MARY STUART, the daughter of James II., was dead, and William of Orange was, save in his connection with this dynasty through his grandfather, Charles I., no member of the historic family whose medallic portraiture I have endeavoured to trace.

The title, therefore, of this portion of my paper is somewhat of a misnomer, I, however, crave the indulgence of my readers for thus carrying on my story until the Stuarts re-appear in the person of Anne, in order to preserve unbroken the continuity of the narrative.

I do this the more readily because the numismatic history of the end of the seventeenth century, embracing the great re-coinage of silver, although so fully reported by Ruding, affords information, which I believe to be hitherto unpublished, concerning the Roettier family, whose handiwork, as the principal engravers employed by the Stuarts, it has been my endeavour to disentangle.

My readers may remember that we left William heart-broken at the death of his wife, whom he had learnt to value all too late—his affection being, as Burnet tells us, "as great as it was just," and in strong contrast to the cold reserve of which he was usually possessed,
for "he went beyond all bounds in it."1 So violent was his grief at the loss of his wife, as we are informed by the bishop, that "there was great reason to apprehend that he was following her"; and we learn that "for some weeks after, he was so little master of himself that he was not capable of minding business or of seeing company."2

Nevertheless, we find in Wyon's *Great Seals of England* an extract specifying the presence of "the King's most Excellent Majesty in Council" within a fortnight of his bereavement.3 Under date January 10th, 1695, we read, "Whereas the Draught of a New Great Seale of England hath been presented to his Ma'ty and approved and is hereunto annexed, It is this day ordered in the Council that James Roettieres and Bartie [sic = Norbert] Roettieres his Ma'ty's Engravers in the Mint do forthwith Engrave the New Seale after the same manner and Draught accordingly, and deliver the same when done to the R't Hono'ble the Lord Keeper of the Great Seale to be presented to His Ma'ty in Council."

Mr. Wyon gives an example of the use of this seal on December 17th, 1695, otherwise we might fancy that January, 1695-6, was the date specified rather than 1694-5, especially because the same author notes that the old seal of William and Mary is found upon a document so late as April 6th, 1695.4

It is therefore apparent that some slight delay must have occurred in the execution of the order, and we may wonder whether we see in the seal the last joint work of both brothers, since not long after the month of April, 1695, mentioned above, namely towards the end of

---

1 Burnet's *History of His Own Times*, vol. iv, p. 249, ed. 1833.
2 Ibid.
3 Wyon's *Great Seals of England*, p. 141, Appendix A, Extract G.
4 Wyon's *Great Seals of England*, pp. 111 and 112. Besides this evidence, I find from the *Treasury Books*, T. 29, vol. viii, that the King was not in the Treasury Council on January 10th, 1695-6. I have not been able to examine the report for January, 1694-5, because no minute-books of that year are at the Record Office. However, The *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial Series 1680–1720*, p. 284, denotes that the Council sat on January 10th, 1694-5. The old seal of William and Mary referred to above is, I find, Add. Ch. 13336 in the Manuscript Room of the British Museum. The seal is in bad condition, but quite legible.
1695, or the beginning of 1696, Norbert, whose name we read in the "Bartie" of the warrant, departed to France leaving the entire responsibility for engraving in the hands of James Roettier.

We have reasons for believing that Norbert quitted England in the latter half of the year 1695, probably prior to the month of August, but the exact date of his exodus is not known.\(^1\) I understand, however, that amongst the interments chronicled at the Tower, the burial on March 6th, 1694–5, of "John Philip, yr. son of Robertus" \(\textit{sic}\) for Norbertus "Roetieres" is entered in the register of St. Peter ad Vincula, and this tends to show that Norbert's family had not definitely quitted England prior to that month.\(^2\)

But we find evidence of his personal presence in London at a later date, for Mr. Nightingale, in an early volume of the \textit{Numismatic Chronicle}, mentions the advertisement of certain medals made by the artist in conjunction with his brother James at the Tower, in February and April, 1695.\(^3\) He derived his information from a newspaper-cutting preserved by Matthew Young, with others of the same nature collected in a book which passed into Mr. Nightingale's possession. By the courtesy of Mr. S. M. Spink, the present owner of this scrap-book,\(^4\) I have seen the printed notice, a piece cut from an old paper, and I observe that the name of the journal is not specified. The date, April 29th, 1695, is written in the margin, presumably by Mr. Young. Mr. Nightingale also leaves the source whence the advertisement is derived in uncertainty, suggesting, however, \textit{The}

\(^1\) In the \textit{MS. Treasury Papers}, vol. iv, 62, Neale, writing on August 18th, 1698, says, "Norbertus went off three years ago."

\(^2\) Information kindly supplied by the Rev. W. H. Milner, Chaplain of St. Peter ad Vincula. With regard to the supposition that John Roettier was a son of Norbert, I must state that on the ground of the birth of James, the only surviving son in 1707, Mr. J. H. Burn suggests in the \textit{Num. Chron.}, 1st series, vol. iii, p. 185, that Norbert Roettier was probably not married until after his arrival in France. This would, however, only apply to his second marriage, for, according to the \textit{Dictionary of National Biography} and Mr. Forrer's \textit{Dictionary of Medallists}, Elizabeth Isard and Winifred Clarke were successively his wives, the latter being the daughter of an Englishman living at St. Germain, and it was Winifred who was the mother of James.


\(^4\) \textit{Cuttings once the property of Matthew Young and B. Nightingale}, p. 21.
Flying Post, a supposition which I have not been able to verify as I was unsuccessful in obtaining the number so dated, but after some search, I found the notice in two successive issues of the London Gazette under date April 25th and 29th. One thing is clear, namely, that Norbert’s departure preceded by some time the termination of the Parliamentary Enquiry into the Affairs of the Mint, and even the action taken by the House of Commons against his brother James in February, 1696-7; but whether he really left England to avoid the suspicions of his disloyalty caused by the disclosures of one Matthew Smith, concerning the abstraction of some dies in January, 1695-6, to send to James II. in France,\(^1\) or merely because a good opening presented itself shortly before this date in that country, remains a matter of very uncertain gossip.

We know that he joined his uncle Joseph, whom in 1703 he finally succeeded as Graveur-Général of the French Mint, remaining permanently abroad and dying whilst still in office in 1727 at Choisy-sur-Seine.

It has been said by some authorities that Norbert “fled to France” to avoid the Mint Enquiry, but it seems as though he departed before the dissatisfaction had reached a sufficient height to make this necessary. The wording of a warrant in the Stuart papers\(^2\) associating his name with that of his uncle Joseph in Paris on December 9th, 1695, might lead us to suppose he was by that time settled in France, but this is no definite proof, because Norbert is mentioned in connection with his father John and his brother James in another grant of the same and subsequent dates; and it is likely that Norbert was to act as intermediary in bringing over the dies in

\(^1\) Memoirs of Secret Service, by Matthew Smith, p. 12. This accusation was levelled against his brother James Roettier at the Mint Enquiry, but this was as Smith writes “above a year after I gave in an account of the matter,” p. 89. For details of this affair see British Numismatic Journal, vol. vi, p. 258.

\(^2\) Stuart Papers, vol. i, p. 109. Warrants for making instruments in “The Mint for the Kingdom of England,” given at St. Germain, November 9th, 1695, to Joseph and Norbert Roettier; and to John, James and Norbert to make dies and punchcouns at the same date and on the following December 18th, see British Numismatic Journal, vol. vi, pp. 257-8.
The Movements of the Roettier Family.

a projected exodus. The movement of the various members of the family are confusedly set forth in the report of the Parliamentary Enquiry published in the Commons' Journals, whence the expression "fled to France" was adopted by modern writers. In an early volume of the Numismatic Chronicle Mr. J. H. Burn gives a good abstract of the Report, and applies the words "fled to France" either to Norbert or to his brother, the younger John Roettier, who did indeed take refuge in flight for political reasons, but seems to have held no post at the Tower. The context, however, in the somewhat rambling account of the Parliamentary Committee's investigations, might lead us to believe that John Roettier's brother Joseph was in question rather than one of his sons, for it deals with the remuneration fixed by the appointment of the three engravers under Charles II., and contains the assertion that the salaries of all three had "been constantly paid to him that remained here" (i.e., John) "notwithstanding one of them went several years since into Flanders" (i.e., Philip), "and the other fled to France." We have, however, no reason to think that Joseph Roettier had cause for flight, and this is not the only inaccuracy of expression in a long report which contains, however, much of interest.

Be this as it may, Walpole states that Norbert retired because a rumour affirmed "that King James was in England and lay concealed in Roetier's house in the Tower." He also repeats a tale of the engraver having maliciously ridiculed William by introducing a face with horns at the King's ear, when he designed the jugate busts on the halfpence of 1694. Had this been the case, we should hardly find the engraver still at the Tower Mint at the end of April, 1695. However, the story cannot be dismissed as due to Walpole's lively imagination, for it was current during the lifetime of Norbert Roettier. We find a reference to it in a pamphlet so early as 1711, in which allusion is made to the "Copper Halfpence stamped by a notorious Villain with the

Devil at King William's right Ear."¹ Nor did the rumour die out, for it was taken up by Vertue, from whom Walpole in turn derived his information.

Let us, therefore, refer to the Vertue manuscripts, where we find the author, after speaking of the elder Roettier, noting that "'Twas his son that was employed in making the halfpence in King William's time, where there is a supposed Satyr's head which by the malice of some persons was reported to be designedly done. After, he left England and was employed by the King of France in his mint, where he has been ever since in great reputation."² A note appended by Wornam in the *Anecdotes of Painting* to Walpole's version of the story reminds us that a similar legend was believed concerning the first halfpenny of George II., when "the knee of Britannia was thought to represent a rat, a Hanoverian one, gnawing into her bowels."³ Walpole implies that the offending coin of 1694 was a proof,⁴ and according to the pamphlet above described, an expression used by James Dundas of Arniestoun⁵ whilst addressing the Faculty of Advocates in 1711, points to its being a rare piece. In discussing the acceptance of the CVIVS EST medal, considered by some of those present as a treasonable act, he said: "Medals are the Documents of History to which all Historians refer, and therefor tho' I should give King William's Stamp with the Devil at his right Ear, I see not how it could be refused, seeing a hundred years hence it would prove that such a coin had been in England."

¹ *The Scotch Medal deciphered*, p. 7. This rare pamphlet, lent to me by Mr. W. J. Webster, contains an account of the presentation to the Faculty of Advocates of the CVIVS EST medal advancing the claims of James II.'s son to the title of James III.


³ *Anecdotes of Painting*, vol. ii, p. 186, note 3.

⁴ "On the proofs were the King's and Queen's head on different sides, with a rose, a ship, etc., but in 1694 it was resolved that the heads should be coupled and Britannia be on the reverse. Hence arose a new matter of complaint," etc., etc. Walpole, as above, p. 186.

⁵ James Dundas of Arniestoun so much provoked his father by his conduct in this matter that he proposed to disinherit him, and was only dissuaded by his second son, Robert, afterwards Lord Advocate. James Dundas however left Scotland for France, where he was killed in a duel. See *A Century of Scottish History*, by Sir Henry Craig, vol. ii, pp. 95–6.
According to J. H. Burn, who, however, quotes no author, the Roettiers had nothing whatever to do with the copper coinage of 1694, made under Sir Joseph Herne's patent. Herne's predecessors, however, Godolphin, Hoare, and Corbet, had employed the engravers from the Royal Mint, and we have strong reasons for believing that the dies, or at least the puncheons, for the halfpence and farthings were usually prepared at the Tower, but of this more anon.

Nevertheless, upon neither the patterns nor the copper currency can I discern with the naked eye, nor indeed with a magnifying glass, any curl of hair which can fairly be twisted into a satyr, and if such accidental disrespect had really been discovered, the die would probably have been destroyed, or at least modified. The latter alternative may, however, have been adopted, for it is worth mentioning that when the magnified picture of William and Mary's jugate halfpenny is thrown upon a sheet from a lantern slide, it is just possible to trace two large round eyes, a pair of horns and also the tail of a problematical demon. If this be so on the current coin, possibly the original die mentioned by James Dundas may have shown an exaggerated blemish in the king's coiffure.

HALFPENNY OF WILLIAM AND MARY, 1694.

Little more than a year after the death of Mary troubles began at the Mint, and perhaps Norbert was wise in avoiding them, for the whole family suffered much discomfort. No actual proof was brought against father or sons, but they were accused, probably with justice, of receiving

---

1 *Num. Chron.*, 1st series, vol. iii, p. 177. The grant to Sir Joseph—or as he was called by Snelling and Montagu, Sir John—Herne, and others was of June, 1694, to run from the midsummer of that year for seven years, see *Commons' Journals*, vol. xiii, p. 198.
money from France,¹ and a warrant for high treason was issued against the eldest of old Roettier's children, his namesake John. He was accused of complicity in Barclay's plot to kill King William, being found "in the Company of Rookwood and Bernardo" (sic. See note ²) "the Assassinators, when they were apprehended" [at Brentford in 1695-6] "and was suspected to be in that Conspiracy himself, having at that time provided himself of Horses and Arms at his own House in Essex, where he entertained very ill Company to the Terror of the Neighbourhood."ᵐ

Young Roettier "fled from Justice" and was not apprehended. Much gossip was, however, current of which his father and his brother James had to bear the brunt, and the Mint Enquiry terminated in their disgrace. They were particularly liable to suspicion because they were members of the Church of Rome, a fact which should have given reason for no surprise, seeing that they were natives of Flanders, a Catholic country, and not of Holland, where the Protestant faith flourished. Great jealousy of all William's Dutch favourites existed, and at that time little distinction was drawn in the minds of Englishmen between Amsterdam and Brussels. All who came from the Low Countries were regarded with distrust, only the religion of William's compatriots palliating their presence. A Netherlander who did not profess the creed of the Protestant King would be an object of dislike to all parties; and the words which encircle the Petition Crown³ prove

¹ We have seen that John and James Roettier both held grants from James II. at St. Germain as Engravers-General of the Mint for the Kingdom of England (see our p. 210, and Stuart Papers, vol. i, p. 109), and it is therefore likely that they did in truth receive stipends. The accusation (see Commons' Journals, vol. xi, p. 776) lay in the fact that there was a letter from one "Daniel Arthur, who is outlawed for high treason, to the said John Rotteer wherein he mentioned the stipend or salary from the French King to the said Rotteer." Moreover, to James were addressed "two several Bills of Exchange from France." The Committee also mentioned the Roettiers' salaries "over and above what they have received from France."

² Commons' Journals, vol. xi, p. 776. Sir George Barclay and the younger John Roettier fled to France. John Bernardi was imprisoned, and Ambrose Rookwood was executed.

³ "Thomas Simon most humbly prays your Majesty to compare this his tryall piece with the Dutch," etc.
that even in the time of Simon, the fact that the Roettiers were foreigners was urged as a bar to their appointment.

