“ONDv on ye 8th March 1703 att 8 in the Forenoon at Kensington dyed his Mat' K. William the third.”

So reads the announcement in the minutes of the Treasury Board of this important event, and the Age of Queen Anne had commenced. “The Age of Queen Anne”! This phrase, so familiar to every Englishman, be his bent towards the study of history or literature, is usually considered synonymous with success. To those, however, who specially interest themselves in portraiture, it is somewhat disappointing, for although we speak of “Queen Anne furniture,” of “Queen Anne architecture,” of “Queen Anne literature”

—yes, and of "Queen Anne plate," with pleasure and admiration, we find no remarkable development in the paintings of the day.

But the glory of the reign, due to the victories of the nation in foreign wars, ultimately resulting in a long awaited, if not a very glorious, peace, and thereby giving a stimulus to commerce and art, is constantly brought before us by medals commemorating battles and finally the termination of hostilities; and fortunately in this form of portraiture we find much to admire.

And not only upon Anne's medals is she well portrayed, for the increased tendency towards high relief upon her coin, although prejudicial to its utility, in its medallic character almost justifies the panegyric of Ruding, who declared that in her reign "we enter upon the second splendid period in the annals of our mints." 1 "The beauty of her coinage," writes this enthusiastic chronicler, "is exceeded only by the admirable works of Simon."

How far the personal influence of the Queen may have affected the currency is hard to determine, but Ruding attributes to her a direct supervision, for he tells us that "her Majesty disliked the appearance of" and rejected an early pattern guinea because it had a bare neck, 2 thus showing her preference for the graceful draperies upon her accepted issues.

We know that Anne was singularly modest in her dress and objected to the fashion characteristic of Charles II.'s court—the bust

---

2 Ibid., vol. ii, p. 65. See also Royal Mint Catalogue, vol. i, p. 142, No. 1556: "This design was submitted to the Queen for approval, but by a warrant dated 30th June, 1702, she directed that the monogram on the reverse should be replaced by a rose, and that on the obverse a dress should be added below the neck."
almost uncovered except by jewellery, and in the matter of ornament she was also extremely moderate, having, as we learn from Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, "no Vanity in her Expences, nor bought any one jewel in the whole Time of her Reign." ¹

The careful restraint of the coinage bears out the contemporary gossip and accords with many of the Queen's pictures, which are usually remarkable for the absence of the enormous pearls with which in the past Lely and even Kneller delighted in enriching their sitters. In a fine portrait of Anne by the latter artist at Windsor the medal of the Garter, hung upon a ribbon, alone adorns her neck, just serving to show off her majestic figure and grace of deportment to perfection.² We have it on record that a bitter altercation arose between the Queen and the despotic Duchess, and was continued actually to the doors of St. Paul's Cathedral, on the discovery in the coach by the Mistress of the Robes that Anne had not donned the jewels selected by her, in virtue of her office, for the Thanksgiving Service after the battle of Oudenarde.³ The argument terminated only—so 'tis said, on Sarah bidding the royal lady "hold her tongue," for the sovereign had offended the wife of her great general in not doing sufficient honour to the occasion of his glorification. Anne, thinking perhaps more of those who had died for the sake of their country than elated by her victory, intended no slight to the commander who had gained it for her, but the Duchess deemed the Queen's modest appearance to be a studied insult to Marlborough.⁴

Whether out of kindly sympathy for the injured feelings of the

¹ In the long inscription engraved by order of the Duchess of Marlborough on the pedestal of Anne's statue at Blenheim Palace. (See Plate facing page 212.) The Duchess of Marlborough referred to Anne's personal adornment only, for she herself was presented by the Queen with a magnificent ring enclosing Marlborough's portrait under a diamond valued at £3,000. (See Strickland's Queens of England, vol. viii, p. 235.)

² Anne had received lessons in deportment and elocution in her youth from Mrs. Barry, the actress, and was remarkable for her well modulated voice and good carriage.

³ The Thanksgiving Service for the battle of Oudenarde was celebrated on August 17th, 1708; the date of the battle being June 30th, 1708, o.s., July 11th, n.s.

Duchess, who had apologized for her want of respect, we cannot say, but the obverse selected for the medal celebrating the victory is one of the most ornate of the Queen's portraits.¹

This bust, however, was not designed specially for the occasion, it being customary for the medals to use one or other of several obverses which had been executed earlier in the reign, with a fresh reverse, bearing on the particular event; and the above effigy of Anne had first appeared in celebration of the Union of Scotland with England.² The closer

¹ Med. III., vol. ii, p. 322, No. 148. The Oudenarde medal was approved and ordered on the 15th December, 1708. See Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18,757, c. 13. According to a price list affixed to this collection of MSS. the medal was sold at £8 in gold, 12s. in silver, and 4s. in copper at the Royal Mint.

² Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 295, No. 107. The Union came into force on May 1st, 1707, but the medal was not struck until April 8th, 1708. See Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18,757,
connection between the kingdoms had been dear to the heart of the
Stuarts from the time when James I. and VI. had assumed the title of
King of Great Britain on his abortive effort towards a political amalga-
mation in 1604. The Queen was overjoyed at the consummation of
this much discussed settlement, and in her speech to the House of
Lords said: "I cannot but look upon it as a peculiar happiness that in
my reign so full a Provision is made for the Peace and Quiet of my
people." ¹

This personal feeling of rejoicing no doubt accounted for her
permission to Croker to portray her in full array of crown and order
of the Garter, with pearls twisted not only in her hair, but also upon her
shoulder. Excepting when the slightly varying puncheons of the Union

medals are utilized, or the type of the Accession memorials is followed,
we usually find Anne rather plainly dressed and uncrowned. Some-
times the laurel wreath may be seen typifying a victory, but even upon
the official Coronation medals a simple fillet alone secures the classical
arrangement of the hair, whilst the diadem on the coins is little more
than a ribbon, diversified in the case of some copper patterns by a
string of pearls.

Anne, although a good woman, was far from clever, and she was
usually dominated by her favourite of the moment. The Jacobite,
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Lord Ailesbury, witnessing with surprised concern the beginning of party government in the Whig dominion of the Marlboroughs, deplored the facility with which the Queen was swayed, and described her as follows in his memoirs: "She inherited one quality which was fatal to her, and which she inherited from her great-grandfather, King James the First, and from her father, King James the Second, which was to entrust her greatest secrets of State into the care of one only. The latter of the two Kings lost his crown by that weakness. His brother, our most gracious King," [Charles II.] "told me more than once he would follow the footsteps of his brother of France, Louis the Fourteenth, who managed Colbert and Louvois, with this addition: — 'Godsfish; when two rogues fall out, their master is then like to know the truth.' And this politic King (and he was when he entered well into the affairs of State) fomented rather than discouraged the two parties of Whig and Tory on the aforesaid wise and politic account. He stuck firm, especially at last, to the former, as they were his most true subjects, but would hear both. The good Queen's Court were either all Whigs or all Tories, according to the temper of the reigning Minister." 1

The very favourite herself, the Duchess of Marlborough, writing after Anne's death in the light of her own jealousy caused by her supplanting rival, Abigail Hill, echoed the complaint that her mistress was dominated by her affections, qualifying her disparagement with the faint praise that "the Queen always meant well how much soever she might be blinded or misguided." 2 She also told Lord Cowper, as he records in his Diary, 3 that "the Queen has no Original Thought on any Subject, is neither good nor bad, but as put into: that she has much Love and Passion while pleas'd for those who please: and can write pretty affectionate Lrs [letters] but do nothing else well." Even the

2 Account of the Conduct of the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough, published 1742, p. 244.
3 October 14th, 1709. Private Diary of William, first Earl Cowper, p. 49. Lord Cowper was Lord Chancellor to Queen Anne from October, 1705, to September, 1710, and was one of the Lords Justices appointed by the Elector of Hanover on the Queen's death. He was reappointed Lord Chancellor under George I. in September, 1714.
gentler Mrs. Marsham, as a modern writer tells us, "frequently deplored Anne's ' want of ready money,' her slang term for independence."¹

Nevertheless, although guided in political affairs of the greatest importance by the leading hand of two women in succession, Anne had the courage in certain matters to assert herself to the verge of obstinacy, as testified by her quarrels with the Duchess, and we believe that she showed a certain initiative where questions of her coinage were concerned. Let us hear Walpole on the subject of Anne's medallic portraiture.²

"A medal being ordered of the new Queen, Harris, a player,³ who succeeded Rotier and was incapable of the office, employed workmen to do the business, among whom was Mr. Croker, who afterwards obtained the place. Sir Godfrey Kneller drew a profile of the Queen, and Mr. Bird, the statuary,⁴ modelled it. Her majesty did not like the essay, and recollected Rotier, but was told the family had left England or were dead. Sir Godfrey being ordered to inspect the work, and going to the Tower, learned that John Rotier was still living, whom he visited and acquainted with what had happened. The old man, in a passion, began a die, but died before he could finish it, in 1703, and was buried in the Tower."

Let us pause for a moment before pursuing this medallic question, and see whether Walpole's account corresponds with the little we know about John Roettier's last years, that we may judge how far we can trust the details of his story.

As a consequence of the Parliamentary Enquiry which compelled his son James to relinquish his office in February, 1696–7, our author

³ Walpole here calls Harris "a player" but this is a mistake, the actor's name was Joseph (fl. 1661–1699), that of the engraver was Henry; he is occasionally referred to as Captain Harris (see Commons' Journal, vol. xi, p. 686, February, 1696, and Luttrell's Diary, vol. iv, p. 191). Narcissus Luttrell speaks on March 2nd, 1696–7, of his appointment, and on August 5th, 1704, of his death, calling him "Capt. Harris," but the prefix "Mr." is used in the Treasury and State Papers Domestic.
⁴ Francis Bird was born in 1667, in London, and at the age of 11 went to Brussels, where he studied for a few years, and thence to Rome. He afterwards worked in London under Grinling Gibbon and Caius Cibber, executing various statues on the exterior of St. Paul's Cathedral and in the interior of Westminster Abbey.
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tells us that "there being suspicions of his carrying on a treasonable correspondence, guards were placed round his house in the Tower, and Lord Lucas, who commanded there, made him so uneasy that he was glad to quit his habitation. He was rich and very infirm, labouring under the stone and gravel, additional reasons for his retiring. He took a house in Red-lion square."  

