PORTRAITURE OF OUR STUART MONARCHS ON THEIR COINS AND MEDALS.

PART II: JAMES II.

BY HELEN FARQUHAR.

I have had the pleasure of discussing with this Society the rise of artistic portraiture from Tudor times,1 carrying forward our researches throughout the reigns in England of the earlier Stuarts.2

I have found no more agreeable task than that of tracing the gradual development of this art, but alas! we have now reached a period when mechanism, once fairly established, may be said to have given the death-blow to originality in numismatics, and a lack of talent became perceptible in almost every branch of portraiture.

The taste of the time for the classic, or rather the pseudo-classic into which it had recently grown, became more and more marked. Most of the royalists had from force of circumstances lived mainly abroad, and the untravelled man was thought synonymous with the disloyal or the ignorant. It was the right thing to understand foreign art, to have a collection of pictures and a cabinet of medals—a term which in those days included coins, but as is always the case when such things are amassed, not as Arundel, as Buckingham, or as Charles I., collected them from a true appreciation of their beauty, but merely as a matter of fashion, the taste began to deteriorate.

1 Vol. iv of this Journal, pp. 79-143.
The diplomatic elder brother of James, deciding matters rather in light of expediency than of art, was naturally forced to suppress, as soon as possible, all evidence of the late government, and accustomed to the milled money of France, he turned his careful attention to the perfection of the currency. Liberality was the order of the day, and expenses grudged by the Commonwealth were disregarded under the crown: hence the milled coinage was established and a perfect mania was developed for striking and collecting medals.

So far as the immediate improvement of the coins was concerned nothing could have been more successful than the introduction of the mill. Of course, accustomed as we are to the celerity of the wonderful machinery now in use, the speed then attained was slow indeed, but as compared with the older system of the hammer it excited universal admiration. We read in the Crosby Records this account of a visit paid by a certain William Blundell to the Tower mint in 1676: "I saw twenty-six guineas impressed in the space of one minute, measured by my minute watch. That coin was polished at the very same stroke (or turn) which made the impression. All this was done by one machine fed by one man and turned by three, and only one guinea was impressed at each turn of the said machine or screw."\(^1\)

By the courtesy of Mr. W. J. Hocking, I am informed that a modern coining press will strike on an average 100 sovereigns per minute, and is also attended by one man only. The gold coinage of 1907 amounted to 22,692,084 pieces, and in 1908 when fewer were required, 11,729,006 sovereigns and 3,996,992 half-sovereigns were minted, whereas the gold coinage of 1676 is recorded as equivalent to £233,610 in guineas and halves.

Apart from the increased rapidity of production, which even then so much surprised the cavalier-diarist, the milled coinage was beneficial in checking the great evil of clipping, so easy of perpetration with the hammered currency, and this practice did not come to an end until it was found possible, under George II. in 1733, to call in the remainder

---

\(^1\) *Crosby Records. A Cavalier's Note Book*, being notes of William Blundell, edited by the Rev. Ellison Gibson, p. 141. The entry is dated June 3rd, 1676.
of the gold which had been made in the primitive manner,\(^1\) whilst the silver had been recoined under William III. in 1697–8.\(^2\)

The utility of the change was indisputable, and so long as the novelty excited controversy—so long as it was a question to provoke the emulation of great medallists, the innovation was productive of artistic results. The competition of Simon with Roettier was a duel between no mean craftsmen, decided, it is true, in favour of the less admirable engraver, but whilst opposition lasted, each workman at the mint was incited to do his best, and there is no doubt that in the coins of Briot, in the coins of Simon, yes, even in the coins of Roettier, the milled process proved its supremacy, and in artistic merit rivalled the portraiture of the beautiful Tudor currency.

But the zenith once attained, the contest over, can we wonder that the milled coins like the medals became somewhat stereotyped and conventional, and that with the death of Simon the personal element seems to disappear, until at the close of the century we find little importance attached to a question of so much moment as the portraiture on the coinage?

Whilst John Roettier remained at the Mint the memory of the struggle survived, but a certain sense of disappointment touches us in the medallic and numismatic portraits of James II, although attributable mainly to this artist and his sons. We are on the downward path, and we shall see later that the coinage of William and Mary is frankly depressing. Neither monarch possessed any artistic discernment, they caused medals to be struck of more than doubtful taste, and although William had the good sense to look into the condition of his currency, to its lack of beauty he was wholly indifferent. The petty wrangles between Harris and the younger members of the Roettier family were not such as foster art, as had been the case in the rivalry of their father

---

\(^1\) In the 5th annual report of the Deputy Master of the Mint for the year 1874 on p. 15, Sir Charles Fremantle speaks of a book found amongst the Mint papers, containing an account of the reception and recoinage from February, 1733, to July, 1734, of "a large quantity of old hammered gold coins of James I., Charles I., and Charles II., which had up till 1733 been current under the name of 'broad pieces.'" Sir Charles tells us that "the rudely fashioned hammered money was in this way finally withdrawn from circulation."
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and uncles with the renowned Simon. The coins of Anne are fine and well executed, but they lack variety; Croker's dexterity consisting rather in precision than in originality.

The numismatic reform fostered by our most artistic king, Charles I., and carried out by his son, Charles II., whom Walpole rather absurdly describes as "the only genius of the House of Stuart," was of very little interest in the eyes of James, whose mind was entirely occupied with questions of creed; and neither of his daughters was endowed with the love of art for art's sake. True it is that Mary, as regent during her husband's absence, had much to do with matters connected with the Mint, and gave them minute attention, but only from a sense of duty; and although we read that Anne once rejected a coin because the lack of drapery offended her, this objection was probably raised by her well-known modesty in dress rather than by any criticism of the design.

Herein, as it appears to me, lies the principal reason for the decline in numismatic and medallic art, an art largely dependent upon the personal supervision of the monarch. James was less discriminating than his brother, and although he profited by the appointments made in the reign of Charles, we are struck by the increasing similarity and want of originality in his medals. William preferred his own countrymen to his new subjects, and the rough Dutch workmanship obtained a very undesirable ascendency in our land. The improvement under Anne was decided, but was due less to the artistic perceptions of the Queen than to the fact that she was guided by others in this as in other matters.

Of course we must admit that a great stumbling block to the beauty of the coinage of the later Stuarts lay in the fact that all portraiture was at a low ebb; but we must remember that medallic perfection did not always synchronise with pictorial success. When in the days of Sir Joshua Reynolds and his school the art of portrait painting attained a very high standard, we do not find a corresponding rise in numismatic representation; whereas a little later the personal intervention of George IV. produced a fine and very varied coinage. The refusal of Pissotucci to work from Chantrey's model provoked the emulation of Merlin and Wyon, and the Italian artist was indulged
by the king with a personal sitting that he might execute the
coronation medal, rather than reproduce the monarch’s features as
portrayed by Sir Thomas Lawrence.

Acknowledging, therefore, that although not wholly responsible
for the decline in numismatic art, we think that the dearth of genius in
other branches contributed towards its gradual decadence, and we will
glance for a moment at the portrait painters in the concluding decades
of the seventeenth century.

Lely and Kneller have left us pictures still admired for their
technique, and which have been rendered more familiar to us by the
practice of mezzotint engraving which had been introduced into
England in 1661 by Prince Rupert, and which greatly enhanced the
charm of the works of these artists in their reproductions.

The pictorial art, however, shows an ever-increasing deterioration
in the era of Charles II. and of James II., and when we look upon the
“beauties” of the court of Charles as represented by Sir Peter Lely,
or still more when we compare their rivals in the days of Mary II.
from the brush of Kneller, we are tempted to ask: Was every woman
fat, fair, simpering, adorned with impossibly large pearls, and dressed
as Walpole quotes, in “a sort of fantastic night-gown fastened with a
single pin”? Was every man exactly like his neighbour as the
bewigged men would lead us to suppose? For this no doubt the
prevailing fashion was largely responsible, and we can but re-echo with
regret the report sent by a city cousin to a member of the Verney
family shortly after the Fire of London, that a change in the mode
consequent on the destruction of many wig-makers’ shops was

1 The invention of mezzotint engraving, due to Ludwig von Siegen, is often
erroneously attributed to Rupert. The Prince was one of the cleverest and most artistic of
James I.’s grandchidren. He learnt and first practised the new method of engraving abroad
circa 1654-7, and introduced it into England after the Restoration. See Evelyn’s
Diary, Feb. 21st and March 13th, 1660-1. See also A Short History of Engraving,
by A. Hind, pp. 258-63. Ludwig von Siegen was born at Utrecht in 1609. The date
of his death is not known, but he still lived in 1676.

2 Walpole’s Anecdotes, vol. ii, p. 92. The line is taken from Lady Mary Wortley
Montagu: “Your night-gown fasten’d with a single pin. Fancy improv’d the wond’rous
charm within.” Montagu, Works, ed. 1803, vol. v, p. 199. At that time a “night-gown”
meant a loose wrapper or dressing gown.
restricted to the fair sex: "All fals locks, and foretops are left off, nothing but our owne haire worne now by women, but men will not bee brought to itt as yet."

But I would not be thought to disparage the talent of Sir Godfrey Kneller, whose picture of James now in the National Portrait Gallery, and here illustrated, may be cited as showing the artist at his best. This portrait is full of life and grace, singularly pleasing in colouring, and the features, which are often too sharp on the coins, are well defined without undue prominence. It affords a proof of Kneller's rapidity of execution, for it is dated 1684, although it bears the kingly attributes, and must therefore have been finished within two months of James II.'s accession. The ships in the background no doubt typify his resumption of the title of Lord High Admiral, which he had resigned in 1673 for political and controversial reasons.

The differences of method employed by Lely and Kneller were exemplified on one occasion when Charles II., desirous of saving himself trouble, in the year 1678, gave the opportunity to both artists of painting him at the same time. Lely, as the established court painter, had the choice of light and position, but in spite of these advantages, his portrait "was only lead-coloured" when Kneller's canvas was nearly finished. The elder artist generously acknowledged the cleverness of his young rival, and the latter's success was assured.

The future Sir Godfrey had a very high opinion of his own.

2 Charles II. died on Feb. 6th, 1684-5, and the year 1685 would be reckoned as commencing on March 25th.
3 James resumed his work at the Admiralty in the May previous to his brother's death, but owing to the Test Act did not take the official title until after his accession. Evelyn, May 12th, 1684; Reresby's Memoirs, pp. 181-2; Burnet, vol. iii, p. 5; Clarke's Life of James, vol. i, p. 745.
4 Peter van der Faes, or Lely, was born in Westphalia in 1618. He came to England in the train of William, Prince of Orange, in 1641, was introduced to the notice of Charles I. in 1647, and continued his employment under the Commonwealth. He was knighted in 1679, died in 1680, and was succeeded in court favour by Kneller. Godfrey Kneller was born at Liibeck in 1646. He came to England in 1675 and was introduced to Charles II. by Monmouth in 1678 as above described. He was created a baronet in 1715 and died in 1723.
JAMES II. BY KNELLER.

Photograph by Emery Walker from the picture in the National Portrait Gallery.
The Qualities of Kneller and Lely.

capabilities, and praised his own work. Sir Peter was more discreet, and we have an amusing record of his estimate of himself in his good-tempered reply to the criticism passed upon him by an intimate friend, who was pleased to say to him: "For God's sake, Sir Peter! how came you to have so great a reputation? You know that I know you are no painter." "My Lord!" answered Lely, "I know that I am not, but I am the best you have."2

Evelyn speaks little of Lely, although he calls him "our famous painter."3 The well-known picture of the diarist is by Sir Godfrey Kneller, but this fact carries no weight in that Lely was no longer in the land of the living when Evelyn was painted.4 We have it, however, on record that he considered the execution of Kneller to be "masterly."

In his correspondence with Pepys, he refers to the high estimation in which the latter held the artist "for his skill in drawing to the life."5 The rival diarist, on the other hand, writes little of Kneller, and frequently refers to Lely, of whose works he was a great admirer; but he in his turn preferred to have his wife painted by Hayls, and on one occasion qualifies some pictures by Lely as "good but not like."6 He also mentions being present at a sitting given by the Duchess of York to this painter without being favourably impressed. "I was well pleased to see that there was nothing near so much resemblance of her face in his work; which is now the second, if not the third time, as there was of my wife's at the very first time, nor do I think at last it can be like, the lines not being in proportion to those of her face."7 He, however, calls a former portrait of the Duchess executed in 1662, together with

1 Pepys' Correspondence, vol. v of Diary, pp. 405 and 407.
2 Walpole's Anecdotes, vol. ii, p. 98.
3 Evelyn's Diary, May 9th, 1683, vol. iii, p. 80.
4 Evelyn gave sittings to Kneller on October 8th, 1685, and June 8th, 1689. See vol. iii of his Diary, pp. 186 and 283.
5 Evelyn's Correspondence. Letter to Pepys, August 12th, 1689, vol. iv of Diary, p. 296.
7 Pepys must allude to his wife's portrait by Hayls painted in 1665-6, for her miniature by Cooper was not begun until July 6th, 1668, vol. ii, pp. 364 and 372, and vol. iv, p. 140. John Hayls was a rival of Lely; he died in 1679.
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another representing Charles II., "most rare things." 1 He implies that the artist lived extravagantly, saying *inter alia* that he went to see "in what pomp his table was laid for himself to go to dinner." 2 It, however, appears that Kneller was not less given to expense, and one of the faults imputed to him was that in his anxiety to make money he would not give himself enough time to finish his portraits. We are told in a note to Walpole's *Anecdotes of Painting* that Kneller preferred portraiture for this reason: "Painters of history," said he, "make the dead live, and do not begin to live themselves till they are dead. I paint the living, and they make me live." 3

Although James II. from the very beginning of his reign was occupied with state affairs of a very harassing nature, he possessed a sufficient share of the Stuart proclivities, to afford facilities to such artists as were available to portray him on his accession. Lely had died in 1680, and Kneller, almost unrivalled, informed a friend in after years when discussing the resemblance of the little Prince of Wales to his parents, that James and his second wife, Mary Beatrice, "have sate to me about thirty-six times apiece, and I know every line in their faces. Mein Gott! I could paint King James now by memory." 4

We learn that when James was apprised of William's arrival at Torbay he was engaged in sitting to the Court painter, and sooner than break his word to Samuel Pepys, for whom this particular portrait was destined, he told Kneller to proceed uninterrupted, "as he was anxious his good friend Pepys should not be disappointed of his present." 5 This picture was subsequently engraved by Vertue, and is here reproduced in memory of the corroboration it offers of the constant testimony borne by his friends, to the loyalty of James to a promise once given. One cannot read the memoirs of the time without frequently coming upon such words as those of the Duke of

---

1 Pepys' *Diary*, vol. i, p. 278, June 18th, 1662.
2 Pepys' *Diary*, vol. i, p. 322, October 20th, 1662.
4 Dallaway's note 2 to Walpole's *Anecdotes*, vol. ii, p. 209.
5 Pepys' Memoir at the beginning of the *Diary*, Lord Braybrooke's edition of 1828, vol. i, xxxix.
Kneller as Court Painter.