We now know from the *Manuscript Treasury Papers* that the family came from Brussels, both father and son craving leave to return thither, the one in a moment of sickness,¹ the other in the hour of his disgrace. To us the certainty of the Roettiers' Flemish origin comes as no surprise, for on the authority of many writers² it was believed that old Roettier was the son of an Antwerp goldsmith; and the Vertue manuscripts—not quoted by Walpole in this particular—give Brussels as an alternative.³ The words of James Roettier's petition to the Lords of the Treasury are absolutely definite, for he states that if they thought him "uncapable to Serve his Maj'ty, w' he is ready to do to the utmost of his art and Power, yo' Pet' most humbly prayeth yo' Lordsp's to obtaine a Pass for yo' Pet to go to Brussells yo' Pet's native Country."⁴

But although the Roettiers were not, strictly speaking, William's fellow-countrymen, nor his chosen servants or co-religionists, there is no reason for supposing that he disliked either John or James Roettier. On the contrary, it would appear that he was inclined to exceptional clemency, for the younger engraver, James, was employed by him in medallic work subsequently to his deposition from the post of cuneator.

Meanwhile the fact that he had, as was officially stated in May, 1696, made no medals for the king since the queen's death,⁵ must be explained

¹ *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. iv, p. 25, speaking of John Roettier, say that he "both very lately and this day hath also told us that he thinketh of betaking himself the first good opportunity to Brussels, the place of his nativity." July 2nd, 1689. Calendared 1556-1696, p. 53.
³ Vertue MS. Add. MS. *Brit. Mus.* 23069, f. 37. "When King Charles II. was in exile and at Brussels or Antwerp he there found Rotier the father, who being a wealthy man, a goldsmith or jeweller, he assisted the King with money, and the King is said to have dwelt in his house sometime," etc., etc.
⁴ *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. xlv, No. 43, May 21st, 1697. A letter from Newton and his colleagues dated July 6th, 1697, also refers to his possible "return with his family to Brussels, his native country." *Ibid.*, as above.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

by the magnitude of the numismatic work with which he was busied at the Mint.\(^1\) Even before the passing of the Re-coinage Bill, the number of dies prepared with William's portrait replacing the jugate busts was considerable, and after that event the artist's hands had no leisure for medal making.

![Shilling of 1695](image)

The portraiture of William alone upon the coins, whether gold, silver, or copper, from 1695 onward, is better than that of the jugate type which immediately preceded it.

![Crown of 1695](image)

Embracing as they do diverse busts fairly representative of William, the various issues exhibited technical differences, owing to a change in cuneators, and as time advanced, James Roettier's successor in office produced some very striking pieces, of which more anon, such as the gold series of 1701. The "Flaming-hair" shillings of 1698 and 1699 are perhaps the most noticeable specimens in silver, being remarkable.

\(^1\) At about this date we have Roettier's assertion that since the preceding January he had made 350 pairs of dies. *Ibid.*, No. 16.
PORTRAIT OF WILLIAM III. FROM A MEZZOTINT IN THE COLLECTION OF
MR. W. SHARP OGDEN, F.S.A.
for a decidedly realistic representation of the fashionably dressed wig.¹

We are more accustomed to think of William as he is brought before us in the mezzotint reproduced as our facing plate from the collection of Mr. W. Sharp Ogden. Although I have been unable to find the exact prototype, it resembles a print engraved by Smith after Wissing and Vandervaart,² except in some slight particulars, such as the presence of the sceptre. As the date 1690 is assigned to the last-mentioned engraving, we may believe that we here have a portrait of the king taken soon after his accession, and at this time the wig had not reached the abnormal height noticeable in a bust by Jan Blommendael in the Mauritshuis at The Hague, which bears date 1699.

Far less exaggeration is seen in the hair of another marble presentation of William, which is possibly by the same hand, being similar in workmanship. We may approximately date this bust a few years earlier, for the companion portrait brings Charles I. before us, reproduced directly, as we believe, from Bernini’s bust, which was destroyed in the Whitehall fire of January, 1697–8. I had the pleasure of illustrating this fine copy of a lost original in our fifth volume, by

¹ This exaggerated form of hair-dressing is, however, more markedly seen upon a horn medallion in the British Museum than in any coin or medal known to me.

² William Wissing, born in 1636 at Amsterdam, was for some time assistant of Lely, but soon made himself a name in England. He died at Burghley, whilst painting a picture of Lord Exeter, in 1689. John Vandervaart was born at Haarlem in 1647 and came to England in 1674, where he assisted Wissing, but ultimately became better known as a mezzotintist and as the master of John Smith, who engraved many of Kneller’s works. Vandervaart died in 1721. Smith was born in 1652 and died in 1742. The dates on his plates range from 1679–1727.
the permission of Mr. Laurence Currie, who now kindly allows me to place William's effigy before you, and it will be found facing this page.

A striking oil painting portraying William III. was produced by Godfried Schalcken,\(^1\) in 1699, and is catalogued at The Hague, as number 158, in the National Collection at the Mauritshuis. Reference to our reproduction of this picture, facing page 264, will show the formal dark curls rolled upward from the face more distinctly than the heavier rendering of the marble. We notice that the parting has been abandoned which is still to be traced in the more graceful wig depicted in oils upon copper in a portrait, almost miniature-like in the fineness of its execution, which I have the pleasure of bringing before you as our frontispiece in its original colouring from my own collection. Unfortunately this work, which I believe is from the hand of Simon Dubois, a Dutch or Flemish artist\(^2\) resident in England from the year 1685 onward, bears no date, but apart from the fashion in hair dressing, pertaining to the early part of William's reign, the fact that the picture is one of a pair, the companion painting representing Mary, suggests that the artist here portrays the royal couple at some period between the accession and the queen's death. This is the more probable because of their likeness to Kneller's full-length portraits at Kensington Palace, dated 1692.

It is interesting to compare the developments of the periwig on the coins with the statues and pictures of the king.

The question of the "Great Re-coinage" is one of primary importance, and as we find in it the mass of James Roettier's activity until his deprivation of office in the early part of the year 1697, let us turn at once to this subject.

For some time past a reform of the silver currency had been

---

\(^{1}\) Godfried Schalcken was born at Made near Geertruidenberg, and died at The Hague on November 16th, 1706. He visited England in 1692, but resided mostly in Holland.

\(^{2}\) Simon Dubois, who died in Rotterdam in 1708, was the son of Hendrick Dubois, resident in that city, painter and art dealer. It is, however, said that Simon was born in Antwerp. He studied under Wovermans, and married a daughter of William Van de Velde the younger.
BUST OF WILLIAM III. IN THE COLLECTION OF MR. LAURENCE CURRIE AT MINLEY MANOR.
imperatively demanded, and could no longer be deferred. “About five millions of clipped money was brought into the exchequer,” writes Burnet in his rapid survey of the crisis in 1696, “and the loss that the nation suffered by the recoining of the money amounted to two millions and two hundred thousand pounds. The coinage was carried on with all possible haste; about eighty thousand pounds was coined every week, yet still this was slow, and the new money was generally kept up, so that for several months little of it appeared.”

Burnet does not precisely date his account, so that we cannot tell to which period of the recoinage he refers; but as time progressed, the activity of the moneyers appears to have been greater than the historian suggests, and certainly the expected, if not the actual output, officially demanded in the middle of 1696, rose to £100,000 weekly; to accomplish which task it was necessary, as is recorded, that the mills should work “20 hours a day.”

The Treasury Papers in the Public Record Office contain much information concerning money matters, and I find that this sum was required from the Tower mint alone. On January 15th, 1696-7, Thomas Neale, the Master of the Mint, states that this amount could be coined if the bullion were supplied ready weighed and tested for use, as had been done in the previous summer. This leaves us to infer that the weekly coinage had then reached a higher figure, in proportion to the number of mills in working order, than was possible under the changed conditions. Referring, therefore, to the documents elated some eight months earlier, I found a report from Neale appended to a list comprising the names of 160 workmen employed by the Corporation of Moneyers, which throws light on the question. These men had, it

1 Burnet, vol. iv, p. 316.
5 It appears from the Mint Report laid before the House of Commons on April 8th, 1697 (Commons’ Journals, vol. xi, pp. 774-5, and Riving, vol. ii, p. 465), that “the Workers and Moneyers, except the Master, are no Standing Officers, nor have Salaries, but as Workmen receive Wages after a certain Rate in the Pound weight for all the Gold
appears, presented a petition against too large an issue of the smaller coins as prejudicial to their percentage in working and I gather from the remarks of Neale, aptly qualified as "rambling" by the Calendarer of the Treasury Papers, that he suggested the weekly sum should be represented as follows:

"20,000 in Crown Pieces,
30,000 in Half-crowns,
10,000 in Shillings,
2,500 in Sixpences,
Total 62,500 in 5 mills of the old mint."

"T.N.," continues Thomas Neale, speaking of himself in the third person, "will undertake in the other mint, to which they have no title, but his Majesty's Pleasure" [i.e., on the new mills], "shillings 30,000 and sixpences 7,500 which, with the 50,000 in great money, and 12,500 in shillings and sixpences to be coined by the Corporation, makes up the 100,000 weekly proposed."

and Silver they work and coin." The sum of one shilling and twopence per one pound, troy weight, was, as we shall see, divided amongst the various officials and workmen. (See our p. 249.) According to Neale's memorandum on the moneyers' petition, the men were now receiving a larger proportion of this allowance than had previously been the case.

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xliii, No. 37, contains an undated memorial from the moneyers in which they bring forward their grievance. They state therein that they employ 120 labourers and 33 horses. This petition will be found at greater length on our p. 247, and pertains to about this period. It is calendared in Treasury Papers, 1556-1696, p. 571, as "Undated but (?) 1696 from the state of the coinage." It is probable that the number of workmen had been increased by the time of Neale's report.

2 The Corporation referred to was the "Corporation of Moneyers," who arrogated to themselves certain rights, afterwards questioned at the Mint Enquiry. By the Parliamentary Report of April 8th, 1697, we find that the working staff at the mint then consisted of "an engraver, two engineers and smith, and above 200 labourers and ordinary workmen," and also "that almost the sole government of the making of money, not only
In addition, we must not forget that so soon as the Country Mints were in operation they contributed no mean quota towards relieving the pressure, for in December, 1696, York alone was declared capable of coining £10,000 weekly, whilst in April, 1697, the output at Bristol was £15,000 per week. Dr. Nelson, in the third volume of our Journal, has given so careful an analysis of the various coinages that I feel I am carrying coals to Newcastle in mentioning a detailed list which has met my eye. This report, covering the period of some months, which came before the House of Commons in the beginning of December, 1696, may, however, satisfy the curious as to the quantity of bullion coined in a part of that year, for it gives us the


1 Commons’ Journals, vol. xi, p. 615, December 5th, 1696. In a report dated December 3rd, signed by Thomas Neale, we read: “At Exeter three presses, one for sixpences, one for shillings, and one for halfcrowns, and one mill. The woodwork for another mill is preparing there, and the iron mill will be made to go hence the end of next week. At Bristol: two presses, one for halfcrowns, one which may be made use of for shillings and sixpences. One mill and another will be ready to go hence about the 15th instant: the woodwork is there preparing in the meantime. At Norwich: the same as Bristol, and another mill going thither. At York: for presses the same as at Bristol, and have but one mill. And say they can coin 10,000 weekly with that one only; however, another is ready to be set up at Chester, the same presses as at Bristol, and one mill only, which is conceived enough for that Place.”

4 Commons’ Journals, vol. xi, pp. 614 and 615.
5 “From the 20th day of February, 1695, to the 30th day of November last, Whole Coinage and Proportion of the Specie in Troy Weight. November 28th, 1696, lb. weight 754,490 Whole Coinage,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 30th, 1696,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>366,446 Crowns and Halfcrowns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315,334 Shillings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72,710 Sixpences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754,490.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368,626 Crowns and Halfcrowns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316,894 Shillings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73,790 Sixpences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759,290 Whole Coinage.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
proportion in troy weight of the denominations issued, and an account of the work performed by the mints in the first few months of their activity. It is unnecessary to reprint in full a document so easily available to the public, but it is worth mentioning that "the whole coinage at the Tower" from the 1st of January, 1695–6, to the 30th of November, 1696, was 763,474 pounds in weight, "which amounts in Tale to about £2,370,000."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid into the Exchequer to the 28th November, 1696</td>
<td>£2,173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid to private Importers of Ingots</td>
<td>£55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid to Importers of Plate</td>
<td>£66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coined at the several Country Mints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>£28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>£7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£2,404,000

Whilst quoting these figures we must bear in mind that the country mints started operations at various times during the summer months of 1696. Chester, for instance, having at the date of this memorandum been active less than two months.

But a truce to details of weights and measures—let us now take a more general view of the subject.

The hammered coins had been clipped and defaced until their intrinsic value fell to half the nominal worth,¹ and the general deterioration of the silver coinage had caused the price of the guinea in 1694 to

¹ Macaulay (ed. 1855) gives a careful study of these light weights in vol. iv, pp. 624, 625; see also Ruding, vol. ii, p. 36, note 2, for a computation made by Mr. Lowndes of money bars weighed at the Exchequer in May, June, and July, 1696. See
reach £1 10s., whilst the constant wars drained the country of the modern milled pieces, because the depreciated coins would not circulate in foreign lands to purchase food for the troops, excepting at a ruinous rate of exchange. Parliament was bound to give serious attention to the matter, whilst the wits of the day satirized the proceedings thus:

"Six Winter months our Senate sits
Five millions for to raise,
And all the while they wrack their wits
To find out means and ways.

Six Summer months our hero spends
On what you'd please to say—
On finding out the ways and means
To squander all away."

Various plans had been suggested from the opening of Parliament on November 22nd, 1695, onwards, and a Bill was introduced for "remedying the ill-state of the Coins." The very next day we find the Lords of the Treasury giving orders to "Mr. Harris and Mr. Rotier to provide ye dyes for 24 presses, and to give my Lords an account what Materialls are ready and what to be provided, and to consult with the Moneyers for the purpose." On December 17th we note the Treasury Board discussing "the King's Proclamation about clipped moneys," and the rapid withdrawal of the silver coin, whilst commanding that "till further Order no Gold be coyned at ye Mint, but in half Guineys"—and that "Mr. Harris and Mr. Rotier be directed to make all expedition possible in preparing to coin new money."

also Folkes' note to p. 117, where it is stated that some of the individual coins weighed but a quarter of the right amount. Evelyn had already complained on the 13th of July, 1694, that "there was hardly any money that was worth above half the nominal value," Diary, vol. iii, p. 335, ed. 1827.

1 Handbook of Coins of Great Britain and Ireland, by H. A. Grueber, p. 135.
2 A good account of these matters is contained in the Political History of England, vol. viii, pp. 394 and 402, edited by Richard Lodge.
3 From Wilkins' "Political Ballads," quoted in The Court of William III., p. 323.
4 7 and 8 Gul. III., c. 1.
Somers, the Lord Keeper, had proposed to the Council a measure which would have saved the country much money, by calling in the defaced coinage very rapidly by means of a proclamation; but this bold advice was pronounced unconstitutional and dangerous, so "though the King liked this proposition, yet all the rest of the Council were against it," and it was rejected. Measures had been passed against the clipper of coin in the session immediately following the Queen's death, but they availed little, and it was felt that all the old hammered silver must be recoined and replaced by a milled currency.

