N terminating the preceding portion of our essay upon William III.'s coinage, I suggested that with your permission we should resume in this volume our endeavour to follow the fortunes of James Roettier and his successors in office.

We left the Tower Mint in the year 1697 in a position of some difficulty. James Roettier, under suspicion of disloyalty, had been removed from his post, and Henry Harris, his superior officer, was no cuneator. Harris had, however, entirely at his disposal the puncheons and dies already provided by the superseded engraver, and quite possibly some of the undergravers, who had worked for several months in the pay of Roettier, were still unofficially available to carry on the almost mechanical process of producing dies from the latter's punches.

But a fresh inconvenience presented itself, for again the question of finance, so much debated in the earlier stages of the recoinage, blocked the way. Let us examine some details concerning the arrangements authorized by the Treasury Board and given in a memorandum, which was indited in after years by John Croker, who from the month of February, 1696-7, became virtually responsible for an adequate supply of dies. Croker, whose German accent is apparent
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in his phonetic spelling of the English language, which he found somewhat difficult to master, writes:

“In the year 1696, when the Great Coynage begining by order of ye Lords of ye Treasury, the Chief officers of ye mint agreat and allowed Mr: Rottiers as Engravers 800£ per annum during that Coynage to Suppley the Mint in ye Tower of London and ye 5 Coentrey Mints with Sufficient dyes to perfect that work, wich the Rottiers enjoyd it for a twelffe month, but after that time the Rottiers were displaced and i enterd upon that buseness under Mr: Harris, and when Mr Harris dit take place of the whole buseness of engraving, he expected the Same allowance, as the Rottiers had had the year before him, but it was disputeth with him, upon what account i never was reightly informed of, but Mr: Harris found himselfe verry much greaved and disapointet and represendet it was impossible and as much unreasonable to keep so many workman upon his hand without assistance, wich were eight people beseids MySelf. Att last it came to that conclusion the Master of ye Mint was to pay and Satisfy all the workman unter him, as long as occasion dit requiere it.

The Rottier had for ye Mint in the Tower beseides ther sallarys 300£
For the mint of Bristol ... ... ... ... ... 100
Chester ... ... ... ... ... 100
Exeter ... ... ... ... ... 100
Norwich ... ... ... ... ... 100
York ... ... ... ... ... 100

800

“The persons and Names of ye Workman Mr Harris employd for Engraving and ther weekly allowance—

Mr Bull
Mr Browne} for making Dyes each 20 Shill per weeke,
Mr Lowe (? or possibly Soane)
Mr King for making letters ... 20 Shillgs p
Mr Williams, Shmith ... 15 Shillgs
Mr Richd Fletcher Ditto ... 15 Shings
Mr Stafford a laborer ... 12 Shils
Mr Fleurois a frenchman labourer 12 Shils

in all per weeke ... 6£. 14 Shills p week.”

This paper forms part of a manuscript book collected by the late
Mr. Alchorne, an Assay Master at the Mint, and now in the British Museum. It deals almost entirely with Croker's medals under Anne and the succeeding monarchs, and contains much valuable matter, to which I shall have occasion to refer when treating of the early years of the eighteenth century. A few undated memoranda, such as the above, obviously from the hand of Croker himself, throw, however, some retrospective light on the past history of the mint, and from these scattered notes we see that nine subordinates, of whom Croker and Bull are the most important to our purpose, were employed by Harris, as against the smaller staff of six working under Roettier.

It is unfortunately not clear from the above whether either Croker or Bull was amongst Roettier's employees, and the fact that their official salary does not appear in the Treasury Papers until after his fall proves nothing, for he alone would have been responsible for their payment had they held private engagements under him.

But some of Croker's own words, contained in another memorial, preserved in the Alchorne collection, supply us with the actual day, otherwise unchronicled, of his first official connection with Harris: "It was Feby. ye 27th, 1696, when j entred upon busseness as Engraver of ye Mint under Harris."

Concerning most of the men mentioned in the memorandum quoted on our previous page as serving Harris, we know little or nothing. I find no trace of Browne, but "Mr. Lowe," if I read the name correctly, may be the "John Lowe" who was made assistant graver at Bristol in July, 1696, or again, although less probably, one of the two officials named Robert Lowe, whom Chamberlayne, in his Present State of Great Britain, mentions in 1727 and subsequent years as "Weigher and Teller" and as

3 Brit. Mus. Addit. 18,757, Mr. Croker's Case,—a memorial concerning the payment of a "Filer" or "Smith."
"Melter" respectively. The name "Mr. King" is reminiscent of one Samuel King, who, on February 10th, 1695–6, suggested a method for "edging the money." Richd. Fletcher should no doubt read Richard Fletcher, and this is a surname which reappears for a considerable period in Chamberlayne's lists in the days of George II., Ruben Fletcher being therein designated as a "Dye Forger," a position akin to that of "smith."

The constant recurrence of family names in the mint lists proves that, as in the case of many companies, the "Corporation" was a "close borough," and, so far as was possible, offices were held by its members from father to son, succeeding one another in places of trust, a not unnatural precaution for the safety of the coinage. Indeed, at a later period we find the moneyers complaining that when, as in the great recoinage, they had been obliged to employ a larger number of persons than their own ranks could supply, the coins had been subject to depredations, which they as a corporation had been obliged to make good.

But let us now endeavour to follow the familiar names of Croker and Bull, turning to the Treasury Papers that we may therein find the arrangement concluded in the year 1697, concerning the remuneration of the young German who remained upwards of forty years in the service of the Crown, engraving the coins of four successive sovereigns, i.e., William III., Anne, George I., and George II., assisted during the reigns of the first three of these monarchs by Samuel Bull.

We find mention of Croker in the Treasury Papers before the warrant, quoted in our last volume, directing that £50 a year, com-

1 Chamberlayne's Magna Britannia Notitia or the Present State of Great Britain, 1727, 1728, and 1735.
3 Chamberlayne, as above, 1727, p. 131; 1728, p. 142; 1729, p. 142; 1735, p. 201, etc.
4 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xc, No. 126, under date June, 1704. They stated that in the recoinage they had "to take to their assistance about 500 Labour."
mencing at Christmas, 1698, should be paid to Bull, and, indeed, earlier than the order for a similar salary assigned to his predecessor John Grillet recorded in a document of August in the above year, the latter having been employed since the previous December.

We have already noticed that the mint authorities in February, 1696–7, asserted their belief that Harris could "carry on the service" for a season, and that by the help of Croker he did so, making use of the puncheons and dies in stock in the Tower. It is, however, not until October that we find any definite mention of his salary, although we have his own statement that from the moment of Roettier's disgrace he began his work for the Crown under Harris, and the official pronouncement concerning his payment substantiates his assertion.

The minutes of the Treasury Board on October 29th, 1697, disclose the following information: "Mr. Harris said that out of his £325 a year Mr. Croker shall have £175 a year as Mr. Rotier had and has to get one or more young men to be instructed, Croker's salary to commence from Febr. last, and my Lords will allow on the Taxes of ye whole £325 a year. Mr. Harris will make a settle on him accordingly; he will live in the house, but pay for his Diet and he is to be ready to assist in instructing others."^4

Another memorial preserved in the Treasury Books, concerning the payment of a "Filer" under date October, 1733, claims for Croker that he had been thirty-six years in the service of the Crown, stating that "in Feb. 1696 he enter'd on the Business as Engraver of his Majt's Mint under Mr. Harris."^5 We see, therefore, that Croker was probably

---

1 See *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. viii, p. 268, note 1. Communication kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking of a "Treasury Warrant dated April, 1700, directed to the Master and Warden of the Mint to pay Mr. Bull, probationer engraver, a salary of £50 a year to commence from Christmas, 1698."

2 See *British Numismatic Journal*, as above. I understand from Mr. Hocking that a Treasury Warrant dated August 16th, 1698, appointed John Grillet to be a probationer engraver at a salary of £50 a year to commence from Christmas, 1697.


not employed by Roettier, or he would have referred to previous work, but whether Samuel Bull or Grillet had been amongst the late cunator's servants, and eventually received office under the Crown, who shall say? Excepting the information which I have just set before you concerning the latter's appointment from Christmas-time in 1697, I have found no details about Grillet, save a notice under date November 1st, 1699, reading: "Mr Newton proposes that ye Sallary of 50l a year wth was lately allow'd to Grillet as additional Engraver may be now allow'd to Mr Bull whch is agreed to." The name is not unknown in the annals of engraving, but it seems rash to endeavour to identify him with the Grillet mentioned by Nagler, Bolzenthal, and Ammon, because to this artist are attributed medals of John Wilhelm, Kürfurst of Pfalz Bayern and his wife between 1690 and 1711, and he is therefore unlikely to have been in England in 1699. To a Frenchman named Grillet are attributed certain engravings, but the information is too vague to clear our difficulty.

With regard to Croker I am making no new suggestion in assigning to him the major part in William III.'s coinage, but until now the fact that his official appointment immediately followed on the disgrace of Roettier has passed unrecorded.

Johann Crocker, better known under his anglicized appellation of John Croker, was born at Dresden on October 21st, 1670, the son of a wood carver, whose early death left him the eldest of several children dependent on his mother. His godfather, a goldsmith, took him as apprentice, and he was brought up as a jeweller, but whilst still young he embraced the career of a die-sinker, and after

1 Treasury Minutes, T. 29, vol. xi, p. 204.
2 See Nagler’s Künstler Lexikon, Band V, p. 376, Bolzenthal, p. 220, and F. L. Ammon’s Sammlung Berühmter Medailleur, No. 129.
4 In contemporary documents, such as the Alchorne M.S. of Croker’s designs, the name is spelt indifferently, Crocker and Croker, and is sometimes even printed as Croaker by Chamberlayne in his Mint lists. In the Treasury Papers the spelling is usually Croker, and he so signed it himself upon a medal of Anne.
"STATE-OF-BRITAIN" MEDAL,
visiting various places in Germany and Holland\textsuperscript{1} came to England in 1691.

It was not until April 7th, 1705,\textsuperscript{2} that he succeeded Henry Harris as chief engraver, and at the time of his application for this place, just then become vacant, it was stated that Henry Harris was “only a Seal-cutter and employed Mr. Croker to do the business of the Mint,”\textsuperscript{3} so we rest assured that all the cuneator’s work was left to Croker, assisted sometimes, as we now know, by his pupil Bull.

To Croker then, we must attribute most of the dies made after those provided by James Roettier were exhausted, and the obvious explanation we now offer, of his closer adherence at first to the type of his predecessor, lies in the desire for uniformity expressed by the officials at the Mint, “that the money may be all alike.” Amongst his earliest independent works, however, untrammelled by this necessity, we may cite one of his rare medals\textsuperscript{4} of William, commemorating the Peace of Ryswick, which, by the courtesy of Mr. Spink, I bring before you on our facing plate, and this portrait supplies a connecting link between the coinage shackled by the old traditions of low relief, and the highly embossed style of his later medallic or numismatic efforts, whilst the careful treatment of the hair and accessories reminds us of some of the patterns to which I shall have occasion to refer later.

The attribution of this medal to Croker is corroborated by a list at the commencement of the Alchorne Manuscript to which I have lately referred. This price list specifies the sum of £30 in gold, £1 17s. in silver, or 17s. in copper, for “A Large Medal of King William on the Peace of Reswick.”

