PORTRAITURE OF OUR STUART MONARCHS ON THEIR COINS AND MEDALS.

PART III: WILLIAM AND MARY.

BY HELEN FARQUHAR.

THOSE readers of our Journal who may have cared to glance through the pages devoted to Stuart portraiture, will remember that we followed the wanderings of James II. in his last years which terminated with his death in exile in 1701. It is now time to retrace our steps to the December of 1688, when the last of our Stuart Kings de facto vacated the English throne, and the country replaced him by a queen of his own line, as joint ruler with a king, chosen from the House of Orange-Nassau.

1 It was decided in the House of Commons on February 8th, 1689, to enact that "King James the Second having abdicated, the Government and Throne being thereby vacant," William and Mary should reign in his stead, and a declaration to this effect was read on February 12th. (Commons Journal, vol. x, pp. 23 and 29.) Debates in the Houses of Lords and Commons had preceded the decision between January 28th and February 8th, 1688-89 (Commons Journal, vol. x, pp. 14–24), concerning the word to be applied to the flight of James; whether he should be said to have "abdicated" instead of "deserted" the throne. It was resolved in the affirmative and Lord Clarendon complained that in the Upper Chamber no division was taken upon the motion "that the prince and princess of Orange might be declared king and queen. This was opposed upon the account of the succession, but nothing would be hearkened to, and so the question was put; and though as near as I could reckon there were near forty negatives and leave asked to enter their dissents, yet it was not thought fit to divide the house." Diary of Henry, Earl of Clarendon, vol. ii; State Letters, p. 165, ed. of 1763.
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"The fruit that I cry
That now is in season, tho' winter is nigh;
'Twill do you all good—and sweeten your blood;
I'm sure it will please you when once understood;
'Tis an Orange!" 1

So sang the anti-Jacobites, punning according to the fashion of
the day, on the name of their elected king. But it was not as a
member of a foreign family that William came to this country, nor was
it solely in the right of Mary that he accepted the crown, for he had no
intention of taking up a position of subordination to his wife. It was
rather as the nearest Protestant male representative of the House of
Stuart, in his own person, that he conceived his claim to the
sovereignty to be equal in value to hers, and as he and his consort
shared a feeling, expressed by Mary, that "women should not meddle
in Government," 2 no dissensions arose between them and he assumed
the principal power.

William was in many respects a thorough Stuart, although like his
mother, Mary, the eldest daughter of Charles I., he possessed pre-
eminently the least attractive qualities of the race. Like her, he was
remarkable for a firmness of character, not unapt to degenerate into
obstinacy. Both were unconciliatory in manner—nay, almost ungraci-
ous—a rare failing in the Stuarts, and it was said of her that although
capable of inspiring great affection from those in immediate attendance
upon her, she, during the short time that she occupied a conspicuous
position in Holland as guardian to her son, took no trouble to become
generally popular, 3 just as Burnet tells us that William in England "did
not descend enough to the humours of his people, to make himself and
his notions more acceptable to them." 4 In her case her inability to make
facile friendships may have been partly the result of shyness and partly

1 Quoted in The Court of William III., by Edwin and Marion Grew, p. 42.
3 Court Life in the Dutch Republic, by Baroness Suzette van Zuylen van Nyvelt,
p. 172, and Five Stuart Princesses, edited by Robert Rait, Mary of Orange, by Algernon
Cecil, p. 225.
owing to the ever-increasing dislike of the country of her adoption, which she felt and even expressed, after the death of the young husband whom she passionately loved. Her son, having, as Burnet says, "observed the errors of too much talking, more than those of too cold a silence," was as taciturn as his great-grandfather, William the Silent, and inherited this reserve of manner from his paternal relations as much as from his mother. He also regarded his residence in his acquired kingdom as an exile equally distasteful to him as was her sojourn in Holland to her, going so far as to admit in conversation with Shrewsbury that he "could not hit on the right way of pleasing England."

Not less in appearance than in demeanour did William recall some of his Stuart relations. He certainly possessed the fine white hands for which this family was renowned, and Evelyn, speaking of him in 1670.

---

1 Court Life in the Dutch Republic, p. 173. We find medals of this youthful pair, hand in hand, see Med. Ill., vol. i, pp. 287-88, Nos. 150–1, but they are not copied from the pictures painted by Antony van Dyck, and by Gerard van Honthorst, in which they appear side by side.


3 The Court of William III., p. 151.
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at the age of twenty, says that he had "a manly, courageous, wise countenance, resembling his mother and the Duke of Gloucester, both deceas'd." The unique medal in the British Museum here illustrated strongly corroborates the diarist's remark. William's plentiful locks, whether in the fairness of early childhood or the dark brown of later years, showed forth in their heavy waves the bright auburn lights of the Stuart family, and his portraits, especially in his youth, when he was a lonely unloved boy, have the pathetic expression, noticeable in the pictures of Charles I. There is an oil painting of William in the Stadthuis at Haarlem by an unknown artist, in which, although the delicate and pallid boy appears overweighted by his armour, we are attracted by the wistful gaze of the pleading brown eyes looking forth as they do from an oval countenance, framed by the rather dark hair. The painting leaves a pleasanter impression than does that of the equally fragile and weary looking child in the National Portrait Gallery, with its curious colouring and ugly yellow frock, emphasizing the pinched form and the narrow face in which the long nose is already too apparent, and we turn from the painfully realistic work of

1 Evelyn's Diary, November 4th, 1670. Henry, Duke of Gloucester, born 1639, the youngest son of Charles I., died of smallpox in 1660 at little more than the age William had now attained. Temple (see his Memoirs by T. P. Courtenay, vol. i, p. 286), speaking of the latter, says, in 1668: "His person . . . is very good, and has much of the Princess in it."

2 Macaulay (vol. iv, p. 408) says that in later life (1693) William ran greater risks in battle than others, "for he could not be persuaded either to encumber his feeble frame with a cuirass, or to hide the ensigns of the Garter, because he thought the star a good rallying point for the troops." We see him, however, often painted in armour in after life, and he is so portrayed at the Battle of the Boyne in 1690, in the equestrian painting at the National Portrait Gallery, and in his medals to the very end.

3 The gradual darkening of its auburn colouring is particularly apparent by the comparison of the almost sandy short hair of an infantile painting at Amsterdam, with the picture of William as a boy by Adrian Hanneman at Hampton Court and the Haarlem portrait. I am of course speaking of a time when the wig had not taken the place which is occupied in pictures of grown-up persons of this period—William in his later portraits generally wears a dark-brown periwig.

4 This picture was painted when William was seven years old, by Cornelis Jansen van Ceulen, who was born of Dutch parentage in London in 1593, and worked in England and in Holland. He is thought to have died in the latter country in 1664.
Cornelis Jansen van Ceulen and are glad to find in Van Abeele's medal of 1654 a more cheerful presentment. The features on the medallion of a baby not four years old naturally give little promise of the ardent fire of his manhood, when Burnet speaks of his "Roman eagle nose, bright sparkling eyes . . . large front and . . . countenance composed to gravity and authority," and a medal by Jeuriaen Pool, illustrated on our facing plate and dated 1655, shows little change of portrait. The last mentioned piece was, according to Van Loon, probably designed to uphold his election before he had attained his fifth year as Stadtholder and Captain-General of their province by the Estates of Overijssel in October, 1654. The struck specimen which I illustrate from the National Collection is very fine and as a portrait more attractive than Van Abeele's work. In his

MARY, PRINCESS OF ORANGE, AND HER SON, 1654; MED. MIL., I, P. 417, NO. 55.

1 Peter van Abeele executed highly embossed and chased silver medals dated from 1622 to 1679. He lived in Amsterdam, and his various portraits of Charles I. and Charles II., of Van Tromp and De Ruyter, besides those of William II. and III. of Orange, are well known.


3 Van Loon, vol. ii, p. 376, No. 2 (see also Blok's History, vol. iv, pp. 224-26). William was appointed Stadtholder of Overijssel, with his uncle Prince William Frederic acting as lieutenant during his minority, but this action provoked much hostility in the States-General, continuing under discussion for a considerable time, and in 1657 the matter was finally postponed until the young Prince should have attained his majority.
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childhood, circa 1660, or about the date of the Haarlem picture, he is described as "very handsome, with a long well-formed face, a gentle eye, an aquiline nose and an alert mind," and as speaking "well and boldly."

It is regrettable that the face of a charming equestrian portrait on the reverse of a later medal, from the hand of Van Abeele, circa 1661, is on too small a scale to give us a really good idea of his features, although the spirited figure reminds us that even in his youth he had a fine seat upon a horse, and as such I am glad to have the opportunity of illustrating this also. It is attributed to the date given above, because it closely resembles the obverse of a medal figured by Van Loon which bears on the reverse a shield of arms within the garter, and William was installed by dispensation a knight of this order on April 10th, 1661. The young Prince was, however, nominated for this honour by letters dated from Paris, April 25th, 1653, and invested at The Hague in the following May, although of course his installation could not take place until after the Restoration—he might therefore be represented as wearing the garter from 1653 onward, and the blue ribbon is seen in the pictures of 1657 by Jansen van Ceulen just mentioned. I would like to suggest that possibly we should carry back the medal to the May of 1660, when the portrait of Charles II. was, according to Van Loon, first produced in celebration of the English King's triumphant departure from The Hague, when accompanied by the Court he rode to Scheveningen to embark for England. Van Abeele's first medal of William, as a baby, is said to have been ordered in 1654 by the indignant mother because the Province of

---

1 History of the People of the Netherlands, by Petrus Blok, Part IV, p. 245; quoting Les Voyages de Monsieur de Monconys.
3 Med. III., vol. i, p. 472, No. 75, is illustrated on our previous plate. No. 74 has the same reverse portraying William but a differing obverse representing Charles almost in full-face.
6 Med. III., vol. i, p. 417, No. 55, see illustration on previous page.
Holland consented to a secret provision, introduced by Cromwell into a treaty with England, which bound the Estates to exclude the House of Orange from power, a prohibition which the Princess was happy enough to see withdrawn before her death. The effigy of the boy is also found alone, or more strangely, was combined with that of his deceased father,—an anachronism frequently found on medals—or with that of his mother as the case might be; for the presentments of the married pair consisted of thin silver plates, which had been originally embossed in 1650 shortly before the death of William II., and could as occasion served be easily combined with that of the young prince on whom the hopes of the Orange party now hung.

It has been rather unkindly said that William had not a very tender mother in Mary, who in a letter to Charles II. playfully assured him that he came before her only child in her affections, but as she declared that she adored her favourite brother “above all things in the world,” this proves no excessive coldness on her part, and her pathetic answer to an enquiry why she, a widow at nineteen, did not remarry, shows that her love for her boy was really paramount. “I desire to be married only to the interests of my son,” said this lonely princess, and indeed, her whole life was spent in the endeavour to reinstate her child and her brother in the places she deemed their due. It is even apparent that she hoped, should her efforts in favour of the restoration of Charles be successful, that she would be enabled through his means, to revive the glory of the House of Orange.

1 The peace was concluded at Westminster on April 5th, 1654, and ratified at The Hague on the 21st, (n.s.). It contained a secret article known as the “Act of Seclusion,” a disability which was removed in 1660. See Court Life in the Dutch Republic, p. 168 and Five Stuart Princesses, pp. 208, 209, 220, and 225, also Blouk, vol. ix, pp. 215-19.


3 Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 393, No. 17. The bust of William II. alone is also found on p. 393, No. 16, and I have illustrated that of Mary combined with the portrait of her brother, the Duke of Gloucester, in the National Collection on our p. 201.


5 Five Stuart Princesses, p. 201.

6 Five Stuart Princesses, pp. 207-10.
William certainly cherished fond memories of the only parent he had ever known, and it is undoubted that she fostered in him a pride of race which remained his guiding star throughout his life. Born on November 4th (o.s.), 1650, after the demise of his father, William had a sad and solitary boyhood, and from the time of his young mother's death on December 24th (o.s.), 1660, when he was but just ten years of age, he seems to have left all childish things behind him, so that we find him a staid unattractive youth, whose only remaining female relative in Holland was a grandmother, who had failed to engage his affections.

The "Child of State," as William was called from the time that the United Provinces definitely assumed his guardianship in 1666, grew up longing for the moment when he should be free, his one desire to rule, his one thought, the glory of his House and his Country. Such was the man who, from motives of policy only, married Mary the daughter of James, then Duke of York, and afterwards James II. Such was the man who accepted the British crown solely because he thought he would be able by English means to fight the battles of Protestantism and of Holland, such was the man who, in spite of an ungracious manner coupled with a singularly cold demeanour, exercised an extraordinary power over all with whom he came in contact.

The marriage of William was celebrated on November 4th (o.s.), 1677, and it was not based on affection on either side. In his case it was a matter of calculation, in Mary's of obedience to the commands of King Charles, who wished to conciliate the Protestant party and strengthen his alliance against France. The suggestion had been made to William some years earlier, to be coldly rejected by the Prince, who was not inclined to matrimony. Even now he informed

1 When the "Act of Secclusion" was repealed in 1660, the Princess placed her son in the care of the States, but in 1666 a more definite arrangement was made by his grandmother, Amalia, widow of Prince Frederic Henry, and mother of William II of Orange, and the child became the Ward of the Estates of Holland. See Blok's History of the People of the Netherlands, vol. iv, pp. 299, 301, and 331, and Court Life in the Dutch Republic, pp. 213 and 231.

2 In 1674, see Memoirs of Sir William Temple, by T. P. Courtenay, vol. 1, p. 431 and p. 444, note *. 
Marriage of William and Mary.

Sir William Temple that he required a most subservient helpmate, and that he "might, perhaps, not be very easy for a wife to live with; he was sure he should not to such wives as were generally in the courts of this age." Temple, who was from time to time employed as Resident Envoy or on special missions to the Dutch States, was favourable to the marriage and very instrumental in bringing it about by the excellent character he gave to the Prince of the Princess, saying that he had "always heard his wife and sister speak with all the advantage that could be of what they could discern in a Princess so young." Of William he had a high opinion, for he describes him, even very early in life, as "a most extreme hopeful prince . . . a young man of more parts than ordinary, and of the better sort; that is, not lying in that kind of wit, which is neither of use to one's self nor to any body else, but in good plain sense, with show of application if he had business that deserved it, and that with extreme good agreeable humour and dispositions and thus far without any vice." Years did not lessen this good impression, and Temple was therefore glad to obtain permission for William to come to England, to arrange in person for this alliance.