On December 23rd, 1695, we find John Evelyn, the diarist, deploiring the situation in the words: "The Parliament's wondrous intent on ways to reform the coin; setting out a proclamation prohibiting the currency of half-crowns, etc., which made much confusion among the people." Again, on January 12th, he writes, "Great confusion and distraction, by reason of the clipp'd money and the difficulty found in reforming it"; but we are glad to find a more satisfactory entry on February 23rd, namely, "They now begin to coin new money."

The difficulty lay not only in the diminished weight of the currency, but also in the fact that much base coin was in circulation, and it was said that some of it was minted in the United Provinces and brought to this country, whilst from a million and a half to two millions of money were yearly carried to Holland, where the Dutch, "having beat down the value of the Guinea abroad to nineteen Shillings Sterling, they remitted them to England where they were current for thirty."

---

3 Commons' Journals, vol. xi, pp. 265, 266, March 12th, 1694-5.
4 Evelyn's Diary, vol. iii, p. 347.
5 Ibid., p. 348.
6 January 23rd, 1695-6, vol. iii, p. 348.
In a petition presented to the House of Commons on February 13th, 1695–6, "divers Merchants and Tradesmen in the City of London," said that people continued to buy and sell guineas, and that still, "at this time, great quantities of Gold is brought up in, and imported thither from Holland, where Four of our milled Crowns and Two weighty Shillings will purchase a guinea."1 "Five Pounds in Silver Specie," writes Oldmixon, "were scarce worth Forty shillings according to Standard."2 He further tells us of "the Master of a Ship who received of a Merchant 35' in Half Crowns, which being to pay a Goldsmith in Lombard Street, there was but one Halfcrown in the 35' which he would take, and that was a mill'd Half Crown; the rest being iron and other base money, clipp'd too, as if it had been Silver."3 He writes that "almost all the current Coin was now Iron, Brass, or Copper wash'd or thinly plated over."

But to return to the discussion of the recoinage. The King had directed the attention of his Commons to the matter in his speech to Parliament on November 23rd, 1695, and measures were soon taken for the calling in of the debased specie from circulation.4 At first it had been thought that £1,000,000 would cover the deficiency caused by recoining all the silver, and a charge of sixty thousand pounds per annum was suggested to pay the interest on this sum.5 It was, however, eventually found that £1,200,000 would be required, and the "window tax" was imposed to raise the money.6

Throughout January, 1695–6, the House of Commons constantly discussed the question, with the result that a Bill was debated and passed "for remedying the ill-State of the Coins," encouraging the public to bring in plate and clipped coin to the Mint.7

---

3 Ibid.  
5 Ibid., vol. xi, pp. 265, 266, March 12th, 1694–5, and p. 302, April 12th, 1695.  
6 Ibid., vol. xi, p. 373, December 31st, 1695, 7 and 8 Gul. III., c. 18.  
But the new issues were still hoarded, and Evelyn, writing so late as May 13th, 1696, complains: "Money still continuing exceeding scarce, so that none was paid or received, but all was on trust, the Mint not supplying for common necessities." The contemporary ballad-monger again summed up the situation thus:—

"We parted with all our old money to show  
We foolishly hoped for plenty of new,  
But might have remembered when we came to the push  
That a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush."  

John Evelyn drearily corroborates this complaint on January 11th: "Want of current money to carry on the smallest concerns, even for daily provisions in the markets." "Guineas lower'd to 22 Shillings and great sume daily transported to Holland where it yields more, with other treasures sent to pay the armies and nothing considerable coin'd of the new and now only current stamp, cause such a scarcity that tumults are every day fear'd, nobody paying or receiving money; so imprudent was the late Parliament to condemn the old, tho' clipp'd and corrupted, till they had provided supplies."  

Evelyn's allusion to the fall in the price of the guinea is explained by one of the recent Acts of Parliament, again reducing the value of this coin, which, under the two late monarchs, Charles and James, had

---

1 Diary, vol. iii, p. 352.  
2 Quoted in The Court of William III., by Edwin and Marion Grew, p. 522.  
3 This reduction dated from April 10th, 1696. Folkes' Table of Silver Coins, p. 127, 7 and 8 Gul. III., c. 19.  
4 Evelyn's vol. iii, pp. 353, 354.  
stood at £1 os. od. and had, as we have seen, risen in 1695 to £1 10s. od. 1

It suffered a rapid decline, dropping successively to £1 8s. od. to £1 6s. od. 2 thence by order to £1 2s. od., and finally subsiding in February, 1698-9, to £1 1s. 6d., at which rate it remained until December, 1717, when it became firmly fixed at £1 1s. od. 3

Parliament in the Session commencing October 20th, 1696, resumed the lengthy discussion, and again we find the King referring to “the difficulties which have arisen upon the Recoinage of Money,” whilst the Commons began proceedings by deciding “that this House will not alter the standard of gold or silver in fineness, weight or Denomination.” 4 As a result of debates in both Houses, there followed rules for the exchange of old coins for new, and the great Bill became law, having passed the Commons on November 24th, 1696, and the Lords on December 2nd following, receiving the royal assent the next day. 5 First it was enacted that no hammered money should pass after December 1st, 1696, excepting under certain conditions. The better pieces, such as “sixpences of sterling silver, not clipped within the innermost Rings” paid in taxes before November 18th, 1696, would be received at the mint at their full value from the

1 Mr. S. Dana Horton in his The Silver Pound, p. 110, places the date when the guinea began to rise above 21s. 6d. (already 1s. 6d. above its value in the last reign) as between September (?), 1694, and June, 1695, when it reached 30s. od.

2 7 and 8 Gul. III., c. 10, March 25th, 1696.


4 Commons' Journals, vol. xi, p. 567, October 20th, 1696. The Secretary to the Treasury, William Lowndes, had advocated the degradation of the standard twenty-five per cent, and it had been suggested in the former session “that the crown-piece should go for 5s. 6d., the half-crown for 2s. 9d. That all money to be coined under the denomination of the half-crown should have a Remedy of 6d. for the ounce.” (See Oldmixon, p. 110.) But the maintenance of this standard was thought to be due to a pamphlet by Locke, exposing the danger of altering the value of the money. (See Oldmixon, p. 150.)


This Bill was termed “An Act for further remedying the ill State of the Coins of the Kingdom.”
collectors until January 10th, 1696-7. Hammered coins might be used “on loans to the King at five shillings and 8d. per ounce until the first of February, 1696-7,” also for arrears of taxes, and at the same rate for certain prospective payments until the 1st of June, 1697. Clipped money was to be received at the mint at five shillings and fourpence per ounce until the 1st of July of that year, and might pass between man and man at five shillings and twopence.\(^1\)

Finally, in the following year, the royal assent was given on January 11th, 1697-8, to an “act to prevent the further Currency of any hammer silver coin of this Kingdom, and for recoining such as was in being.”\(^2\) By this enactment old specie was carried up to London or to the Country mints by March 1st, 1697-8, to be paid out again in fresh coin by March 25th, 1698.\(^3\)

![Half-Crown of 1697](image)

Fresh taxes had been imposed, exchequer bills had been issued to meet the immediate pressure, and the Bank of England had undertaken, in return for important concessions,\(^4\) to furnish £2,500,000 towards

---

\(^1\) Statutes of the Realm, vol. vii, pp. 162-4, 8 and 9 Gul. III., c. 2.


\(^3\) This Bill passed the Lords on January 8th, 1697-8, see Lords’ Journals, vol. xvi, p. 189.

\(^4\) See Political History of England, vol. viii, p. 402, “No rival corporation was to be created; its charter was guaranteed till 1710, and after that date it could only be dissolved on giving a year’s notice.” The establishment of the Bank of England was due to Charles Montagu in 1694. Evelyn’s first mention of it is on July 1st, 1694, but the Queen signed
The Great Recoinage.

The sum required to make up the deficiency constituted by the loss of bullion. After a period, wonderfully short considering the magnitude of the undertaking, a sufficient currency was provided, upwards of six million pounds in half-crowns, shillings, and sixpences being issued in two years. William has sometimes received the entire credit for this

the draught charter on June the 8th, and it was granted towards the middle of July. (See Rapin, vol. iii, p. 253.) The first governor, Sir John Houblon, was appointed July 10th, 1694.

1 Ruding, vol. ii, p. 57, who based his calculations on an official document written in 1699 by Mr. Lowndes, the Secretary to the Treasury, estimated that the whole charges and losses amounted to "not less than £2,700,000."

2 The Mint Catalogue, vol. i, p. 132, by W. J. Hocking. The author purposely omits the crowns from this computation, these coins being made from bullion imported in the ordinary way, and not therefore considered as part of the recoinage. We have, however, seen, p. 221, that the output of crowns in 1696 was considerable. Ruding, vol. ii, p. 57, gives the total, of course including the crowns, at £6,882,928 19s. 2d. Marshall (View of the Silver Coins, p. xvii) brings out the figures at £7,014,047 16s. 11d., namely, £1,692,625 11s. 6d. in the country, and £5,321,422 5s. 5d. in London; Folkes (p. 124) prints that the silver, melted between September 30th, 1695, and December 31st, 1699, was ultimately recoined into £6,435,039 14s. 9d. But Ruding (vol. i, p. 86), quoting Folkes, p. 129, in a table of the coinages of various reigns, mentions, within a fraction, the same sum as was specified by Marshall, namely, £7,014,047 16s. 11d., as the total silver coinage of William's reign after the death of Mary, not of the recoinage only. The recoinage at the Tower during a shorter period, i.e., 1696 to 99 n.s., inclusive, stands thus, as I learn from information kindly supplied to me from the records at the Royal Mint by Mr. Hocking, who uses the new style of reckoning in his computation starting with January, in:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total in £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>2,514,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>2,192,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>3,266,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>60,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,091,121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst from the same records he further supplies the following table, showing:
reform, but many modern historians suggest to us that it was due to the co-operation of Isaac Newton, the Warden of the Mint, with Charles Montagu, Chancellor of the Exchequer, guided by the advice of Locke and the most learned men of the day.

Macaulay\(^1\) tells us that "the great body of the Whigs attributed the restoration of the health of the state to the genius and firmness of their leader, Montagu.\(^3\) His enemies were forced to confess sulkily and sneeringly that every one of his schemes had succeeded, the first Bank subscription, the second Bank subscription, the recoinage, the general mortgage, the Exchequer bills."

But credit be where credit is due, and I cannot forbear mentioning that in turning over the manuscript minute-books of the Treasury Council, which are for consultation at the Public Record Office,\(^3\) I have come across more than one notice of William III.’s personal interest and generosity in mint affairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Coinage</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>457,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>316,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>458,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>257,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>310,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,800,951

raising the total of the recoinage to £6,892,072. This, it will be observed, is rather higher than that given by Folkes or Ruding, but it is only natural, as our evidence shows, that some of the country mints worked a little later than the midsummer, 1698, the date adopted by Folkes. According to the figures kindly given to me by Mr. Hocking, William’s total silver coinage after Mary’s death resulted in £7,023,211.

\(^{1}\) History of England, vol. iv, 731.

\(^{2}\) Charles Montagu, who had been one of the Lords of the Treasury since March, 1691-2, was made Chancellor of the Exchequer in April, 1694, and became First Commissioner of the Treasury on May 1st, 1697. He was created Baron Halifax in December, 1700, and Earl of Halifax in 1714. He died in the following year.

\(^{3}\) These Treasury Books are referred to in the Calendars as Minutes Books, and according to the numbering in use at the Record Office, when the documents were calendared, the most useful to our present purpose figured as Minute Book VI. It is now called T. 29, vol. viii, and extends from April 12th, 1695, to September 11th, 1696. I have adopted the newer style of reference.
We see, for instance, that “the King thinks Mr. Neale should have an assistant at the King’s charge, but not to take away any part of Mr. Neale’s profit, and Mr. Hall to be assistant.”

Sometimes we find William giving personal orders or an expression of judgment on financial matters, for he was present at the Treasury Board on February 19th, 1695–6, and himself instructed Mr. Neale “that the gold brought into the Mint, tho’ it be melted shall not be preferred in Coining before the silver that is brought into the Mint before it.”

He again attended the Council on April 29th, 1696, and the minutes inform us that “the King will not encourage any propos (sic) importing more than the value of 22s to a Guiney for Gold.”

One hears, however, with amusement, William’s estimate of talent,

---

1 Thomas Neale was Master of the Mint from July, 1678, to March, 1698-9. We learn from the *Mint Catalogue*, vol. ii, pp. 231 and 233-4, that “at first he was one of the Commissioners of the Mint, but before the 22nd of July, 1686, he rendered the accounts of the Mint in his own name alone. There is no patent of his appointment preserved, but it may have been issued after the accession of James II., whose first Warrant, dated 7th February, 1684, is addressed to the Commissioners of the Mint. In a document, dated 7th August, 1690, authorizing Charles Shephard, a merchant of London, to be his deputy, Neale refers to his own appointment as Master, having been made by Letters Patent under the Great Seal, dated 7th August, 1678.” Neale was “groom-porter” to Charles II., and a many-sided man. His name is frequently to be found in the *State Papers* in relation to various schemes, and he was connected with the “lottery-loan” of 1694. The date of his death is sometimes given as 1705, but in a report (Cal. Treasury Papers, 1708-14, p. 573, vol. clxv, No. 241) concerning these lottery transactions dated 1710 it is said that he died about January, 1699.

2 T. 29, vol. viii, p. 150, February 19th, 1695–6, and I learn from Mr. Hocking that the patent of Mr. Hall’s appointment is dated February 26th. It is interesting to find in the *Commons’ Journals*, vol. xi, p. 775, that one of the reforms suggested by the Committee of the Mint Enquiry on April 8th, 1697, was that the Mint Master should undertake this charge. We read that “Mr. Hall, a very careful, diligent Officer, is the Master Workers’ Deputy and doth the whole business of the Mint in Mr. Neale’s absence; hath 400l salary; and that not paid by the Master Worker; though upon the modestest Computation his profits will come to above 14,000l this year. Yet the King pays him this 400l per annum on a new establishment, which charge the Committee think very reasonable, and that Mr. Sheppard or the Master Worker should ease the King of paying the same.” The “Mr. Sheppard” in question held a mortgage on Neale’s salary.


when, as tradition states, it was suggested that he should consult Isaac Newton on a point of difficulty: "Pooh," said the King, "he is only a philosopher, what can he know?"¹ Nearer acquaintance, presumably changed the royal opinion of this great man, who, nevertheless, only received a knighthood in recognition of his services to science after the death of this King.² William III. may not have framed so high an estimate as did the poet Pope, who wrote the lines:

"Nature and Nature’s laws lay hid in night:
God said: ‘Let Newton be!’ and all was light."

but fortunately he utilized his services. The man who discovered the laws of gravitation, the theory of fluxions, and the differential calculus, the author, moreover, of many other valuable additions to the knowledge of the time, was also instrumental in restoring the financial credit of the country.