All this is very definite, but supplies no date. We know, however, from the Commons' Journals that on April 8th, 1696, "Old Rotteer is still continued in the Graver's House in the Tower, though he will not, nor ever did, own the King," whilst on the 6th of the following July the question was yet undecided by the Treasury Board, for we have seen in our last volume that Newton, Neale and Molyneux, craving an ultimatum about James Roettier's renewed employment and the restoration of his property, enquired also "about his father, whether he shall be allowed an habitation in the Mint."  We must assume from a petition presented in August, 1698, that the Lords of the Treasury declined the proposition, for James and John together speak of "having in obedience to your Lordships' order removed from their house in the Tower, and of the consequent necessity of hiring two houses."

We conclude therefore that John Roettier's retirement was not so voluntary, as Walpole gives us to understand, and his constant complaints of dire poverty contradict the writer's statements that "he was rich"; although his appointment being "for life" his salary could not be withdrawn. One of his petitions for arrears was favourably endorsed by the Mint officials on the 30th of June, 1702, i.e., after the accession of Anne, but we know not whether, upon the removal by William's death of any fear of treason, the Lords of the Treasury reinstated the old man in his residence or whether, as is more probable, Kneller's report to the Queen of his successful mission caused her intervention on

5 Information kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking from the Royal Mint.
his behalf. Walpole’s narrative suggests that the painter actually found
the engraver at the Tower, but this would not prove that he was
officially domiciled there, for it is on record that after the termination
of the great recoinage, the Mint authorities had more space at their
disposal than was required, and let some of the premises to the
public. We read under date February 13th, 1699-1700, that “the
Mint have att present twice as much roome as Ever they can make use
of for the future, and it is very well knowne that severall of their houses
stand Empty and others Rented by Persons no ways concerned with
them.” It is therefore within the bounds of possibility that the old
engraver and his family had returned as tenants to the locality where
they had passed their earlier days, so that Kneller going to the Tower
learnt that “John Roettier was still living,” and found him on the spot.
Vertue says that “John Roettier dyed near Red Lyon Square,” but in
this he is not followed by the author of Anecdotes of Painting, who, as
we have seen, tells us that he “was buried in the Tower,” neither is it
to Walpole alone that we owe the knowledge of his place of sepulchre.
A brass tablet at the west end of the Chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula
records the names of many interred actually within the walls of the
building, and that of the old engraver figures amongst them. The fact
that he was so buried is considered as conclusive proof that he was in
official residence within the Tower when he died. We may therefore
suppose that before June 17th, 1703, Queen Anne had confirmed him
in his former privileges.

The Chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula, within the Tower precincts,
having fallen into disrepair, was restored in 1876-7, and the bones of all
interments found therein were placed beneath the altar or in the vault,
whilst the names of the dead, mostly illustrious prisoners who had met

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxix, No. 34. See also The Tower of London, by Richard
Davey, pp. 9 and 73, where it is stated, although without date, that there were at one
time two inns within the precincts of the Tower. This author also tells us that certain
Lieutenants of the fortress “allowed public-houses to be erected” and let lodgings to
persons who had no official residence there, “filling up every corner with tenants from
whom they collected heavy rents.”

Anecdotes of Painting upon Vertue’s note-books.
their execution within the Tower walls, were inscribed upon the brass tablet mentioned above. Here, close to the coffin plates of Lords Lovat, Kilmarnock and Balmerino—three Jacobites decapitated after the '45—and with yet earlier notices recording the deaths of Jane Grey, of Anne Boleyn and other political victims, we find the words "John Rotier 1703."

The burial register gives us little more detail, namely "1703 John Rotier 17 June in the Chappell," and I find on investigation that although two other members of his family were buried in the precincts of St. Peter's during Roettier's tenure of office, the dates of their interments cast no light on the time of his temporary absence and return.

Having seen how far Walpole has enlightened us as to John Roettier's last days, let us examine the sidelights thrown by his story of the projected medal upon the history of Anne's numismatic portraiture, and follow the clue offered by Kneller's design.

By the courtesy of the Duke of Portland, I reproduce as our frontispiece a profile portrait of the Queen by Sir Godfrey. It is an oil painting measuring 30 inches by 25 inches, life size, in gold brocaded dress, and the head is turned to the left, as on the currency. Let us ask whether it was precisely copied upon any extant medal, and whether the

1 Extracts from the burial register, given by Mr. Doyne C. Bell in his *Chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula*, pp. 42 to 49, show that besides the State prisoners many official personages were interred within the Chapel. We read of "Ye Crown Keeper"—a "Surveyor of Ordinance"—"Ye Keeper of ye Jewell Office" and even of a warder who had served 60 years. During the eighteenth and first part of the nineteenth centuries, as we learn from Lord Redesdale's *A Tragedy in Stone*, pp. 30 and 31, "any person however obscure, who might chance to die within the precincts of the Tower," found burial in the nave and aisles—the older graves being disturbed to make room for them. The chancel contained the more important personages.

2 See *The Chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula*, pp. 48 and 290.

3 Much information concerning the registers has been kindly supplied to me by the Rev. W. H. Milner, the Chaplain of St. Peter's. The burials referred to in our text were those of "Cornelia Rotier, January 19th, 1683" and "John Philip ye son of Robertus (sic for Norbertus) Rotieres, March 6th, 1694 o.s." I have been unable to ascertain anything concerning Cornelia, no member of the family having married any person of that name.

4 No. 372, in the Welbeck privately printed catalogue, in which it is traditionally noted that the picture is "said to be a study for the coinage."
types of the coinage also owe their origin to Anne’s Court-painter, for we would gladly hold him responsible for the fine busts engraved by Croker, with which the coins were adorned. *The Postman*, a newspaper of the time, under date April 4th, 1702, published, as we learn from Miss Strickland,¹ the following notice. “We hear that the Queen had lately had her picture drawn by Sir Godfrey Kneller in order to grave an impress by for her coronation medals and coin. And ’tis said, on the reverse of the medals is to be represented the goddess Pallas destroying a giant, but we are not sure that this is actually agreed upon.”

This allegorical design was indeed carried out, being intended to typify Anne’s readiness to continue her brother-in-law’s warlike policy, but the bust on the obverse was, as we shall see, no slavish copy of Kneller’s drawing, and proves that a free hand was given to the engravers in reproducing the Queen’s likeness.

But we must not dally at present over the obverse type of the coronation medal, which, like the coins, is so pleasing in its simplicity that we can hardly believe that in this rendering of her features Anne was disappointed. But we may rest assured that the picture drawn by Kneller for the purpose is before us, and by the kindness of the librarian at Welbeck, Mr. Richard Goulding, to whose courtesy I owe much information, I hear that one or two replicas of the sketch exist in oil. Let us turn, therefore, from the Medal Room in the British Museum to the Department of Prints and Drawings, and look for a reproduction of the handiwork of Sir Godfrey Kneller, where we shall find a mezzotint by John Simon, bearing the following inscription:— “Done from ye Original Picture by wch all the Medals and Coin has been & are now Made.”² The title beneath the engraving reads,

¹ *Queens of England*, vol. xiii, p. 144. I have not been successful in finding a copy of *The Postman* so dated.

² Chaloner Smith No. 10. John Simon was born in France in 1675 and died in 1751. He came to England as a refugee, and Chaloner Smith does not think that his earliest plates in London date “before the middle of Queen Anne’s reign.” The inscription, moreover, remains unchanged in the second state of the print, excepting that Simon’s address, which on the first impression reads “against Cross Lane in Long Acre,” is omitted in the second state, he having changed his place of business in 1720. We may therefore assume that, so far as Simon knew, no correction in his assertion...
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"Serenissima et Potentissima Anna D. Gr. Mag. Brit Franciae et Hiberniae Regina, etc. Inaugurata XXIII° die Aprilis Anno 1702."

The signature "G. Kneller S.R. et Angl. Eques Aur. Pinx. I. Simon fec." completes our certainty that we have here a copy of the Court-painter’s design for the coinage.

We see the Queen in profile turned to the right, for the mezzotint reverses the drawing as is so frequently the case. She wears a crown upon her head, the hair gracefully and loosely carried upward from the face, no jewels upon her neck, but bears the George upon her breast, whilst a lovelock rests upon her left shoulder. The whole, but for the omission of the Queen’s tucker, is an accurate reproduction of the Duke of Portland’s picture. The sleeves are decorated, the mantle is lined with ermine, and the whole, excepting in the last particular, brings John Croker’s Union Medals clearly to mind, but was not copied by him, so far as we know, before 1706-7. There is, however, in the National Collection a medallion by John Obrisset, dated 1705, representing Anne in this dress, closely resembling the undated specimen in my own collection illustrated on our next page.

In the British Museum there is also a very fine bronze medallion commemorating the Union, of which the oil-painting, but for a slight upward pose of the Queen’s head, is the precise prototype, but of this moment let us compare Kneller’s picture with Bird’s statue of Queen

regarding the coins was required during the life of Anne. Chaloner Smith and others give the death of J. Simon as occurring about 1755, but it is now dated as above. See A Short History of Engraving, by Arthur Hind.

The coins and medals of Anne look to left, the lovelock falling upon her right shoulder. The natural result of engraving a plate for a mezzotint directly from a picture would be the reversal in the print. Kneller’s original design for the coins was probably to left in order to be copied on a puncheon, also to left, from which a die would be sunk to right and finally the coin struck to left.

Van Loon, vol. iv, p. 349, places the largest of John Croker’s medals attributed to the Union (Med. III., vol. ii, p. 298, No. 115—illustrated facing our p. 264), amongst those commemorating the accession—but Newton’s authorization for striking it is dated February, 1706-7. It is on the other hand possible that Croker designed it earlier, for it appears immediately after the coronation medals in his list of medals offered for sale, included in the Alchorne MSS.
THE ORIGINAL STATUE OF QUEEN ANNE AT ST. PAUL'S.
Anne in our City's midst, with the result that here our assurance is made doubly sure that this statue is not the model to which Walpole alludes. The present effigy which stands in front of St. Paul's Cathedral is not the original work for which Bird was, according to most authorities, paid £1,130; and which to judge by the old print, which I now reproduce on our plate, was very inferior to the copy from the hand of Mr. Belt, which replaced it in 1886 by order of the Corporation of London, owing to the disrepair into which had fallen Bird's poor effort, erected in 1712, to commemorate the completion of St. Paul's Cathedral. Bird's statue provoked much animadversion, and I am not surprised, if our print gives any true idea of its proportions;

1 Bird received £250 for the statue of Anne and £220 for each of the figures round the base, making a total of £1,130; but according to The Life of Sir Christopher Wren, published by James Elmes in 1823 (p. 491), he was also paid £50 for the arms and shields.