It is probable that the remarkably high relief of the later coinage was in part, if not entirely, due to Isaac Newton, who endorsed, with

\begin{footnotes}
\item[2] Information kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking from the Mint Records, this being the date of the actual patent. Croker’s appointment is referred to in the Treasury Papers, vol. cxlii, p. 75, as being on March 10th, 1704-5, see minute to a memorial written in October, 1715.
\end{footnotes}
his colleagues, a petition that the cuneators should be allowed to make medals as conducive to a good currency under Anne,\(^1\) and it is interesting to watch its gradual development from the time that Newton succeeded Neale as Master of the Mint and assumed a more direct responsibility for the coinage,\(^2\) until in 1701 the gold presented almost as medallion an appearance as did that of the following reign. The gold coinage of this year, as noticed by Mr. Kenyon,\(^3\) was extremely large, owing to a proclamation of February 5th, 1700-1, fixing the value in England of the French louis d’or and Spanish pistoles at 17s. instead of 17s. 6d.,\(^4\) “which brought,” as he tells us, “such a vast quantity of them into the Mint that £1,400,000 was coined out of them.”\(^5\)

![Guinea of 1701, High Relief Type](image)

So great was the influx that it already amounted to £9,700 at the end of one week, and according to the Mint Records, it was resolved by the Warden and Master “for the greater help to the Importers, that

---

2. “The Warden or Keeper of Exchange of Bullion and new-coined Monies, is, by his office a Magistrate set over the Exchanges or Mints . . . he takes care of the Buildings and pays the Charges of Repairs . . . He supervises the whole process of the Coinage and pays the Charges thereof etc. etc. The Master upon any new Occasion of Coinage contracts with the King, by Indenture; and according to the Indenture, by the Assistance of his aforesaid Servants receives, melts, or refines, assays and allays the Gold and Silver to be coined etc. etc.” Commons’ Journals, vol. xi, p. 774.
5. I learn from Mr. Hocking that the amount of gold coined in the Tower between January, 1700-1, and the end of 1704, was £1,190,019, so the sum mentioned by Mr. Kenyon evidently extends over a longer period, probably beyond the death of William III., in March, 1701-2, for the King’s head would continue to appear upon Anne’s coinage until her dies were ready.
Influx of French Gold.
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Gold should be melted three times a week and paid out on Mondayes and Wednesdayes and Fridayes to continue during the great Importation of gold."¹ Burnet tells us it was suspected that much of this French money was sent over for purposes of bribery. "It is certain," writes he, "great sums came over this winter from France, the packet-boat came seldom without 10,000 louis d'ors, it brought often more; the nation was filled with them and in six months' time a million of guineas were coined out of them."²

FIVE-GUINEA PIECE OF 1701.

Here, then, we see the necessity for new puncheons, owing to the strain on the dies in use since 1699, and the outcome may be observed in the high-relief coinage—the five-guinea and the two-guinea piece and the second guinea of 1701. The two-guinea piece of 1699, figured by Ruding on Plate XVI, 14, is generally regarded as apocryphal, but the author seldom made a mistake, and there seems a possibility that it exists. As portrayed, it adhered to the older type and resembles the guinea of that date illustrated on the same plate and numbered 15, and if not included by mistake, must be regarded as a pattern of extreme rarity.³ The enormous quantity of gold coined may have suggested the re-issue in 1701, as a memento, of a two-guinea piece, which with the possible exception above cited of Ruding's example, had not

² Burnet's History of His Own Time, vol. iv, p. 474, ed. of 1833.
³ In the 1840 edition of Ruding, vol. ii, p. 362, note *, this two-guinea piece is qualified as unknown and supposed to be imaginary, see also Kenyon, p. 180.
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appeared since Mary's death, and it was utilized by the Mint officials for the most striking portrait of the whole of the new series, but the matter of the designer and of the engraver is somewhat puzzling.

At first sight we unhesitatingly ascribe the entire high-relief coinage to Croker, assimilating it with the bold execution of the currency which followed in the next reign, although the fine technique scarcely compensates for the singularly ugly portraiture of William. The treatment of the hair, albeit more boldly massed, reminds us of Croker's medal, facing our page 243 and compares, not unfavourably, with the fine pieces of Queen Anne, made when his art had attained its zenith, whilst the coarseness of portraiture recalls the elector guinea of George I.

ELECTOR GUINEA OF GEORGE I., 1714.

We conclude that the young German had shaken himself free from the trammels of a copyist and struck out a fresh line, although whether of his own initiative or by desire of his superiors is an undecided question. The technique of the new departure from the medallic point of view is admirable, whatever the portraiture may be, but the fact that very high relief is prejudicial to the duration of the coinage, militates against our admiration of these gold pieces, in that they violate the canons of art in not combining utility with beauty.

But the puzzling Mint Records, to which we have before referred, make us doubt whether Samuel Bull be not possibly the originator of these busts of the King. The same document which mentions the

2 Information kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking from MS. Mint Reports, concerning a list of puncheons with, in some cases, the name of the makers supplied, and remaining in stock on January 13th, 1701-2.
halfpence and farthings in stock at the Tower in 1702, speaks not only of shillings, but of head puncheons for the five-, one- and half-guinea pieces by Samuel Bull. These are, be it noted, in addition to other punches for all denominations of gold and silver, and the artist's name for this complete series not being given, we must believe that we see here the hand of Croker, be the designs new or merely in working order. No puncheon for the two-guinea piece is mentioned as being by Bull.

We are, therefore, faced by three possibilities. We may believe that Croker and Bull worked together at the new coinage—duplicate puncheons being required, owing to the press of die sinking—and that Croker had finished a head for the two-guinea piece, so far not reproduced by Bull. Or we may prefer to think that the coins designed by the latter were never struck, owing to William's death—and only Croker's dies are known to us—or again we may assume that the 1701 coinage is attributable to Bull alone, and he had not completed the two-guinea puncheon when the inventory was drawn up in January, 1700-1. We cannot suppose his puncheons were those for the earlier

1 The half-guinea piece of the high-relief type is, so far as I can ascertain, unknown to collectors, but it should have been issued, for a punch resembling the bust on the two-guinea piece is to be seen in the Mint Collection, Mint Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 15, No. 196. The punch is not much worn by use.

2 I have not been able to ascertain at what period of the year 1701 the two-guinea piece was first issued, but I learn from Mr. Hocking that a trial of the pyx covering the period from December 23rd, 1699, to August 6th, 1701, included five-guinea pieces, but no specimens of the value of two guineas. It is, therefore, clear that they, if intended for currency at all, were not amongst the earlier coinage of 1701. It is even possible that they
coins of 1699, for we are met by the same difficulty we discussed on pages 267 and 268 of our last volume concerning the halfpence and farthings, namely, that they were not at the Mint, when in April, 1700, an earlier inventory was taken, and a shilling only was specified as being by Bull. If Croker be not responsible for any part of the 1701 coinage, and if the second set of puncheons, including a head for the double guinea in the Mint list, be those preserved from the year 1699, then Ruding in figuring a two-guinea piece at that date was probably not in error. Since we find that Bull’s name is not connected with designs for gold in the list of April, 1700, at which time only a shilling had been officially catalogued as his, obviously the honours of the earlier productions remain with Croker.\(^1\) Although in much higher relief the gold pieces of 1701 indicate, like the contemporaneous copper, an advance in workmanship, and we have in the time of Anne a good deal of evidence that Bull was a very able artist. The high-relief coins are, however, so nearly allied to Croker’s productions that it is almost futile, unless we have signatures or documentary evidence to guide us, to attempt discrimination between the artists. A little later the initials of Croker on the obverses and of Bull on the reverses of medals under Anne occasionally prove the similarity in their technique, and the fact that the pupil, were issued after the king’s death. The date would remain unaltered upon the coins until Anne’s dies were ready, apart from the fact that coins struck in February and March would still be correctly dated 1701 according to the old style.

\(^1\) See *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. viii, p. 267. Information kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking from the *MS. Mint Records* of April 13th, 1700, attributing one shilling to Bull, whilst mentioning a sequence of other coins not from his hand.
although inclined towards a bolder method, sometimes subordinated his style to that of his master, corroborates our impression that both pupil and master did but obey the directions of the authorities at the Mint.

The high-relief coinage in a less accentuated form continued its sway, and under George II., before John Croker died in March, 1740-1, his style had already been as successfully imitated by Sigismund Tanner as we believe it had been copied under the preceding sovereign by Samuel Bull. The petition, dated January 30th, 1728-9, for permission to bind Tanner as apprentice-engraver, which was granted by a warrant on March 5th, 1728-9, speaks of Croker as "his Ma’s first graver, the only one now living who has hitherto made Puncheons for Heads on the Coins," it is, therefore, clear that Bull was then dead. The exact date of his death I have so far been unable to ascertain, but on the accession of George I. his position at the Mint under Croker was ratified on September 14th, 1715, and his name figures until the year 1726 inclusive, but not after that date in Chamberlayne’s lists of Mint officers, as the “Second Engraver.” The post of “Deputy Engraver” being, however, held by John Rolles in his stead in 1727, according to Anglia Notitia, suggests a temporary measure, and I understand from Mr. Hocking that the latter’s appointment was made in September, 1726, and that he passed on to the office of Seal Engraver about a year later. The place of Assistant Engraver is left blank in the years 1728 and 1729 by Chamberlayne.

But to return to the coinage of William III. The guinea of the new type was not amongst the first coins issued in 1701, for examples are found so dated with the obverse in use in 1700, and, indeed, from 1697 onward.

---

1 The “old head” coinage of George II., attributed to Tanner, was issued upon the gold in 1739—the silver in 1743, and the copper in 1740.

2 See King’s Warrants, T. 52, vol. xxxvi, pp. 281-3. From the warrant it appears that Tanner had been a candidate for the post since Christmas, 1728, from which time he had been “Making Specimens by way of Tryal.”

Amongst the puncheons in the Royal Mint, one bearing this bust of a broader and more finished type than its predecessors is referred by Mr. Hocking to the guinea of 1698, and is attributed by him to John Croker. It will be remembered that I gave on page 271 of our last volume the date 1697 as that of the introduction of this head, a fact not mentioned by Mr. Kenyon. I have an example of this very rare coin.

The only other guinea I have seen of this date bears the earlier bust from the hand of Roettier, which had been in use since 1695.

We notice, therefore, that the change of hand found in the workmanship of the gold coincided with that upon the silver, and was consequent upon

2 See the illustration in our last volume, p. 271, and note 1 on that page.
3 Lot 890, Montagu Collection.
the dismissal of James Roettier, being perhaps more marked than
the slight difference seen upon the less valuable metal, which at the
moment absorbed all the activity of the Mint. To return, then, to the
fact that it is not until 1698 that we discern any real tendency to
higher relief in shillings, and that in the rest of the silver this develop-
ment never occurs, and let us review the currency from the crown to
the sixpence of William III.

I understand from Mr. Hocking that the issue of silver in
1695 was very small, being only £62; we must therefore, I
think, assume that nearly all the crowns and shillings dated '95
made their appearance between January 1st and March 24th of
1695-6; and the first reference in the Treasury Papers to any
particular coins coming within these dates shows that half-crown
patterns also existed.

On February 19th, 1695-6, then, we find Harris showing
William "2 Puncheons for Crowns and ½ Crowns, which he thinks
better than those of Rotiers." The royal criticism is not recorded,
and we are left in uncertainty as to whether Harris was exhibiting an
effort of his own or trying to introduce some young engraver, such as
John Croker or Samuel Bull, to the King’s notice. We know not even
whether these pieces yet remain. I have seen no patterns for 1695,
and some proofs of 1696 in the National Collection appear to be
restrikes of the accepted coinage, taken from dies which must be
credited to Roettier.