Although most of the reports connected with mint affairs at that period ran in Neale’s name, as Master of the Mint, we find that Newton as Warden sometimes endorsed his letters. I have seen a note from his hand on the memorandum already referred to on our p. 219 concerning the rapidity of the coinage both at the Tower and country towns. Neale stated that the issues were retarded owing to the delay caused by testing on the premises the validity of the old coin; and suggested that persons should be appointed to weigh and inspect

¹ Strickland’s *Queens of England*, vol. vii, p. 185.
² Isaac Newton, born on December 25th, 1642, died on March 29th, 1726-7. He was knighted in 1705 on the occasion of Queen Anne’s visit to Cambridge, which University he represented in Parliament. He became Warden of the Mint on March 19th, 1695-6, and held this post until December, 1699, becoming Master and Worker in succession to his former colleague, Thomas Neale. His patent as Master is dated February 3rd, 1699-1700. See *Mint Catalogue*, vol. ii, pp. 231 and 234. The office of Warden or Keeper of the Mint was established in very early times, virtually as a check upon the other officers. See *Commons’ Journals*, vol. xi, p. 774, where in April, 1697, we read: “He supervises the whole process of the Coinage and pays the Charge thereof, and the Salaries of the Officers except the Master’s Salary and Wages, and such Salaries as are appointed to be paid by the Master.” In the *Mint Catalogue*, vol. ii, p. 297, we also read that the office of Warden was abolished by Act of Parliament in 1817, and the duties were merged in those of the Master.
The Rapidity of the Coinage.

The money before it was brought to the mint. He said that "it was impossible for the Tower Mills to despatch above 30,000l. Whereas if they were supplied with silver Ingutts (as last summer), they are now in such order they could coin 100,000l weekly," and that the same difficulty applied to the Country Mints. This document bears a postscript written and signed by Newton:—"I have seen the Proposal and believe that if good bagains be made for ye Country Mints it will be for his Matie's service." But we cannot pause to multiply instances of Newton's efficiency, and must turn to the institution of the five mints at Bristol, Chester, Exeter, Norwich, and York, which provoked some debate, as did every question of the new coinage.

It would appear that even the smaller number of four additional mints suggested was considered dangerous by some members of the House of Lords, who unavailingly objected on January 10th, 1695-6, that "since the only Expedient yet found for clipping is to make all the money milled, if the Mystery or Art should be once discovered to false Coiners, what is most likely to be by employing as many Hands as must be used for Four Mints more, the Mischiefs of false Coining would be left altogether remediless for the future, and false Money perpetually made to the Ruin of the Nation." It is apparent that at this time the question of preventives against these evil practices was under discussion in the Treasury Chambers, and one entry in the Minute Books shows us that special

---

2 The Report of the Mint Enquiry contains information showing that this matter was arranged. "Mr. Ambrose agreed with the Lords of the Treasury for Fourpence a pound for melting all the clipped and hammered money to be milled, at the Exchequer," and the King paid "the charge of the carriage to the Tower." See Commons' Journals, vol. xi, p. 776. See also Cal. Treasury Papers, 1550-1696, p. 493, vol. xxxvi, No. 43, February 14th, and March 3rd, and No. 52, March 13th, 1695-6, from which it appears that, owing to the price of coals, etc., a small increase was required on the former charge for refining, casting in bars, etc.
3 Lords' Journals, vol. xv, p. 637, January 10th, 1695-6. See also p. 645, January 18th. The Bill (7 and 8 GuI. III., c. 1), however, passed the Lords without amendments on January 20th (p. 646), and received the royal assent on January 21st, 1695-6, p. 647.
points were reserved for the royal decision. We read on February 3rd, 1695–6: “To know the King’s pleasure, whether he will have Decus and Tutamen or Restituta on ye new money’s Edge.” The Monarch’s verdict is not recorded, but the coins answer for themselves—the larger retaining the inscription chosen by Charles II. whilst the smaller were milled.

The inscribed edge and the milling were important as checks to the crime of clipping, but other plans were advocated. On February 10th we find one Samuel King, is to “go to the Officers of the Mint with his proposal for edging the money, and if they like it to come to their Lordshpps againe. An order to be prepared according to ye pleasure of ye Warden of ye Mint.”

The Mint Master was not ready to adopt every suggestion, for shortly before this time we notice that Mr. Neale, on February 2nd, gave his opinion to the Lords of the Treasury that “the proposal of Mr. Abbey for having every other letter turned inward will not hinder Counterfeit at all.” Nevertheless, “Mr. Abbey with some of ye Goldsmiths Company” was ordered to meet Roettier and Brant, the provost of the moneyers, before the board on the following Wednesday, February 7th, presumably to discuss this subject and the want of room in the Tower for additional mills, together with the great question of the Country Mints, with the result that five additional mills were

---

2 This inscription, “Decus et Tutamen,” was suggested to Charles II. by John Evelyn, he having seen it on a vignette in Cardinal Richelieu’s Greek Testament of 1642. It was originally taken from Virgil, see Mint Catalogue, vol. i, pp. 426,427, and Evelyn’s Discourse on Medals, p. 225, from which it appears that Mr. Slingsby advised the addition of the words “in armis”—being the context in Virgil, but not in the vignette. He was, however, overruled by Evelyn on artistic grounds.
5 The Report, read on April 8th, 1697, before the House of Commons (Commons’ Journals, vol. xi, p. 774) concerning the duties of the various Mint-officials, explains that the moneyers “live in the Country, attend the Mint whenever called, take Apprentices and form them into a government by electing one of them to be their Provost.” In the Treasury Papers we often find John Brant or Braint mentioned in this capacity. See vol. xxxvii, 79, and T. 29, vol. viii, p. 141, and Commons’ Journals, vol. xi, p. 615.
then ordered by their Lordships for the Tower and two for the provinces.\(^1\)

From this time forward, especially in the following May, the *Treasury Books* are replete with instructions to the Mint officials “to be speeding in providing Materials for ye Country Mints, particularly for 2 of them at the first.”\(^2\) Again Neale is directed, on May 16th, 1696, to expedite into the country the officers for the two mints of York and Exeter.\(^3\)

Another entry of the same date attracts our attention to the early uncertainty as to the localities to be thus favoured, for it contains a request to the Mint Master “to send Officers to Bristoll, Norwich, and *Hereford* to take care and make provisions for Mints to be sett up there.”\(^4\)

We know, however, that the minting privileges of the last-mentioned town were not revived, for we recognize no coinage thence of later date than the middle of the thirteenth century. But that the mention of Hereford was no clerical error for Chester is proved by a letter addressed by Mr. Foley, the Speaker, to William Lowndes, Secretary to the Treasury, under date March 12th, 1695–6, ventilating the question, namely,\(^5\) “When the Bill past about receiving the Silver, in which there was a provision that there should be foure mints at least in the remote parts of the Kingdome,\(^6\) I did speak to his Ma\(^{th}\)s myself

\(^1\) *Treasury Books*, T. 29, vol. viii, p. 144. “Mr. Neale and the Provost of ye Moneyers are directed to be preparing for five Mills more than those already at ye Tower and for 2 of the Country Mints, Feb. 7, 1695–6.”


\(^3\) T. 29, vol. viii, p. 299, May 16th, 1696.


\(^5\) *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. xxxvi, No. 51.

\(^6\) 7 and 8 Gul. III., c. 1.
and got several other persons to request that one of the four mints might be set up at Hereford. I understood that it was his Majesty's pleasure it should be so, and have accordingly acquainted the City of Hereford therewith. I hear nothing of late of that matter, therefore desire you to take care that his Majesty be minded thereof, and his pleasure known therein.” We have no record of the King’s decision, but we see that the mint was still in contemplation in the following May, and even later, for Neale, writing a report of the progress of his preparations under date June 9th, after explaining that the people of Bristol were greatly pleased with the expectation of a mint there and “will pay the rent of a house,” that at Norwich a “place very convenient had been found rent free,” that a choice of buildings had been suggested for York, one of which, “the Mannour,” was offered at the owner’s expense, ends his letter with a reference to Hereford. “I have no particular account from Exeter yet, but undoubtedly shall have to-morrow—not from Hereford, but shall this week.” On the 23rd of the same month comes the report concerning a mint house:—“that at Hereford have found a fit place for it,” and that it could “be ready in five weeks if spurred on,” £100 being already in hand towards the expenses. No mention is made of Chester in this letter, nor have I found any dated document referring to it prior to August, but it was ultimately substituted for Hereford. At one moment, however, both towns were under discussion, for an undated memorandum, probably drawn up in the month of June, 1696, brings before us suggestions for the election of Wardens or Deputy Controllers for six mints, and here

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxviii, No. 41.
2 In No. 30 of above, under date May 30th, 1690, is a proposition of choosing a “Sugar-House” in St. Peter’s Street at Bristol, at the expense of the city, which could be prepared in six weeks, the magistrates suggesting that the cost of alterations should fall upon the King.
3 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxviii, No. 41, see also No. 64 of above. “The Mayor and City give (sic) a place.”
4 In MS. Treasury Papers, as above, No. 64, under date June 23rd, it is stated that the rent of the house at Exeter will be £40 a year, “and the whole charge 800 at least: it may be at work in a month.”
5 Ibid., No. 64.
Preparations for the Country Mints.

one Mr. Batson is a candidate for the post of Warden at Hereford, and a Mr. Lamb for that of Controller at Chester.\(^1\) This list, although endorsed "Agreed," must have been subject to alteration by the Lords of the Treasury, for it does not concur with a more complete document of July 30th, 1696, to which I shall have occasion to refer later,\(^2\) for although many of the names are repeated, the localities and posts in which we subsequently find these officers serving are in many instances changed. Mr. Batson’s name does not reappear, so far as my knowledge takes me, in these rather complicated accounts.

In February, 1695-6, we first find Mr. Neale presenting a "scheme for the Country Mints," and that "my Lords desire him to take care therein, but would not have ye Work at ye Tower hindered thereby."\(^3\) On May 25th, 1696, we read that "the Moneyers promise to have the marking tools ready for all the Country Mints,"\(^4\) and "a sufficient number of Workmen for those Mints," and perhaps it was neither due to Neale nor to the cunators that some delay occurred. On June 8th we notice Newton and Thomas Hall explaining that the London officials are occupied in preparing their deputies for the work in the "five mints in the Country." They say that the "Iron Work and Instruments" are "in good forwardness," that "five persons are provided for Deputy Wardens and one already instructing, and five other persons for Deputy Master and Worker are provided, two of which are already instructing, but the Controller refuses to appoint any Deputies, and the Assay Master will find

\(^1\) MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xlvi, No. 52, annotated "January (?), 1696-7," by a later hand, but I think this is somewhat late, and it is more likely to follow immediately upon a letter from Newton and Hall on June 8th, 1696; see Treasury Papers, vol. xxxviii, No. 39, stating that various officers were preparing for the posts, and that some of the London officials were instructing their deputies. In the early and incomplete list no Warden is suggested for Chester, and no Controller for Hereford. The Mr. Lamb who is specified as the candidate for the Controllership of Chester, was, however, appointed to Norwich, and the post of Deputy-Controller at £100 a year at Chester was filled by the friend of Newton, the astronomer Edmund Halley, who there made various scientific observations.

\(^2\) MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xlvi, No. 52, see our p. 252.


Deputies, but not be answerable for them," and so forth.\(^1\) The following day comes the report from Neale, already quoted on p. 236, detailing the progress of various buildings, from which it appears that if the money for alteration be at once forthcoming, at the expense of about £100 or £200, the work at Bristol "may be done in a month or 5 weekes," and the mint at Norwich "if stayed not for money will be ready in 6 weeks."\(^2\) The same applied to York, and a further report comes from the North on June 23rd, 1696, that Captain Barton, whom we find as the Deputy Controller for York in the July list, had been sent to that town and had found the "Mannor House fitt." By this time the house at Exeter was "in great readiness," and at Bristol it was arranged that the mint should be rent free for two years, and if continued afterwards the King was to pay for it.\(^3\) On June 9th, Neale had informed the Treasury Board that both for Bristol and Norwich "the Officers on my part are ready," so he, at least, should not be accused of dallying.\(^4\)

Be this as it may, on July 22nd we find that the Treasury Bench was irritated by the dilatoriness of the Controller of the Mint, for an order concerning the dispatch of certain clipped money to be sent to the country mints had terminated with an injunction to Mr. Hoare to attend in the afternoon at the Treasury Chamber, a mandate which had not met with due attention.\(^5\)

James Hoare, it appears, neglected the summons, and sent his grandson as a substitute, for we read:—"Mr. Hoare, Junr., my

\(^1\) MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxviii, No. 39.
\(^2\) MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxviii, No. 41.
\(^3\) MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxviii, No. 64.
\(^4\) Ibid., No. 41.
\(^5\) T. 29, vol. viii, p. 348, July 22nd, 1696. "1,000 lb. of Standard Silver, proceeding from the Clipt Moneys lent or to be lent to the Exchequer gen., by the Privy Seal for 5sh. 8d. an ounce is to be sent to every Country Mint to be coyned there and applied to such uses as my Lords shall direct."
\(^7\) This is not the only occasion upon which Henry Hoare appears as substitute for his grandfather (for which see also T. 29, vol. viii, June 10th, p. 321), to whom he had been appointed assistant on July 8th, 1695, "but without sallary, my Lords not thinking fitt to increase the charge of the Mint at this time." See T. 29, vol. viii, p. 57.
Lords told him the business of the Country Mints is at a Stand, because his Grandfather does not make his replies, and that their Lords must know to-morrow whether he will make his replies or no: his answer must be Writing."¹

We find no record of a reason for Hoare's non-attendance, but are met from time to time by manifestations of impatience on the part of the Treasury Bench, such as that of September 8th, 1696:—"Officers of the Mint call'd in. My Lords desire the provost to use all despatch in the business of ye Country Mints."² By this time the Exeter mint was already working, and in the course of the month three other towns followed suit, Chester alone being behindhand;³ although there also preparations had been instituted by August 7th; and it had been decided by the Treasury Board that consignments of bullion should be forwarded to all five mints to be converted into coin so early as August 5th, 1696.⁴ We have, moreover, seen what progress was made by the end of the year, both as regards the furnishing of the mints and presses, and also the amounts produced.⁵

³ MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxix, No. 32, August 7th, 1696, where it is stated that only £100 had reached Chester for the necessary expenses, as against £200 sent the other mints.
⁴ T. 29, vol. viii, p. 358, "1,000 lb. wt. of that silver" (the clipped silver) "is to be sent to each of those Mints, York, Exon and Bristol, and 500 lb. wt. to Norwich and Chester, Aug. 5th, 1696."
⁵ Commons' Journals, vol. xi, pp. 614 and 615, see also the list taken from the report of the amount of money coined at the various mints by November 30th, 1696, on our p. 222.
By the courtesy of Mr. Hocking, who has very kindly sought out many matters in the manuscript documents at the Royal Mint for me, I am able to give information as to the length of time in which coining was conducted in the provinces during William III.'s reign, ranging from August, 1696, to September, 1698; Exeter being the earliest and Bristol the longest in operation. The Mint Records supply these dates:

Exeter from August, 1696, to July, 1698.
York from September, 1696, to April, 1698.
Bristol from September, 1696, to September, 1698.
Norwich from September, 1696, to April, 1698.
Chester from October, 1696, to June, 1698.¹

These details throw light on a subject which has long puzzled numismatists, namely, the fact that Ruding,² who gives the accounts as finally made up in 1699, has left the impression that although we have no provincial coinage bearing date 1698, the mills must still have continued in operation throughout that year. Other authors have followed this cue, and it has been suggested by one writer,³ to whom we owe a debt of gratitude for his lucid explanation of the sequence of the coins, that the dies dated 1697, bearing a hooked harp with vertical strings on the reverse, were prepared so late in that year as to remain

¹ Information kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking from manuscript sources at the Mint.
Country Mints still working in 1698.

in use during 1698. We now see that three of the country mints, namely, Bristol, Exeter, and Chester, must certainly have pursued this plan for a considerable period after the new date, 1698, should have appeared even according to the old style, but it was apparently not considered worth while to alter the dates upon the dies, as the prolongation of the provincial coinage had not been intentional, seeing that the wording of the Act of Parliament had proscribed the return of bullion in the form of coin from the country mints before March 25th, 1698.¹

A report placed by John Locke before the House of Commons in 1698 states that between May 1st and September 12th in that year the coinage was £72,366 85. in silver, being “only some Remain of our clipped and hammered money.”²

It is conceivable that pressure of work may have delayed the final coining, and this was perhaps somewhat surprising even to the Lords of the Treasury, for I find an order dated July 6th, 1698, reading, “House of the Mint to be restored to the city of Bristol.”³ Clearly, therefore, it had been expected that this—the last of the Tower’s auxiliaries—would not be required beyond that date.