Berwick,¹ who emphasises the saying of the King “that he would rather lose his crown than be guilty of an unjust action”²; or the pronouncement of Reresby: “There was no Prince at that time observed to be more punctual of his word,”³ or again the eulogy of the loyal Ailesbury: “I do affirm he was the most honest and sincere man I ever knew, a great and good Englishman.”⁴

But it is time to turn to the numismatic and medallic side of the question. James was admirably represented by John Roettier, who worked for him both before and after his accession. Indeed, the medals of the Duke of York give us a pleasanter impression of James than those of a later period, just as many of us prefer his pictures by Lely when he was still young and handsome, to the more forcible paintings by Kneller, when his features had sharpened and the expression of his face had become more stern.⁵

Were it not for Roettier’s early medals, the task of describing attractive medallic portraits of James would be minimised, for in the years of exile we find few varieties worthy of discussion from the artistic point of view. As Duke of York we do not notice the beak-like nose which is increasingly apparent on the coinage with each issue of fresh dies, and even on the coronation medal, which I here illustrate, no-

![Coronation Medal of James II.](image)

---

¹ James Fitz James, Duke of Berwick and Marshal of France, was born in 1670, the natural son of James II. by Arabella Churchill. He died in 1734, leaving straightforward memoirs which, some forty-three years after the death of the author, were published in the original French, and republished in an English translation in 1779.


⁴ Memoirs of Thomas Earl of Ailesbury, p. 131.

⁵ The difference in the appearance of James caused by the flight of time may be well studied in the two fine portraits by Lely and Kneller respectively at Chelsea Hospital.
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undue prominence of this feature strikes the observer. The king and queen had separate souvenirs designed to commemorate this event, and the official medal representing Mary of Modena is distinctly pleasing.

There is a rather flattering bust of James by Arondeaux\(^1\) struck to celebrate the conclusion of Monmouth's rebellion in 1685, but, apart from John Roettier, the medallist most employed at court during this short reign was George Bower. Some years after the king's flight, Norbert Roettier took up the work abroad, and the exile's portrait by this artist appears on the obverse of specimens with the head of his son upon the reverse.\(^2\) These medals were supplemented for distribution by medalets representing the little prince alone,\(^3\) for the elder James soon became sensible that a second Restoration of the Stuarts was not likely to take place in his lifetime, and consequently endeavoured rather to keep alive the claims of his heir than to press his own recall. At a later period the bust of James II. jugate with

\(^1\) Med. III., vol. i, p. 615, No. 27. Arondeaux was probably of Flemish extraction.
that of Mary Beatrice adored the obverse of a medal, the head of their son appearing upon the reverse, but no longer as a child, for this medal is of the year 1712, and presents a rather foolish combination in that James II. died in 1701, so that the portraits do not synchronise. The design was, of course, executed as a memorial showing forth the claims of IACOBVS III. to the united kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland. There are besides a few medals bearing the effigy of the elder James after his exodus from England. These are by Jan Smeltzing, and need scarcely enter into our discussion, for most of the post-Revolution examples are in very bad taste, being of a satirical nature perpetrated in derision and neither good in execution nor in design, but they give us on the obverse varying and not uncomplimentary rendering of the exiled king's features, taken in some instances from portraits engraved whilst he still reigned. A rare specimen of Smeltzing's early work bearing a striking but peculiar bust is here reproduced from the cabinet of Mr. S. M. Spink.


The poverty of James may be held partly, if not wholly, responsible for the lack of medals struck during his exile, for he shared the Stuart fondness for memorials of the kind, and we learn that when, on the 11th of December, 1688, the occasion of his first disastrous flight

after William’s landing, he was robbed at Faversham of the contents of his pockets; amongst the diamonds, watches and relics upon his person there were two gold medals, the one commemorative of Charles II.’s birth, the other of that of his own son James.¹ These together with his coronation ring and some of the jewels were returned to him by the freebooters on their discovery of his identity, but he suffered them to retain the money “near 200l. in gold,” or according to some authorities twice that sum, which would have been of more immediate use to him, and was consequently obliged “to serve his present want” by borrowing £100 from some loyal bystanders, a loan which he afterward punctiliously repaid.²

The custom of giving coins and medals as mementoes was on the increase, and we learn from Miss Strickland that Mary Beatrice, who had fled with the little Prince two days before James’s unfortunate detention at Faversham, had been more fortunate than was her husband in effecting her escape unmolested, and carried away amongst her jewels “a casket full of rose nobles coined during the reigns of the Sovereigns of the House of Lancaster. These had become very scarce, and a superstitious value was attached to them at that time in Europe, as it was believed that the gold from which they were struck had been the fruits of some successful alchymist’s labours in transmuting inferior metals into gold. One of the Lancastrian coins was regarded as a valuable present to the ladies of the French court.”³

These curiosities once exhausted, a medal was the most natural keepsake to bestow on any adherent to the Stuart cause, but it was not always desirable to display these openly, and Lord Manchester, writing

¹ Allan Fea’s James II. and his Wives, p. 198.
² Notes and Queries, 3rd Series, vol. v, pp. 391–3. “The king would not receive his gold again of which he was plundered, but ordered it to be divided among ye yt took him.” The account is taken from the diary of an anonymous eye-witness evidently in attendance on the king. Other authorities give the amount distributed as four hundred guineas, see Rapin, vol. ii, p. 782, and Jesse’s Memoirs of the Stuarts, vol. iv, p. 415. Another contemporary letter-writer (Ellis’s Original Letters, 2nd Series, vol. iv, p. 176) tells us that James not only refused to take back his money from the men, but “gave them an additional ten guineas to drink his health.” Miss Strickland, on the other hand (Queens of England, vol. vi, 281), speaks of the sum as three hundred guineas.
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from Paris and describing to Lord Jersey the efforts made in 1699 to induce recruits to join the standard, tells us something concerning the substitute employed:—"They have invented a sort of Button," writes Manchester, "which every one that engages for K.J. wears on his Coat: that they have a small Roll of Parchment on which are written the first Letters of these Words: 'God bless K.J. and prosper his Interest,' which will appear out of the Button if it be turned round by an Instrument like a Skrew made on purpose."1

The bestowal of any coin as a remembrance was a frequent habit of the Stuarts, and it is related that during the hours passed by Charles II. in hiding from his enemies, whilst a fugitive after the battle of Worcester, he lightened the tedium of his seclusion by boring holes in the coins he had in his pockets in order to bestow them as parting gifts on his hosts, and such specimens have been kept and handed down as precious heirlooms in various families. In a contemporary work, the Clastrum Regale Reseratum, we read: "His Majesty was pleased to discover himself to the Captain (Elesden) and to give him a piece of foreign gold in which in his solitary hours he made a hole to put a ribbon in. Many like pieces His Majesty vouchsafed the Colonel (Wyndham) and his Lady to be kept as Records of his Majesty's favour and of their own fidelity to his most Sacred Person in the day of his greatest Trial. All which they have most thankfully treasured up as the chiefest Jewels of their Family."2

It may be asked why Charles, travelling in disguise, should carry in his pocket "a piece of foreign gold," for he came not directly from abroad, but from Scotland,3 where he had resided for more than a year.


2 Tract IV, printed in After Worcester Fight, by Allan Fea, p. 193; see also The Flight of the King, pp. 105 and 108, by the same author. This tract, Clastrum Regale Reseratum, was written by Anne, wife, or as some suppose, sister of the Colonel Wyndham mentioned above, and was first published in the year 1667. There were several subsequent editions, of which the third of the year 1681 is that reprinted by Mr. Fea (see Introduction to After Worcester Fight). Colonel Wyndham was remarkably loyal in his efforts for the safety of Charles.

3 Charles arrived in Scotland from Breda in June, 1650, whither he had retired from...
It is, however, possible that the coin may have been one of the earlier pieces of James I., as James VI. of that country, with which the authoress of the *Claustrum Regale Reseratum*, Anne Wyndham, might not be familiar. As a reason for such a selection we might suggest that Charles would not wish to attract attention by endeavouring to pass any peculiar coin as ordinary currency, also that in default of units bearing his father’s effigy he would not care to bestow the Commonwealth money, and at that time he had no portraits of his own to give, for excepting upon his Scottish coronation medal and upon one or two badges, which would not be available, he was not yet represented. I have in my possession the small pewter badge bearing his father’s effigy, given by the younger Charles to Richard Penderel as a token, during the Boscobel episode, and such portraits would be doubly acceptable, for we know with what reverence any relic recalling this monarch was treated. Many instances might be cited of the handing down to the next heir of such a memento as the most treasured family possession. One touching instance appears in Lady Herbert's memoirs, wherein the death of Sir Edward Herbert on the field of Worcester is described, and we read that in his last moments he sent an affectionate message to his mother, and to his next brother a ring, which had belonged to his father, a former Sir Edward, who had died from the effects of wounds received in the late king's service at the battle of Naseby. This ring bore a head of Charles I., and the inscription "Abyde Loyall" was most appropriate to the house of Herbert, so eminently "loyal" to our first three Stuart kings, if less invariably so in the reign of James II., who, however, found in Jersey in the preceding February. He entered England in August, 1651, and was defeated at Worcester on September 3rd, 1651.

1 Richard Penderel was one of six brothers, of whom he was the most active in aiding the escape of the young king. After the Restoration the family was richly rewarded and tradition states that it was upon Richard’s arrival at Whitehall, armed with the badge, that he received recognition at the hands of Charles. See vol. ii of this *Journal*, p. 248.


3 We must, of course, admit that the motto was forgotten by Arthur Herbert, created Earl of Torrington by William III. for his services against James, and by Henry Herbert, in whose favour William revived the title of Lord Herbert of Cherbury. Arthur Herbert, afterwards Lord Torrington, was estranged from James on the subject of the repeal of the
William, first Marquis and titular Duke of Powis, and his family devoted adherents to the Stuart cause.¹

Curiously enough, neither in his Irish campaign nor in his projected recapture of this kingdom, did James II. resort to the practice of issuing military badges as had been done during the Civil War, and we are thus deprived of a series of portraits, which might have given us many varieties.

Ireland, fighting for James after the sister island had deserted him, was badly requited by this monarch.

![GUN-MONEY: SIXPENCE.](image)

To numismatists the gun-money is of interest as prolonging the period in which we may look for the effigy of a Stuart king upon the currency. To the lover of portraiture this coinage affords an excellent example of emergency work, but to the historian it recalls a very regrettable instance of the weakness of James II.

![GUN-MONEY: SILVER PATTERN FOR LARGE SHILLING.](image)

We cannot doubt that had he been successful in regaining the British crown he would have redeemed these brass and copper issues, Test Act, and being dismissed from his office as Admiral of the Fleet, threw in his lot with the Dutch and convoyed William's expedition to England. Henry Herbert also joined the Prince of Orange in Holland in 1688, and Thomas, eighth Earl of Pembroke, similarly gave in his adhesion to the new régime.

William, Lord Powis, followed James into exile and filled important posts at the court of St. Germain. His wife was governess to the royal children and his son William was only secondary to his son-in-law Lord Nithsdale, in loyalty to the House of Stuart.
which were of the nature of tokens, for in his proclamations on the subject the king expressly limits the time of currency to "during our pleasure," stating that the coins were "for the present necessity, and therefore we do not intend that the same shall continue for any long time," thus making a distinct promise to replace them in the future.¹ The fates declared against the king, and the damage to Ireland was irremediable, for William coming into power was naturally unwilling to take upon his shoulders the liabilities incurred by his fallen father-in-law, and late in the year 1690 decreed the gun-money to its intrinsic worth, the large half-crown to a penny, the smaller to three farthings, and so on to the end of the gamut of this disgraceful coinage; even the pewter pennies and halfpennies of James being reduced to half their nominal value.² Bad as was the substitution of brass, gun-metal, tin

or copper for silver, which resulted in £3,616 5s. 6d. worth of mixed metal being forced on the country as representing £907,420 13s. 6d., James was unable to procure enough even of this base substance to satisfy his necessities, and he caused the half-crowns and shillings to be struck in smaller sizes, reissuing the large half-crowns restamped as crowns, etc., thus increasing his liability to £1,347,421.³

² The proclamations of William with regard to the gun-money are published in The Coinage of Ireland, as before quoted, pp. 250–2, also in Spink’s Numismatic Circular, March, 1909. William finally called in this money in February, 1690–1.
³ The Coinage of Ireland, as before, p. 190.
There is an interesting letter from the Duke of Tyrconnel to Mary of Modena, dated Dublin Castle, December 12th o.s. 1689, in which he writes: "Our want of copper is very great,¹ that thing alone being our support as to the payment of our army . . . for not a farthing of gold or silver is now to be had in this whole nation . . . I pray Madam let 50 tons of copper be sent us besides the 40 tons a-coming before the end of March and 10 ton of steel, for we begin now to make forearms."² Not a month later than the March men-

¹ Note 5 in Ruding, vol. ii, on p. 25, quotes from a work written some 20 years only after the event: "It seems that they not only bought but pillaged even the citizens' kitchens, etc., because they found it difficult to get copper and brass for the mint." Ruding also says that Lord Melfort commanded the Master-General of the Ordnance to deliver two brass cannon to the commissioners of the mint, to supply the coinage.

from Ireland say," writes Lord Melfort to Lewis Innes,\(^1\) on April 23rd, 1690, "that the brass money goes now among the Rebel's army as well as guineas, that it pays debts and clears mortgages as well as other money did."\(^3\) In another communication written to Father Maxwell at the same time, Melfort remarks: "I am glad of the success of the Copper money; God alone was the sender of it, and nobody has reason to be vain of it. To His own name be the glory of it, for undeniably it has done good; but that it should go amongst the Rebels is a strange thing."\(^3\) Stranger still must it appear to us that Melfort should cast the responsibility of this very questionable work upon Providence, and it has ever remained a blot upon the fame of James II. that he did not emulate his father in preserving the integrity of the currency in the time of stress and trouble.

The gun-money of James was issued from June, 1689, to October, 1690, being minted, after the capture of Dublin in July, during the last four months at Limerick only, and in the following year halfpence and farthings were overstruck upon the existing large and small brass shillings respectively for circulation during the siege, the gallant city holding out for James until October, 1691.\(^4\) Dr. Philip Nelson\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Lewis Innes was the President of the Scots' College at Paris, and acted as James's Secretary of State for Scotland.


\(^4\) *The Coinage of Ireland*, as before quoted, p. 191.