Of Mary, who had been most carefully brought up in the Protestant faith, and in the spirit of obedience to her Uncle Charles, we learn that on being informed of her approaching marriage, "she wept all that afternoon and all the following day," and her father, with perhaps a prophetic feeling that William would not make him a very pleasant son-in-law, also reluctantly gave his consent to the match under pressure from his brother—consoling himself with the

---

2 Ibid., vol. i, p. 468.
3 Ibid., p. 285 in the year 1668.
4 Permission was given in September, 1677, to the Prince of Orange to come over. Ibid., p. 503.
5 Mary and Anne were educated by Henry Compton, Bishop of London, a preceptor chosen by Charles II., who took them from their father's control, being distrustful of his influence, owing to his increased tendency towards the Church of Rome after his wife's death in the Catholic faith.
6 The Court of William III., p. 23.
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remark to the Council as he did so, that "he hoped he had given sufficient testimony of his right intentions to the Public good, and that People would no more say he designed altering the Government in Church and State."

The medals struck in commemoration of the marriage are not particularly interesting; perhaps the most pleasing in point of portraiture being that here illustrated, which gives a good idea of the pair at their respective ages of 27 and 15 years.

MEDAL COMMEMORATING THE MARRIAGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY; MED. III., VOL. I, P. 568, NO. 235.

It is believed to be the work of Nicholas Chevalier, a Protestant minister and native of Sedan, who was said to have taken refuge in Holland on the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 and to have worked in Amsterdam and Utrecht, but this date hardly coincides with the making of a Dutch medal in 1677, if an original portrait. Possibly therefore the design was adapted from some

1 Clarke's Life of James II., vol. i, p. 510
2 Med. III., vol. i, p. 568, No. 235, also P. 569, No. 236 almost exactly similar.
3 A very similar portrait of Mary exists on some coronation medals which are copies by George Hautsch made at Nuremberg under the superintendence of L. G. Lauffer, and these medals bear the initials G. H. and L. G. L. Med. III., vol. i, pp. 666-67, Nos. 35-37, and vol. ii, p. 727.
4 Med. III., vol. iii, p. 722. It is there mentioned that some of Chevalier's medals are only copies of those by other artists; but as the busts here illustrated were later copied by Hautsch, we should, I think, conclude that they are originals by Chevalier, he possibly using a painting as his model.
PORTRAIT OF MARY, WIFE OF WILLIAM III, AS PRINCESS OF ORANGE.

AFTER LELY, FROM A MEZZOTINT IN THE COLLECTION OF MR. W. SHARP OGDEN.
contemporary picture and executed at Sedan, unless some uncertainty attaches to the artist's story, for the portraiture agrees with the suggested date.

Nearly the same obverse, representing William, was used with a bust of his mother upon the reverse, and is another instance of the frequent habit of placing in juxtaposition portraits which were not contemporaneous, the one with the other.¹

The medallic souvenirs of William and Mary at this period are neither common nor pleasing, and so far as the young Princess is concerned, it seems a pity that at a time when so many medals were made at the Court of her uncle Charles II. some memory of her childhood by one of the Roettier family should not have been handed down to us. At the time of her marriage, Mary—twelve years younger than her husband—was very graceful, already tall and generally admired. She and William were perhaps an ill-assorted pair, so that it was not judicious to paint them side by side, but the fact, often brought verbally before us, that he was small, sickly-looking and unattractive would not appear within the compass of a medal, and there are several paintings of the Prince of Orange, which show us that he was not altogether lacking in good looks, which the feebleness of his frame did not entirely submerge.

The charming mezzotint of the bridegroom, which has been kindly lent to me for illustration, and which forms our frontispiece, was the work in 1678 of Abraham Blooteling;² taken from a portrait by Lely, and is, with its companion picture of the bride, on our facing plate, most characteristic of Sir Peter's style.

¹ Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 576, No. 239, by Chevalier. See Illustrated Edition, Plate iviii, 9, where it is catalogued as the work of Chevalier.

² Abraham Blooteling was born in 1640 and died at Amsterdam in January, 1690, according to recent research. His last dated portrait is of the year 1685. "He came to England about 1672–73, staying until 1676 and worked in mezzotint for the most part after pictures by Lely." See A Short History of Engraving and Etching, A. M. Hind, pp. 152 and 266, also Thieme-Becker's Künstler-Lexikon, vol. iv, p. 139. Bryan's Dictionary of Painters, ed. 1903–5, gave his dates as 1634–98.
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commenced on October 1, 1677, and extended over less than two months, and we may assume that the pictures were ordered in commemoration of the nuptials which were celebrated on November 4th. Peter van der Faes, generally known as Lely, had settled in this country in 1641, coming over in the train of William II. of Nassau, the father of our William III., when he visited England on a similar quest to that of his son, namely, his marriage to a Princess Mary of the House of Stuart. Lely on this occasion also painted them in commemoration of their wedding, which ceremony was performed at Whitehall on the 2nd of May, 1641, and it is not on record that Lely ever returned to the Netherlands. As he remained in England throughout the time of the Commonwealth and died in London on November 30th, 1680, we may be almost sure that the portraits of the younger William and Mary were painted before their departure for the States, for which country they set out as soon after their wedding as the stormy weather permitted, namely, on November 28th, 1677, having left Whitehall nine days earlier.

Amongst the objects of interest in the Rijks Museum, at Amsterdam, is a small mother-of-pearl medallion, undated and unsigned, but clearly of this period, which vividly recalls our frontispiece, even to the rivets in the armour and pattern of the lace cravat, and this carving in its turn shows forth a marked resemblance to an oil painting by Wissing, also in the Dutch National Collection.

2 Nos. 95 and 100 in the Stuart Exhibition of 1889, lent by the Earl of Crawford.
3 By the courtesy of the Director of the Rijks Museum, I understand, that this medallion is probably the work of Cornelis Belliken, who became a member of the Artists' Guild at Middelburgh, in 1663, and who was well known as an engraver of mother-of-pearl. The probable date of this carving comes together with another in the same collection executed somewhat later, within the scope of his work. A pair of portraits in the Franks collection in the British Museum also represent William and Mary in much the same style, but are of a still later date, for the arms of England are engraved on the silver case in which the medallions are enclosed, and the carvings must therefore belong to the post-Revolution period, with which also the mode of hair-dressing agrees. The second carving in the Rijks Museum recalls a picture by Kneller of William in armour, now at Kensington Palace.

4 Number 2691 in the Rijks Museum Catalogue.
William's hair, according to the pictures of 1678, had grown very dark with auburn lights relieving the heavy masses, and the smooth parting, with the curls falling on either side, is far more becoming than the piled-up wig of later days, when fashion endeavoured to add some inches to the height by means of the coiffure—as exemplified by the "flaming hair" of the coinage of 1698–99. It might be thought that William from the time of his arrival in England, encouraged this lofty style of hair-dressing to bring the top of his head on a level with that of his wife, were it not that Mary, to whom such an addition was quite unnecessary, followed the same mode, although wearing her own hair; and also that this exaggerated fashion rather increased than diminished after the death of the Queen. According to tradition another expedient was adopted at the royal receptions, where William stood upon a footstool in order to emulate the dignity of his Queen, and his effigy is so placed in the Islip Chamber at Westminster Abbey, but even then it does not attain this object—perhaps because in this instance the wig worn by the King is not quite contemporaneous and is not of the fashionable height. We cannot, however, attach much importance to these figures, for they were not made to be carried in the funeral procession, but their origin was due to a later wish to mark the place of their burial. Miss Strickland writes that William was said to look

1 We have reason to believe, in spite of the frequent statements in various histories, that the figures of William and Mary were not carried at their funerals. Miss Strickland says that Mary's effigy "was placed over her coffin," but I learn from Dr. Robinson, now Dean of Wells, and late Dean of Westminster, that the figures of William, Mary and Anne are simply waxworks made for show some twenty years or more after the death of William, as appears from a reference to them in an order of Dean Bradford on March 26th, 1724. By a misprint the date appears as 1727 in the account of The Funeral Effigies, given by Mr. St. John Hope, and Dr. Robinson, Archaeologia, vol. ix, pp. 517–70. Vertue in his MS. (Brit. Mus. Addit., 23069, p. 51) written in 1724–25, examined the old effigies at that time stored in presses in the Islip Chambers, and he does not mention the figures of Charles II., William, Mary, or Anne, which must have been then standing over their graves in the Abbey in the absence of monuments. Dean Robinson speaks of that of the first-mentioned king as being so seen in 1723, being probably designed for the same object. Archaeologia, vol. ix, p. 568. The effigy of Charles II. was made from the usual death mask taken on the king's demise, but was not carried at the funeral.
"diminutive" with Mary when he used to take her arm as he walked, and calls attention to the great disparity in the respective statures of the pair in the waxen figures to which I have just referred, mentioning that Mary is represented as being six feet in height,¹ and, indeed, I think this is not much over-stating the matter. We learn, however, from the private letter² quoted below that she was not so tall as her stepmother, Mary d’Este, who whilst of fine proportions was not abnormally tall, and we may perhaps allow for some slight inaccuracies in the two effigies which are certainly good portraits.³ One Dutch historian, if rightly translated, speaks of William as "tall,"⁴ but he is usually said to have measured little more than five feet, and the flattering pictures of certain artists, notably Wissing, led to misapprehensions.⁵ Lady Cavendish describing the royal pair on the day of their proclamation as joint monarchs writes as follows: —"The King applies himself mightily to business and is wonderfully admired for his great wisdom and prudence in ordering all things. He is a man of no presence, but looks very homely at first sight, but if one looks long on him he has something in his face both wise and good. But as for the Queen, she is really altogether very handsome, her face is agreeable, and her shape and motions extremely graceful and fine. She is tall but not so tall as the last Queen."

Such then were the Prince and Princess of Orange, aged respectively thirty-eight and twenty-six, when, in February, 1688–89, in response to the call of the Protestant party they took joint possession of the crown. William, however, would brook no divided rule, nor consider that the

² Letter from Lady Cavendish to Mrs. Jane Allington, printed in Memoirs of Lady Russell and Lady Herbert, by Lady Stepney, p. 138.
³ If viewed in profile these effigies are very like the coins, but the forehead of Mary does not recede so disagreeably as on the currency, although the double chin is quite as visible.
⁴ Blok, vol. iv, p. 400, English translation. I understand that in Dutch the same word denotes tall and great, and I cannot help thinking that the latter was intended.
⁵ Strickland, Queens of England, vol. vii, p. 143. The heroic equestrian figure painted by Kneller in 1697 (see the Hampton Court Catalogue, No. 29) suggests a tall man, but as a rule Sir Godfrey gives a truer idea of William's appearance.
The Subordination of the Queen.

relationship of Mary, as daughter to the late King, gave her a claim to a higher place in the government than he held as the grandson of Charles I.; and his attitude towards his wife in particular, and the kingdom in general, is pithily summed up in the words of a modern writer, in quoting whom I hope I shall not be accused of partisanship. "The crown of England," says the author of The Story of the Household Cavalry, "having been offered by a number of persons (who had not the right to dispose of it) to two distinguished individuals (who equally had no right to accept it), the 'glorious Revolution' was complete, leaving only unsolved the curious, if purely academic question, how far it is possible, within the same realm and over the same subjects, for a male and female sovereign to bear joint and simultaneous rule. The problem received a practical solution by William's usurpation of the whole sovereign power to himself."¹

But let us rather say that the position of the new King and Queen is well typified by the subordination of her head to his in the jugate coinage which combined the portraits of the two monarchs in a different manner from the face-to-face busts of Mary Tudor and Philip II. of Spain.

In a former volume of our Journal, I have called attention to the custom of placing upon the obverse of a coin the busts of two persons facing one another, as coming from Spain, where the currency of Ferdinand and Isabella, as sovereigns of Aragon and Castile in their
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Joint rule, had served as a model copied by their descendants; a type no doubt revived from Roman times. We may similarly trace the jugate busts to the coins of early days—whether in the Greek in Egypt in the portraits attributable to the reign of Ptolemy II, of himself with Arsinoe II., and of Ptolemy I, with Berenice I., or some 150 years later in Syria of Cleopatra with Antiochus VIII., 125-121 B.C., the latter examples being so beautiful in design, that no one could take exception to the precedent. Rather later, again we find specimens in the Roman coinage to which it is perhaps safer to refer that of William and Mary, because the taste of their day tended to the revival of Roman art; let us, therefore, seek such instances as are afforded by the portraits of Mark Antony and Octavia, 39 B.C., or of Claudius and Agrippina, A.D. 50. In A.D. 54-55 Nero made use of the jugate type when portrayed with his mother, Agrippina, but not invariably, since he had recourse to the face-to-face representation also, but even in England we have in Roman times three busts conjoined on a coin in the case of Carausius with Maximian and Diocletian, circa A.D. 290.

The classic armour—low-necked and Roman in form—in which William appears, makes us turn more readily to this remote period than to the Italian and German designs of the sixteenth century, such as the pattern for a testoon of Maximilian I. and Bianca Maria Sforza, made by Gian Marco Cavalli at Hall in 1506, or to those of Maximilian II., as King of Bohemia, and his wife Mary, issued in 1562-64. It is scarcely necessary to further enumerate continental examples such as the fine portraits by Guillaume Dupré of Henri IV.

5 Maximilian I. married Bianca, daughter of Ludovico Sforza, as his second wife. He reigned as Emperor from 1493-1519. Maximilian II., his great-grandson, became Emperor in 1564, being at the time of his election King of Hungary and Bohemia.
6 Guillaume Dupré was Contrôleur-Général des Effigies from 1606 to 1639. He was born circa 1574-76 (see Forrer’s *Dictionary of Medallists*, and Mazerolle’s *Médailleurs*)
Origin of the jugate Design.

of France and Marie de Medici, or their medallion by Simon de Passe,¹ who pursued the same fashion in his counters of Charles and Henrietta Maria,² or again our Dutch-fishery medals³ of these sovereigns which were of German origin being by Hans Reinhard, once known as Heinrich Reitz⁴; for the custom was not especially Dutch, but resulted from the revival of pseudo-classical taste which attained its height in England at the end of the eighteenth century.

