlier in date than the Passe plaque.

One of these medallions, Med. III., vol. i, p. 193, No. 14, here illustrated, is a very fine piece of work, the other, No. 15, also shown, is an inferior cast copy, decorated with a heavy border.

It is probable that the adverse opinion of James on the Spaniards was expressed in a moment of petulance over the failure of the negotiations for a Spanish match, for, as a rule, his relations with that country were more friendly than suited the feelings of his people, with whom in that buccaneering age, peace with Spain was by no means popular.

The original struck medallion, No. 14, is ascribed by Pinkerton, in his *Medallic History*, Plate XII, No. 6, to Hilliard, and comparison with such numismatic work as we have of his, renders this extremely likely, the more so as it nearly reproduces the miniatures of James by this artist at Windsor and at Montagu House, in position and even in size; though in the pictures the severe simplicity of dress gives place to a striped and embroidered doublet, and the crown is not portrayed upon the hat.

---

1 Illustrated in the *Connoisseur* of January, 1906, plate facing p. 234, No. 8.
The reverse of this medal reappears with another obverse, but the portrait is very different and the work of a foreign hand.¹

There are notices calendared in the *Domestic State Papers*, and in Devon's *Issues of the Exchequer*, of payments for various medals, executed by numerous artists in the years 1604, 1605 and 1606, but there is a fair amount of reason for thinking that the following entry applies to the fine medal, No. 14, attributed above to Hilliard, and of which the beautiful example in the British Museum is in gold. We read that on December 26th, 1604, a warrant was issued "to pay to Nich. Hilliard £64 10s. for 12 gold medals."² Now the fact that the pendant ascribed by Pinkerton to Hilliard is amongst the few still existing in the precious metal, proves little or nothing, for we know that James caused many other such presents to be made,³ which have not come down to us, and the intrinsic value of golden medallions resulted in the destruction of many artistic works in times of adversity. But in favour of Pinkerton's attribution, I may state that the fine workmanship of the *Peace-with-Spain* medal recalls Elizabeth's Armada badge, No. 129,⁴ which, in a former article, I ventured to ascribe to Hilliard, though the dress of the king is naturally less elaborate than that of the queen.

Anthony Weldon mentions James I.'s "large eyes ever rowling after any stranger that came in his presence,"⁵ and they are very noticeable in this portrait; the same peculiarity is seen on another extremely rare badge, *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, p. 194, No. 17, made in October, 1604, on the endeavour of the king to establish the Union between England and Scotland. Although this effort failed, the words MAG. BRIT. ... R...X. were in November, 1604,⁶ substituted

---

¹ *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, p. 194, No. 16.
³ Upwards of fifty medals are specified in a list of gifts supplied by John Williams for distribution by James in the year 1606 alone. See Devon's *Issues of the Exchequer*, pp. 300–301.
⁵ Character of King James, published in Smeeton's *Historical and Biographical Tracts*, vol. i, p. 55.
⁶ *State Papers Dom.*, Nov. 4, 1604, docquet, MS. in Public Record Office.
for the ANG, SCO... REX. in use upon the coins issued prior to the king's well-meant attempt, and the fresh title appears upon the badge as well as upon the coinage.

The proposal of James to effect the Union was rejected by the English Parliament in November, 1606, after much discussion, the Scots being at that time inclined towards it. This is curious, for when, more than a hundred years later, the measure was finally carried, the opposition came from the Scottish side. Hume says that the precipitation of the monarch in assuming on his own authority in 1604, the title of King of Great Britain, "had been observed to do more injury than service to the cause," but it is worthy of remark that the Peace-with-Spain badge, struck in August, 1604, was the last medallic specimen on which James used the older designation. The

\[\text{ATTEMPTED-UNION MEDAL, MED. ILL., I, P. 194, NO. 17.}\]

Intended-Union medal is cast and chased, and although it is not of specially fine execution, one of the three existing examples has a beautiful openwork border, which renders it very attractive, and the portrait with the graceful hat and plume is not unpleasing.

The large and becoming headgear is also observable on several medallions, probably intended for suspension to the massive gold chains of the day. We have already found John Baptista and Charles Anthony receiving orders for medals in the year 1604—possibly those men-

2 The medal illustrated is in the British Museum, the second specimen is in the Hunter collection, and that with the border is in a private cabinet.
3 See p. 149.
4 Record Office MS., State Papers Dom., vol. x, docquet, Nov. 4, 1604.
tioned above, for the type is only specified as "according to such pattern as his Ma\textsuperscript{ie} shall allow." We read that William Herrick\textsuperscript{1} and Arnold Lulls\textsuperscript{2} made two pictures of gold set with stones, given by the queen to "the late French Ambassador and the Lady his wife" in 1605. They also produced chains and medals of gold in December, 1606, whilst John Williams\textsuperscript{3} was constantly employed, and it seems impossible in the light of our present knowledge to decide to which artist any particular badge may be fairly attributed, excepting in the case of "a fair besant," which Charles Anthony had "made for his Ma\textsuperscript{le}s service." For this, according to a MS. in the Public Record Office,\textsuperscript{4} I find that he received the payment of £47 7s.—thus settling the vexed question as to who the maker might be of the beautiful cliché pattern in the British Museum, for an obverse of this coin, known as Med. Ill., i, p. 187, No. 2.

The Issues of the Exchequer in some cases gives the weight of a chain or pendant, and to this fact we might look for assistance, were it not that none of the medallions which I have so far had the opportunity of weighing, have reached the required standard. John Williams made thirty-eight medals for James at one time, besides divers others in the same year, executed for some special purpose, and the weight of the thirty-eight specimens collectively is given at 61 ozs. 18 dwt. 12 grs., whilst one of the single examples is mentioned at 1 oz. 10 dwt. We thus see that they averaged from 720 to 756 grs., whereas the heaviest of the gold badges known to me weighs 698 grs., and is in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris.

The struck medallion which I have ventured to ascribe to Hilliard turns the scale at 556 grs., and one of the few other gold pendants

\textsuperscript{1} Devon's Issues of the Exchequer, pp. 49 and 52.
\textsuperscript{2} Arnold Lulls is frequently mentioned as one of the King's jewellers, but in 1620 he is sentenced to pay a fine of £8,000 for "unlawful transporting of coin." Cal. State Papers Dom., 1619-23, p. 119, vol. cxii.
\textsuperscript{3} John Williams, the king's goldsmith, was a person of some importance, and Sir Henry Coke advised in 1609 "that he should be put into the Commission of the Peace for London as was Sir Richard Martin, the Queen's goldsmith in the late reign. This was in consequence of the daily robbery of the King's plate." See Calendar of State Papers Dom., 1603-10, p. 574, vol. i.
\textsuperscript{4} State Papers Dom., MS. Public Record Office, vol. x, docquet, Nov. 4, 1604.
which remain to us, Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 233, No. 96,1 in silver at the
British Museum, but in gold in the Hunter collection, though much
larger, weighs, as I am courteously informed from Glasgow, only 483
grs.; and this is curious, for the specimen at Paris, to which I have
just referred, is, as we have seen, 215 grs. heavier. It is probably
thicker in the flan, but of this I am no judge, because I have not seen
the Glasgow example. It is, of course, possible that the many
medallions made by Williams were not all of the same design and
may have varied greatly in weight, so no certainty is attained by
dividing 61 ozs. 18 dwts. 12 grs. by 38. The discrepancy between
two cast medals of similar type, such as the specimens of No. 96, may be
partly caused by the shrinkage of the metal as the successive casts
were made, but so large a variant as that mentioned above is greater
than can be thus explained, and shows the futility of relying on weight
for purposes of identification in pieces of this nature. I have weighed
some of the other silver or bronze medallions of this series of honorary

1 This medal bears an exact resemblance to a miniature now in the Imperial Gallery at
Vienna, in the collection of the Arch Duke Ferdinand of the Tyrol, who died in 1595; but I
find that this portrait, together with its companion miniature of Anne of Denmark, was a later
addition to this sixteenth century collection. See p. 90 and Plate II, Nos. 215 and 215A
of the six vol. of Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlung des Alterhöchsten Kaiserhaus.
The miniature of Anne is precisely like her coronation medal, Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 192,
No. 12. The two portraits are attributed to Nicholas Hilliard, circa 1603, though unsigned
and undated, but the two medals are not by the same hand, and that of James does not
suggest his workmanship.
rewards such as Nos. 95–97 and 99, and calculated the difference in specific gravity between the minerals, but judging from such few specimens as were within my reach, I have not found that they can have approached the 720 grs., and upwards, of the productions mentioned in the *Issues of the Exchequer* as being by Williams; furthermore we are not even sure that these examples were ever made in the more precious metal, so, for the present, the works of Williams remain unidentified.

Most of the medallions are cast and chased, and if any of these could be definitely ascribed to Williams, we might find the explanation of the fact that he was paid much less for his work than was Hilliard. On folio 62 of the third volume of the *Privy Seal Book* at the Record Office, I find that £45 was allowed for the gold of the twelve medals made by Nicholas Hilliard, and £19 10s. for “the making and workmanship of the same,” he being paid “the sum of three-score and four pounds ten shillings” for the completed medallions, which is at the rate of over £5 for each example. On the other hand, Williams received only £5 10s. for “the fashion” of his thirty-eight specimens, or roughly speaking, 3s. a piece, against an average of £1 12s. 6d. paid to Hilliard for the “making and workmanship” of each of his.

The collars were a much more costly affair, for we find Williams obtaining £9 4s. 4d. for making a single chain given by the King to the Chancellor of Emden, valued in its entirety at £115 17s. 4d.¹

James was by no means too ready to pay his bills, and enormous sums—as money was then reckoned—were owing to this jeweller and various others. This monarch, whose liabilities in 1608 reached £1,000,000, whose expenditure sometimes exceeded his income by £200,000 a year,² and who already in 1606 was labouring under a deficit of £735,000, augmented in three years to this amount from the debt of £400,000 inherited from Elizabeth, is often found ordering such trifles as a chain and hat-band set with diamonds at the price of

---

¹ Devon's *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 300.
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£4,000, or "a chain of gold with a tablet with the king's portrait" at £900, to give as presents, and the queen was no less extravagant.

I find an order to pay ten per cent. to any person who would advance money to the jewellers, to provide Anne of Denmark with jewels valued at £20,500, and the unpunctuality of the court payments is made manifest by the fact that even the regular fees remained owing for years. The emoluments of William Herrick, John Spilman and George Heriot, granted to them on their appointment as royal jewellers in 1603, accumulated as a debt until 1616, and the £900 for the great chain, mentioned above, was only delivered to the executors of George Heriot in December, 1624, together with £170 for another tablet. Bills for Prince Henry's jewels were discharged after his death, whilst many of the orders executed for Prince Charles only received their due remuneration after his accession to the throne.

There are, however, many instances when James loyally met his liabilities, and we find warrants for large sums, such as £5,774 11s. 6½d. for plate and jewels given to various ambassadors in new year's gifts and for the expenses of the jewel office, or again, £4,328 5s. 9d. for gilt plate designed for the same purpose, and many like entries are frequently found in the books as paid. Sometimes James had his jewels reset for the use of others, and some important pieces made their way out to Spain, during the negotiations for the proposed engagement of Charles; but on the breaking off of the match, these were in most cases returned. It is estimated that the gems despatched to Charles and Buckingham were valued at £600,000.

It is no wonder that the monarch was in frequent difficulties; his

1 Cat. of State Papers Dom., 1611-18, p. 194, vol. lxxiv.
3 Ibid., 1603-10, p. 574, vol. l.
7 Ibid., 1603-10, p. 507, vol. clxiv.
8 Ibid., p. 394, vol. xxxi.
large claims upon the Commons, forced as he was by his necessities to call them to his aid, left an uneasy legacy to his son, in the constant disputes, as to what should belong to the king by royal right, or what should be his by free gift.

The fact is that James had curiously little knowledge of the value of money unless placed before him in a tangible form, for if he could be made to realise the magnitude of the sums he lavished on his favourites he would retract the gift. The Lord Treasurer, profiting by this peculiarity, caused the sum of £20,000 promised by the king to Somerset, to be tied up in four large and heavy bags containing £5,000 each, and then so placed them that James was bound to see them and ask what they were. He was informed that it was the money for Somerset. "Zounds, man!" exclaimed the monarch, "five thousand is enough to serve his turn," and the remaining £15,000 were saved to the exchequer.¹ It was said, however, that his courtiers could get anything from him for the asking, and once when Lord Holland whispered to one of the gentlemen-in-waiting that he wished he could have the spending of £3,000, which was carried past him on its way to the Privy Purse, the king overhearing the remark, at once ordered that it should be given him. Indeed, it was truthfully reported that "the setting up of these golden calves"—to wit, the royal favourites, "cost England more than Elizabeth spent on all her wars." James was not wanting in the smaller liberalities in the way of gifts, such as "one hundred poundes for a drollery" to Ben Jonson, who rolled off a grace which struck the fancy of the somewhat bibulous king. The verses were as follows:

"Our King and Queen the Lord God bless,  
The Palsgrave and the Lady Besse,  
And God bless every living thing  
That lives and breathes and loves the King,  
God bless the Council of Estate  
And Buckingham the fortunate,  
God bless them all and keep them safe,  
And God bless me and God bless Ralph."²

¹ Jesse's *Memoirs of the Stuarts*, vol. i, pp. 66 and 67.  
Now Ralph was the "drawer of canarie" at Ben Jonson's tavern, The Swanne Tavern, Charing Cross, and the king was delighted at being bracketed with the pot-boy—for he was an odd mixture of the sage with the buffoon. But in justice to him, it should be stated that his real knowledge of letters led him to appreciate the great talents of the dramatist, whose powers, as a writer of masques and poems, had ample opportunity of expression at the court of James, who rewarded his services with a pension of £200 a year. Indeed, it may be said of James, that literature met with more encouragement at his hands than it did at those of his successor, whose fine taste was more turned to the acquisition of art treasures than of libraries.

Although Anthony Weldon says that James "had rather spent £100,000 on Embassies to keep or procure a peace with dishonour, than £10,000 on an army that would have forced peace with honour,"¹ this favourite policy of "peace at any price" was perhaps dictated, not entirely by the want of courage of which he is often accused, but by the fact that his extravagance and useless prodigality left him without funds for more important matters. At the same time, the unwarlike tendency of the king was so well known, that Grainger tells us how "he is said to have been painted abroad with a scabbard without a sword, and with a sword which nobody could draw, though several were pulling at it."²

It was clearly not to the martial spirit of James, but to the custom of the times, that we must attribute the armour in which he is usually portrayed upon his coins.

The large ruff, which plays so important a part in the late portraits of Elizabeth or the early coinage of Charles I., is by no means a prominent feature on that of James, and he is sometimes seen in a plain collar—a far more artistic finish, appearing as it does above a breastplate, than even the smallest ruff of an occasional coin or medal.

The practice of depicting a king in armour was prevalent on the Continent, and from his childhood we are accustomed to see James

¹ Character of King James, p. 57.
thus portrayed, but it is remarked that he wore a ruff on days when it must have been as inconvenient as it would have been on a warlike expedition, for he went out hunting most unsuitably dressed, "in trowser-breeches wearing a large ruff," when, being a bad rider though an ardent sportsman, his appearance was extremely ridiculous.

I have stated that in spite of his fondness for ostentation, he did not care for dress, and we read that he wore his garments as long as they would hang together, "as by his good will he would never change his cloathes till very ragges." He hated extremes of fashion, exclaiming when offered by his attendants the shoes of the day adorned with large rosettes, that they would make a "ruff-footed dove" of him, but this very indifference to dress may have led to the fact that on most of his coins, he is represented in armour of a restrained and not over decorated style.

We may follow with interest the gradations of the three-quarter type of Edward VI. so much affected by James, especially upon the Scottish coinage of his boyhood, from the rickety thin child to the portly man on the fine units struck after his accession to the English throne.

We read under January, 1581–2, an entry in the Treasury accounts for Scotland, which specifies the payment of £10 to "my lord Seytonis painter for certane pictures of his Maiestis visage drawin be him and given to the sinkare to be gravin in the new cunyie"; and £100 is paid to "Thomas Foulis goldsmyth for sinking the new Irnis." The example of this coinage which I now illustrate, is the twenty-shilling piece of 1582, one of a long series of portraits of the little prince.

SCOTTISH TWENTY-SHILLING PIECE OF 1582.

1 Anthony Weldon's Character of James I., p. 56, vol. i, Smeeton's Historical Tracts.
2 Ibid.
Mr. Burns informs us that the puncheons, etc., for the first issues of James after his accession to the English throne were made in London by James Acheson, Master of the Mint for Scotland, and were sent home by him in June, 1605, and delivered into the hands of Thomas Foulis, "Sinker of His Majestie's Irines."

The finest of the new coins was the unit, ordered by the proclamation of the 15th of November, 1604, and slightly altered in its second issue in the arrangement of the arms on the reverse.

The type bears a strong resemblance to that in use in England at the same time.

These Scottish coins carry us on to the reign of his son, for curiously enough, but for the change of title, the units bearing this portrait were almost exactly reproduced by Charles I.

We do not lack instances of the retention for many years of the deceased ruler's effigy upon coins, instead of the immediate substitution of the new king's likeness, vide the case of Henry VIII., but in the sixteenth century, portraiture on our currency was in its infancy, whereas under Charles I. it almost attained its zenith. He had such excellent judgment in drawing and painting that, to quote one of his most severe critics, "he might have got a livelihood by them"; and we find in his

2 Ibid., p. 430.
3 Ibid., p. 441.
4 The Nunsuch Charles; his Character, p. 189.
later issues a marked improvement in artistic portrayal upon those of his father. It is, therefore, indeed strange that Charles, with his great love of art and of numismatics, should not more quickly have replaced James I.'s effigy by a representation more closely resembling himself.

The very slight difference between the three-quarter length figure of Charles on his first Scottish unit and that of his father, lies in the pointed shape of the beard. It is noticed by Mr. Burns, that although orders were given that the new seals and coinage should be of "the same form, ordour and impression, as our said darrest Lord and father his seals were maid, with alteration and change of our portrait allanerlie in place of our said darrest Lord and fatheris." Dickesone, whose services Charles had inherited from James I., was, however, not considered capable of designing the new king's portrait.

At the beginning of the reign, no doubt, Dickesone had not enjoyed any opportunity of personally studying his master, for Charles did not visit Scotland until 1633, but not later than June, 1636, on a demand for small coin, it was settled that the designs for these should be committed to Briot, he being "best experienced with suche lively impressions"; the reason given being that Charles Dickesone had "not been in use to grav[e] his magesteis face."

The illustration I now give is of Briot's Scottish unit of 1637, which replaced the earlier and meaningless portraits by Dickesone. It is

described by Mr. Edward Burns in his Coinage of Scotland as “one of the finest coins in the British series.”

In the northern kingdom Briot was perhaps assisted in engraving, though not in designing the dies, the less neat specimens being sometimes attributed to his son-in-law, John Falconer, son of Sir Alexander Falconer of Halkerbourn, by whom some of the coins were initialed; but the sinking of the dies of certain small pieces was unfortunately entrusted to Dickestone, who is said to have intentionally spoilt the portraits out of spite towards his foreign rival, and the ugly threeshilling pieces of 1642 are entirely the work of the less skilled engraver. Mr. Cochran-Patrick gives “a warrant anent copper money of the year 1631,” in which the Scottish officials are enjoined to receive “Nicholas Bryot graver of his Maiesties minte in Ingland” and “suffer and permitt him” to set up his engine, etc., for coining. Although, according to Mr. Burns, Briot, on his appointment of the 7th of August, 1635, to the mastership of the Scottish mint, declined to be bound to a residence in the north, he had, it appears, already paid visits to that country. Amongst the undated manuscripts in the Public Record Office, is one to which in the Calendars of State Papers,

1 Burns, vol. ii, p. 482, Plate LXXIV, 1032.
2 Handbook of Coins of Great Britain (British Museum). Attention is, however, called to the fact that it is possible that Falconer merely initialed the coins as acting master of the Mint at Edinburgh in the absence of Briot, not as engraver. See Burns’s Coinage of Scotland, vol. ii, p. 463.
Appointment of Nicholas Briot.

the date "1633?" is tentatively assigned. It is a letter written by Briot to Charles with regard to the confirmation of his English appointment of January, 1633. In this petition he states that the "grant of the office of one of the chief gravers of the Tower having passed the Signet and the Privy Seal, remains in the hands of the Attorney-General by reason of petitioner's absence in Scotland. The king having granted the office of an undergraver to John East, the petitioner prays that his grant may pass the Great Seal before that of East, or that the grants may pass together."

We thus see the constant delays and opposition which surrounded an official appointment in the seventeenth century, for Briot had applied for this post in October, 1630, on the resignation of John Gilbert. The negotiations had already been some time on foot, for as early as in November, 1628, we read of a "grant to John Gilbert of a pension of £50 per annum for surrender of his patent of Chief Graver of the mint," but the affair was evidently not finally decided until October 13th, 1630, when we find the "minute of a recognizance entered into by Edward Green before Sir Robert Rich, Master of Chancery, whereby he acknowledged a surrender formerly made by John Gilbert of the office of graver of the Irons for the moneys of the late king, held by him jointly with Green."