Who made the Irish Emergency Coins?

has illustrated the various emergency coins imposed upon Ireland, including the pewter currency of 1689 and 1690; the latter, a specimen of which I put before you, being decorated with a remarkable portrait of James, reminiscent of the undraped and short-haired bust seen upon the Maundy money. He attributes all the dies for the moneys of necessity to "Roettier, one of a family of medallists, which, for a period of sixty years, was intimately associated with the Stuart cause," but Dr. Nelson does not help us to determine to which member of the family the credit is due. The excellence of the portraiture at any rate upon the earliest pieces would indeed lead one to suppose that John Roettier was responsible for them, but he must, I find, have been aided by his sons, if not entirely superseded by them. In the Treasury Papers under date July 2nd, 1689, we read that the "father hath for some months past lost the use of his right hand by the shrinking of the Tendents (sic) and is not able to work any more." Whilst under date March 19th, 1689-90, the fear was expressed that he would not be able to resume his occupation "by reason of a lameness in his right hand." It is possible that Roettier made the most of his ailment when unwilling to perform any service for William III., for we find in the Report of the House of Commons on the Mint in 1696-7, that "old Roettier did not ever own the king or do any one thing as Graver since the Revolution." The complaint was then lodged of his disaffection not of his incapacity, but it was

---

1 The Coinage of Ireland, as before quoted, p. 191.
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against his interest to admit at the beginning of the new reign that he was useless at the mint, and it is therefore clear that the excuse must have had some foundation; and we also know that his sons, James and Norbert, had recently relieved him of a great part of the chief engraver's work. There is much similarity in the technique of the various members of this talented family, so that it is at all times difficult to dissociate their productions. Possibly the "lameness" of Roettier was only partial, but the date of the first Irish pieces would come within the "some months past" designated in July, 1689, and it is hardly likely that he had recovered sufficiently by the time they ceased to be issued to take much part in the engraving. I understand from one of our medical friends that the expression "shrinking of the tendents" (for tendons) has no modern equivalent, but certainly denotes a loss of muscular power. This might very possibly be set up from continual use of the right arm in the labour of engraving, and indeed, it is stated in the Treasury Papers under date November 27th (?) 1700, that he was "disabled in his hands by reason of his extraordinary service in being engraver to his Majesty Mint, and especially upon the alteration of the Coyne,"¹ thus showing that the evil originally arose from overwork. The trade paralysis hereby implied, although necessitating complete cessation of work for a time, might be of a temporary or recurrent nature. Roettier, however, was sixty years of age, and it is unlikely that his work would ever again be quite so good after the attack. It is noticeable that most of the later issues are not equal to the early, and it might be suggested that he, if he in truth resumed his occupation, may have contributed some of the pieces of 1690. We have, however, in the documents just cited, the indication that his ailment was troublesome in both hands in 1700, and we find no absolute proof of his recovery in that the coronation medal of William and Mary,² ascribed to him, is declared by James and Norbert to have been made by them, "without his assistance";³ also

² Med. Ill., i, p. 662, No. 25.
the medal struck upon the death of Mary in 1694-5, once thought to be his work, is now attributed to James Roettier.\(^1\) It has been suggested that possibly\(^2\) the medals struck in May, 1690, upon Mary's first regency\(^3\) may be by John Roettier, but on careful comparison with his various portraits of the Queen, I scarcely think the bust can be his work. I should be inclined to believe that the elder artist engraved no medals of importance after 1688 o.s., were it not that Walpole implies that the injury was not permanent, for he tells us, that in 1703, Sir Godfrey Kneller requested John Roettier to engrave a portrait of Queen Anne, and that the old medallist was only prevented by death from following the suggestion, leaving an unfinished die, which he had begun with feverish haste to prepare.\(^4\)

But I have already dallied too long with the subject of this disastrous Irish coinage, and as it has been more ably discussed by Dr. Nelson, who published his interesting paper in the initial volume of this journal, I must refer the reader to his pages and turn to the sister kingdom of Scotland.

The administration of James as his brother's representative in the North whilst still Duke of York, has led to much animadversion, but upon the whole it was successful in view of the policy which, as Viceroy, he was obliged to adopt, and, although naturally anxious to terminate a residence which was, in truth, a polite form of exile, he endeavoured to make himself popular. Stories are told of graceful speeches made by him, to whom they did not come as easily as to his brother, and I may cite one which has the real Stuart ring about it. James wished to knight Cameron of Lochiel, and for that purpose asked him for his sword. The highland chief, ignorant of his design, passed it to the Viceroy in its scabbard, but the blade being somewhat rusty, James could not release it. "This sword," exclaimed he, "used never

\(^3\) Med. Ill., vol. i, pp. 704-5, Nos. 111 and 112.
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to be difficult to draw in the service of the crown." Cameron bared the steel and returned it to the prince, who took it saying: "You see the sword of Lochiel obeys no hand but his own." In such ways James really endeared himself to the Scottish people, and in the days of his son and grandson Scotland was not backward in the Stuart cause, but at the time of his accession, the creed of James II. was as much a bar between him and his northern subjects, whom he had aggravated by his religious prosecutions, as it was in England, where his ill-judged zeal too strongly showed itself, whereas the Irish found therein a bond of sympathy.

We have seen, as numismatists, how Ireland suffered for her loyalty. In Scotland, the coinage leaves little to be desired; although, it is true, there was a slight diminution in weight, but the fineness of the coins was increased and it was ordered that "all the money . . . shall be lettered and grained round the edges." This precaution against clipping was in common practice in England as early as 1663 and appeared in certain instances yet earlier.

Neither gold nor copper was issued, only pieces of the value of forty and ten shillings-Scots' being circulated, and no coins were struck in Scotland until the year 1687. James assumed upon this currency the English crown and title, following in the latter particular the precedent of his grandfather James I., who on his accession to the English throne dropped the numeral 6 formerly in use upon his coins, and called himself JACOBVS • D. G • MAG • BRIT • FRAN • & HIB • REX. In the case of the two succeeding monarchs the name of Charles being new to Scotland, the titles CAROLVS and CAROLVS II were applicable to both kingdoms, but on the pattern coinage of the third James—the son of James II., we find a reversion in JACOBVS • VIII • DEI • GRATIA which appeared to dissociate the two kingdoms, i.e., the Northern, then

1 Burns' The Coinage of Scotland, vol. ii, p. 503 to p. 505. Amongst the few numismatic notices in the Calendar of Treasury Papers 1556 to 1696, we find on p. 23, vol. ii, 29, 1687, a report from the officers of the English mint concerning "standard" and "indented pieces" to be sent to Lord Maitland for the opening of the Scottish mint in the first week in May, 1687, none such having been sent since October 19th, 1660. These "standard pieces" would be plates of gold and silver of the prescribed composition for the coins, and would be required owing to the increased fineness ordered by the indentures.
as he hoped willing to receive him, from the Southern, where the Hanoverian succession was more firmly rooted.

The dies for the coinage of Scotland were executed for James II. by John Roettier, the engraver to the English mint. By the act of the Scottish Parliament on June 14th, 1686, silver pieces of the value of sixty, of twenty and of five shillings each were also ordered,¹ though it is not known whether the design was ever carried out for the last two denominations, but amongst the collection of puncheons and dies purchased by Matthew Young from the descendants of John Roettier were the finished dies for the sixty-shilling piece.

![Sixty-shilling piece by John Roettier](image)

Much as the habit of making re-strikes is generally to be deprecated, we cannot regret that Young utilised these dies to a limited extent, before defacing them and placing them out of harm's way in the National collection. The above coin, which in England we should term a crown, brings before us one of the best portraits of James, and as it bears few marks of rust it offers a far better opportunity of admiring the details of Roettier's workmanship than does the ordinary coinage. It is rather difficult to find circulated coins with the laurel leaves appearing uninjured or the curls unrubbed above the king's head, whether in the peruke of the English issues or the less elaborately dressed hair of the Scottish silver, and the sixty-shilling piece consequently finds a place in many a collector's cabinet. The portrait on the Scottish coinage would excite admiration, being amongst the

best prepared by John Roettier, were it not that the nose is even sharper and more beak-like than it is represented in the English examples. I have before remarked upon this peculiarity in Roettier's later coins of this king, which is not apparent in many pictures, unless it be in the painting by Riley\(^1\) in the National Portrait Gallery, and is still less noticeable in such busts and statues as I have seen.

Curiously enough, one very early sketch of James at the age of two, drawn in tinted chalks by Van Dyck, suggests that even as a baby this slightly hooked nose was indicated, though I am bound to say it does not appear in the finished picture. By the kindness of Mrs. Arthur James, I am able to reproduce this interesting drawing, which she inherited from the collection of Sir Joshua Reynolds. It is obviously the original life-sized sketch for the oil painting in the Royal Gallery at Turin, where James is represented with his elder brother and sister, and which Mr. Cust describes as “the most beautiful piece of child-portraiture in the world.”\(^3\) To this prototype I have referred the medal

---

\(^1\) John Riley was born in London in 1646, and painted Charles II., James II., and William and Mary. It was on seeing a picture of himself by this artist that Charles exclaimed, “Is this like me? Odd’s fish, what an ugly dog I am.” Riley died in 1691.

\(^2\) Anthony Van Dyke, by Lionel Cust, p. 110. The picture is there illustrated on the opposite page. It was painted on the return of the artist from the Netherlands before the groups of the three children at Windsor, Paris and Dresden were executed, but they are all of the year 1635. The fact that a pastel copy by Canevari, taken from the Turin picture of this child’s head, unaccompanied by his brother and sister, was mistakenly catalogued at the Accademia di San Luca at Rome as La Figlia di Carlo I. has led to much confusion, in that it has often been reproduced and has been supposed to represent a girl.

---
ORIGINAL SKETCH IN TINTED CRAYON OF JAMES II. AS A CHILD, BY VANDYCK, IN THE COLLECTION OF MRS. ARTHUR JAMES, FOR THE PAINTING IN THE ROYAL GALLERY AT TURIN.
Features of James.

of the children of Charles I.¹ which I illustrated in my former article, and reproduce here.

It is curious that this characteristic nose of James should not always be noticeable in sculpture if sufficiently obvious to appear in the rough sketch of so young a child, and this feature in the principal bronzes although rather large, is particularly well-shaped. One of the most important representations of James is the fine brazen statue executed in 1686 by Grinling Gibbons, which now stands out sharply against the red wall of the new Admiralty buildings in Whitehall facing St. James's Park.² Although the nose is not unpleasantly accentuated in the bronze, it reminds us strongly of the Scottish coinage if viewed in profile, for here we see the king posing as a Roman warrior with a graceful figure and really fine features, the hair being cut short as suitable to the classic dress.

One of the peculiarities of the Scottish silver lies in the absence of the overwhelming wig; another in the fact that the bust is always turned towards the right, whereas in Ireland and in England, excepting upon the tin halfpenny and farthing, the head faces to the left.

The Treasury Papers³ contain a great many references to the

¹ Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 373, No. 72, illustrated in my first part of The Portraiture of the Stuart Monarchs in vol. v of this Journal, p. 194.

² How far this bronze may be regarded as the unaided work of Grinling Gibbons has been discussed by various authorities; but according to Vertue, Gibbons himself signed the agreement for the statue of James at the price of £300. In the Dictionary of National Biography we read that Dyvoet of Mechlin and Laurens of Brussels assisted Gibbons in the execution of his statues, and Vertue as quoted by Walpole says, they "modelled and cast" this example, thus implying that the design alone is attributable to Gibbons. See Walpole's Anecdotes, vol. ii, pp. 170 and 173.

³ Calendared in Treasury Papers 1556 to 1696, pp. 22–31, at various dates from
working of the Cornish tin mines, by a company at Lostwithiel called the "Contractors of the Pre-emption of Tyn," and Lord Bath, Eliah Palmer, and Richard Holt, are reported as submitting plans to the government including propositions for coining under certain complicated conditions,1 "Pence, Halfpence, and Farthings of Intrinsick value for England, Scotland, Ireland, and the American plantations belonging to the Crown of England to be exported Custom free."2 They suggest making patterns for the coins above mentioned "for his Majestie's approbation." They bargain for the use until the king's lease thereof shall have expired in the following August of Skinner's Hall, where this tin coinage had hitherto been effected, to "consider whether it will be fit for them to continue the Stannary mint there, or remove to another place." They ask for the "engines, presses, tools, and utensils belonging to His Majesty in Skinner's Hall, being bought with his Majestie's money, and were made use of by the Commissioners or their officers in making and vending the late tin farthings."3 These instruments, the manuscript list whereof contains no mention of dies, were finally consigned to Richard Holt, who gives a receipt for them in July, 1688.4 I find no direct evidence of the coinage being carried out, though Lord Bath writes on October 23rd, 1688, concerning the plans for the "Farme which we have been so long about, being now happily concluded";5 but it would appear on the contrary that on December 27th, 1688, ergo after the exodus of the king, the company were requested to pay the duty on "3 coynages, which would have been actually accomplished for the Crown if the Tyn had not been farmed."6 "The March 4th, 1686–7, to December 7th, 1688. I give references to original MS. documents to which I had recourse, the calendar not supplying details.

1 The "Contractors of the King's Pre-emption," as this Company was styled, agreed to pay £16,000 for eleven or twenty-one years "leaving the benefit of the coyning of Pence, Half-pence and Farthings of Intrinsick value to his Majesties dispose," or £18,000 per annum, with the "privilege of making Pence, Halfpence, and Farthings of Intrinsick value," MS. Treasury Papers, vol. ii, 39 and 40.
6 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. iii, 58.
difficulty of the times" was urged in extenuation of non-payment of rent, their contract having been sealed on June 19th, 1688, just six months before the flight of James.

The current tin coins with a copper plug in the centre, for which indentures were according to Montagu\(^1\) granted to Thomas Neale,\(^2\) are of 1685, 1686 and 1687.

\[\text{TIN FARTHING OF JAMES II.}\]

He tells us that the halfpenny and farthing of 1688 are stated to exist, but he considers this doubtful. The penny in tin is not known, and we have already mentioned that no Scottish coinage of inferior metal was issued. The reference to the American plantations brings before us the curious pieces, called "Plantation money,"\(^3\) of which the value was the twenty-fourth part of a Spanish real. These coins, one of which by the courtesy of Mr. S. M. Spink I here illustrate, are of the size of a halfpenny, of equestrian type, and bear no date. They were made for Maryland and Baltimore, but whether they or any coins at all emanated from the Cornish company who shall say? nor can we tell

---

1 Montagu's *Copper Coins of England*, p. 59.
2 Thomas Neale was Master of the English Mint.
3 Atkins' *Coins of the British Possessions and Colonies*, p. 258, No. 60.
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the type which Lord Bath and his friends purposed to issue in England. As to the intended quantity we have more information, for the company was bound not to "coyn in any one year above the value of ten thousand pounds sterling without his Majesties leave, during the first three years of their patent." After this time they might have "liberty of coyning beyond the sume to the value of Thirty Thousand Pounds sterling."\(^1\) The known varieties present the short-haired bust, seen as I have remarked not only upon the Scottish silver and some of the Irish emergency coins, but upon the Maundy money of England, which bears a very good portrait of James, and the absence of the wig is also noticeable in some of Roettier's best medals.