2 James Elmes, and Miss Strickland, vol. viii, p. 318, following his lead, date the statue about the year 1708, but the inscription on the base of the modern copy gives the facts as I have stated in the text. As printed, the date upon the engraving, probably issued soon after the erection of the statue, is 1713. The last stone of the Cathedral was set in 1710.
certainly also many examples of his art—save the mark—which we now find in St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey, are frankly bad enough to justify the severe criticisms passed upon Bird by Walpole and by some other contemporaries. Nevertheless, Defoe spoke of Anne's presentment as "very masterly done," and the extant version is quite pleasing, so that even admitting that it presents a great improvement on the original we may presume a fair portrait. Bird's statue in point of detail has more features in common with the rather smaller standing figure in Queen Anne's Gate, and the later effigy erected at Blenheim by the Duchess of Marlborough in memory of her dead mistress, illustrated on our facing plate, than with Sir Godfrey Kneller's sketch for the coinage, although reminiscent of some of his large pictures, especially in the arrangement of the hair.

We must, moreover, admit that some few of Bird's monuments are not without talent, and Miss Strickland, who was acquainted with the original statue of Anne, says that it had "the merit of personal resemblance." Bird then was, perhaps, capable of making a likeness, although not of flattering his model; and there is amongst the medallions now in the British Museum a fine leaden portrait of Queen Anne, 7 3/8 inches in diameter which I am permitted to bring before you, facing page 214, with the suggestion that it might be the "essay" by this

---

2 Quoted in a note by Austin Dobson in his edition, 1907, of Leigh Hunt's The Town, p. 60.
3 The plate engraved was by Fourdrinier, a French artist, who studied under Picart in Amsterdam, settled in London in 1726 and worked here some 30 years, principally as a book illustrator. I understand from information kindly supplied by Mr. Hind that this artist, who was born in 1698 and died in 1758, was most probably Paul the elder, and not Peter as stated by Redgrave, Bryan and others. Our facing plate is the same as that prefixed to an account of the Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough published in 1742.
4 The Duchess of Marlborough caused Rysbrach in 1738 to make this statue of Queen Anne. Seeing that John Michael Rysbrach did not arrive in England until 1720, he can never have seen his model, and was moreover, according to most authorities, only born in 1693, so that he was a child at the time of her death. Vertue dates his birth even later (Vertue MS. 23,668, f. 51), saying that he was "about 20 years old when he came to this country," but this is probably an error. He was born in Antwerp, the son of a landscape painter, Pieter Rysbrach, or, as it is spelled by some, Rysbrack or Rysbracht.
STATUE OF QUEEN ANNE AT BLENHEIM.

The following Character of the late Majesty, Queen Anne, was written by her Grace Sarah Duchess of Marlborough and Collated and thus Enlarged.

Erected at BLENHEIM.

Queen Anne was very generous in her person, in Religion, without Affectation, in the Assembly, just, she had no title Ambitious, which appeared in the person of her Majesty at Tom Williams being preferred to the Crown before the time it was taken from the King. She had the best reason for following such examples & governing with Prudence, as reached the comprehension of all. In her greatest sufferings, she was forced to all sacrifices for the advantage of the Nation. She journeyed to Naples, where she was ever received and entertained by the people of those Provinces. She was under all the Kings of Jordan, 14 years and 9 months. She always paid the greatest Respect to every King and Queen, and never insisted upon any Controversy of Religion, more than what was established in the Nation. She paid regularly by Henry Charles, Duke of Marlborough. After the decease of the Queen, she was received into the Church of England. She was a very great lady in the House of Lords, and more than most women. She died after a few years and 9 months. The lady who attended on her in this last illness was lady in the Equestrian statue not brought to life.

SARAH MARLBOROUGH MRS. COPESTRE.

Handly inscrib'd to her Grace SARAH Duchess of Marlborough.

Published according to Act of Parliament.
Bird, the Sculptor.

Although so like a smaller medal by Croker, after the laureate bust had been adopted by him at a later period, that it has been regarded as a model executed by him on which to base his own portraits, it seems to me rather the work of a statuary than a jeweller, as Croker was said to be, being bolder and more massive than his highly finished work: and the fact that he made successful renderings of it at a later date would not discountenance the possibility that this somewhat less favourable likeness did not at first meet with the Queen's approval. The ornate dress is reminiscent of Bird's statue and recalls Kneller's sketch, although not so precisely as the more finished bronze medal (Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 251, Nos. 43 and 44, commemorating the Queen's Bounty of 1704, but were not struck until 1711, and Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 369, No. 218, and pp. 373-4, Nos. 218 and 219 were struck in 1710, on the battles of Douay, Almenara and Saragossa.

GUINEA OF 1702.

Had Walpole not spoken definitely of a medal in 1703 rather than a coin, we might fancy we saw the unfortunate portrait in the rejected guinea illustrated on our p. 200, for not only was the bare neck altered to meet the Queen's wishes, but a more pleasing outline was given to the profile under Croker's skilful hand in the current coinage. We have no certain means of ascertaining what artist produced the offending guinea, but its execution resembles that of its followers, and we recognise the hand of John Croker, the assistant graver at the Mint, upon the gold coins circulated from 1702 onward.

The amended portrait was presumably approved, for we find little or no change until after the Union, an event which called for alteration

---

1 Med. Ill., plate cxxxviii, i. See plate facing the next page.
2 Med. Ill., vol. ii, pp. 251, Nos. 43 and 44, commemorating the Queen's Bounty of 1704, but were not struck until 1711, and Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 369, No. 218, and pp. 373-4, Nos. 218 and 219 were struck in 1710, on the battles of Douay, Almenara and Saragossa.
3 The pattern guinea was submitted in June, 1702.
in the arms on the reverse, and was in some cases commemorated by a new bust on the obverse. Curiously enough a very slight difference in the obverse puncheon in the course of 1706 was accompanied on the five-guinea pieces by the new Union reverse, although the Act did not come into force until May, 1707. The coins were no doubt struck and dated according to the old style immediately after the Bill received the royal assent on March 6th, 1706–7. A fresh portrait with the drapery following a curved instead of a straight line is noticeable in 1709. The shillings of the first year of Anne are quite pleasing as examples of Croker's workmanship, and so are the slightly differing portraits which appeared in 1703, in 1707 and 1713, although the two last show signs of increasing heaviness of outline, for we must bear in mind that although Anne's features were good, and she was on the whole a comely woman, she became more and more puffy and fat in the face as her gout and love of eating gained upon her, so that her marked double chin was difficult to ignore. We must

1 See illustration on p. 203.
LEADEN MEDALLION OF QUEEN ANNE, IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.
conclude that the probable impediment to the employment of Croker as a medallist in 1703, was the fact that die-sinking for the coinage was at the moment absorbing his time.

But to return to John Roettier and the possible identification of his unfinished effort at portraying the Queen. I have in our former volumes often mentioned the puncheons and dies, once the property of the Roettier family, and presented by Matthew Young in 1828 to the British Museum. By the courtesy of Mr. Grueber I made, some time ago, a detailed examination of this horde, which brings strongly before us the extreme care bestowed by these artists upon their work. We again and again find puncheons with which the engraver was apparently not satisfied, thrown aside for others with a minute difference. Many dies were in process of elaboration when abandoned, others lack an obverse or a reverse and are unknown in a completed state. Some of these

1 See *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. iii, pp. 236–238; vol. viii, pp. 260–267; and vol. ix, p. 270. On the death of John Roettier many dies and puncheons were in his possession, including several pieces by the brothers who had worked with him in England, and the much discussed stock confiscated and returned after James Roettier’s disgrace. These objects were, it seems, conveyed to Norbert Roettier, who was then working at the French Mint, and after his death in 1727 were offered to the exiled Stuarts, but at so high a price as to be rejected; they were finally sold by the descendants of Norbert Roettier to a man named Cox, from whose hands they passed into those of Matthew Young. He, after making such restrikes as he deemed advisable, presented the collection to the British Museum. See *Num. Chron.*, 1st series, vol. iii, p. 186.
Matthew Young combined, so that restrikings exist of more than one medal never issued by the Roettiers. In other instances the portraits are new to the public, and amongst these we find two representing Anne. One, the illustration of which is given on our preceding page, is an unfinished matrix with the hair dressed in a peculiar manner, but otherwise it is of a simple character, although quite unlike any extant medal; whilst the other, a puncheon, somewhat reminds us of a bust later used by Croker to commemorate the Queen's Bounty, and to which we have already had occasion to refer, as bearing a laureated head of the Queen.

The large finished puncheon, presenting the portrait of Anne as laureated, recalls the leaden plaque tentatively ascribed by me to Bird. It has no definite reverse and I have ventured, somewhat on Matthew Young's principle of guesswork, to associate with it a graceful but

---

1 Queen Anne made a free gift of the first fruits and tenths, hitherto part of the Crown revenue, to be applied to the benefit of the Church, but although the Bill embodying this transfer received the royal assent on April 3rd, 1704, Croker only obtained the authorization to strike the medal on November 28th, 1711. It figures in his price list at £8 in gold, 12s. in silver, and 4s. in copper. See Alchorne's *Original Designs of Medals engraved by John Croker*. Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 18,757, c. 13.

2 See our page 213.

3 See our pages 212–13.
equally incomplete puncheon, in which the seated figure bears a distinct resemblance to the Queen, and which agrees fairly with the size of the obverse. Neither of these essays is particularly reminiscent of Kneller's sketch, but if we admit for the sake of argument that Anne may have wished to commemorate a victory in 1703, a laureated rather than crowned bust might be considered desirable. Again it is possible that Roettier's most successful experiment might not be amongst the puncheons in Matthew Young's collection, for Walpole concludes his narrative with the remark that "the unfinished die with others of the twelve Caesars were sent to France to his relations, whence two of them [the relations] arrived, hoping to be employed . . . . . but not meeting with any success they returned."
Now the visit of the younger members of the family was not made, so far as we know, until about the year 1730 or later, and we do not find in the British Museum the dies here mentioned of the twelve Cæsars, which were then brought to England with several others by the cousins—James, the son, sometimes in error called grandson, of James Roettier, and his namesake James Roettier-de-la-Tour, the son of Norbert. Although the younger of these two artists was offered employment at the Mint, they made no long stay in this country. If, however, they did bring over the die representing Anne, they may not have carried it back across the water in order to replace it in the collection afterwards sold to Young.