On October 2nd, 1630, Briot had written complaining that, though a warrant had been sent to the officers of the Mint on the 2nd day of the previous February, to place him in possession of "sufficient lodging" for his instruments and workmen at the Tower that he might "perform his promise . . . on a proposition about the fabrication of the king's moneys," he had never been able to obtain the desired place where he might work. He submitted that he had been "hindered by the Officers of the Mint upon the pretext that

2 Ibid., 1629-31, p. 353, October 2nd, 1630, vol. ccxiv, No. 5.
3 Ibid., Bruce, 1628-29, p. 375, November 12th, 1628, vol. cxx.
5 This warrant is specified as of February 11th, 1629-30, in a subsequent document of June 15th, 1631, published in Rymer's Fadler, xix, p. 287.
he is not of their body and corporation.” His letter was finally countersigned, “The King, being well acquainted with the abilities of the petitioner, directs the Attorney-General to call for the joint patent for the Chief Graver of the Irons, and if he finds that His Majesty may without prejudice grant the petitioner’s request, he is to prepare a bill accordingly.” It was clear that Charles recognised the beauty of the foreign artist’s work, but the only immediate result of the correspondence appears to have been the denial, on the 16th of the same month, by the accused officials of the truth of Briot’s allegations, and a counter petition on their part that “when he shall give notice to be fitted with his instruments” a commission should be appointed “to report on the trial undertaken by him to be made.”

However, on the 13th of June, 1631, a fresh edict was issued to Parkhurst, the Warden, Harley, the Master, and Rogers, the Controller of the Mint, making provisions concerning bullion to be given to “Nicholas Bryott an alien or Stranger borne in the Dukedom of Loraine,” that his servants should be admitted to the Mint, that he should be allowed time to train them, that a commission should judge his work, and finally, that those appointed should “make certificate unto us” if agreed together or “if you cannot all agree, separately.” The king further states that he did, and still does “intend that this sort of Coyne shall have course and be received as our other moneys made by the ordinary way of the Hammer.” To this period we owe the coinage with flower and B, of which I give an example below.

In the meantime, Briot had constantly addressed the king on various propositions concerning the coinage “by mill and engines,

2 Rymer’s Fyjura, xix, p. 288.
Records of Briot in the State Papers.

which will prevent counterfeiting," not only as to the silver currency\(^1\)
but also the copper issues, suggesting increased weight and a reformation
of "the ugliness and deformities of the stamp in use" for the farthing, and
the introduction of a halfpenny\(^2\) and half-farthing\(^3\) in brass or copper. We
have much evidence of Briot's work for Charles from 1626 onward,
including a warrant\(^4\) of the 6th of September in that year to "make the
Great Seal of England according to a model presented by him to the
king," and to receive enough bullion for the purpose. This seal is a very
fine example of work, and was in use from 1627 to 1640. Again in
September, 1626, we find the order repeated "for making a Great Seal
(Wyon, Plate XXVII) in silver, and a Privy Seal and Signet in gold,
and a Council Seal in silver for the Queen's\(^5\) majesty." The Great Seal
of Scotland was also made by the same artist in 1627,\(^6\) when the sum
of £60 in silver was provided for the purpose.

The first actual patent concerning the coinage given to Briot with
which I am conversant, was dated the 16th of December, 1628;\(^7\) it
granted to him "the privilege to be a free Denizen and also full Power
and Authority to Frame and Engrave the first Designs and Effigies
of the King's Image, in such Sizes and Formes as are to serve in all sorts
of Coins of Gold and Silver." Briot's pattern half-crown, dated 1628,
is well known. I do not illustrate it here because it does not come
under the head of portraiture, being of the equestrian type; but it is
a very artistic performance.\(^8\)

We note that by this time the resignation of Gilbert was in
contemplation and semi-officially recognised, and that Briot unofficially
takes his place as cuneator. Here we have the renewal of the contest
between the milled and hammered methods,\(^9\) first started by Mestrell

\(^1\) Cat. State Papers Dom., 1628-29, p. 428, vol. cxxiv, No. 68.
\(^3\) Ibid., 1629-31, pp. 352-353, vol. cxxiv, No. 68.
\(^4\) Ibid., 1625-26, p. 573, Appendix, September 6th, 1626.
\(^5\) Ibid., Appendix, September 6th, 1626.
\(^6\) Devon's Issues of the Exchequer, p. 356.
\(^7\) Rymer's Foedera, xix, p. 40.
\(^8\) Evelyn, p. 127, considered it a medal to commemorate the Rochelle expedition.
\(^9\) The word "milled," now generally applied to the graining of the edge of coins, is
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under Elizabeth, carried on by Briot throughout the reign of Charles I., and by Simon and Blondeau in the days of the Commonwealth, only to be finally decided after the Restoration in the triumph of Roettier. The competition between Briot and his opponents began in 1628 and was still at its height ten years later, in June, 1638, as is shown by the following letter from the king to some of his officers at the Tower.

"We are resolved to have a fair trial what despatch may be made in the fabrique of our moneys by mills and presses moved by Nicholas Briot, in comparison of the ancient way of the hammer, and to that purpose we commanded our pleasure to be signified on the 28th of May last, and have since been moved on behalf of Briot to proceed to this trial according to the commission of the seventh year of our reign, when Sir Robert Harly was our officer in the mint. As the proceeding on that commission will not give such present despatch as we might expect, our pleasure is that the first thing to be done shall be the trial of despatch according to our directions of the 28th of May, and we require you to proceed therein without delay or further excuse on either party, and when this is done, the commission shall be proceeded upon as desired on behalf of Briot." We are not told the result of this trial, though to it we, no doubt, owe the beautiful series with mint-mark anchor, but, clearly, the speed of the mill cannot have been demonstrated to the satisfaction of those concerned, for the hammer continued to hold its sway in the main, although we have early evidence that Charles I. was in favour of a milled currency. There is a document in the Public Record Office which is undated, but the abstract of it has been assigned in the Calendars of State Papers, with a query, to the year 1633, though personally having seen the original manuscript itself, I think I am justified in suggesting that it should be dated 1630. It is a petition by Green to have a warrant issued for the execution of certain pieces of milled money, and commences with the words "Whereas yor Mat* is pleased that some of yor money both of gold

here used in its older sense, and understood to imply the introduction of mechanical pressure. See Num. Chron., New Series, vol. v, pp. 298-312.


and silver shall be fabricated by way of press and milling, and also to have pieces of gold of \( xx^4 \) and of \( iii^6 \) embossed high, and prest in an engine of a less compass than the \( xx^4 \) pieces now made, but of the same standard and according to the forme of pieces of your Matre now current, and of the same forme your Matre hath seene and approved, and remaineth in the hands of the Warden of the Mynt," etc.

I am not acquainted with any three-pound piece answering to this description, but surely the example remaining "in the hands of the Warden of the Mynt" must be the gold twenty-shilling pattern in very high relief which, excepting in some slight details of dress, closely resembles the current coinage of the year 1630, see Ruding, XIII, 4 and Kenyon type 2. It bears the new reverse decoration, an oval shield which had only just come into use, and first appears upon a proof in the British Museum bearing the mint-mark heart, though only given by Mr. Kenyon with plume or rose. These patterns "embossed high" and representing the king crowned, as on the coins, are dated 1630, bearing the mint-mark heart, or undated, excepting by the mint-mark plume of the same year. An example is here illustrated from the National Collection.
There are better executed patterns for twenty shillings in equally high relief but adorned with an uncrowned bust, and these lead us to a culminating point of interest in the magnificent five-broad piece, usually known as the Juxon Medal, now in the British Museum. They are all, and I had always thought rightly, from their general likeness to his badges and known work, attributed to Rawlins, but I have been puzzled by the difficulties involved in the date. The five-broad piece bears the mint-mark rose, that is to say, 1631; the pattern sovereigns of the same type have the mint-mark lys or plume, both of the year 1630.

Now if we accept the suggestion made, with a query, by Mr. Warwick Wroth in the Dictionary of National Biography, that Rawlins was born in 1620, he cannot have been old enough in 1630 to produce work which, if his, must be classed as almost his best. The convincing evidence for Mr. Wroth's hypothesis lies, as he courteously informs me in the fact that when Rawlins first published
his tragedy\(^1\) entitled "The Rebellion" in 1640,\(^2\) he was addressed in various congratulatory verses appended to the play as a very young man\(^3\)—"a springot of thy tender age," etc. One friend alludes to "the disproportion 'twixt thy lines and years," and he himself in his dedication begs to be excused any shortcomings because "thou knowest that youth hath many faults whereon I depend." Indeed, it is stated by all the writers on dramatic subjects whose books I have consulted, some being almost contemporary with our playwright, that he was very young when he wrote his play. It is, of course, possible that it was composed some years previously to the date of publication, and from internal evidence such as the place where it was first acted, it is believed that Rawlins produced it in 1637,\(^4\) when it was played "nine days in succession and divers times since with good applause,"\(^5\) but it is not likely that the adulatory verses were written before the first performance, even if they preceded the publication of the drama. If then Rawlins was almost a boy in 1637, it is difficult to suppose that he was doing admirable medallion work seven years earlier.

Different dates have been given at various times as the most probable for the birth of the engraver. "About 1600" is the suggestion thrown out in \textit{Medallie Illustrations of British History},\(^6\) but this, I learn, is an unfortunate misprint for 1610. The book, though of the greatest value to collectors, was originally written at a time when the names of Edward Green and other engravers were unknown to the numismatic world, and many of the sources of information now within our reach were not at the disposal of its joint authors—let us therefore seek a more decided pronouncement. Nagler

---

\(^1\) Republished in \textit{Ancient British Drama}, vol. iii, p. 544 \textit{et seq.}
\(^2\) Entered at Stationers' Hall November 20th, 1639, and published in 1640 and 1654. See \textit{Aber's Transcripts}, vol. iv.
\(^3\) \textit{Ancient British Drama}, vol. iii, p. 546.
\(^4\) \textit{History of English Dramatic Literature}, vol. iii, p. 161, by A. W. Ward, and \textit{Chronicle of the English Drama}, by G. Fleay, vol. ii, p. 169, where it is stated that there is no exact evidence as to the first production of the play, but the King's Company of Revels probably took the Bull Theatre in 1637, and it was there that the play was produced.
\(^5\) \textit{Ancient British Drama}, vol. iii, p. 572.
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gives 1610 without the qualifying question, but without stating his authority. Would that we knew whence he derived his information, for it does not agree with the opinions of the dramatic writers, and surely a man of thirty, or even seven and twenty, is no "springot of a tender age"?

Very little is definitely known about Rawlins. True, the name thrice occurs in the State Papers of the years 1629 to 1633, when a certain Thomas Rawlins makes difficulties over the resignation of a patent in reversion from "His late Majesty" of the office of surveyor and keeper of the Armoury,¹ but it seems more likely that this was another person of the same name who is frequently mentioned under the reign of James I., and was high sheriff of Essex in June, 1605,² and therefore cannot be our Thomas Rawlins, who survived till 1670, but was more probably his father, grandfather, or uncle.

We know that when Rawlins wrote his play, he was already in receipt of good emoluments as an engraver, for he says in his preface that he has "no desire to bee knowne by a threadbare cloake [of a poet] having a calling that will maintaine it woolly."³

In Medallic Illustrations of British History we read that he was appointed engraver to Charles I. in 1643, and a warrant preserved at the College of Arms⁴ is addressed to him as "our graver of Seals, Stamps, and Medals" on June 1st, 1643. Nagler gives the date of his attaining to the office of chief engraver as 1648, whilst the Dictionary of National Biography mentions the twenty-third year of the king, i.e., between March, 1647, and March, 1648, but not one of these facts helps us as to what Rawlins was doing in 1630—or tells us whether he could have been amongst the men working under Green at the Mint so early in the century.

That the petitions on the subject of the highly embossed patterns

⁴ MS. 1, 26, vol. 90, College of Arms; reference to MS. kindly supplied to me by Mr. W. J. Hocking. Printed in full in *Num. Chron.,* 1st Series, vol. xv, p. 81.
are put forth by Edward Green and not by Rawlins, would not disturb us, were the date satisfactory, for the office of chief engraver, though it included the responsibility for the designs, did not necessarily entail that the work should be that of the head official. Green in his petition asks "that yore servant and such as shalbe employed in the service may have reasonable recompense and satisfaction for his and their paynes according to former precedents." 1 Again in 1631 (?) we find a warrant concerning the coinage giving permission to Sir William Parkhurst "to impress a sufficient number of workmen for Green's assistance." 2 But was Rawlins amongst these workmen, and if not, who but Green could have been the engraver of the highly embossed pieces, some of which are undoubtedly above his capabilities as evidenced by the coins? 3

Assisted by Mr. Grueber who, now as ever, generously placed his help at my disposal, I have made a careful inspection of the work of Green upon the coinage, of Rawlins in his signed medals in high relief, and of such few "highly embossed" examples as we find from the hand of Briot, comparing one with another, with the result that Mr. Grueber's concurrence justifies me in throwing out the suggestion that the patterns should be divided into two groups:—one, comprising the crowned specimens of mint-mark heart and plume with their likeness to the coinage of the moment in point of portraiture, of lettering, and of design, to be credited to Edward Green, whilst the other, which is represented by the far superior Juxon Medal of 1631 and its smaller prototypes of 1630, might in default of Rawlins be assigned to Briot.

The work upon the Return-to-London medals, 4 one of which I here illustrate, may be compared by the reader with the five-broad-piece with satisfactory result, and it seems to me not impossible that Edward Green, ordered by the king to produce a "highly embossed" currency, should have himself designed the less graceful crowned specimens, whilst Briot, who was, as we have seen at the

---

1 Public Record Office State Papers, vol. cclvi, No. 46. Undated in the original MS., but dated 1633 (?) in the Calendar of 1631-33.
2 State Papers Dom., 1631-33, Bruce, p. 214, vol. ccv, No. 3.
3 Med. Ill., i, pp. 266-7, Nos. 62 to 65.
period of the lys and plume mint-marks, trying his experiments at
the mint, may in co-operation or rivalry have put forth the better

uncrowned series. In support of my hypothesis, I may call attention
to the strong likeness between the heads upon these patterns and on
some other rare examples bearing Briot's own mint-marks and initial,
such as No. 283 on Plate 1X of the Murdoch sale-catalogue of
June 10th, 1903, dated 1630, mint-mark St. George, or the fine pattern
for a crown here shown. The Montagu specimen of this coin, which
was sold on November 15th, 1896, for £50 (Lot 394) was described
as "the chef d'œuvre of Briot," and the Murdoch example—Lot 294—
realised even a larger sum, namely £61.

There are many other pieces undated and of less good workman-
ship and lettering, call them medals, intended half-crowns, or what you
will, Med. Ill., vol. i, pp. 372 to 374. Nos. 265 to 268, always with the
same head, which is occasionally also found rather more highly finished

Rawlins and his Work.

upon boxes, containing counters, ranging from the years 1632 to 1636.\(^1\) All these have been attributed, probably rightly, to Rawlins, who reproduced the portrait upon many of his badges, some of which were not cast until 1648–9, \(\text{ergo}\), after the death of the French artist; but Rawlins, clearly, often copied Briot's work, and must indeed, if half the medals and patterns known by his name be his own work, have been a very unreliable artist. One cannot refrain from wondering whether the description given of him by Evelyn as a "debased fellow"\(^2\) may not throw some light on the fact that he, who was capable of such admirable design and detail as are displayed upon some of his signed badges, coins, and medals, could yet be guilty of the inferior finish of many of the specimens for which he is held responsible.

There is one more point to which I should like to call attention in reference to my suggestion, as to the possible co-operation of Green and Briot in the patterns of 1630. Green in the same document\(^3\) refers to certain medals, or as he terms them, "Pieces of Coyne made in the manner of Largesses to express the joy of yo"\(^n\) Matie's happy issue." These were also to be made "by press and millinge" and must be the little jettons struck in commemoration of the birth of Prince Charles\(^4\) in 1630, some of which are signed by Briot's initial, and were

\(^1\) The date of the counters in no way serves to date these boxes, because it is not certain that each box contains the set originally designed for it, and, personally, I should be inclined to think my box, though of mid-seventeenth century work, is not so old as the counters it holds.


\(^3\) *State Papers Dom.*, 1633 (?), undated in original MS. at Public Record Office, cclvi, No. 46.

\(^4\) *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, pp. 253 and 255, Nos. 34–36 and 38–39. There were similar
therefore clearly made in co-operation with him at the Mint. Amongst
the medalettes is a rarer and unsigned type (Med. III., vol. i, p. 254,
No. 37) which is not milled, but which nevertheless has been attributed
to Briot, although, as is stated, “it is inferior in style to his usual
work.” Here, again, I think the hand of Edward Green appears, and
in this also, in the fresh light thrown upon the latter’s work, Mr. Grueber
agrees with my suggestion.

MEDAL ON THE BIRTH OF PRINCE CHARLES, MED. ILL., VOL. I, P. 254, NO. 37.

The petition contains also the expression of Green’s willingness
“with the assistance of the rest of the Officers of the Mynt, to use the
utmost of his endeavours and paynes for to Amend all things amis in
the Coynes now made according to yo’re Ma’iss Royall instruction.”
May this not point to the wishes of the chief engraver not only to
adopt the methods of Briot, but to have the co-operation of one
whom, in October of the year 1630, as we have seen, p. 173, he had
desired should be associated with him in his office on the completion
of Gilbert’s resignation?

I have not been able to ascertain that any warrant was issued in
reply to Green’s petition, but probably it failed, for we have seen the
difficulties which encompassed the introduction of the milled coinage,
and only a few pattern pieces of it remain to us.

Orders continue to be addressed to Edward Green as chief
engraver until the year 1640,¹ and there is reason to believe that he
medalettes made on the birth of James in 1633 (Med. III., vol. i, pp. 267–8, Nos. 64 and
65), and I think it is probably on this account, that in the Calendar of State Papers the
document has been dated 1633 (?), but I hope I have shown that the evidence is stronger
in favour of 1630.

¹ Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1639–40, p. 349, January 18th, 1639–40,
vol. ccccxlii.
Death of Edward Green.

continued in office until his death, circa 1645. Although the last order directed to him, which has come under my notice, is comprised in a warrant for making a new great seal in January, 1639–40, it is likely that Green was willing to retain his post, when in 1642 many of the royal officials were removed from the Tower Mint which had been seized by the parliamentary party, and the more loyal Briot followed the fortunes of the king. Possibly I libel Green, for I have been unable to identify his work on the later coinage of Charles, but it appears that no one was appointed to succeed him until his demise terminated his tenure of office, for the patent nominating Edward Wade and Thomas Simon as joint engravers in the April of 1645, during the pleasure of both Houses of Parliament, specifies that they are to receive the same “emoluments; diets, houses and advantages” as had been enjoyed by “Edward Green, deceased,” without mention of any intermediate possessor.

The king had removed to York on March 19th, 1642, making that city his headquarters for the next five months, and meanwhile Briot was, of course, still at the Tower, but he was called thence on behalf of Charles on May 6th for consultation “at your earliest convenience on the subject of the letter you wrote some days past.” This letter, written on May 1st, contained a request from the engraver that the king would appoint “certain Lords of the Council to hear his propositions concerning the coinage to whom he may explain the good results which would ensue therefrom to his Majesty and the State.” Briot seemingly replied to the invitation of Charles that he was ill, for on May 30th, Secretary Nicholas wrote again from the North saying that “on account of his late indisposition the king was pleased to direct

---

1 Presumably Wyon, xxviii, in use from 1640 to 1646. Although this order is addressed to Green as chief engraver, I think there is reason to believe that the work was executed by Simon, then engraving at the Mint, as it is almost indistinguishable in workmanship from the copy he made from it three years later for the Parliament. See p. 209.
his not coming to court at present." On June 21st, however, "M. Briot, his Majesty's graver of the Mint," was commanded to come at once to York, bringing with him all his instruments for coining money,² and he was finally informed that an order had been despatched on the 30th of the same month to Sir William Parkhurst to advance him the expenses necessary for his journey, and pressing him to come speedily.³

The payment was clearly inadequate, for after the Restoration we find the widow of the artist petitioning for relief, or for the sum of £3,000, due from the late monarch to her husband "when he died in 1646,⁴ he having followed the king with the needful stamps to York and Oxford."