It may be asked why William and Mary did not follow the precedent set them by their predecessors, Philip and Mary I., on the English throne, nor am I prepared to give a definite answer to the question; but William was not in the same circumstances as Philip of Spain, being really the ruler of this country, whilst Philip was only king-consort, to the grief of his wife, who was as anxious as her Stuart namesake to share her exalted station with her husband. It is, however, apparent that the face-to-face type was not disliked by William and Mary, for we find it upon several medals—even upon some of those celebrating the Coronation⁵ and the restoration⁶ of the Protestant power, and a number of patterns were also made for the coinage in yet another style, showing the busts of the two sovereigns on the opposite sides, a practice which had been suggested in Tudor times,⁷ and was,

[Insert image of coins]
again, the repetition of a Roman custom. The pattern farthing, here illustrated, shows us that, had this alternative design been accepted, we should not have profited, the profile view of Mary being almost as unbecoming when seen in its entirety as when overshadowed by her husband—indeed, none of her coins and medals suggests the handsome woman described by her contemporaries.

Walpole quotes Vertue in attributing to Norbert Roettier the patterns with the King's head on one side, the Queen's on the other, and I am able to place before you a very remarkable specimen of one of these types from Mr. Spink's collection. I might hazard in corroboration the suggestion that the high relief is more reminiscent of the usual style of Norbert Roettier than of his brother James, being more medallic. The whole series of patterns reminds us of the Regency medals of 1690 attributed to the two brothers, and no doubt they both submitted various types before the current coin was selected. The jugate type held its sway until Mary's death, and some of the smaller pieces are not unpleasing, witness the sixpence here illustrated, but it is noticeable—although this is, of course, accidental—that in the

1 Lot 117 in the Montagu Sale of July 15th, 1897; see also Montagu's Copper Coins, p. 67, 4, and Med. Ill., vol. 1, p. 690, No. 79.
second issue, when the halvercrown experienced some alteration, the head of the King concealed that of the Queen slightly more than in the original design.

In many ways William recalls his predecessor Philip of Spain—in that each in turn married an English princess with a view to securing the co-operation of our country in foreign wars, and the futility of Philip's position may have had something to do with William's determination that his tenure of the monarchy should not be dependent on the Queen's life. Both princes, poles asunder in their religious beliefs, cared only for the advancement of their creeds and the good of their native land—each valued England merely as an auxiliary to his own dominion, and it was as a foreigner although not as a conqueror that each desired to annex her crown. The heart and soul of William of Orange were with his father's people, who loved him, whilst they feared him as well, partly for his own prowess, partly for the glamour which hung around his ancestry. During a sad and ailing childhood early severed from all natural ties, his passionate nature had been schooled before he reached his teens, to a self-control which seldom left him. One definite object remained in view, the freedom of Holland from her enemies, and it fell out, that at a time when most boys would be content to find amusement in the chase, which was indeed, save that of war, his only pastime throughout his life. \(^1\) William, finding that the authority

---

\(^1\) Temple in 1668 describes William as "loving hunting as much as he hated swearing." Memoirs of Sir William Temple, by T. P. Courtenay, vol. i, p. 286, and Burnet in 1686 writes, "he hated talking, and all house games more. This put him on a perpetual course of hunting, to which he seemed to give himself up, beyond any man I ever knew." Burnet, iii, 133.
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of the States in the person of the Grand Pensionary de Witt galled him beyond endurance, burst the bonds of guardianship. The Prince of Orange, becoming successively Captain-General and Stadtholder, kept his foes at bay: and but for his energetic opposition the Government would have consented to a dishonourable peace with France. Under the guidance of William III.—for in Holland as afterwards in England William was the third ruler so called—the United Provinces resorted to the means adopted by his great grandfather William the First or "the Silent," against the Spaniard of old, and the young leader justified his name together with the motto of the family: "Moi je serai Nassau—je maindiendray." Possibly this proud maxim was balanced in his mind by those other words inscribed above them upon his flag, when he invaded England: "Pro religione et libertate"; for these also represented his highest ideals. As a Dutch historian has said of him, "he risked his life times innumerable; he ventured his domestic happiness in the service of his policy, when he united himself with a woman who, not until much later, won his heart by her self-sacrificing love; and he overcame his personal inclinations by submitting to the limitation of his royal power in England, the necessary condition of his elevation, which assured to him England's help against France."

An undaunted and renowned, although not always a successful general, William was a firm believer in the hereditary right of his race to govern autocratically, but when at the age of eight and thirty he came to England with matured judgment, although dominated by the same inflexibility of character, with which he had asserted himself in his youth—he could not put forth a plea for absolute sovereignty, partly because "Divine right" was the war cry of the Stuarts whom he came to supplant, and partly because his one "right" to the crown lay in an Act

---

1 Blok's *History of the People of the Netherlands*, vol. iv, pp. 385-86.
2 Petrus Blok's *History of the People of the Netherlands*, vol. iv, p. 469.
4 Mr. Fortescue in his *History of the British Army*, vol. i, pp. 356-57, ascribes William's reverses in warfare as a general, partly to the fact "that it would seem that his physical weakness debarred him from steady and sustained effort." This author considers that "he lacked tactical instinct, and above all he lacked patience; in a word, to use a modern phrase, he was a very clever amateur."
of Parliament. Nevertheless, even during his frequent absences from England the iron hand was felt within the glove, and by a threat that if thwarted he would return permanently to his native country, William was able to assume towards his ministers a position which was almost autocratic.

At the beginning of his reign he called both Whigs and Tories to his Cabinet, but finding the former more subservient he, as time progressed, appointed these in preference as his ministers, with the result that he laid the foundation of that party government which became usual under Anne and her successors.

William was, however, naturally disposed to keep all possible power in his own hands.

He was by no means averse to the name of Defender or Preserver of the Faith, which was not only one of his official designations as our king, but was also in truth his title to the English throne, and which in his youth he had personally earned upon the Continent. On more than one occasion after his accession was he thus designated upon his medals, and the legend GVILIELMVS III. MAGNVS FID STAT surrounds a fine bust by Jan Luder, which appeared upon medallie specimens celebrating the subjugation of Ireland in 1690, the triumphal entry into The Hague on January 26th (n.s.) or February 5th (o.s.), 1691, on his return to his native country from the Emerald Isle, and the Peace of Ryswick in 1697. All these medals are extremely rare, but I have been permitted to reproduce from the National Collection one of those commemorating William's return to Holland after his successful campaign in Ireland.

This Prince, of all Princes, disliked show and ceremony, but

2 The Mother of Parliaments, by Harry Graham, p. 33.
3 Jan Luder was a Dutch medallist who worked much for William and Mary in Holland, and is said to have visited England in his latter days: his medals are dated from circa 1680 to 1710—see Med. III., vol. ii, p. 731.
naturally his Dutch subjects received him with great enthusiasm; he, however, made the characteristic remark that "there would have been twice the amount had the Queen been with me," thus testifying to the popularity of Mary in her adopted country.¹

Perhaps the most pleasing of all the jugate portraits of the joint monarchs also asserts their claims to be regarded as the upholders of the Church, for Mary is associated by the English artist, Bower,² with her husband in a legend reading: REX • ET • REGINA • FIDEI • DEFENSORES. The obverse which bears the design in question was used with more than one reverse,³ typical of the restoration of the Protestant or the destruction of the Catholic power in England, and the example which I bring before you was struck to commemorate a riot which took place upon the flight of James, when several

¹ *Court Life in the Dutch Republic*, p. 349.
² We need hardly remind our readers that George Bower had received a "grant of the office of Embosser in ordinary" in the January of the year 1663-64—see *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1663-64*, p. 462, vol. xci, 96.
³ *Med. Ill.,* vol. i, pp. 658 and 660, Nos. 18-21, and p. 661, No. 22.
convent chapels were destroyed, amongst others that of Lincoln's Inn'Fields, which is here portrayed as in flames.


Bower was never more successful than in this form of double portraiture, and we possess a sufficient number of his medals\(^1\) to know that he turned all too readily to the rising sun, and threw in his lot with the cause of the House of Orange. Although we deplore the ugliness of the reverse decoration, the busts conjoined upon the obverse of the "accession," or as they are often called "coronation," medals are good examples of his skill, and if designed for distribution at the official ceremony on April 11th, 1689, they possess the extra attraction of being amongst the last medallic works of this artist, the dies being


\(^1\) See Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 639, No. 64, p. 658, No. 18, p. 660, No. 21, p. 663, No. 26, and p. 668, No. 38. Nos. 21 and 26 are illustrated above; Nos. 78 and 38 so nearly
completed within a year of Bower’s death, which occurred on the 1st of March, 1689–90, as I learn from information kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking, to whom I am indebted for many details concerning the medallist. The struck specimens of the larger of these medals¹ are rare, although the cast pieces are common enough.

The coronation medals of the royal pair are many and varied, but as was very naturally the case, the artists patronised by William were mostly foreigners, and Luder, the brothers Smeltzing, Boskam, Hautsch and others constantly depicted the Prince and Princess, now reigning monarchs in England. Jan Smeltzing, whose medal bears a fair portrait,² was a native of Leyden, and has already been noticed in vol. vi, p. 223, as the maker of certain medals portraying James II. He resided chiefly at his birthplace where he died, 1693, but he had also visited France. His technique was much esteemed, but his medals were often satirical and in bad taste, involving him in unpopularity. There was a younger Smeltzing named Martin, who also executed medals for William III.; but his style is inferior to that of the elder artist, whom he survived by several years, dying in February, 1713–14. Jan Boskam, some of whose portraits of William are very striking, came from Nimègue, and worked during the Prince’s lifetime in Amsterdam, and afterwards—between 1703 and 1706—in Berlin, whence he returned to the Dutch capital. It is known that he was in Amsterdam until 1708,³ but, so far as I can ascertain, the date of his death is not reported. George Hautsch was born in Nuremberg, and worked from 1683 to 1712 in that city and afterwards in Vienna. But it is not necessary to enumerate the productions of these artists, for at that time a

resemble 2: that I have not reproduced them and No. 64 portraying William alone is not very pleasing.

² Jan Smeltzing’s Coronation Medal, although not a very graceful portrait, is a good likeness, Med. III., vol. i, p. 661, No. 28. It has been sometimes said that he was born at Nimègue and that he died either in 1695 or 1703, but for the latest information see Forrer’s Dictionary of Medallists. According to this author it is doubtful whether Martin was, as hitherto stated, his brother or was related to another Johannes Smeltzing, known as a dies-sinker only.
Medals of foreign Artists.

Medal was struck to celebrate every event, whether of importance, such as the Battle of the Boyne, the entry into Dublin, and the re-taking of Namur, or occurrences of more trivial incident. Every step was followed, such as the arrival of envoys to invite William to England, his departure from Holland, and his landing at Torbay, to be represented by a large series of medals from the hands of Bower, Luder, Smeltzing and others.

But to John Roettier in spite of his known loyalty to the lost cause we, of course, look for an official coronation medal, which would naturally be demanded from one in residence at the Royal Mint, and for a moment we think that we find it in the specimen illustrated below. Hereon the reverse design is, however, rather unfortunately chosen, representing as it does the fall of Phaeton from his chariot, for the malicious said that it was suggestive of Tullia driving over the remains of her dethroned father.

But hereby hangs a tale, for the examples usually attributed to this artist vary slightly, two differing pairs of dies having been used; and it appears that the one should be considered as due to James, the other to Norbert, the two sons of John Roettier, who stated as much.

---

2 Ibid., pp. 720-21, Nos. 143-45.
7 Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 662, and Macaulay’s History of England, vol. iii, p. 120.
when presenting a petition to the Lords of the Treasury in March, 1689-90, for the appointment of joint engravers in the place of Bower deceased. They put forward the plea that they had been “Engravers to yr Mint in the two last Kings' Reignes, and did make for their present Mat' the Coronation Medalls and Puncheons for the Gvynyes and halfe Crownes, and supplied Dyes to the Mint to Coyne with untill the Place was given to one Mr. George Bower's, who is since dead.”

An earlier paper gives a long report from the officers of the Mint on the then position of affairs, wherein they declare that owing to John Roettier's illness, which I described at some length in a former volume of our journal, his sons had “without his assistance engraved their present Mat's Greate Seals and made the Puncheons and Dyes for the Coronation Medalls and for the coyne of gold and silver that has hitherto been prepared.” We may, therefore, consider it certain that these portraits passed publicly as the work of John Roettier, still the official holder of the appointment, although the fact that the two sets of dies were the work of James and Norbert respectively was known to the Master of the Mint. It would appear that Neale—the Mint Master—was in favour of the coin-dies being made by James and Norbert Roettier, for in his first notification to the Lords of the Treasury of the death of “Mr. Bower, engraver to the Mint,” dated March 11th, 1689, he suggests on the question of refilling the vacancy that “if the King and their Lordships thought fit that the Roettiers (who know best how to do it) should be employed in it,” they might be so employed by the “master worker” without making any formal appointment, the cuneators in the meantime receiving the salary through him.

1 See MS. Treasury Papers in the Record Office, vol. vii, 79, where the subject is necessarily clearer than in the abstract of the Calendar Treasury Papers, 1556 to 1696, p. 110. The petition is undated, but calendared as “about March.”
2 MS. Treasury Papers in the Record Office, vol. iv, p. 25, July 2nd, 1689. An abstract may be found in Cal. Treasury Papers, 1556 to 1696, p. 53.
4 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. vii, 63, calendared in Treasury Papers, 1556 to 1696, p. 166, in abstract only.
Many details are found in the manuscript Treasury Papers concerning the salaries to be apportioned to the various engravers, for Henry Harris also applied for the place of "Chief Graver of the Stamps and Irons," a post which he alleged "formerly belonged to the Chief Graver of the King's Seals, and was performed by himself, Servants, or such able men as he cal'd in to assist him." He further asserted his capability, "having been educated in the Art and being now the Chief Graver of their Mat' Seales"; but much doubt appears, on the face of the report just quoted, as to whether the Roettiers were not in truth the "able men" whom he "cal'd in to assist him" even in seal engraving.