There is, moreover, one large cliché portraying Anne, which I have ventured to attribute to John Roettier rather than to his son Norbert, mainly on a question of workmanship; and possibly we may here find the results of the dying engraver's last sketch, produced by his descendants and presented for sale.

It is, however, more likely that the clichés were proofs struck contemporaneously, for old John Roettier and his son, not less than Thomas Simon, were much in the habit of striking thin silver plates to observe the progress of their work, and the shell next shown is just sufficiently rare to bear this interpretation. Such pieces were sometimes offered for the royal inspection, and were perhaps retained and presented for sale.

1 James Roettier, engraver to the English Mint, died, as we know, in 1698, leaving a son James, born at Bromley in Kent in 1698, who settled in Paris in 1718, but removed to the Low Countries as graveur général in 1733, having shortly before this time visited England. His cousin James, the son of Norbert, was born at St. Germain en Laye in 1707, and died in the employment of Louis XV. as goldsmith and engraver to the exiled Stuarts in 1784. Walpole implies that these young men arrived immediately after John's death, but Norbert himself was in a lucrative post in France, and his uncle Philip and his cousin George were also fully employed, whilst the other members of the family were not of an age to render a visit to England possible. The date of this visit is given in Num. Chron., 1st series, vol. iii, pp. 57 and 186, as "sometime in or about 1730." Mr. Forrer, in his Dictionary of Medallists, places it in 1732 or 1733, whilst Med. III., vol. ii, p. 737, and the Dictionary of National Biography mention 1731.

2 The specimen in the British Museum here illustrated and one now in my own collection are from the same die, but the lettering on the latter example is slightly double-struck. There are probably others, but I have met with none.
to some friend by the Queen at a time when a medal or miniature was still the most desirable substitute for a large picture, although the mezzotint and print were beginning to take the place now filled by a photograph.

I have gone too fully into the matter of these clichés in our former volumes\(^1\) to warrant my enlarging on the subject here, but I may repeat

\[\text{Cliché of Anne. Med. Ill., Vol. II, P. 231, No. 11.}\]

that after careful comparison of workmanship, aided by Mr. Grueber, I make so bold as to suggest the attribution of the better examples in this series of medallion portraits, amongst them the above, to John Roettier. The bust here reproduced bears a strong resemblance to that wherewith Croker decorated a medal celebrating the capture of certain

Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

cities by Marlborough in 1703—those of Bonn on May 4th, Huy on August 15th, and Limbourg on September 16th (o.s.) of that year.  

I am able to place before you these two portraits for comparison from the National Collection, with the suggestion that the die for the cliché had been retained at the Mint, and that, Roettier dying without engraving a reduced copy of the required size for a medal to commemorate the victories of 1703, Croker utilized the design when performing rather later the desired commission. The date of issue of Croker's version is somewhat uncertain, for the same bust appears on a medal combining the portraiture of the Queen with that of Prince George, formerly assigned to the year 1702, because of the honours conferred upon him in that year; examination of the Alchorne manu-

1 Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 246, No. 35. This medal was advertised for sale in Croker's price list at £7 in gold, 12s. in silver, and 4s. in copper.

2 Prince George was made Generalissimo of the Forces on 17th April, 1702, and Lord High Admiral on the 21st May following. See Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 233, No. 14.
scripts, however, informs us that Croker's design for this medal was accepted on the 20th of February, 1706-7, and its issue authorized "in fine gold and fine silver." The fact that the obverse as well as the reverse was then submitted to the Mint Authorities, is suggestive that the portrait was then offered for the first time, for most of the drawings in the Alchorne collection are of the reverse only, it being specified which obverse puncheon should be used from the stock in hand. It is, therefore, probable that the issue of the war medal, and of that commemorating Prince George's military and naval appointments, followed the events at a considerable interval.

It is noticeable that in Roettier's plaque the Queen faces to the right, whereas invariably upon her coins, and usually upon her medals, her head is turned to the left—a fact which might be explained if Croker copied Roettier's die, using it as a model for his reduced puncheon.

The fact that the old Jacobite engraver entered keenly into a project for portraying Anne corroborates a remark made by Ailesbury concerning the general content at her accession. "The Queen," writes the faithful chronicler of Stuart affairs, "who succeeded the late King William came to the Crown with a universal joy. She was a good and generous Princess of herself, and a daughter of the late King James; that took off the edge, and even the more moderate Jacobites were pleased to see at least a daughter of that good, but unfortunate, King on the throne."

2 Exceptions to this rule lie in foreign medals, or draughtsmen, by Martin Brunner and Jean Dassier, such as Med. Ill., vol. ii, pp. 243-4, Nos. 32, 31, 32. See also the design for a Union medal by Pierre Violier illustrated in Messrs. Spinks' Numismatic Circular, April, 1898, p. 2685. The Violier, being in the form of a design only, might be reversed on execution. I learn from Mr. Goulding that amongst the papers of Sir Robert Harley at Welbeck, there is a water-colour version of this drawing, which was no doubt sent to Sir Robert for his approval, he being one of the commissioners for the Union.
3 See p. 210, note 1. It is clearly proved by the large quantities of puncheons at the Royal Mint and in the collection at the British Museum that both Roettier and Croker made puncheons from which to sink their dies, and afterwards worked them up by engraving.
We may wonder why Anne, requiring a medal in 1703, did not have recourse to the eminently successful coronation portrait produced in 1702.\textsuperscript{1} No fewer than four dies are known, presenting very slight differences, and one would think that although Croker might be too busy with the coinage in 1703 to make a fresh study, his old puncheons of the former year would still have been available, but the issue was extremely large and the head may have become worn, for we cannot omit to notice that his accession\textsuperscript{2} and coronation medals were copied by Christian Wermuth\textsuperscript{3} and by Jan Boskam,\textsuperscript{4} and it is possible

\textsuperscript{1} Med. Ill., vol. ii, pp 228–30, Nos. 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9.
\textsuperscript{2} Med. Ill., vol. ii, pp. 227–8, Nos. 1 and 3.
\textsuperscript{3} Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 225, No. 2, and 229, No. 5, and 230, No. 10.
that one of these copies was undertaken abroad, on the death of
Roettier, to commemorate the taking of Bonn, rather than delayed
to await Croker's leisure.

We find upon the accession medals a rather less pleasing bust
than its almost immediate successor, designed for the coronation,1
but it was not absolutely rejected, for apart from appearing with two

differing reverses2 at this period, one of which Croker euphoniously
described as "The Chain of Hearts," we meet it later in the year,
commemorating the Queen's victories.3 So late as 1708 we still find

1 The Queen succeeded William III. on the 8th of March, 1701-2. The Coronation
ceremony was performed on the 23rd of April, 1702.

2 Med. Ill., vol. ii, pp. 227-8, Nos. 1 and 3. These medals are priced in Croker's
list at £3 15s. in gold, 5s. in silver, and 1s. 6d. in copper.

3 Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 236, No. 18. Expedition to Vigo Bay, October, 1702. And
p. 241, No. 26, in the same month, Capitulation of Towns on the Meuse.
Wermuth reverting to it as a model, when other more acceptable portraits would have been available.

Curiously enough the reverse decoration of the accession medal, illustrated on page 223, is better designed than the majority of its compeers, but the legend, ENTIRELY ENGLISH, was held by some to be in doubtful taste, for it was thought to reflect upon the late King, the words being used by Anne in her speech to Parliament immediately after the death of William. The phrase, however, caught the fancy of the multitude, and was also utilized by Christian Wermuth upon one of his coronation medals. The ceremony was performed on April 23rd, 1702, and medals and medalets were struck in several varieties and sizes. We find in the larger and official coronation medal a good portrait combined with a poor reverse, loaded as was so frequently the case at that period with a symbolical and pseudo-classical design, typifying in this instance Anne's readiness to carry on the wars begun by her predecessor.

1 Wermuth's copies commemorated the Accession, Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 227, No. 2, also Vigo, p. 237, No. 19 in 1702, and other events in 1708, p. 311, No. 132, and pp. 319-20, Nos. 144-5.

2 Oldmixon's History of England from William and Mary to George I., p. 276.

3 Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 231, No. 10. The words quoted formed part of the Queen's speech on March 11th, 1702, in addressing Parliament:—"As I know my heart to be entirely English I can very sincerely assure you that there is not anything you can expect or desire which I shall not be ready to do for the happiness and prosperity of England." See Strickland's Queens, vol. viii, p. 131, and Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 227, No. 1. Anne was of pure English descent, her mother being Anne, daughter of the first Earl of Clarendon.
The Coronation Medals.

On the subject of these souvenirs Newton was much exercised, "the time for making medals for the Coronation being very short." Firstly, he wished for orders concerning the thickness of the flan, and secondly, the cost formed the theme of his letters to the Treasury. Writing for instructions early in April, he suggested that "the silver medals may be 22 and the gold 20 in the pound weight Troy. If a pound weight be divided into 18 medals they would take the impression better, for the former gold medals were too thin."

I have found evidence that the weight was not increased in compliance with this suggestion, and, with the exception of a very heavy example in the British Museum, such gold coronation medals as I have had the opportunity of weighing have been lighter than those of William and Mary, of which Evelyn condemns "the sculpture" as "very mean." It is difficult without a greater experience than falls to the share of the ordinary collector accurately to determine the average weight of these medals either in gold or silver, for they are very variable, and although 18, 20, or 22, might turn the scale at a pound, I have met with no medal weighing precisely 320, 288, or 262 grains. By the courtesy of Mr. Spink and Mr. Baldwin I have compared specimens from their cabinets with my own and with the examples in the British Museum, and as a result I find varieties in silver from 226 to 250½ grains under Anne, as against 245 to 260 under William and Mary, the most common weight in the year 1689 being about 245, whilst in 1702, 241 grains is the frequent figure, thus falling far below the 262 grains we should expect to find at the rate of 22 medals to the pound in silver. As regards examples under Anne in gold, we have mentioned the specimen in the National Collection

1 *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. lxxix, No. 46.
2 *Med. Ill.*, vol. ii, p. 228, No. 4, weighing 569½ grains.
3 Evelyn's *Diary*, vol. iii, p. 277, ed. of 1827—April 11th, 1689, where the diarist states that "the Parliament men were feasted at the Exchequer chamber" after the coronation "and had each a gold medal given them, worth five and forty shillings." Besides 300 gold and 1,200 silver medals given to his courtiers, William presented 515 in gold to the Commons and 28 of double value to foreign Ministers. Anne distributed 300 in gold and 1,250 in silver through the Treasurer of the Household, 518 in gold through the Speaker, and 40 of the heavier type through the Lord Chamberlain. See *Brit. Mus. Addit. MS.* 18,759, f. 150.
weighing $569\frac{1}{2}$ grains, and it is noticed in the *Montagu Catalogue* that the owner’s example was struck upon an extra thick flan, but the weight is not given. Possibly these specimens may be two of the forty which were specially struck as gifts to foreign Ministers, “Strangers of Quality,” and Ambassadors, at 10 medals to the pound Troy. The desired weight is more nearly approached under William and Mary by a coronation souvenir in gold, in Mr. Baldwin’s cabinet, which turns the scale at $327$ grains, whilst in this instance, again, the example in the Department of Coins and Medals is $40$ grains heavier. On the other hand, Mr. Baldwin’s specimen of 1702 weighs $5$ grains more than is warranted by the division of 20 medals in the pound, being $293$ grains in weight.