We thus follow Briot working for Charles from almost the beginning of the reign and dying in his service. The time of his arrival in this country is usually stated to have been in the year 1625, and though in a letter dated October 2nd, 1630, he complained that he had already "lost six years since he first came to England" without obtaining the official recognition he desired,⁵ thus suggesting that he migrated originally from France in 1624, we must admit that Briot was not always as accurate in his statements, as he was in his work, and it seems likely that he exaggerated the first few weeks, or months, of his residence in London into a whole year. It appears from French official documents that he was still in Paris in May, 1625,⁶ when a delay was specially accorded to him for the arrangement of his affairs, on the expiration of an edict of the previous year relating to this settlement.⁷

² Ibid., p. 344 (in French), vol. cccexc, No. 27.
³ Ibid., p. 347 (in French), vol. cccexc, No. 43.
⁴ Ibid., 1662, p. 394, vol. iv, No. 100.
Briot was at this time in such difficulties that his exodus was absolutely a flight. Monsieur Mazerolle in his * Médailleurs Français * places his departure between the 16th of September and the 31st of October, n.s., 1625.¹ I have not been able to discover his precise reasons for giving these dates, but he prints a power of attorney made out by French notaries and signed by Nicholas Briot on the 18th of July in favour of his brother Isaac, and this would probably be one of his last acts before leaving the country.² An attested copy dated October the 11th was produced in court by Isaac on the 21st of October, n.s., and we find him appearing on his brother’s behalf during his absence on October the 2nd, n.s., answering to our September the 22nd, and possibly yet earlier.³ We must, therefore, assume that Nicholas Briot writing on our October the 2nd, o.s. 1630, was speaking roughly in saying that he had been six years in England, for his departure from Paris cannot have taken place before the 18th of July, n.s., or according to our reckoning the 8th of July, 1625 o.s.⁴ But for the constant encouragement he received from the king, he would probably have despaired, for it is said that he left France merely because of the opposition with which his system was there regarded, and his consequent money difficulties,⁵ and he seemed likely to reap no better reward here.

His patterns for the French Mint are well-known and very fine, especially the *piedforts* of 1616 and 1617, and the *essai de franc* and the *demi-franc* of 1618 bearing the head of Louis XIII., executed from a wax model by Guillaume Dupré.⁶ It has been remarked that he produced better work in France than in our country,⁷ and this I am constrained to admit is undoubtedly true, being probably due to the

---

¹ F. Mazerolle’s *Les Médailleurs Français*, vol. i, cxixvi.
⁴ The Gregorian Calendar was in use in France after December 9th, 1582, and in England it superseded the old style in September, 1752, but at the time of which I speak, i.e., in 1625, the difference was of ten days, only rising to eleven days at the end of February, 1700.
⁵ Mazerolle, vol. i, cxxiv and cxxv.
⁶ Illustrated on Plate LXXXVI, No. 54, of Hoffman’s *Monnaies Royales*.
⁷ *Dictionary of Medallists*, by L. Forrer (under Briot).
influence exerted over him by Dupré, an artist of a far higher calibre, and perhaps the greatest medallist France has ever produced. Guillaume Dupré, who was contrôleur général des effigies, modelled his portraits in wax and cast a series of magnificent medals, but made no puncheons for coins. The pieces of Louis XIII. of 1618, were struck at the Monnaie du Moulin by Pierre Regnier from Briot’s dies made after Dupré’s waxen originals. The complaint lodged by him that Briot did not faithfully carry out his designs, figured as one of the charges made at the French Mint against the engraver in 1618, and again in 1624.”

Specimens of one of the earliest of his signed and dated works executed for Charles I. in England, were distributed at the coronation of the 2nd of February, 1626-27, Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 243, No. 10; but although interesting as such, the medal is not a particularly good example of Briot’s skill.

Charles paid £100 on 10th April, 1626, by an order of the preceding November to “Nicholas Breeott, a French graver,” for “sundry particulars by him brought, by His Majesty’s commandment needful and necessary for the making of Stamps to stamp certain pieces of largess of gold and silver in memory of his Majesty’s Coronation, as also for his labour and pains, taken in making and graving certain puncheons for the shaping of his Majesty’s picture and the other device upon the said pieces of largess, and likewise for making a little signet for his Majesty remaining in his own custody.”

We notice that in this document Briot is described as “a French engraver”—and as engraver to the French mint he might be properly so-called, but he was really a native of Lorraine, at that time still an independent duchy. Nicholas Briot was born in 1579 or 1580 at Damblain in Bassigny in the Duchy of Bar. He was the son of

1 Mazerolle, vol. i, Introduction, cxx. See also list of puncheons in Appendix, pp. 620 and 621.
2 Mazerolle, vol. i, cxx.
Early life of Briot.

Didier Briot, who was also an engraver, and the purchaser of a lease of the mint at Charleville, where he worked from 1608 to 1611. Didier afterwards removed to Sédan, circa 1612 or 1613, when he superintended the "Monnaie" for about eighteen or twenty months.

Nicholas Briot was sent by his father to Germany to study the machinery there in use, whilst the Charleville mint was under the direction of the elder Briot, and he went again on the same errand for the Duke of Lorraine in 1614. Nicholas held the position of graveur général to this Prince from 1611 to 1625 concomitantly with the same office in Paris. Monsieur Rondot says that he neglected his functions at Nancy after 1615, and was absent from his post during many years, but Monsieur Mazerolle notices his activity there in 1620, 1623, and 1624. Briot was Tailleur Général des Monnaies in Paris from 1606 to 1625, but he worked under Dupré, who at first shared with Jean Pillon the office of contrôleur général, and on the death of Pillon in 1617 became sole superintendent until his own demise, which took place in 1642 or 1643.

It is thought that the foreign artist may have owed his introduction to the English court to Theodore de Mayerne, who was invited to England in 1611 to act as physician to James I., and afterward to his son Charles, and who had filled the same post under two of the Gallic monarchs. He was perhaps acquainted with Briot in France, but many years intervened between the arrival of the doctor and that of the medallist in this country. Monsieur Mazerolle informs us that Briot was obliged for a time after his arrival in London to earn his livelihood as a medical practitioner, and may have been thus thrown with de Mayerne. Be this as it may, we have in the leaden example

---

1 "Didier Briot marchand fut adjudicataire en 1608 de la ferme de la monnaie de Charleville. Il en fut dépossédé en 1611... il s’établit à Sédan dont il afferma la monnaie. Outre qu’il avait fait le commerce dans les Flandres il avait gravé des coins de monnaies et de jetons." Les Médailleurs, etc., par Natalis Rondot, p. 269.
4 Mazerolle, vol. i, cxii.
5 Mazerolle, vol. cxxviii, cxxix and cxxxvii.
6 Rondot, p. 265.
8 Mazerolle, vol. i, cxxvi and pp. 484 and 485: "Nicolas Briot estoit retiré en Angletérrre... Il exercoit autict royaulme la medicine et avoir fait de belles cures mesme
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of the medal portraying de Mayerne, an earlier proof of Briot's activity in England, than in any work executed for Charles—inasmuch as the Frenchman's portrait is dated 1625.

Amongst the official documents published by Monsieur Mazerolle, we find the evidence of one Jehan Delanoue or Delanque, who deposed on January 8th, n.s., 1628, that he had heard that during the absence of Nicholas Briot from Paris, then of about two years' duration, he had been engaged in the fabrication of certain pieces with the portraits of the king and queen of England on the obverse, and a design upon the reverse, which he could not recall. The only medalettes which answer to this description are the so-called marriage medals of Charles I. and Henrietta, Med. Ill., vol. i, Nos. 1 to 3. The wedding service in England was performed in June, 1625, shortly before the advent of Briot in this country—the ceremony by proxy, in France, having taken place in May. Some of the medalettes are dated 1626, and were probably intended for distribution at the coronation, but they vary slightly in details and much in execution. A few specimens are struck and are of sufficiently good workmanship to justify me in suggesting that they might be the work of Briot, possibly made in France for the first ceremony, and freely copied as casts by inferior workmen in England, whilst those dated 1626 are within the scope of his work in London.

We have seen that Briot's first official patterns for coinage were of the year 1628, but it is hard to decide how far his influence was exerted to effect the improvement found in the ordinary outputs of the Tower, as opposed to the beautifully finished pieces which we associate with his name. We cannot fail to notice that portraiture as practised qu'il avoit fait et gravé les sceaux du roy d'Angleterre." Evidence of one Bonne, on hearsay from "Philippes Bryot dudit Nicolas," dated January 8th, 1628.

1 Mazerolle, vol. i, p. 484; "Nicolas Bryot estoit absent de ceste ville de Paris dès et depuis deux ans ou environ et qu'icelluy Nicolas Bryot estoit refugie en Angleterre ou il travailloit à la fabrication de quelques espèces portans d'un costé la figure du Roy et Royne d'Angleterre et au revers d'une devise dont il n'est memoriatif."

2 The peculiar lettering of Briot is noticeable on some of these medalettes.

3 Since the above was in print, I notice that Mr. Forrer, in the current number of his Dictionary, says that some of these jettons were made by Pierre Regnier (q.v.), by order of Louis XIII., whilst others were engraved by Briot, and occasionally bear his initials.
by Green, when Briot was working at the Mint, shows a marked advance upon the busts of the earlier issues of Charles, struck during the period of the joint engravership of Green with Gilbert, and that with some few exceptions, probably the work of Simon, the deterioration of the Tower coinage set in soon after the departure of Briot for York, in 1642, though there is some reason to believe that Edward Green was still in office. On the other hand the sixpences and more especially the shillings commencing with type 1 B, bearing the mint-mark heart, such as Hawkins 512, and in gold with type 1 A of the same mint, and those which immediately followed, namely, plume and rose, clearly show that Green, unhampered by Gilbert, was a very fine workman in point of execution, though perhaps not in portraiture. Even in this respect some improvement was, however, gradually apparent, for the busts on the unit illustrated by Ruding, on Plate XIII, 4, and reproduced on our p. 177, and the shilling of type 2 B, here shown, are fairly representative of the king as he appeared in the paintings of the time.
The first bust after the accession of Charles is, as we have seen, unlike him, but the succeeding coins of 1626 and the following years, commencing in the middle of the period marked by the mint-mark cross-Calvary, show forth a change of type, and in justice to John Gilbert and Edward Green, who were still joint engravers at that period, it is only fair to state that we notice how much stiffer and less well featured are the early portraits of the young monarch by Mytens, the court painter of the day, who preceded Van Dyck in this office, than are those of the latter artist, and the same stiffness strikes us even in the early medals of Briot of the type with the ruff.

As an example of the grace displayed by Van Dyck in portraying a model who was not really beautiful, I am permitted to reproduce an engraving by Pieter de Jode,\(^1\) from the collection of Mr. W. Sharp Ogden, which, according to the inscription below, is from a picture of Henrietta Maria, by the the court painter. I have been unable to trace the exact prototype amongst Sir Anthony's paintings, but it presents similarities to several, and excepting for the alteration in the pose of the arm, is extremely like the Queen in the large family group at Windsor Castle.

The picture of Charles I. and Henrietta, by Van Dyck, which by the kindness of Lord Craven I am able to here illustrate, is a smaller replica of the better known and large picture in the Duke of Grafton's collection and particularly attractive. The Euston example which has been engraved by Van Voerst\(^2\) and by Vertue, was reproduced in

---

\(^1\) Pieter de Jode the younger, born at Antwerp, 1606, engraved many portraits after Van Dyck, and this is, according to Bryan, one of his most esteemed prints.

\(^2\) Vertue's plate (reworked from that of 1634 by Van Voerst) was engraved in 1742, and is to be found in *Vetusta Monumenta.*
PORTRAIT OF HENRIETTA MARIA, BY VAN DYCK, FROM A LINE ENGRAVING BY DE JODE,
IN THE COLLECTION OF MR. W. SHARP OGDEN.
Mr. Cust's Life of Anthony Van Dyck, and has been exhibited in London. The smaller, and to my mind more beautiful painting, is only one of the many fine pictures at Combe Abbey of the Stuart family by the best artists of the day, for the "Queen of Hearts," Elizabeth, the sister of Charles I., had spent the days of her youth at Combe, then the residence of Lord Harington, and in her last years as the home of the Earl of Craven, it, together with his London house in Drury Lane, became the shelter of herself and her children in their adversity, until her own house in Leicester Fields was ready for her reception. Elizabeth returned to England on the Restoration, and died in February, 1661-62, leaving her pictures to Lord Craven.

Vertue tells us that at the sale of Charles I.'s collection, "The King and Queen with a laurel" was appraised at £60. The picture was painted in 1634, and in the following year a small medal was struck by Nicholas Briot, in three varieties, evidently based on the design of Van Dyck's composition, though the laurel wreath is omitted for want of space.

It is known as "the Children of Charles I." from the reverse decoration, which latter was probably taken from a portrait, now in Turin, of Mary, Charles and James, by the Dutch artist. The date of

---

1 Illustrated on p. 103 of Mr. Cust's book.
2 Vertue's MS., Brit. Mus. Addit. MS., 23072, f. 21 to f. 27. List of pictures sold at the death of the king.
3 This was no doubt the large example in the Duke of Grafton's collection.
this picture is 1635, and I think it must have been painted fairly early in the year, for Prince Charles still appears in his long coat or frock, whilst in the varying family groups at Windsor, at Dresden and the Louvre, the little prince has adopted a more manly dress, and yet these examples are still dated 1635. It is said that Henrietta Maria was very particular about the children's clothes, and did not like the sketch now at Paris, because the pinafore of Prince James was omitted.

I may, perhaps, be allowed to quote a modern author with regard to the influence exerted upon the portraiture of Charles by the brush of Sir Anthony. Mr. Cust writes in his life of the painter: "With the arrival of Van Dyck the king appeared transformed. Instead of the rather gawky youth depicted by Mytens, there appears a hero of romance with an indefinable look of destiny and sadness in his eyes." ¹ Hence I think it is rather to the example set by the Dutch artist than to the skill in portraiture of the engravers, that we owe the improvement of the third type, for we have noticed that in France, Briot was not the originator of the designs which he engraved, but his cooperation was no doubt invaluable to Green, for his capacity was indisputable. In proof of his confidence in his own skill, I may mention that he was not afraid of entering into competition with Dupré, and offered at Paris to make one puncheon after the wax model of the contrôleur des effigies, and another according to his own taste,² and we have at present no evidence that his English coins were not entirely designed by himself.

¹ Anthony van Dyck, p. 97, by Lionel Cust.
But to return to the earlier coinage, there is in the British Museum a pattern for a gold crown bearing the mint-mark cross-Calvary, 1626 and 1627, varying slightly from the ordinary type 1 A of Kenyon. This little coin is of very fine execution, comparing favourably with most of the earlier work, and I should be inclined to attribute it to Green. In point of portraiture it resembles the usual busts of the period, but not so accurately as it does those which appeared in the succeeding years, beginning with the mint-mark heart and followed by the plume.

We may assume that Charles was not contented with his early presentments, for they were repeatedly changed upon his English coins, until a more satisfactory likeness was produced, probably from Van Dyck’s pictures. The monarch had in Nicholas Briot in whom even his detractors allow mechanical skill,1 an able coadjutor, and both in England and Scotland his really beautiful coinage shows what would be produced by a clever engraver under an artistic king.

It is said of Charles that he was easy to portray, and Roger de Piles tells us how a blind artist of the seventeenth century modelled a waxen rendering of a marble bust of the king (probably Bernini’s original) by the aid of the sense of touch only, and that it was “very like.” So good were the portraits executed by this sculptor, whom a

1 Monsieur Mazerolle calls him “un habile mécanicien,” and admits that “comme artiste il ne manque pas d’un certain mérite,” though he considers that some of the instruments he claimed as inventor, were merely the mills brought from Germany and improved or adapted in France, and that the process introduced by him into England was simply that in use at the Monnaie du Moulin in Paris. See Les Médaillleurs Français, vol. i, cxxvii and cxxviii. The Monnaie du Moulin was established in France under Béchot by Henri II. in 1551, and from 1552 onwards dies for coins were engraved there, but on the death of the king in 1559, medals alone were made there with few exceptions until Varin succeeded in re-establishing the milled money in 1639, long after the departure of Briot. See Num. Chron., Fourth Series, vol. ix, 1909, pp. 68 and 83.

2 Grainger’s Biographical History of England, vol. ii, p. 87, ed. 1779, and De Piles’s Principles of Painting, pp. 200 and 201. In describing the process when working, the artist said, “I feel my original, I examine the dimensions, the risings and cavities; these I endeavour to keep in my memory, then I feel my wax and comparing one with the other by moving my hand backwards and forwards, I finish my work in the best manner I can.” De Piles’ book was originally written in French in 1708 and translated in 1779.
man afterwards known to de Piles had met at Cambassi in Tuscany, that the Duke of Bracciano refused to believe in his complete blindness and applied the further test of sitting in a cellar, to ensure perfect darkness whilst his own bust was modelled. Of course this Italian had, as he himself expressed it, "eyes at his fingers' ends," but no doubt the fact that this copy of a bust, itself merely the outcome of a picture, tends to show how striking was the face of Charles I., which in its dignified pathos had a trick of impressing itself upon the imagination, hence nearly every portrait of him is unmistakable, not as in Elizabeth's case from the dress and decoration, but from the personality of the man. So much does this strike the eye even in those curious and rare pictures entitled "Black Charles," painted of the king attired as he appeared at the Whitehall trial, that the expression brings the whole scene before us though the colouring is incorrectly rendered.¹ But any further description of the monarch's characteristics would be superfluous here, for his coins and medals are before us.

Owing to the good taste of Charles, there was a complete change in the fashion of dress during the first years of his reign, when the stiff and uncompromising ruff, which had held sway for about a century, gave place to the graceful and falling lace collar popularized by Van Dyck.² Briot gives us examples of both these modes on medals, and also upon a halfgroat, if I am right in attributing to him a pattern here shown, which is extremely rare, for I have heard of only one other example besides my own specimen. It bears the mint-mark heart, and we have seen that he was not regularly established at the Mint until after the beginning of October, 1630, and that his trial coinage was still in

¹ These pictures show the king in a high-crowned hat and clothed in black, holding his staff. The name of "the Black Charles" is owing partly to the dress, but more to the fact that the beard and hair are far too dark.

² This falling lace-trimmed collar or "Valona," as it was called in Spain, was originally a Spanish fashion which came into vogue in Madrid in 1623. A miniature of Charles I., illustrated in *The Connoisseur* for June, 1909, p. 82, portrays him so adorned during his visit to the Infanta Maria, and it is mentioned that he was one of the first to adopt this fashion; but it did not become common in England till after the arrival of Van Dyck.
debate in June, 1631; but the workmanship is so entirely that of Briot, that the suggestion is perhaps permissible of the preparation of the die somewhat earlier in the year 1630, just as he made the halfcrown of 1628. If not by the French artist, this halfgroat must be by Green, to whose usual patterns it is, however, far superior.

If I am justified in ascribing this example to Briot it may be taken as a sample of his minute work upon the ruff, whilst the coins, with two distinctive busts, both typical of the period, when the turned-down collar was in vogue, may serve as a proof of the engraver's skill in portraying lace and such details, without overloading with ornamentation. I have given a specimen of the earlier design with mint-mark flower and B on p. 174, and the shilling here illustrated is a variety of the second type, inasmuch as the crown breaks the inner circle, but otherwise it differs little from Briot's ordinary coinage with the mint-mark anchor.

This English series, with its slightly differing busts, is beautiful both in execution and design, and the king's real appreciation of the artist's talents is attested by the fact that Charles carried his Scottish coronation medal in his pocket.

1 According to Ruding (vol. ii, p. 459) and Folkes, p. 77, the change from heart to plume took place in June, 1630. Briot had the king's permission to work at the Mint from February in that year (see p. 173), and to make dies for the coinage from December, 1628 (see p. 175).
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The specimen here illustrated is of the rare type, struck in both silver and gold, on a thick flan on the edge of which words are inscribed stating that the medal was made from Scottish gold—curiously enough, this inscription appears equally upon examples found in both metals.

It was not upon the currency alone that Briot exhibited his powers. We have many fine medals and numismatic portraits of Charles and of the royal family, and we know that the engraver even turned his attention to the making of coin-weights, for both king and artist were most anxious to raise the coinage to a high order of merit. These weights include the portraits of the king's predecessors, and those of James I. are so good that it has even been suggested that Briot must have been personally acquainted with his model, but the evidence produced by Monsieur Mazerolle as to Briot's presence in France at a later date than March, 1625, when James I. died, militates against this hypothesis.¹

The love of medals was largely on the increase at this time in England, and it was undoubtedly fostered by Charles, but a great many of this monarch's medallic portraits are memorials cast after his death for purposes of sentiment. Curiously enough, it is amongst such that Evelyn selects those executed by John and Norbert Roettier in February, 1694-5, as being "the most like to his serene countenance,"² a further proof, if any were needed, of the fact that the medallists relied largely on the excellent paintings of Van Dyck and others for their inspiration.