In support of this suggestion there is the evidence before us of the claim of the brothers to the recognition of their work on the great seals of William and Mary, and in the Appendix to Wyon's comprehensive book we find a warrant of the 10th January, 1695, ordering "James Roettieres and 'Bartie' (sic for Norbert?) Roettieres, His Mat' Engravers in the Mint, to Engrave the New Seale" for William after the Queen's death, according to a draught already supplied. This example of the artists' skill was, after all, a mere repetition on the obverse of that in use under James II. with fresh legends; it is, however, so far as one may judge from old waxen impressions, typical in general character of the workmanship of the Roettier family. Amongst the curiosities preserved in the British Museum there is a carved stone model in high relief, a pattern for a counter-seal, portraying William and Mary on horseback, but differing both in design and execution, from the reverse of the great seal used

---

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. vii, 69, calendared in Treasury Papers, 1556 to 1696, p. 108, but not printed in full. The petition of Henry Harris is endorsed in another hand with the words, "For the King. Mr. Harris to have the Place and employ the Roetiers under him."
2 Wyon's Great Seals, Plate XL. Used according to Wyon, p. 111, in March 1688-89, if not before, and commenced immediately on William's arrival in December, 1688.
3 See Wyon's Plate XLI, p. 112. Warrant in Appendix A. Extract G, p. 141.
4 Wyon Plate XXXIX.
5 Ibid., p. 113.
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in England during their joint reigns. We know so little about the technique of Henry Harris, that it is with the greatest diffidence that I ask whether this should be considered as a rejected composition of this engraver or one of his men, rather than as an unfinished design by James or Norbert Roettier, whose style it does not resemble, being markedly inferior to their usual productions. No artist’s name is attached to it in the official catalogue.\(^1\) During the life of Mary, for what reason we do not know, a fresh seal was ordered on the 5th of July, 1694; but the command was not carried out.\(^2\) We learn, not from Wyon’s copy of the warrant, which mentions no engraver, but from the Mint Catalogue, that in this year such a commission was entrusted to John Roettier,\(^3\) but certainly this model is not from his hand, and being undated we cannot tell whether it should be referred to this period or to the year 1689, for at that time also a proposed alteration in the arms on the obverse gave occasion for an order which was not executed.\(^4\) The State Papers Domestic contain many warrants addressed, however, to Harris ordering seals, such as “two new seals for our signet in February\(^5\) 1689–90,” and again in March\(^6\) and in April, “four small seals for our Private Letters of Cashet”\(^7\); then follow in May alterations in the legend of the seal of the County of Chester\(^8\) from the name of James to those of William and

---

\(^1\) No. xxxv, 110, Detached Seals, W. de G. Birch’s Catalogue of Seals in the British Museum, vol. i, note on p. 69. The stone model was added to the National Collection by Mr. S. Clinch in 1832, and is figured in Trésor de Numismatique et de Glyptique, Sceaux des Rois et Reines d’Angleterre, Plate XXVIII, where, however, the fact that it is a variant from the great seal in use is not mentioned.


\(^3\) Mint Catalogue, vol. i, p. 15.

\(^4\) Wyon, p. 111 and Appendix A, Extract E. Warrant of May 23rd, 1689.

\(^5\) S.P.D., Entry Book 338, p. 171, Feb. 16th, 1689, calendared in State Papers Dom., 1689 to 1690, p. 4, as Warrant Book 34, but the numbering is now changed, and I give the references at present in use at the Record Office.


\(^7\) S.P.D., Entry Book 338, pp. 263 and 287, April 4th, 1689, calendared as above, p. 52.

\(^8\) S.P.D., Entry Book 338, p. 332, May 10th, 1689, calendared as above, p. 97.
Mary; and a "new silver Seal to be used as our Privy Seal in August, 1690." Again, we find changes in the County Seals in December, and the great seal of Ireland figures on March 24th, 1689-90. We believe that such skill as Henry Harris possessed was principally devoted to seal engraving, but great pressure of work must have arisen at the beginning of the new reign, and he would be justified in seeking some assistance in spite of the brief respite allowed by such entries as the following, under date April 15th, 1689: "The old seal of the Exchequer to be used until a new one be made."

Before leaving the subject of seals, I may mention that on September 11th, 1689, some interesting information reached William Bentinck, Earl of Portland, from an anonymous correspondent who wrote: "This is to acquaint you that the Great Seal of England is counterfeited, and as far as I am able to judge, for some military expedition in favour of the late King James, or for imitating some orders to the great prejudice of the King." It is not clear whether the writer refers to a forgery of William's new seal, ordered immediately after the Prince's arrival, or to the use by James of his copy, made in January, 1688-89, in France, of his own great seal which had been cast by him into the Thames in the previous December and which was recovered and restored to William. We notice that in the sister-kingdom of Scotland the great seal of James was in use until January 25th, 1690, when an order was issued for a new design to take its place.

1 S.P.D., Entry Book 338, p. 460, August 10th, 1689, calendared as above, p. 219.
3 S.P.D., Entry Book 340, p. 111, calendared in State Papers Dom., 1689 to 1690, p. 525, March 24th, 1689-90. We notice that the wording of the order suggests the possibility that Harris had coadjutors, for we read, "Our will and pleasure is that you forthwith Engrave or Cause to be Engraved in Silver a Great Seal for Our Kingdom of Ireland," etc., etc.
4 Cal. Treasury Papers, 1702 to 1707, p. 297.
5 Cal. State Papers Domestic, 1689 to 1690, p. 64.
6 Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1689-90, p. 250.
All such warrants would naturally have been addressed to Harris in his official capacity—in whatsoever way the work was subdivided, but necessarily some agreement must have been made concerning remuneration, and James and Norbert Roettier, as the real performers of the duties entailed, claimed the larger share of the salary. The position of affairs was rather complicated, but it appears from various papers and especially from the report signed by Thomas Neale, the Master of the Mint, and presented to the Lords of the Treasury on July 2nd, 1689, that a certain grant was made by Charles II. to the three brothers Roettier on the 3rd of July, 1669, to make "Effigies and Designes for Gold and Silver Coins." This grant entitled them to receive £450 yearly during their joint lives, and was to be reduced by £100 on the death of each brother, the ultimate survivor being allowed £250 only; but besides this sum John Roettier had £450 per annum as "graver of Meddals and Agats." Thomas Neale states that they were also allowed by Indentures of the Mint, made in 1670 and in 1686, "which last was confirmed by their present Majesties in 1689 in sums of 325."

The brothers of John Roettier had, as we have seen in my former article, retired to foreign parts; Joseph leaving for Paris in 1672 or 1673 and subsequently becoming Graver Gdndral of French coins in 1682; whilst Philip was nominated "Engraver General of the Coins of the Netherlands" on December 4th, 1684, and appears from the

Admiralty Papers. It was, however, in the previous April that the Scottish throne was declared vacant. The crown was offered to William and Mary, who took the coronation oaths on May 11th, 1689. It was shortly after this event, on May 23rd, that a new seal for England, bearing the addition of the Scottish arms, was ordered, but was apparently never finished. See The Royal House of Stuart, vol. ii, p. 321; Browne's History of the Highlands, vol. ii, p. 127. Concerning the seals see Wyon, pp. 111 and 141, Appendix A, Extract E.

4 See Forrer's Dictionary of Medallists, where it is also stated that on the 5th of August, 1686, he received the appointment of Engraver-General to the King of Spain in the Low Countries. He died towards the end of 1718.
The Appointment of George Bower.

Treasury Papers to have finally departed to take up his office some two months later after some prolonged temporary absences from this country, extending at times over several years. In spite of these facts the patent continued "to run in the words, vizt. : To the three Roettiers as Chief Engravers of the Mint $325^1$ per an.," and the report proceeds to show that John Roettier was suffering from a disablement in his right hand, being "not able to work any longer and hath both very lately and this very day told us that he thinks of betaking himself the first good opportunity to Brussells, the place of his nativity." Then follows the recommendation of the sons James and Norbert as being "good proficients in their father’s art, with whom they have wrought jointly upon the Puncheons and Dies for the Mint for several years past." We know that John Roettier thought better of this plan of travel; nevertheless, it is clear that he ceded the cuneator’s place to George Bower, and a minute of the following week, i.e., July 9, 1689, shows that a warrant was given "to Bower to make a Puncheon for the halfe Guineys and to worke it in the Mint."

We may judge that the coin received the official sanction, whether or not we may find it in the specimen before us, for I learn from Mr. Hocking that Bower received a patent dated 19th October, 1689, authorising him to engrave designs for all coins and medals with an

---

1 *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. iv, 25. "Philip left England in about February, 1684-5, and is now in the Mint in Brussells." Mr. Forrer however states that he appears to have been in England on November 3rd, 1685, when his son Francis was born.


3 The reference for this minute is given in the Calendar of Treasury Papers, 1556 to 1696, p. 53, as Minute Book No. 1, p. 62, but the numbering at the Record Office has been changed and this Minute Book now stands as T. 29, 7: p. 61, July 9, 1689.
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allowance of £325 a year from the “feast of St. Michaell the Archangell,” 1689, i.e., the previous 29th September. Bower died on the 1st of March following, the balance due of his salary being paid subsequently to his widow, “Grizell Bowers.”¹ We know that neither the brothers Roettier nor Henry Harris lost any time in applying for his place, their respective petitions being before us in the month of March.² No doubt Harris considered, that like Bower his longer services warranted his preference over the younger Roettier, he having served officially under Charles II.,³ and holding the necessary confirmation, dated August 23rd, 1689, from William and Mary, which we find in a grant of £50 per annum to “Henry Harris, gent., of the Office of one of the Chief Ingravers of our Signetts Seals Stamps and Arms, the Engraving of ye Irons or dyes of the mint and medalls only excepted.”⁴

In March, 1689-90, an arrangement was made between Harris and the sons of John Roettier, specifying that the £450 granted to the father should still be paid to them, that the fees of the Mint should be payable to Harris, and that he should hand them over to James and Norbert, minus £150 deducted for himself. With this compromise all were satisfied, “provided that the aforesaid 450⁵, payable out of the Exchequer, be constantly paid them as well as the fee or fees payable out of the Tower, otherwise the said Mr. Roetieres having large families are not able to maintain them out of so small an allowance as is otherwise payable for the said works.”⁶

On these premises the two brothers agreed to give Harris their

¹ Information kindly supplied by Mr. W. J. Hocking, Assistant Superintendent of the Royal Mint.
² Cal. Treasury Papers, 1556 to 1696, pp. 108 and 110. MS. Treasury Papers, vii, Nos. 69 and 79.
³ Cal. State Papers, Dom., Addenda, 1660-70, p. 525, November 11th, 1670.
⁴ S.P.D. Entry Book 338, p. 443, dated August 23rd, 1689. Calendared State Papers, Dom., 1689-90, p. 228, as Warrant Book 34, p. 443. The payments as we find in the original MSS. were ordered to date from “the feast of St. John ye Baptist last past,” and to include all the perquisites, fees, etc., which “Thomas Symon or any other hath formerly held or enjoyed or ought to have held.”
⁵ MS. Treasury Papers, vol. vii, No. 69.

assistance "in graving Irons and Dies for his Majesty's Mint, seeming very imenible to it," although at first they had "desired to have the whole salary between them." These terms received at this time the assent of all parties concerned, and the document is minuted "Agreed to by the Board and Mr. Harris' Warrant ordered," but of the resultant wrangles between the engravers, we shall hear later. We must, however, at present return to the time prior to the appointment of Harris.

Whether Bower really made the die for the half-guinea is an interesting question. We observe that it is not mentioned in the list of dies prepared by the Roettiers previously to March, 1689–90, only half-crowns and guineas being specified, and we have seen that on the previous July 9th such a coin was ordered, but the half-guinea as we illustrate it, on page 229, is not worthy of Bower's skill. Bower usually erred on the side of conventional precision rather than in a lack of technical exactitude, and the specimen before us is of rough execution. Both in technique and portraiture it is markedly inferior to his coronation medal made but a few months before; neither is it comparable with the guineas made by his rivals, James and Norbert Roettier, and but for the fact of Bower's obtaining the office of Chief Engraver, the doubt would cross the mind whether the half-guinea might not be the work of Harris or some inferior artist, and that the medallist was prevented by approaching death or failing powers from producing the die. It would seem that some trouble was

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. vii, No. 79, see also our p. 224.
2 We must, however, note that Bower's medals are not by any means all equal in execution with those made for the coronation. The Torbay medal, for instance (Med. III., vol. i, p. 639, No. 64), is a very poor production. I have an ornament obviously designed for the decoration of a box or book, which appears to be a direct and contemporary copy of the larger coronation medal (Med. III., vol. i, p. 668, No. 38), and it forms a connecting link between the fine work of the latter and the rougher coinage. There are in the British Museum two snuff-boxes bearing the same heads, but much coarser in execution, and one of these being in impressed horn, a method not heretofore attributed to Bower, we must hesitate in pronouncing my jugate busts to be the work of this artist; the more especially because such snuff-boxes are usually attributable to the reign of Anne, and one of those in question agrees with this type, but my specimen is far sharper in workmanship than Obrisset's productions, which date from circa 1705 to 1727. The heads on the boxes are reproductions of Bower's medals, the horn being impressed from a die, the silver being cast.
taken to ascertain who would best perform the work of cuneator, for when the Mint officials had recommended the appointment of the young Roettiers on July 2nd, they were ordered by the Lords of the Treasury to "enquire after other engravers to serve and to come to their Lds when they are ready." Possibly, however, Bower was not in enjoyment of his full powers, and the appointment was given to him as to an old servant, for although he lived, as we have seen, some five months after he received it, there is little good work which can definitely be ascribed to him at this period. We shall, however, find in the tin coinage strong corroborative evidence that Bower did produce dies for coins, and that these were not equal to his medals. There are in the State Papers documents concerning the tin half-pence and farthings, and directions are given by Shrewsbury in the name of William and Mary in November, 1689, to the Commissioners of this coinage for "our portraiture and effigies with these words GVLIELMVS ET MARIA on the one side, and the figure of a woman sitting on a globe as was on the first Tynn Farthings and

Halfpence with the word BRITANNIA, on the other side." Details are set forth concerning a "stud of copper wyre, in ye center," and the inscribed edge "NVMMORVM . FAMVLVS and the year of our

3 Charles Talbot, 12th Earl and afterwards the only Duke of Shrewsbury, was at this time Secretary of State to William and Mary.
Who designed the Tin Coinage of 1689?

Lord," but we need not enter into these here, for they answer to the ordinary type with which we are all familiar.