The discrepancy in the amount of metal found in medals is often greater than can be explained by a note appended to Croker’s price list, informing his clients that the cost of some of his wares, ranging from about £3 to the large sum of £30 per piece, is subject to alteration on this account: “The Price of Gold Medals is according to their Weight, so may be two or three Shillings more or less than what is here set down.” The coronation medal is there scheduled at £3 15s., and possibly Croker claimed the right to a variation of some 3 or 4 per cent. on the smaller and cheaper pieces, rather than the very slight allowance which a couple of shillings would represent if he referred only to the more expensive examples. This is the more likely because it is noticeable that a remedy of one halfpenny in 42 was considered permissible by those who managed the copper currency, and possibly no greater effort was made to preserve an exact accuracy with regard to the coronation medals, so long as the desired average was fairly attained on the very large creation demanded by the Queen for distribution. We know that the total issue must have been considerable, for besides 2,058 specimens made for the Court, examples were offered to the public not only in gold, as I have said, at £3 15s., but also at 5s.,

1 *Montagu Sale, May, 1897, Lot 564.*
2 *Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18,757, c. 13.* Note to a printed list bound into the book, the same list appearing in manuscript amongst the papers, but without the note.
3 *MS. Treasury Papers, vol. ciii, No. 88.*
and at 1s. 6d., in silver and in copper respectively. Newton mentions the sum of "2485½18s and 3½" as the expenditure on these souvenirs struck in the two superior metals expressly for Anne, and here, of course, the charge would be rendered at cost price with no thought of profit. Newton requests separate payment for the souvenirs on the plea of "the Coynage Duty in the opinion of Mr. Attorney General being not applicable to the service," and therefore informs the "Lords Commrs of her Maytes Treasury" that "other Money will be requisite." Towards the end of the year we find the Master of the Mint begging for a settlement of his claim, and writing again to Lord Godolphin on the subject. There is due to me for Medals for her Maytes Coronation the summ of 2485½ 18. 3½, and for the paymt of this debt I humbly conceive the Civil List to be the proper fund. I am now to make up my Accompts for the year ending this Christmas, and that I may balance this part of my Accompts I humbly" [beg] "yo' Lordp that the money above mentioned may be impost to me before the year expire." It is satisfactory to read the minute attached to this request: "To be pd out of Civil List mo. since 8 March," and to know that the coinage money was freed from an unfair burden.

But what was this fund of which Newton speaks? The Coinage Duty was voted by the House of Commons to defray mint expenses,

---

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxix, No. 56, April 15th, 1702. The approximate cost of striking medals some 37 years after the date in question is brought before us by Tanner in a memorial amongst the Alchorne MSS. He states that in making 102 medals of Milton in January, 1738–9, 15 days were required and he had to pay £1 17s. 6d. for preparing the blanks at 2s. 6d. a day, also "To ye Surveyor 3 days at 5s. a day." "To ye Filer 3 days at 25. 6d." "To ye Blancher 3½ days at 1s. 8d." "To a Labourer 3 days at 1s. 8d." "To Coals Melting pots, Aquafortis Salt-petre and a copper pan 12s. od." "To an iron borer 10s. od." "To 2 outtings and six springs 4s. od.," and "to 8 doz. and ½ Shagreen cases, 10s. a doz." Drawing the copper to a proper size came to 2s. 6d., whilst providing the copper blanks, 50 in number, cost 18s. 9d. The silver, 4 ounces at 6s. od., totalled £1 4s. 0d. The "Money Expended" reached altogether, according to the engraver's rather faulty arithmetic, £11 9s. 7d., and it is pathetic to see that the further charge "Fur my own Attendance 1. 10. 0" is struck out by the mint authorities. According to Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18,759, the cost of coining Anne's gold medals at 20 to the pound Troy was 3s. apiece, and of the silver, at 22 to the pound, 6d. each.

2 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxix, Nos. 40 and 56.

and instituted by an Act of Parliament in the year 1666, imposing a tax upon the importation of wines, spirits, beer, cider, and vinegar.\textsuperscript{1} The amount assigned to the Mint was then limited to £3,000 per annum, but the Act was renewed every seven years, and in 1705 the annual sum was increased to £3,500,\textsuperscript{2} and again augmented in 1708 to £4,700, besides an additional £400 a year specially granted for the suppression of forgery.\textsuperscript{3} Extra expenses were also met by this fund, such as "£1915. 11. 6 the Loss by the Plate taken in at certain rates and coined pursuant to an address of the House of Commons, 5th May 1711: \textsuperscript{4} and an Act was passed to facilitate the settlement of the employees' claims, when we read that "a Sum not exceeding 2700. 5. 3\frac{1}{2} was to be paid out of Coinage Duty to the Provost and Moneyers of Mint of the Tower of London for recoining the money of Scotland." These charges had been legalized by the Act of March, 1708, when my Lord Treasurer was permitted to "Issue out of Coynage Duty 500\$ pr Ann over and above 3000 a year for the uses of the Mint, and 6000\$ to pay a premium of 2\frac{3}{4} an Ounce for plate etc., brought into ye Mint before 1st Xber 1709, 1200\$ for the Mints in Scotland, and 400\$ a year from 1st June 1709 for the charge of prosecuting Clippers and Coyners."\textsuperscript{5} The last item must have been a relief to the purse of the overburdened Mint Master, who in April, 1702, requested from the Lord High Treasurer the permission to apply certain sums amounting to "1886\$ 6s. 3\frac{1}{2} left in his hands by his predecessor, Thomas Neale, to the object of "rebuilding the Press House and paying Mr. Weddell a salary of 60\$ Annum to which the

\textsuperscript{1} 18 and 19 Carl. II., c. 5, Stats., vol. 5, p. 600. The money was to be devoted to "Fees and Salaries of the Officers of the Mint or Mints and towards maintaining and repairing of the Houses, Offices and Buildings, and other necessary for assay, melting downe, and on coyning." This Act was revived 25 Carl. II., c. 8; 1 Jac. II., c. 7; 4 William and Mary, c. 24; and 12 and 13 Gul. III., c. 11.

\textsuperscript{2} 4 and 5 Anne, c. 9.

\textsuperscript{3} Information kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking. See also 7 Anne, c. xxiv, and Ruding, vol. ii, pp. 62 and 63.

\textsuperscript{4} Anne 12, c. 7, Stats., vol. ix, p. 554.

\textsuperscript{5} Danny MS. entitled \textit{List of the Funds granted under Anne}.

\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid.} Abstract from Act 7 Anne, c. 24. The Act specified that the wrought plate, British or Foreign, must in order to be accepted be "of the Standard of Eleven Ounces Two pennyweight fine."
Coynage duty is not applicable. The office of clerk to the Warden of the Mint in London in connection with apprehending false coiners is mentioned in the Treasury Papers of 1702 and 1703 as that of a "Mr. Weddell," who had been Warden of the Mint at Chester; and Newton specially informs us that he was paid this sum of £60 for "prosecuting Clippers and Coiners," so we may assume that the £400 specified by the Acts of Parliament for this and similar expenses had become a necessity when the funds in hand had been exhausted.

According to some contemporary account books at Danny, which, by the courtesy of their owner, Mr. W. H. Campion, I have examined, considerably larger sums than those stipulated for by the Acts in the earlier years of Anne's reign, were paid "to Isaac Newton Esqre Mar and Worker of her Majts Mint upon acct out of coynage Duty." The payment varied from £3,486 14s. 4½d. between Michaelmas, 1702, and the same date in 1703, to upwards of £7,000 in some of the succeeding years. Why, considering that the changes in the Acts were

---

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxix, No. 56.
3 Newton writes also on March 18th, 1702-3, that he has still in his hands some money "formerly imprest to Mr. Neale, out of other Funds than the Coinage Duty, out of wch I pay a salary of sixty pounds per ann to Mr. Robert Weddell for his services in prosecuting Clippers and Coiners." See Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxv, No. 9.
4 One of the Danny MS. Account Books ranging from 1702 to 1709. Unfortunately some of the pages are missing from the beginning and end of this volume. This hiatus embraces the first months of Anne's reign from Lady Day to Michaelmas 1702, and all the accounts from September, 1707, to the same date in 1708.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michaelmas 1702 to 1703</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3,486 14 4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1703 to 1704</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1704 to 1705</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1705 to 1706</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1706 to 1707</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1707 to 1708</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1708 to 1709</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remainder of the manuscript is missing, and in one year only of those represented does the amount received under the heading of "Coynage Duty for the Mint, being 10s. p. Tun on Wines imported," exceed the sum paid over to Newton, but we notice that between Michaelmas, 1708, and the same date in 1709 the receipts reach £7,795 9s. 7½d., whilst £7,541 1s. 2d. only was disbursed.
not yet made, the sums disbursed to Newton rose suddenly to a much higher figure, I have been unable to ascertain, and unluckily the manuscript from which I quote stops just at the time the authorization comes into force for subsidizing the Scottish Mint.