Perhaps the most interesting of all the medallic portraits of James in the fashionable headgear or in his natural yet cropped locks, are the two Battle-of-Lowestoft specimens\(^2\) illustrated on our plates. They commemorate the Duke of York's victory over the Dutch on June 3rd, 1665, and one hardly knows whether or not we should endorse the opinion of Pepys, who implies that he thought the Lord High Admiral looked better with his hair cut short in order to don the periwig, than he did when wearing it.\(^3\) Henry Slingsby, when money difficulties after his retirement from office\(^4\) made him desire to part with his collection,

\(^1\) MS. Treasury Papers, May 31st, 1688, vol. ii, 48 and 50.
\(^2\) Med. Ill., vol. i, pp. 504-5, Nos. 142-3.
\(^3\) Pepys' Diary, February 15th, 1663-4. "He first put on a periwigg to-day, but methought his hair cut short thereto did look very prettily of itself before he put on his periwigg."
\(^4\) See Commons' Journal of April 8th, 1697, vol. xi, p. 775. Enquiry into the affairs at the Mint. "The Committee does observe the Scire facias was brought by King James against Henry Slingsby, Esqre, for not doing his duty as Comptroller of the Mint in the Tower, and he was turned out, but on application of his good friends he had 500£. per annum for his life." Evelyn on January 12th, 1687-8, writes: "Mr. Slingsby, Master
tendered these two medals to his friend Pepys for the sums of £3 14s.
and £2 3s, respectively, a high price, when one takes the fact into
consideration that the artist still lived.1

Amongst the objects of interest which I have been permitted to
illustrate, there is at the British Museum an early nineteenth-century
leaden impression from a contemporary die made by John Roettier or
one of his sons.2 This type of portrait with very slight variations was
made to do duty on more than one occasion, and as this piece bears no
legend, it is not easy to date it; but the face looks older, and the
of the Mint, being under very deplorable circumstances on account of his creditors, and
especially with the King, I did my endeavour with the Lords of the Treasury to be
favourable to him." The records at the Mint concerning the latter part of Henry
Slingsby's Mastership are very fragmentary, but I understand from Mr. Hocking, who
has kindly looked through them for me, that it is clear that a Commission of enquiry into
his Mint affairs was appointed by Royal Warrant, dated June 9th, 1680. Slingsby was
suspended from this date; his duties as master were executed by the Commission, and it
is possible that matters dragged on until the accession of James, when his indentures were
formally cancelled, as referred to in the above extract from the Commons' Journal.
Slingsby appears to have died about 1690.

1 Pepys' Diary, vol. v. Correspondence October 11th, 1687, p. 132. See also vol. v
of this Journal, pp. 254 and 255.
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features sharper than they appear in the first example struck by John Roettier on the Battle-of-Lowestoft medal in the lifetime of Charles II., and the specimen here illustrated was probably designed in 1685, when the bust upon the former medal was reproduced with a fresh legend, adorned with the royal titles immediately upon the accession of James, to celebrate the repulse of Monmouth and Argyle.\(^1\) It is suggested that the portrait was unacceptable, and that the die remained unused, which seems not improbable, for we find in it the peculiar nose, increasingly observable from 1686 to 1688, whether in gold or silver, rather than the better formed features of the earlier medal, No. 143 of the reign of Charles II. or on the later naval and military reward of James II., No. 28, although of this also I have never seen a contemporary striking. When Roettier had time to produce a finished work, the final choice appears to have fallen upon a fresh and more pleasing representation\(^2\) with long hair, rather reminiscent of the first Lowestoft medal, No. 142.

The principal interest attached to the second of the two Lowestoft medals, No. 143, lies in the resemblance it suggests between the royal brothers on comparison with the representation of Charles II. by the same artist at a similar age. I refer to the bust catalogued in *Medallic Illustrations* on p. 460 as No. 54, which displays a group of emblematic figures typical of fortitude, peace, and wisdom on the

\(^1\) *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, p. 616, No. 28. Curiously enough the altered legend is not worded precisely, as a note found by Mr. Hawkins amongst the Stuart Papers would have led us to expect. In this note (see *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, p. 305) Roettier states that he had erased the inscription on the Duke of York's medal substituting the words Jacobus Secundus D.G. M.B. F. et Hib. Rex., but no such specimen is known, whereas this medal reads IACOBVS • II • DEI • GRA • ANG • SCO • FRA • ET • HIB • REX •

\(^2\) *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, p. 617, No. 29.
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reverse, and is classed as commemorative of the Restoration, although
struck rather later, as is the case with many medallic portraits referring
to that event. We know that the Roettiers were not in England
until the end of 1661, and the short locks of Charles point to some
period subsequent to 1663, for we read in Pepys’ Diary that it was
not until then that he prepared himself for the assumption of a periwig.¹
Slingsby asked Pepys to give him £2 3s. for this medal when he
wished to sell his collection in 1687.²

The likeness between the brothers, distinctly marked in these
medals, is barely perceptible in the coinage, and not at all discernible
in paintings. James had a better mouth than Charles, a sharper nose,
and very different colouring, being much fairer and having, until
marked by the smallpox,³ a fine complexion which set off his more
regular features. His good looks, especially in his youth, excited
comparisons unfavourable to the swarthy Charles, but the younger
brother, of little more than medium height, lacked the commanding

¹ Pepys, November 2nd, 1663, says that the king intends to wear a wig, and mentions
on April 18th, 1664, that he has seen him in one for the first time.
² Pepys, vol. v, p. 132.
³ James had smallpox in 1667.
figure of the elder, and still more was his face destitute of the cleverness and vivacity of expression which characterised Charles. "The King," said Buckingham, "could see things if he would; the Duke would see things if he could," and in after years Ailesbury, who was devoted to all the Stuarts, sums up the capacity of James in the words: "In fine, he wanted nothing but the talent of his royal brother, who certainly was a great master of the art called king-craft—and no one knew men better, and this king less."

It is said of James that in his early years in personal appearance, as well as in his later misfortunes, he recalled his father; and Ailesbury describing him as he saw him at Faversham during his unfortunate flight, seems to have been especially struck by the similarity of his look and bearing to those of Charles I. "Sitting in a great chair," writes this faithful subject, "his hat on, and his beard being much grown, he resembled the picture of his royal father at the pretended Court of Justice." Certainly a description given of him by an anonymous and contemporary writer suggests many points in common: "His face was rather long, his complexion fair, and his countenance engaging. But his outward carriage was a little stiff and constrained. He was not so gracious as he was courteous and obliging. . . . Having some hesitation in his speech, his conversation was not so graceful as it was judicious and solid." But although many of these characteristics

1 Burnet's History of his Own Times, vol. i, p. 304.
2 Memoirs of Thomas Earl of Ailesbury, p. 131. Also on p. 96, speaking of Charles II., he writes: "He was a great master of King-craft, and I wish God his Royal father and brother had been endowed with the same talent."
3 Ailesbury alludes to the portrait at one time attributed to Van Dyck, but now ascribed to Edward Bower in All Souls' College, Oxford, of which a fine mezzotint was engraved by John Faber the elder in 1713. A similar picture signed by Edward Bower, in the collection of the Duke of Rutland at Belvoir Castle, has led to the discovery of the artist; it was, as tradition states, painted during the king's captivity at Carisbrooke Castle, but Charles is dressed as he appeared at his trial, and it has always been received as representing that event. It has served as the model for paintings, usually called "The Black Charles," described in the first part of this article in vol. v, p. 196.
5 Probably Lewis Innes. See my note on p. 54 on the authorship of the Life of King James II., edited by Stanier Clarke.
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appeared in his father, in actual cast of countenance the coins and medals of Charles I. and of James II. do not present any particular resemblance, the nose being different in shape, and the habitually clean-shaven face of the son giving no indication of the serene expression for which his father was usually renowned. There is, however, a picture by Lely at Sion House, which affords us a good opportunity of comparing their features, and in this a certain likeness may be seen. It is one of the most pathetic representations of both Charles and James, and is described by Evelyn as "the last of our blessed kings and ye Duke of York." The painting, which was executed at Hampton Court in the year 1647, is almost worthy of Van Dyck, and shows us Lely at his best; for the face of Charles has the composed but melancholy aspect so peculiar to him, whilst the sadness of his eyes is reflected in the rather anxious look in those of his boy, and a general similarity of lineaments strikes the critic.

The reign of James was so short, that of course the greater proportion of his pictures represent him as Duke of York. Van Dyck painted him as a child, Dobson, the pupil of Sir Anthony, and Peter Lely carried on the work, which was later supplemented by Kneller and Wissing, whilst Samuel Cooper and his followers, as miniaturists, portrayed him at varying ages. Cooper died in 1672 before the accession of James, but his fine miniatures in the Royal Collection and in that of the Duke of Buccleuch are well known, and

---

1 Evelyn’s *Diary*, vol. ii, p. 134.

2 The picture is at Sion House in the collection of the Duke of Northumberland, who, according to Walpole, holds the receipt for £30 paid by his ancestor to Lely for the painting. See Walpole’s *Anecdotes*, vol. ii, p. 93, note 5, and p. 94, note 2. Evelyn must have been mistaken in supposing it to be "the last painted of the king," for the portrait executed by Edward Bower in Carisbrooke Castle, now in the collection of the Duke of Rutland (see note on p. 244), must be the last for which the king gave sittings, with the exception of some miniatures painted between his condemnation and his execution.

3 There is a fine picture of James in his youth at Windsor Castle by William Dobson. Born in 1610, he succeeded Van Dyck as Sergeant Painter in 1641, and died in 1646.

4 One of the two miniatures of James, by Samuel Cooper, at Montagu House, is dated 167(?), the last figure being illegible, but as the artist died in 1672, we may place it within a year or two. It portrays the Duke in a very fair wig and as remarkably handsome, but less stern in expression than in the miniature at Windsor referred to
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it is thought that the hand of Mary Beale appears in an example at Minley Manor.\(^1\) Lely depicted James from youth to manhood, and to him we owe several portraits painted during the lifetime of his first wife. Among these I may call attention to a charming picture at Euston Hall,\(^2\) which vividly brings him before us in his early married days, accompanied by Anne Hyde, whom Lely here portrays as a much handsomer woman than is usually suggested by the court painter's brush. The Duchess of York must, however, have been contented with the commoner type of Sir Peter's portraits, for we learn that it was owing to her high appreciation of his representations of herself that she caused the famous procession of "Hampton Court beauties" to be painted by him.\(^3\) She was, according to de Grammont, at the time the Duke of York married her, "no perfect beauty, yet there was none at the court of Holland that eclipsed her,"\(^4\) and Sir John Reresby, writing in 1665, \textit{i.e.}, about the time when Lely was executing the portrait adversely criticised by Pepys, calls her "a very handsome personage."\(^5\) It is a matter of regret that we have no medallic record of this princess, who was, again to quote Reresby, "a woman of fine wit,"\(^6\) and as Burnet tells us, "was a very extraordinary woman," who "understood what belonged to a princess,"\(^7\) and being as she was a patron of the arts, we can but wonder that no medal portraying her is known to us.

But we must return to the portraiture of James, and we must not omit to mention William Wissing, who was born in 1656 in Amsterdam, and who assisted Sir Peter Lely in England, and became extremely above; the nose is particularly well shaped in all three portraits, and this feature is not at all prominent in some interesting early paintings attributed to Alexander Cooper, the brother of Samuel, now at the Rijks Museum at Amsterdam, and belonging originally to the royal cabinet at the Mauritshuis at The Hague, whence they were transferred to the keeping of the State Galleries in 1876.

\(^1\) In the collection of Mr. Laurence Currie.  
\(^2\) In the collection of the Duke of Grafton.  
\(^3\) \textit{Memoirs of Count Grammont}, vol. ii, p. 71, ed. of 1811.  
\(^5\) \textit{Memoirs of Sir John Reresby}, p. 11.  
\(^6\) \textit{Ibid.}.  
\(^7\) Burnet's \textit{History of his Own Times}, vol. i, p. 307.
JAMES II. BY WISSING, FROM A MEZZOTINT BY R. WILLIAMS.
fashionable after the death of his master. I am able, by the kindness of Mr. W. Sharp Ogden, to reproduce a mezzotint by Williams after Wissing. The original picture must have been painted within two years of the king’s accession, for the artist died early in 1687.

The link between pictorial portraiture and the medallic art is noticeable in this reign in the increase of bas-reliefs and raised plaques, a practice still more developed at a later period when David Le Marchand, with his carved ivory, and Obrisset, with his pressed horn, made their medallions in the days of Queen Anne and George I. But already under Charles II. and James II. we find various carved medallions, from the rough bone examples representing James I. and his grandson James II., now at Farr, near Inverness, and originally at Culloden House, to the beautifully finished pearwood carvings in the British Museum, which bring Charles II. and his brother so vividly before our eyes that we cannot help wondering whether Grinling Gibbons might be held responsible for their chiselling.

Although the medallic portraits of James are not so striking as those of his predecessor on the throne, we have presentments more or less excellent, nor was he solely indebted for them to the Roettier family, but it must ever be a subject of regret that the misplaced economy of the prince and the petulance of the artist caused the destruction of the waxen sketch made by Abraham Simon of the Duke of York. Vertue tells us, speaking of Charles II., that “the king sat for his picture to be modelled,” on his intention to establish the Order of the Royal Oak, for which purpose he gave to Abraham Simon the reward “of an hundred Broad pieces” on the completion of the medal in gold. “Some time after, he was also employed to model the portrait of his Majesty’s brother, the Duke of York, in the same manner as he had done the king’s, which, when he had performed in wax, an enquiry

1 R. Williams, the engraver, practised his art circa 1680–1704, and many of his plates were published by Edward Cooper towards the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries.

2 David Le Marchand carved in ivory, and amongst his works shown at the British Museum are celebrities of the beginning of the eighteenth century—a bust of Newton dated 1718, and a plaque of George I. done from life. Le Marchand died in 1726.
was made what reward he expected? He answer'd an hundred Pieces as his Majesty had given him. But it being reported that the Duke intended to give him only fifty, Simon, pretending that something was further to be done for the improvement thereof, got the model into his own hands again, and by squeezing it together entirely defac'd it. This rash and contemptuous action lost him all favour at court among persons of honour and distinction, and little more of his works were afterwards seen. Thus disregarded and despised he wasted the remainder of his days in obscurity and want: still retaining the antique habit and appearance, pride and poverty before described, till some years after the Revolution, when he died.1 A curious commentary on the way in which the "persons of honour and distinction" of those days were swayed by the royal displeasure is the opinion expressed by Evelyn, who, as a connoisseur, should have risen above such sordid considerations, but who, instead of commiserating the unfortunate disgrace of the artist, spoke of him after his death as "the late squalid Embosser."2

On Plate XXXVII of Vertue's biography of the Simons, above the illustration of the great seal made by Thomas Simon, Abraham's younger and more distinguished brother, we find a "Sketch of a medal intended for the Duke of York."3 Vertue, who is not always very definite in his letterpress, gives no further explanation of this

---

1 Vertue's Medals, Coins, etc., of Thomas Simon, pp. 59 and 60.
2 Discourse on Medals, p. 225.
3 Vertue's Medals, Coins, etc., p. 63.
drawing, and does not say whence he obtained it. It bears the date 1665, which may afford a clue as to the reason why the sketch was, so far as we are aware, never carried out, inasmuch as Thomas Simon did not survive that entire year. Presumably, Vertue had some evidence that the drawing was made by the younger brother, or we might fancy we saw a reminiscence of the spoilt waxen original of Abraham Simon, for collaboration on their part was very frequent. Were it not for the inscription, \textsc{Iacobvs \cdot D \cdot Ebor \cdot E \cdot Alb \cdot Adimiral \cdot Ang}, it would not occur to us that it represented James, whom it does not resemble, but allowance must be made for an engraving taken from a sketch before photography had made illustration simple and accurate.