Let us see, wherefore, when all the mints had, with this exception, ceased to coin by the middle of 1698 n.s., the accounts were not made up until the end of 1699? The Treasury Papers show us that this delay was counted as a grievance by certain persons, as exemplified in

¹ See our p. 228. The Bill passed the Lords on January 8th, 1697–8 (see Lords’ Journals, vol. xi, p. 189), and received the royal assent on January 14th, p. 194, 9 Gul. III., c. 2, Statutes of the Realm, vol. vii, p. 297.
² The Silver Pound, by S. Dana Horton, p. 252.
³ T. 29, vol. x, p. 197. The Connoisseur of February, 1911, pp. 87–92, gives an interesting account, by A. W. Little, of St. Peter’s Hospital, the name by which the old Mint at Bristol is now called. The author states that it is often still spoken of by its old designation. First a private residence, it became a sugar refinery, but in 1696 was purchased for minting purposes, and “during the two short years that the mint was in operation nearly half a million of silver money was coined there. . . . In the year 1698, the past glories of the House were laid low, for the house was again purchased, this time for a workhouse and asylum, since when the term ‘hospital’ has been applied to it.” The purchase was effected for £800, see p. 88 of above Connoisseur.
a petition from the officers and clerks of these establishments, dated February 27th, 1699-1700. The petitioners state that "they had discharged the duties of their respective Posts in ye late Country Mints faithfully and honourably, and have ever since ye determination of ye said business (w'h is allmost 18 months) attended from time to time ye Officers at ye Mint at ye Tower," etc., etc.

They complain that they had already desired a settlement of accounts in the previous April, and remarking on the difficulties of visiting London, "Pray for a speedy redress." But in spite of the assertion of honour and fidelity we find that the fault lay with the petitioners, for in some instances the delay was caused by irregularities in the mints, especially in that of Chester, where a defaulting clerk had given trouble so early as in November, 1697. So great was the confusion that we even find the Tower accounts affected thereby, and Thomas Molyneux asks in an undated paper, which must have been written towards the end of 1700, for leave to defer until the latter end of the ensuing January, the task of making up his controller's rolls for the Tower and the five country mints, which should already be presented. He says that "these Bookes being confusedly kept, and not according to the method prescribed them," he had found it needful to have some of them now transcribed, and that he hopes by "the latter end of January next" that he will not only have cleared up these difficulties, but "bring up my Roll of our Mint at the Tower to next Xmas, as also the Roll for that year before Mr. Hoare died,

2 These retrospective "allmost 18 months" bring us back to August, 1698, coinciding approximately with the dates given from the Mint Reports on our p. 249.
3 Edward Lewis, Deputy Controller's clerk at Chester. His misbehaviour is reported on November 9th, 1697. MS. Treasury Books, T. 29, vol. x, p. 41, and February 2nd, 1697-8, T. 29, vol. x, p. 103. At an earlier period in the Commons' Journals, vol. xi, p. 776, the "Committee of Enquiry into the Affairs of the Mint" complained, in April, 1697, of the dilatoriness of the officers at York and Norwich in making up their accounts, "the Officers of the said Mints pretending that they have not nor cannot yet make up the same until they have melted down several sweeps."
4 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. Ixxi, No. 64, calendared in Treasury Papers, 1697-1701-2, p. 446, as "End of 1700 or 1701?"
which has never been passed yet."\textsuperscript{1} We even find outstanding accounts in the Treasury Papers of 1702.\textsuperscript{2}

But my readers will say: "What has all this to do with portraiture?" and I can only reply in apology that some of these details, which I have found whilst searching in the Treasury Papers for information about the Roettiers, have appeared to me to clear from the path a few technical difficulties. I would, therefore, direct the attention of others interested in the subject to the Treasury Papers, and very specially to the MS. Treasury Minute Books, known at the Record Office as T. 29, vols. viii and ix. No doubt when the State Papers Domestic\textsuperscript{3} of William III. are as ably calendared or indexed as are the Treasury Papers and Minute Books, other obscure points will be unveiled.

Let us return, then, to James Roettier and his portraiture of William, whether in town or country.

We have of recent years had clear expositions of the work done at Bristol, Chester, Exeter, Norwich, and York, in our own Journal\textsuperscript{4} and in the Numismatic Chronicle,\textsuperscript{5} but I must call attention to the fact, which has hitherto passed almost unnoticed, namely, that the institution of the country mints did not lessen the duties of the overworked

\textsuperscript{1} Mr. James Hoare, the late controller, is mentioned as deceased in the Commons' Report of April 8th, 1697. In Treasury Papers, vol. xxxvi, No. 48, under date March 11th, 1695-6, we find a request that the salaries of Hoare and of several other officials should be doubled during the recoining—Hoare consequently received an additional £300 a year. On his death he was succeeded by Molyneux, against whom (see Cal. Treasury Papers, vol. lxx, pp. 9, 42, and 50) certain complaints were made in 1700. The matter was referred to the King's decision, but his verdict is not reported. The calendarer, however, remarks that John Ellis was appointed in his place on May 7th, 1701.

\textsuperscript{2} MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxi, No. 40, concerning Chester on the 4th of August, 1702, and vol. lxxxiv, No. 29, of Norwich, November 23rd, 1702.

\textsuperscript{3} The State Papers Domestic of William III. are at present only calendared to the end of the year 1695, another volume is, however, in the press.

\textsuperscript{4} British Numismatic Journal, vol. iii, pp. 223-8, where Dr. Philip Nelson publishes from a manuscript several notes of the amounts coined in the country mints down to October 26th, 1697.

\textsuperscript{5} Num. Chron., 4th series, vol. vi, pp. 358-84. Mr. T. H. B. Graham here gives interesting details of the types of the country coinages.
engravers at the Tower, and that James Roettier, together with his workmen, is responsible for the dies with which the coinage opened. The corroboration afforded by the official manuscripts of a remark made by Mr. T. H. B. Graham in the Numismatic Chronicle, as to the likeness between the types issued at London and the various towns, is worthy of attention. "It is unlikely," writes the author, "that every provincial mint had a staff of skilled engravers attached to it during its transient existence, and so the uniformity of design . . . may be explained by the supposition that most of the dies were engraved in London, and forwarded to the country in order that the mechanical process of coining might be executed there."¹

Mr. Hocking tells me that in a letter from the Bristol Mint, dated August 29th, 1696, Roettier is mentioned as being there as engraver.²

Whether he personally visited all the five country towns, who shall say, but we know that he supplied the dies from the Tower of London, and we read the complaints of overwork lodged by him when the recoineage was in full swing.

We have then, firstly, a memorial upon the increased work at the Tower, to which that of the country mints was to be added. It was written about the middle of the year 1696, and accompanied by a report from Neale.³

² The Bristol Mint commenced operations in September, and it is therefore probable that Roettier inspected it to see whether all was in order.
³ Roettier’s memorial is undated, but it was referred to Neale for his further elucidation, and his report thereon is dated May 22nd, 1696. See Treasury Papers, vol. xxxviii,
James Roettier's Salary.

The Lords of the Treasury were informed that "The former establishment of the Mint was 2 mills and 5 Presses, which Mr. Rutyer maintained with sufficient dies for the coining . . . for which there was 325li per ann payable by the Mint, whereof Mr. Rutyer had 175li, and the other 150li Mr. Harris keeps for himself, Mr. Harris never being able to give Mr. Rutyer any assistance. There are now added 8 mills and 11 Presses more, and the said Rutyer hath not only kept all the new mills and presses as they were ordered with dyes, and will oblige himself to make dyes for all the other Mills and Presses that are ready to goe to work, wherion all his time will be imployed, soe that he must loose all profits by makeing of Medalls." 1

Thomas Neale comments upon this memorial that he "Never heard of the limitation to the number of mills, but understood all to be supplied." He also tells us that "as to the loss pretended to in being taken off from making Medalls, he cannot but take notice that there had been no Medalls made for his Majtie since the death of the late Queen." 3

Roettier had further stated that he "must employ six persons in the said work to assist him, whose Sallarys will be about four hundred pounds pr ann," and "that he had since 30 January made 350 prs. of dyes, besides puncheons for the Service of the present Coynage, and hath born all the charge of paying the workmen out of his own pocket and never reed but 43li 15/- towards the same." 4

The calendarer of the Treasury Papers refers us to the Minute Books in relation to this memorial, and we read:—"The Warden of the Mint proposes 175li addition per an to Mr. Roteers for himself, and 200li per ann for his men. Soe he take upon him the finding of ye

---

1 For this arrangement between Harris and Roettier, see British Numismatic Journal, vol. vii, pp. 228-31.
2 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxviii, No. 16.
3 Ibid., No. 17. We may remark that even before the Queen's death the number of James Roettier's medals is not large. See Med. Ill., vol. i, pp. 662 and 704, and vol. ii, pp. 64, 65, 111, 112, 121-3.
4 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxviii, No. 16.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

dyes for ye Country Mints as well as ye Tower, whch Mr. Neal consents to and is to be p\(^4\) out of his poundage." . . . "My Lords recommend it to ye Officers of ye Mint to agree with Mr. Rotiers."

The engraver had informed his employers that he must supply his workmen with "Meals, Drink, Lodging, Washing, and Wages, the charges whereof he humbly conceived at ye nearest computation will amount to 400" per Ann, in regard they must woork both night and day."

My Lords, as we shall see, partly acceded to his requests, but he was denied a substantial alleviation of his expenses in the house of one Bennet adjoining his own residence in the Tower, where he had hoped to domicile his assistants. Neale's reply specified that, "although the ground on which it stood did formerly belong to the engraver's house, it was now in the possession of the Office of the Ordinance and not at the disposal of the Office of the Mint." This was perhaps not only a monetary, but also a personal annoyance to James Roettier, for in the previous March his rival Harris had been gratified with an official residence, as we learn from a note in the Treasury Books, reading:—
"March 17, 1695-6. Mr. Harris is to be accomodated w\(^\text{th}\) a hous in ye Mint."

It does not appear whether the Treasury supplied Roettier with any other refuge for his men, but his employers did not at this moment seem very liberally disposed towards him or to the Corporation of Moneyers, who consisted, as we have seen, of the working staff in all its minor officers, and the next scene before the Board suggests a tone of annoyance, for we find that a request for larger perquisites made by this body received a curt refusal.

At a meeting of the Council on May 25th, 1696, those present were "Mr. Neale, Mr. Newton, Mr. Lyall, together with the Provost,"

2 *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. xxxviii, No. 17.
(i.e., Braint) "and several members of the Moneyers upon their complaint y' their allowance for making ye money is not sufficient," and we are told that "My Lords do not see any reason for an Increase."

We find in the Treasury Papers, calendared as of uncertain date, a memorial which explains the grievance of this Corporation. The moneyers state they have "been a Corporation for about 300 years last past," that they have coined "silver money att 9d per pound" under a sign manual of Charles II., but they can no longer do so now, "that his Present Mat^e and the Act of Parliament have enacted that one halfe of the Coinage shall be in Shillings and Sixpences, besides the small money to be made according to the Indenture of the Mint, which is 18 ounces in groats, threepences, twopences and pence upon every hundred Weight." They complain that about six weeks earlier they had delivered a petition by their provost and had been told that "your Lord^ps have taken care to speak to the Master Worker the-upon," and that "he had said he would take care to remedy the Complaints therein, and afterwards said that he had done soe, and that they were agreed, which is nothing soe." The 9d. per pound weight troy referred to above was the sole pay of the moneyers, being a percentage on the money coined. This sum was, of course, divided between many workmen, and we notice that even their 9d. was only contingent on the perfection of the coin, 8d. being the established pay and the extra 1d. a bonus. Thus we read:

"To the Moneyers by Indenture 0. 0. 8d.
To them more by sign Manuel 0. 0. 1d." and this question was often insisted upon by Neale in his dealings with the Lords of the Treasury.

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xlii, No. 37, calendared in abstract, 1556-1696, p. 574.
2 By the provisions of 7 and 8, Gul. III., c. 1, it was enacted that from February 4th, 1695-96, forty pounds in every hundred pounds weight troy of silver should be coined into shillings, and ten pounds into sixpences. With regard to the smaller pieces no directions were given, excepting that all other coins were to be "pursuant" to the indenture then in force. Statutes of the Realm, vol. vii, p. 4.
3 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxvi, No. 52, endorsed "March 13th, 1695, agreed to by my Lords."
However, matters were, it seems, satisfactorily arranged, and James Roettier's personal affairs were placed on a better footing, a final settlement being made on May 25th, 1696, to give "Roettier from the 30th of January last past the summe of eight hundred pounds per An for himselfe and six servants, etc., during this present coynage including therein the sum of 175 paid by the said Thomas Neale to ye said James Roettier upon a former agreement, ye said 800 p. Ann to be paid by Quarterly payments." In an earlier document, proposing an increase of £300 a year during the recoinage to the Controller, Mr. Hoare, partly in compensation for damage done to his garden, and increments to various other officials, in most cases doubling their salaries, Neale writes as follows: "The Rotiers Engravers have 450 yearly Penson besides the pay of the Mint being only 325 yearly, which 325 yearly alone would be a very seemly allowance for so much engraving work as this years Coinage requires, and must be performed or all will stand still. What to say in this case I can't tell, but submit the rest to your Lords." Two days later, on March 13th, 1695-6, we read that out of his 3½d. poundage on the coinage, the master is expected to pay the temporarily increased salaries, and amongst them we find "Rotiers for engraving 880," with an erasing line through the figures and "900" substituted, but, as we shall see, it is clear that the sum ultimately fixed was £800, although the above document is endorsed "Agreed to by my Lords." We learn from the Commons’ Journals and the Treasury Books that this £800 was exclusive of the annuity of £450 and the salary of £350 derived by John Roettier, the father of James, from the

1 "The Moneyers promise to have the marking tools ready for all the Country Mints, and a sufficient number of Workmen for these Mints. The iron work of two of the mills in the Country to be provided for the Contract already made by Mr. Neal, and for the other three of the Moneyers." T. 29, vol. viii, p. 307.