There are in the British Museum two differing and curious pattern
crowns, the King’s hair falling across his breast, the date 1696 and the
edge inscribed OCTAVO, which is too late, therefore, for the February
in question, which should, according to the old style, read 1695, and
one of these is suggestive of Croker’s early manner, for it resembles
the “State-of-Britain” medal, illustrated facing our page 243, in the
narrowness of William’s face and in the highly curled, almost wiry,
locks of the wig. We cannot, however, suppose that this is the actual

1 Treasury Minutes, T. 29, vol. viii, p. 159.
2 Catalogued by Marshall in his View of the Silver Coins, No. 233, and illustrated by
Mr. Graham in Num. Chron., 4th series, vol. vi, Plate XXIV as No. 5.
pattern submitted to the King in February, 1695–6, purposely postdated with a view to the fact that it probably would not be issued before March 25th, for the details of the reverse decoration assimilate it with coinage of the latter part of 1696 rather than with the beginning of that year.¹

This bust is not reproduced, so far as I can ascertain, in a half-crown, but I think I recognize the same hand in the finely curling hair of a pattern shilling in the National Collection, dated 1699, which, together with a unique sixpence of the year 1696,² similar to the crown I have the pleasure of illustrating.

A punch for a half-guinea by the same artist, and agreeing in type, is in the Mint Museum.³

¹ The numeral octavo shows that this coin was struck between February 13th, 1695–6, and February 12th, 1696–7, but the hooked vertical harp on the reverse, a type which became general in 1697, leads us to assign it to the latest possible date. The placing of the stops, alternately only in the legend, agrees with this date. See Num. Chron., as above.

² Num. Chron., as above, Plate XXV, p. 11.

If, however, these coins be by John Croker, it is curious that they should not have come into use after his appointment; besides this, a crown dated OCTAVO could not be within the scope of the artist's official work.¹ It is, of course, possible that each of these coins represents an effort on the part of Croker to obtain the place of graver, and in this light we may suggest that the crown and sixpence were made by him at the moment when James Roettier was suspended from office early in February, 1696–7, as evidences of his skill before the restrictions as to change of portraiture had been imposed by the Mint authorities. The date of the shilling precludes it from forming an actual part of such a series, unless we believe that Croker produced the die subsequently from a puncheon, made in his earlier manner, contemporaneously with the crown and sixpence. The puncheon for half-a-guinea, bearing a similar portrait—No. 197 in the Mint Museum—throws no light on the matter, being undated, and I have seen neither die nor coin made from this punch.

The workmanship of these examples is far superior to that of the other pattern crown of 1696,² which is reproduced in a sixpence of extreme rarity in 1696³ and less rarely in 1697.⁴ Besides my own,

I have seen two specimens of the earlier date, one in the British Museum, and the second in the collection of Colonel Morrieson, but none

¹ Neither crown nor sixpence is in the fine state usually found in patterns—the shilling is a proof. All three are of extreme rarity, possibly unique.
of the three is in such condition as would denote them to be patterns. Moreover, although by no means common, I have had the opportunity of examining nine specimens pertaining to the year 1697, and minute differences in the reverse dies, such as the number and position of the strings in the harp, etc., declare that their issue at the Tower must have extended over a considerable period. The date, as we have seen, in the first issue precludes our belief that this portrait with the large head, curiously unlike the usual rendering of the King's features, was a final challenge to Roettier in July, 1697, by Harris, according to the competition suggested by Roettier to the Treasury authorities, which I quoted on page 272 of our last volume. But the fact that the sixpence came into circulation after Roettier's disgrace, and that it bears no likeness to his workmanship, neither to that of Bull, if we may be guided by his few signed medals, nor to that of Croker, leads me tentatively to suggest that the crown and sixpence represent a not very successful contribution by Harris himself, or by some undergraver whom he temporarily employed with a view to maintaining his own position, in the February of 1696–7.

With the year 1698 we come at last to a marked change of portraiture and treatment in the silver. The copies of the Roettier coinage were gradually superseded by the flaming-hair shilling, shown in our last volume on page 217, which reigned for two years, 1698 and 1699; but it was not long unchallenged if, as we read in Hawkins'  

---

1 Most of the examples which I have seen have transverse strings, varying in number from four to five. Mr. Graham, however, has kindly shown me two specimens with a vertical stringed harp, one having a blundered legend. See Num. Chron., as before, p. 380. The hooked vertical harp became more general towards the end of the year 1697.
Silver Coins, a specimen existed of the "high-hair" type dated 1698. This entirely new bust in turn held sway during 1699, 1700 and 1701.

Again we are met by the impossibility of disentangling the work of Bull from that of Croker, shilling puncheons by both artists figuring in the Mint lists as being in stock in 1700 and 1701-2. The King looks younger upon this final shilling than upon its predecessors, but its greatest peculiarity, especially if we look at the proofs, such as that here illustrated, lies in the tendency, which we cannot fail to notice, towards a higher relief. Hawkins says: "In 1699 a shilling was struck, very different from any of the preceding, in high relief," so also writes Marshall, and again, we cannot forbear wondering whether this may be the shilling for which a puncheon by Bull is mentioned as being in stock in April, 1700, a precursor perhaps of the curious portrait later seen upon the gold, for the pattern illustrated on our page 252 is not in sufficiently high relief for us to identify it with the

---

2. MS. Mint Records.
5. MS. Mint Records.
description given above by Hawkins and Marshall. But enough of the shillings: let us return to the larger coins, although the ordinary crowns throw little light upon the matter of the engravers, as regards their workmanship. The five-shilling pieces with the curved breast-plate were replaced in the course of 1696 by a fresh bust, the armour taking a straighter line; but as these commonly exist with OCTAVO on the edge, they must have been issued before Roettier’s departure. It has been noted by various authors that Mr. Cuff possessed a curious crown of 1697, an exact description of which is lacking. Hawkins, who no doubt saw it, calls it a rare variety.\(^1\) Marshall writes that it is “not like either No. 234 or 235, but between the two” (i.e., between

\(^1\) Hawkins, p. 393.
\(^2\) Marshall, p. 38, No. 236.
with hair flowing across the breast. There is in the British Museum a crown of 1697, with edge inscribed NONO, purchased at the Cuff sale in 1654, which I am permitted to illustrate, and not only has Mr. Graham, as he kindly informs me, acquired (since writing his article) a precisely similar piece, but so also has Colonel Morrieson, the type following that of the ordinary coin of the preceding year.

I was anxious to ascertain whether Mr. Cuff possessed any other specimen which had not found its way into his sale, and by the courtesy of Mr. Webster, who is the fortunate possessor of the late Mr. Cuff's copy of Ruding's Annals, annotated by his own hand, I was enabled to study his note on the subject. I find that he wrote against Ruding, Plate XXXVI, 1 (i.e., the type with the curved cuirass), "I have a crown dated 1697, I do not know another." I believe, therefore, that Mr. Cuff merely deemed his coin, mistakenly, as we now know, to be unique, for it is not very likely that his reference was to the curved cuirass of 1695, which had been already discarded in 1696. The fact that, with these rare exceptions, we find no crowns in 1697, nor, indeed, until 1700, requires some explanation. Although no crowns were

issued by the country mints, the large quantity put forth in London in 1696 had possibly supplied the market sufficiently, for we have seen that the profit to the workmen was greater in making large coins than small. Neale had with some difficulty induced them to strike

---

1 Num. Chron., as before, p. 368.
2 Cuff Catalogue, Lot 1420. This was the only 1697 crown in the Cuff sale.
shillings and *sixpences rather than crowns and half-crowns.1 It is extremely curious that the records of the output seldom agree with the rarity of coins at this day, and we shall see that the scarcity of guineas dated 1697 is a matter no more easily explained. The entire gold coinage from January, 1696–7, to the end of the current year was, as I learn from Mr. Hocking, £120,447.2 It is true that this computation includes three months, which should bear date 1696, according to old style, instead of 1697, and I cannot tell what proportion should be allotted to half-guineas, a coin which is, however, also rare in the latter year. A very large number of guineas had been required by the King for payment of the troops, when, as we have seen, the price of these coins had risen enormously, owing to the fact that our defective silver was not received in foreign markets. Whilst the price of the guinea was high, the Royal Mint coining free of expense, produced a large quantity for private persons, to whose interest it was to turn ingots into currency in order to profit by the exchange, and a bill was discussed and passed in February, 1695–6,3 to take off the obligation, imposed in the time of Charles II.,4 to coin guineas, which interfered with the rapid output of silver. Thomas Neale placed before the House of Commons a list of these "private persons," for whom this office had been performed, between Lady Day, 1695, and the following February 13th, 1695–6, the number of coins amounting to 721,280 guineas.5 In spite of the great quantity here specified, the guinea of 1695 is not reckoned especially common, perhaps because it was very largely exported during the war, and this heavy demand continued throughout

---

2 MS. *Mint Records*.
3 The obligation to coin guineas was taken off between March 2nd, 1695–6, and the following January, but an Act of the succeeding year reduced this period to November 10th, 1696, 7th and 8th *Gul. III.*, c. 13. See also *Commons' Journals*, vol. xi, pp. 449, 457 and 464—1695–6. The Bill passed the Commons, February 24th, 1695–6.
4 18th *Carol. II.*, c. 5, 1666.
5 *Commons' Journals*, as above, p. 446, February 13th, 1695–6. The total gold coinage of the year 1695 n.s. was £717,218, whence it appears that the greater part of the coinage must have been for private persons.
The Gold Coinage of 1697 and 1698.

The output of 1696 was, nevertheless, a little larger than that of 1697, which is curious, seeing the regulations to prevent the gold issue from hampering the silver. We find the officers of the Mint called into the Treasury Chamber on February 12th, 1695-6, and instructed that "none of the Gold is to be coyned till the silver first delivered be dispatched." It was, however, later specified by Act of Parliament that "one or more Mill or Mills—Presse or Presses" should specially be set aside for coining gold, and that all others should be devoted to the recoinage of the silver, but that "they should be kept in distinct amounts and not interfere one with another."

In September, 1698, a report was submitted to the House of Commons by John Locke and others, on the propriety of lowering the value of the guinea from 22s. to 21s. 6d., because the high price at which it stood caused too large an importation of gold, and it is mentioned that 250,713 guineas had been coined between the preceding May 1st and September 12th in 1698. I learn from the Royal Mint that between January and December in that year the gold coinage reached £471,666, and, owing to the lowering of the value of the guinea, to the adequate supply of silver which had re-established our credit abroad, and to the fact that the Peace of Ryswick, signed in September, 1697, had put an end to the constant drain on the country, no necessity arose for an abnormally large issue of gold again until the year 1701, of which we have already spoken.

It is noticeable that regulations temporarily relieving the Mint authorities from the obligation to coin guineas between March 2nd, 1695-6, and the following November, made an exception in favour of

1 £138,617 in the twelve months, beginning January, 1695-6. We have seen that between March 2nd and the following November 10th the Mint was not under obligation to coin gold. See note 3 of previous page.
3 8° and 9° Gul. III., c. 1, Statutes, vol. vii, pp. 161 and 162, 1696-7. This Act repealed that of the former year, and enacted that from November 10th, 1696, one or more mills should be devoted to the coining of gold.
4 The Silver Pound, p. 252.
5 The gold issue between January and the ensuing December was £141,377 in 1699, £120,212 in 1700, £1,190,019 in 1701.
the South African Company, directing that bullion supplied by this body should be issued in the form of half-guineas, and I learn, therefore, without surprise, that coins so dated are not uncommon. Little of interest attaches to the type of the half-guinea, and the specimens which I place before you prove that little, if any, change of portrait is to be found in these coins, which agree better with Roettier’s bust upon the
guinea from 1695–97 than with Croker’s dies which followed. We have seen that a high-relief puncheon, which has suffered little use, is preserved in the Royal Mint, and no doubt this type would have superseded the above had William lived. Another puncheon, accompanied by two dies in the same Museum, recalls absolutely the bust of William on the halfpence and farthings made during the lifetime of Mary, such as Montagu 3, which I illustrate, by the kindness of Mr. Weightman, and Montagu 15, etc.