² Evelyn's Discourse of Medals, xxxiv, p. 112.
These medals were advertised by the Roettiers for sale “in copper 5s., in copper-gilt 10s., and if bespoke in silver 25s. each.”¹ They are described in *Medallic Illustration of British History*, pp. 346–347, Nos. 199 to 202, and No. 201, which I am able to illustrate here, is perhaps as pleasing as any of the varieties. According to Mr. J. H. Burn, the Roettiers founded their portrait upon the picture by Van Dyck used by Bernini in 1638 to help him in making his bust of the king;² but if this be a fact, the painting can only have been copied so far as the countenance is concerned, and not in the details of the costume. The picture in question is now at Windsor Castle;³ it represents Charles in three positions, arrayed in satin garments and a lace collar, this being the dress most frequently delineated by Van Dyck, and it is not the same as that represented on the medal, where Charles appears in armour. Bernini’s bust, so far as can be ascertained, followed the lines of the picture, but unfortunately the Italian sculptor’s work was lost in the fire at Whitehall in 1687–8. A very fine though unfinished line engraving of the middle of the seventeenth century, perhaps the work of Van Voerst,⁴ now in the British Museum, probably represents this work of art,⁵ and there is

² *Num. Chron.*, vol. iii, 1st Series, p. 179.
⁴ Robert van Voerst, born circa 1600, visited England when young and executed several English portraits.
⁵ Since writing the above I find that the subject has been much more ably discussed by Mr. Lionel Cust in the *Burlington Magazine* for March, 1909; he illustrates this drawing, thus making a work which is possibly unique available to the general public.
a marble bust in the collection of Mr. Laurence Currie at Minley Manor which by his kindness I am able to reproduce,¹ and which may, I should think, have been made before the destruction of the original, but singularly fine as these two examples are, they do not specially remind us of Roettier's medal. There are, however, as I endeavoured to show in my paper on the Royalist Badges,² many works of the Carolian medallists, which bear an exact resemblance to this and other pictures by Van Dyck even in the point of dress, whilst the medal in question is more like the equestrian statue at Charing Cross than it is to any of Sir Anthony's paintings.

Hubert Le Sueur's statue had a curious history, which though well known as to its general facts, is worthy of repetition in its details. It was originally ordered in January, 1630-31, by the Lord Treasurer, Sir Richard Weston, afterwards Earl of Portland, to be erected at Roehampton,³ or as Vertue, and an eighteenth century edition of a print by Hollar state, for the family of Arundel.⁴ From the various measurements and materials mentioned, it is clear there were several examples of the equestrian statue of Charles I. by Le Sueur. A very small model is mentioned in Vanderdort's catalogue, and Vertue states that Hollar's engraving from Lord Arundel's collection was drawn from the magnificent figure "cast in brass . . . exceeding the proportions in life, being almost 10 feet high," whereas the proposed contract published in full in Carpenter's Pictorial Codices, p. 188 et seq., is for a statue in "yeallow and red copper," little more than life size, in this agreeing with the bronze now at Charing Cross. Peacham in the Complete Gentleman, ed. 1634, p. 108, speaks of "the great horse with his Majestie upon it twice as great as life, and now well nigh finished." It seems probable that the Arundel examples engraved by Hollar and quoted by Vertue, Brit. Mus. Addit. MS., 23069, f. 20, and the

¹ Mr. Cust remarks on the fact that in the engraving the heavy lock of hair falls on the right shoulder, whereas in the picture it is on the left, but in the Minley bust the picture is reproduced, and I should be inclined to think the engraver reversed it.
² Vol. ii of this Journal, pp. 251 and 259.
MARBLE BUST OF CHARLES I. IN THE COLLECTION OF MR. LAURENCE CURRIE.
original ordered by Lord Treasurer Weston, at £600 in 1631, to be completed in eighteen months, are distinct, and that the latter is now at Charing Cross.\(^1\) The abstract of the agreement may be seen in the Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1629–30, p. 167.

At the outbreak of the Civil War, whether on account of the demise of Lord Portland, which had taken place in March, 1634–35, or for some other reason, the bronze still remained in the premises where it had been cast,\(^3\) although it was clearly finished in 1633, for it bears that date. After the death of Charles, the parliament ordered that the statue should be broken up, but an enterprising brazier, a man named John Rivet, Ryvett, or Revett, to whom it was sold for the purpose of destruction, quietly buried it. He showed a few pieces of metal as evidence that he had complied with the government’s behest, and made a fortune by selling medallions\(^3\) bearing the effigy of the king on horseback, as relics to cavaliers, or as trophies to the regicides, implying that he had made them from the molten bronze. The turn of the tide brought back the Stuarts. Revett was able to produce man and horse unharmed, and presented the trophy to Charles II. In course of time, though not until after the death of Hubert Le Sueur (and possibly that of Revett—if we accept the date given by Walpole) the statue found its way to Charing Cross,\(^4\) where a pedestal was designed for it by Grinling Gibbons, and executed in marble by Joshua Marshall.

\(^1\) It is true that the inscription under Wenceslaus Hollar’s print stated, not only that the brass “was made for the Earle of Arundell,” but also that it represents the statue at Charing Cross, which passed through the hands of Revett, but this title is not on the examples of contemporary issue, and appears only upon a late edition published and sold by a printer named H. Overton, of the reign of Queen Anne and later, and it is possible that he had no authority for his statement; moreover, the lettering is not by the hand of Hollar, who died in 1677. See Wenzel Hollar, von Gustav Parthey, p. 319, and Borovsky’s Ergänzungen zu Parthey’s Hollar, p. 47.

\(^2\) Walpole’s Anecdotes, vol. ii, pp. 44 and 45.

\(^3\) There exist still some bronze plaques of this type, one of which may be seen in the FitzHenry collection and another was in the possession of the late Mr. F. G. Hilton Price.

\(^4\) Walpole and Vertue mention the year as “about 1678,” whilst Mr. Cust, in the Dictionary of Biography, gives 1674 as the date of the erection of the statue; all are agreed in saying it was placed at Charing Cross by Danby, as Lord Treasurer, i.e., between 1673 and 1678. See Walpole’s Anecdotes, vol. i, p. 44, and Vertue’s Brit. Mus. Addit. MS., 23069, f. 20; also Dussieux, Les Artistes Français, p. 54.
Revett appears to have died by his own hand in 1675, in distressed circumstances. It appears from the Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1675-76, pp. 272, 276, and 279, that the estates of "John Ryvett" were forfeited to the Crown in consequence of his suicide in August, 1675, but they were restored to his widow because "the estate being small the king gives it to her for her support." It is not stated whether this grace was in recognition of the preservation of the equestrian portrait. The exact time of Le Sueur's demise is not known, but it is believed that he died circa 1652; the date of the erection of the statue is variously given as 1674 or 1678.

The Restoration had in no way abated the desire of the public for representations of the late King, who had been practically canonized owing to his heroic, if at times very impolitic defence of the Church of England, and some of the memorials of this later date are particularly fine. I am able to give a plate of a bas-relief in marble, which, owing to the fact that the companion plaque represents an unidentified divine in the flowing wig of the first decade of the eighteenth century, I am inclined to believe pertains to the reign of Queen Anne. I have been unable to find the exact prototype of this portrait of Charles I., but it bears a strong resemblance to more than one painting by Van Dyck, though the armour portrayed in the marble is of a more ornate and classical type; and apart from this peculiarity it also reminds us of Le Sueur's statue. There are several busts of the king of the beginning of the eighteenth century, such as those at Windsor Castle and at the National Portrait Gallery, and there are examples of a rather earlier date probably made about the time when William III. was anxious to accentuate his relationship to the Stuarts—his portrait forming the pendant, as is the case with the Minley example on our plate facing p. 200.

Anne pursued the same course as her brother-in-law, and some rare medallions are known bearing her head on one side and that of Charles I. on the other. Nor are these the last examples of such memorials, for so long as there remained any hope in the breasts of the Stuarts that they might regain the throne, the portrait of the "Martyr King" was the best card they could play.
MARBLE BAS-RELIEF OF CHARLES I: MEMORIAL, CIRCA 1700.
Amongst the most beautiful badges, by Rawlins which may, I think, trace their origin to Van Dyck’s pictures, is perhaps the finest of all the medallic portraits of the king. I allude to the obverse of the Forlorn-Hope badge (Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 301, No. 122), but as a rule, Briot’s medals show more individuality and originality than those of Rawlins, and I must not omit to mention those cast by the foreign artist to assert the dominion of the sea, Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 256, 1

1 Illustrated in vol. ii of this journal, p. 246.
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No. 41, and p. 285, No. 97, bearing two differing and admirable busts of Charles.

I would gladly call attention to many other medals, but space fails me, and it is really for the great improvement in the coinage that we owe our thanks to this artist, for the coins struck by Briot in his mill are of a beauty not easily surpassed; his apparatus was not usually applied to such large pieces as those here shown, which are cast and chased, and one cannot but regret that for the greater part of the currency the hammered process still obtained.

The unfortunate reign of Charles I. was so much marred by civil war that we must admire the way in which he maintained the standard of the coinage, never permitting it to be debased,\textsuperscript{1} and we naturally cannot look for art or portraiture upon the siege coins, but some of the pieces of the local mints such as York, Aberystwith and Oxford are of a very high order of merit. We must, however, remember that the York mint had been in operation since 1629, and Briot is said to have provided the early dies,\textsuperscript{2} many of which remind me more strictly of the Scottish coinage of his son-in-law Falconer; Briot may moreover have visited it on his first journey to Scotland. It has even been suggested that Thomas Simon was at one time working at York, and that he there attracted the attention of Briot on his way north in 1633,\textsuperscript{3} but I have been unable to recognise his work, and I am bound to say that the lettering of the York mint, so far as I have studied it, lacks the rather peculiar capital A, characteristic of Briot's work no less than Simon's, but the method of striking is very regular, and the coins are well finished, thus reminding us of the former's coinage.\textsuperscript{4} We have seen that Briot, however, was responsible for the mintage of 1642, in York, and may have remained there, or rather returned thither, for a short period, for his movements between his arrival in the northern county and his residence at Oxford are somewhat uncertain. It is,

\textsuperscript{1} Disraeli's \textit{Commentaries on Charles I.}, vol. i, p. 194.
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Handbook of the Coins of Great Britain and Ireland}, p. 121.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Num. Chron.}, 1st Series, vol. iv, p. 213.
\textsuperscript{4} It is, of course, impossible to rely solely on lettering in endeavouring to decide the origin of a coin for no doubt the legend was sometimes the work of an under-graver.
indeed, stated that for a time in 1642 or 1644, he revisited France,\(^1\) shortly again to appear in England; there are, however, intervals between his arrival in York in July, 1642, and his death at Oxford in 1646, which remain still unaccounted for.

The mint at Aberystwith had been in operation since 1637, under the able management of Thomas Bushell. The minute finish of some of the smaller coins bears comparison with that of Briot, but the lettering does not recall his work.

It is not known whence the Welsh dies were derived, but it has been suggested that they were sent from London, and this seems likely, because the deterioration in the Aberystwith portrait appears to be coincident with the time when the Parliament seized the Tower mint; the king's men, probably Rawlins amongst them, in many cases left their employment, and Briot went to York to join his master.

With regard to Oxford, it is known that Sir William Parkhurst and Thomas Bushell were wardens of the mint,\(^2\) which was set up in New Inn Hall, on the 3rd of January, 1642–3, under their management. To them an order is addressed on the 18th of May, 1643, for the manufacture of the Forlorn-Hope medal, one of the most beautiful of the badges executed by Rawlins. The plant of the Aberystwith mint had been moved to Oxford via Shrewsbury,\(^3\) in 1642, as is stated in a petition from Bushell: “In 1642 he proposed the discovery of a rich mine, but being required in other ways, brought 1,000 miners at


\(^2\) Nicholas' "History of Honorary Medals" in his *History of the Orders of Knighthood*, vol. iv, Part II, m. 5.

his own expense to Derby; he also brought his coining instruments and fine silver from Wales to Shrewsbury and Oxford, whereby he was able to coin money for his Majesty," etc. This, however, does not tell us who was the maker of the dies, but some of the coins of 1644 to 1646 bear the initial of Rawlins, and the warrant ordering him to make a special badge for Sir Robert Welsh,¹ is dated Oxford, 1st June, 1643. The coins of this city are less finished and of poorer portraiture in the beginning of the king's residence there than during the succeeding years, but I have noticed the peculiar lettering of Briot on a £3 piece of 1642, and the great hurry might account for the rougher work, though it would be rash, in default of any evidence having presented itself to me of the early arrival of our artist in the University city, to speak of the possibility that Briot made this or any other coin in particular, at this date. The gold of 1644 to 1646 presents some very fine pictures of Charles, and considering the haste with which plate or bullion had to be converted into coin, we cannot fail to admire, though we cannot with certainty determine the maker.

The improvement in the later pieces may have been due to the advent of Briot, but as a rule the lettering on this better struck coinage does not particularly recall the precision of the French medallist. We cannot, however, rely entirely on the shape of a letter, for occasionally the obverse and the reverse of a coin or medal present contradictory

evidence in this respect; see the Dominion-of-the-Sea medal No. 97, where we find a straight topped A on the reverse. In the year 1648, after Briot's death, a medal was struck at Oxford by one Nicholas Burghers, *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, 334, No. 178. He is described as engraver to the University, and as such may possibly have assisted earlier at the Oxford mint, but the only piece of his work which I have seen, a poor specimen in lead, does not bear comparison with the coinage.

In addition to the celebrated Oxford crown for which he is famous we have, of course, many examples of Rawlins's work issued from the Oxford mint which prove his prolonged stay in that city; such as the hastily-executed Kineton Medal, *Med. Ill.*, i, p. 306, No. 130, the Taking-of-Bristol, 307, Nos. 131 and 132, Peace-or-War, 308, No. 134, all of the year 1643, and the fine medallion in 1644, of Sir William Parkhurst, a very faithful adherent of Charles, Warden of the mint under three generations, James I., Charles I., and Charles II. But it is of no use to enumerate his various works—at Oxford or elsewhere—unless it be to mention that a small and signed medallion of Thomas Harper shows him still active in 1647, for the numerous badges of *circa* 1649 need not be recalled here. He was probably in France for a time between 1649 and 1652, for he records in a letter to Evelyn¹ that they had met in Paris, and the diarist settled in England in the last-mentioned year. But were it not that he made a few tradesmen's tokens between 1652 and 1660, and a medal for Sir Robert Rolles² in 1655, and that we know from the letter to Evelyn,³ which was an appeal for monetary help, how he was imprisoned for debt in 1657–8, we should lose all sight of him until the Restoration recalled him to prosperity.

I cannot stay to speak of the coins of Bristol, which resemble those of Oxford in character, or of Exeter, which present many varieties specially well struck, for there is nothing very distinctive in the portraiture of the king. We must turn to the Tower of London, now in possession of his enemies.

¹ *Num. Chron.*, vol. iv, p. 123, where Rawlins's appeal to Evelyn is given in full.
The greatest artist to be found in England in the middle of the seventeenth century was Thomas Simon, who was working at the Royal Mint when it was finally seized by the Parliamentarians in 1642. It is therefore curious that almost all the coins struck at the Tower with mint-mark triangle-in-circle, and those following thereon, should be of very inferior workmanship. But whilst turning over some shillings at the British Museum, I came across two of mint-marks (P), 1643, and eye, 1645, respectively so fine, that I think they may be fairly attributed to Simon. I am glad to have the privilege of illustrating these coins, which present the bust then in use, though in execution they are very superior to the ordinary issue of the day, and it is possible Simon made the first die and that it was more roughly copied by his colleagues. The peculiar A's of Simon are noticeable upon these fine examples, and are like those used by Briot, though perhaps a little straighter, but so far as I can judge, they are seldom, if ever, found on specimens executed by Green or Rawlins, for the two latter almost invariably made the A with a pointed or square top, whereas Simon and Briot sloped the letter at a one-sided angle on the top of the upstroke. The joint
appointment of Thomas Simon with Edward Wade to the post of chief engraver was, as we have already seen on p. 185, of the year 1645, and it has been suggested that the coinage bearing the king's bust was not issued after 1646, inasmuch as no fresh mint-mark follows that of the sceptre. But this, I think, is a mistake, for it was not until 1649 that the type was replaced with a design which gave no scope for the talent of a great artist, and a hiatus of three years would have to be assumed, whereas there is some reason to believe that the coins bearing the mint-mark sceptre, with two, if not more varying portraits of Charles, extended over the period from 1646 to 1649. By the courtesy of Mr. Hocking I am informed that the Masters' and Workers' Accounts for that period were not for the financial year only, as was usually the case at the mint, but from April 1st, 1646, to May 15th, 1649, and Ruding remarks that there was a great demand for money during those years. We may also note that Sir Robert Harley, Master of the Mint, does not seem to have objected to coining money bearing the king's effigy for the Parliament; indeed, his dismissal on the 16th of May, 1649, was occasioned by his refusal to do otherwise. It, therefore, remains a problem why Simon should have been so little employed upon the coinage, which until circa 1649, was presumably left in the main to the tender mercies of Wade, but the answer may lie in the fact that a great amount of work had to be executed not only upon the great seals, but upon those for the Courts of Justice, and various other public offices. We learn that Simon was the maker of the great seal ordered by Parliament in 1643, to replace that sent to York by the Lord Keeper Littleton for the use of the king in June, 1642, and but for the

1 It is clear that Simon was employed in making dies and puncheons for the Commonwealth, for in a manuscript list of his works, now at the Royal Mint, he enumerates thirteen specimens, "six of the old Parliament, seven by the order of his Highness." *Num. Chron.,* 1909, p. 96; "Simon's Coins," W. J. Hocking.

2 Ruding, vol. i, pp. 404 and 405.

3 Ruding, vol. i, p. 428, and Folkes, p. 94.

4 Simon is mentioned as Sole Chief Engraver from 1649 onward, so Wade must have been superseded unless he resigned or died.

5 Wyon's *Great Seals,* Plate XXIX.

6 Wyon, Plate XXVIII, p. 86.

substitution of the date 1643 for that of 1640 upon the original seal, it is an accurate copy of its predecessor. When the latter eventually fell into the hands of the Parliament, on the surrender of Oxford in 1646, it was at once broken up. Simon received £100 for making the seal of 1643, £40 to be paid in advance, and £60 to follow on the completion of the work.  

Shortly before the death of the king, when it was thought necessary that the royal effigy should be removed from the coins and seals, Simon was entrusted with a commission to engrave the great seal of the Commonwealth, and £200 was promised to him for that purpose. Such speed was exacted that it was a very poor performance, for less than a month elapsed between the time when the design was approved on January 9th, and February 7th, 1648-9, when it was brought ready for use into the House of Commons, and the final order had only been delivered to Simon on January 26th.  

In 1651, the engraver replaced the original seal with a much finer example following almost the same lines, but in a superior manner, and this great seal remained in use until a better opportunity was afforded to Simon, of showing his skill in portraiture by engraving the equestrian figure of Oliver Cromwell in February, 1655, and again in 1657, a design which required but the change of the head to serve for Richard Cromwell in 1658.  

We must, however, revert to the lifetime of Charles I., and note his personal influence in these matters. Simon had chosen his lot; Briot and Rawlins were the only men of skill available at the outset of
the king's wanderings, and Rawlins appears to have possessed a special talent for making the badges required during the campaign. Without, therefore, placing him on a level with his rivals we may admire the high relief exhibited upon these pendants, which occupied more or less the position now held by the war medal. Many of these badges are

singularly beautiful in the way of portraiture, such as Med. Ill., I, p. 357, No. 222, and some are noted for their graceful ornamental borders such as the example here illustrated, whilst others are but rough copies made by inferior artists. The badge was the reward, or distinctive mark,

given by the leaders to their followers during the Civil War, but of its origin and development I have spoken at length in my paper on the Stuart badges. I there dwelt upon the fondness of the king for medallic portraits, so I will not discuss the matter here further than to draw attention to the fact that even in his adversity Charles, who was

usually most unsuccessful in the choice of his ministers and generals, displayed great acumen whenever an artist was concerned. The king, though he had not the leisure to study sufficiently to attain any personal excellence as a painter, could place his finger on the slightest mistake in a drawing, and the artistic instinct never failed him when he was left to use his own judgment uninfluenced by others.

Vertue\(^1\) tells a story of a discussion as to the painter of a certain picture: "The king asked, 'Whose hand was that?' Some guessed one, others were of another opinion, but none were positive. At last, said the king, 'This is of such a man's hand, I know it as well as if I had seen him draw it, but' (said he) 'is there but one man's hand in this picture?' None did discern whether there was or not, but most concluded there was but one hand. Said the king, 'I am sure there are two hands, for I know the hand that did the heads, but the hand that did the rest I never saw before.'" Vertue then relates how, on inquiry, it was ascertained that the picture had been seen in Rome some ten years before with the heads only finished, and on the death of the painter, his widow, "wanting money, got the best master she could to finish it and make it saleable." "This," concludes the narrator, "is strong proof of the king's judicious skill in so critical a point of art."

With so good a judge of their productions, can we wonder that painters put forth their best powers for his approval, and we must admit that the path of the numismatic artist was made easy by the numerous faithful and beautiful portraits of Charles, the works of Van Dyck, and also by the good features and marvellously serene expression of the royal countenance. Moreover, Charles was himself a lover of medals, and as such we owe him our thanks, his tastes having been early directed to the acquisition of such art treasures by his brother, Henry, who left him his collection.