The coinage of Scotland was subjected to alteration owing to the Union, the most important change being in the substitution of the English currency for that hitherto peculiar to Scotland, which had differed in values as well as in portraiture. The letter E, for Edinburgh, was placed upon the coins for purposes of identification, and it was arranged that Dr. David Gregory, described by Newton as a "Professor of Astronomy at Oxford," should oversee the northern mint at a salary of £250 for all charges for three months stay. Three of the Moneyers Company, Thomas Seabrook, Henry Haley and Richard Collard, were to be sent "to undertake the coinage of the money" at 9d. per lb. weight, and a bonus of 3s. per week extra if the weekly output exceeded a thousand pounds of metal. They were also to be paid their travelling expenses of £16 each for their journeys, and to be supplied with dies and puncheons from England. Dr. Gregory had to make various experiments owing to difficulty in the melting, it being made there with Pit coal, and he remained at Edinburgh until November 21st, 1707, when, the new method being understood, he left. Besides £1,200 for the maintenance, working and the fees and salaries of the officers of the Scottish Mint, specially voted as payable from the Coinage Duty, and sums drawn from an extra £6,000 for payment of a premium of 2½d. on every ounce

1 One of the Articles of the Union was that "the Coin shall be of the same standard and value throughout the United Kingdom." By the Act, 7 Anne, c. 24, £1,200 was to be allowed out of the Coinage Duty for the expenses of the Mint of Scotland which the recointage entailed, and the English Mint provided dies and certain workmen. "For making up the loss which private persons may sustain," special provisions were made (see Burns, vol. ii, p. 526).

2 Thomas Seabrook was one of the two apprentices at Norwich during the great recointage.


of plate brought for conversion into the bullion, the London Mint officials, as we have seen, received a substantial remuneration for their part in the matter.1

The prices of the dies and puncheons to be sent from England were carefully arranged, i.e., "Sixpenny Dyes at 9/6 a pair, Shilling Dyes at 13/6d a pair, Half Crown Dyes at 19/6 a pair and Crown Dyes at 26/6 a pair, and Sixpenny Puncheons at £10 a pair, Shilling Puncheons at £15 a pair, half Crown Puncheons at £20 a pair and Crown Puncheons at £25 a pair."2 The London officials on July 9th, 1707, professed themselves as "ready to furnish them [the Scottish officials] at present with Dyes for Sixpences and Shillings and Puncheons for Sixpences at those prices and shall soon be ready to furnish them with as many Dyes and Puncheons of all sorts as they shall desire." But on August 29th, Stanley, Newton and Ellis account for a delay in sending the half-crown and crown puncheons, because they "were made, but failed in the hardening, and new ones are making."3 The Scottish graver at this time desiring "Puncheons for the small arms and letters," we are informed that "they are providing," but still delays ensued, for we hear on September 6th, 1707, that "the mint is now at worst, but they'r not yet provided with all things necessary to make a thorough coinage,"4 although, as Mr. Cochran-Patrick tells us, all the old Scottish money had been called in by August.5

Reference to the warrant of 20th June, 1707, published in full by this well-known authority,6 proves that dies as well as puncheons for crowns, half-crowns, shillings and sixpences were indeed sent from London, but seemingly in restricted quantities only, for the Mint Master at Edinburgh was enjoined also to coin from dies made from the puncheons received from the Tower, and to cause his Scottish graver "to make new Dyes" from these puncheons and "also to make new

1 See our p. 228.
2 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cii, No. 64.
3 Ibid., vol. cii, No. 110.
4 Ibid., No. 121.
6 Cochran-Patrick, vol. ii, p. 307. See also Treasury Papers, vol. cii, No. 40, June 2nd, 1707, when the orders were drafted and approved by the Treasury.
puncheons, and to use them for making Dyes,” with the proviso that the result must be “perfectly lyke the moneys coyned in our mint in the Tower.” One tenth part of the silver brought to the Edinburgh office was to be recoined into sixpences, four-tenths into shillings, three-tenths into half-crowns and the remaining two-tenths into crowns.

Perhaps it was because of the large issue of the shillings and comparatively large output of sixpences, that as regards these coins alone the puncheons as well as the dies required renewal, for the half of the bullion represented by the two smaller coins caused a greater strain upon the dies, insomuch as five times more sixpences and ten times more shillings than crowns must be struck to produce the required results. We find in the Treasury Papers a claim entered in 1712 by James Clerk, the engraver to the Scottish Mint, and his colleague Joseph Cave, which refers to these puncheons and to some smaller currency. The latter is vainly sought by collectors, although we have evidence that a die and a pattern piece exist.

James Clerk, whose earlier coinage presented a very inferior type of portraiture, had a regular salary as Mint engraver, which was retained by him throughout his life and was even enjoyed by his successor, Cave, for

---

1 The crowns agree with the second variety of the English head; the half-crown having also the second bust. There are three types in shillings, the third bust being peculiar to Edinburgh, whilst the first and second represent the second and third English respectively. See Burns, vol. ii, pp. 228 to 235.


3 Ibid., vol. cdlx, No. 45.
many years after the Edinburgh Mint had become inoperative. The office of "governour of the Mint in Scotland" was not formally abolished until 1817, but we have seen no currency dated later than 1709, although Mr. Cochran-Patrick speaks of proof coinages of shillings and sixpences struck in Edinburgh after the Union until 1711. As pertaining to the last mentioned date the following extract from the Treasury Papers is therefore not without interest. Clerk complains that he shares his salary of £50 with Cave, and that no extra payment has been made them as "conjoinet Engravers of her Majestie's Mint in Scotland," although "your Petitioners att the time of the Recoinage of Scotland did, by order of the Master worker, make one Shilling Head and Reverse, one Six Pence Head and Reverse, and by virtue of a Warrand from her Majestie directed to the general of the said Mint they have since made Puncheons and Letters for small Coynes, viz. Four Pence, Three Pence, Two Pence and one Penny, having only a Sallery of Fiftie Pounds a year as Sinkers and no Allowance as gravers." They demand a total of £210: namely, £60 on the score of their "Extraordinary

1 James Clerk, or Clark, had been engraver to the Scottish Mint for William III. We find him entered as drawing his salary of £50 a year until 1723, inclusive, in Chamberlayne's *State of Great Britain* (Part II, Book III, p. 37), but in the next volume, printed in 1726 (Part II, Book III, p. 47), Joseph Cave takes his place, and he still holds it in Chamberlayne's list in 1755 (Part III, p. 47).

2 The Coinage of Scotland, vol. ii, Plate XVI.

3 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cxi, No. 45.

4 A report dated June 2nd, 1707, from the London Mint Office to the Lord High Treasurer, on the arrangements to be made at Edinburgh, had suggested that the graver should be instructed "to use such master puncheons as shall be sent him from the Tower for making the moneys of both mints perfectly alike, until the puncheons made by himself shall be approv'd by the offic's of that Mint." MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cii, No. 46 Minuted "approved, order to be prepared accordingly."
Trouble during the great Coinage as hath been allowed to other officers besides £30 for Mr. Cave's charge and attendance, together with the price of the puncheons — they place the shilling at £30, the sixpence at £20, and the smaller coins together at £70. A minute of January 7th, 1711-12, refers this request to the London Mint officials, who, replying on July 16th, 1712, materially reduced the bill to £15 for the shillings and £10 for the sixpences, saying that these were "the rates allowed to the gravers of the Mint in the Tower for the like puncheons made by them for the late Recoinage of Monies in Scotland," making, curiously enough, no reference to sums formerly paid to Clerk for original work under William III., perhaps because he in that instance had demanded and received prepayment. The remuneration for the small pieces was similarly reduced on this basis by a sliding scale to another £25, namely, £4, £6, £7 and £8 respectively, for the penny to the groat, and the claim that other officials had received payment for "extraordinary trouble" was dismissed with the words:—"Wee have hitherto reported no allowance, and we find that Mr. Cave's attendance was without order and voluntary."

This document corroborates the suggestion put forth by the late Mr. Burns¹ that a copper pattern groat engraved with the letter E and the date 1711, which was described in the Numismatic Chronicle by Mr. Wingate, together with a die similarly marked for the half groat, might owe its origin to the necessity "of supplying Scotland with small silver, of which there was great need," but Mr. Burns considered the copper groat, and a silver example known to him of the obverse only, to be due to later and non-contemporaneous striking after the die had rusted, and thought that no coinage of later date than 1709 was issued in Scotland. Mr. Wingate, on the contrary, was of opinion that the worn condition of the die was due to use, not to age, and that it was likely that some pieces were produced.² Another problem which puzzled Mr. Burns and other writers may perhaps be elucidated by Clerk's charge for puncheons. I allude to the star after the E on some

Edinburgh coins. Ruding said that in 1708, "after the apprehensions of invasion were at an end, the forty-shilling pieces Scottish and other coins of that sort, which had been brought to the mint at Edinburgh, but which had been issued again from the necessity of that time, were called a second time into the mint and re-coined into sterling money the same as the English." Ruding said that in 1708, "after the apprehensions of invasion were at an end, the forty-shilling pieces Scottish and other coins of that sort, which had been brought to the mint at Edinburgh, but which had been issued again from the necessity of that time, were called a second time into the mint and re-coined into sterling money the same as the English." 

These coins," continues Ruding, "were distinguished from those coined in 1707 by a mullet of six points." But this explanation could not be stretched to cover three dates, namely, 1707, 1708 and 1709, all of which appear with the star. There are several different busts on the shillings. The first Scottish shilling (Burns, 1087) bears Anne’s second—or "Vigo”—English portrait, whilst the second Scottish head (Burns, 1089) is in type like the third English; these are both found with the letter E unstarred, but the former only of these two busts is seen also with the star, at least so we are informed by Mr. Burns, an author on whose researches we may rely. The third type, which is always marked with a star and dated 1708 and 1709, is a variant from those emanating from London. Neither shilling nor sixpence is published without a star in 1709, and both are uncommon in 1708, whilst the starred coins of 1707 are extremely rare. May we not therefore suppose that the Tower mint supplied the puncheons and a limited number of dies dated 1707 and 1708, designed according to Anne’s English currency of the outgoing type of head, and that dies were

1 Annals of the Coinage, vol. ii, p. 64. See also Cochran-Patrick, vol. i, p. cvi: "All the English silver money was called in in April, and in August, all foreign and Scottish money was called in, and re-issued as the coinage of the United Kingdom. The threatened invasion in 1708 caused another proclamation in which the currency of Scottish coins was temporarily permitted. In April, however, they were finally called in and re-minted at the Mint in Edinburgh."

2 Ruding errs in this description, which should read: "a five pointed star."

3 Hawkins' second and third types are found on coins in 1707 and 1708 in England. This accounts for the early type of these being used on Scottish coins. The shillings and sixpences, E, without the star of 1708, are very rare. See Burns, vol. ii, p. 532.