We must ever regret that Thomas Simon performed no work for James, excepting the Admiralty seal above mentioned,\footnote{See last page and Vertue's \textit{Medals, Coins, etc.}, Plate XXXVII, and p. 63.} which was, as Vertue tells us, but a reproduction of that of his predecessor in office, the Earl of Northumberland, with the substitution of the "Name, Titles, Arms, and other Insignia on the Sails, Flags, etc." Death had removed the artist nearly twenty years before James ascended the throne, and therefore let us see to whom, apart from the Roettier family, he was indebted for his medallic portraiture.

I have already had occasion to mention George Bower, whose talent can, of course, in no way be compared with that of the Simons. His skill is somewhat mechanical, and should we contrast his poorly executed portrait in profile of Sancroft\footnote{\textit{Med. Ill.}, vol. i, p. 622, No. 37.} with the rough and forcible, although rather coarsely rendered medal by an unknown Dutch artist\footnote{\textit{Med. Ill.}, vol. i, p. 625, No. 42.} which exactly resembles the primate with his surrounding bishops as depicted in the National Portrait Gallery, we should condemn him as one who modelled men rather as he wished to see them than as they were. But we must look at Bower's medals as a whole, and although conventional, some of them are worthy of great admiration, and are distinctly more complimentary to James than those of any other medallist of his day.
George Bower worked in London from 1650 onwards, and in January, 1664, became one of the engravers to the Mint and "embosser in ordinary," a post retained by him until his death, which presumably occurred at the end of the year 1689 or at the beginning of 1690.1

Amongst the medals which Bower executed for James is a most inappropriately named example: "The prudence of James."2 The reverse bears the legend "NVLLVM NUMEN ABEST," and these words had already appeared circa 1682 on another medal of James by the same artist, which was decorated on the obverse with a short-haired bust,3 and as the passage quoted from Juvenal to be complete should run "Nullum Numen abest, si sit prudentia," the implication is that Prudence was the presiding deity of this most imprudent ruler. In satire upon the above assumption a die was commenced to commemorate the so-called abdication of the king, namely, his flight of the 11th of December o.s. 1688. Upon this specimen Britannia appears seated beside a globe, upon which one of two infant genii is drawing three reversed crowns, and the legend reads QVIA VNVS ABEEST. Now the curious circumstance is that this die, from

---

1 Calendar of Treasury Papers, 1556-1696, p. 108, March 19th, 1689-90, vol. vii, 69. "Petition of Henry Harris for the office of Chiefe graver of the Stamps and Irons of the King's Mint" vacant on Bower's recent decease. Ibid., p. 53, vol. iv, 25. An entry in the Minute Book of July 2nd, 1689, shows that Bower was ordered to make a puncheon for a half-guinea, proving that he was still alive in the middle of the year 1689. MS. Minute Book V, p. 62, calendared as Minute Book 1, in the Public Record Office, for the numbering has been changed.

2 Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 607, No. 11.

3 Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 589, No. 266.

which there is a leaden impression in the British Museum, was found in an unfinished condition amongst the oft-quoted collection purchased by Mr. Young from John Roettier’s heirs. The curiosity lies not in the fact that the artist never replaced his damaged work, but that he, who could not endure engraving for William III. or even, according to the report presented to the House of Commons,1 “ever own the king,” should have been induced to put forth a scoff at his master’s lack of prudence in this satirical reply to No. 11. The only explanation lies in Roettier’s possible jealousy of Bower, the artist employed upon the first-mentioned medal, or in the suggestion that the die, which was probably made about the time when John Roettier was disabled,2 should rather be attributed to his son James, who when suspended from office in 1697 was allowed to retain his dies and puncheons for medals, and whose property of this class on his death in 1698 would, very naturally, fall into the hands of his father, who was obliged to maintain the widow and seven children out of his own pension from the government.3

I had already too long trespassed on your patience whilst discussing the more eminent artists of the reign of Charles II. to take George Bower’s work into consideration; but one of his most successful medals was a portrait of the earlier monarch with that of his wife upon the reverse,4 and he was not less happy in his presentments of James and Mary Beatrice.

I have the pleasure of illustrating from the National Collection some fine medals of the Duke and Mary, Duchess of York, by Bower, which appeared some six or seven years after their marriage,5 and one of which was re-issued with slight alterations on the birth of their son in 1688.6

1 Commons’ Journal, xi, p. 776. See also our p. 231.
2 It is, of course, possible that in this very disablement lay the reason why the cracked die was never replaced.
5 The marriage took place in 1673, and the medals were issued in 1680.
6 Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 627, No. 45.
In the first of the series James appears in a lace cravat, and offers a rather unusual portrait. In the second we find the ordinary drapery, whilst in the third he is laureated; but all present the same bust of his wife on the reverse, whether as Duchess of York or as Queen.

After their accession to the throne in February, 1685, Bower made many excellent medallic portraits of the pair, although the official coronation medals were, as we have seen, by Roettier.¹

³ Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 627, No. 45.
⁴ See pp. 221-2.
Amongst the works of the former artist I may instance such varieties as are described in *Medallic Illustrations*, vol. i, pp. 608 and 609, Nos. 12 to 14, or the far more pleasing jugate busts mentioned on p. 610, No. 16, with the sun upon the reverse and bearing the legend

"FORTES RADI SED BENIGNI," or on a unique specimen in the British Museum the words: QUIS - NUNC - HALIÆETUS.¹

A slightly differing but no less beautiful example is found in another rare leaden cast in the National Collection, catalogued as *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, p. 616, No. 21, and this portrait is more familiar to

¹ This specimen is not mentioned in the older edition of *Med. Ill.*, but appears amongst the illustrations on Plate LXIII as No. 15 of the new edition.
us as reproduced in 1687, when it was struck to celebrate the recovery of a Spanish wreck, lost many years before, containing treasure amounting to £300,000.

This enterprise of salvage was not due to the king, who had refused to take part in the matter, unlike his brother Charles who had fostered a former unsuccessful attempt to raise the treasure, but once the feat accomplished, James was nothing loth to share in the triumph by presenting medals to the promoters of the expedition; and the legend, taken from Ovid—*Semper tibi pendet hamus*—refers to the perseverance required in this venture.

Mary of Modena, who was twenty-seven years of age when James came to the throne, was still in the bloom of her beauty. Bower was distinctly at his best in portraying her, and in this he was aided by the fact that her features lent themselves to the profile view. The charms of the young Italian beauty were such as were best suited to medallic reproduction, whereas it had been almost impossible to do justice to the brilliant eyes of Henrietta Maria, or to disguise the ill-shaped nose and mouth of Catherine of Braganza.

Lord Peterborough gives us a delightful impression of Mary Beatrice as she appeared at the time of her marriage. She was only fifteen years old, and he tells us that she was "tall and admirably shaped, her Complexion was of the last fairness, her Hair black as Jet, so were her Eyebrows and Eyes." James was of an amorous disposition, and was not always particular as to the ladies whom he regarded with preference, and so much was this the case that Charles II. once remarked that he believed the priests chose James's mistresses for him by way of penance; but in the matter of a second wife he was hard to please. As regards his first marriage, Anne Hyde had for a time captivated his youthful fancy, and had gradually acquired a great moral ascendancy over him, indeed Pepys reports the town gossip that "The Duke of York, in all things, but in his amours, is led by the

---

nose by his wife;"¹ but her influence was that of the strong mind of a clever woman rather than the force of great personal attraction. It is clear that she grew fat² and lost her looks some time before her death in 1671, she was however still possessed of enough charm to insure attention, and Reresby,³ writing in 1665, comments without surprise on the love displayed for her by "Mr. Sydney,⁴ the handsomest youth of his time," saying that "he might well be excused," and he concludes "the Duchess on her part seemed kind to him, but very innocently." Even the malicious de Grammont, who was not so certain but what she returned Sydney's passion, said of Anne, that "she appeared to have found the secret of pleasing every one," and there seems reason to believe that had she lived her influence would have been more beneficial to James than that of his younger and more beautiful second wife, who proud and adoring, never criticised his behaviour."

It was suggested to the Duke of York, on the death of Anne, that it was expedient he should lose no time in securing a fresh partner, but he was not very easy to please, being resolved that his new duchess should adorn the court. In 1673, his final choice lay between the aunt and the sister of the Duke of Modena. The former was the more suitable in point of age, but to the chagrin of both ladies James selected the younger. Unwilling as she was to marry him, one of the strongest proofs of the charms which he still possessed lies in the fact, that in spite of his many infidelities and her formerly expressed distaste for the marriage in the abstract, the love she bore him after a very short time amounted to worship, and that she positively idolised him in her thoughts throughout the dangers and difficulties of his later years.

But although we found in Bower the most able exponent of Mary Beatrice's beauty, we must not forget that Roettier also portrayed her

¹ Pepys' Diary, October 30th, 1668.
² Memoirs of Grammont, vol. ii, p. 220. "The poor princess, gratifying her good appetite, grew so plump and fat that it was a blessing to see her."
³ Memoirs of Sir John Kereshy, p. 11.
not only upon the coronation medal, to which we have already referred, but we learn from an old list of dies by John Roettier left in an unfinished or unused condition in the hands of his grandson, that the artist made "one with the heads of James II. and his Queen like that of Bower's Naufraga Reperta," i.e., like Med. III., vol. i. p. 619, No. 33, illustrated by me on our page 253.

Naturally enough much of John Roettier's time was devoted to the currency of James, and it may be of interest to notice the rough and ready mode of calculation employed in a mint indenture of 1686 concerning "four sorts of money of Crown gold." Here we find it specified that: "one piece shall be called the Ten shilling piece running for Ten shillings sterling and there shall be fourscore and nine of those in the Pound weight Troy," and so we proceed throughout the list. The "Twenty shilling piece" is thus described, "forty four of those and one Ten shilling piece or the weight of a Ten shilling piece in the pound weight Troy," and again the forty shilling piece as "22 of those and one ten shilling piece" to the pound, and "one other piece shall be called the 5/ piece running for 5/., and there shall be 9 of those wanting one ten shilling piece in the weight of one Pound Troy." James in this adhered to the 129 3/4 grains to the guinea ordered by his brother Charles in 1670, preserving also the fineness of "22 Carrats of fine gold and two Carrats of Alloy in every pound weight Troy" throughout his reign.

\[\text{FIVE GUINEA PIECE OF JAMES II.}\]

1 Med. III., vol. i. p. 606, No. 7, illustrated on p. 222 hereof
In our familiarity with the word guinea as applied to the twenty-one shilling piece of a later period we are apt to forget that although the expression came into common use in the days of Charles II. in consequence of the quantity of gold imported from Guinea in Africa, it was not until the 22nd of December, 1717, under George I. that its value was fixed at £1 1s.,\(^1\) after it had passed through many vicissitudes, rising in 1694 to the sum of £1 10s., whence it gradually declined.\(^2\) During the reign, therefore, of James, we see that although commonly called a guinea, the coin was in reality a "twenty shilling piece" as specified in the indenture.

The gold coinage is fine, and were it not, especially in the later issues, for the excessive sharpness of the features before mentioned, it would be an excellent example of the cunetor's best workmanship.

In John Roettier, James had not only an able medallist, but a co-religionist, and a servant who from interest and circumstances as well as from inclination was faithful to his cause, and who as engraver at the mint so long as the reign lasted, had most important work to perform, but he did not follow his king into exile. Possibly it was thought that he could be of more service to James by remaining at the Tower of London, indeed the Stuart Papers supply us with significant information on the subject. On November 9th, 1695, a warrant was addressed from St. Germains to John, James, and Norbert Roettier appointing them "to be engravers general of the Mint for the Kingdom of England, with power to engrave all sorts of puncheons and dies for coining of gold and silver there in such manner as they shall be from time to time directed, and also to be makers of the king's medals and counters."\(^3\) A further warrant of the same day permits Joseph, graveur général to the French mint, together with his nephew Norbert, "to be makers of all instruments, tools, and engines fit and necessary for edging and milling all sorts of gold and silver, to be coined in the Mint for the Kingdom of England in such manner

\(^1\) The History of Currency, by W. A. Sharp, p. 233.

\(^2\) H. A. Grueber's Handbook of Coins of Great Britain and Ireland, pp. 135, 137, 140 and 142.

as they shall from time to time be ordered."¹ This warrant seems to imply that the coins were to be minted in France, where Joseph was residing, Norbert, who was probably still in England, acting as intermediary for the transmission of the dies. On the 18th of December, 1695, James required John, James, and Norbert Roettier to prepare "dies for coining five-pound pieces, forty-shilling pieces, guineas, and half-guineas of gold with the royal arms on one side and the picture of the king on the other, as marked below Nos. 1 and 2, and also puncheons and dies for coining crowns, half-crowns, shillings, and sixpences in silver with the royal arms on one side and the picture of the king on the other, as marked below Nos. 3 and 4, with said sketches at foot."² It would be interesting if these designs could now be compared with the ordinary issues, but from other evidence it seems probable that no new departure was intended, and that they should adhere to the lines of the coinage used by James before his departure. In the following January, according to his memoirs, a certain Captain Matthew Smith made disclosures to the Government in the person of James Vernon,³ concerning a plot against William, and alleged that one Major Holmes was commissioned "to procure some deys from Roettier in the Tower to be sent over to the late king to coin some mill'd money to pay his Army when he landed in England." Smith asserted that he had advised Vernon to take the "Deys of King Charles and King James out of Roettier's hands," and that "Mr. V— declared that he would do so," but it appears that no great weight was attached to his communications at the time.⁴ In the

---

³ James Vernon was Under Secretary of State, Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury, being his chief. Smith accused Shrewsbury and Vernon of neglecting the information which he had given them, but they were exonerated by William III.
⁴ Smith's Memoirs of Secret Service, 1699, Preface XII, and p. 89. Matthew Smith, an informer speaking of the disclosures, which he had made, says in his preface "that he discover'd where a quantity of arms were conceal'd . . . as also the Dyes of the Tower which were conveyed away by Hewet and others by the help of Mr. Roettier, and which were at Mr. Vernon's house on Sunday the 19th January, 1695." A note in Walpole's Anecdotes, vol. ii, p. 186, quotes this as meaning that the dies were taken to
Accusations against the Roettiers.

Commons' Journal, under the date of April 8th, 1697, we find a long report of a commission appointed to look into the affairs of the mint and to enquire into the actions of the Roettiers, but these proceedings belong more properly to the reign of William III., and it must suffice me for the moment to say that owing to the trial of certain persons for false coining, it transpired that "several pieces of new crowns and half-crowns had been counterfeited lately, which they were positive were done with dies that are in the Tower," and that it was thought that dies had been feloniously abstracted from the mint. Furthermore, White, a coiner, had asserted that "he could have dyes from Roteer when he pleased," and it was said that "one Hunter, a servant of the moneyers, conveyed away several of the Mint dies." The result was the retirement of John Roettier to his own house in Red Lion Square, whilst his son James was suspended from office. Norbert had not awaited the outcome of the enquiry and had already found employment in France.