One cannot help wondering whether, had Prince Henry lived, the course of events would have been changed. According to the description left to us of this young man, he seems to have been a very paragon. Foscarini calls him the "peer of Henry of France [Henri IV.] in

\(^1\) Vertue, *Brit. Mus. Add. MS.*, 23072, f. 43B.
greatness, magnanimity, and valour," but the virtues of those who die at an early age, all untried, are often magnified by their biographers, and possibly Henry would have been no more fitted than was Charles, to control the current of Puritan doctrine which precipitated the Rebellion. But Henry, like his brother, in his ardent love of religion, was yet unlike him in his sympathies. He was anti-Catholic, and was regarded by the advanced party as a likely reformer of the Church. Also, he was possessed, even at the age of eighteen, of a remarkably strong character, and enjoyed such extreme popularity, that his father was jealous of him, and feared rather than loved him. Possibly he might have led the Puritan movement, which resulted in the civil war, rather than have tried to stem the torrent in its course, a feat unsuccessfully attempted by his unfortunate, though equally conscientious brother.

Had Henry lived, we cannot doubt that his currency would have been beautiful, for his face, which strongly resembled that of Henry V., was as comely as his figure; so, at least, we are always informed, and such pictures as remain to us, especially the fine miniatures by Isaac Oliver, bear out the rather extravagant praise of his person written at the time of his death. The admirable portrait in profile by this artist in the collection of the Duke of Buccleuch, of the young prince in Roman costume, would have made a splendid model for the coinage. The well-known prints of the Prince of Wales, published after his death by Simon van de Passe in 1612, and in Drayton's *Polyolbion* by Holle in 1613, were probably both executed from a common original, now no longer extant, but once at Whitehall. They show forth the excellence of Henry's features and the grace of his figure so well that we much regret that the artists did not reproduce their engravings in the form of medals, though amongst the counters attributed to the school of Simon van de Passe is a very poor, but faithful reproduction of his print. It

1 De la Boderie, writing to France whilst on an embassy to England, in 1606, says of Henry, "He is a Prince who promises very much and whose friendship cannot but be one day of advantage." Birch's *Life of Prince Henry*, p. 69, quoting *Les Ambassades de la Boderie*, p. 59.
2 There is another fine profile of the Prince, an engraving by Holle, representing the effigy upon the funeral car, in Chapman's *Epicede*.
is possible that Holle or Charles Anthony may be responsible for the two really good medallic portraits of Henry which still exist, and of one of these I possess a very fine example, in gold, which I here illustrate. The beauty of the workmanship suggests the hand of the makers of James I.'s best gold coinage of Charles Anthony, or still more, perhaps of Holle, recalling the rose ryals of 1619. It is, however, not known whether he was employed in a subordinate capacity at this early date at the mint, for we have seen that he only became cuneator in 1618, whereas the medals, though undated, must have been executed before 1612—the year of the prince's death—at which time Anthony still occupied the chief post. From the shape of Henry's collar and his generally youthful appearance, I should be inclined to suggest that he is represented at about the age of nine, for though these open collars are still to be found upon a few of his later portraits, such as the beautiful miniature by Isaac Oliver in Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan's collection, the mode even in these is slightly changed, the hair much longer and freer, and the medal more nearly resembles the picture, now at Hampton

1 Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan's Catalogue, by Dr. George Williamson, vol. i, Plate 13, No. 45, p. 53.
Court, of Prince Henry assisting at the death of a stag, which is said to be of 1603. Henry was made a Knight of the Garter, in the July of that year, two days after his arrival at Windsor; he wears the order in the picture, but, it will be noticed, not in the medal, and as the medallist can scarcely have executed his work so shortly after Henry's advent, it appears to me likely that it was copied from a picture and struck in anticipation of his coming. As Holle predeceased his king, James I., Henry would have been indebted to Gilbert and Green for his early coinage, had he survived to require it, but he displayed a knowledge of the arts and a love of numismatics so great, being amongst the first royal collectors of medals, that one feels that in after years Thomas Simon would have put forth his best efforts for the prince as he did for Cromwell, and that in Henry he would have had a better model and perhaps a more appreciative critic, than in the rough soldier with his rugged features and contempt for appearances.

Oliver Cromwell, as Lord Protector, had no prescriptive rights, nor indeed any right, save that given him by the Council, to place his portrait on the coinage; and as he was neither Stuart nor monarch I have, perhaps, no occasion to cite his patterns here, but I do so in order to carry the chain of Simon's history unbroken to the reign of Charles II.

The excellent articles published by Mr. T. H. B. Graham in 1908 on the silver coins of Cromwell, and by Mr. W. J. Hocking in the following year describing the work of Simon at the mint, have given us so much interesting detail concerning Oliver's portrait series that it would be useless for me to add, excepting from the artistic or personal point of view, to a question already far more ably discussed.

The Protector's coins are dated 1656 and 1658 and, as we find in repeated orders, were made with the consent of the Council. They were so much admired that they were shortly regarded as curios, the crowns being sold even in the days of Pepys in 1663 for so much as 25s. to 30s. He speaks of them thus: "Upon my word those of the

2 *Ibid.*, vol. ix, pp. 91 to 118, by Mr. W. J. Hocking, to whom I am indebted for much information.
3 *Pepys Diary*, March 9th, 1662-3.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

Protector are more like in my mind than the king's, but both very well worth seeing." They certainly afford a convincing proof of the excellent result obtainable by the genius of a great artist, even though the subject be unpromising.

From the point of view of the numismatologist, we cannot regret that the opportunity of executing these designs for a projected coinage was afforded to Thomas Simon. According to the popularly received version of the story, the idea of placing his "effigies" on the coinage in 1656-8 was attributable to the ambition of Oliver to assume in all things the status of king, but it is observable that some of the coins were struck after the parliamentary proposal that he should adopt the royal title had been decided by himself in the negative, that none of the patterns bear the word Rex instead of Protector, that the original stamps and inscriptions for such specimens as are dated 1656 having been contemplated\(^1\) some time before, had already been ordered in September,\(^2\) and approved as early as November\(^3\) 27th, 1656, Simon being ordered to proceed with their manufacture, with the assistance of Blondeau, on December 3rd\(^4\) and December 11th\(^5\) of that year, some weeks prior to the attempted assassination,\(^6\) which gave rise to the official discussion of the matter in Parliament, and finally that

\(^1\) *Cal. State Papers Dom.* July (?), 1656, vol. cxxix, p. 49, No. 86.
\(^5\) Vertue's *Medals, Coins, etc.*, ed. 1780, p. 71.
\(^6\) A man called Sidderscombe tried to fire Whitehall on January 8th, 1657, and in the House of Commons a member, whilst expressing his joy at the deliverance of the
Cromwell's portrait, Wyon, Plate XXXII, was already in use on the great seal,\(^1\) so that in placing it upon the coinage he was but taking one step further on a path already trodden by him. It is, of course, possible, nay likely, that Oliver may have ventured upon one of the royal prerogatives to test the feelings of the people in a matter of such importance to himself and the country, and have thus suggested as a move in his political game the offer of the crown, which he most reluctantly declined. It is only fair to state that it is thought that the money was at first intended to be issued as an experiment, for, from the fact that the coinage of Oliver was not described in the proclamation withdrawing the Commonwealth specie from the currency after November 30th, 1661, Ruding deduced that it was never in circulation,\(^2\) and it has been computed that only about 16,000, at the most, probably not more than 10,000, pieces were issued.\(^3\)

Preparations, however, were made for a larger coinage, and had Oliver lived an Act would probably have been passed to make the pieces legally current. It had been decided on September 11th, 1656, that £2,000 of bullion, from the Spanish prize\(^4\) money, should be delivered to Blondeau that he might work from Simon's dies, but a long time elapsed before the result was ready for the use of Oliver or his Council, and the coins of 1656 were not completed before the middle of 1657.\(^5\)

The Protectorate with regal powers had been conferred on Oliver, Protector, first raised the question of making him king. *Political History of England*, vol. vii, p. 444.

\(^1\) Wyon's *Great Seals*, p. 96, quotes an order in Council of February 15th, 1654–5, approving the drawing for the great seal, "which bears the portraiture of his Highness," and making Simon "sole Chief Engraver for the Mint and Seals and have the fees of . . . per annum annexed to that place." He also refers to the privy seal and others "mentioned in several orders of August 25th, 1654." He quotes the Interregnum Papers 75, p. 683, as containing the orders for this great seal.

\(^2\) Ruding, vol. ii, note to p. 5.

\(^3\) Num. Chron., 1909, by Mr. W. J. Hocking, vol. ix, p. 94.

\(^4\) State Papers, Proceedings in Council, 1656–7, p. 106, vol. cxxx. For "Spanish Money," see State Papers, 1656–7, p. 136, vol. cxxx, where it is stated "The Spaniards say there is taken 9 millions of pieces of eight." Edward Blackwell had charge of the prize money, and there are several notices in the State Papers concerning it indexed under his name.

and he had been inducted with considerable ceremony to his office in December, 1653, but those who upheld him as Protector had no defence against penal prosecution, if the monarchy should be later restored, whilst the followers of a king de facto were secured by an Act of Henry VII.; therefore some persons had long been ready to confer the royal title upon him. The matter was much pressed in the beginning of the year 1657, then reckoned as 1656, and on March 31st, 1657, "the humble petition and advice," suggesting the adoption of the name as well as the office of king, was presented to Cromwell to be refused by him in a hesitating manner after three days' consideration, and again more definitely declined on May 8th. But for the opposition openly expressed on behalf of a portion of the army by Desborough, Fleetwood and Lambert, and more privately by sundry others, it is thought that Cromwell would have accepted the offer of the Commons. It was not without a mental struggle that he laid aside his personal ambition, rather than cause division amongst the officers of the sole force on which he could rely, for it was in his troops that his strength lay. We cannot forbear to admire Oliver's sagacity in this matter, even if we doubt his sincerity, but whether or not we think that he was honest therein, in his politics or even in his religion, he was intensely so as regards his personal appearance.

It is said that he told Peter Lely he would not permit him to draw him if he omitted the warts on his countenance, saying: "I desire you to use your skill to paint a picture truly like and not flatter me at all, but remark all the roughness and pimples, warts and everything as you see me, otherwise I never will pay a farthing for it." Cromwell, iconoclast as he appeared to be, was no despiser of the arts and realised that a portrait to be good must be true.

It was said of him that "He was a great lover of music, and entertained the most skilful in that science in his pay and family. He

---

2 Ibid., pp. 446-448.
3 Walpole's Anecdotes, vol. ii, p. 94, ed. 1888. There is however a picture of Cromwell by Lely in the Pitti Gallery at Florence, which greatly flatters the Protector, and the usual warts are barely visible.
respected all persons that were exemious in any art, and would procure
them to be sent or brought to him.”

His appreciation of real talent was shown by the fact that he gave
£300 for the Raphael cartoons, and £1,000 for those of Andrea
Mantagna, when they were offered for auction on their annexation by
the Government after the death of Charles I., and Cromwell insisted
on the retention in their original positions of many pictures belonging
to the royal collection, in order that his residences at Whitehall and
Hampton Court might not be disfigured.

His various medals by Thomas Simon attest his patronage of the
artist. Vertue mentions that amongst the few stone seals known to be
the work of this artist, was a specimen bearing “Oliver’s head,” and I
have seen a fine cameo in the collection of gems at Devonshire House
which presents a portrait attributed to Simon, much resembling the
coins. It is noticeable that when the Parliament wished to pay him
the compliment of placing his “effigies” upon the badge commemo-
rating the battle of Dunbar, he was consulted concerning the design,
and though feigning an indifference to his portraiture which he can
scarcely have felt, he expressed himself clearly on the question.
Thomas Simon was sent to Scotland purposely to portray him, and
Cromwell whilst writing that:—“It was not a little wonder to me that

2 Whitehall, by W. J. Loftie, p. 48. The Raphael cartoons are now in the Victoria
and Albert Museum, Room 94.
3 Vertue’s MSS., Brit. Mus. Addit. MS., 23970, f. 79. It appears from the account
in this MS. that Simon preferred working in relief, and that he “actually made punches
for every purpose, being extreme ready at it and liked that way much better than cutting
inward; nay, at that time lived Martin Johnson, a seal cutter whose works in seals are
very good, and he did cut heads of persons in steel seals very well, but was of opposite
temper or practice, for he would not make use of any puncheons but cutt all with tools
inward; he was so averse to Simon that he would say of him that he was a puncher, not
a graver. Simon was ready at every kind of work relating to his profession modelled in
wax, and cut several famous onyxes and stone seals, particularly Oliver’s head,” etc., etc.
Vertue had this account from one Marlow, who had purchased some of Simon’s punches
from his widow in 1676, and had many details from a man named Whiteman, whose
brother had “learnt to grave of Simon.”
4 Letter to the Committee of the Army, February 4th, 1550, printed in Simon’s
Medals, Coins, etc., by Vertue, ed. 1780, p. 74*.
you should send Mr. Symonds so great a journey upon business
importinge so little as far as it relates to me," recommended as a
personal obligation to himself that the medallist should have that
"imploym'in yo' service wh ch Nicholas Biott¹ had before him, indeed
the man is ingenious and worthie of encouragem'.” We have seen,
however, that Simon already held office, though not a life appointment
under Parliament;³ his joint engravership with Edward Wade has
already been mentioned, and Mr. Nightingale, writing in the Numis-
matic Chronicle, quotes a paper which he had seen in the Audit Office
Enrolment MSS. as follows:³ "Die Mercurii 25th April, 1649.

Resolved upon the question by the Coñons assembled in Parliament
that Thomas Symon bee appointed to bee sole cheife Engraver of the
Mints and Seales," so that the recommendation seems scarcely necessary.
A further indenture dated⁴ two days later, speaks of Simon as
“graver of the Irons,” whilst the name of John East still appears as
under-graver, a post to which he had been appointed in 1633, at a time
when Green and Briot were occupying the chief places in the reign
of the late king.

The Government had found in Simon an instrument ready to
execute any medallic work, and took advantage of the situation as we
have seen, but were it not for these and other references to this
engraver as holding an important position at the mint, the terms of the
warrant given to him by Cromwell might have led one to believe that

¹ The name Nicholas Biott is inserted by another hand.
³ Ibid., p. 216.
⁴ Ibid., p. 217.
the artist had waited until Oliver was in power as Protector for official recognition.

This patent given by Cromwell on July 9th, 1656, appoints Thomas Simon "sole cheafe Engraver of ye irons of ye moneyes of us and our successors" at a salary of "£xxx a year" paid quarterly from March the 25, 1655, but also specifies that he is to have the sole privilege of cutting "badges of honor, seals, escutcheons, stampes and armes," and is "to be our medall-maker of the medalls of or belonging to us and our successors, to have and exercise . . . during the natural life of him the saide Thomas Symon, and likewise to have the makeing of all and singular the chaines thereunto belonging." He was to receive the "fees, rewards, allowance and profits" enjoyed by his predecessors in either office, Anthony, Gilbert, Green, "or any of them or any other engravers or cutters belonging to any King or Queen of England." From this document it appears that Simon was to have an extra salary "as our medall-maker" and seal engraver of £13 6s. 8d. "payable and commencing as afores'd beyond the cuneator's usual £30 a year specified above. This may partly account for the confusion that is sometimes found with regard to the remuneration given to artists when in charge of the Mint—variously stated at £30, £40 or £50 a year, though no process of arithmetic will correctly reconcile the figures, for we must see that in this case £13 6s. 8d. is to be added to £30, making £43 6s. 8d. a year, and this is neither one thing nor the other. We only know that Simon was in receipt of £50 a year at the time of his death, and of course the dies were all separately charged by the cuneator at a high price. Amongst the State Papers, for instance,

1 Printed in full in Vertue's Medals, Coins, etc., ed. 1780, pp. 67-72.
2 On July 22nd, 1655, Cromwell paid £410 4s. 6d. to a certain George Altrington "for a chain of gold and a jewel of his Highness' portrait." See Cal. State Papers Dom., p. 589.
4 Vertue's Medals, Coins, etc., p. 71; Num. Chron., 1st Series, vol. vii, pp. 43 and 44.
somewhat earlier in the same year, we find a payment of £300 on account to Simon as "Chief Medall-maker." This may have been inclusive of the bullion used, but Simon sometimes asked £100 or more for a medal.

The miniatures painted by Samuel Cooper are said to have been of great assistance to the medallists of his day, but Thomas Simon, though sometimes aided by his brother Abraham, did not really require the co-operation of any other artist. We have seen that he had a personal interview with Cromwell in order that he might make a satisfactory portrait for the Dunbar medal, but it is stated that the coins were based upon a sketch by Cooper, and there is "a curious limning drawn by Samuel Cooper; the original whereof is preserved in the collection of the Duke of Devonshire," which according to Vertue served as a model for a medal struck in 1653.

This drawing, which is on paper, and executed in grey Italian chalk slightly tinted with red, presents a profile to right, reversed on the medal, and shows the Protector in armour faintly indicated and a turned down collar. It is very striking, and more impressive than the medallic rendering where the elaborated dress detracts from the simplicity of the whole. It is the only profile sketch by Cooper with which I am acquainted, and as such is more easily compared with the coinage than his more finished miniatures, with the result that the absolute truthfulness of both artists is established.

1 Vertue's Medals, Coins, etc., of Thomas Simon, ed. 1780; Appendix V, p. 85 et seq.
2 Vertue's Medals, Coins, etc., of Thomas Simon, ed. 1780, p. 74*.
3 Ibid., p. 13.
Samuel Cooper's works are perhaps of even more value to us in his inimitable representations of Charles II., for in his case also the oil painters of the day lacked greatly in expression. Evelyn tells us how he held the candle “when Mr. Cooper ye rare limner, was crayoning of the king's face and head, to make the stamps for the new mill'd money now contriving . . . . he choosing the night and candle-light for ye better finding out the shadows. During this his May descoursed on several things relating to painting and graving.” In this instance Cooper's drawing was the basis for the competitive coins by Simon and Roettier, resulting finally in the protest of the Petition Crown against its more successful, though less admirable rival, when “the Dutchman's” work was selected for the milled coinage.

To judge by the excellence of these numismatic portraits, the original sketch of the king by Cooper must have been striking in its faithfulness. Walpole compares the artist with Van Dyck saying, “if a glass could expand Cooper's pictures to the size of Van Dyck's, they would appear to have been painted for that proportion; if his portrait of Cromwell could be so enlarged, I don't know, but Van Dyck's would appear less great by the comparison.”

The extraordinary force of the splendid miniatures, of the Protector, of Charles II., and others, which I have seen at Windsor, at Montagu House and in various private and public collections, seem to me almost to justify Walpole's high estimate of the miniaturist powers, and whilst we rejoice that Charles I. had a Van Dyck to bring his features before us in an idealized form, by ever emphasizing the beauty of his expression, we are fain to seek in Samuel Cooper for the strength and power, which is so little seen in the portraits of Oliver Cromwell by Walker and other artists patronised by him.

Evelyn in his Discourse on Medals speaks of Cromwell with the bias usual in his day, and writes that he finds “the greatest Dissimulation, Boldness, Crime, Ambition in every stroke and touch in the lines of his double face as accurately stamped on his medals by Simon or

1 Evelyn's Diary, January 10th, 1661–62.
enlarged in Taille Douce by Lombard\(^1\) from a picture of Walker’s most resembling him.”

To me, Robert Walker’s paintings generally seem to lack the sternness one expects to find in the Protector’s portraits, but they were apparently approved by Cromwell, perhaps partly on that account, for upon an example, presented by Oliver to Christina, Queen of Sweden, he placed an inscription in Latin to the effect that to this “bright star of the Northern Pole” he hoped that his face, though wrinkled with the cares of state, would show that to monarchs he was not “always fierce.”\(^2\) The rare engraving which by the kindness of Mr. W. Sharp Ogden I am able to reproduce, brings Oliver before us with a similarly mild countenance. It is probably a rendering of the very fine picture of which there are examples at the National Portrait Gallery and at Althorp of Oliver with his young page, and it is according to Nagler the portrait “most resembling him” to which Evelyn referred. The Althorp picture was finely engraved by Peter Lombard, by Gaywood and by Sherwin and published by Stent, who also sold our illustration, but the reproduction may be by another hand from some other sketch of Cromwell unknown to me, though the head is exactly like that of the three-quarter length figure in Lord Spencer’s collection, reversed though it be, as is often the case with prints.

We learn from the *Dictionary of National Biography*, that Simon was employed to make the head of the effigy carried at Oliver’s funeral on November 23rd, 1658\(^3\); but this is, of course, not amongst the figures known as “the ragged regiment,” of which the majority are now no longer shown to the public, though still preserved in Westminster Abbey. The most excellent artists of the day were often employed in making the face and hands of these effigies.

Mr. St. John Hope\(^4\) tells us that the representation of Henry VII.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Cromwell paid £20 to Lombard on July 18th, 1655, “for presenting several portraits of his Highness to the Council”; *Cal. State Papers Dom.*, 1656–7, p. 589.

\(^2\) This picture is at Euston Hall, in the collection of the Duke of Grafton.

\(^3\) On November 23rd, Thomas Simon, as “chief graver of the Mint,” was amongst the officers who walked in the funeral procession; *Walpole*, vol. ii, p. 74.