2 Mint Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 15. Punch No. 196. See also our p. 247, note r.
This bust of William reappeared on copper pieces alone, and were it not for the half-guinea dies, we might imagine the puncheon to have belonged to the copper series. As it is, we must regard both dies and puncheon as suggestive of rejected patterns from the hand of Norbert Roettier, before his departure for France. The punch shows signs of wear, but this can be accounted for, since it may have been used for the halfpence and farthings. Of another punch for a half-guinea with slightly curled hair, like the rare sixpence of 1696, I have already spoken.¹

The question of the Scottish coinage was touched upon by me in our seventh volume² and need not detain us long, for it is unnecessary to recapitulate the ample evidence given by the late Mr. Cochran-Patrick as to the engraver of William’s issues in gold in 1701, and in silver and copper from 1695 onwards, the coins clearly emanating from one hand, and that the hand of James Clark.³ The busts on the Scottish currency are well engraved, but singularly ungraceful, and it is matter of regret that the practice pursued on the accession of William and Mary of sending puncheons and sample dies from England had been temporarily abandoned. It was, however, natural that in the stress of work caused by the great recoinage in England, recourse should be had to the assistance of a special graver for the Scottish mint.

³ Records of the Coinage of Scotland, vol. ii, pp. 244, 249, 256, and 278.
On November 6th, 1698, we notice the despatch to Ireland of some coin-weights, but I have seen few references to the monetary affairs of the Sister Isle after the withdrawal of the gun money.

The *Treasury Papers* under date September 1st, 1698, inform us that the Lords of the Treasury agreed to the report of the officers of the Mint "on the proposal of a mint in Ireland," but we are not informed of the terms of this "proposal."

Other documents, however, throw some light on this affair, for we find that before the death of Queen Mary a request was sent from Dublin for the grant of a local establishment for "coyning Silver monies at 11 per cent. Lighter than it is now in their Ma's Mint in the Tower," but it was hampered by this suggestion of lowering the standard, which did not meet with the approval of the London officials. The Lord Lieutenant—Lord Methuen—and others of his Council had advised this course, and were met by a report, under date November 4th, 1693, proving that a reduction of even one per cent. might be very prejudicial on the required issue of £50,000 and far more so, if the above proposal were carried out. The officers stated their opinion "that if their Majies shall be pleased to cause a mint to be erected in Ireland, It will be much to their Honour, Justice and Interest to establish it upon the same Standard both in weight and fineness of that of England, and to be altered from time to time as that shall be and not otherwise." Again, on June 19th, 1694, the Commissioners of Revenue, amongst whom was a future Lord Mayor of Dublin, Bartholomew Van Homrigh, concerning whom we shall hear more anon, resumed the vexed question and spoke of ten per cent. below standard as a possible solution of the problem. Excepting ducatoons, equalling 6s., there was hardly any silver, and the guinea, they stated, was at that time current in Ireland for 23s., whilst it reached but 22s. in England. Difficulties were experienced in exchanging the tin halfpence, and the scarcity of small money was

---


very great. The mint officers on July 4th, 1694, brought forward their former report, but in spite of their admission that an Irish mint might be required, no silver coinage was specially made for the Sister Isle under William, either before or after Mary's demise, and so far as I am aware, the halfpence of 1695 and 1696 form the only Irish issue between the death of the Queen and the advent of the House of Hanover, when William Wood's patents created great excitement. We notice, however, the recurrence of this question, for Lord Fairfax and William Russell, in May, 1701, fruitlessly petitioned for permission to coin copper pence, halfpence, and farthings for Ireland, and for purposes of export. On the plea that the extant grants "for coynage of Copper money in England and the Plantations and Collonys beyond seas is already expired or very nearly expiring," they, whilst pressing for the colonial patent, mentioned the postponement of the Irish matter, until Lord Rochester, the new Lord Lieutenant, should be established at Dublin. The subject of instituting an Irish mint was fully discussed at the Treasury Council on June 6th and 10th, 1701, with the result that the King was requested "to have an Instrucion given to Ld Lt of Ireland to Rep^ upon his arrivall in that Kingdome, whether the want of smaller species of English mo. be very great and very prejudiciall to the Trade of that Kingdom, what the charge may be of Erecting a Mint to coyn the foreign Silver mo. now current there into the Smaller Species of English mony, and whether there be a sufficient quantity of Forreign mony there for that purpose. To the end an authority may be given by his Maty to his Exc^ to Erect a Mint there either for two or 3 years as he shall report it necessary." Whether

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxiv, No. 22. Calendared 1697-1701, p. 492. Minuted May 14th, 1701, "Not granted." See also Treasury Minutes, T. 29, vol. xii, p. 279, "Lord Fairfax Mem", about Coining Copper Money read. It cannot be granted." It is beyond our province here to pursue the subject of colonial issues, but those interested in the subject will find a proposition from one Samuel Davis to coin copper, or "mixt metall," with "severall mottoes and devices for ye severall colonys" in the same year. See Cal. Treasury Papers, 1697-1701, p. 507, vol. lxxv, No. 13.

2 Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, was named Lord Lieutenant on December 12th, 1700, but his departure was delayed until September, 1701.
the King's death put a stop to the project we do not know, but we hear no more of an Irish coinage in his reign.

The subject of the lesser values in currency leads us to some remarks on the small pieces commonly called Maundy money, and the vexed question as to the groat of 1702, with its puzzling date belonging to a period within the reign of Anne, according to the old style of reckoning, inasmuch as William, dying on March 8th, 1701–2, did not see the beginning of 1702.

This die must either have been prepared a few weeks beforehand, as a projected issue of currency or for the bestowal on Thursday, April 2nd, of the Maundy dole. All evidence, so far as I am able to ascertain, tends to prove that the dates in use upon the coinage at this period adhered to the old style, and all thought of the groat's appearance before William's death is therefore discountenanced, but, of course, dies were often sunk in anticipation. For whichever purpose this particular die was engraved, I incline to assign the bulk of these coins to currency rather than to charitable distribution, for the fact that they, although not absolutely common, are not very rare, leads me to believe that they were not struck only as Maundy money by the King's successor. Anne may very likely have made use of them for both purposes, pending the readiness of her own dies, although the still smaller pieces not having been finished, the lack of uniformity must have been apparent, whilst the anomaly of date was unavoidable. There is much evidence that small silver was in regular demand for circulation, and although commonly known to collectors of Stuart and later coins as "Maundy money," it is clear that pieces under sixpence in value are found too frequently to represent solely the gifts presented at Easter-time. Neither can we omit to notice, on the other hand, that
during certain years the necessary doles are not known to us, being either lost or unprovided. Possibly the currency of foregoing dates supplied the deficiency if—and this is uncertain, the distribution always included silver pence to represent the age of the sovereign, besides gold, clothing, and provisions. None of these little coins have been seen bearing William's effigy alone dated 1694–5–6 or 7, and the Maundy distribution of March 21st, 1694–5, would call for the first of these doles, specimens being also required in 1696 and 97. Regarded as currency we should not expect to find pieces dated earlier than 1695, and we might suggest that the objection raised by the workmen to the carrying out of an indenture, ordering that eighteen ounces in every hundredweight of silver should "be in groats, threepences, twopences and pence," might account for the hiatus in 1696 and 1697, during the great recoinage, whilst the small total of this metal coined in 1695 would answer for the lack of pieces in the currency of that year.  

It is believed that William took no personal part in the distribution of Maundy gifts, but that they were dispensed by the Lord High Almoner. By the courtesy of the Secretary of His Majesty's Almonry, I learn that the form taken by the doles varied at different periods, and that "between 1688 and 1724 the records are rather vague," but of this more anon, for we must reconsider the subject in our next volume in the light of Anne's part in this matter.

We know that William discarded the ceremony of touching performed by his predecessors on the throne, so that no touchpiece bears his name nor that of his wife, and it was wittily, if somewhat flippantly, said by Miss Strickland that "William the Conqueror and William the Hollander had equally repudiated the claim of healing the sick, because they were too much occupied in killing those who were well."  

1 M.S. Treasury Papers, vol. xlii, No. 37.  
3 See article published in The Guardian of April 5th, 1893.  
4 Queens of England, vol. viii, p. 199. The attitude of William I. towards "touching" is conjectural, there is, however, as Dr. Raymond Crawford tells us in The King's Evil, pp. 21 and 30, lack of evidence of "healing" by him and the immediately succeeding monarchs in England.
It is told of him that only on one occasion did he consent to touch for the "King's Evil," when instead of the usual formula he merely said to the patient: "God give you better health and more sense." When he saw people flocking to Hampton Court, before it was known that he did not claim this "right divine," he ordered their departure with characteristic bluntness: "It is a silly superstition, give the poor creatures some money and send them away."

William was not easily led by the opinions of others, and we do not know how far the king himself may have sifted matters as regards James Roettier, but it cannot be said that either Neale or Newton pressed the appointment of Croker, or unjustly upheld the claims of Harris as opposed to those of the Roettier family. On the contrary, eighteen months after the disgrace of the cuneator, namely, in August, 1698, in forwarding one of Roettier's complaints concerning himself and those dependent upon him, the Warden and Master remark: "We believe the Petition may be true, and that James Roettier is very capable of making medals, and on that score deserves his Maj's favour."

We are glad to find this paper minuted "½ a year to be paid."

But even although Newton may personally have deemed the suppliant deserving, he was obliged to hedge him about with precautions while employing him at the mint, as the following letter of October 22nd, 1698, will show: "Sir, Pray let Mr. James Roettiers have the use of the great Crown Press in the long Press-room for coyning Medalls, and let some person you can confide in attend to see that Mr. Roettiers make no other use of the said press or press-room there for coyning Medalls.—To Mr. John Braint, Provost of the Moniers," signed "Is. Newton."

Were it not that the date of this letter brings us just within the

---

2 Ibid., and Ernest Law's History of Hampton Court Palace, vol. iii, p. 4.
4 Letter quoted from the Tower Records by Mr. Doyne Courtney in The Chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula, p. 290.
The Dublin Collar and Badge.