All this affair was of course subsequently to the time when James first ordered the Roettiers to prepare him the series of dies to which I have referred, but it appears from all the charges made against John Roettier in particular, that he was very strongly suspected of doing everything in his power to aid in the restoration of a Catholic monarchy; and that dies had certainly been conveyed out of the Tower: but whether in January, 1695-6, he made a successful effort to send any such dies to James, and if so, whether they were specially made from patterns ordered in the previous December, we cannot at present ascertain.

"Mr. Vernon's house," but I believe, on referring to the text, that Smith means it was there he lodged the information. See also Num. Chron., 1st Series, vol. iii, p. 179, where a clear account is given of the whole matter.

1 Commons' Journal, xi, p. 774 et seq.
3 White was condemned for clipping and coining on January 27th, 1696-7, Commons' Journal, vol. xi, p. 678.
4 Commons' Journal, vol. xi, p. 775, April 8th, 1697. It appears that "Hunter and one Scotch Robin, who was also concerned in the same fact, have sheltered themselves in the mint in Scotland."
No coin-dies dated 1695 or 1696 were found amongst the Roettiers' possessions now in the British Museum, and no coinage of James II, bearing these dates is known, but of course if any money was struck from old dies abstracted from the Tower and sent to France, as these would have borne the figures 1688 at latest, it would be indistinguishable from the ordinary issues.

I referred just now to a list of the Roettier medals copied from a paper in the possession of Thomas Snelling in January, 1776, which is described as a "catalogue of a part of the dies that Mr. Roettier, goldsmith to His Majesty (of France), has now in his hands, which were engraved by his grandfather, John Roettier, which have never yet been struck."

In this collection we find mention of "A head of James II, rather old without inscription," "Another ditto smaller," and it strikes us that these might possibly be dies intended for the coinage unless we believe, as I should be more inclined to think, that the first.

2 James Roettier, the son of Norbert and grandson of John Roettier, born 1707, died 1764, was goldsmith to the French Court, but worked in England from 1731 to 1733.
catalogued was the large medal\textsuperscript{1} illustrated from the National Collection on p. 241, a solitary impression made in lead on the acquisition of the dies by Matthew Young, no contemporary specimen being known, and that the smaller piece which figures on the list is the military or naval reward,\textsuperscript{2} which is of the Lowestoft medal type excepting for the assumption of the royal titles—for of this also the dies are in the Museum, and the example in the National Collection is of the early nineteenth century. I possess a curious trial piece in lead of this later date, probably made by Matthew Young in testing the die. It is of the obverse only and I illustrate it on p. 260 because I have never met with a contemporary specimen and the restrikes are extremely rare.

We have not far to seek in realising that in the earlier part of the year 1696 an English coinage was of supreme importance to James. Mary, the king's eldest daughter, had died on December 20th, 1694, and Anne, who, owing to a quarrel with her sister concerning Sarah, Lady, afterwards Duchess of Marlborough, had not been on the best of terms with the House of Orange, gladly seized the opportunity of becoming reconciled to William. The Jacobites were, however, so much the more stirred to action, and the fall of Namur on August 4th, 1695, inclined Louis XIV. to give greater encouragement to the plotters.

Berwick went to England to reconnoitre, but learning in London that a plan was in progress "against the person of the Prince of Orange," he returned to France, "so as not to be confounded with the conspirators"—for thus he expresses himself in his memoirs.\textsuperscript{3} He found James anxiously awaiting him at Cherbourg, where the French

\textsuperscript{1} Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 617, No. 30.

\textsuperscript{2} Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 616, No. 28.

\textsuperscript{3} Memoirs of James FitzJames, Duke of Berwick, vol. i, pp. 132-7. It appears on his own showing that from a mistaken sense of "honour" Berwick did not "disuade" Barclay from the plot, although he declined participation in it. James, on the other hand, not only on this occasion but several times previously, had refused to countenance any proposal to assassinate William (see Life of King James, by Stanier Clarke, vol. ii, p. 545). James personally denied any complicity in the violent measures, and assured the Papal Nuncio "of his innocence respecting the supposed conspiracy." Letter from Rizzini quoted in Mary of Modena, by Martin Haile, p. 323. Evelyn also tells us that the plotters "acquitted King James of inciting them to it, and died very penitent." Diary, March 8th, 1695-6, vol. iii, p. 350.
fleets was stationed expecting a signal from England which never arrived, and throughout the March and April of 1696 the exiled king remained watching the coast. The plot was discovered and had ruined his projects, for it had rendered William more popular and aroused the vigilance of the Anti-Jacobites, but it is easy to see that had a French invasion of England taken place at this juncture, the necessity would have arisen for the production of a coinage bearing James's effigy, rather than that the English should be compelled to use foreign money, which would have accentuated the fact that he was restored to the throne by the intervention of an alien power.

After the peace of Ryswick was signed in October, 1697, there remained but little hope of ultimate restoration, and James gave himself up to a life of religious exercises. He did not, however, omit to preserve some regal formalities, and we learn with interest that at the time of his death, his great seals of England and Ireland in silver, and that of Scotland in brass, were found in his cabinet; and that the two former, with some other pieces of silver plate, were given to Roettier to melt and remould into a fresh great seal for his son.

The story of the seal, which was dropped into the Thames by James II. in his flight on December 11th, 1688 o.s., and subsequently fished up by boatmen and carried to William III., is too well known to require repetition. It was made the subject of a commemoration medal a hundred years after the event, and appears with William's bust on the obverse, whilst the reverse represents James crossing the river with Sir Edward Hales.

Of more interest to us, however, as being almost contemporary and illustrative of the literary style of James, is the account of the

1 *Archaeologia*, vol. xviii, p. 229 to p. 233. Inventory of valuables in the possession of James II. at the time of his death. See also *Notes and Queries*, 2nd Series, vol. xii, p. 317.

3 James Francis Edward, son of James II. as James III., issued warrants to Norbert Roettier for making the great seal of the kingdom of England on October 31st, 1701, and for those of Scotland and Ireland on October 15th, 1702. See *Stuart Papers*, vol. i, p. 165. Entry Book 4, p. 61.

3 Wyon's *Great Seals of England*, p. 109, and Plate XXXIX.

4 *Med. Ill.*, vol. i, p. 646, No. 75.
James orders a New Great Seal.

making of two fresh seals written by himself on February 20th, 1693. From this paper I give extracts, because it shows that even in his exile the king was not inclined to tolerate inferior workmanship.

After explaining that "We were convinced it was absolutely necessary for us to withdraw from our Kingdom of England," the king continued: "We have thought fit to destroy our great Seal . . . and being resolved to lay hold on the first opportunity to return . . . and knowing the necessity of having a Great Seal of England with us, we issued our warrant in the month of January, 1688-9, to one Rottier to make one, which we carried with us to our kingdom of Ireland. But finding that Great Seal as being made in haste was imperfect in the graving and the impressions made thereby not so beautiful as the impression of our Great Seal of England used to be, we gave our order and warrant under our royal hand and signed, to the above named Rottier bearing date 29th May, 1691 . . . to engrave a new Great Seal for our Kingdom of England, and ordered the forementioned Great Seal made in January, 1688-9, to be broken in our presence, which was accordingly done."

The first great seal, considered "so beautiful" by James, has all the appearance of being the work of John Roettier, whereas its successor, made in France, was probably that of his brother Joseph. The historic seal referred to above, which reposed at the bottom of the Thames, is, however, more usually attributed to "Mr. East," who is mentioned in the Treasury Papers as "engraver to his Majesty King James," and in the Lowndes Manuscript as the maker of seals for Barbadoes and Jamaica.

The task of disentangling the various offices held at the Mint is often difficult, for sometimes the cuneator was also the engraver of seals, or on the contrary the latter post was separately confided to

1 Stuart Papers, vol. i, p. 77. Entry Book 3, p. 47.
2 The king, writing in France, uses the double date, January, 1688, for his English readers, and 1689 according to the calendar already in use in the country of his refuge.
3 Wyon, Plate XXXIX.
4 Wyon's Great Seals, p. 190.
5 Calendar of Treasury Papers, 1714-1719, p. 228, vol. cc, 17.
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a medallist. We have seen that Bower's commission as "embosser in ordinary" eventually grew into that of engraver to the mint,¹ and on his death, which was before the final displacement of the Roettiers, we find that Henry Harris, who was Engraver of the Seals, stated when petitioning William III. for the office of "chiefe graver of the Stamps and Irons of the mint," that the function "formerly belonged to the chiefe graver of the King's Seals, and was perform'd by himself, Servants or such able men as hee cal'd in to assist him."² Henry Harris was, according to Allan Wyon,³ the successor of East as engraver of seals; but the fact that I have seen no other specimen of the latter's work with which to compare the great seal of James, makes it at present impossible for me, in default of documentary evidence, to apportion the results of their labours to the various artists. Harris, as I explained in our last volume,⁴ had held under Charles II. the appointment of "engraver of the king's signets, arms, seals, excepting the irons of the mint and medals," from the year 1670 if we abide by the dating of the State Papers⁵ or as Ruding,⁶ I venture to suggest, mistakenly, has it from 1680, but again some difficulty arises when we seek to identify his work, for although he himself declared that he "had been educated in the art,"⁷ it appears doubtful how much of the actual engraving he personally performed.

We know little about East; but Horace Walpole,⁸ Bolzenthal⁹ and J. H. Burn¹⁰ speak of Thomas East as a pupil of Thomas Simon, and this would be the highest recommendation to his contemporaries, for

³ Wyon's Great Seals, p. 190. See also Dictionary of National Biography under Harris. In the State Papers, warrants on the subject of seals are addressed to him from the commencement of the reign of William III.
⁵ Cal. State Papers, Addenda 1660–70, p. 525.
⁶ Ruding, vol. i, p. 45. (Anno 32 of Charles II.)
⁹ Bolzenthal's Skizzen zur Kunstgeschichte der Modernen Medaillen Arbeit, p. 234.
¹⁰ Num. Chron., vol. iii, 1st Series, p. 174. See also Forrer's Dictionary of Medallists
Simon's skill was so generally revered that his renown was cited in a play, published shortly after his death, as a noted maker of seals.\footnote{1 \textit{Num. Chron.}, vol. vii, 1st Series, p. 146, quoting Shadwell's \textit{Sullen Lovers}, published in 1668.} The name of East, however, is no new thing in the annals of the mint, for \textit{John East} appears as "\textit{Under Graver}" in the reign of Charles I.,\footnote{2 \textit{Calendar of State Papers Domestic}, 1633–34, p. 361, vol. cclvi, 47.} and again under Cromwell.\footnote{3 \textit{Num. Chron.}, vol. iv, 1st Series, p. 217, in the year 1649.} Probably Thomas East was a son or young relation of this official, but the details of the latter part of Charles II.'s reign and of the three years when his brother ruled, are still amongst the unpublished \textit{State Papers,*} and the \textit{Dictionary of National Biography} supplies no information concerning any engraver called East, so this is mere guesswork.

Most unfortunately, as compared with those of the preceding Stuart monarchs, the reign of James II. presents, apart from private letters printed by the Historical MS. Commission, few documents available to the general public relating to the internal administration of the kingdom. The Calendars of \textit{State Papers} of this short period, whether \textit{Domestic} or \textit{Irish}, have yet to be compiled; the \textit{Calendar of Treasury Papers} devotes but 17 pages to the years 1685 to 1688 inclusive; the \textit{Stuart Papers} at Windsor Castle are still in progress of publication, and admirably arranged as are these last sources of information, they throw but little light on numismatic matters.

It is a pity that the biography commenced by Anne Hyde, and shown by her to Bishop Burnet, did not survive; for he says of her that "she had great knowledge and a lively sense of things," that "she writ well" and had finished one volume drawn from the journal of her husband.\footnote{4 The \textit{State Papers Domestic} of the year 1678 are still in progress of publication, and we may hope that the completion of the series will follow in due course.} We cannot but regret also that many of his personal manuscripts, together with his autobiography, were destroyed at the time of the French Revolution. The papers had been deposited in the Scots' College at Paris, whence they were removed for safety,\footnote{5 Burnet's \textit{History of his own times}, vol. i, p. 307.} but

\footnote{6 Burnet's \textit{History of his own times}, vol. i, p. 307.}

\footnote{7 See Introduction to the \textit{Stuart Papers}, vol. i, also preface to Clarke's \textit{Life of King James}, vol. i, xvii, and Charles James Fox's \textit{History of James II.}, p. xxix.}
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were nevertheless burnt. Fortunately in an incomplete form the memoirs of the king have come down to us, for James Macpherson in 1775 printed extracts, made by Thomas Carte, and purchased by him from this historian's widow, which he amplified by his own studies at the Scots' College. Nor is this all, for in 1816, after the arrival in England of a portion of the Stuart manuscripts, James Stanier Clarke, historiographer royal, published a work entitled, The Life of James II. collected out of Memoirs writ of his own Hand. This book was based upon an abstract which had been completed, according to some authorities by order of the Chevalier de St. George, from the original manuscript whilst it still remained in the hands of its custodians at the Scottish seminary in the Rue des Fossés St. Victor.