2 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxviii, No. 17, minuted "625" above ye all of 175 on ye Mint estab.


patent bestowed upon him in the reign of Charles II.\textsuperscript{1} This grant had been made by the indulgent monarch “for life” instead of “during pleasure,” and was one of the difficulties with which the Mint Enquiry of 1696–7 had to contend. The Committee then recommended the House of Commons to abolish the custom of making such appointments in future.\textsuperscript{2}

But as matters now stood, father and son each received £800 a year, and each was free to earn in addition as much as he could by private work as a medallist. James Roettier, however, was liable for such heavy expenses that his profits must have been inconsiderable, unless he had a share in the percentage upon the coinage which was paid to certain members of the staff, but of this hypothesis we have no evidence.

Not only in the Treasury Papers of March, 1695–6,\textsuperscript{3} but also in the Commons’ Journals we find a short list showing the way in which the Mint charges which were paid by the Treasury for coining, were apportioned.\textsuperscript{4} We read, “By the late act of Parliament One Shilling and Two pence was allowed for the melting, milling and Edging of the Silver money to be coined, which One Shilling and Twopence\textsuperscript{5} the Great Officers have distributed

\texttt{£ s. d.}

To the Moneyers for every Pound Weight of Melted Silver 9
To the Master Worker \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots 3\frac{1}{4}
To the Smith that does all the Work \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots 0\frac{1}{4}
For rounding, blanching and edging \ldots \ldots \ldots 1\frac{1}{2} “

\textsuperscript{1} See British Numismatic Journal, vol. v, p. 258, vol. vii, p. 228, and State Papers Entry Book 26, f. 54, also Treasury Books T. 29, vol. iii, pp. 121 and 125, and Treasury Papers, vol. iv, p. 25, and vol. vii, 69. We read in the Minute Books, Friday, 18th June, 1669, “Mr. Slingsby called in about ye gravers of ye Mint whoe insist to have their Patent for life because they may be blind,” and Monday, June 21st, 1669, “Roteers, ye Engravers called in, that they have a patent for their lives and be p\textsuperscript{4} at ye Mint, a Warrant.” see T. 29, vol. iii, pp. 121 and 125. The patent was of July 3rd, 1669.

\textsuperscript{2} Commons’ Journals, vol. xi, p. 777, “No Officer of the Mint ought to have or enjoy any place in the same for Life.” See also Ruding, vol. ii, p. 470.

\textsuperscript{3} MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xxxvi, No. 52. \textsuperscript{4} Commons’ Journals, vol. xi, p. 776.

\textsuperscript{4} We have seen on our p. 233, note 2, that besides this 1s. 2d. the king paid 4d. a pound for melting all the clipped silver, and the Committee objected that the entire charge thus rose to 1s. 6d. notwithstanding the late Act. See also Ruding, vol. ii, p. 465.
In another part of this report we find the duties of the Moneyers and of the "Smith" defined. "That the Moneyers draw, cut-out, size, blanch and coin" the money, and that the staff consisted, besides the Warden, the Controller, the Master, the Clerk of the Irons and various other Clerks and Auditors, of "an Engraver, two Engineers and Smith and above 200 labourers," and that the "Clerk of the Irons' Business is to keep an Account of all the Dyes made and hardened by the Smith, and when they are worn out, he sees them defaced in the Presence of the Warden, Master, and Comptroller. He now keeps an Account of all the Dyes that are sunk and for that End has one of the Keys to the Great Press and to the Box of Puncheons."

It appears, however, that James Roettier, although he probably had no part in the royalty of 1s. 2d. per pound weight in coining, claimed and was able to obtain extra payment for the 500 pairs of dies which he engraved for the country mints, and indeed always made a charge for the dies. In petitioning the Lords of the Treasury after his displacement from office for the sum of £66 10s., owing to the seizure of his property, of which more anon, he adds a request for remuneration for work performed on "five hundred pair of Dyes for the Country Mints, which are out of the Contract."

The Master and his colleagues, reporting on this document, remark that "Mr. Neale intends to pay him his demand of sixty pounds ten shillings and with y' Lord's approbation to give him fifty pounds more (being the summ he desired) for y' five hundred pair of Dyes for the Country Mints."

1 Commons' Journals, vol. xi, p. 774.
2 Snelling, in his View of the Silver Coins, p. 53, mentions the salary of the Smith of the Mint at £40 in 1599 and 1649, but gives no information concerning the later date.
3 Treasury Papers, vol. xli, No. 43, May 21st, 1697. Petition of James Roettier. It seems fairly certain that these 500 pairs of dies did not include the 350 pairs mentioned nearly a year before, for the latter appear to have been designed for the Tower, and the £43 10s. which he then owned that he had received, represents a slightly higher rate of payment than that for the 500 pairs. This is not unnatural, seeing that the Tower coinage included a great diversity of puncheons, comprising busts for the gold, silver, and copper pieces.
In a later paper we find the engraver acknowledging the payment of £66 10s., but denying any agreement for any particular sum for the much discussed provincial coin dies, as to which he writes, “I refere myself to y’ Lords[J]ugements.”\(^1\) This document is minuted, “Mr. Neal saies that Roettiere left it to Mr. Neal to do what he pleaded for the Country Mints, that he gave him 50 and he took it, Mr. N. will give him ye 50 for ye Mint tools.”\(^2\)

We thus see that James Roettier received an additional fee averaging 2s. for every pair of dies executed for his provincial work. Thomas Simon, some forty years earlier, had, as we know, made a separate and sometimes very high charge for every die he fashioned,\(^3\) but his salary was far lower, being only £40, than that enjoyed by his successors in office, and more of the nature of a retaining fee; consequently a lesser remuneration for every individual piece of work would be tendered to more highly-salaried officials. Certainly James Roettier’s allusion to the country dies as being “out of the contract,” suggests that although the Lords of the Treasury had insisted that he should undertake this extra task, the special remuneration for the punches was not absolutely fixed, and that the engraver usually made terms for the use of his dies, which he clearly considered as his own property until he had been paid.

The portraiture of the provincial silver bears, as we might expect, similar busts to the contemporaneous London coinage, and it is interesting to definitely learn that it is originally attributable to the engravers at headquarters, but that an assistant graver resided in the country towns. We notice that these facts agree with Mr. Graham’s remark, that “the busts are usually well engraved, but the lettering and other minor details sometimes betray more hasty and perhaps local workmanship.”\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Treasury Papers, vol. xlvii, No. 50.
\(^2\) Ibid. See also T. 29, vol. ix, p. 253, where, together with an order for the restoration of some of his effects, we notice the decision that “Mr. Neale will pay him the 50" for the Dies for the Country Mints,” September 6th, 1697.
\(^3\) Vertue’s Medals, Coins, etc., of Thomas Simon, ed. 1780, Appendix V.
In this, the Treasury Papers corroborate Mr. Graham's observations, for I find a list, dated July 30th, 1696, of all the officials to be appointed for the mints of Exeter, York, Bristol, Norwich, and Chester, with the salaries enjoyed by them, from the deputy-wardens' at £120 each down to the deputy porter's at £20, and we see that at each mint the yearly fee of £40 is set apart for the assistant graver. The sum of £50 was paid to the King's clerks, and the assistant gravers received no more than the ordinary clerks and other minor officials, but no chief graver's name or salary appears: it is therefore probable that it was merely deemed necessary to have a man on the spot capable of rendering expert assistance. We have no absolute evidence that the puncheons ever left the Tower, and I understand that it is more likely that they would not be entrusted to the provincial towns, but it is possible that the pressure of work in London would account for "hasty" workmanship, and it seems likely that once all the puncheons were engraved and a sufficient number of dies produced by the chief engraver, the minor details, to which Mr. Graham alludes, would be entrusted to his assistants in the metropolis. The Treasury Minute Books under date July 22nd, 1696, ergo just a week earlier than the drawing-up of the complete list, supply us with the information that Roettier was empowered to choose his deputy. We read: "Mr. Roteir to provide a man to polish the Dyes in each Country Mint at a reasonable Sallary to be allowed by ye K(ing), not exceeding

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xlviii, No. 52 (calendared in abstract in Treasury Papers, 1697-1701-2, p. 108). The list is accompanied by a letter dated November 9th, 1697, from Newton and his colleagues requesting therein a warrant from time to time to pay these salaries. The total expenses reached £630 for each mint, namely, £470 for officers, £120 for clerks, and £40 for the assistant engraver.

2 The fact that the lettering was later confided to subordinates is proved by a list, amongst the manuscripts in the British Museum, drawn up by Croker, which has come under my notice since writing the above. Mention is made of a payment to one "Mr. King for making letters 20 shilgs per Weeke." Unfortunately the paper is undated, but it refers to the recoinage after the departure of Roettier. See Brit. Mus. Addit. MS., 18,757, c. 13. Possibly this may be the same Samuel King who put forward suggestions in 1695-6 concerning a method of coining. See our p. 234.
40 a year."

The names of the "Assist' Gravers" are given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>Mr. Sam' Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Mr. John Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Mr. John Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Mr. Sam' Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Mr. Lancelot Photus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and not one of these is known to fame, so we may safely assume that their duties lay chiefly in the care of and polishing dies. It is, however, fair to state that in a memorandum of a later date, Croker, whilst mentioning three engravers, who were employed by Harris in making dies after Roettier's disgrace, speaks, if I read the manuscript rightly, of "Mr. Lowe," but the name is so indistinctly written that, had I not been acquainted with it as that of the late assistant-graver at Bristol, I should have believed it to be "Soane," and I am by no means sure that the latter is not the correct reading.

Again, I must not omit to mention that in a report presented to the House of Commons in December, 1696, one or more moneyers are specified for each mint, also an apprentice and in some cases two of the latter, but the names given figure with those of labourers, and in more than one instance may be identified with the common workmen at the Tower, whom we have seen ranked as the "Corporation of Moneyers." The title of Moneyer, therefore, once that of an important official under the crown, had, it seems, degenerated into that of the man in charge of the machinery. The number of mills worked by these persons is set forth together with their names in this document, which is too long to quote in its entirety, and those interested in the exact state of the various mints at that moment will find details on our page 221. It is, however, worthy of notice that William Chalkhill, a labourer working at the Tower in May, 1696, figures as a moneyer at Exeter in December, and that other workmen from London named

---

2 Commons' Journals, December 5th, 1696, vol. xi, p. 615.
In this, the *Treasury Papers* corroborate Mr. Graham’s observations, for I find a list, dated July 30th, 1696, of all the officials to be appointed for the mints of Exeter, York, Bristol, Norwich, and Chester, with the salaries enjoyed by them, from the deputy-wardens’ at £120 each down to the deputy porter’s at £20, and we see that at each mint the yearly fee of £40 is set apart for the assistant graver. The sum of £50 was paid to the King’s clerks, and the assistant gravers received no more than the ordinary clerks and other minor officials, but no chief graver’s name or salary appears: it is therefore probable that it was merely deemed necessary to have a man on the spot capable of rendering expert assistance. We have no absolute evidence that the puncheons ever left the Tower, and I understand that it is more likely that they would not be entrusted to the provincial towns, but it is possible that the pressure of work in London would account for “hasty” workmanship, and it seems likely that once all the puncheons were engraved and a sufficient number of dies produced by the chief engraver, the minor details, to which Mr. Graham alludes, would be entrusted to his assistants in the metropolis. The *Treasury Minute Books* under date July 22nd, 1696, ergo just a week earlier than the drawing-up of the complete list, supply us with the information that Roettier was empowered to choose his deputy. We read: “Mr. Roteir to provide a man to polish the Dyes in each Country Mint at a reasonable Sallary to be allowed by ye K(ing), not exceeding

---

1 *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. xlviii, No. 52 (calendared in abstract in *Treasury Papers*, 1697-1701-2, p. 108). The list is accompanied by a letter dated November 9th, 1697, from Newton and his colleagues requesting therein a warrant from time to time to pay these salaries. The total expenses reached £630 for each mint, namely, £470 for officers, £120 for clerks, and £40 for the assistant engraver.

2 The fact that the lettering was later confided to subordinates is proved by a list, amongst the manuscripts in the British Museum, drawn up by Croker, which has come under my notice since writing the above. Mention is made of a payment to one “Mr. King for making letters 20 shilgs per Weeke.” Unfortunately the paper is undated, but it refers to the recoinage after the departure of Roettier. See *Brit. Mus. Addit. MS.*, 18,757, c. 13. Possibly this may be the same Samuel King who put forward suggestions in 1695-6 concerning a method of coining. See our p. 234.
The names of the "Assist' Gravers" are given as follows:

In "Exeter, Mr. Sam Andrews"
"Bristoll, Mr. John Lowe"
"Norwich, Mr. John Young"
"York, Mr. Sam Smith"
"Chester, Mr. Lancelot Photus"

and not one of these is known to fame, so we may safely assume that their duties lay chiefly in the care of and polishing dies. It is, however, fair to state that in a memorandum of a later date, Croker, whilst mentioning three engravers, who were employed by Harris in making dies after Roettier's disgrace, speaks, if I read the manuscript rightly, of "Mr. Lowe," but the name is so indistinctly written that, had I not been acquainted with it as that of the late assistant-graver at Bristol, I should have believed it to be "Soane," and I am by no means sure that the latter is not the correct reading.

Again, I must not omit to mention that in a report presented to the House of Commons in December, 1696, one or more moneyers are specified for each mint, also an apprentice and in some cases two of the latter, but the names given figure with those of labourers, and in more than one instance may be identified with the common workmen at the Tower, whom we have seen ranked as the "Corporation of Moneyers." The title of Moneyer, therefore, once that of an important official under the crown, had, it seems, degenerated into that of the man in charge of the machinery. The number of mills worked by these persons is set forth together with their names in this document, which is too long to quote in its entirety, and those interested in the exact state of the various mints at that moment will find details on our page 221. It is, however, worthy of notice that William Chalkhill, a labourer working at the Tower in May, 1696, figures as a moneyer at Exeter in December, and that other workmen from London named

2 Commons' Journals, December 5th, 1696, vol. xi, p. 615.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

Moses Baker and Thomas Hyde appear at Norwich, whilst Clement Hyde and John Smith take up their residence at York. Each country mint would no doubt be the better for such experienced men as could be spared by the Tower authorities, the complement of the provincial establishments being from five to nine labourers, in addition to one or more moneyers and apprentices. Norwich had at this time the largest staff, Bristol and York the largest output, though York was later surpassed by Exeter and Chester, and we must bear in mind that the Bristol mint was better managed throughout than those of York and Norwich, as appears from the Commons' Journals of April 8th, 1697. But in comparing the activity of the various mints in December, 1696, we must not fail to remember that Chester was yet in its infancy, whilst York represented one of the two earliest foundations, and that the mints are usually mentioned in the Treasury Papers in the following order:—Exeter, York, Bristol, Norwich, and Chester, no doubt according to date of foundation.