\(^4\) *Archeologia*, vol. ix, pp. 517–570, Mr. St. John Hope on “The Funeral Effigies of the Kings and Queens of England.”

\(^5\) *Ibid.*, Plates LXI and LXII.
PORTRAIT OF CROMWELL FROM A CONTEMPORARY ENGRAVING IN THE COLLECTION OF MR. W. SHARP OGDEN.
"is finely modelled and painted" and that "the work is Renaissance and that of a master, most likely an Italian," hence one feels inclined to wonder whether it was by Torrigiano? The effigy of James I. is now without the head and hands, and the likeness is lost to us; but they were described in the contemporary records of accounts as "curiously wroughte" by Maximilian Colt,1 and he received ten pounds for making them, and the same sum for the rest of the body, whilst John de Critz was paid no less for "paynting the face of the Royall Representation." The figure of Henry, Prince of Wales, is in no better case, but the waxen image of Charles II. still remains in the Islip Chamber. Mr. St. John Hope informs us that it at one time stood over his grave in the Abbey, though it is not known to have been carried at the funeral: it gives a fair idea of the king:

We may now pass on to the Restoration, and resume our discussion of the Stuart monarchs, for Richard Cromwell, though a lover of art and literature, was wanting in those characteristics which make history, and of him it is not necessary that I should speak, for excepting upon his great seal, to which I have already alluded, p. 200, he is unrepresented in medallic portraiture.

Charles II.

The great question in the numismatic world of the days of Charles II. is that of Simon versus the Roettier family. The king was most fortunate in succeeding to the services of Thomas Simon, and whether or not his politics and principles were congenial to the Merry

1 Maximilian Colt, or Poultrain, was also commissioned to make the "representation" of Anne of Denmark, whilst Abraham Vanderdort received the usual fee for the face and hands of Prince Henry. Colt was the sculptor of Queen Elizabeth's tomb in Westminster Abbey, for which he was paid £600, according to the Dictionary of National Biography, or as Vertue states (Brit. Mus. Addit., 23069, f. 9), £170 for his own work and John de Critz £100, whilst the total "of stone in all" was £965. Colt carved the monuments of the daughters of James also. Some accounts of the period entitled, "An Abstract of the Present State of his Majestie's Revenue," enumerate the expenses at £3,500 for "Tombes for the late Queen, the King's two daughters, and the late Queen of Scots, the King's mother."
Monarch, there is no doubt the medallist was much employed by Charles, though the latter naturally took the earliest possible opportunity of rewarding the faithful Rawlins, who had fallen into great poverty during the ascendancy of the Commonwealth. Directly after his accession he conferred upon him the appointment of chief engraver, thereby confirming his father's grant of his twenty-third year.

During the beginning of the reign Simon was busy at the Tower, having applied in 1660 "for the employment of Chief Engraver to his Majesty and the Mint," a position which he states that "he held under the late king." He asks "for pardon, because by order of Parliament he made the Great Seal of 1643, and was their chief graver of the Mint and seals"—a no small offence, for Charles I. had declared that he would "proceed with all severity against anyone counterfeiting our Great Seal or money," and the act had been pronounced high treason by a statute of Edward III. The post for which Simon asked was, as I have just said, reserved for Rawlins, but on May 31st, 1661, we find in the State Papers a grant "to Thomas Simon of the office of one of the Engravers of the King's arms, shields and stamps," and Mr. Nightingale, in the Numismatic Chronicle, quotes a patent dated June 2nd, 1661, appointing him with an allowance of £50 a year to succeed "Nicholas Briot, defunct," thus naturally ignoring all the warrants of the Commonwealth or of Cromwell.

It is fairly clear that at first Thomas Rawlins and Simon shared in name the office of chief engraver, but that most of the work devolved upon the latter; whilst, subsequently, the Roettiers were almost alone responsible for the milled coinage, Simon being employed

1 *Cal. State Papers*, Treasury books, 1660-1667, July 7th, 1660: "Thomas Swallow restored to his office as Clerk of the Irons and Surveyor of the Melting House in the Mint. . . . Thomas Rawlins restored to his place as graver of the Mint, David Ramage to be continued in his present employment of preserving all the mills, presses, cutters and other engines for making money at the Mint." Early Entry Book I, p. 12.


3 See p. 200 of this Journal.

4 Wyon's *Great Seals*, pp. 86 and 89.


6 *Num. Chron.*, 1st series, vol. iv, p. 222. Vertue, *Medals, Coins, etc.*, p. 55, also quotes this document as being in the "Office Book of the Rolls Chapel" and says that Simon was appointed thereby "Chief Graver of the Mint."
upon seals and medals, and the alteration of some of his own dies; but there is one entry in the State Papers which might lead us to suppose that Rawlins had a hand in the first coinage usually attributed entirely to Simon. This order is addressed to Sir William Parkhurst, who had been reinstated by Charles II. in the place of warden of the Mint, which he had held under Charles I. It is dated June, 1660, almost immediately after the Restoration, and directs the preparation of irons “for coining money at the Mint, and to cause Thomas Rawlins, chief-engraver, to grave the king’s effigies, etc., thereon.” No coinage has, however, been identified as the work of Rawlins, except, perhaps, the patterns for some copper farthings, but it is of course possible that he, being very apt as a copyist, may have assisted Simon in the production of the hammered money always attributed to him alone.

Rawlins remained in office until 1670, when on his demise he was apparently succeeded in some branches of his work by Henry Harris, but though there are in the State Papers some few notices of the work of Rawlins, they are of the early years of Charles II.’s reign and appear to refer principally to seals, and I notice that the petition of Harris is “for the place of engraver of the seals of his Majesty, void by death of... Rawlins.” The grant to Henry Harris, which follows, specifies “the office of making and engraving the king’s signets, arms, seals, etc., except the irons of the Mint and medals—salary, £50 a year.” Curiously enough, a draft for this document speaks of the post as being “void by death of Thos. Symon, to whom it was granted in 1661, including the office of graving the irons”; but, as it is apparent that the place of graver of seals did not remain unfilled from the time of Simon’s decease in 1665 until 1670, it is possible that the draft was erroneously worded, for we shall find that in the interval a great seal

---

2 Patterns for farthings exist bearing the initial R, but are attributed by some authorities to Ramage.
4 Calendar of State Papers Dom., Addenda 1660–70, p. 525, November 11th, 1670, Entry Book 34, p. 56. Minute.
5 Calendar of State Papers Dom., Car. II., 280, No. 97.
had been engraved by Roettier, and it would rather appear that Harris succeeded to the place of Rawlins almost as a sinecure, for no coins nor medals by him are known.

The *Calendar of Domestic State Papers* contains many references to Simon, amongst others, the authorisation to make the dies for the coinage in the beginning of 1661–62, but we know that he came yet earlier to the assistance of Rawlins. *Ruding*\(^1\) quotes commands of August 10th, August 18th and September 21st, 1660; the two former being printed in full in the second edition of Vertue’s biography of Simon,\(^2\) whilst the last is there dated 1661, but probably by mistake. We read an order of the “tenth August, twelveth year of our reign to cause Thomas Symonds to draw and grave and cause to be drawn and graven all such patterns and irons” as were needed. Under August the 18th we find a notice to hurry the engraver, who, “by reason he pretended he had other warrants for graving several seals for Scotland and Ireland,” was behind-hand with his dies, and ordering that he should “forbear all other services until he hath perfected all things which belong to him to doe for setting the Mint presently at worke, and that he use all speed and diligence herein, suitable to the absoluteness of this order and herof he is not to faile.”

Another paper given by Vertue is a warrant from Charles to Simon, dated August the 25th, “the twelveth yeare of our reign,” telling him to prepare the several stamps for gold and silver according to the draughts “herein expressed.”\(^3\) One of these drawings is of a shilling of the first coinage. Then follows the command of September the 21st, 1660, by which the king directs that “you forthwith prepare the original and master puncheon and charges, as also some dies or stamps for our gold and silver coin,”\(^4\) and this document in its turn refers to a former order of June 27th—which was about the time that a warrant was issued to Rawlins to the same effect.

That Simon, in course of time, obeyed the behest is clear, for in

---

\(^1\) *Ruding*, vol. ii, p. 2.
\(^2\) Vertue’s *Medals, Coins, etc.*, of Simon, ed. 1780, Appendices i, ii and iii.
\(^3\) Vertue’s *Medals, etc.*, ed. 1780, p. 69.
\(^4\) *Vertue*, p. 84.
\(^5\) *Ruding*, ii, p. 2.
Simon journeys to France.
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his account, printed in Appendix V of Vertue's book,\(^1\) he charges £280 "for fourteen several original stamps by way of the hammer, viz., the crown, the half-crown, the shilling, the sixpence, the fourpence, the threepence, the twopence, the penny, the halfpenny in silver, and for gold the twenty, the ten, and the five shilling and the angel piece."\(^2\) The celerity desired by the impatient Charles was unattainable, he, however; naturally objecting to the coins of the Commonwealth, caused them to be proclaimed as non-current after November 30th,\(^3\) 1661, a date extended for payments to the king until the following March. Simon had other business to occupy him as well as that of cuneator, for his coronation medal\(^4\) of April, 1661, is one of his most finished works, nor was his plea that he was employed upon the seals, etc., vain,\(^5\) and when it was decided that the coinage should be milled, there was extra trouble in store for him.

On November 8th, 1661,\(^6\) Simon was sent to France on business connected with his office, and to obtain the services of Blondeau. As

---

\(^1\) Vertue's Medals, p. 89.
\(^2\) Vertue's Medals, pp. 69\(^*\) and 70\(^*\), Plate xxxix, D and E. This angel is not known in its entirety excepting by a sketch upon the warrant figured in Vertue, but in proof of the fact that Simon made the die, I may mention that I have a cliché of the reverse.
\(^3\) Riving, vol. ii, p. 6, and Pepys, November 30th, 1661: "This is the last day for the old State's coyne to pass in common payments, but they say it is to pass in publique payment to the king three months still."
\(^4\) Simon charges £110 for the original coronation medal and £10 10s. besides for "engraving the stamps and coyning to the value of £300 work for the use of his Majestie." Vertue's Medals, etc., Appendix V, fo. 89.
\(^6\) Calendar State Papers Dom., 1661-62, p. 140.
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was not unusual in those days, the expenses incurred by him upon this journey remained unpaid for years, and were still owing to him at the time of his death.\textsuperscript{1} It has been suggested\textsuperscript{2} that Simon himself on this occasion arranged for the arrival in England of the Roettiers, in whom he hoped to find auxiliaries, little thinking that they would prove his rivals, and one cannot help feeling that had Simon been willing to hasten his movements and provide a more hurried though less admirable coinage, he would have retained the place of coiner to the end.

The hammered pieces suffered largely from the rapidity with which they were produced, and Pepys tells us how superior were the dies as compared with the impressions.\textsuperscript{3} He writes: "Met with Mr. Slingsby,\textsuperscript{4} who showed me the stamps for the king's new coinage; which is strange to see, how good they are in the stamps and bad in the money, for lack of skill to make them; but he says Blondeau\textsuperscript{5} will shortly come over, and then we shall have it better, and the best in the world." Blondeau's installation at the Tower was some time delayed, and the hammered coinage was not abolished as quickly as Pepys hoped that it would be. His expression of opinion as to the faulty striking of the

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{proof_for_a_broad_1st_coinage_of_charles_ii.png}
\caption{Proof for a Broad. 1st Coinage of Charles II.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{1} Petition from his widow, see \textit{Num. Chron.}, 1st series, vol. iv, p. 228.
\textsuperscript{2} By Mr. Burn in \textit{Num. Chron.}, 1st series, vol. iii, p. 161.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Pepys}, February 8th, 1660-61.
\textsuperscript{4} Henry Slingsby, deputy master of the Mint, was no friend to Simon, and it may have been partly owing to his influence that the Englishman was superseded by his foreign rival. Pepys tells us that when he visited the Mint on 9th March, 1662-3, and compared Simon's work with that of Roettier "he (Slingsby) extolls those of Roettier above all others."
\textsuperscript{5} Blondeau was at this time still working at the Paris mint where the mill and screw, after many vicissitudes, had been re-established under Varin in 1640. See \textit{Num. Chron.}, 4th series, vol. ix, p. 84.
coins is corroborated by two clichés in my possession, proofs in thin silver foil for a broad and for a half-crown respectively, of the 1st series, which clearly show the excellence of the design when carefully reproduced from the dies. The broad in the current coin loses in sharpness, and the half-crown of this date is very rarely seen in sufficiently good condition for comparison. In spite, however, of the disadvantages under which the hammered issues laboured, they are in my eyes more pleasing in composition though perhaps less like the king, than is the subsequent milled coinage by Roettier.

The improvement in the method of striking may be seen in the little silver pieces concerning which Simon makes a claim for £35 in payment for work done in “altering the stamps for the fourpenny, threepenny, twopenny and penny by way of the mill, wherein I and my servant wrought two months.”

Mr. Burn in the *Numismatic*
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Chronicle,\(^1\) writes that "this change has reference to the pieces having the king's bust extending to the edge of the coin, the legend commencing on the left side from the breast. The alteration was from those having the bust within the legend designated the 1st sort (by Mr. Hawkins), which from their extreme scarcity ought to be classed among the pattern pieces of Thomas Simon." Mr. Hawkins\(^2\) considered this more regularly struck series to be intended to serve as Maundy money.

A very clear and interesting article describing and illustrating these small coins will be found in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1879, pp. 92-98, by Mr. Webb, in which he calls these examples Type II and Type VI respectively. The little coins are interesting as proving that Simon still gave his attention to numismatic work after the Roettiers had displaced him as caudator at the mint. The *Calendar of Domestic State Papers* contains many references to our English engraver's activity at the Tower after the decision in favour of the Roettiers, and we know that he was employed in making stamps for the coinage in Scotland from November, 1662, to January, 1663.\(^3\) The Scottish coinage was not issued until 1664, and the twenty-mark piece in gold, though enumerated in the list of his claims\(^4\) did not make its appearance. An order of the Privy Council of October 20th, 1663,

\(^1\) *Num. Chron.*, 1st series, vol. iii, 166.
\(^3\) *Num. Chron.*, 1st series, vol. iii, p. 166, and *Vertue's Medals*, pp. 71* to 72*.
\(^4\) *Vertue's Medals, Coins, etc.*, Appendix V, p. 91. "£100 for original stamps for eight several sorts of coynes for gold and silver moneys for Scotland, gold twenty mark piece, ten mark piece, two mark piece, half mark piece, and forty penny piece all in a new manner and form to coyne by way of the mill or press engraving. . . . I have only delivered the silver," and on p. 72* we find Maitland remarking on the omission of the gold puncheons, whilst acknowledging receipt of the silver species of "on hundred and sixtie punsions whereof there is saiven hard punsions, saiven for graving of plate and the rest small punsions for giving impressions."
intrusted the making of the dies to Joachim Harder, the graver of
the Edinburgh Mint, and although Simon specifies the puncheons, etc.,
as amongst his works, it is difficult to decide the exact amount of his
responsibility in the matter. The bust is fairly good and like the king,
but not equal to the English portraits. But Simon had little leisure
to bestow upon the coinage for the entries concerning seals are
continual, sometimes as many as 23 or even 25 being mentioned
in one bill or receipt, whilst other items occur at intervals, and
the work of engraving the great seal of 1663 must have occupied much of
his time.

Clarendon, writing in 1655, tells us that “The king had been
without a great seal, it having been lost. But he had lately employed
a graver to prepare a great seal, which he kept himself, not intending
to confer that office whilst he remained abroad.” This seal, which is
dated 1653, remained in use for ten years, for Mr. Wyon informs us
that impressions from it are found upon parchments until it was replaced
in 1663 by the very fine work of Simon, and quotes the following
document concerning the latter. “At the Court of Whitehall the
17th June, 1663, Present the king’s most excellent Majestie in Council.
This day Mr. Symonds, his Majestie’s graver presented his Majestie
with a new Great Seale which was delivered to the Lord High
Chancellor of England.” The seal made in 1653 was, it appears, far
inferior to its successors, but one cannot help wondering whether it was
the first product of the exiled king’s acquaintance with some member

1 Burns’ *Coinage of Scotland*, vol. ii, p. 494.
2 Some years after the death of Simon a slight change was made in the Scottish
coinage after 1672, at which date some of the marks are initialed F, by Falconer,
son-in-law of Briot. The second issue ordered in 1675, comprising the dollar and its parts,
was entrusted to Roettier; on these the style and work nearly resemble the English coins,
but the portraiture does the artist no credit, the king’s face being utterly devoid of
expression.
5 *Cal. State Papers Dom.*, p. 17, September 20th, 1664, vol. cii, and April, 1664, in
Cal. of the years 1663-4, p. 543, and Vertue’s *Medals, etc.*, Appendix V.
6 *Wyon*, Plate XXXVII, p. 57.
8 *Wyon*, Appendix A, p. 139, from the *Records of the Privy Council*. 
of the Roettier family, for it resembles in design the counter-seal of 1672, which should I think be attributed to the Dutch engraver. Mr. Wyon points to some confusion on the part of Vertue who, in his biography of Simon describes the seal of 1672 as the work of that medallist, though in reality it was made after his demise. We find orders for a great seal in the State Papers dated February 22nd and March 6th, 1667, to John and Joseph Roettier, "to make a new Great Seal in the same form as that now in use," but Mr. Wyon tells us that the new design appears first upon documents of 1672, and that the older seal was still used in 1670. This was the year of the appointment of Harris, but I think we may safely assume from its general resemblance to his work, that the new seal is from the hand of Roettier. Mr. J. H. Burn moreover published in the Numismatic Chronicle an undated petition and a letter of August, 1684, addressed respectively to the Commissioners of the Treasury and to Lord Rochester, praying for payment of £200 still due to John Roettier out of £400 for two great seals. The petitioner stated that he had received the first £200 "some short time before your Lordships' last adjournment."

The subject is too long and intricate for me to enter into details here, but it seems possible that the two great seals are: firstly, that engraved from the old pattern as ordered in 1666-7, and secondly, that made from a new design brought into use between 1670 and 1672. Or again, it is possible that the idea of renewing the old seal in 1667 was abandoned in favour of a fresh, and consequently somewhat deferred equestrian portrait of the king, for Mr. Akerman in an article written in an earlier volume of the same publication, showed good reason for thinking that a charge made by Roettier in 1677 for engraving a great

1 Vertue's Medals, Plate XXVIII, and Wyon, Plate XXXVIII, pp. 107 and 190.
3 Wyon, p. 105.
4 Cal. State Papers, Addenda, 1669, 1670, p. 525. See also p. 227 of this Journal. Ruding (vol. i, p. 45) stated erroneously, I think, that Henry Harris was appointed engraver in 1680. We have seen that the office conferred on him in 1670 was that of seal engraver only, exclusively of that of cuneator. He was made chief engraver in March 1689-90. See Cal. Treasury Papers, 1659-66, March 19-22, 1689-90, vol. vii, 69.
Competition between Simon and Roettier.

seal, should be associated with a former undated petition referring to the order of 1667; and it appears to me that this account for £246 3s. 2d.¹ seems unduly high if no new design were provided, whilst one of the items “for making of the moulds and casting of the great seal at several times” suggests alterations in the scheme which would delay the production. If we suppose that the appeal of 1677 met with no immediate response, the pressing demands of 1684 might represent the balance for the expenses incurred for the newly designed seal of circa 1672, and a subsequent reproduction of the same model at a lower rate which would be only natural.

But a truce to surmise. We have wandered too far from the early years of the reign, and must return to the time when, on January 31st, 1661–2, Simon was commanded to lay aside all other business and prepare puncheons, dies, etc., for coining by press and screw,² and yet again on February 3rd “to make stamps for the new coin.”³ The orders issued to the Roettiers bear almost the same date, for we read that they are enjoined on January 24th, 1661–2, to produce “counter puncheons and matrices for coining by press,”¹ and on February 7th the contest between the engravers is foreshadowed, for we find a warrant “to permit Thos. Simon one of the chief gravers, and John and Joseph Roettier severally to engage a trial piece of silver of the value of five shillings according to drafts shown to the king; and none to disturb them till the work is done and presented to his Majesty for judgement.”⁵

We frequently find that Simon was unable to keep pace with the demands made upon his time. In the State Papers of 1662, there is a “Warrant to the officers of the mint to coin by the hammer into 20/s and 10/s pieces such defective gold as Stephen Fox⁶ shall deliver

¹ The total charge was £246 3s. 2d., but the sum of £48 5s. od. had been paid on account, leaving the balance remaining due £197 18s. 2d.
⁶ Stephen Fox was the Army Paymaster.
unto the Mint, the dyes made by Thos. Simon for coining with press and screw being found insufficient for the service."