But these documents, although they throw much light on the character of the man, do not elucidate questions which here concern us. It may, however, be interesting to put before the reader a part of the personal description of James, given by the compiler of the memoir: "Something above middle stature, well-shaped, very nervous and strong . . . ." says this anonymous writer. "He was affable and easy of access, for he affected not formalitie, tho' no one knew the ceremonial better, nor was more exact (when necessary) in the observance of it; in his conversation and arguing, he endeavour'd rather to convince with good reason than fine expressions . . . . His temper was naturally hot and colorick, but in his latter days his virtue got the mastery over it, and in his younger it scarce ever so overpower'd him as to force him to any action unbecoming his character." In speaking

1 Original Papers, by James Macpherson.
2 The Royal Stuarts in their connection with Art and Letters, pp. 245-6, by Blaikie Murdoch, and Original Papers, by Macpherson, vol. i, p. 6.
3 Papers left in the hands of the English Benedictines at Rome, and purchased in 1805 and brought to England in 1810, being the first consignment of the Stuart Papers. See vol. i, Introduction, pp. i to viii.
4 This abstract is variously attributed to Thomas Innes, or to Charles Dryden the son of the poet, or to Lewis Innes the Principal of the Scots' College, to whose care the MS. was confided by James in March, 1701. Clarke's Life of King James II., vol. i, xix to xxiii. See also Preface Fox's History of King James. Modern opinion is in favour of the claims of Lewis Innes.
5 Life of King James II., vol. ii, p. 604.
of James as a soldier, the author writes: "He had two great masters in that art" (of war), "the Prince of Condé and the Maréchal de Turenne, whose esteem and friendship he so entirely gained, that the former bore testimony to his valour that: 'If ever any man was void of Fear it was (he sayd) the Duke of York.'" 1 The courage of James has been impugned by adverse critics, when at the crucial moment of his life, his personal prowess was overcome by an attack of illness which amounted to aberration, and at no time did he display the ready grasp of the situation for which his brother was noted, but no one can call him coward of whom Turenne said that he was in his youth "the greatest Prince and like to be the greatest General of his time." 2

Although he attained to the position of Lieutenant-General in the French Army, Turenne's prophecy was not literally fulfilled; but James became a distinguished Admiral, and as such showed both courage and technical skill. His conduct was misrepresented by contemporary gossip, which was repeated although not always credited, by various writers 3 on the occasion of the terrible wreck of his frigate, the Gloucester, on May 3rd, 1682, when James, although only with difficulty persuaded to do so, escaped with a number of documents of importance to the king, and such members of his staff as the boat would hold. 4 It is therefore pleasant to read the tribute of Pepys to his seamanship, for he tells us that the accident was caused by "an obstinate overwinning of the pilot in opposition to all the contrary opinions of Sir J. Berry, 5 his master, mates, Col. Legg (sic) and the Duke himself." 6 Lingard bears witness to the generosity of James to the families of those who

1 Life of King James II., vol. ii, p. 610.
2 Burnet's Own Times, vol. iii, p. 4.
4 See evidence given by Allan Fea from the accounts of Berry and Hyde in James II. and his Wives, pp. 101-2.
5 Sir John Berry was in command of the Gloucester. "Col. Legg," to whom Pepys alluded, was George Legge, afterwards first Baron Dartmouth. They were both exonerated from blame with regard to the wreck and attained high naval positions as Admirals.
perished in the disaster,¹ the loss being estimated at about two hundred persons,² and calls attention to the unfairness, both towards the Duke and Legge, of the account given by Burnet, which was later disproved by letters from Dartmouth and others.³ The kindness of heart displayed by James, together with his coolness of head, is exemplified in the story of his insistency, at much personal risk, upon taking into his boat an unfortunate musician who implored his aid, although the frail craft in which he was escaping, was already overcrowded with members of his suite. "He is a poor fiddler enough," said the musical Duke, with a rare touch of his brother's humour, "but we will save him."⁴ Again Ailesbury reports that on the plea that he was "a Christian"⁵ he refused to allow the ejection of another person found hidden in the boat as they were about to put off. The popularity of the Prince, no less than the bravery of the British sailor, was evinced by the cheer which broke from those remaining on board as "they saw his Royal Highness in safety."⁶

¹ Lingard, vol. xii, note on p. 308. "James gave eleven months pay to the widow of every seaman who perished, and a sum of money to each child of such seaman."

² Lingard reckons the loss at 200 men, and Pepys speaks of "about 200." Sir James Dick (Ellis's Original Letters, vol. iv, 2nd Series, p. 69) estimates the number at "above 200," whilst Burnet mentions "150 persons," and Rapin says "several persons of quality were unfortunately drowned with "130 seamen."

³ See letter from William Legge, first Earl of Dartmouth, the son of Colonel Legge, the first Baron, note to Burnet, vol. ii, p. 325, ed. 1833.

⁴ The Royal Stuarts, by Blaikie Murdoch, p. 243.


James as Subject and Ruler.

A medal struck by Bower in commemoration of James's rescue on this occasion from the wreck of the Gloucester, gives us a fine portrait of him, of rather more expressive countenance than the majority of this artist's works.

The Prince was neither wanting in bravery nor in generosity, but his courage was perhaps more physical than moral, being of the type which will boldly meet personal danger, whereas he had not the nerve which can face a difficult position with equanimity and promptitude. In common with several other members of his family, he was the victim of circumstances; a troubled youth and after the beneficent supervision of his father was removed, a careless upbringing, similar to that of his brother Charles, wrought in his very different character a contrary result. James sacrificed everything to his religion, but the duties he least understood were those which he was called upon to perform, the duties of a constitutional monarch. He was a good and loyal subject to his brother, but as king he failed to grasp the significance of the change which his father had died to combat, and thus brought his own reign to an end only less violent than that of Charles I., because instead of fighting for the absolute rights which he claimed, he ran away.

He expected to take up the reins of government just as they had been wrenched from his father's grasp, and failing to do this, he gave up the contest. Far more popular in his youth than Charles II. at the court of Louis XIV., owing to his personal appearance and address, and to his superior knowledge of the French language, he distinguished himself before the Restoration in many ways, and after that event showed his stamina in various matters, not the least of which was the championship of a creed which cost him his popularity and eventually his crown. His position became so strained that little justice has been done to such good qualities as he possessed, and his own firm belief in the bygone doctrine of the divine right of kings became his bane. Burnet sums up his character, not very kindly, in the saying that "he had no true judgment, and was soon determined by those whom he

1 Med. III., vol. i, p. 586, No. 263, see illustration on opposite page.
trusted, but he was obstinate against all other advices."1 James lacked the tact and ready wit of Charles, and he had little of that qualifying sense of humour which endeared the latter to his people, but it was the obstinacy, which Burnet so much deprecated, that led the nation to forget that he really intended its welfare, so that the courage displayed in his early campaigns and in his naval career whilst fighting the Dutch, was ignored in the failure from a political point of view of his later life. The Bishop does him but scant justice when he says, "He was esteemed in the former parts of his life a man of great courage, as he was through it a man of great application to business; he had no vivacity of thought, invention, or expression, but he had a good judgment where his religion or his education gave him not a bias, which it did very often. He was naturally a man of truth, fidelity, and justice . . . he was a gentle master, and was very easy to all who came near him, yet he was not so apt to pardon as one ought to be who is the vice-regent of that God who is slow to anger and ready to forgive."2

Certainly we cannot say that James showed himself "apt to pardon" in the Monmouth rebellion, or in his treatment of the Covenanters at the beginning of his reign, but even in this his conduct has been much misrepresented. Ailesbury3 frequently assures us that James was not vindictive towards his enemies, and a note to Burnet's history tells us that "The Duke of Bucks says that he never forgave Lord Jeffreys for his cruelties in the West,"4 and even the Bishop himself quotes the testimony of an eye-witness that "he was hurried into the effusion of blood by Jeffries' impetuous and cruel temper." He often merely drifted with a tide he could not stem, and in so doing resembled his father and brother. This is perhaps no excuse, for we are inclined to endorse the opinion of Burnet, who remarked whilst speaking of precedents put forward in justification for the prosecutions of the Catholics during the agitation against the Popish Plot under the easy-

---

1 Burnet's *History of his own Times*, vol. i, p. 304.
2 Burnet's *History of his own Times*, vol. iv, p. 539.
3 Ailesbury's *Memoirs*, pp. 77 and 132.
4 Editorial note in the edition of 1833 of Burnet's *History*, vol. iii, p. 66.
going Charles: "I have always thought that a precedent against reason signified no more than that the like injustice had been done before." 1

The advance of years wrought in James a softer spirit, and whatever his faults may have been, it cannot be denied that he was a kind father, and that the ingratitude shown towards him by his two elder daughters was undeserved. Alas! that his exile from his kingdom was brought about by his total inability to understand that however enlightened might be his desire for religious toleration, it was impossible to force it upon the people by unconstitutional means.

The obstinacy of James kept him unaware that as the Catholic ruler of a Protestant land his policy, to meet with even partial success, should have been conducted with greater circumspection. We are told by Ailesbury that even his co-religionists regretted his violence in their cause, in placing members of their faith in high legal offices, and he writes: "I knew many Lords and a great number of gentlemen of the Roman Catholic religion that lamented, crying out: 'These measures will ruin us all.'" 2 He considered himself "above the law," and said so to Somerset, who had refused to introduce the Papal Nuncio at court, on the plea that the visit was contrary to the British constitution. The reply of the Duke, "Your Majesty may be above the law, but I am not," represented the feelings of the more tolerant of the people, whilst the general sentiment was that one who considered himself "above the law" was no safe ruler for the country.

Very rarely in those days was an open-minded spirit to be found like that of old Lady Stair, who, tired of listening to the animadversions of Claverhouse against John Knox, retorted: "Why are ye so severe? Ye are baith reformers. He gained his point by clavers whilst ye attempt to gain yours by knocks." 3

As Duke of York and heir to the throne, James filled a difficult position with much dignity. Great affection existed between the two

---

1 Burnet’s History of his own Times, vol. ii, p. 182.
2 Ailesbury’s Memoirs, p. 152.
3 A Group of Scottish Women, by Henry Graham, p. 25. Claverhouse is pronounced Claver’se in Scotland, and "clavers" means talk.
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brothers, but Charles II., although always ready to uphold his intended successor, was obliged at times to give way to popular clamour, a necessity which James never understood. Nevertheless, his influence over Charles was so great that it was said by Waller, the poet, in 1684, shortly before the monarch's demise, that "The House of Commons resolved that the Duke should not reign over them after the king's death, but the king in opposition to him was resolved he should reign even during his life."1

The concluding years of James, spent in exile in the pious exercise of his creed, left such an impression of sanctity that in his funeral oration, couched in more than the habitual fulsomeness of adulation expected at that time, the preacher actually dared to assert that the king had never committed a mortal sin, whereupon his natural son, the Duke of Berwick, was heard to murmur, "Never a mortal sin! Then what am I? Am I a trifling sin?"

By the irony of fate, the final honours to the memory of James were paid with befitting reverence more than a hundred years after his death by the orders of one of the Hanoverian line.2 When he died in a foreign land his body, embalmed and enclosed in a leaden coffin, was kept unburied in the chapel of St. Edmund belonging to the Benedictines in the Rue St. Jacques at Paris, awaiting the time when it should be possible to transfer it to Westminster Abbey. During the French Revolution the Sans-culottes broke open the coffin to "get at the lead to cast into bullets,"3 and a Mr. FitzSimons, an Irishman,

1 Adventures of King James of England, p. 293.
2 A receptacle containing parts of the king's praecordia was exhumed upon the restoration of the church at St. Germain-en-Laye in 1824, and by desire of George IV. the relics were honourably re-interred, and a monument with a fitting inscription was erected (see Notes and Queries, 1st Series, vol. ii, p. 427), which was in its turn succeeded by another memorial ordered by Queen Victoria in 1855 (see James II. and his Wives, p. 296), who also contributed £50 towards the restoration of the chapel in 1857, see Jacques II Stuart, par J. Dulon, p. 64.
3 The Comité du Salut Public gave orders in July, 1793, that all the royal tombs in St. Denis should be destroyed and the coffins converted into bullets and cannon. The Commissaire aux Plombs during the following October and November rifled the churches of Paris for this purpose, including the chapel in the Rue St. Jacques. See Les Tablettes de la Schola, 1907, No. 4 of a series of articles entitled Le Passé d'une Salle de Concert, par Monsieur de la Laurencie.
imprisoned in the monastery in Paris in 1793, who was present, has left on record that the corpse was in an extraordinary state of preservation, "beautiful and perfect. The hands and nails were very fine; I moved and bent every finger. I never saw so fine a set of teeth in my life . . . The feet also were very beautiful. The face and cheeks were just as if he were alive. The French and English prisoners gave money to the Sans-culottes for showing the body." 1

Miss Strickland distinctly states that when the allies reached Paris in 1813 the king still lay unburied, for although orders were given by Robespierre for the burial they were not carried out, and that measures were taken for the safety of the body by George, Prince of Wales then Prince Regent, who caused its removal to St. Germains, whither it was followed in funeral procession by the English then resident in Paris, irrespective of their differences of creed, "as though he had been a beloved sovereign who had died the previous week."

Other historians have objected that the interval between the desecration of the Benedictine chapel in 1793 and the year 1813 leaves the whereabouts of the uncoffined remains inexplicable, but it has been suggested that a possible solution of the enigma lies in the fact that James was a Freemason, and that the sympathies of the Sans-culottes might consequently have been engaged for the private removal of the embalmed corpse to a place of temporary sepulture. 3 Be that as it may, in the year 1824 a monument was erected by the order of George IV. at St. Germains, and some portion of the remains of James were then honourably reinterred. It is, however, possible that

1 Notes and Queries, vol. ii, 1st Series, p. 243. The account was given by Mr. Fitz Simons to one Mr. Pitman Jones in 1840, and it was published in 1850.


3 See the account given in Le Pas é d'une Salle de Concert, No. 4, by M. de la Laurencie, the Secrétaire Général de la Schola Cantoram, which now occupies the premises of the Benedictine Monastery in the Rue St. Jacques. To this gentleman and to M. Charles Noufflard I am indebted for many details concerning these events. Much information about the death of James II. and the arrangements made by Louis XIV. for his funeral may be found in Mary of Modena, by Martin Haile, pp. 353-5, and Appendix B; also in James II. and his Wives, pp. 288-97.

4 See note 2 on p. 272 concerning these remains, and Jacques II Stuart, par J. Dulon, pp. 60-4, for full description of the monument.
these consisted only of the intestines and lungs, which according to his desire, were divided between the parish church of St. Germains and the British College at St. Omer, whilst his brains were bestowed upon the Scots' College, and his heart was sent to the convent chapel of Sainte Marie at Chaillot. The eye-witness of the curious scene during the Terror further informs us that the Sans-culottes said that they would put the body "in a hole in a cemetery," and that "King George made every effort to find it, but his researches were fruitless." He ends by telling us that: "Around the chapel were several wax moulds hung up, made probably at the time of the king's death; the corpse was very like them."

Mr. Allan Fea in his James II. and His Wives gives an illustration of a death-mask of the king which is, he states, in the Museum at Dunkirk. Whether this be one of those from the mortuary chapel of the Benedictines I cannot say, but it bears a strong resemblance to the English coinage by Roettier. He also tells us that another of these waxen effigies is in the possession of the Duc de FitzJames, and an old document quoted by him suggests that yet another is in the convent, but a modern French writer speaks of this bust in the past tense. A curious print of a monument erected to James in the chapel of the Scots' College in Paris shows us in a medallion which surmounted the sarcophagus an excellent portrait of the king. This engraving I am able to reproduce in a reduced size, and the likeness between the coinage and the bas-relief at once strikes the beholder. We learn that "a memorial was erected in 1703 by James Duke of Perth in the Scots' College, and that an urn containing the brains of the king formerly stood on the top of it." Jesse in his Memoirs of the Stuarts, written in the year 1840, tells us that this monument of black and white marble, the work of Louis Garnier, was then still to be seen in the Rue des Fossés St. Victor "in the

1 James II. and His Wives, p. 297.
2 Exhibited at the Stuart Exhibition in 1889, No. 1093, see catalogue.
3 James II. and His Wives, p. 292, quoting Rawlinson MSS., Bodleian Library.
4 Le Passé d'une Salle de Concert, No. 3, by M. de la Laurencie, from whose kind communication I understand that the bust is no longer at the Schola Cantorum.
ERECTED in the CHAPPEL of the SCOTCH COLLEGE
at LOUVES in the YEAR 1703.

THE MONUMENT
OF KING JAMES.
The Monument at the Scots' College.