But a truce to these dry bones,—let us turn to the living history, and see how these matters affected our friends the Roettiers, and consequently the portraiture of the King.

From the time of James II.'s flight, the family of Roettier had been subjected to suspicion, and as I have already shown, not without reason, for John the father had retained the title of chief engraver to the exiled

---

1 Commons' Journals, April 8th, 1697, vol. xi, p. 774. "The Committee take notice that at the Mints of York and Norwich there lyeth dead very great Sums of hammered money uncoyned by the Negligence of the Officers in these Mints. At Bristol there is now coined 15,000 per week." See also p. 776, where the Committee complains that "in the Mints of York and Norwich there are far greater Difficiencies than in any of the other Mints, viz., in that at York, by above 2,800l and that at Norwich by about 500l."
king, and there was evidence, disregarded at the time, that before the projected invasion of 1695–6, efforts had been made to procure some Dys or Deys from Roettier in the Tower, to send over to the late King to coin some Mill’d Money to pay his Army, when he landed in England. It was also said that the Dyes of the Tower were convey’d away by Hewet and others, by the help of Mr. Roetier, and it was suggested that it would be wise to take the disused dies of Charles II. and James II. out of the engraver’s hands, under a pretence of seeing them.

We have noticed that particular distrust arose from the fact that both Roettiers were Catholics, in an age when the passions of the majority of the people were inflamed by controversial arguments. John was regarded with so much distrust that objections were raised when Henry Hyde, second Earl of Clarendon, who on June 25th, 1690, was imprisoned in the Tower for alleged conspiracies and for refusing to swear allegiance to the new king, asked on the 9th of August following that the engraver might be permitted to visit him.

The Governor, Lord Lucas, it is true, partly acceded to his request, for to tell the story in the prisoner’s own words, this officer said that: “Mr. Dod should come with him (Roettier) at any time, but he must not be alone with me, because he was a papist. Very pleasant!” The Queen’s uncle naturally resented this suspicion, but Lord Lucas appears to have been particularly mistrustful as regards John Roettier, for in the subsequent investigation concerning the Mint affairs in 1697, he declared that the Tower is not safe while so many Papists are

1 Smith’s Memoirs of Secret Service, p. 89. Smith was an informer who gave belated evidence in Fenwick’s Case in 1697 concerning the Assassination Plot, in the hope of incriminating some of the ministers. He alleged that he had given warning of the treasonable practices as above, but had met with little attention, and this was his object in dragging Roettier’s name into the affair.

2 Ibid., Preface, p. xii.

3 Ibid., p. 89.

4 See p. 214.


6 Dod was, according to Lord Clarendon, the “gentleman gaoler” of the Tower. See Diary as above, p. 251.
entertained in Rotier's house." He also told the Committee of Enquiry that "he is a very dangerous person to be in the Tower,"¹ and "he would remove him if he could."² It was alleged that the old cuneator kept "an Irish Papist in his House,"³ and again that the Roettiers being themselves "violent Papists" . . . "refuse to take the Oaths, or to subscribe the Association as by Law they ought to do," that their correspondence with France was illegal,⁴ and that it was not considered safe by the Committee that Roettier should have charge of the dies, insomuch as "several pieces of new Crowns and Halfcrowns have been counterfeited lately which they were positive were done with the dies in the Tower."⁵ The scrutiny had commenced early in 1696-7 by the appointment of a Committee "to examine what Dyes have been got out of the Tower, and by what means," and it was thought that "some person concerned in the counterfeiting" had "clandestinely delivered" them. Who then should be suspected but "Mr. Roteer, who cuts the Dyes and has the keeping thereof and of the Great Press, and though Captain Harris be Patent Officer, and ought to have the Inspection of the Dyes, yet the said Rotteer would never suffer him to come in the House where the Press and Dyes are kept."⁶

The evidence of coiners and clippers of the currency was brought forward. A certain Thomas White,⁷ condemned for making copper

² Commons' Journals, p. 776, April 8th, 1697, and Ruding, vol. ii, 470.
³ Commons' Journals, p. 686.
⁴ Ibid., p. 776. Apart from communications between John Roettier and the outlaw Daniel Arthur, "two letters out of France" had been directed by the latter to James Roettier "even since the Act of Parliament that makes it Capital to hold Correspondence with France."
⁶ Ibid., p. 686.
⁷ Commons' Journals, vol. xi, pp. 678 and 686, January 27th, 1696-7. White, in Newgate, turned King's evidence on the suggested hope that "Favour was intended him." He implicated various coiners and money-changers, amongst others Daniel Ware, who was one of the witnesses against him at his trial, and who, being a smith, had made him a press for false coinage. White did not accuse the Roettiers in his personal evidence, but stated that "Hunter, Russell, and Chapman were at work in the Country with several Dyes, which Hunter stole out of the Tower, being Servant there." We notice that
guineas in the Fleet Prison, had, according to Daniel Ware, another bad character, informed him, the witness, that he "could have dyes from Roteer when he pleased," and it was stated that "one Hunter, a Servant to the Moneyers, conveyed away several of the Mint Dyes," so that "it appeared either a Connivance or a great Neglect in the Person intrusted with the Dyes."2

On the commencement of this Mint Enquiry it was ordered by the House of Commons that "all Puncheons, Dyes, Presses and other things belonging to his Majesty’s Mint in the Hands of Mr. Rotier in the Tower be immediately seized by the officers of the Mint."3

The Commons’ report is rather confused in wording, and it is not always possible to determine which of the two persons, the father or the son, is designated as “Mr. Rotier,” but just as it is clear that the elder is intended when he is spoken of as the holder of a patent under Charles II., or as unwilling to work for William III., so we may conclude that the younger is in question when referred to in the present tense as maker of the dies. The offence alleged was the abstraction of coin dies to make “new Crowns and half Crowns”; although, if these were to be sent out to James II. in exile, we should have deemed it more probable that the puncheons prior to the Revolution would be used such effigies being more agreeable to the dethroned king than the portrait of his supplanter. It was, moreover, implied in 1695-6 by the informer Smith,5 that the dies of Charles and James alone were endangered in Roettier’s hands.

July, 1691, it had been asserted that the engraver’s house was in such condition that the puncheons and dies might easily be stolen (Cat. Treasury Papers, 1556-1696, p. 182). It is, however, probable that this was no longer the case in 1696.

4 See Commons’ Journals, vol. xi, p. 776. In corroboration of this often-asserted fact Mr. Hocking tells me that in a petition to the Treasury from the Mint in about May, 1701, relative to the method of paying the salaries of the engravers as originally granted to the three Roettiers, he finds the sentence “John Roettiers, the only person now claiming the same, has not served his present Majesty as graver either for Medals or Money.”

In the April of 1700 a quantity of old dies were defaced in the presence of the mint officers which had been found concealed "in a tubb in young James Rotteeres House, in all 37," and another parcel was discovered "sunk and left in a Clossett in the Engravers House, being in Number Eighty-seaven."1 The first find contained dies of William and Mary, and apparently also of William alone.2 The second collection is undescribed, beyond the fact that it consisted of more "Dyes of Mr. Rotteers of several sorts," and we cannot tell whether they were the dies of Charles II. and James II., which, according to Matthew Smith, should have been withdrawn from the engraver's hands, and which Roettier had hidden in consequence, or whether he had merely attempted to guard some of his property from later confiscation. It would have been still more interesting could we have known whether any of these hidden treasures represented the incriminating supply ordered by James II. in December, 1695, of all denominations in gold and silver according to a design then specified but unknown to us.3 Or again, what could be more likely than that Roettier should conceal the dies, for James II.'s gun-money, if any such were still in his possession.

Be this as it may, it is clear that James was the "Mr. Rotier" whose goods were seized on February 2nd, 1696-7, by order of Parliament, for it is he and not his father who appeals to the Lords of the Treasury for the restoration of his medal puncheons that had been confiscated with Mint property.

Shortly after the House of Commons had given the command, which later provoked so much controversy, the Lords of the Treasury, having read a signed paper from Harris concerning dies and puncheons, had consulted Neale and Newton, bidding them advise whether the

1 Information kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking from MS. Mint Records.

2 The list of the thirty-seven dies contains crowns and half-crowns, but whether all of William with Mary, or in part of William alone, is not clear. A die for a five-guinea obverse is specified, a coin not struck between the date of the death of the Queen and that of the engraver. We regret the loss of a "design for a Medall K. W." (i.e., of King William).

business of the Mint could be carried on without Roettier.\(^1\) The answer, that "they think Mr. Harris can carry on the service if Mr. Rotier be turn’d out," produced the following result:—"My Lords direct them (with Mr. Harris) to take possession of his Shop, Puncheons, Dyes and other Property relating to the Mint and deliver them to Mr. Harris."

This order produced a petition from James Roettier, descanting on his grievances: "his tools and house having been seized so that (he) had forthwth to leave his habitaçon in the Tower, by which sudden Removall yr Pet’s and his family have been great Sufferers." He sets forth that "the Warden of the Mint hath thro’ a mistake seiz’d all yr Pet’s Medalls, Puncheons, Dyes and several Tooles belonging to yr Pet w’d in no way relate to his Maj’y Coyne, but properley the Right of y’ Pet’.”\(^2\) This petition being referred to Neale for explanation, he replied that, "the Dyes and Puncheons in his (Roettier’s) custody were seized by direction of the Commons, and that he was removed from his employment and his working rooms, and Tools had been seized by the Warden and Master, but that the Warden soon after restored almost all his tools to his father and told him before his son’s departure to Flanders, the rest should be restored together with such Dyes and Puncheons as were his.”\(^3\)

A renewed appeal from the petitioner, a little later, reiterates his demand concerning his "Puncheons, Medall-Dyes, and severall Tools," still in the custody of the Wardens, and asks for an order to have them again.\(^4\) This time he is successful, for on September 7th, at the meeting of the Treasury Board, the minutes read: "Roettiers is to have his dyes and puncheons that are usefull onely for medalls and have no relacon to the coyning of mony.”\(^5\)

Fortunately for our numismatic studies one or two coin-puncheons

---

\(^1\) *MS. Treasury Book*, T. 29, vol. ix, p. 93, February 26th, 1696.
\(^2\) *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. xlvi, No. 43 (Cat. Treasury Papers, 1697–1701–2, May 21st, 1697).
\(^3\) *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. xlvi, No. 43, July 6th, 1697.
\(^4\) *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. xlvii, No. 50.
escaped this confiscation, but the concluding words no doubt sounded as a death-knell to James Roettier’s hopes, for to quote his words: “there is a particular Contract between Mr. Neale and myselfe about halfepence and farthings which Mr. Neale seems willing to continue with the consent of yr Lordships, as also I am ready and willing to serve his Matie to the utmost of my Art and Ability, as yr Lordships shall direct,” 1 and it did not seem likely that he would be allowed to make fresh dies when the custody of his old productions was denied to him. We may, however, congratulate ourselves that amongst the dies presented by Matthew Young 2 to the British Museum we find an unfinished head-puncheon for a halfpenny of William III., which sheds light on the question.

James Roettier’s appeal concerning the copper money is of interest, because a certain amount of doubt is thereby dissipated with regard to the details of contracts for coinages such as those effected under Sir Joseph Herne’s patent, which, according to some authorities, were not under the direct supervision of the Tower officers. Mr. Hocking informs me that the puncheons and also the dies for copper coin were usually prepared in the Royal Mint and issued to the patentees. It appears, however, that in 1694 and the following years a change may have crept in, for Snelling, in describing the experiences to which the makers of halfpence and farthings were liable—the cost of production being sixpence per pound Troy—says: “the graving of the dyes costs no more than a farthing per lb. weight, instead of one penny as at first, the patentees having been offered them done at that price by some foreign engravers.” 3

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xlvi, No. 50.

2 In 1828 Matthew Young having made some restrikes, presented to the Museum a collection of dies which he had purchased from a man named Cox, who had acquired them from survivors of the Roettier family. This large number of dies and puncheons consists principally of designs for medals by John Roettier of the reigns of Charles II. and James II., and those executed by Norbert Roettier at the French Court for the exiled Stuarts, but works by Philip and James Roettier are also present. For the history of the collection see my remarks in British Numismatic Journal, vol. iii, p. 236.

3 View of the Copper Coin, p. 40, note 4.
We must remember that this remark would not apply to the original puncheons, but only to the subsequent dies. In searching the Treasury Papers\(^1\) of Queen Anne's time, I found a memorial stating that: "the coinages of copper money in the reign of King Charles the 2nd, King James ye 2nd and in the beginning of the reign of the late King and Queen, had been carried on at the charge of the Crown under the care and direction of the principal Officers of the Mint"; thereby implying that the practice had been altered under William and Mary, and it is not perhaps impossible that Roettier was employed outside the Mint under private contract with Neale, or directly with the Patentees.

Certain ungranted petitions for himself and partners from one "Abell Slany, Citizen and Woollen draper of London,"\(^2\) who was one of the participants in Herne's patent,\(^3\) explain matters more fully, for we learn from the Manuscript Treasury Papers that they had been "allowed to Coin 700 tuns at 21 pence ye pound weight, without being accountable to Government." They state that they "had the Liberty of Melting, Rolling and Cutting the Copper at their own office which made 'em lyable to be suspected of adulterating the Mettal"; whilst under Anne they desire "the Copper to be melted, Roll'd, Cutt and Stampt at your Mat'ies Mint in the Tower."

It appears that the Petitioners had "sustained very great Losses in the exchange of the tin money for the new copper." It had, however, been to facilitate this transaction specially that the innovation had been permitted, and the Mint Officials recommended that, should half-pence or farthings be required, Anne's Treasury Council should revert to the older system, whereby the coinage "was performed by one or more Commissioners, who had money imprested from the Exchequer to buy Tin and Copper, and coined at 20d. ye Pound Haverdupois, and

---

\(^1\) MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xciv, April 5th, 1705; Calendared 1702-7, p. 337.
\(^2\) MS. Treasury Papers, vols. lxxxiv, No. 138; lxxxv, No. 147; and lxxxvi, Nos. 91 and 102.
\(^3\) See Snelling's View of the Copper Coin, p. 39, who states that in 1694 the patent for seven years was granted to Sir J. Herne, "and others," and that "these other persons were Abel Slaney and Daniel Barton."
accounted on oath to the Government for ye Produce thereof.” We may believe that a friendly feeling existed between Slaney and Roettier, for we notice the latter refuting objections raised on April the 6th, 1696, before the House of Commons against the Patentees’ manner of coining, when he informs the Committee that “he takes Casting of Copper Blanks for Halfpence and Farthings to be the most proper Way of making them, for they can be cast much faster than roll’d . . . . and that the Patentees pay the same Rate for casting as for Rolling.”

So much for the possibilities of the continued employment of Roettier in the copper coinage. Let us now turn to the technical side. Comparison between the busts upon the earlier halfpence and the farthings of William III. with the silver coinage of the moment, leads us to recognize without hesitation the hand of James Roettier in the portrait, whilst that upon the second halfpenny has hitherto presented a problem. The puncheons had now been in use since 1695, and it would seem, from the reference to the contract with Neale in the above petition, that some change was in contemplation, but whether in the obverse or reverse is not clear. The change both of bust and of reverse on the halfpence was effected in the middle of the year 1699.