5 Mr. Hoblyn writing in Num. Chron., New Series, vol. xix, p. 140, says that he reluctantly came to the conclusion that a shilling of 1709 in Mr. Wakeford’s collection although appearing unstarred, showed signs, through a powerful glass, of a star very faintly
made from the puncheons when these patterns were exhausted, marking the star on these new dies before a fresh supply came from England with the "Union" bust? The rarity of such copies of 1707 would be natural, for the original dies sent in July should hardly have required replacing before January, when, in Scotland (the new style of dating being in use), the dies marked 1708 would take up the work. We should have thought that the fresh type of bust must have arrived in Scotland before January in that year, for otherwise no example with this portrait would have been struck coupled with a reverse bearing date 1707, but Mr. Burns remarks that it was no infrequent occurrence in Scotland to find the obverse dies of one year combined with reverses of another;¹ and moreover the fact that the old style was still used in England would account for the numeral 7 instead of 8 being present on dies made at the Tower. Clerk and Cave produced their own fairly accurate copies of the puncheons, they being entitled by their commission to do so,² and here we find the starred specimens of 1708 and 1709; of which third bust, as we have seen, no unstarred examples exist, unless struck and apparently partly erased. By the kindness of the present owner, Mr. Bearman, I have seen this shilling and can also see a little trace of the star, but I should be more inclined to think that the small star on the die was accidentally stopped out at the moment of striking, than that the marks had been made and removed—for the coin is in fine condition. That the star existed is made almost certain by comparison of this shilling with another in the same collection, and seemingly from the same die, which is clearly starred; and in this instance also some of the rays or points of the star have failed in the striking.

² See Treasury Papers, cii, No. 40, June 2nd, 1707. It was recommended by Newton and Stanley that the graver should be commanded to use the puncheons sent him from the Tower "until the puncheons made by himself should be approved by the officers of that mint."
indeed the doubtful specimens mentioned in our note should be taken into consideration.¹

The sixpences vary so little in bust that it is difficult to trace a change of puncheon, but I think I am right in believing that one of the sixpences illustrated below, marked with a starred E in 1708, varies from the ordinary type, and I have seen more than one example of the variety. I regret that in common with such numismatists with whom I have communicated I have seen no sixpence of 1709 with or without a star. The absence of the star on the groat and half-groat would not militate against this explanation, for as no puncheon was supplied from

England there was no necessity for a private sign upon the dies. With regard then to the shilling and sixpence which owe their origin to the puncheons and dies of Clerk and Cave, it might be suggested that for purposes of remuneration they were permitted to use this mark. We have noticed that under William III., Clerk had insisted on prepayment before the delivery of his handiwork, which was granted so as not to impede the coinage;² and such not being the custom of the English Treasury it is possible the engraver was allowed to emphasize his claim upon the dies. Dr. W. H. Scott, in a *Note on the New Shilling of Queen Anne*, remarks in answer to an endeavour made by Mr. Gibbs to substantiate Ruding’s explanation, that he considers this star to have no particular reference to a second mintage, but that it was simply used as a means of distinguishing contemporary coinages, perhaps by different moneyers.³ I would like to add that on the late starred coins

¹ See p. 235, note 5.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

Anne appears to me to be less well portrayed, although, these coins being rarely obtained in good condition, it is rather difficult to base an argument on their execution. We have a better opportunity of judging Clerk's style in William III.'s gold. We have there seen him at his best and appreciate the wisdom of supplying him with a model, but whether this star was a maker's mark, as I venture to agree with Dr. Scott in suggesting, or (as Mr. Burns believed) the sign of a different origin of the bullion of finer quality than that of the majority of the coins first melted, and consequently subject to no alteration of alloy, I must ask my readers to decide. Howbeit, we have seen that the Scottish engravers charge for the puncheons for the shillings and lesser coins only, and that the type of bust upon certain shillings dated 1708 and 1709 with the star is peculiar to the Edinburgh coinage; which is in favour of the ascription to Clerk and Cave, who would probably also place their sign on the dies they made from the English puncheons. Should the solitary sixpence of 1709 mentioned in the catalogue of the Rev. Henry Christmas as bearing the starred E, come under more particular notice, it would be interesting to see whether it presented the same bust as these last issued shillings, or that of the rather peculiar sixpence which I have illustrated, for should this prove true, another link in the chain would be established. But it will be remembered that this sixpence was referred to by Mr. Hoblyn, in his *Edinburgh Coinage of Queen Anne*, as probably "an error of description, or of the printer." 1

The crowns and half-crowns illustrated by Ruding with the starred E are discredited by other writers. Be this as it may, the fact of their existence or non-existence would not affect the argument, for the dies sent from England might have been copied in Edinburgh if the necessity arose. Mr. Hoblyn, however, remarks a slight divergence from the ordinary Tower type in some crowns of 1708 unstared. If, therefore, my suggested theory for the starred coins be correct, this puncheon, which, unless 1708 is a misprint for 1707, I cannot trace, must be a product of the Tower Mint, and probably a portrait from the hand of

---

1 *Num. Chron.*, New Series, vol. xix, p. 141. I have been unable to discover anyone who has seen this sixpence.
Bull instead of Croker. The variant of 1707 is, I think we may safely say, a forgery.

It is possible that had Mr. Burns known of Clerk's claim he might have attached more importance to Dr. Scott's judgment as to the "moneyers," which I here suggest should read engravers.

I hope I may be excused for so long a disquisition upon the subject of the Scottish final coinage, for it is one of the most important numismatic events in the reign of Queen Anne—a salutary measure which, however, although in a lesser degree than the English recoinage of William, cost the country a very large sum of money. The loss was considerable, and in compensation for new liabilities imposed upon Scotland in taxation and other expenses, a grant, called "the equivalent," of a sum of £398,085 was ordered, to use the words of a well-known modern writer, "to be paid by England at the Union, and it was agreed that this should be applied towards providing Scotland with a new coinage, paying up in full the shareholders of the bankrupt Scotch African Company thereafter to be dissolved, and for encouraging manufactories and fisheries."¹

We have already seen that this fund was supplemented by drafts on the "Coinage Duty," mainly obtained from the excise revenue—the alterations in which formed one of the most unpopular measures imposed by the Union.

The apparent need for small currency in Scotland leads us to a passing suggestion, made in the July of 1702, that a copper penny should be substituted for the small silver coin then current in England, the mint officials being of opinion that "the penny by reason of its smallness" was easily lost.² This idea received no encouragement, and the fact is known to all numismatists, that the large penny of baser metal only came into circulation under George III., in 1797, and no serious proposition concerning its production in Anne's reign is before us; but we find memorials offered without delay on the vexed question of half-pence and farthings.

² MS. Treasury Papers, lxxx, No. 105.
In writing about the copper coinage under William III., I had occasion to refer to petitions written after his demise on this subject, because they threw retrospective light on the issue of half-pence and farthings.\(^1\) One of these from "Slaney and others" was a suggestion to coin five hundred tons of these coins in five years "of fine English copper to a Standard that shall be agreed to by the officers of the Mint, and the Copper to be melted Roll'd Cutt and Stamp'd at your Mat'ies Mint at the Tower, subject to a Comptroller att the Undertaker's expense, but to be appointed by your Mat'ies."\(^2\) The minute "Let him put the Proposal in writing" provoked a request to permit seven hundred tons to be coined, making no "Greater Quantity than shall be found necessary for the Publick good" at one period, and offering £5,000 for the privilege and a rent of £1,000 a year under certain conditions.\(^3\) This document is minuted on May 25th:—"My Lords will speak with the officers of the Mint;" and a similar proposal on slightly different terms, made on July 6th, 1703, was again referred to expert opinion.\(^4\)

But Stanley, Newton and Ellis, Warden, Master and Comptroller, vetoed the suggested copper coinage on two grounds. Firstly, they deemed that if such currency were required, it would be wiser to return to the older plan in use before the necessity of exchanging the tin money then in circulation had resulted in special privileges being granted to Slaney.\(^5\) According to the older official arrangement "ye Coinage of halfpence and farthings was performed by one or more Commissioners, who had money imprested from ye Exchq' to buy Copper and Tin, and Coin'd at 20\(^d\) ye Pound Haverdupois, and accounted upon Oath to the Government for ye Produce thereof." Secondly, they remarked as of greater importance that, "We do not hear there is any demand of Farthings and Halfpence at present," and they explained the "want in some places" by "unequal distribution," "for," said they, "we are informed they are overstockt with them in

---

\(^1\) *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. viii, pp. 261–2.


\(^3\) *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. lxxxv, No. 141. May 18th, 1703.

\(^4\) *MS. Treasury Papers*, lxxxvi, No. 91.

\(^5\) *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. lxxxvi, No. 102.
The Copper Coinage.

other Places, as at ye Generall Post Office about Newcastle, and at Leicester," and they held that more should not be made "for fear of stopping ye Currency of those that are already abroad." This finished the discussion for the moment, for we read on the 13th of July, 1703: "My Lords concurre wth this Report." Nevertheless the subject was re-opened before long, and again competitors were in the field in the persons of Thomas Renda and Edward Ambrose, who had been in partnership with Slaney and Barton, but who on May 1st, 1705, were informed that: "When there is occasion for new farthings, his Lordship is resolved to employ ye Officers of ye Mint in ye affair." This decision probably resulted from a petition put forth by "the Corporation of Monyers" who were "in great straits" in the month of March, 1704–5, and the employees at the Tower consequently desired "a Licence of Coyning a quantity of Copper halfpence and farthings, not exceeding 30 tunns a year, under the direction and Check of the Officers of the Mint, and such restrictions as your Lordship shall think fit." A minute which is attached to a sympathetic report upon the Corporation's petition, reads: "25 Apr. 1705. Read and approved. There is no want of Copper money in any part of England at present, and when there is, my Lords will pursue this method." The Mint officers in their report, after discussing a fresh proposal from William Shepard and his partners, who wished "to coin forty or fifty Tunns p. ann. of copper Halfpence and farthings for the space of Eight or Ten years," had again explained under date April 5th, 1705, that the coinage of copper money in the time of Charles II., of James II., and at the beginning of the late reign, had been carried on at the charge of the Crown under the supervision of the Mint officials, and suggested that they should issue copper coins in small quantities as required, under the same rules as gold and silver, "out of the clear profit whereof her Majesty may have it in her power either to relieve


2 MS. Treasury Papers, xciv, No. 8, referred March 22nd and 23rd, "to the Mint officers for report which was rendered Apr. 5th, and debated April 25th, 1705."