The mayoralty at Dublin of Thomas Quin, the successor of Van Homrigh, we might have believed that the medal produced by James Roettier when the "great Crown Press" was placed at his disposal, might be identified with the fine portrait of William III., perhaps the best work of the artist, which was presented, attached to a massive SS collar, in 1698 to the city of Dublin during the period when Bartholomew Van Homrigh was in office. The father of Esther, better known as the unfortunate "Vanessa" of Swift, was himself a Dutch merchant and shipowner from Amsterdam, who had preceded William from Holland and had obtained places of profit, being Alderman of Dublin before the Revolution. He made himself useful to his distinguished fellow countryman as Commissary-General to King William in the Irish army.¹ I find in the Calendar of Treasury Papers a request preferred by him stating on January 16th, 1696-7, that he expected to be elected Mayor, and asking the king's permission to accept the office in addition to his duty in the "affairs of the revenue."² The minute "My Lords approve" apparently placed matters on a satisfactory footing, for Van Homrigh was elected Lord Mayor of Dublin on April 16th, 1697, and came into office on October 15th of that year, and three days later, on the 18th-28th of the same month, William at his Court of Loo in Holland, signed and dated, according to the new style, a royal warrant authorizing the making of the collar at his request. "The cost was estimated at £770 and was to be paid out of the Irish revenue," as we learn from a modern writer.³ For the task James Roettier was selected, for the medal was to be "made in England by the most skilful workman or artist in things of that kind." It was to be worn, suspended in the form of a badge, by Van Homrigh and his successors in office, but whether it was finished in time for this civic dignitary long to enjoy it, we cannot say for certain, for his tenure of the post terminated on October 21st, 1698,

¹ The English Court in Exile, by Edwin and Marion Grew, p. 207. See also Sir Frederick Falkiner's Foundation of the Hospital in Dublin, pp. 116-9.
³ The Foundation of the Hospital of Charles II. in Dublin by Sir Frederick Falkiner, p. 119. We find therein noted that a surplus remained of £250, and this, in July, 1701 the city voted should be applied to the purchase of three gold chains for the Mayor and Sheriffs of the city in succession. See also Gilbert's Calendar, vol. vi, p. viii.
namely, the Friday after Michaelmas-day, that being the date when the
change of mayor was usually effected in the Irish capital, at the end of
the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{1}

We see, however, from various letters printed by Sir John Gilbert
in the appendix to his Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin, that the
matter was somewhat long in hand.\textsuperscript{2} Van Homrigh, on July 3rd,
refers to his request for the medal as having been made, he must
therefore have petitioned the King on the subject whilst only
Lord Mayor designate. He states that he is most anxious that the
"collar of SS with his majestie's effegies thereon may be got ready
and if possible may be here before Michaelmas next." Renewed
appeals for speed followed on July 9th, addressed to William's
secretary Blathwayt, and produced the warrant from the King,
but delay still baffled Van Homrigh, who wrote again on August
20th. However, William's signature on October 18th and finally
a warrant from the Irish Lords Justices on November 27th, 1697,
made all things sure, and it was ordered that the ornament should
be finished and delivered. The fact that the medal bears date 1698
proves that some months elapsed before Van Homrigh finally secured
his bauble, but another document, printed by Sir John Gilbert under
date July 22nd, 1698, recorded the services of the Lord Mayor in
having obtained the gift "without any charge or expence to this citty;"
and the consequent presentation to him of £100 as a mark of Dublin's
gratitude.\textsuperscript{3} We must therefore conclude that the decoration was worn
by Bartholomew Van Homrigh.

But why was a chain of office at this time specially desired?

\textsuperscript{1} From information kindly supplied by Mr. Burtchaell, Athlone Pursuivant of Arms, and
from Gilbert's Calendar, vol. i, p. 73, and vol. v, pp. 500 and 519, I learn that Bartholomew
Van Homrigh became a member of the Common Council of Dublin about the year 1685,
was named an Alderman in the new charter granted to the city by James II., October 27th,
1697, but was removed from office for being absent in England in July, 1689. After the
old corporation was restored by William III. he was elected Sheriff, April 24th, 1691, and
the same day an Alderman, which excused him from serving as Sheriff, whence his election
as Mayor followed in due course.

\textsuperscript{2} Gilbert's Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin, vol. vi, Appendix v, pp. 605-9.
\textsuperscript{3} Gilbert, vol. vi, pp. 199, 200.
THE "DUBLIN MEDAL" OF 1698. MED. ILL., VOL. II, P. 197, NO. 509.
We learn from the *Medallic Illustrations of British History* that "the collar which Charles II. had presented to the Lord Mayor of Dublin was carried off by Sir Michael Creagh during the contest between William and James," but the capital of Ireland held out bravely for the latter king until July, 1690, and the recently published *Stuart Papers* show that it was Creagh's successor in office who delivered the chain and medal to the exiled family. We have now before us the information that on September 27th, 1695, James II. sent the following warrant to Sir Terence M'Dermott, "late Lord Mayor of Dublin": "Whereas the chain or collar and medal of gold belonging to the City of Dublin was delivered to you by Sir William Ellis, chamberlain and treasurer of the said city, when you entered into the Mayoralty, and is now remaining in your hands, and whereas we have not yet determined in whose custody the said chain and medal ought to remain during our absence from our kingdoms, whether in yours as the last Mayor of the city, or in Sir W. Ellis' custody as chamberlain and treasurer thereof, our will and pleasure is that you forthwith deliver them to the said Sir W. Ellis to be deposited in our hands and preserved by us for our said city." The further vicissitudes of the original ornament are unknown to me, but we see on our facing plate the type of its remplaçant which King William presented to the Corporation with the new collar, for it was in all respects similar to the silver example which I show from the National Collection. It is, of course, possible that the king called upon Roettier to make additional

---

1 *Med. Ill.,* vol. ii, p. 197, No. 509. Sir Michael Creagh was Lord Mayor of Dublin from 1688 to 1689, being elected on the second Friday after Easter, 1688, i.e., on April 26th, and it would seem from the document quoted below from the *Stuart Papers* that he must have ceded the collar to his successor, Terence M'Dermott, who was knighted by James II. during his tenure of office on May 14th, 1690. Michael Creagh had received his knighthood in 1686.

2 Terence M'Dermott was Lord Mayor of Dublin from 1689 to 1690, being elected on the second Friday after Easter in 1689, i.e., on April 12th.

3 *Stuart Papers,* vol. i, p. 108; Entry Book 3, p. 77. James would, of course, not recognize appointments made after the City of Dublin fell into the hands of William.

4 By the courtesy of Mr. Campbell, Town Clerk of Dublin, I learn that the chain with the portrait attached by a gold ring, smelted on to the medal so as to form a badge, is still worn on special occasions by the Lord Mayor of Dublin.
specimens of this medal, which, as we see, is not unique, although very rare, and a further supply may have been required by William in October, 1698, after the original ornament had been presented.

Amongst the relics of the Roettiers in the British Museum, to which I have so often had occasion to refer, is a large unfinished puncheon portraying William III.—helmeted as a Roman warrior—a not unnatural guise for the victor at the termination of the war in a time when classical emblems reigned supreme.

So far as our knowledge takes us, no completed version of this design exists, and in our uncertainty as to the precise day or even month of James Roettier’s death, we are tempted to wonder whether he expired before his dies were ready, and was therefore unable to profit by Newton’s permission of access to the mint. The workmanship of this puncheon bespeaks the hand of James Roettier, and its presence in the collection makes it almost certain that we owe it to him, for his father would design no portrait of William, even if we could pronounce it good enough for attribution to him. No reverse presents itself, and this is also the case with regard to a similarly unfinished puncheon of Mary, a design which I take the opportunity of placing before you as a possible, although unlikely, complement to the obverse representing her husband at so late a date.
There is yet another portrait of William III. executed after the Mint Enquiry had robbed the engraver of his position of cuneator, which, after comparison with many specimens of the artist's work, Mr. Grueber and I, in consultation, decided should be tentatively...
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

ascribed to James Roettier. It forms one of the series of silver clichés published by Mr. Grueber in the Appendix to *Medallic Illustrations of British History*, and I gave my reasons in our seventh volume for thinking that we see in it the effort of James Roettier to regain the royal favour by exalting the king as the restorer of peace. The workmanship of this silver plaque, and its likeness in point of portraiture to the Dublin medal, render this attribution justifiable, and we may wonder whether it achieved its object in attracting William’s attention, and obtained for the medallist the order for Van Homrigh’s decoration.

It is apparent that James Roettier, chosen for so important a commission, had not entirely lost all court favour, and had he not died before the end of the year 1698, he might possibly have regained his official position.

James Roettier, like King William, succumbed to the effects of a fall from his horse, from which, according to J. H. Burn, and Walpole, from whom the former probably derived his information, he “received some hurt,” and, “retiring to Bromley for the air, took cold and died there,” leaving his wife and children dependent upon their grandfather. After his death the appeals of his father became quite pathetic, as he pressed for the payment of the annuity granted to him and his brothers by Charles II. He states that there were due to them on their “penœon of four hundred and fifty pounds p. Ann Two Yeares and halfe Arrears, Ending at Christmas last past.” The paper is accompanied by a certificate dated November 27th, 1700, signed by Charles Montagu, stating that Roettier had been paid until “Midsummer 1696 and no farther.” The suggestion, however, comes from the Treasury that “Joseph and Philip having withdrawn themselves,” John should

1 Plate CLXXXIII, No. 6.
3 The date of James Roettier’s death is always given as 1698, and he died as we have seen (p. 266) later than the 22nd of October in that year; but whether he survived the beginning of the year ’99, according to new style, I have not been able to ascertain.
6 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxi, No. 22, *Cal. Treasury Papers*, 1697–1701, p. 437; undated petition of John Roettier, which must have been presented, some time, in the first half of the year 1699.
receive only £250 per annum "as tho' he be now the sole survivor of the three brothers," the larger sum having been granted during their "joint naturall Lives," with the proviso that £100 should be deducted on the death of each of the patentees. John Roettier prays for help on the plea that James his son "is lately dead," and that he had "no Estate or Employment whereby to maintain himself, Wife, children and seven small Grand children and their Mother"; and states that he is "disabled in his hands by reason of his extraordinary Service to his Maties Mint, and especially upon the alteraion of the Coyne."

This statement leads us to wonder whether John Roettier did in truth consent at the beginning of William and Mary's reign to work for the new Government, or sufficiently recover from his earlier illness to take any part in the great recoinage, but in face of the assertions made by his sons that they executed the dies in 1689–90, and the report in the House of Commons in 1696–7 that he would not "do any one thing as Graver since the Revolution," it would seem that he referred merely to the institution of the milled coinage under Charles II. The question of his disablement, whether permanent or temporary, has been discussed by us before, but Vertue's remark on his continued residence in this country, bespeaks an intermittent rather than a total disability, for he says that whilst "refusing to be employed in the service of King William, tho' required and importuned by several.

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxi, No. 22.
2 John Roettier had in the year 1658 married Catharine Prot, by whom he had five daughters besides the three sons, John (born 1661), James (born 1663), to whom this paper has principally referred, and Norbert (born circa 1665).
3 According to the pedigree given by Mr. Burn in Num. Chron., 1st series, vol. iii, p. 189, James Roettier was the father of five daughters and one son, James, born at Bromley in 1698, who eventually succeeded his uncle Philip at the Antwerp Mint. We have, however, another record of the seventh child mentioned in the above petition, for James Roettier in a former memorial, MS. Treasury Papers, vol. iv, No. 62, speaks of his "wife and seaven small children."
5 Commons' Journals, vol. xi, p. 776. It is somewhat significant that although the payment of two engravers is given by Guy Miege in his New State of England, published in 1693, in his list of the Mint officers he only mentions Henry Harris as graver.
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persons of quality he lived here some years after and wrought for himself."¹

It is always reported that John Roettier retired temporarily to a house of his own in Red Lion Square, but at precisely what date and whether by choice or of necessity is not quite clear. Walpole says that Lord Lucas, the Governor of the Tower, placed a guard round his residence there, and "made him so uneasy that he was glad to quit his habitation:"² but the Commons’ Journals affirm on April 8th, 1697, that the elder Roettier "still continued in the Graver's House in the Tower,"³ and one of the entries in the Treasury Papers, under date July 6th, 1697, shows that the question was not yet decided by the authorities as to whether he "should still be allowed habitation in the Mint."⁴

That his exodus occurred prior to August 18th, 1698, is, however, proved by a memorial from himself and his son, stating "That John Roettier is very aged and the other Peticon, James hath a wife and seaven small children and no Employment at present by means whereof," [to live] "as alsoe by haveing in obedience to your Lordships order removed from their house in the Tower, and by their numerous families obliged to be at the extraordinary charge for hiring two houses, your Peticoners are reduced to very great streights."⁵

Here, then, we must leave John Roettier for the present until we find him again in the reign of Queen Anne.