A commission had been issued on the 12th of October, 1689, to Charles Godolphin, James Hoare and Andrew Corbet for making these coins, but it would seem from the excessive rarity of specimens bearing so early a date, that the order of November was not carried out to any great extent previously to March 25th, 1690. Mr. Montagu tells us that he never met with an example of either halfpenny or farthing, but quotes the authority of Snelling and Batty for the existence of both. Mr. Hoblyn, however, had specimens in his cabinet, and these have passed into the hands of Mr. Weightman, who has a second tin halfpenny from the same source in finer condition and from a different die, but I think from the same puncheon, and also a copper farthing of this rare type, and by his favour I illustrate two of the tin pieces of 1689.

A fine specimen of a similar halfpenny to that last mentioned is in the British Museum. Through the courtesy of Mr. Baldwin I have also had

---


3 Hoblyn Sale, December 7th, 1906, Lot 153. The halfpenny mentioned by Snelling had the date in the exergue, and the figures 1689 are clear in this position on the farthing here illustrated, also a faint indication of such appears on one of Mr. Weightman's halfpennies. The dates on the edges of these three halfpennies being more rubbed are not so easy to determine.

4 Hoblyn Sale, Lot 154.

5 The farthing is from Lot 153, and the halfpenny from Lot 154.
the opportunity of carefully examining another tin farthing of the year 1689. He had originally called my attention to the marked peculiarity of the type of this date, which is so unlike the common tin coinage that followed it, and yet so like the half-guinea of 1689. Allowing for the fact of the longer legends in the shorter space, we shall see that some of the letters, especially the capital G and the V of GVIELMVS, are in the half-guinea quite characteristic of Bower's medallic work, and this is even clearer in the tin coins. It is, however, not well to lay too much stress on lettering, and I leave our readers to judge for themselves by comparing the coin illustrated on our page 229 with the general portraiture of those now set before them, whether the hand of the same artist does not reappear in the high bridge and in the deep hollow, within the nose of William, in the very rough work, and in the bust which is differently draped to that on the succeeding armour-clad halfpenny and farthing of 1690, although not, of course, nude as on the gold. Now Snelling says that George Bower was employed from November 1st, 1689, for four months, and upon his death, Henry Harris and James Roettier, and I am glad to say that I have succeeded in finding his authority for this statement. A manuscript collection entitled "Papers Relating to the Seventeenth Century," amongst the Harleian documents in the British Museum, contains a copy of a warrant dated 22nd April, 1691, for payment by the Treasury of nine persons employed under "the Commission for Coyning Tynn Farthings," for services commencing at Michaelmas, 1689. Here we read that "George Bowers, deceased, was employed for four months from the first of November, 1689, at one hundred and fifty Pounds per annum. Henry Harris and James Roettiers, the present gravers at one hundred Pounds per annum each from the 1st of April 1690."

The story of the tin coinage carries us on to that of the copper, which followed it. In 1693 a patent was issued to Andrew Corbet to

---

1 This characteristic is very marked in Bower's unpleasing medal of the Landing of William of Orange at Torbay, 1688. Med. III., vol. i, p. 639, No. 64.
2 See tin halfpenny illustrated on our page 232.
3 Snelling, View of the Copper Coins, p. 38, Note 3.
The Copper Coinage of 1692 and 1694.

replace the former currency in this more durable metal, but no coins corresponding to this date are, so far as I am aware, at present known, although Snelling mentions farthings of 1693.\(^1\) Patterns were perhaps made for that year, for 1692 produced a copper farthing of peculiar type, a bust with long hair not unlike the ordinary tin, but quite different from its successors of 1694. One of these rare coins I reproduce from Mr. Weightman's cabinet.\(^2\)

COPPER FARTHINGS, OF 1692, AND 1694.

Sir John Hearne and others took up the concession in the place of Corbet,\(^3\) but before long the usual complications where private patentees are concerned occurred, of which Ruding gives details. In January, 1695-6, insinuations were made, although not proved, of light weight, of base materials and of the scarcity of the amount put forth;\(^4\) the difficulty of obtaining the coins in exchange for the older tin issues was constantly alleged, some of the tradesmen objecting that they had so much of it left on their hands that they had to melt it at their own loss, and this was one of the complaints made against the Mint also during the Parliamentary inquiry of 1696-97.\(^5\) In the March of 1697-98, the objection raised two years earlier was reversed, the charge being that the Proprietors of the Copper Coinage had made "extravagant quantities of Copper Halfpence and Farthings, which are now become a greater Clog and Inconvenience to Trade than the

\(^1\) Snelling, p. 42.
\(^2\) The farthing of 1692 is extremely rare, but I have seen one in the National Collection and another in that of Mr. Baldwin, as well as the specimen here illustrated.
\(^3\) Montagu's *Copper Coins*, p. 63, and Ruding, vol. ii, p. 34.
\(^4\) Commons Journal, xi, p. 388, January 13th; see also Snelling, p. 40, and Ruding, vol. ii, pp. 45 and 50.
\(^5\) Commons Journal, xi, p. 775.
white Farthings were.\textsuperscript{1} Finally, after many petitions had been read, a bill to stop the coining of "Farthings and Halfpence for one year"\textsuperscript{2} passed the Commons on May 23rd, 1698, and was approved by the Lords on June 21st; but proposals to renew this Act on its expiration were, it seems, discussed although ultimately dropped.\textsuperscript{3} I understand from a well-known collector, that copper coins are seldom found in good condition of the year 1698 and are far from common, and this would appear natural, inasmuch as the prohibition commenced on June 24th, and only pieces struck after the previous March would bear the date 1698, so that we might expect a marked lessening of the output, and we can only account for the rarity of the poor specimens being no greater by the complaints we have quoted above of the "extravagant quantities" made at that particular time.

But let us return to the coinage as established at the beginning of the reign and glance at the gold and silver. We find that to prevent delay, because the dies to be made would require "some considerable time," a warrant was issued on February 15th, 1688–89, "to proceed to coyn the Gold and Silver Bullion now in the Mint, as also such Gold and Silver as shall be brought into our Mint, with the same Dyes that were formerly made and used for that Service until the aforesaid puncheons and dyes with our Effigies and Arms shall be made and finished."\textsuperscript{4} Moreover, even as the year progressed, we see that although guineas and half-guineas are dated 1689 and that other denominations were ordered, the halfcrown is, with the exception of the Maundy money, the only silver coin bearing the names of William and Mary which was struck during that year.

The Maundy money presents a problem, for it is too rough to be fairly attributed to the Roettiers, neither can we class it with the half-

\textsuperscript{1} Commons Journal, vol. xii, p. 136, on March 1st, and throughout the month, on pp. 154, 160, 167, 181, etc.
\textsuperscript{2} Commons Journal, vol. xii, pp. 283 and 324; see also Statutes of the Realm, vol. vii, 9\textsuperscript{a}, Gul. iii, c. 36, p. 409.
\textsuperscript{3} Snelling, p. 41.
guinea and tin coinage of Bower, because the first distribution occurred on Thursday, the 28th of March, 1689, some time prior to the latter's official appointment of October 19th in that year. Very poor portraits appear to have been issued until 1691 and '92, when a slight improvement is seen in some of the pieces, but it was not maintained throughout.

In the course of 1691 a change was made in the type of the half-crown, as we have seen on our examples on pages 213 and 217. The Calendar of State Papers as printed contains a clerical error, which implies the intention that the two-shilling piece should take the place of the shilling in the projected coinage of 1689, but reference to the original manuscript clears up the mystery, and I give the document as I saw it at the Record Office to avoid possible confusion on this point, preserving the peculiar spelling of the time. The warrant is addressed to “Thomas Neadle (sic for Neale), Master and Worker of our Mint, to cause to be empressed upon our silver Coynes, vizt: the five Shilling piece, the two Shilling and six pence Piece, the shilling peace and ye sixpence, the Royall Arms marshalled as is depicted on a Draught which was directed to be done by our Rt Trusty and Rt Entirely Beloved Cousin and Counci[or] Henry Duke of Norfolk Earl Marshall and shewed to Us and approved of by Us.” A second order to the same effect, but no doubt necessitated by the change of type in the halfcrown and the deferred

---

1 The words appear thus accidentally misprinted in the abstract calendared in the State Papers Domestic of 1689-90 on p. 158, “Warrant to Thomas Neadle (‘Neadle’) master and worker of our mint directing him to impress on silver coins, viz : the 5th piece, 2nd 6th piece, the 2nd piece, and the 6th piece, the royal arms, marshalled, as is depicted in a draught prepared by Henry Duke of Norfolk, earl marshall.”

2 S.P.D. Entry Book 338, p. 377, June 19th, 1689. (This Entry Book is referred to in the Calendar as Warrant Book 34.)
issue of the other coins, is dated September the 15th, 1691, and in this instance the shilling is correctly mentioned in the *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*.

The pressure of work at the Mint and the death of the chief engraver, which, as we have seen, delayed the early issue of the English coinage, do not appear to have prevented the fact that the first Scottish dies and puncheons were sent to Edinburgh from the Tower, instead of being engraved in the North. The proclamation dated September the 26th, 1690, concerning the Mint of Scotland fixes the date of opening for October the 15th, but although I have never seen a coin so dated, the forty-shilling piece is, curiously enough, known, according to Burns, bearing date 1689, and Robertson mentions that these rarities are found with edge inscribed both as "primo" and "secundo."

The order of September, 1690, however, contained a reference to a previous Act passed by the Parliament of James II., which met at Edinburgh in 1686, and also specified the fact of William and Mary "haveing signed a warrant for coynade of the date the eight day of February last by past, for the severall species of silver coyne

---

conforme to the forsaid Act of Parliament," etc. Burns suggested that the dies for the forty-shilling pieces were made in advance of the official opening of the Mint. We find in the State Papers under date November 19th, 1689, a warrant addressed to "James Roetteirs, chief graver of our Mint in the Tower of London," directing him "forthwith to engrave and finish all such Puncheons, Counter Puncheons, Matrices, and Dyes for the silver Coin of our Kingdome of Scotland as are desired of you by the Generall or Master of our Mint in our said Kingdome." At the same time Melville, the Scottish Secretary of State, directed that £200 sterling should be paid to William Denholme of Westshiells, master of the mint of Scotland, or his order for defraying the cost of the instruments for the Scottish mint "to be made in our Tower of London for the use of our said Mint."

The warrant addressed to Roettier is of interest not only because he is therein styled chief engraver, and because it corroborates the minute of the Privy Council, quoted by Burns and given in extenso by Cochran-Patrick, which states that the dies were brought from England, but still more because to James Clark, the engraver of the

---

1 Cochran-Patrick, vol. ii, p. 226. The Act of 1686 is given on pp. 209-215 by Cochran-Patrick, but he does not print the order of February 8th, 1690, although he gives various documents from November 7th, 1689, onwards, including one of April 11th, 1690, ordering "Mr. Hary Aldcorne, Essay Master, to bring before the Lord Cardross generall of the Mint, the head punchons and reverses of the fourtie shilling and ten shilling peices," etc., and reference is therein made to the king's commands for "thrie pund peices, fourtie, twentie, ten and five shilling peices." See Cochran-Patrick, vol. ii, p. 222.

2 Burns, vol. ii, p. 508. The prescribed weight and design for the forty-shilling piece is given with that of the other species in a warrant of September 26th, 1690 (Cochran-Patrick, vol. ii, p. 227), and no mention is therein made that this coin was already current.

3 S.P. Scotland Warrant Book 14, No. 209, p. 213, calendared in the State Papers Domestic, 1689–90, on p. 324. I find in the original MS. that this warrant, dated from Holland House on November 19th, 1689, gave instruction that when finished the dies, etc., should be delivered to Lord Melville, Secretary of State for Scotland, or some person appointed by him.

4 S.P. Scotland Warrant Book 14, No. 211, p. 214. This order is addressed by Melville to the collectors of revenues of the Kingdom of Scotland, Sir Patrick Murray and James Oswald.

Scottish Mint, are due the coins prepared for William III. after the death of Mary,\(^1\) and Burns suggests that he may possibly have made the dies for the copper pieces of the earlier coinage.\(^2\) The question is far from easy to decide, for the halfpence are not always to be found in a fine state, and the best I have seen, here illustrated from the National Collection, does not equal the silver by James Roettier. On the other hand, neither does it particularly resemble the later coins by Clark, who was inclined to exaggerate the King's nose. The pistole of 1701, a revival of gold currency in Scotland, and a reproduction of which I place before you for comparison, is a good example of James Clark's style, and we see that he was a fair workman, although not so flattering an exponent of the King's features as was James Roettier, or his successor Croker, who had by this time replaced the latter at the English Mint.

William, like James I., who was James VI. in Scotland, adopted the expedient of omitting numerals after his name, calling himself simply GVLIELMUS · DEI · GRATIA on his Scottish coins to avoid the anomaly of being the third monarch of the name in England and the second only in the North.

\(^1\) Cochran-Patrick, vol. ii, pp. 244, 249, 256, and 278.
Changes in the Irish Currency.

In Ireland it has always been objected against William that he rewarded his favourites at the expense of the country, and we have such testimony as that of Ailesbury that he was "mightily lavish towards his Dutch favourites and others whom he loved, but by paper, not out of pocket;" but, to give the devil his due, he set right one crying evil in restoring the Irish currency. A halfpenny was issued as soon as possible by him bearing his own portrait with that of Mary, and he called in the Gun-money of James II., proclaiming it, until finally recalled from circulation in February, 1690-91, at its intrinsic value. This important reduction causing the so-called crowns and large halfcrowns to be current at a penny, the small halfcrowns at three farthings and the shillings and sixpences at one farthing each, was made immediately after the Battle of the Boyne, which was fought on July 1st, 1690. This victory, so important to William, inasmuch as it practically terminated the Irish defence of his father-in-law's cause, the pacification which followed it, and the new king's entry into Dublin, were celebrated by the striking of various medals, mostly the work of foreigners, amongst whom I may specially mention Jan Luder and Regnier Arondeaux. William is depicted on horseback about to cross

IRISH HALFPENNY OF WILLIAM AND MARY.