I believe that I am right in stating that we are acquainted with no milled ten-shilling piece by Simon. Mr. Kenyon states that "some patterns for gold units and double-crowns were executed by him;" but I have found no evidence concerning a half-broad. One of the finest portraits is that of 1662, and it is probable that it is to the dies for this coin that the engraver alludes in his list of charges as having occupied him and his servants during "nine and ten weeks' time," and he requires £45 for its manufacture. There are other patterns, sometimes classed as milled broads by Simon, made in 1660, which appear with three differing busts to right, and two different reverses, and they are singularly beautiful. Examples are found in silver, and Folkes thought that some varieties might be intended for currency in that metal. The acknowledged pattern, namely, that of 1662, is not unlike the hammered coinage, but presents some slight varieties, though the head is always turned towards the left.

By this time the friction between the rival cuneators had reached so acute a stage, that in April, 1662, Henry Slingsby deposed in a report to the Council that he and his colleagues "had proposed unto Thomas Simon and John Roettier gravers of the Mint to accept of certain praemia therein specified for the furnishing the Mint with stamps for coining in the new way; but that by reason of a contest in art between them, they had found it difficult to bring them to any agreement."

Much has been made of the fact that Simon was called upon on January 24th, 1661-2, to deliver up such coining implements as he had in his keeping to the officers of the Mint, but no disgrace was implied,

---

2 Kenyon's Gold Coins, p. 171.
5 Folkes' Table, etc., p. 107.
6 Two specimens illustrated, Montagu Catalogue, Plate XIII, Nos. 820 and 822.
7 Ruding, vol. ii, p. 8; Folkes' Table of English Silver Coins, p. 106.
Advent of the Roettiers.

and similar directions concerning Briot's dies were given in the following August to Ramage and other members of the staff. These directions appear to have merely been preventives against carrying on the business outside the precincts of the Tower, because there was evidence that some of the late king's puncheons had been offered for sale, and although it has been asserted¹ that no more official commands from the Mint were issued to Simon, we have seen that this was far from being the case.

But it was, no doubt, not from any dissatisfaction with Simon, unless perhaps for his dilatoriness, but in order to accelerate an already hurried issue that the king had sent for the Roettiers, whose talents he had possibly learned to appreciate during his residence abroad. According to Walpole,² Charles had borrowed money in his exile at Antwerp, of the father, a goldsmith—the banker of those days—and wished in consequence to employ the sons. This story is discountenanced by Mr. Burn, writing in the Numismatic Chronicle,³ but Mr. Nightingale in a later article⁴ in the same publication, says that he sees no reason for thinking that Walpole should not have been correct, inasmuch as he had his information through Vertue, who obtained it in 1745 from the then surviving members of the Roettier family. The anecdote is, moreover, inherently probable, for Charles in his early years was compelled to live from hand to mouth, whilst his followers almost starved on borrowed means, so that on his arrival in England the arrears of the debts he had incurred on the Continent pressed heavily upon him, and any way of repaying them without monetary outlay was most welcome to him.

Be this as it may, the triumph of the Dutch family was assured, and on the 19th of May, 1662,⁵ John Roettier was commanded "to prepare all the master puncheons, letters and charges for silver and gold coins to be made by mill and press, and to make dies for coining according to directions," and on the same day⁶ he was appointed to be

"one of the chief engravers of the Mint," and to receive "£50 a year from the Mint with a convenient dwelling house."

We have seen that on the accession of Charles, David Ramage had been permitted to retain his post as superintendent of the mills and presses. At about this period he died, but still a difficulty arose concerning the installation of Blondeau, and until Blondeau could be established, the milled coinage must wait. It was natural that Simon should have been anxious to obtain the services of the French engineer, who in the time of the Commonwealth, both in 1651 and in 1656, had been the rival of David Ramage and the able coadjutor of Simon in striking the milled coinage.

In 1656, the question of his domicile had been mooted, and it was preliminarily settled that the Wardens of the Mint should allot to him "that house in the Tower where M. Biott formerly worked," and he was "authorised to use all such forges and tools as are there and such others in the Tower as he needs, and Mr. Simons to prepare the dies with fitting stamps and inscriptions," and his salary was fixed at £100 a year.

But Blondeau was desirous of secrecy, for he had his own method of striking money, and Worcester House was then suggested, but finally it was settled by the Protector's Council after much debate that his mills should be erected at Drury House, and that if necessary the books and papers of one Abraham Brown should be displaced for his convenience. It was there that Oliver's money was struck. Drury

---

1 See note to p. 226.
3 David Ramage died some time between August, 1662, and the November of that year. See pp. 237 and 239.
House stood at the corner of Drury Lane and Wych Street, having been built in the reign of Elizabeth by Sir William Drury. It was rebuilt and its name changed to Craven House, as the residence of Lord Craven, and as such was for a short time after the Restoration the abode of Elizabeth of Bohemia, but in the year 1656 it was in the hands of the Trustees of the Delinquents’ Lands and was turned into Government offices.

Would that Blondeau had remained in England, for the trouble of installation had now to be faced again amid endless delays, and accommodation had to be found for him at the Mint. The *State Papers* contain many entries on this subject. Under date November 6th, 1662: “There is a notice to remove especially the widow and children of David Ramage, still living between the gates of the Mint, who have obstructed the service and been very obstinate, in order that the workmen employed in the new way of coining may have dwelling houses.” Directions follow “for erecting and preparing tools and engines for the new way of coining gold and silver by mill and press with grained edges.” Money had been voted for the purpose. It had been agreed on May 17th, 1662, that Blondeau should have letters of denization, the handsome pension of £100 a year, and lodgings in the Tower. In the following October, the title of Engineer to the Mint was granted to him, but it was some time before the new regulations could be put into force, and it appears that the purchase money for the sale of Dunkirk was also awaited to be used as bullion.

This last difficulty is finally overcome. Pepys tells us that on November 21st, 1662, “This day come the king’s pleasure ships from Calais with the Dunkirke money, being 400,000 pistolles,” and three days later, viz., under November 24th, that “the king and duke are come this morning to the Tower to see the Dunkirke

---

3 *Cal. State Papers*, 1661-2, pp. 562 and 574, November 18th, 1662, vol. lxiii, Entry Book 9, 64, and November 28th, vol. lxiii, docquet.
4 *Cal. State Papers Dom.* 1661-62, p. 522, vol. lxi, Entry Book 9, p. 6. This grant is for twenty-one years, but Blondeau left England again in April, 1664, and I have not been able to ascertain whether he continued to receive any payment from England.
money . . . we saw none of the money, but Mr. Slingsby did show the king, and I did see the stamps of the new money that is now to be made by Blondeau's fashion, which are very neat and very like the king." On February the 6th, the new coinage was put in hand, and on March 9th, 1662-3, we again find Pepys privately examining samples of the new milled coin at the Mint; but under May 19th of that year he informs us that by "the method of making this new money . . . they now coyne between 16 and 24,000 pounds a week," for Roettier's coinage had been proclaimed current on March 27th, 1663.2

There are crowns by the Dutch engraver of 1662, but these must be considered as the forerunners of the general issue, and we may bear in mind that in those times the 27th of March was reckoned but as the third day of the new year.

In August, 1663, a commission attended by Evelyn commenced its sittings and busied itself with the affairs of the Mint.3 As late as March 9th, 1663-4, he writes in his diary, "Now it was that the fine mill'd coin both of white money and guineas was established."

No specimen of Simon's crown dated 1662 is known. The Reddite Crown with its Latin appeal on its edge to "render unto

---

1 Folkes’ Table of English Coins, p. 108.
3 Evelyn’s Diary, August 20th and 27th, 1663, and March 9th, 1663-4.
4 The legend on the Reddite Crown is Reddite Quae Caesaris Caesaris, etc., followed by the word Post, clouds and a rising sun, for Post nubila Phoebus.
Caesar the things which are Caesar's," with the hope expressed symbolically that after darkness comes light, the yet rarer specimens with the English translation of the Latin invocation and the Petition crown, all bear the date 1663. The inscription on the former specimens may have been intended by Simon to apply, not as is usually thought, to his own re-establishment as cuneator, but to the "glorious restoration" of Charles II., and the idea crosses the mind of the enquirer: Was this Reddite coin the rejected pattern crown; was Roettier's coinage given the preference because his work was first presented to the king?

By the kindness of Mr. Spink, I am able to illustrate the Reddite crown, which bears exactly the same portrait as the more celebrated Petition crown, and is perhaps less well known, being yet more rare than the wonderful tour de force so much prized by collectors.

Simon's Petition crown, with its pathetic appeal upon the edge, was of course placed before the commission mentioned above, but the masterpiece was of no avail. Mr. Burn tells us that twenty specimens of this coin were said to have been struck, one of which was presented to Lord Chancellor Clarendon. Mr. Bergne, writing in 1853, was able

1 Mr. Bergne in Num. Chron., xvi, 1st series, pp. 141-146, enumerates eleven specimens of the Reddite in silver and two in pewter, and three of the Render-unto-Caeser crown all in pewter.

2 We must bear in mind that there exists in pewter a specimen of the trial crown without any inscription on the edge, and herein we may perhaps find the original pattern prepared by Simon.

to enumerate fifteen examples of this work of art then known, this pattern being found in silver only.¹

These relics have usually been most carefully preserved, but even a worn coin realises a comparatively large sum, whilst a perfect crown has been known to sell for £500 at public auctions.

Although we may feel with truth that Roettier's bust of Charles compares ill with that of Simon, it is yet not to be despised, and we should remember to the credit of all artists concerned in portraying this monarch that they had an ugly model. Indeed, the head on John Roettier's crown is so fine that one may see the character of the man, and admire the mixture of cynicism, cleverness, good nature and wit displayed, the latter quality sparkling so much in the individual that the reverse of the picture was forgotten in the glamour surrounding him. Charles II., lacking most of his father's best characteristics, possessed the two gifts most necessary to a king, powers in which Charles I. was wanting—the gift of speech—i.e., the art of always saying the right thing, and the no less capacity for profiting by the actions of others, for his tact enabled him to succeed where others failed.

An instance of his happy turn of phrase is found in the story, which tells how he refused to ratify the choice of the House of Commons of a Speaker² obnoxious to himself, when he, the only monarch who ever ventured to dispute the election of such an official, put all right by the pretty speech that he "reserved him for higher preferment."

He practised a politic, if rather cynical loyalty to his ministers working good or evil, which led him to say, "I will stick by my old friends, for if I do not I shall have nobody stick to me," or again, "my father died for forsaking his servant; for myself, I will die some other way."

It was this loyalty which led him to reinstate his father's old adherents, Parkhurst, Swallowe and Rawlins. It was this tact which endeared him to his people, a people to whom he returned on the

² Sir Edward Seymour in 1678.
Character of Charles II.

swing of the pendulum, a people tired of the austere ways of Oliver Cromwell, a people who had found out that their so-called liberties were less regarded under a military government than under a monarch, and who were ready to welcome a little enjoyment with the rather sentimental love which arose from the sensational death of the late king.

Although the younger Charles was in every way inferior to his father as a judge of art, he yet was a collector of miniatures and of curios, and a generous supporter of talent. He gave encouragement to anything which tended to the glorification of his court and his kingdom, and was ever ready to take the advice of such men as John Evelyn in the employment of a young artist or in the reward of merit, giving great attention to the architectural plans of London after the fire of 1666, at which time he put himself to serious personal inconvenience to relieve the distressed.

Charles II., who had absolutely no personal vanity, was most anxious to introduce a simpler taste in dress into England, less liable to change than that he had seen in his youth at the court of France. Pepys, who though born of an old Cambridgeshire family, and cousin to his patron Edward Montagu, first Earl of Sandwich,1 was himself the son of a tailor, and always interested in sartorial affairs, says:

"The King hath yesterday in Council declared his resolution of setting a fashion in dress, which will never alter. It will be a vest, I know not well how, but it is to teach the nobility thrift, and will do good."

A few days later the diarist further explains:2 "This day the King begins to put on his new vest . . . being a long cassock close to the body, of black cloth and pined with white silk under it, and a coat over it, and the legs ruffled with black riband like a pigeon's leg . . . they say the King says the pinking upon the whites

1 Sandwich held an important commission in the navy, and Pepys, who acted as secretary to his cousin on his taking the command of the fleet which brought Charles II. back to England at the Restoration, owed much to his relationship throughout the earlier portion of the reign. It was Sandwich who procured for him his appointment as Clerk of the Acts of the Navy.
2 Pepys, October 8th, 1666.
3 Pepys, October 13th, 15th and 17th.
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makes them too much like magpies, therefore hath bespoke one of plain velvet.” The removal of the white no doubt increased the utility of the suit, but we do not usually associate the word “thrift” with the court of Charles, and one is glad to hear that he should have made some efforts in that direction, though the well-meant effort was not long sustained, for the French King, resenting the fact that England no more adopted Paris fashions, caused his footmen to assume the dress of the English court, and his derision was too much for the courage even of Charles II. Too good-natured to refuse anything to others, too pleasure-loving to deny anything to himself, we can only attribute his sudden excess of economy to the distress occasioned by the terrible fire of the preceding month, or to the strong interest taken by the king in the navy, which was at that time in great straits for money. Once more to quote the diarist, who was again in this instance talking of a matter which, as Clerk of the Acts of the Navy, he was in a position fully to understand,1 Pepys says: “Time spending and no money to set anything in hand with, the end must be speedy ruin.”2 Charles II.’s anxiety concerning the introduction of a standing army is well known. His pride in his navy was even greater, and is commemorated by several naval medals bearing good portraits of the king—witness Med. III., vol. i, pp. 503 and 504, Nos. 139 to 141, and p. 506, Nos. 144 and 145, etc., by Roettier, Rawlins and Simon respectively.

I illustrate the example by Roettier struck to celebrate the Battle of Lowestoft.3 This is one of his best presentments of Charles.

The Nos penes imperium medal, Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 506, No. 144, is supposed to have been struck in celebration of the same victory. It is, according to Mr. Nightingale, “entitled to rank as the finest example of Rawlins’s talent as an artist,”4 and he places it on a par with the Petition crown.

1 Samuel Pepys became “Clerk of the Acts of the Navy” in 1660 and “Secretary for the affairs of the Navy” in 1673.
2 Pepys Diary, October 8th, 1666.
3 3rd of June, 1665.
No one will deny that the third specimen which I have mentioned—No. 145, a small medal claiming the dominion of the sea—is one of Simon's most remarkably finished works.¹

¹ The reverse of this medal is an elaboration of the seal made by Simon for the Admiralty Office. See Vertue's Medals, etc., Plate XXXIII. p. 55.
It has the melancholy honour of being probably his last effort, for it was made to celebrate the naval battle of June 3rd, 1665, and it is known that Simon died no later than July in that year during the plague, his will being proved in the following August. If any further evidence were needed that this artist was active in the service of Charles to the very end, the instance of these medals, all struck to commemorate one event by the three chief engravers, would afford us the opportunity of showing that they worked concurrently as royal medallists. The greater rarity of the specimens executed by Rawlins and Simon would point to the certainty that Roettier's work was selected by the king for general distribution, though this may be partly attributable to the immediate death of Simon. There are other medals by John Roettier struck for the same purpose, and in a list of the medallic works of this artist, it is stated that a smaller example than that illustrated on the former page was designed to be given to persons under the rank of captain, "who had signalised themselves in actions at sea."

I have said that Charles I. was particularly easy to portray; not so Charles II. It is curious how meaningless many of the paintings of this monarch are; but, excepting the miniaturist Cooper, there were few really first-rate painters in England at that period. I am, however, by the kindness of Dr. Williamson, able to give an illustration of a remarkably good drawing in plumbago on vellum by David Loggan, possibly the original sketch for one of his engraved portraits of the king. This German artist, who settled in England before the Restoration, became famous for his highly finished pencilled pictures, which were much in fashion at the courts of Charles II. and the succeeding monarchs. Walpole says that as an engraver he was a pupil of Simon van de Passe in Denmark. The majority of the painters who held

---

1 The will of Thomas Simon was proved August 3rd, 1665, and was dated June 17th, 1665; but it is known that he was still alive on the 1st of July in that year, and he is believed to have died of the plague. *Num. Chron.*, 1st series, vol. v, pp. 167-172, and vol. vii, p. 23.
2 *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, p. 504, No. 140.
3 David Loggan, born at Dantzic about 1630, died in London in 1693.
4 Walpole's *Anecdotes*, vol. iii, p. 217, ed. 1888.
CHARLES II, FROM A DRAWING BY DAVID LOGGAN IN THE COLLECTION OF DR. GEORGE WILLIAMSON.
Portraits of Charles II. by the Court Painters.

the chief positions at court, such as Peter Lely, of whom it was said that "he painted many fine pictures, but few good portraits," and the no less conventional Godfrey Kneller, though possessed of a certain talent, had but small powers of discernment. So much was this the case that Dryden writing concerning the former said: "It was objected against a late noble Painter that he drew many graceful pictures, but few of them were like, and this happened to him because he always studied himself more than those who sat to him."

Vertue, from whose manuscript I take this criticism, comments thus: "The real reason is that he was not so firm of line in his lineaments as he was an excellent colourist and of a fine freedom of hand." Be this as it may, of both Lely and Kneller one may say that their pictures, with some exceptions, are more like each other than they are or can have been like the individual model, whereas the sculptural, numismatic and medallic portraits of the day sparkle with life and expression, and the colossal marble bust, the gift of Mr. Durlacher to the nation, now at the Victoria and Albert Museum, and the famous Petition crown seem to me infinitely more suggestive of the man, than are the majority of the painted effigies of the versatile Charles with which I am acquainted. I have, however, the pleasure of reproducing in colour as the frontispiece to this paper, a very striking and original chalk sketch of Charles II. by Sir Peter Lely in Mr. W. Sharp Ogden's possession. Unlike many pictures of this artist, the colouring is especially correct, for most of Lely's portraits show the king with a coal-black wig with none of the chestnut lights to be seen in the hair of all the Stuarts, whether dark or fair. This peculiarity is so well given in our sketch that I should be inclined to regard it as a proof that it must have been crayoned before Charles adopted the fashionable coiffure. Lady Chaworth, writing to her brother, Lord Roos, concerning a copy made for her in 1676 of an oil painting by this artist,

1 Grainger's Biographical History, vol. iv, p. 117.
3 The bust is dated 1684, and is signed HONNORE PELLE, but I regret to say that I have so far been unable to identify the sculptor. To judge by his treatment of the subject, he would appear to be of the school of Bernini. The signature may, of course, be an abbreviation.
comments on his inaccuracy as a colourist: "I have made the copier correct Mr. Lilie's fault towards all men in wronging, by making blacker, older and moroser in his draughts than they are."

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of correct colouring. The saying of the Italian Bernini that "it is the impossiblest thing in the world to make a picture in stone naturally resembling any person" was exemplified by him to his sitter, Mr. Nicholas Stone, by covering the face of a man with flour, and then asking the Englishman whether he should have known him. His negative reply proved that the tint of the eyes, the hair and general appearance of the face carry more weight than the bare fact of accurate outline.

Charles II. was not handsome, having, as was once said of him, "a most saturnine harsh countenance," which, however, was belied by his character and often exaggerated in his pictures, especially in his youth. This, again, was redeemed in life by the fire of his eyes and in the liveliness of the ever-changing expression of the otherwise ugly mouth, which it is so difficult for an artist to portray, and it is ever in the eyes and mouth that we must look for a true likeness. Successful as was Thomas Simon in his portraiture, even he cannot conceal, indeed he was rather apt to accentuate, the king's chief blemish, the large mouth which he inherited from his mother, and this to a certain extent spoils the appearance of the hammered gold coinage, though it is less prominent in the pattern guineas of 1660 and 1662. In dealing with this difficulty, we see the true artist, for who can fail to be struck by this feature as represented on the *Jam Florescit* medal, *Med. Ill.* i, p. 475, No. 83, illustrated here, p. 251, and still more so on the masterpiece called the Petition crown, where the expression of the cynic comes out most strongly. This force was so characteristic of all Simon's portraiture that Pepys, comparing the coinage prepared by Roettier for Charles, with that designed for Oliver by Simon, tells us


3 See p. 236.

4 Pepys, March 9th, 1662-3; "and, indeed, I think they are the better because the sweeter of the two; but upon my word, those of the Protector are more like, in my mind, than the King's, but both very well worth seeing." See p. 216.
that he thought the king's likeness "the better, because the sweeter of the two," though we have seen that he considered the coins of the Protector to be more truly representative of the models portrayed.

Curiously enough, the sardonic curl of the lips is far more marked in nearly all the coins, whether by Simon or Roettier, than in the various miniatures of the witty monarch painted by Samuel Cooper, on whose work we should be able to rely for accuracy, for he was so faithful an artist that we may even note in one of the splendid miniatures at Windsor, that the king's parting was becoming thin, a fact which serves to date the painting, inasmuch as Charles began to wear a wig towards the end of 1663 or in the beginning of 1664.1 It is possible the sketch specially executed by Cooper for the coinage may give this peculiarly cynical expression, but this sketch I have never seen; and most of the miniatures present a three-quarter face view unsuitable for the purpose.

It is said of Henrietta Maria, that when she arrived in France, very ill after the birth of her youngest child and her subsequent flight from Exeter, she was so thin that her face appeared to be all mouth, and this feature, which is hardly noticeable in the beautiful portraits of her by Van Dyck, was indeed the great disfigurement of her son, and must to a certain extent mar all his portraits. But in spite of this blemish his coins are very fine, although his greatest attractions, namely, his extremely handsome stature2 and carriage, were, of course, lost in the scope of a small metal disc.