It now only remains to be considered how far the monarch’s character and personality influenced the medals and coinage. We might have expected that he who loved Holland, and only valued England as her auxiliary, would have imported his own Dutch medallists and given them the chief posts at the Mint, but such was not the case, and we have seen that he made no attempt to displace those in office, so that even when a change became necessary

¹ Vertue’s MS., Brit. Mus., Add. 23,069, f. 37.
⁴ MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xlvi, No. 43.
⁵ MS. Treasury Papers, vol. iv, No. 62.
the new engraver was a German, not a Dutchman. Excepting in building and gardening, resulting from his desire to make himself a country home like his much-loved palace at Loo, he did little to affect the arts in Great Britain, and often as he is accused of favouritism towards his own countrymen, he generally made use for this purpose of artists already domiciled in England.

Let us turn for a moment to the story of his palace at Hampton Court, the residence in which, for William's sake, Mary took so great an interest, that with characteristic heart searching she attributed the subsidence of one of the walls to God's anger at her impatience, rather than to the defective structure of the building. In William's patronage of gardening and architecture we find the only examples of any leaning towards art. Truly, it is a formal taste, the taste of his time, which comes before us—and yet we thank him for his formal gardening, the planting of chestnuts in Bushey Park, and above all for his Dutch love of flowers—although in its development he converted into a suburban villa the beautiful palace of Wolsey and Henry VIII., already so much admired for its fountains and maze by Evelyn, when prepared for the arrival of Catharine of Braganza, the bride of Charles II. The weak health of the King made his residence outside the town imperative, a well-known fact, corroborated by Mary in her diary, thus: "The misfortune of the King's health, which hindered him being at Whitehall, put people out of humour, being here naturally lazy." It was, indeed, one of the many causes of his unpopularity, and his ministers resented the ten or twelve miles of bad road which lay between them and him. Lord Halifax told Sir John Reresby that he had begged the King "to lye sometimes in town and that his Answer was, 'It was not to be done except his Lordship desired to see him dead,' which, said my Lord, was a very short Answer."

---

1 Doebner's *Memoirs of Mary Queen of England*, p. 17.
2 Evelyn's *Diary*, June 9th, 1662, ed. 1827, vol. ii, p. 192. The diarist, however, finds room for criticism. "All these gardens might be exceeding improved as being too narrow for such a palace."
3 Doebner, p. 15.
the loss of five or six hours a day in transit, was so serious to members of the Government\(^1\) that William commanded also the preparation of Kensington Palace. The decoration of these two great houses gave scope for the employment of such eminent men as he found at hand—Wren, Verrio, Godfrey Kneller, and Grinling Gibbon. Wren had a difficult task to perform in endeavouring to assimilate new rooms with the fine old Tudor palace of Hampton Court, and was, as we are told, further hampered by the King's individual pronouncements, for he had no real understanding of art.\(^3\) Dallaway, the editor of Walpole, tells us that he was "assured by a descendant of Sir Christopher that he gave another design for Hampton Court in a better taste, which Queen Mary wished to have executed, but was overruled."\(^3\) Be this as it may, we can but regret that William caused portions of the most interesting parts of the old building to be destroyed, which had survived from the time of Henry VIII. Whether we now admire the paintings of Verrio or not, they were then held in high esteem and suited the style of the day, and none can fail to appreciate the carvings of Grinling Gibbon, or the beauty of the fine gates and screen of wrought iron designed by Jean Tijou.\(^4\) It is a sign of the discrimination of the King that he caused a special room to be built at Hampton Court adequately to display the Raphael cartoons, which had for long lain rolled up in dust and mould,\(^6\) and although it may be to the accident

\(^1\) History of Hampton Court Palace, vol. iii, p. 12, and Macaulay, vol. iii, p. 58.
\(^2\) History of Hampton Court Palace, vol. iii, p. 6.
\(^3\) Walpole, vol. ii, p. 177, note 1.
\(^4\) Mr. Law tells us in his History of Hampton Court Palace, vol. iii, pp. 54–60, that these gates, once entirely attributed to Huntingdon Shaw, are now known to have been designed by Jean Tijou, a Frenchman, said to have been introduced to William by Daniel Marot, the prince's architect in Holland, who assisted in making plans for the garden.
\(^5\) The Raphael cartoons are now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington. It is noticeable that Evelyn, on June 9th, 1662, mentions the "incomparable furniture" at Hampton Court, "especially hangings designed by Raphael very rich with gold," etc. It therefore appears that in the time of Charles II., tapestries made after these cartoons were in the palace, but Evelyn's statement is confused. The hangings now replacing in the galleries the cartoons removed to the Museum in 1865, were presented to the Crown in 1905. The original cartoons, purchased by Charles I., were reserved by Cromwell from the public sale of the King's goods.
of his weakly constitution, which caused him to dread confinement within four walls, that we are forced to trace the love of fresh air which made "Dutch William" foster the growth of trees and flowers; to his credit it is held that the plan of the gardens at Hampton Court was "devised by the king himself." 1 Verrio, 2 it is said, at first refused to work for the house of Orange, being a Catholic and a loyal adherent to James II., until "at last," as Walpole has it, "by persuasion of Lord Exeter he consented to serve King William and was sent to Hampton Court, where amongst other things he painted the grand staircase as ill as if he had spoiled it on principle." 3 Grinling Gibbon was master-carver both in wood and stone, whilst another sculptor, Caius Gabriel Cibber, is the first Dutchman of whom we hear in connection with the work. 4 Kneller was called upon by Mary to paint his "Beauties," and for his services the King conferred a knighthood, besides a medal and chain worth £300, upon him, and "as an extraordinary mark of his grace and favour, honour'd him with the present of the sword by the hands of the Lord Chamberlain." 5

But whilst we enumerate the changes brought about in William's reign, we must remember that when he died, Anne had to pay for many things ordered by him, and we might call attention to the fact that if the earlier Stuarts were constantly blamed for non-payment of their bills, many instances are cited by Mr. Law in his History of Hampton Court Palace of demands for arrears made upon Anne after William's death. 6 We must, however, bear in mind the statement of the master-bricklayer, Richard Stacey, that, "part of the work was

1 History of Hampton Court Palace, vol. iii, p. 20, quoting Defoe's Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain.
2 Antonio Verrio, born at Lecce in South Italy in 1639 (?), died at Hampton Court in 1707, having been employed to a considerable extent by the English monarchs from Charles II. to Anne.
3 Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting, vol. ii, p. 121.
4 Caius Gabriel Cibber, born in Holland in 1630, lived many years in England and died in 1700. He was the father of Colley Cibber, the actor.
5 Vertue MS., Brit. Mus., Add. 23,069, f. 13b. Kneller was knighted on March 3rd, 1691-2. He was later granted an annuity of £200 by William on June 7th, 1695.
finished in her present Majesty's reign, although directed by the late King."

A rather striking example of Kneller's contributions towards the adornment of the buildings carried out by William, is the portrait of the King in Chelsea Hospital, where the unfinished work, begun by Charles II. at the request, as tradition states, of Nell Gwynne, was still in process of completion. This picture, one of the fine series representing our monarchs, gives the beholder a better idea of William's appearance than the majority of his presentments, because the artist makes no attempt to endow him with a height which he did not possess. Not unnaturally, perhaps, we find in the Dutch galleries a larger selection of portraits from which to form a true notion of the Prince of Orange than we have in public collections in England, but, on the whole, I should say that after his accession the English artists were more favourable to the King, and certainly the pleasantest miniature of him, exhibited in the Rijks Museum at Amsterdam, is attributed to an Englishman, Lawrence (sometimes called Lewis) Cross. As a young man there are interesting busts and pictures of him in Holland, whilst in private galleries in our own country Dutch artists are well represented, and perhaps renderings of his features by Netscher, Verkolje, and Schalcken are the more characteristic. It is to Caspar Netscher that we owe the portrait at Rotterdam brought before us on our facing plate, and we notice the heavy mass of dark hair bringing into vivid contrast the pallid complexion of the Prince. By the courtesy of

1 History of Hampton Court Palace, vol. iii, p. 175.
2 Chelsea Hospital was opened in 1694.
3 "L. Cross," as I learn from Mr. Goulding that the artist himself signed his name, was formerly called Lewis Crosse, spelt with a final e by Walpole and others. He is now usually believed to have borne the Christian name of Lawrence. He was born circa 1650 and died in 1724.
4 Caspar Netscher was born at Heidelberg in 1639, and died at The Hague in 1684, having resided there since 1660.
5 Johannes Verkolje was born at Amsterdam in 1650, and died at Delft in 1698. He was a painter of small portraits and also a mezzotint engraver.
6 Godfried Schalcken was born at Dortrecht in 1643, and died in 1706, having passed the greater part of his life in Holland, but he did make one visit to England, where, however, his success was small. A portrait of William by him was illustrated in our last volume.
WILLIAM III. AS PRINCE OF ORANGE, BOYMAN'S MUSEUM, ROTTERDAM.
Mr. Richard Goulding, librarian to the Duke of Portland, I understand that this picture is very similar to a small whole-length by the same artist, dated 1674, in the Duke of Portland’s collection at Welbeck Abbey, which abounds in mementoes of this king. There is a very striking although ugly picture by Schalcken, at the Rijks Museum, showing William with a strong illumination thrown upon his face from a candle held in his hand. For this purpose, according to Walpole, Godfried Schalcken made the King hold the light “till the tallow ran down upon his fingers.” 1 The strength of his physiognomy is cleverly, if not pleasingly, marked, and is well brought out by this trick of shading to which the painter was much addicted.

The portrait with which we are all perhaps most familiar is the full-length representation in gorgeous robes, to be found not only in private houses such as Welbeck, but in public places such as the London Museum, the Inner Temple, and, reduced to half-length, in various reproductions, or to head and shoulders as in the small copper example which formed the frontispiece in our last volume. The companion miniature of Mary takes the same place of honour in our present issue, and I should like to say here that I think my somewhat too hasty acceptance of an attribution as regards these small copper versions of Kneller’s portraits to Simon du Bois, gives way before comparison with other paintings by this artist of William and Mary, of which Mr. Goulding has kindly favoured me with photographs from Welbeck.

Famous in the domain of art as was the country from which William came, it is curious how little beauty he imported to England. Holland had but lately passed her zenith both in painting and etching, and the time was still remembered when masters, such as Rembrandt, excelled with the burin as with the brush. 2 Landscape and genre pictures had come into vogue, but it would be out of place here to enumerate the painters of grouped portraits or of single figures for which Holland had become famous, or even the noted artists whom she had lent to England since the days of William’s grandfather.

1 Walpole’s *Anecdotes*, vol. ii, p. 232.
2 Rembrandt’s most vivid etchings are of about the period of William’s birth. Rembrandt died in October, 1669.
But far from bringing beautiful things into his acquired kingdom from the land of his birth, our Dutch ruler removed to his palace at Loo various treasures, including some fine sixteenth-century tapestry of the time of Edward VI. This was, perhaps, the greatest sign he ever gave of any talent as a connoisseur, for, curiously enough, the large collection of Dutch pictures now at Buckingham Palace was not formed by him, and one of the treasures in the Mauritshuis at The Hague is a masterpiece by Gerard Dou,¹ which had been presented to Charles II. on his Restoration, and passed from the possession of James II. into his son-in-law's hands.