1 Ailesbury's Memoirs, p. 502.
2 The proclamations of July 10th, 1690, and of February 23rd, 1690-91, of William, with regard to the Gun-money, the former altering the value and the latter withdrawing it from circulation, are published in the "Coinage of Ireland" by Philip Nelson in the British Numismatic Journal, vol. i, pp. 250-51.
6 Regnier Arondeaux was a Dutch medallist of Flemish origin who, towards the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, resided mostly in
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

the river, or is personified as Hercules slaying the Hydra, or again, the reverse shows us Bellona or the goddess of Liberty, in approval of his success, just as on his arrival he was typified by Jan Smeltzing as an eagle flying to the fray according to his saying that "he did not come thither to let the Grass grow under his Feet." The Irish campaign caused the most poignant anxiety to Mary, who writes in her private diary: "I dreaded to think my father and husband might once more meet in the field, and the fears that my father might fall by our arms, or either of them fall where 'tither was present, was to me the dreadfullest prospect in the world." The departure of William necessitated the appointment of Mary as Regent, to act for him as well as for herself in the joint sovereignty, and her rule on such occasions is commemorated by many medals. These productions again are mostly due to foreigners, who were naturally employed by William to such an extent that the accusation is frequently brought against him that he preferred them to his new subjects, but any favour extended towards the Roettiers, although of Flemish origin, cannot be imputed to partiality; far from it, for they were the servants of the late king and were strongly suspected of disloyalty to his successors. Nevertheless, we look for some production on this occasion from the three talented members of this family, who were still in office at the Tower, and I bring before you from the National Collection the medal attributed to one of the two sons, although

the Netherlands, in Deventer and other places. He worked for William from 1678 to 1702, but the date of his death is not more exactly particularised than probably in the first half of the eighteenth century." Thieme-Becker, Künstler-Lexikon, vol. ii, p. 49.

6 Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England, ed. by Dr. R. Doebner, p. 48, being printed from her MS. private diary in the Hanoverian State Archives.
8 See Med. Ill., Plate LXXVII, 7.
Mary as Regent.

It calls for little admiration in its rendering of the Queen’s features. Her hair is dressed in the prevailing fashion, a mode which was singularly unbecoming to her, inasmuch as it accentuated the rather receding forehead and the double chin, which was daily growing more apparent as Mary became fat.

The Queen gives some interesting details in her diary concerning her first regency, and explains that the king consulted her upon his going to Ireland “whether,”’ to quote her own words, “in his absence all should be governed in my name, or if it should be left to the Privy Council with order to acquaint me with all things. I only desired he would take care I should not make a foolish figure in the world. I told him that the thing in effect was the same, for being wholly a stranger to business, it must be the Privy Council must do things.”¹ She proceeds to say that, “He therefore made choice of 9 persons to advise in his absence,”² a course with which she was pleased, for thinking, as we have seen, that women should not meddle in Government, she had always tried to talk with him on other subjects in order to distract his thoughts. “I have ever used myself,” wrote Mary, “not to trouble the king about business since I was

¹ Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England, 1689–1693, p. 22.
² The Regency Bill had provided that whenever William left the country, Mary should administer the affairs of the kingdom in their joint names.
married to him, for I saw him so full of it, I thought, and he has told me so himself, that when he would get from it he was glad to come to me to have his thoughts diverted by other discourse.” Nevertheless, it was through correspondence with the Queen that William conducted the affairs of the kingdom during this and her subsequent regencies, and we find that he had great reliance on her judgment, leaving her, as he did, at moments of great anxiety.

We can but agree with a modern writer, who says of him: “The self-reliant, calm audacity which had prompted him to send back his transports from Torbay continued to guide him, and in 1691 he went to take the command in Flanders with as much apparent security as if the seething discontent he left in England had been personal loyalty and affection. Ably seconded by his wife, he conducted the affairs of England in minute detail from abroad, while prosecuting the intricate diplomatic relations which resulted in the Great Alliance, and while engaged in an arduous war with France, which would have taxed to the utmost the powers of a lesser man.” His prolonged absences were partly attributable to the necessity of his presence in the field, partly to his absolute confidence in his wife’s capacity for government, and partly to the fact that he had accepted this kingdom more as a source of supplies to humble the pride of his enemies abroad than from any pleasure that he found in residing in this country. That Mary tried to avoid doing anything of importance without consulting him is clear, although her regencies were many and long; and she remarks in a letter to the Electrice Sophia of Hanover in 1693:

“There has never bin a year yet since the first I came into England in which the King has not bin longer away. I think almost 8 months in the year he is from home; that is one of my crosses.” She was an able woman, but overwhelmed by fear of displeasing her husband and of rendering him jealous by putting herself forward. He unfortunately gave her a different cause for jealousy, and she was perhaps

1 Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England, p. 23.
Mary's Affection for her Husband.

not altogether wise in masking her really admirable intelligence, for had she earlier shown him her mental qualities he might possibly have turned less frequently to her clever maid of honour for intellectual conversation. Elizabeth Villiers, for whose sake William, almost from the moment of his marriage, neglected his wife, had no physical attractions, but great powers of mind; so much was this the case that Swift writing to Stella said of her: “she is the wisest woman I ever saw”; on the other hand he describes her as “squinting like a dragon.”

In spite, however, of Mary's knowledge that she was not the first in his affections, her loyalty rose above his neglect, and in her French diary, written in 1688, she describes her feeling on hearing of the possibility that the birth of a brother might deprive her of her heirship to the English crown, and says that not on her own account does she care, but only for the sake of William and her religious creed. “Apart,” writes Mary, “from the interests of the Church, the love I bear the Prince makes me wish him all that he deserves, and though I regret to have only three crowns to bring him, I am not blinded by my love; no, I can see his faults, but I say this because I know his merits also.” She became devoted to her husband, as is attested by her diary, which tells us of her anxieties on the score of his health, of her fears for his safety, her joy at his return or at his approval of her administration; and of her misery when under the impression that her father was implicated in a plot for his murder, which she all too readily believed, just as she credited the rumours

1 Elizabeth Villiers was the daughter of Sir Edward Villiers, and her mother was governess to the daughters of James II. Elizabeth went to Holland with Mary on her marriage in 1677, and accompanied her on her return to England in 1689. After the death of the Queen, William broke off his connection with Elizabeth, who then married Lord George Hamilton, whom William created Earl of Orkney. She died in 1733.

2 Lettres et Mémoires de Marie, Reine d’Angleterre, p. 63, by Comtesse Bentinck: “Eh bien que je regrette de n’avoir que trois couronnes à lui porter ce n’est point mon amour que m’aveugle, non je puis voir ses fautes, mais je dis ceci parce que je connais aussi ses mérites.”

3 Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England, p. 33.

4 Memoirs, pp. 54 and 57. In 1692 a Frenchman named Barthélemy de Grandval purposed to assassinate William in the Netherlands, but the plot was discovered in time
that her brother was a supposititious child. A letter from James II. to the Electrice Sophia shows how much grieved he was at the knowledge of Mary's distrust. "In Holland," writes the King, "they talk of my sonne as if he were a suposed child, they that beleve such a falсety must think me the worst man in the world. I suppose they judg me by themselves, for els they could not thinke me capable of so abominable a thing."

The unfilial attitude of his daughter towards James has caused much argument, but her diary attests that it was not without the greatest pain that she decided between her duty as a daughter and as a wife; she depicts her sorrow at leaving Holland, where she "knew the persons and the way of living," for England, where she "was now grown a perfect stranger." She writes: "The uncertainty of what might be done there, the misfortunes of my father, the thought of coming in his place, the lining of all this together made me very loathe to leave Holland. . . . Yet when I saw England, my native country, which long absence made me a stranger to, I felt a secret joy . . . but that was soon checked with the consideration of my father's misfortunes which came immediately to my mind. The joy of seeing the Prince strove against the melancholy, and the thoughts that I should my husband see owned the deliverer of my country made me vain; but alas, poor mortal! thought I then, from who has he delivered it, but from my father. Thus were my thoughts taken up, and while I put the (b)est face on, my heart suffert a great (d)cal." Again she writes: "I saw my husband in a prosperous Way and blessed God for it, and was sorry I could not so much rejoice as his wife ought, neither was I so sad as became a daughter of a distressed king."

to prevent the attempt. Boskam's medals commemorated Grandval's execution on August 13th (m.s.), 1692 (Med. Ill., vol. ii, pp. 75 and 76, Nos. 287-88). There are other designs by inferior artists. (Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 77, Nos. 289-90.)

1 Lettres et Mémoires de Marie, Reine d'Angleterre, pp. 72-76 and 87.
2 Letter dated Whitehall, September 28th, 1688, published in 1886 by Dr. Doebner in the same volume with Mary's Private Diary, see Memoirs of Mary, p. 72.
4 Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England, p. 10.
5 Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England, p. 3.
Mary's Conduct on her Accession.

We must not think that the Queen's diary was written with a view to self-justification, for she tells us that at one moment, fearing a Jacobite invasion, she kept the papers in a bag tied to her side, “resolving if anything happened to have them ready to burn.”¹ We cannot regret that these pages, meant for no unauthorised eye, were published in 1886, for they afford a much-needed palliation of the levity with which Mary appeared to the astonished public to enter on her reign. “It was believ'd,” wrote Evelyn on the day of the proclamation of the new King and Queen, “that both, especially the Princesse, would have shew'd some (seeming) reluctance at least, of assuming her father's Crown, and made some apology . . . but nothing of all this appear'd: she came into Whitehall laughing and jolly, as to a wedding, so as to seem quite transported.”² Evelyn's further description of her conduct is too well known to need verbatim repetition; he comments on her running from room to room to examine the furniture, on her at once taking possession of the apartments lately occupied by James II. and his wife, on her resuming, without delay, the practice of playing basset in public, and finally remarks that “she takes nothing to heart.”³ The contrast between the demeanour of the husband and wife does not escape her critic, for “the Prince,” says Evelyn, “has a thoughtful countenance, is wonderful serious and silent, and seems to treat all persons alike gravely, and to be very intent on affaires,” but this comparison was hard on Mary, who, as Burnet tells us, “was acting a part which was not very natural to her.”⁴ He says that he took her to task concerning the bad impression she was making on her new

³ Mary's behaviour was also blamed by her uncle, Henry, Lord Clarendon, who states in his *Diary* (vol. ii, pp. 148-49) that he remonstrated with her on her conduct and she said that: “It was true she did call for cards, because she was used to play, and she never loved to do anything that looked like an affected constraint.”
⁴ I answered that I was sorry Her Royal Highness should think that showing a trouble for her father's misfortune should be interpreted by anyone as an affected constraint. At all this she appeared not a jot moved.”
⁵ *Burnet's History of his own Times*, vol. iii, p. 406.
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subjects, and that she told him "that the letters which had been writ to her had obliged her to put on a cheerfulness, in which she might perhaps go too fare, because she was obeying directions." William had heard it rumoured amongst his English adherents "that she was not well pleased with the late transactions" and had written to her before she left Holland telling her to appear cheerful in order that her friends might not be discouraged—and in thus controlling his wife's conduct he exposed her with his usual selfishness to the opprobrium which was really his due.

Ailesbury comments on her placing her husband in all things before her father. "She, as a good wife (whether she had a suitable return I question much), submitted patiently, but had her anxieties of mind continually on her. She was wise and prudent and well foresaw the fatal consequences which might have attended her in case of refusal, so outwardly she submitted, but God knows what she suffered inwardly and to a high degree, but she was prudent, and her conduct the same, and endued with all noble qualities toward God in the first place, and toward man." Ailesbury possibly wronged William to some extent, for in spite of his cold unsympathetic nature he became finally much attached to his wife, and his affection for her is reported to date from the time when he understood that she was not his rival for power. Burnet tells us that when he was in Holland, so early as 1686 he boldly stepped in where angels fear to tread, but proved himself no fool, for he asked Mary whether she would consent to share the throne with her husband should she ever succeed to it, and have the crown vested in him during his life, "because a titular kingship was no acceptable thing to a man, especially if it was to depend on another's life." He obtained from her a very definite

1 Ailesbury's Memoirs, vol. i, p. 299.
2 Burnet visited Holland in 1664, but only for a short time; he held a living at Saltash, and was afterwards Professor of Divinity at Glasgow. After the accession of James II. he left England and returned to Holland in 1686, and settled there, returning to England in 1688 with the Prince of Orange, who made him Bishop of Salisbury in 1689.
answer. She said "she did not think that the husband was ever to be obedient to the wife," and whilst she promised William "he should always bear rule, she asked only that he would obey the command of 'Husbands, love your wives,' as she should do that of 'Wives, be obedient to your husbands in all things.'" This submission fell in with the views of William, who is reported to have said that "he did not choose to be gentleman-usher to his own wife." Her absolute loyalty won his affection, and that he appreciated her devotion is clear inasmuch as at her death he said of her that "during the whole course of their marriage he had never known a single fault in her"; or again that "there was a worth in her that nobody knew besides himself," and when it came to his own turn to die a lock of her hair was found in a locket suspended by a black ribbon over his heart. His expression on hearing that there was no hope for the Queen's recovery "that from being the happiest, he was now going to be the miserablest creature upon earth," was indeed true, and so great was his anxiety and grief that during her sickness, when he was in constant attendance upon her, he fainted often, being, as the bishop tells us, "in an agony that amazed us all." His natural courage would in any case have bidden him brave the smallpox—the illness which had attacked Mary and which has been truthfully said to be "the enemy of the House of Orange," having deprived William of both father and mother at an early age—but he was safe from infection, having passed through this disease in his youth.

Mary was a great loss to the country, for her influence was for good—but from the point of view of art it was almost nil. True, she patronised artists to some extent but without much success, although in emulation of Lely's presentments of the "Beauties" at Windsor Castle in the time of her uncle Charles, she commissioned Godfrey

1 Burnet, vol. iii, p. 139.
3 William nearly succumbed to smallpox in 1675, and was only saved by the devotion of his lifelong friend and servant William Bentinck, afterwards first Earl of Portland.
4 Lely's Beauties painted by order of Anne, Duchess of York, the mother of Mary, were originally placed at Windsor, but were removed early in the last century to Hampton
Kneller to paint a similar collection for her new palace. To her consequently we owe the second "Beauty" series at Hampton Court, a doubtful boon, for these pictures show little of the skill which Kneller undoubtedly possessed, and her choice of models was characteristic of her, for she selected those whom she loved—her friends—for the purpose of portrayal rather than those who were accustomed to adulation as pretty women. The result was that she offended so many of her suite by the omission of their claims, that noting their ill-humour she asked Lady Dorchester the reason of her sudden unpopularity. "Madam," came the reply, "were His Majesty to order portraits of all the wits in his court would not the rest think he called them fools?" 1

As regards Mary's own personal appearance, pictures vary greatly. Kneller was a better painter of men than of women; Caspar Netscher's 3 presentment at the Rijks Museum is stiff and almost unpleasing, but there is a pretty little picture probably by this artist or one of his sons, Constantine or Theodore, 3 in the National Gallery, which forms a rather favourable contrast to that by Wissing in almost the same pose, near which it hangs, and an example by Jan Verkolje 4 at Haarlem displays an excellent complexion and other good points.