The chapel of what was once the famous Scots' College," but that during the Revolution "sacrilegious hands" had removed the "urn of gilded bronze." Jesse gives the lengthy Latin inscription upon the sarcophagus, which does not appear in our plate, and which is, I learn, now much defaced. A short account of the College des Escossais and complete descriptions of the various royal tablets in the chapel are to be found in Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica. Our print was engraved by Du Bosc, collaborating with Gravelot for Tindal's translation of Rapin's History of England, and appeared in the edition of 1743; but it was executed some years earlier, for we

---

1 Jesse's Memoirs of the Stuarts, vol. iv, pp. 442-4. When the King bequeathed his brains to the Scots' College they were placed in a receptacle at the base of the pyramid bearing, as we see in our plate, the medallion of James, and surmounted by a flaming lamp. It is said that the brains were scattered at the Revolution, but this should be interpreted as thrown aside, for Mr. Fea in his James II. and His Wives draws attention to the publication, in the Times of March 7th, 1833, of the discovery of a "leaden case, containing the brains in size and shape resembling a liquor bottle without a neck," which was thought to be the inner lining of the missing bronze urn. From information kindly supplied by Monsieur Charles Noufflard, I learn that not only the brazen casket, but all the metal ornaments, have been wrenched from their places, and although still recognisable in the antechamber of the chapel, the monument has suffered much mutilation.

2 Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica, vol. vii, pp. 32-5, published in 1841, where it is stated that the college was originally founded in the Rue des Amandiers in Paris in 1385, but was removed in 1665 to the Rue des Fossés St. Victor, and here after the college itself was in abeyance and the buildings let to a private school, the chapel still remains "a point of attraction to all students of English history." By the courtesy of M. Charles Noufflard I understand that the name of the street has been changed to Rue Cardinal Lemoine, and that the property, which still belongs to the congregation of Scottish Bishops, is leased to the Institution Chevallier, where young men are coached for examinations.

3 This print bears the words, "The Monument of King James II. Erected in the Chappel of the Scotch College at Paris in the year 1703, Gravelot del. C. Du Bosc fecit." Claude Du Bosc was born in France in 1682. He came in 1712 to England to assist Dorigny in the task of engraving the cartoons at Hampton Court, but owing to some disagreement left him before the completion of the work and set up on his own account. In 1732 Hubert Francois Gravelot joined him, and collaborated with him in various book illustrations. Gravelot was born in Paris in 1699, and died in France in 1773, having finally settled there in 1754. It is said that he left England for a short time in 1745, at which date it is suggested with a query in the Dictionary of National Biography that the death of Du Bosc may have taken place.
find it, together with the portrait of James, which we illustrated facing our page 220 in Vertue's *Heads of the Kings of England proper to Rapin*, prepared for this folio edition in 1736. A differing version of the same subject by another hand in the Print Room of the British Museum presents a more distinct rendering of the King's medallion than does our example.

There are not many memorial medals of this king, but I would gladly draw attention to the beautiful medallions in thin silver of the type technically called shells or, more modernly, *clichés*,¹ of which there are specimens, the one in a private cabinet, the other in the Franks' collection at the British Museum, and which are, I regret to say, too fragile for illustration. There are two varieties of these very rare medallions, but the bust on both is the same, the difference lying in

¹ The French word *cliché* originally meant a stereotype-plate cast from a block, and as such should be applied to cast pieces only; but it is now generally used in modern catalogues to imply a thin proof impression from a die.
the legend, for one bears the date of the death of James, the other only the words IACOBVS • II • D • G • MAG • BR • FRA • ET • HIB • REX. Fortunately there is one example in the National Collection stamped in lead which is of a more solid character, and which I am permitted to reproduce here. The fact that this portrait is not directly copied from any known medal of James makes it appear likely that it is the original effort either of John Roettier, who had the features of the royal model during this short reign constantly at his command, or of Norbert Roettier, who was with the king in his exile. The concluding date in the legend on the above would prove if absolutely contemporary with the original engraving of the die, that the plaque was not executed until after the death of James, but it may be that the inscription was a later addition, by one of these artists, both of whom survived their master, the more especially because it appears on one variety only. Personally, giving my opinion for what it is worth, I am inclined to date it 1688, and to see the hand of John Roettier in the portrait, for in all particulars it more nearly resembles the Lowestoft medal of the Duke of York, No. 142, which appeared on our plate facing page 240, or the Naval Reward of 1685, No. 29, than any work executed by Norbert.

These shells are classed with others as a series representing the Stuart sovereigns, executed in the reign of Anne, and attributed to Norbert Roettier partly on account of their general likeness to the works of the family, partly because the bust on the plaque of Charles I. is similar to that signed by this artist, when in 1695 in conjunction with his father he made the memorials of this king. The cliche of Charles most nearly resembles John Roettier's medals in drapery and detail, though perhaps the turn of features is nearer to the example by Norbert. Now this portrait was copied by John Obrisset, who in

the reigns of Anne and George I. worked in horn and thin silver, mounting various busts in high relief on tortoise-shell boxes, or impressing the horn itself with the die. But in spite of the strong resemblance between Obrisset's boxes or medallions and the plaque of Charles, we can hardly suppose him to have been the original maker of the clichés, because not one of the other portraits upon his snuffboxes has any affinity with the rest of the series, and instead of copying the James II. medallion which I have just illustrated, he took for his model the Battle-of-Lowestoft medal with the short locks, No. 143, as my readers will see for themselves if they compare our plate facing page 240 with the tortoise-shell portrait illustrated below from the National Collection. Apart from this consideration, the silver work of Obrisset is not equal to that of the best of these thin plaques though some of his horn medallions are very fine.

Dismissing then the claims of Obrisset, it may be asked why, seeing that John Roettier died so early in the reign of Anne, do I suggest, apart from the style of the portraiture of James, that the series of silver medallions may possibly be rather the work of John Roettier
Who made the Clichés?

than of his son? Firstly, the portraits of the various monarchs are of very uneven workmanship, and if they be really all by one artist, which I am almost inclined to doubt, this might be accounted for in that Roettier may have executed those of Charles I. and James II. before his disablement, whilst the less finished performances, notably a very poor example in the National Collection, portraying Mary, must, if attributable to any member of this talented family, be due to the time when his powers were impaired by the lameness of his hand. This plaque representing Mary is so badly executed that one would assume it to be by an inferior artist, were it not that it is connected in style both with the portrait of James II. and that of Anne, by the companion medallion representing William. The cliché of Anne is rather fine, and we have seen that, according to Walpole, Roettier was at the time of his death working at the design for a medal of this Queen, but as the various renderings, especially as regards the House of Orange, differ much in quality, it is unsafe to speak with any certainty of the hand which wrought them. In favour of this assumption that the puncheon for James's bust was made by John Roettier in his prime, are the figures 88 on the truncation of the shoulder, which might more naturally refer to the date when the die was originally sunk than to the year of the cessation of his rule in England, in that neither John nor Norbert Roettier would acknowledge this act as an abdication, and therefore an official termination of his reign—because it was not so intended by James. Secondly, if the plaques were made by Norbert, or the lettering added during his residence in France, it would have been likely that he would have used the new style of reckoning in use in that country, whereas the dates in the legend: nat. October 17th, 33 ob. September 4th, 1701, point to English origin, for they are given, although not accurately, according to the old style.

The death of James really took place on September 6th, o.s., but it is curious to notice the frequent mistakes made by medallists concerning chronology. For instance, Dassier, who at a later period

1 There are two varieties representing both Mary and William, one pair being very inferior to the other.

2 Jean Dassier was born in 1676 at Geneva, where he held the office of Chief
designed a memorial of this king, engraved the date of his demise as September 5th, 1701, and notes the birth of the Duke of York as taking place on the 13th of October, 1633.\(^1\) Here again, together with the artist responsible for the silver shells, Dassier possibly makes a mistake, for according to most authorities, James was born neither on the 13th, nor on the 17th of October. We should be able to rely on the word of his sister Elizabeth, who states that his birthday was the 14th,\(^8\) and this is the day given in the abstract taken from his original memoirs as printed by Stanier Clarke,\(^5\) but although correctly stated on one of the medalets, distributed in the year 1633, upon which we read, as we should expect, NATVS·OCT. 14\(^4\) on another of these little souvenirs,\(^6\) struck to celebrate his baptism, stands NAT-VS·OCT. and his hastily executed accession medal of 1685 repeats the error,\(^6\) whilst some contemporary prints in the British Museum give the date of his birth as October 13th, agreeing therein with Dassier.

It is a pity that the chain of the royal clichés is broken by the absence of any large specimen known to us representing Charles II., but in order to bring before you the excellence of John Roettier’s work on this scale, I am permitted to reproduce a fine silver plaque of a more solid character in the Franks collection. It exists also cast in lead in the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum, but the silver medallion is the more delicately chased. A similar example of the same design and quality in the more precious metal was illustrated in vol. ii, p. 489, of this Journal, from the cabinet of Mr. T. W. Barron, but as it was not reproduced quite full size, I think best to here show the specimen from the National Collection. I referred to this portrait in my former article as reminding us of some

---

\(^1\) Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 216, No. 537.  
\(^3\) The Life of James the Second, vol. i, p. 1.  
\(^4\) Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 267, No. 64.  
\(^5\) Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 268, No. 65.  
\(^6\) Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 603, No. 1.
Amongst the most interesting memorials of James, which it has been my good fortune to see, is a ring in a collection of Stuart relics in the possession of the Duke of Buccleuch, which, by his kindness, I have examined. These treasures, formerly owned by Henry, Cardinal York, consist of rings, seals and miniatures of historic value, and that to which I specially refer, is a head in wax, or ivory, in relief on a dark ground, covered by a glass and surrounded by small diamonds.

The King is here portrayed as wearing a pointed diadem in the same precious stones, probably intended to represent a celestial crown; the profile head is like that upon the gun-money, only turned to the right instead of to the left, and fairly resembles the portrait by Norbert Roettier, on the medal with Prince James upon the reverse,\(^1\) illustrated upon our page 222, excepting that the nose in the cameo is much exaggerated.

Pictures of James, executed after his death, unless belonging to a series portraying the monarchs of England are by no means common, for it was not to the interest of the ruling party to recall his features, but to such a sequence may pertain a curious enamel of the eighteenth century by William Craft, which forms our frontispiece. Craft was an enamellist, better skilled in the manipulation of his material than in power as a draftsman—hence his productions are more curious than attractive. They are rare, but there are three or four examples in the British Museum, including a miniature of William III., thus suggesting a sequence of portraits.

One specimen in the Franks collection is dated 1802, and we know that he exhibited in the Royal Academy between 1774 and 1795. I believe my enamel to be taken from a contemporary print after Kneller, by Jean Louis Durant, a French engraver who worked in London towards the end of the seventeenth century, chiefly as a book-illustrator.

The history of James has suffered much from partisan writers, and it is with a feeling of relief that we turn from the pages of Burnet and Macaulay to those of more fair-minded authors, for, as Mr. Fitz Gerald Molloy writes, this last historian “presented his characters daubed with lampblack, or glittering with gold-leaf according to his prejudices:\(^2\) whilst we must ever remember that any book such as that published by Charles James Fox, written about a hundred years after the death of James, was almost bound to blacken the memory of the Stuarts if it were to find favour with a dynasty which had not forgotten the “'45.” Whilst a Stuart, however old and unadventurous, in the person of

\(^2\) Victoria Regina, by FitzGerald Molloy, p. 435.
James, a true Englishman.

Cardinal York, still remained a tacit claimant of the throne,¹ the party question still biased the historian, but modern writers have done much to rehabilitate the character of our last Stuart king.

Although we are bound to accept the evidence of Fox, as printed by him in Barillon's letters to Louis XIV.,² and believe that James was anxious to obtain French gold to impose his will upon his people, we can never forget that at the bottom of his heart he was entirely English, and that when told by Avaux, the agent in Ireland of his foreign ally, that the French fleet had defeated the British in Bantry Bay, his first thought was of sorrow for the navy which he had commanded with so much pride, and he exclaimed: "It is the first time they have done so." Again at the battle of La Hogue, James, watching his fellow countrymen hoard the French hulls, was heard to say: "My brave English! Look, none but my brave English could do that." He forgot the downfall of his hopes in the success of his nation; and Ailesbury tells us that he gave offence at the French court because he "lamented when he heard of any fleet of merchantmen that were taken or destroyed," being "so great an Englishman."³ He further describes him as "a high protector of trade," and one who "had nothing so much at heart as the strength and glory of the fleet and navy."⁴ In the words of a modern historian, James was "a straightforward English gentleman, a courageous soldier, a skilful admiral, an excellent man of business"⁵; or as another writer, perhaps more aptly qualifies him, "not only a skilful and victorious naval commander, but an industrious and capable Admiralty chief."⁶ Yet one more of our recent authors sums up his character thus: "Whatever may have been his immorality ... James had proved himself a brave sailor in his youth, and coming to the throne had striven to reform the court morally and economically, had

¹ The History of the Early Part of the Reign of James II., by Fox, was published shortly after the death of the author, 1808, when Henry, Cardinal York, second and last surviving grandson of James II., was but a year dead.

² Appendix to Fox's History.

³ Ailesbury's Memoirs, p. 491.

⁴ Ibid., p. 131.

⁵ Adventures of James II. of England, p. 496.

⁶ The King over the Water, by Alice Shield and Andrew Lang, p. 7.
reorganised the army and the navy, had shown a patriot spirit and had devoted his keen business capacities to the interest of the State."

A straightforward writer, as the abstract of his memoirs proves, a lover of music, and if not the most artistic descendant of a race whom a modern partisan describes as "a family of artists scorned by a nation of shopkeepers," he was still a steady patron of the muses. Though no rival with the pen of his father and grandfather, his advice to his son, inspired if not actually drawn up by him, will brook comparison with their works in its admirable common sense; and this advice, which he did not live to see carried out, bore fruit in that his son grew up grave and sedate, possessed of most of his father's best qualities, including that loyalty to his religion which excluded him from his throne, and caused the worldly wise to say of each James in turn, "Had he been less devout, it had been better for him."

"A kind husband . . . the most indulgent father in the world, and the most unfortunate in some of his children . . . the best master and the worst served, a most constant friend; yet never Prince found fewer in his greatest necessities," thus may I epitomise the description given of him by the compiler of his memoirs.

He was spared much sorrow in that he expired in 1701 before death had robbed him of his youngest daughter Louisa—whom he called his "consolatrice," before the failure of his son's hopes—before even it was irrevocably proved by the accession of Anne that she failed to acknowledge the claims of the male heir, thus repeating the action of her sister Mary to the breaking of her father's heart.

1 Victoria Regina, by FitzGerald Molloy, p. 437.
2 The Royal Stuarts in their connection with Art and Letters, Blaikie Murdoch, p. 19.
3 Ailesbury attributes the actual authorship of this work to Father Saunders, the king's confessor. See Ailesbury's Memoirs, p. 496. These sensible admonitions left by James at his death, and drawn up in 1692, were printed at the end of Stanier Clarke's book, pp. 619-42, and Macpherson (Original Papers, vol. i, p. 77) says that James "when he was in Ireland in 1690 employed some part of his time in drawing up instructions to his son."
4 The King over the Water, where no reference is given, but these words are quoted by Miss Shield.
Let the words of the old Scottish doggerel be his epitaph—for it leads us on to the reigns of the last two Stuart Queens, which with your permission I hope next year to describe—

"O what's the rhyme to porringer?
Ken ye the rhyme to porringer?
King James the Seventh had a dochter,
And he's ge'ed her to an Oranger.
Ken ye how he requited him?
Ken ye how he requited him?
The lad has into England come,
And ta'en the crown in spite o' him."
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