But William was not wholly to blame in his lack of appreciation of the more peaceful arts, for towards the end of the seventeenth century in Holland, as in England, some decadence was perceptible, and the golden age of the Netherlands terminated just as it did in our own country, with the imported influence of the ornate taste prevalent at the court of Louis XIV., when simplicity gave way to excessive ornamentation. Again we might suggest, with Ruding, that although the Prince had received a good education and should, from association with the best examples of painting in his native land, have understood the arts, "the genius of William III. directed his attention to glory of a far different kind from that which is to be acquired by their advancement."² We may add that the desire to emulate the Roman or classic dress, as we find it represented on statues, monuments, and medals, tended to increase as the century progressed, and certainly a laurel crown, typical of martial distinction, was more appropriate to William than to others amongst his predecessors or contemporaries.

An example of such a bust, which might almost be mistaken for one of the Cæsars, is by the courtesy of Mr. J. W. G. Bond, here illustrated. It is made of lead and stands over the entrance of Creech Grange, Dorsetshire, where it no doubt commemorates the addition of

¹ Gerard Dou, born April 7th, 1613, at Leyden, where he was buried on February 9th, 1674–5, is well known as a painter of carefully finished pictures, painted usually on a small scale.
a classical front to a much older building in the beginning of the eighteenth century.

It is quite startling to find the noted warrior portrayed by a modern German artist, Herr Baücke, in civil garb, as is his statue presented to the late King Edward VII., in 1907 by the German Emperor, William II., which now adorns the garden in front of Kensington Palace. William of Orange there appears in the ordinary dress of his time with hat and feathers, instead of the usual armour and crown of bays, and the artist appears to have thrown convention to the winds in rejecting the ancient tradition. Contemporary statues of this king are few in England; even that in St. James’s Square owing its origin to a legacy of one Samuel Travers, bequeathed in 1724 but not carried into effect until 1806, when the money was discovered amongst some unclaimed dividends. It was then entrusted to one of the sons of John Bacon the sculptor, who was commissioned to produce a bronze effigy, which was finished in 1808, the pedestal having waited for


2 According to Mr. Dasent and to Mr. Chancellor (see Lives of the British Sculptors, p. 208), the work was entrusted to the younger John Bacon—the Dictionary of National Biography mentions the name of his brother Thomas.
many years.\(^1\) The erection of such a monument had been intermittently discussed from 1697 onward,\(^2\) and during the course of years the idea of substituting a figure of George I. had been advocated in 1721 by the Chevalier de David, who wished to model such a portrait himself\(^3\); but William carried the day. The equestrian statue in Dublin was unveiled with great pomp and ceremony on College Green on July 1st, 1701, the anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne.\(^4\) It was produced at the cost of £800, according to a contract drawn up in April, 1700, with Grinling Gibbon, the payments to be made in instalments of £200 each, and has, I believe, been represented upon Orange and centenary medals—but these are revivals with which we have no immediate interest. The statue at Bristol was erected in 1736.

Concerning contemporary memorial medals I have not much to chronicle, but I am permitted to bring before you, from the National Collection, one of the most striking.

It was believed to be from the hand of Jan Luder, but it is unsigned, and its exact resemblance to John Croker's "State of Britain Medal," facing our page 243, might justify the suggestion that it was amongst his rare efforts to produce a portrait of William on so large a scale. It consists of two gold plates united by a rim, and was purchased in 1878 by the late Sir Augustus, then Mr., Franks, from the descendants of one Jeremiah Scott, of Ballingarry, County Tipperary, who "was present at the Battle of the Boyne and received a gold medal from King

---

\(^1\) According to Robert Seymour's continuation of Stow's Survey of London, published in 1733, the pedestal, designed for William's statue, stood at that date in the centre of a large ornamental basin of water seven feet deep. (See vol. ii, book v, p. 663.) In Stripe's map, given in the edition of 1720, no such pond appears, and a pathway is marked as running through the Square. (See vol. ii, chap. 6, p. 81.) It is therefore clear that these alterations were made on the death of Travers.

\(^2\) Luttrell's Diary, vol. iv, p. 316, December, 1697. "The King's statue in brasse is ordered to be sett up in St. James's Square with several devices and mottoes trampling down popery, breaking the chains of bondage, slavery, etc."

\(^3\) The Squares of London, by Edwin Beresford Chancellor, p. 104, and The History of St. James's Square, as above, p. 51.

\(^4\) Calendar of the Ancient Records of Dublin, by John Gilbert, vol. vi, p. ix, Preface, and the Foundation of the Hospital, by Sir Frederick Falkiner, p. 120.
William III." It was thought by the family that this was the badge in question, but in spite of the reverse so typical of the battlefield—the obverse memorial inscription, as was remarked by the distinguished authors of *Medallic Illustrations of British History*, precludes our believing this to have been the case. I would, however, suggest the possibility that the loyal adherent received or ordered from Croker this remembrance of the King upon his death in 1702, and that the gold

"Battle of the Boyne" medal was originally uniface and was combined, as the reverse with an obverse made on King William's death for this purpose. Otherwise we must regret that the presentation gold medal has disappeared. It is, however, possible that the grant of land immediately followed the services rendered by Scott, and that the medallion was only promised by William and finished after his decease.

Although William had devoted adherents, mostly of Dutch origin, we seldom find amongst the English that feeling of affection for

---

1 Scott's *Memorials of the Scotts of Scot's Hall*, published 1876, at which time the King's gift was said to be "in the possession of J. J. Scott, b. Feb. 20, 1807." Jeremiah Scott "went to Ireland with William and settled there." See also *Med. Ill.*, vol. ii, p. 220.

2 With this theory the emblems represented on the reverse of the medal agree.
him which existed towards his grandfather, and we look in vain for the sentiment which prompted Prince Rupert, as a boy in prison, to carve from memory a portrait of his uncle Charles I. on a peachstone, which became an heirloom to be treasured in the home of his descendants; and the loyalty toward the exiled family, which encased a memorial in the privacy of a locket or tiny box, was not felt in England, where the House of Orange was concerned. We do, indeed, find an excellent bust of William III. carved on a walnut shell in the British Museum, but the companion portrait of George I. proves that the little works of art were not contemporaneous with the earlier of these two kings. Portrait-boxes were made, probably after William’s death, by Obrisset and others, and we also notice an enamel by William Craft in the National Collection. Obrisset was noted for his medallions in horn and tortoiseshell and I have described some of his work in our earlier volumes, but he appears to have turned his attention less to William than to Anne, in whose reign we find signed and dated pieces by him. To his hand, however, may, perhaps, be due an oval tortoiseshell plaque in the Duke of Portland’s collection which, as I understand, closely resembles the silver plaque which I illustrated facing page 256 in our seventh volume. The fact that it is hollow, like the medallion, might, on the other hand, suggest that, instead of a copy by Obrisset, it might be a trial piece made by Norbert Roettier; for Obrisset’s horn boxes usually present an even surface on the reverse. It is interesting to know that at the back of the Welbeck specimen, in the handwriting of the Swiss tutor to the sons of the first Duke of Portland, the words are written, “An

1 I am informed that this stone is discernible as painted in the hat of the Prince Palatine in a portrait in the same family’s possession, the ornament having been given by Prince Rupert to his father, who always wore it. Rupert was taken prisoner by the Austrians at Vlotho on the Weser and remained three years at Linz before recovering his liberty, in 1641.


4 The existence of this plaque has come to my knowledge since I published my articles in our former volumes.
Quarrels between Mary and Anne.

Excellent Picture of King William." The faience—the new fancy of the day—was less complimentary, and sometimes a grotesque endeavour to reproduce the features of the monarch upon pieces of pottery, such as a plate from Delft or a Fulham-ware mug, meets our eye, but excepting in Ulster, where Orange memorials abound, sentimental recollections of William are more the exception than the rule, for he was not beloved by his English subjects, and relations between himself and his successor had been rather strained. Mary had strong differences of opinion with her sister, and her husband had not been able to steer quite clear of the quarrel, although, as she herself tells us, "the King thought it an ungenerous thing to fall out with a woman, and went and told her so, upon which she said he should find by her behaviour she would never give him cause." This seeming humility did not much affect Anne's conduct towards Mary during the queen's lifetime, but on her death, peace was re-established, although but little love was lost on either side, and William was mourned by few.

The lack of artistic merit in the majority of the King's medals gives us little cause to regret that a larger number were not specially designed for memorial purposes.

A small portrait by Christian Wermuth, one of a series of counters, is fairly representative of William's features, but absurdly eulogistic in the wording of the legend, which reads EST PIVS QVAM PERFECTVM.

1 The second Earl of Portland was created Duke in 1716—the information is therefore no doubt that of one who had seen the late king.

2 A large dish from which Prince Charlie is said to have eaten oat-cake at a farmhouse on the retreat from Culloden is, by the irony of circumstances, so decorated, and various examples are to be seen in the London Museum.


4 Christian Wermuth was born at Altenburg in 1661, and died at Gotha in 1723. He was engraver to the mint in the latter city and was a very prolific medallist.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

The portrait had originally appeared in commemoration of the Peace of Ryswick in 1697, and was utilized in 1701–2 with fresh reverses, one merely stating the respective dates and places of the King's birth and death, whilst the other, as the above suggests, signified that his virtues were more highly appreciated abroad than in England.

Such memorials as exist usually bear old busts, and perhaps the most pleasing amongst them is the portrait of the King by Boskam, which had appeared so early as 1692, with a horrible reverse, representing the execution of Grandval, the intended assassin, and was frequently utilized on subsequent occasions, too many for mention. I selected for illustration, on page 253 of our seventh volume, one specimen which commemorates the death of Mary, and on the demise of William this head reappeared, with a reverse showing forth the eagle, a favourite type of this warlike King, flying to his rest, the sun setting in the heavens. It is a good example of the highly strained flattery of the day, and this bust gives William a less haggard expression than usual.


and was perhaps popular on that account. It is, however, not so instinct with life, being probably less like the King than another of Boskam's presentments, which I have the pleasure of reproducing from the National Collection, and which commemorates the retaking of Namur.

The reverse of the above is by no means alone in bringing William before us as a horseman, and we cannot but regret that the equestrian type so characteristic of this King should not have been revived upon the half-crowns. From his earlier years, as we saw in our seventh volume,¹ the Prince of Orange was portrayed on horseback, and the medal illustrated above and struck in 1672 in celebration of his attainment to the dignity of Stadtholder, Captain and Admiral-General of the United Provinces, would, with slight modification, have made an admirable device for a half-crown.