Court, where they now hang in William's State Bedroom. Some confusion subsequently arose in speaking of the paintings of Lely and Kneller, which were known in old days as "the Windsor Beauties" and "the Hampton Court Beauties" respectively; see The History of Hampton Court Palace, by Ernest Law, vol. iii, p. 30.

1 Strickland, vol. vii, p. 399, Walpole's Anecdotes, vol. iii, p. 206, note 2. It appears that William and Mary were satisfied with these pictures, for Kneller was rewarded with a knighthood and "the additional present of a medal and chain worth £300." Ibid., p. 207. Kneller's "Beauty" were engraved by John Faber, Junior, and are in the mezzotint more pleasing than in the originals. The picture of Mary herself no longer hangs at Hampton Court, but, judging from Faber's print, I believe it to be the painting now to be seen at Kensington Palace.

2 Caspar Netscher, born in Heidelberg in 1639, died at The Hague in 1684, having resided there since 1660.

3 Constantine Netscher, baptized at The Hague on the 16th December, 1668, was buried there on 27th March, 1723 (n.s.); he was the pupil of his father Caspar. His eldest brother Theodore was born in 1661 at Bordeaux and resided much in France, but eventually fixed his residence at The Hague, and is said to have visited England in 1715; he died in 1732 at Hulst in Holland.

4 Jan Verkolje, born in Amsterdam in 1650, was chiefly known as a painter of small portraits. He settled in Delft in 1672 and died there in 1693.
Most artists portray her with darker hair than it is rumoured she possessed, but a pleasing oil miniature at Montagu House probably gives the correct colouring, and shows us a fair and quite good-looking woman, while the small painting by Verkolje mentioned above suggests a decidedly red shade of brown.

Miss Strickland describes a framed lock of her hair in a private collection as of “a pale brown” and of “an extremely fine and silky texture.” The authenticity of this relic seems undoubted, for at the back of the frame is written by Mary’s own hand: “My haire, cut off. March ye 5th 1688.”¹ The dress of the day was singularly unbecoming to her, but the earlier portraits such as that illustrated opposite page 208 from the brush of Lely, painted before the fashion became general of dragging up the softer locks from the forehead, show us a rather handsome woman with the long Stuart nose, fine almond shaped eyes and well-formed mouth. It was, however, a rather uninteresting face which, unfortunately, as years advanced, grew too fat, the double chin so painfully apparent on her medallion portraits becoming much too visible by the time when, still a young woman, she ascended the English throne. A modern writer has commented upon her want of vanity in suffering such “painfully realistic medals” to be struck, and calls them together with those of her husband “the best index to the artistic instinct of William and Mary.”²

The long series of medals commemorating the death of the Queen attests the general sorrow, but I will not inflict upon our readers a detailed description of the varied works executed by Luder, Boskam, Arondeaux and other artists.³ So far as I know them they are all inartistic, and did we depend upon these alone we should find it hard to realise that Mary was considered handsome by her contemporaries. In support, however, of this statement I may quote Mdme. de Sevigny’s requiem pronouncement:—“She was but thirty-three, she was beautiful, she was a reigning queen, and she is dead in three days.”⁴

⁴ Strickland’s Queens of England, vol. vii, p. 444. Mary showed symptoms of
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The description of her medallic memorials by Miss Strickland, no specialist in the matter, may be taken as a sample of the impression they would make on an amateur, who would put technical considerations aside. "Many medals," writes this historian, "were struck on the occasion of Mary's death; they chiefly represent her as very fat and full in the bust with a prodigious amplitude of double chin; the hair stuck up in front some inches higher than the crown of the head, as if the queen had just pulled off her high cornette cap; the hair is thus depicted as standing on end, very high on the forehead, and very low behind, a fashion which gives an ugly outline of the head." The "cornette" referred to by Miss Strickland is brought before us in the facing engraving by John Smith after a picture by Jan van der Vaart, to which the date 1690 is assigned in Smith's British Mezzotints. This head dress was an erection of lace frills stiffened by wires, and Addison tells us in the Spectator of June 22nd, 1711, that "about ten years ago," i.e. not long before the death of William, the lady's "head" or "fontange," as it was sometimes called, "shot up to a very great height insomuch that the female part of our species were much taller than the men." In our portrait we already notice that Mary on her arrival in England was no longer the slender girl whose grace of figure, however, at the time of her marriage gave promise of the dignity of later years, when Burnet speaks rather of the "sweetness in her deportment that charmed,"

indisposition on the 19th or 20th of December, 1694; after a few days smallpox was declared and she died on the 28th of the month.

2 John Smith, born 1652, died 1742, was much employed by Kneller to engrave his pictures, but he worked also for others, such as J. van der Vaart, from whom he received instruction in the art of mezzotint scraping.
3 Jan van der Vaart was born at Haarlem in 1647. He came to England in 1674, and was employed by Wissing to paint draperies and such details, but also painted portraits and still life on his own account. He ultimately became a mezzotint engraver and died in London in 1721.
4 Smith's British Mezzotints, vol. iii, p. 1198, No. 176.
5 The fontange was so called after a French court beauty, Marie de Fontange. Her hair becoming accidentally loosened whilst hunting, she hastily tied it up with a lace trimmed kerchief and was so much admired by Louis XIV., that the Court adopted a fashion which in time became exaggerated to a ridiculous height.
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and of her "noble expression" than of actual beauty of features, although he lays stress on the fact that "her person was majestic, and created respect." Waller the poet compared a picture of her by Wissing to a portrait of Queen Elizabeth, but it is difficult to regard this likeness as being much more than a courtly comparison between her and one whom he considered, as he said, "the greatest woman the world ever saw," for according to Miss Strickland it was based upon a portrait not particularly representative of Mary.

Some of the Dutch medals avoid the coiffure to which Miss Strickland so rightly objected, and by favour of the British Museum authorities I hereby illustrate her bust as it appeared from the hand of

1 Burnet, vol. iii, p. 133.
2 Strickland's *Queens of England*, vol. vii, p. 142. "How do you like that portrait of my elder daughter?" asked the father, drawing Waller's attention to a fine whole-length of Mary just opposite to his chair. "My eyes are dim," replied Waller, "but if that is the Princess of Orange she bears some resemblance to the greatest woman the world ever saw." The king asked whom he meant, and testified some surprise when Waller answered, "Queen Elizabeth." "She had great ministers," dryly observed the King. "And when did your Majesty know a fool choose wise ones," rejoined Waller impressively. This story was no doubt taken by Miss Strickland from Samuel Johnson, who gives it in much the same words in his *Lives of the Poets*; see Waller in vol. ii, p. 337, edition of 1825. Johnson, however, admits that he had heard it told of some other men."
Jan Boskam, a portrait frequently reproduced by this artist\(^1\) and also by Jan Luder\(^2\) with slight variations and differing reverses.

Many of these medals have representations on the reverse of catafalques, monuments and effigies, all of a fanciful nature, but portraying the lying-in-state at Whitehall or showing forth the coffin under its canopy at Westminster Abbey, and I cannot tell to which of these Miss Strickland refers when she calls attention to the fact that, although medallically represented, no monument of the Queen was ever erected in the place of her sepulture.\(^3\) May we not, however, say with Macaulay that from the point of view of usefulness, the memorial which William raised in her honour in the dedication of Greenwich Hospital as a retreat for seamen, was "a monument the most superb that was ever created by any sovereign," and the historian tells us that in the courtyard of the building "had the king's life been prolonged till the works were completed, a statue of her who was the real foundress of the institution would have had a conspicuous place."\(^4\) The reverses of two medals\(^5\) by James Roettier in the British Museum, known, however, only as roughly struck in lead, recall the lying-in-state, but a similar bust to

---

\(^1\) Med. Ill., vol. ii, pp. 107, 110, 114, 115, Nos. 335, 341, 349, 351.
\(^3\) Strickland's Queens, vol. vii, 464.
that appearing on the obverse of these rare memorials is seen upon the common copper pieces sold by Norbert Roettier and his brother at the Mint at the price of 5s. each and here illustrated. To James alone we owe another extremely rare specimen differing but slightly from this, although with another reverse, and composed of two thin plates united by a strong rim. All these portraits in turn strongly remind us of the Regency Medal portrayed on page 243.1 To James Roettier also is now attributed the medal with the figure of a woman seated on a globe, which was at one time classified amongst John Roettier's possible works.2 We have no reliable information as to the condition of the elder artist's disabled hands at this period, nor do we know whether he had sufficiently recovered to execute any tribute to Mary's memory. There are, nevertheless, some medallic portraits of the Stuart sovereigns, from Charles I. to Anne, concerning which I wrote in my article on King James II.,3 venturing for the following reasons on the evidence then before me to suggest that these clichés, if regarded as coming from the hand of one man only, might possibly be attributable to the failing powers of John, rather than to his slightly less expert, although at this time more efficient son Norbert. I thought it curious, unless the later specimens were the efforts of one whose powers were impaired, that this series of plaques should be of such uneven workmanship, and suggested that they were made at long intervals, those representing Charles I.4 and James II.5 being of a high order of merit, such as might have been executed in the plenitude of John Roettier's activity, during the lifetime of the latter king—in 1688 according to the date on the truncation of the shoulder—whilst, as our readers may see for themselves, some of those of William and Mary6 bear but faint traces of the same technical skill,

1 Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 705, No. 112.
6 William as represented on p. 256, and Mary on p. 259.
although others again are gracefully conceived and of good quality throughout. The fine plaque of William reproduced on our facing plate, appears to be, judging from the letterpress, a variety of that described in the first edition of *Medallic Illustrations of British History* on page 221, as number 546, a specimen then in the Franks collection, which bore the date of William’s death, and which was considered by its possessor to be one of a set of memorials, designed in the reign of Queen Anne by Norbert Roettier. It has struck me as unlikely that he should use the English style of reckoning, if he designed the medallion after he had taken up his residence in France, and he would besides have little motive as the servant of the titular King James III. for making memorials of those who had supplanted his master. I regarded this bust of William as a connecting link

1 Plaques illustrated on our facing plate.
SILVER PLAQUES OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN THE AUTHOR'S COLLECTION.
between the better and the inferior plaques, and deemed that the inequality of execution might be due to the intermittent nature of John Roettier's complaint. Recent research has, however, thrown more light upon the question of dates, and we find that some of these difficulties are now dissipated, but the differences of technique remain to be explained.

Assisted by the kindly co-operation afforded by Mr. Grueber, who now as always generously placed both his time and help at my disposal, I have studied the cliches in the British Museum together with the companion medallions on our plate, with the resulting agreement between us that the fresh data is of sufficient interest to justify publication.

Firstly, I must draw your attention to the fact that the portraits are a pair, contemporaneously framed alike, to form a single gift. Secondly, this particular bust of Mary has, so far as I know, never been seen without an obituary inscription. We may therefore safely conclude that the two plaques in my collection were struck soon after Mary's death, and may be dated before Norbert Roettier's departure from this country.¹

I consequently reconsider my suggestion so far as the pair of portraits of William and Mary are concerned, but I am still of opinion that the clichés representing Charles I. and James II. are of an earlier date and still better execution, and that on technical grounds we must regard the series as begun by John Roettier the father, whilst his sons, James and Norbert, carried out the elder artist's work in this matter just as they did upon the coinage, designing the puncheons as required.

Until quite recently I had never seen an example portraying Charles II. made in these thin silver sheets, a loss which I deplored in our last volume, now, however, there are two slightly varying specimens known to me, struck from a differing or altered die. Both appear by the courtesy of their possessors—the Duke of Atholl and Mr. Berney-Ficklin—on our next plate, and they will also be found on Plate CLXXXIII in the Appendix of the new edition of Medallie

¹ Norbert Roettier was still in England in April, 1695, see Num. Chron., vol. ii, 1st Series, p. 254, and the exact date of his departure for France is not known, but is believed to have been in that year.
Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland, now in the press, one being uninscribed whilst the other (No. 206 in the Exhibition of Stuart Relics at Cambridge in the May of this year) bears a memorial inscription.

In treatment and design Charles II.'s bust agrees with those of Charles I. and James II., and is strongly reminiscent of the Felicitas Britanniae medal⁵ and of the solid silver plaque,⁶ illustrated in our fifth and sixth volumes respectively, also of various smaller medals, and I must therefore, with Mr. Grueber's concurrence, suggest that it be referred to John Roettier.

We may further notice the lettering which is used in the spelling of the name CAROLUS, for we find the vowel U instead of the more usual V in both medallions. The plaque of Charles I. bears a similar bust to the memorial advertised by James and Norbert Roettier in 1695,⁷ and this in its turn was probably a reproduction of that signed by their father John at apparently an earlier date,⁸ and which appears to me to bear a stronger resemblance to the cliché in question than does Norbert's signed medal with a differing reverse—so that possibly the medallion may be the original sketch.

There are in the British Museum other clichés of William and Mary, which I have been permitted to bring before you in the letterpress of our pages 256 and 259, but these are, as I have said, of less successful execution, and are no doubt, as now described in the new edition of Medallic Illustrations, the efforts of an inferior artist aiming at the same style of portraiture, and as such need not any longer be taken into consideration, whilst we are looking

---

⁵ Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 460, No. 53. Plate XLIII, No. 8. See our vol. v facing p. 252, where by a clerical error the medal was numbered 54.
⁷ Num. Chron., vol. ii, 1st Series, p. 254, where Mr. Nightingale quotes an advertisement from a book of cuttings belonging to Matthew Young, and now in the collection of Mr. S. M. Spink, by whose courtesy I have examined it.
⁸ See Med. Ill., new edition, Plate XXX, No. 10, 11-12, where the date 1670 is assigned to No. 11. There are three varieties, one signed by John, one by Norbert, and the other unsigned, and the last may be, I think, that advertised in 1695 by James and Norbert. The bust on the plaque is draped like John's signed medal, whereas that bearing Norbert's signature bears no mantle.
SILVER PLAQUE OF CHARLES II. IN THE COLLECTION OF THE DUKE OF ATHOLL.
SILVER PLAQUE OF CHARLES II. IN THE COLLECTION OF MR. BERNEY-FICKLIN.
for the achievements of John Roettier or his sons.  