No doubt the difficulty of supplying the place of the dismissed engraver, or of obtaining permission for him to make use of these puncheons and dies when ready, may have delayed the alteration in

* The Patentees were accused of tardiness in exchanging the tin money for copper, of tampering with weight and material, and of bad coining in using cast instead of rolled blanks, etc., but they were acquitted by the House of any breach of contract. See *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. lxxxv, No. 141, and Commons' Journals, vol. xi, pp. 545–49.
type, but it did not come into effect until some months after the
death of Roettier, and then on the halfpence only. On the farthings,
so far as I can ascertain, no change of bust was made.¹

In our last volume² we noticed the Act (9 Gul. III., c. 36) for
stopping the coining of farthings and halfpence for one year, between
June 24th, 1698, and the same date in 1699, so that we look for and
find little copper money dated 1698, June being, according to the old
style, but the third month in the year.

A slight variation was instituted upon the reverse of both coins in
1698, the date appearing in the legend instead of in the exergue, but
in the latter half of 1699 an entirely new reverse reverted to the
earlier form of dating. The halfpenny now carried a fresh portrait of
the King, rather more precise in workmanship, and the question arose
—was it by a different hand?

On technical grounds, being less hurriedly executed, the answer
appeared uncertain, and in point of portraiture we notice a difference
in the King’s face, but this is a mere expression of opinion, whereas
the fact that Roettier was dead when the puncheon first came into use,
strongly suggested to me that we must look for a fresh engraver,
although it was of course possible that puncheons for a new copper
coinage might be amongst the confiscated possessions of 1697.

This question is, however, now set at rest, for by the courtesy
of Mr. Grueber, I have been given the opportunity of examining all
the dies and puncheons in the collection presented by Matthew Young

¹ I have never seen the farthing of 1701, which is of extreme rarity, but there is no
printed evidence of a change of bust.

to the British Museum, and I discovered and place before you an unfinished head-puncheon for the second bust, which came into use in 1699. Whether it escaped the search of 1697—or whether it was made subsequently to that search in preparation for the "private contract" with Neale—or afterwards in fulfilment of that contract, who shall say? But its presence in the collection is definite proof that to James Roettier we owe the bust on the halfpence of 1699, although the dies were not required until after his death. In favour of the suggestion that Roettier carried out his agreement privately with Neale, is the careful and less hurried workmanship of the new halfpenny as issued. No head-puncheon for a new farthing is amongst these relics, and possibly the state of the dies had not demanded the execution of a fresh design during the engraver's life. But an unfinished reverse puncheon for a farthing, bearing a slightly differing Britannia from any design known to us, is to be found amongst these Roettier dies, and suggests the possibility that, had James lived to accomplish his task, we might have seen it in currency; and the fact that the face of the effigy more nearly resembles Queen Mary than
PORTRAIT OF WILLIAM III, PAINTED IN 1699 BY GODFRIED SCHALCKEN.
IN THE DUTCH NATIONAL COLLECTION AT THE HAGUE.
“la belle Stuart” and the days of Charles II., certainly strengthens this hypothesis.

Yet two more puncheons may possibly belong to this period, but there is so little variation in the representation of Britannia from the moment when, in 1672, Frances, Duchess of Richmond, was portrayed by the elder Roettier, upon the reverse of the current halfpenny, until 1699, when, under William III. the figure assumed a fresh position, with a head more like his deceased Queen, that I hesitate concerning the attribution of these efforts.

The absence of lettering or date makes it difficult to decide whether we here see original sketches by John Roettier or late copies.

1 This design, taken originally from the bronze coins of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius and the medallion of Commodus with the figure of Britannia, was adopted by John Roettier for the reverse decoration of the Quatuor Maria Vindici copper pattern in 1665 and 1666. The halfpenny and farthing with altered legends became current in 1672. The face of Britannia is said to be that of Frances Stuart, Duchess of Richmond, as may be more clearly seen on the Favente Deo medals of 1667.—See Med. Ill., vol. i, pp. 535–6, Nos. 185–7.
by his son James intended for use with the new bust of William III., and perhaps rejected in favour of a newer design more resembling the late Queen. The fine proof halfpenny in gold in the British Museum, here illustrated, serves to show that the portraiture of Britannia remained unchanged until after Mary's death.

The Act forbidding the issue of copper coins during the greater part of 1698, had probably preserved James Roettier's old dies longer than had been anticipated when he entered into the contract with Neale, and the punches for the farthings remained in use until 1700, if not later. But though no change of bust is noticeable upon these small coins, new dies, of course, appear, and in the British Museum on one of those rare and curious pieces bearing the head on both sides, which were probably made with the object of trying a fresh die, a slight difference may be detected in the position of the bust on the flan. Whether this pattern is contemporaneous with a halfpenny trial piece in the collection of Mr. Weightman, who shall say? If so, the farthing is possibly an experimental effort made to determine whether the king wished any alteration to be made in the smaller coin in 1699, a question answered in the negative, perhaps because Roettier had left no new design for a

---

1 9 Gul. III., c. 36, Statutes of the Realm, vol. vii, p. 409. See also Brit. Num. Journal, vol. vii, pp. 235, 236, concerning the Act of Parliament passed on May 23rd, 1698, to stop the coining of halfpence and farthings from June 24th, 1698, for one year, owing to petitions stating that the patentees had abused their privilege by making too large an issue. Commons' Journals, vol. xii, pp. 283 and 324.

2 See note on p. 263 concerning the farthing of 1701.
Some Halfpennies and Farthings.

farthing behind him, it being understood that the existing puncheons would be available for many years.

Until the discovery of the new halfpenny puncheon I had wondered, if not by James Roettier, to whom we should attribute the new halfpenny of 1699, whether to John Croker or some other engraver. By the courtesy of Mr. Hocking, I learn that a record of 1702 details the official inspection of certain dies then in stock at the Tower.¹ This list mentions head-puncheons for halfpence and farthings by one Samuel Bull, assistant engraver, and I was consequently inclined to attribute the new bust to him, but this did not seem absolutely to prove the matter, for an earlier document of April 13th, 1700,² specifies no copper-coins, and speaks only of a shilling as being the work of this artist, whilst supplying a sequence of other coins not from his hand. If Samuel Bull, who had been in receipt of a regular yearly salary as

¹ **MS. Mint Reports,** January 13th, 1701-2.
² **Ibid.** These lists specify the number of punches in stock at the Mint, which were either available for use, or, being worn, should be defaced.
a probationer- engraver at the Tower since Christmas, 1698, had executed the design for the new halfpence shortly after his appointment, they should have been in the Mint when the record of 1700 was drawn up, unless, as I thought it to be just possible, they were in the hands of the contractors. The fact that this practice of making an inventory at the Mint was of recent institution, forbade much hope of discovering what puncheons were in stock at an earlier period. Now, therefore, the question arises—are these not new puncheons for halfpence and farthings made subsequently to that last-mentioned date, which owing to the King's death in March, 1701-2, were not required and are unknown to us? We regret that they are no longer available, for the difficulty of recognizing Bull's work in a more important coinage would be thereby minimized.

There are, as we know, small peculiarities apart from the date on the reverses of coins which help us to determine approximately the order of their sequence, allowing, of course, for the probability that occasionally the obverse and reverse were not scrupulously kept together. We owe to Mr. Graham in the Numismatic Chronicle a systematic chronological arrangement of the changes in the silver of 1696 and 1697, be it in the shape of the harp in the arms on the reverse, or what not.

Following, therefore, the evidence of this author, let us see when Roettier's dies were replaced in the country mints by the second bust, so much rarer on these issues, and whether we must attribute this second

1 MS. Mint Records, kindly communicated by Mr. Hocking, "A Treasury Warrant dated April, 1700, directed the Master and Warden of the Mint to pay Mr. Bull, probationer engraver, a salary of £50 a year to commence from Christmas, 1698." It is possible that Samuel Bull at this period may have succeeded to the place vacated by John Grillet, of whom more will be said, for in the Treasury Minute Books, T. 29, vol. xi, p. 204, we read "Mr. Newton proposes that ye Sallary of 50[^] a year wch was lately allowed to Grillet as an additional Engraver may be allowed to Mr. Bull, wch is agreed to. November 1st, 1699." From the Mint Records above quoted, we should judge that the warrant of 1700 followed upon this decision. It is, however, apparent that Bull was employed at a yet earlier date at the mint, for an undated memorandum of Croker's mentions him as receiving at one time during the recoinage twenty shillings a week, personally paid by the Master.

A Change in Portraiture.

bust on the shillings and sixpences to him or to his successor. Reference to Mr. Graham’s careful analysis shows us that in one isolated case, possibly, as I have said, due to the use of an old reverse die, the change of bust has been seen on a shilling dated 1696,¹ and Hawkins mentions also a sixpence,² but we look for the new portrait upon coins made in the latter half of the year 1697, more varieties existing, however, with the first than with the second head. Hawkins³ tells us that “in the latter part of the year 1697 and the subsequent year, the heads on the sixpences are a little broader and of neater workmanship.” It is indeed observable that the change in hand is more apparent on these coins than on the larger pieces, unless perhaps on the Exeter half-crowns of 1697, which appear with two slightly varying busts, with NONO on the edge.

![Exeter Half-Crown "NONO," 1697. Second Bust.](image)

I illustrate two Bristol sixpences, the first of which must, of course, be attributed to Roettier, and the second, giving my opinion on the

![Bristol Sixpence, First Bust, 1697.](image)

¹ One shilling of Chester mentioned by Mr. Graham on p. 375. He tells me he has seen no other specimen.

² Hawkins, p. 395, in the Cuff Collection, but it is not mentioned in the Cuff sale catalogue.

³ Ibid.
score of the greater prominence of the features, and the more precise workmanship of the fresh portraiture, to John Croker, of whom more anon.

I do not wish to press this suggestion in that we have, as we shall see, Roettier’s assertion that his designs and his only had been used down to July, 1697, and should it be proved that the second bust exists on more than accidental specimens in 1696, the inference would be that James Roettier left behind him puncheons with both heads, the second not being brought into general use until required.

This is not an altogether impossible or unbelievable hypothesis, as we know that he was paid £66 10s. for the property seized at the Mint by order of the Parliament, exclusively of £50 for his tools, and the same sum for the 500 pairs of dies engraved for the use of the country mints. In favour of this assumption we remark that in the half-crowns the change is so slight that we cannot dogmatize as to when a fresh hand is apparent in it, although one of the punches in the Mint Museum, undated of course, shows that in some cases this was perceptible, and the type of the Exeter half-crown, illustrated from

Mr. Spink’s collection on our last page, indicates that the earlier puncheons were replaced in one at least of the country towns. Against
it is the fact that the press of work does not appear to have diminished but rather to have increased after the departure of Roettier, Croker having eight assistants as against the six persons employed by his predecessors. Secondly, the late shillings of 1697 and the earlier issues of 1698, adhering to the second type, have so great an affinity with the guinea\(^1\) illustrated below, which is usually attributed to Croker, that if the gold be his we can hardly see another hand in the silver.

The great problem in disentangling the work of William III.’s cunecators has always lain in the fact that there is so little change in portraiture or in technique in the coinage of the year 1697, when, owing to the dismissal of James Roettier in February, 1696–7, we should begin to look for a new hand in the silver, the strain upon the puncheons for so large an issue being considerable. We have noted that in the following May, James Roettier appealed for payment for 500 pairs of dies made for the country mints, but we must remember that these dies cannot have been made later than the first two months of 1697, \textit{n.s.}, after which date he had no access to his tools, and if they were designed for immediate use, they should bear date 1696, according to the reckoning of the time. But in anticipation of the required output for the coming year, it is by no means improbable that Roettier sank dies in readiness for many months to come: consequently we feel no surprise at the delay in adopting a new bust.

The \textit{Treasury Papers}\(^2\) supply evidence not only that Roettier’s puncheons were used, but that his dies were copied intentionally, and we may assume that the “six servants” who had worked under him

\(^1\) \textit{Mint Catalogue}, vol. i, p. 133, and vol. ii, p. 15. This type of guinea was first issued in 1697, see lot 890, Montagu collection.

\(^2\) \textit{Treasury Papers}, vol. xlvi, No. 43, May 21st, 1697.
would be at the disposal of the Mint officers, whilst the property seized in his house included a large number of his puncheons, from which they could prepare fresh dies.\(^1\) Let us turn to the *Treasury Papers* before quoted, and we notice the animus which lay in the rivalry between Harris and Roettier, for in addressing the Lords of the Treasury, the cuneator accuses this officer of deception,\(^2\) "Yo' Pet' hath been informed that Mr. Harris hath engaged himselfe to yo' Lordps to make his Puncheons as good as your Pet', wh he has not performed haveing made use of all yo' Pet's work except one Shilling Puncheon which he took off from yo' Pet's Dye,\(^3\) So that he has showed nothing of his own Art." This accusation, being referred on May 26th to the consideration and report of the Warden, Master-Worker and Controller of the Mint, elicits the reply that:—"We know not how far Mr. Harris may have engaged himself to yo'a Lord's to make new Puncheons as good as Mr. Roettiers, but we have hitherto endeavoured to engage him (contrary to his mind) to copy after Mr. Roettier's Puncheons that the money may be all alike . . . .\(^4\) "We most humbly submit to yo' Lord's great wisdom whether he shall be more employed as Engraver in his Ma'tes Mint, or allowed a maintenance here till Mr. Harris shall show such specimens of his Art as he may have promised to yo' Lord's, or return with his family to Brussells his native country." This memorandum produced a counterblast from James Roettier, who asserted "That Mr. Harris, as in the report (Contrary to his mind), hath copied after me that the mony might be all alike, is an Excuse Easily decided, if Yr Lord's would be pleased to grant an Order to each of us whereby we may be enabled to show the difference of our Art to yo' Lord's, that accordingly Yr Lord's may make use of the ablest for his Ma'tes service."\(^5\)

---

1 The fact that he was paid £66 10s. for those which were seized, besides the country dies, shows that the supply was large.

2 *Treasury Papers*, vol. xlvi, No. 43, May 21st, 1697.

3 I understand that this process is possible if the die be in a perfect state of preservation.

4 MS. *Treasury Papers*, vol. xlvi, No. 43, May 26th, 1697.

5 MS. *Treasury Papers*, vol. xlvii, No. 50.
The fact that Roettier did not go to Brussels suggests that some encouragement was given to him to remain; but we have no account of a trial of skill such as that which is recorded in the reign of Charles II., between the elder Roettier and Thomas Simon. We know, however, that Harris was able to satisfy those in authority that if he, a seal-cutter, was not personally able to fill the cuneator’s place, he could carry on the work from the material in stock until such time as his probationer-engravers could supply new puncheons.

Who then were these probationers? I have too long trespassed on your patience to answer this question now, but I will, with your permission, resume the subject in our next volume, and discuss Roettier’s successors, together with such information as I have been able to gather concerning the medallic portraiture of William III.
COLOURS OF THE 43RD FOOT (THE MONMOUTHSHIRE LIGHT INFANTRY)
IN THE PARISH CHURCH, MONMOUTH.

Plate I.