Burnet, whose remarks upon Charles II. were often characterised by bad taste and inaccuracy, compares him in appearance and disposition with Tiberius. He says that he saw a statue of this emperor at Rome, which, but for the fact that Tiberius had lost his teeth, "was so like King Charles, that Prince Borghese and Signior Domenico, to whom it belonged, did agree with me in thinking that it looked like a statue made for him."3 I do not recall the marble in

---

1 Pepys mentions under November 2nd, 1663, that the king is turning grey, and intends to wear a wig; and on the following April 18th, 1664, that he has seen him for the first time "with his periwig, but not altered at all."

2 Charles II. was 6 feet 2 inches in height and remarkably well proportioned.

3 Burnet's History of His Own Times, vol. ii, p. 482.
question, but I have studied many busts and gems representing the emperor at various ages, and have examined, side by side, the coins of the two rulers. Those of Tiberius are very handsome and finely executed, but the shape of the mouth is different and in such statues as bear no mark of restoration, the bridge of the nose is much higher than is that of Charles II., and though at the first glance a certain likeness may be seen between the two portraits on the coins, the expression of the faces does not justify the malevolent comparison.

Of the large quantity of his badges with their varying busts, I have spoken before,\(^1\) but they are mostly of inferior execution, and would not in any case come under the head of artistic portraiture. They were hastily cast to stir up that loyalty which the far more beautiful memorials of his father had tended to preserve; some of them, however, by Thomas Rawlins, are worthy of study.

Amongst the best works of this artist are the medals designed for the coronation\(^2\) bearing the words *Dixi Custodiam*.\(^3\) The finish of these is so admirable that it rivals that of the Coronation medal of Simon, illustrated on p. 217, and which is usually quoted as the masterpiece of that medallist. But many of the portraits executed by Rawlins lack the vigour of Simon's work, the expression of the king's face wanting the individuality he so eminently possessed, though the little badges of Charles when a boy are sufficiently like the charming miniature by David de Grange, the property of Lord Dysart at Ham House, and

\(^1\) Vol. ii of this *Journal*, p. 279 et seq.
\(^2\) *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, pp. 473-475, Nos. 78-81.
\(^3\) *Med. Ill.*, i, 473, No. 78, p. 475, No. 83.
CHARLES II. AS KING OF THE SCOTS, FROM A RARE ENGRAVING IN THE COLLECTION OF MR. W. SHARP OGDEN.
some of the pictures at Combe Abbey, or again the rare print from Mr. W. Sharp Ogden's collection which I am permitted to reproduce here to show that the young king, whether portrayed medallically or pictorially possessed many attractions. These badges were, perhaps, coincidently made in France by Rawlins. The signature "G. L." upon our illustration, points to Gabriel Ladame, an artist who often engraved his own drawings. He worked in Paris from 1645 to 1661, and it is therefore likely that he enjoyed the opportunity of personal acquaintance with the young king; and the print would probably be prepared for the expedition into Scotland of 1650, just as Charles was entering his twenty-first year, or on his return in commemoration of the Scottish coronation which took place in January, 1651.

Perhaps the most pleasing likeness of Charles, executed by Thomas Simon, is a larger medal classed amongst those struck to
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commemorate the English coronation, bearing on the reverse the date, April 23rd, 1661, and the inscription, Jam Florescit.

Vertue suggested that this was the medal designed by Abraham Simon,1 by desire of Charles II. for the Knights of the Order of the Royal Oak at the price of £100, but later and more conclusive evidence is given in *Medallic Illustrations of British History* identifying it with the pendant for which his brother Simon received, or rather demanded, £28, for "embossing the head and engraving the reverse." It figures in the list of his claims given in Appendix V of the revised edition of Vertue's life of the artist, published in 1780,2 with the further charge of £20 10s. for two medals bearing this design, given to the king's master cooks, at the weight of 3 oz. 2 dwt. 16 grs., and again for a similar badge for an Italian musician,3 at the sum of £38 although rather lighter, namely, 1 oz. 10 dwt. 8 grs. Vertue says that Walpole's example, which he attributes to Abraham Simon, turned the scales at 4 oz.,4 and I find that the specimen at the British Museum weighs 849½ grains, so one can only assume that the pieces varied largely in thickness of flan. We must conclude that the ornament was worn by members of the royal household.

The portrait is very fine, whether originally designed by Abraham or Thomas Simon, for the elder brother frequently supplied the first waxen sketch; but perhaps even more characteristic of the witty Charles is the slightly cynical portrait on the large and elaborate production of one of the brothers Roettier, to which a similar doubt as to the designer exists. It commemorates the arrival of the king on May 29th, 1660, though it was probably struck about 1665.

This medal, of which unfortunately there are many re-strikes, is inscribed FELICITAS BRITANNIAE and the portrait on the obverse

1 Vertue's *Medals, Coins, etc.*, p. 46.
2 Vertue's *Medals, Coins, etc.*, ed. 1780, p. 89.
3 In the petition for payment sent to the Treasury by Simon's widow, the claim is reduced to £10 10s., because there was neither warrant nor "receipt therefor submitted as aforesaid," i.e., in Simon's former "Accompt." It is thought that the "Italian Musician" was probably Giovanni Baptista Draghi, in the service of Queen Catherine." See *Num. Chron.*, 1st series, vol. iv, p. 228.
4 Vertue's *Medals*, p. 46, note.
is generally attributed to John Roettier, but Nagler assigns it to Philip¹ the third member of the firm, whilst Mr. J. H. Burn³ remarked that it was "stated by the family that the head on the obverse was the work of his brother Joseph,³ afterwards the chief engraver in the French Mint at Paris." The list of works by the Roettiers from which Mr. Burn deduces this information, may be found in the same volume of the Numismatic Chronicle in which he published his article; and was copied by Mr. James Bindley from a paper in the possession of Thomas Snelling in 1776.⁴

I have studied the works of Joseph Roettier in the Bibliothèque Nationale and giving my opinion for what it is worth, I should say that the portrait on this medal bears more affinity to the treatment of John Roettier than to the productions of Joseph, executed later at the French mint. It is of course difficult to dissociate the work of the two brothers, who shared the position of chief engraver of the English coinage until the departure of Joseph for Paris, but in that city it is presumable that the latter was largely responsible from 1672 or 1673 onward for the portraiture on the French currency, especially after 1682, when he became tailleur général des monnaies with the further appointment in 1694 of graveur particulier de la monnaie de Paris.⁵

There is, I understand, amongst the Stuart Papers at Windsor Castle, a complete list of the dies which remained in the hands of Norbert Roettier's widow at the time of his death in 1727. It was often quoted by Mr. Hawkins, but I have not seen it; possibly when the manuscripts of that date shall be sifted we may derive much information concerning the dates of some of the medals, but at present the Stuart Papers are only calendared and printed down to the year 1717,

¹ Philip Roettier was born in 1640 and died at Antwerp in 1712. He would, therefore, be aged twenty-four, or twenty-five, in 1665.
³ Joseph was the second brother. See Num. Chron., 1st series, vol. iii, pp. 57-60, and pedigree on p. 189. Joseph Roettier was born on Aug. 1st, 1635, died at Paris in Sept., 1703, see Rondot, p. 313.
⁵ Les Médailleurs et les Graveurs de Monnaies, par Natalis Rondot. Édité par H. de la Tour, p. 314.
and though I believe that we may shortly expect a volume containing
the documents of the following year, I fear it will be long before we
reach the letters of 1727. Mr. Hawkins, however, can have found
nothing in the list to disturb the usual attribution of the *Felicitas
Britanniae* medal to John Roettier, for he considered it to be his
work.

In a correspondence between the exiled Stuarts and Mrs. Roettier
concerning the dies, the widow asked so large a price for them that
they were left on her hands, but were subsequently acquired by Mathew
Young\(^1\) about one hundred years later, from a man named Cox who
had purchased them from her family.

The dies of the *Felicitas Britanniae* medal were not, however, as
stated by Mr. Burn\(^2\) amongst those purchased by Mr. Young in 1828,
or if they were so, he did not present them to the British Museum
after making re-strikes from them, as was the case with the majority of
the collection. A very short time ago they were offered by their
possessor of the moment to the public, but they are no longer in a
condition for further use, and so the fact that they have not been
defaced is of little importance now.

The medal is in such high relief that it serves as a good example
of the great success of Roettier’s method; being to my mind, in point of
portraiture, one of the finest medals of the day, and it was clearly a good
specimen of the taste of the period, for Evelyn, the art critic of the
court, describes it as “exquisitely designed.”\(^3\)

So highly was this portrait esteemed that Slingsby in 1687 asked
Pepys £4 10s. for it, and stated that he offered it and other medals at
the price he himself had paid when in his official position he had the
opportunity to “chuse the best struck off.” He sends the diarist a long
list of medals “which you shall have at the rate I paid for. When

---

1 Mathew Young acquired the dies from a person named Cox, who had obtained
them from the daughters of Roettier in their extreme old age. See my paper, “Patterns and
Medals bearing the legend Jacobus III., or Jacobus VIII.,” *British Numismatic Journal*,
vol. iii, p. 236.


3 *Discourse of Medals*, p. 127.
Portraits of Queen Catharine.

Roettier happens to die they may be worth five or ten pounds more, and yet are not (to) be had, many of the stamps being broke and spoiled."¹

Two panes of glass taken from an old house² in Purfleet and now in the British and the Victoria and Albert Museums, respectively, are decorated with the bust of Charles II. in very high relief. They recall this portrait and others by Roettier, more particularly Med. III., vol. i, p. 600, No. 287, with the same border, so nearly that one feels they must owe their design to a common original.

A fair example of John Roettier’s work is the oft quoted “golden medal,”³ Med. III., vol. i, p. 489, No. 111, concerning which the courtly Waller wrote,

“Our guard upon the royal side,
On the reverse our beauty’s pride,
Here we discern the frown and smile,
The force and glory of our isle.”

THE GOLDEN MEDAL OF CHARLES AND CATHARINE.

MED. ILL., VOL. I, P. 489, NO. 111.

It commemorates the wedding of Charles with Catharine, and is perhaps one of the least disagreeable of the early medallic portraits of the Queen, but this is not saying much, for she did not show to advantage on her first arrival, when she suffered from the uncompromising

¹ Pepys, vol. v, p. 132. Ed. 1828. Correspondence Oct. 11, 1687. The total amounts to £43, so the expected rise in price was large in proportion, and has hardly been realised.

² Whitbread’s House, Purfleet.

³ This medal must not be confused with the inferior and somewhat larger copy executed about the same time.
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Spanish fashions which she fortunately soon discarded. Few of our English artists present her in a pleasing light, though Samuel Cooper, it is true, contrived to give a really forcible and yet a pretty picture of this princess. It is said that the painter she most affected was Jacob Huysmans, from whose brush proceeds the original of the fine mezzotint lent to me for reproduction by Mr. W. Sharp Ogden. Huysmans, who was the rival of Lely, depicted the queen full-length as St. Catharine with angels, the wheel, and other emblems, and it is said that he himself preferred this to his other pictures. The position in our print and in the oil painting is the same, and but for a few alterations in dress, the two are identical, but the latter may not be the particular portrait copied by the engraver, for Huysmans frequently portrayed her. The fondness of Queen Catharine for representing her patron saint is exemplified in some of her medals, the obverse of the specimens varying little from the bust upon the Golden medal, whilst St. Catharine appears upon the reverse, and the design of this same reverse is also used as the obverse of another and smaller medallion. Upon the whole, I think, the most pleasing medallic representation of the queen in my possession is that upon the British Colonisation medal (Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 546, No. 203), where she is seen jugate with the king; it is the work of John Roettier in 1670.

British Colonisation Medal of Charles and Catharine,


1 In the Royal Collection at Windsor Castle.
3 Med. Ill., vol. i, pp. 490 and 491, Nos. 112 and 114.
QUEEN CATHARINE, FROM A MEZZOTINT IN THE COLLECTION OF MR. W. SHARP OGDEN.
Financial position of the Roettiers.

A finer portrait of Charles by the same artist is the Christ's Hospital medal of 1673, Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 556, No. 217, called by Evelyn in his enthusiasm a "glorious medallion." 1

It will be observed that after the death of Simon, all the good medallic presentments of Charles II. are by John Roettier, for he was far more successful than such medallists as Bower and Peter van Abeele in bringing the king before our eyes. I cannot cite the many examples produced by the rival artists, for I have already too long trespassed on the patience of my readers, and space lacks for reviewing the unending procession, for the age of Charles II. was the age of medallists in England.

The king, though perhaps not prompt in his payments, was above all things generous. We have seen that the grant to John Roettier as "one of the chief Engravers of the Mint" of May 19th, 1662, included the "fee of £50 a year from the Mint with a convenient dwelling-house." 2 and this was already a higher remuneration than that enjoyed by some of his predecessors in the reign of Charles I.; but one of the

1 Discourse of Medals, p. 140.
entries in the *State Papers* of June, 1664, mentions that the sum of £500 a year was granted to the three brothers Roettier "employed in engraving and embossing dies, etc., for gold and silver for coinage, for which they are to produce the iron and steel at their own expense." Another warrant of January, 1668, mentions "£350 to be given to John, Joseph and Philip Roettiers, chief gravers of the Mint, as a free gift for service."

Finally, a fresh grant is made on April 7th, 1669, to the brothers "as engravers of stone of the office of chief engravers of the Mint with a salary of £450, they having at the king's instance left their native country to employ their art in his service." The necessity for a new appointment seems to have arisen in a few weeks, from the fact that they only held their office during pleasure, for we read—that "John, Joseph and Philip Roettier insist to have their patent for life because they may become blind," and three days later we find their request allowed—"ordered that they have a patent (for their office) for their lives to be paid at the Mint." It appears from two reports made to the Treasury in 1689-90, that John Roettier received from Charles £325 yearly as cuneator for himself and his coadjutors, and also as "graver of medals and agate, £450 for life."

He continued to enjoy these salaries shared by his assistants until the inquiry into the affairs of the Mint in 1697, although Joseph and Philip had both quitted England and their nephews,

---

3 *Cal. of State Papers Dom.*, 1668-69, p. 270. Entry Book 26, f. 54.
7 *Common's Journal*, vol. xi, p. 776.
8 It is stated in the *Treasury Papers*, July 2nd, 1689, vol. ix, p. 53, "Joseph had left England about ten years since, and Philip about February, 1684-5." It is therefore difficult to determine the exact date of their departure, but according to French authorities such as M. Rondot (*Les Médaillleurs et les Graveurs de Monnaies*, p. 314) Joseph arrived in Paris in 1672 or 1673 and was naturalised there in 1674, whilst Philip (see *Ibid.*, p. 309) was also naturalised in France in the same year, and afterwards served Philip V.,
James and Norbert, the sons of John, had succeeded them in office.¹

Joseph had received the full appointment of Graveur-Général to the French court in 1682 after the resignation of François Varin,² the son of Jean Varin, who died in 1672; and Philip, according to Mr. Burn, went to Flanders, circa 1678, and there entered the service of the King of Spain,³ but it is difficult to ascertain the exact dates of the movement of these brothers. We have in the State Papers under February 21st, 1679, a pass to enable Philip Roettier to travel in Italy for his artistic improvement, with a special stipulation that he should return to this country,⁴ but we have few records of his performances in England, though his name appears in all the documents concerning his brothers.

It is not necessary to enumerate the many occasions on which we find payments made to these artists or to Simon, for it is almost impossible to dissociate the remuneration for the work from the bullion employed. The fact that the widow⁵ of Simon in 1666, like the relict of Briot, was obliged to press for large sums still owing after the death of the engraver, proves the unpunctuality of all the financial transactions of the State, and an entry in the Treasury Books⁶ of May 24th, 1665, is a pathetic comment on Simon’s long term of service, for we find:

"£1,000 to Thomas Symon, one of the king’s engravers, he having

of Spain, in Flanders. The date of his appointment in that country is not given, but Nagler in his Monogrammisten, vol. iv, p. 907, says he was still in England in 1680.

² Rondot’s Médailleurs, pp. 280-284 and 314-315.
⁵ Simon’s widow claimed £2,164 as arrears due to her husband; the itemised account is printed by Mr. Nightingale in Num. Chron., 1st series, vol. iv, pp. 227–229. We learn from Vertue (MS. B.M. Addit. 23079, f. 78r) that Mrs. Simon married a second time. He tells us that in 1676 a certain Mr. Marlow bought some dies of “the widow of Simon, who was then re-married to Mr. ——, a dissenting person,” and further remarks that the son of Simon was of weak intellect and was unable to follow his father’s profession, hence the sale of these “tools, stamps and puncheons.”
made for the king's service several great seals for England, Scotland, Ireland and the Foreign Plantations, also many stamps, medals, etc., and having not yet received any payments towards the satisfaction of the same." Charles was, as I have said, generous, but he was extravagant, and the demands made upon him were immense. He has been accused of injustice towards Simon, but we have seen that Simon retained his salary to the end, that his talents were in no way slighted, though tardily paid, and that his rivals, the Roettiers, found the same difficulty in obtaining remuneration.

So much was this the case, that the latter in one petition speak of being "in great want and necessity, and put to hard difficulties and shifts for procuring money, being a stranger here in England"; or again, implore speedy payment, "otherwise we shall be ruined, being put to great straights for moneys to maintain my family and paying the workmen of the Mint," and at one moment the appeal is for £1,012 10s. the arrears of salary due to them.

Whilst glancing for a moment at the personal responsibility of the king in the selection of his artists, we must remember that the doctrine of expediency, learnt in his youth in the hard school of adversity, guided all his actions; too clever to fall into the errors of his father, the younger Charles had yet a very difficult course to steer, and he kept his popularity by floating in the middle of the stream. Simon's politics were not in sympathy with those of the king. Charles had nothing for which to thank him in the past; he had, on the contrary, to hold out the hand of forgiveness to the servant of the Commonwealth, but Simon's talents must not be lost, so he must be employed upon seals and medals to the last, whilst the new coinage was confided to the Roettiers—themselves great medallists—and to whom the monarch may have been under personal obligations.

This is typical of the King's actions throughout his reign. Charles was a Catholic at heart, but he had too much wit and too little principle to avow a belief which subsequently cost his brother James the crown, for he well understood that the time was not ripe.

for religious toleration, and that his political strength lay in the Church of England, as opposed to the Puritanism of which the people were weary.¹

The idol of the nation, Charles had every outward quality which appealed to the hearts of his subjects—a perfect tactician, a proficient in country sport, a graceful and an active man, so rapid a walker that his courtiers found it difficult to keep pace with him, a lover of animals, and a patron of the turf, of music and of the drama; for he encouraged the very amusements of which the nation had for some years been deprived. In more serious pursuits, his interest in science and literature is evidenced by his ready support of learned institutions, by his friendship with Hobbes and Dryden, whilst his patronage of Wren and Grinling Gibbons, of Lely, of Van de Velde, of Cooper, of Hollar, and of others, bears witness to his attention to the artistic branch of the kingdom's progress.

Fully half a Frenchman by birth, Charles combined the qualities of both nations, and, educated as he had been in a despotic monarchy, he believed, as he himself stated, that "much may be done by the personal intervention of Kings";² but his native shrewdness kept him from falling into the errors committed by other members of his family.

He was a keen judge of character. It was said of him, "Where men had chinks he could see through them as soon as anyone about him," and Sir William Temple wrote that he had "great quickness of conception, great pleasantness of wit, great variety of knowledge, more observation and a truer judgment of men than one would have imagined; he desired nothing but to be easy himself and that everybody else should be so."³

Though but a dilettante as compared to his father in the real knowledge of art, his singular faculty for making the best of the materials within his reach resulted in artistic success, and he consequently produced almost as fine a currency and a more remarkable

¹ Early History of the Tories, Roylance Kent, p. 143.
² Historical MSS., vol. iv, p. 39, G. M. Heathcote papers.
medallic series than Charles I. had ever been able to obtain. This was, however, partly owing to the fact that the art of striking medals in high relief was better understood in the latter than in the former half of the seventeenth century, and partly to the more peaceful times in which he reigned.

If I have not already too much wearied my readers with the subject of medallic portraiture, I hope I may be allowed in some future volume to follow the story of the Stuarts throughout the days of James II. and his two daughters Mary and Anne.

It now only remains to me to thank those who have allowed me to study or illustrate from their collections, also very specially our editors and many members of this Society and others for the help they have given me during such researches as I have been able to make concerning the problems at which I have glanced, and to express a hope that the references I have given to the many admirable volumes of the Calendars of State Papers, may save time to those more learned than myself who will perhaps try to decipher at greater length more of the documents at the fountain head.

I only claim to have treated these matters on the surface, excepting in those instances where the abstracts in the Calendars did not satisfy my requirements or fit in with dates previously known to us, and which needed further elucidation from the original MSS. in the Record Office, where, as in the British Museum, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Bibliothèque Nationale and other public places of research, I have always met with the readiest courtesy and attention.