A somewhat similar cliché portraying the Duke of Marlborough may be placed in the same class.  

Were it not that Obrisset, although he reproduced the Roettiers' portrait of Charles I in horn and silver on the tops of snuff boxes, never so far as I can ascertain used the designs under discussion of the later monarchs, we might have thought that some of the specimens were due to him, but in the first place, although it is believed that Obrisset made dies for his horn medallions, the silver examples are usually casts taken from copies of known medals, and thicker in substance than those struck pieces.  

Secondly, he did little original

1 Med. Ill., Plates XCVII, No. 3, and CXIV, No. 2.
3 Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 347, No. 282. This is the cliché of Charles I which we have been discussing.
work, and if he had designed these portraits he would hardly have
discarded in preference to mounting them, for boxes exist signed by
him and portraying William III., whom he usually represented on
horseback. There are also examples with a peculiarly stiff bust of the
monarch, the prototype of which I have never been able to trace
medallically—or again, both in silver and in shell we find the King's
head together with Mary's, their jugate busts being taken from Bower's
coronation medal. On these types I have not seen Obrisset's signature,
but the technique of the dual portrait is more reminiscent of his style
than the hard and formal portrait above mentioned.

Whether the silver portraits of William were originally intended
for memorials or not, was until now a question of some difficulty.
According to the evidence before the distinguished authors of the
Medallic Illustrations of British History at the time of its first
publication, the medallions were naturally regarded as such, because the
only dated specimen referred to his death, and the general similarity
in size and in design, although not precisely in execution, made the
clichés appear as one series, carried forward to the reign of Anne.

But some of the pieces in my collection throw light, as we see, on
this matter, and point to an earlier origin. Quite recently, moreover,
I acquired another portrait of William of similar type to the bust on
our plate, although differing slightly in treatment and being in much
lower relief. Here we have an exact date, for the figures 1697 are
inscribed on the truncation of the King's shoulder.

The words which appear in the field of the medallion—PAX · EST ·
CONCLUSA—must refer to the Peace of Ryswick finally signed after

1 See note 2 on p. 231, where the possibility is discussed of these boxes being
the work of Obrisset. The equestrian portrait is found with this artist's signature in full,
and with the change in the horseman's head is a mere reproduction of a specimen bearing
the legend "Carolus Rex," and signed with the initials O. B., the most usual monogram
of Obrisset, but giving my opinion for what it is worth, I should not be inclined to
attribute the large bust of William in horn or shell to him. Marlborough was also
represented by this artist, but the bust of the general is not taken from the plaque
referred to on our last page.

2 Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 231, No. 11, Plate CXV, 13. The medallion of Anne
celebrates her coronation and will be discussed in a future volume.
much discussion in the October of that year, whilst the words of the
legend celebrate William's triumph over the plots of his enemies, and
read: GVLIEL·III·D·G·MAG·BR·FRA·ET·HIB·REX·
CONSPIRATIO·DETECTA.\textsuperscript{1} Apart from technical considerations
this specimen can hardly proceed from the hand of Norbert Roettier,
engraver to the English Court at St. Germain, for although
Louis XIV. was a party to the treaty, it abrogated the rights of the
deposed King James II. by acknowledging his rival William III.; and
the medallion commemorated the defeat of plots for which the French
monarch was held responsible. But Norbert's brother James was at
that time still living, and had every possible motive for making a medal
in glorification of William, having fallen into disfavour at the beginning
of the year 1697 and being most anxious to be reinstated in the
office from which he had been displaced. James Roettier as a rule
worked in lower relief than his brother Norbert, and herein the
medallion agrees with our observations. Moreover, although in the
treatment of the hair and portraiture it bears the stamp of the Roettier
family's workmanship, it does not appear to be by the same hand as
any of the other medallions, but recalls the Dublin medal on which the
signature of James is found,\textsuperscript{3} as I hope to show by means of illustration in our next volume in comparing the medals executed in 1697.
Norbert Roettier was no longer in London at this date, but with
regard to the pair of portraits representing William and Mary, we
have, I think, now proved that they were struck before his departure,
and if the Queen's be not quite equal in every respect to that of her
husband, it may be that the artist was hurried in preparing a memorial
of her, as a pendant to an already existing bust of the King.

Be this as it may, the puncheons must have been left in England;

\textsuperscript{1} The year 1697 opened with the execution of Sir John Fenwick on January 28th,
1696–97, for participating in Barclay's plot to assassinate William in 1695 and other
treasonable practices. It is, however, possible that the words refer merely to the political
situation terminated by the conclusion of the Peace of Ryswick on September 10th–20th,
1697, and its final signature on October 29th–30th, when William's position as king was
acknowledged by the foreign powers, who had plotted for his overthrow.

\textsuperscript{2} Med. III., vol. ii, p. 197, No. 509.
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for rare as the known varieties are, we believe that in some cases the same bust of William is found with and without the date of death, from which I argue that the lettering in the old style on the Franks memorial was an addition. In conclusion we may note that the portrait of William—the companion to that of Mary in my collection—is without date, and the pair must have been presented by the King himself, for who but he would cause the curious words to be inscribed above her bust, QUIS・DABIT・SIMILEM. He considered her to be a queen whom none could replace, but such a sentence would not have been complimentary to Anne, if the memorials had been made after her accession. He also thought Mary irreplaceable as a wife, for otherwise he would probably have remarried after the death of the little Duke of Gloucester, in July, 1700, had left Anne without an heir, for we must remember that had William become the father of children by a second wife they would have been by the Act of Parliament in the direct line of succession, on the demise of his sister-in-law. He had urged a like consideration upon Mary, telling her that should he die during one of his campaigns she must choose a second husband. Such adulatory expressions as the QUIS・DABIT・SIMILEM above referred to, are, however, not unknown as a tribute from the artist or the recipient of the gift; witness a contemporary miniature in enamel of William at Minley, on the back of which are engraved the words, “Like unto him, there was no king before him,” followed by the reference to 2 Kings xxiii, 25, thus comparing him with Josiah, king of Judah. If, however, the flattering

1 These words are also inscribed on Mary’s portrait in another private collection, and this also forms one of a pair with a plaque of William similar to mine.

2 Commons Journal, vol. x, p. 24, February 8th, and p. 29, February 12th, 1688. The crown was assigned “to the Prince and Princess ” (of Orange) “during their joint lives . . . or to the Survivor of them; after their Deceases, to the heirs of the Body of the said Princess, and for default of such issue to Princess Anne of Denmark and heirs of her body, and for default of such issue to the Heirs of the Body of the said Prince of Orange.”

3 Lettres et Mémoires de Marie, Reine d’Angleterre, pp. 80 and 91.

4 In the collection of Mr. Lawrence Currie. The full verse runs: “And like unto him was there no king before him, that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses; neither after him arose there any like him.”
legend were incised by the artist and that artist be indeed any member of the Roettier family, it would serve as a corroboration of the little appreciated fact that Mary was kind to her father's servants. Also one cannot forbear wondering whether in the face of the allegation that John Roettier "would not take the oaths" and "would not ever serve the King," the toleration displayed towards him, prior to the Parliamentary enquiry into the affairs of the Mint, was not due to her influence, and whether his two sons were not employed at her desire.

Ailesbury, who "esteemed her as a princess that had no fault," tells us she showed great clemency towards himself, and that in general "her humanity was without example," whilst of William, although he admits that "he was far from being cruel," he writes: "he was not easy in forgiving, and I had too much experience of that, for why I know not to this hour." This adherent of the Stuarts describes Mary when at a Council and tells us that a "list of persons to be taken up was presented to her, and my name at the head, on which her Majesty was graciously pleased to say I had sufficiently been made uneasy two years before, and for nothing, and for that reason my name should be struck out . . . The first Secretary of State . . . said that they had orders from the King, then in Flanders, at the Army. The Queen with warmth said: "My Lord, show me your orders." On which the Secretary of State replied; "Madame, we have received orders to clap up a certain number." On which she laughed, and with life and judgment added, "I thought persons were to be taken up for crimes and not to make up numbers as they empanel jurymen." Lord Ailesbury then tells us that she substituted the name of Robert Earl of Scarsdale for his, one whom presumably she considered more dangerously disposed to her husband. This shrewd

1 Ailesbury's Memoirs, vol. i, p. 299.

2 Ibid., vol. ii, p. 502. Subsequently to Mary's death Ailesbury suffered a long imprisonment under William in 1695-96, his wife dying during his incarceration in the Tower. He was permitted to retire to Brussels in 1696, and died there in 1741, having married secondly a Countess of Sanu, in the Duchy of Brabant.

observer informs us that William without giving offence to his own countrymen did not always control his temper, that he had "an habitual way of striking his foot toward a person he was angry with, and doing the same thing after he was King toward an English lord he cried out: "I am not a Dutchman." The fact remains that William, who "had a dry morose way with him, having seldom a merry countenance," was born a Dutchman, and understood his own people, being understood by them, but had not the secret of adapting himself to his surroundings, so that he once petulantly exclaimed to Sir John Fenwick:

"I care not whether you and all your people were under water." His manners were bad, and excited remark at the court, but we must remember, with Lord Macaulay, that "one misfortune which was imputed to him as a crime was his bad English," whilst his foreign accent, his inelegant diction, and the poverty of his vocabulary contributed toward his taciturnity and brusqueness. One of his compatriots tells us on the other hand that "he spoke English, French, and German as easily as Dutch, and had a fair knowledge of Latin, Italian, and Spanish," and Burnet makes the same remark, so we must assume that his accent was less perfect than his acquaintance with our vernacular.

Mary had received an admirable education, and was a perfect mistress of French, as we see by her letters and diary, published by Countess Bentinck, but as we have noticed from extracts from Mary's English diary, even the British-born princess was apt to make mistakes in both the spelling and diction of her native language, to which she had become unused during her long sojourn in Holland. This,

2 It is said that the anger displayed on this occasion by William at the desertion of some of Sir John Fenwick's men serving in the Netherlands, was the cause of his subsequent animosity against the king. See p. 261, note 1.
3 Ibid., vol. ii, p. 390.
6 Lettres et Mémoires de Marie, Reine a'Angleterre, being a collection of private papers of the Heeckeren van Wassenaer family.
7 Strickland's vol. vii, p. 11; see also Doebner, Preface to Memoirs of Mary, pp. 7–8.
however, also applied—though in a lesser degree—to her French composition, but allowance must be made for the usually defective orthography of the time. Her religious education was so thorough, that she had no difficulty in holding her own in arguments with her father.¹

Although to Mary we owe the recognition of the beauties of china or faience used for purposes of decoration, the majority of the objets de vertu imported by the royal pair were not such as to excite admiration. We have an instance of the fantastic and curious in the practice of impressing wood on horn with dies so as to make a medal. A certain Martin Brunner,² a German, made sets of draughtsmen on this principle, using, it is believed, a medal die for the purpose, inasmuch as we find the same portraits struck in lead and soft metal, possibly intended as proofs for the wooden pieces. They are also found sometimes in more precious substances—witness the silver gilt medallion,

¹ Correspondence between James II. and his daughter on his change of religion, pp. 4–24, in Lettres et Mémoires de Marie, Reine d’Angleterre: Collection de Documents authentiques publiés par Mechtild, Comtesse Bentinck. See also Mary’s account of this in her French Diary, ibid., pp. 57–61.

² Martin Brunner, born in Nuremberg in 1659, worked in Prague and Breslau, but returned to his native place and there died in 1725.
which I illustrate more on account of its rarity than for artistic reasons, the design being stiff and unpleasing.

If William was unpopular because he was uncouth, the court ladies of the day found Mary a little dull, for although we see that she was not completely destitute of a sense of humour, they were accustomed to an atmosphere of wit and gaiety, and her sterling qualities did not appeal to them.

It is pleasant to hear that the Electrice Sophia of Brandenburg, herself a clever woman, said that Mary's "beauty equalled her mental gifts," but her accomplishments were more solid than attractive, and it was told of her that "she did not know one picture from another and had little or no ear for music, asking Purcell, a great composer of the day, to play a jig."\(^1\) On the other hand if it be true that her only artistic employment was that of embroidery, we must remember that she had great responsibilities, and little time for recreation, the double

\(^1\) *Pageants of London*, by R. Davey, p. 339.
business of managing the state and keeping William informed on all questions, falling upon her, as it did, during his frequent sojourns on the Continent. Moreover all authorities are not agreed as to her want of appreciation of art, for although she was not personally gifted in this particular, she encouraged the efforts of others, and we have records of her individual interest in the alterations at Hampton Court Palace. She had in Christopher Wren an enthusiastic admirer, and in his biography, written by his son, we read that she bestowed great attention upon his building plans and "pleased herself... to give thereon her own Judgment which was exquisite; for there were few Arts or Sciences in which her Majesty had not only an elegant Taste, but a Knowledge much superior to any of her Sex, in that or (it may be) in any former Age."¹ But without endorsing the very high estimate of her qualities, held by one whose father's designs she approved, even to the destruction of a great part of Henry VIII.'s beautiful old building—some allowance must be made for the taste of the time, when Versailles was the cynosure of all eyes, and undoubtedly Hampton Court with its admirable carvings is a monument to Mary's understanding of architecture and decorative design. From the point of view of the numismatist I would put forward for her the claim made by Miss Strickland,² that she gave her personal attention to the proposed improvement of the currency, although it was not carried out or even brought into prominent discussion during her lifetime, but the question of this great reform is so lengthy that we will, with your permission, resume the story of William's last years in another volume. Let us therefore be content to think of Mary as of a good wife and an honest Regent; of William in the words of Arondeaux³ upon one of his memorial medals, as "the greatest of the Dutch, the controller of minds and men."

¹ Parentalia, p. 326, by Christopher Wren, son of the great architect, published in 1750, by his grandson Stephen Wren.
³ See Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 221, No. 547. The dedication on the medal runs NASSAVIOR PRINCIPI BATAVORVM MAXIMO AC ARMORVM MODERATORI CONSECR.
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE TOKENS.
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