Such a revival would have carried us back to the days of Charles I., but although William very naturally strove to accentuate his Stuart descent, it is curious how seldom we find a combination in portraiture of grandfather and grandson in medallic form. We might have expected to find medals portraying William III. on the obverse and Charles I. on the reverse, for this practice survived to the days of Anne, and we have noticed the combined portraiture of his childhood.

with his parents or with Charles II. I received the description of a brass plaque, a portrait of William, the measurement of which agrees with a similar bust of Charles I. in my collection, of early eighteenth-century workmanship, but not having been able to compare them I cannot pronounce that they were intended for a pair. Apart from medallion work, I have, however, in a former article, called attention to a remarkable marble bust of Charles, which was, no doubt, made in the reign of William, as is proved by the companion effigy representing the latter king. The portrait of the English grandfather is, we must believe, a copy of the celebrated lost marble executed by Bernini in 1638, and destroyed at the Whitehall fire, whilst the fellow to this fine work is an interesting and original representation of the Dutch grandson, which, by the kindness of the owner of both busts, Mr. Laurence Currie, I was able to illustrate in our last volume. Judging from the inscription, D • F • A • GUILELMO • HENRICO • D • G • P • ARAUSIO • BELG • GUB • M • BRIT • R • FIDEI • LIBERTATIS • VINDICI • 1689, the artist wished to mark the fact that William upheld the Church, which had suffered an eclipse at the death of Charles. But this is perhaps straining a point, for, although the champion of the Protestant cause, the new king was a strong Calvinist, and considered episcopal government too latitudinarian. Mary, on the other hand, in spite of impartial attendance, whilst in Holland, at services according to English or Dutch rites, was extremely glad when circumstances enabled her definitely to resume the practice of her religion as learnt in her girlhood.

I have said, giving my opinion for what it is worth, that of all the medallion portraits of William III. I consider the Dublin medal to be the finest, but many of those designed by the other artists patronized by this King present well-executed busts, and one of the best is the Triumphant Entry into The Hague, by Jan Smeltzing, illustrated in our seventh volume on page 220.
We may also cite, in spite of the bad taste which marks its reverse—namely, a Gallic cock flung before the British lion—Jan Boskam's rare Battle of la Hogue medal, of which when the die cracked, a hasty and slightly differing reproduction was made in rather rougher style by the same artist. I select the latter for illustration from the National Collection, in that it bears a more intelligent-looking likeness of the King than the majority of his medallic presentments. This naval battle was still better commemorated by Luder, as seen on our facing plate, but although some of the busts are good and well executed nearly all the medallic work of the period is marred by the weakness or vulgarity of the reverse types, as in Boskam's medal above illustrated.

William's personal appearance has been described by a modern Dutch writer, who calls this Prince of the House of Orange "a grand but solitary figure, more imposing than attractive." Professor Petrus Blok pictures from contemporary canvases by Netscher and Blooteling, and from the pen portraits of William's secretary Huygens, "the oblong face framed by long locks, with the piercing glance, the long Stuart nose, the imperious attitude, weakly stooping, simply dressed upon his

4 The nose of William was more aquiline than those of his Stuart relations, but the majority of the family had large noses.
strong horse.” William was absolutely at his best on horseback, and lost the stiffness of demeanour which usually made him appear awkward, and our facing plate, from his lifelike presentment in the National Portrait Gallery, and thought to be probably from the brush of Jan Wyck, is but one of many equestrian portraits. Amongst them we should call attention to the large allegorical picture at Hampton Court, said to represent William landing at Margate in 1697, and painted by Kneller in 1701, which is, however, neither pleasing nor true to life in that it magnifies his proportions unduly. Medallically we often find him seated upon his horse and habited as a Roman general—and I bring before you a Dutch presentment more rare than beautiful. Again we see him on his “Entry into Dublin” on a medal from the hand of Jan Luder, an obverse which the artist had already used as the reverse in commemorating the Battle of the Boyne, and Arondeaux also produced William’s equestrian figure crossing the river on the same occasion at the head of his troops.

1 Jan Wijck, commonly called in England Wyck or Wyke, was born at Haarlem, circa 1640. He died at Mortlake in 1702. He was usually a painter of equestrian and battle scenes. There is, however, another half-length picture of William III. by him in the same gallery.

WILLIAM III. AT THE BATTLE OF THE BOYNE, IN THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.
But to return to the analysis of the Prince's character by his com-
patriot, who calls him one of "the best representatives of the Dutch
national type."1 "Energetic, alert, ambitious, crafty, resourceful,
persistent, rough, inflexible, hard, mistrustful, he was all that, and
furthermore taciturn and reserved owing to the pitiful circumstances of
his life during the decisive years of his youth." "Intellectually a
giant," so he tells us, in his early manhood in Holland was "the
coughing youth, to whom the entire nation now looked up as to its
rescuer from dire distress," and if "not ideally gifted" he was yet
possessed of "clear judgment, healthy understanding" and an
"excellent memory."

He was, to epitomize the careful parallel between James II. and
William III. drawn by a modern writer,2 a ruler who made his depend-
ants lean upon him; and who did not rely upon them, as his father-in-
law had done, to his ruin. "His accomplices at first," says this author,
"his servants later, were made to understand that they depended upon
him, while he never suffered himself to be influenced by them." On
the other hand, "King James thought to bind men to him by ties
of gratitude, and was cruelly betrayed by those upon whom he had
heaped his greatest benefits."

In his government of Holland and in that of England he was
ready, it is true, to overlook the maladministration of his tools so long
as they would obey him blindly,3 and one great blot upon his fame in
countenancing the massacre of Glencoe4 is paralleled by the fact that

1 Blok's History of the People of the Netherlands, vol. iv, p. 450, translated by
Oscar Bierstadt.
2 Martin Haile in James Francis Edward, p. 40.
3 Blok, pp. 444 and 445.
4 The massacre of Glencoe, on February 13th, 1692, was not perpetrated during one
of Mary's regencies, and William cannot be wholly exonerated even by Macaulay. No
steps whatever were taken at the time to punish the perpetrators, but the Secretary of
State, John Dalrymple, the Master of Stair, some years afterwards retired from office in
defence to public opinion, expressed during the Enquiry of 1695, and when some six
months later he succeeded to his father's title he refrained for a considerable time from
taking his seat in the House of Lords. Albeit blamed by the Commission of Enquiry,
this censure was "remitted" by William, and Stair was made a Privy Councillor by Anne,
finally to be promoted to an Earldom. See Political History of England, vol. viii,
pp. 336–9, and compare Macaulay, vol. iv, pp. 198–217, with Brown's History of the
although absent, and therefore not personally responsible for the murder of the brothers De Witt, "he did not punish the crime on account of the number and position of the guilty men! What is worse, he rewarded the shameless offenders, and consequently did not hesitate to assume the appearance of approving their actions, even of complicity in their crime."  

So little did William care about his English kingdom, that when thwarted in 1698 by the Houses of Parliament in his wish to retain his Dutch guards, he threatened his ministers to return permanently to his native country, and was with difficulty restrained by Somers from this course. William's was a strong character and his strength lay, as Burnet tells us, "rather in the true discerning of a sound judgment than in imagination or invention." The Bishop calls him "an exact observer of men and of things," and speaks of his "memory that amazed all about him, for it never failed him," and says that "he spoke little and very slowly, and most commonly with a disgusting dryness, which was his character at all times, except in the day of battle, for then he was all fire, though without passion, he was then everywhere, and looked at everything."  

We have the King's own word for it, when rejoicing at the outset of the Irish campaign, that he would rather face the cannon's mouth than the House of Commons, and according to Burnet, "he instructed his own ministers himself, but he did not apply himself enough to affairs at home, he tried how he could govern us by balancing the two parties one against another, but he came at last to be persuaded that the Tories were irreconcilable to him, and he was resolved to try and trust them no more."


1 Blok, vol. iv, p. 396. On August 20th, n.s., 1672, Cornelius and John de Witt were torn to pieces by a mob of the Prince's party at The Hague.


4 Ibid., pp. 563, 564, see also Mother of Parliaments, p. 83, by Henry Graham, who writes: "William had begun by convening mixed cabinets, of Whigs and Tories, but in 1693 he determined to appoint ministers of one party, and in two years his cabinet was entirely composed of Whigs."
There is pathos in his remark to his Dutch favourite, Portland, who, reporting to him some public defalcations which had impaired the revenue, petulantly exclaimed: "Is there one honest man in the whole of Great Britain?" "Yes," replied the King, "there are as many men of high honour in this country as in any other, perhaps more, but they are not my friends." 1

A Dutch authoress has described him thus:—"Like all the Nassaus he was a born soldier, and he early became proficient in military science, and in the allied branch of mathematics. He certainly never acquired the mental culture that opens a world of delight to most men of his abilities. He remained indifferent to literature and science in a general sense." 2 This writer quotes William’s secretary, Huygens, as an authority for stating that "in later life he showed some interest in art." 3 If this be so, the evidence must be sought rather in Holland than in England, and indeed in many ways he was a great Englishman, but he was a greater Dutchman.

But whether or not we discern in William much interest in the peaceful arts, we owe him a debt of gratitude for his support of a measure which removed the reproach of a clipped and debased currency from our country, not only by upholding Somers in his first unsuccessful efforts towards the solution of this difficult question, but in his steady countenance of Montagu, to whom the reform was ultimately due—and let us thus take leave of him,

William died, aged 51, on March 8th, 1701-2, from the after effects of a fall from his horse on February 21st, caused by the animal stumbling over a mole heap. According to some authorities, the pony, named Sorrel, had been the property of Sir John Fenwick, and had been confiscated to the King’s use on its master’s execution, and some saw in the accident a retributive justice. 4 The mole as "the

2 Court Life in the Dutch Republic, by Baroness S. van Z. van Nyevelt, p. 237.
3 Court Life as before, referring to Ising’s Haagsche Schetsen, vol. iv, pp. 186, 189, 190, where this authoress quotes Constantine Huygens’ diary.
4 The story is carefully sifted in The History of Hampton Court Palace, vol. iii. p. 166, where the author says: "Sorrel is stated, though we know not with what accuracy, to have belonged to Sir John Fenwick, who was attainted on a charge of conspiracy against
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little gentleman in velvet” was toasted by the Jacobites, but the death of William had come too late or too early for their cause—too late because James II. had also passed away—too early because the titular King James III. was not old enough to claim his rights. So the crown was given to a second Stuart princess, whose reign was characterized by wars abroad, but a certain revival of peaceful arts at home. The mighty hand which had swayed great destinies was paralysed by the approach of death, and could not sign the document which despoiled William’s brother-in-law of the throne, but a facsimile was affixed at the bedside, and the golden opportunity was lost. His strong grasp was removed from the helm, and the sceptre fell into the soft white hand of Anne, who seized it, regardless, as her sister had been, of the brother who should have come between her and the throne, and forgetful of the parent, who whether or not he possessed the secret of acting as the father of his people, had ever been an affectionate and lenient father to his children. William, who stood in a less near relationship to the male members of the House of Stuart, was perhaps, in a sense, less to blame than his wife. Mary, on the other hand was partly exonerated by her conception of conjugal duty. Be this as it may, let us put politics aside—

“The knight’s bones are dust,
And the great sword rust,
His soul is with the saints, I trust.”

the king’s life, and executed in 1697, when William seized all his personal effects and converted them to his own use, amongst them the horse that proved fatal to him.” See also the accounts given in The Royal House of Stuart, by Samuel Cowen, vol. ii, p. 440, and Strickland, vol. viii, pp. 58 and 118.

1 James Francis Edward, by Martin Haile, p. 61, and Tindal’s Summary of the History of England, vol. iii, p. 177, March 6th, 1701-2, vol. v of Tindal’s edition of Rapin. See also Macaulay, vol. v, p. 307, ed. 1851. “The Abjuration Bill and a Money Bill were awaiting his assent. That assent he felt that he should not be able to give in person. He therefore ordered a commission to be prepared for his signature. His hand was now too weak to form the letters of his name, and it was suggested that a stamp should be prepared. On the seventh of March the stamp was ready.” Macaulay describes how it was not until the 7th, the day before his death, that William finally “put the stamp to the parchment,” which authorized the commission to act for him.

2 The Knight's Tomb, by S. Coleridge.