3 Ibid.

4 William Shepard, N. Shepard and George Freeman.
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the wants of moneyers of the Mint, many of whom we must inform your Lordship are in a starving condition, or to gratify any other person."\(^1\)

Nevertheless, again in December, 1707, we find various proposals submitted by three separate parties: firstly, William Cooper and D. Allen; secondly, "Sir Talbot Clerke and his father Sir Clem Clerke"; thirdly, Thomas Chambers. One of these tenders, that of Sir Talbot Clerke, casts a certain light upon the expenses of coining; otherwise I would not trouble you with a repetition of the details in these rejected schemes.\(^2\) Clerke proposed sending "into the Mint two tons pr week of blanks of malleable Copper to be coined til they have disposed of 700 Tuns, and to have the dispensing of them into the several parts of the Kingdom when coined." He wished "to cut a pound weight into 21 pence, with a remedy of a half-penny, and he reckoned to be allowed for the copper 12\(^d\) per pound, for the hammering and cutting into blanks 6\(^d\), for the dispensing 1\(^d\), and pay for the coinage 2\(^d\), but yet proposed to receive these summes by weight so as for every pound weight of copper to receive back a pound weight of money, and give no account by Tale." The report of the Mint officials referred the Treasury Board to their former explanations of July 1st, 1703, on the desirability of not "overstocking the nation," with the result that on the 14th of April, 1708, "My Lord" of the Treasury announced that he "doth not thinke there is any occasion for coyning more farthings and halfpence at present."

The time, however, at last arrived—of this the numerous patterns of 1713 assure us—when the coinage of William III. had ceased to glut the market, and Croker put forth his skill to produce a singularly pleasing series, which, had Anne survived, would no doubt have come into general currency. It is indeed believed from the fact that the farthing of 1714 is found in greater quantities and less perfect condition

\(^1\) *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. xciv, No. 8. The Mint Officers recommended that:—"Whenever her Majesty shall think fitt to order Copper money to be coyned, that it may be performed as near as may be to the methods of the Mint, that either a Gen\(^H\) Importer or the Master Worker may have money Imprest to him to buy copper to be coined into halfpence and farthings."

\(^2\) *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. ciii, No. 88, December 6th, 1707.
than any of its four predecessors of 1713, that it was in circulation for a short time, and that Anne's death in August, 1714, stopped its further issue. The patterns of the previous year comprise another seated Britannia, slightly differing in pose on the reverse; a variety with a portico framing the figure; and another with Peace in a biga in celebration of the Peace of Utrecht, it having been suggested by Dean Swift that an emblematic coinage would be desirable. Yet another coin bearing the legend BELLO ET PACE—be it a pattern for a farthing or a jetton, as was suggested by the late Mr. Montagu—commemorates the same event. A myth has grown up around these farthings—an extreme rarity, by no means warranted by fact, being attributed to them—and many a disappointment has been felt by poor persons, who thought that they possessed a fortune in a small copper piece, on being informed that, with one exception, even the rarer patterns will not realize more than a few pounds in the sale room. The Bello et Pace pattern with the

1 Montagu 11.
2 Montagu 12.
4 Num. Chron. as above, pp. 139-155. H. Montagu on Queen Anne's so-called Bello et Pace Farthing. See also Med. Ill., Plate CXXXVI, No. 4, and Ruding, Suppl., Part II, Plate IV, No. 1.
standing figure is really rare, only four specimens being known. The inferior workmanship of these farthings, unworthy of Croker, suggested to Mr. William Till that “they might have been executed by Samuel Butt” (sic for Bull) “or Gabriel Clerk, two other mint engravers of this period.” Mr. Montagu naturally resented this imputation on Bull’s powers, Bull being, as may be seen from the reverses of various medals, a very able engraver, who worked in rather high relief. Gabriel le Clerk is quite out of the question, for he left England in 1709, and so could not have made the pattern some four years later. Of his work, to which we shall later have occasion to refer, it is not easy to speak with decision, seeing that with the exception of a rather poor signed thaler

of Basle, undated, but ascribed by Mr. Forrer in his *Dictionary of Medallists* to about the year 1685, I have been unable to meet with any signed specimen from which to judge of his powers; and Mr. Montagu denied all knowledge of him, probably not recognizing his name as Clerk. It would, perhaps, be hazardous to suggest that one Francis Beresford, of whom more anon, and who was apprenticed to Croker in 1712, might have produced a pattern coin at this period.

From the artistic point of view, the halfpence of this date are even more attractive than Croker’s pattern farthings, because the Britannia on the reverse so clearly portrays Queen Anne. So pleasing is this small rendering of the royal figure—a flattering portrait, since she by this time had grown very fat—that I am tempted to place two slightly varying examples before you, on this and the following page, from the National Collection, namely, Montagu 3 and 4.

---

1 *The Farthings of Queen Anne*, by Wm. Till, 1837, p. 8.
Mr. Montagu tells us that some authorities doubt their correct attribution to Croker on account of their lower relief and more minute elaboration of detail, but he does not appear to agree with these critics, and I can only state that there is no change in the die of the obverse in another coin, Montagu 5, illustrated for comparison as the second on this page, which he places in the same category, and which appears amongst the designs attributed to Croker in the Alchorne manuscript, being one of the rare instances in which both sides of the coin are there shown. This is, however, no absolute evidence, for several drawings are to be found in the book which were carried out and signed by Samuel Bull, being reverses to Croker's medals, and we are left in the dark as to the exact amount of responsibility of each artist in the matter. The pencilling all seems due to one hand, and it is possible that Croker sometimes drew the design to be executed by his subordinates. The halfpenny, as delineated in the manuscript, bears the legend BRITANNIA. INTEGRA, on the reverse, whilst the Queen's hair divides the words of the title upon the obverse, after MAG instead of after BR, and of the many varieties of this type given by Mr. Montagu the drawing most nearly resembles No. 5 illustrated above. The design is incorporated in the Alchorne volume, without explanation, in common with many others, some of which we have already discussed—

**Pattern Halfpenny of 1713. Montagu 4.**

**Pattern Halfpenny. Montagu 5.**
they being probably rejected patterns submitted by the engraver—for they do not bear the endorsement of approval which is written below some twenty drawings.

But we must return to an earlier time when the need for new currency was so small that in March, 1704-5, we left the Corporation of Moneyers protesting that they “remayneing in great straits must inevitably fall to ruine if not speedely releiv'd,”¹ a complaint which is supported by some figures, kindly supplied to me by Mr. Hocking, whose boundless knowledge of the manuscripts preserved at the Royal Mint, and ready courtesy to enquiring students, have placed much important information at my disposal. These Mint records disclose the fact that from March 25th, 1703, the beginning of the year reckoning by the old style, £570 only was issued in gold, and £5,580 in silver before March 25th, 1704. From that time to the same date in 1705 the gold coinage was nil, and the output of silver only reached £6,842, whilst from 1705 to 1706, although a decided increase is noticeable in the gold, which rose to £14,531 sterling, there was a decrease in silver, which fell to £1,632.²

We must bear in mind that the proportion of gold to silver is about one to fourteen, and that whilst it would require about 2,265 lbs. of the cheaper metal to coin £6,842, little over 330 lbs of gold would produce the much larger sum of £14,531: on the other hand the percentage paid to the moneyers, which was, as we know at the time of the great recoinage, ninepence in the pound weight for silver, was much larger for gold. The exact sum which would fall to the share of the Corporation under Anne I am not able to ascertain, but it was stated at the Mint Enquiry in 1697 that “by the ancient establishment of the Mint, seven shillings were allowed for the coinage of a pound gold, and one shilling and sixpence for one pound weight silver.”³ Now of the above eighteen pence, certain shares went to the Master, the Melter,

² Mr. Hocking informs me that from January, 1702-3, to March, 1706, coinage is only recorded in the following months: Gold—January, 1702-3, May, 1703, April, 1705, March, 1705-6. Silver—March, 1702-3, March, 1703-4, April, 1704, April, 1705, March, 1705-6.
the Smith, and others, and ninepence was the moneyers' quota from this allowance, but in 1673 they were refused an extra sixpence on the gold, that is, an increase to one half of the seven shillings of the Mint allowance.  

By the kindness of Mr. Hocking, I learn that in 1706 the number of moneyers was fifteen, not of course counting the persons employed by them only when occasion required. The difficulty of ascertaining the fluctuations of the Corporation, the members of which divided the percentage on coinage operations, prevents us from obtaining at all times a definite idea of a moneyer's remuneration. Chamberlayne in his State of Britain, a periodical of the nature of Whitaker's Almanack of the present day, but irregularly issued, describes the "Company of Moneyers" as consisting under Charles II., James II. and William and Mary, of "above 40 persons." Unless, however, he included the labourers, who were not really "of the Corporation," he was mistaken, for the Mint evidence supplies the figures—fifteen in 1668, ten in 1670, and thirteen in 1693. No doubt the recoinage under William increased their ranks, but Chamberlayne in the reign of Anne cautiously changes his wording, and speaks of the moneyers as "an indefinite number of Persons to Work and Coin gold and Silver Money and answer Waste and Charges," and as we have seen above, they were fifteen in 1706.  

1 Blondeau under the Commonwealth offered to accept the same terms as those proposed by the moneyers, namely, 5s. for gold and 1s. for silver for milled coin (Thomason Tracts, 669, f. 15, s. 33). The moneyers stated that they were then receiving 2s. 5d. for gold and 9d. for silver by way of the hammer. They agreed in 1666 to 3d. for gold and 8d. for silver, but Charles II., in 1673, granted an extra 1d. for the silver (Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18,759, f. 76).  

2 Evidence given in the Mint Enquiry of 1848 concerning the moneyers.  

3 Anglia Britannia Notitia, or the Present State of Great Britain, by Ed. and J. Chamberlayne. Dr. Edward Chamberlayne was tutor to one of the sons of Charles II. and instructor in English to Prince George of Denmark; he died in 1703 and the publication was carried on by his son, who, after the Union, changed its name to Magna Britanniae Notitia.  

4 The number of moneyers differed considerably at various periods. A list published on January 27th, 1652, gives 59 moneyers and 51 labourers employed by them (see Thomason Tracts, E 1079—10, No. 2). Blondeau had complained that the Corporation had "given to understand that they have 200 poor families which are maintained by the
This Company of Moneyers, always called in the Treasury Papers by the more dignified name of "Corporation," had, as we read in the manuscript copy of their petition of 1704, been driven at an earlier moment of inaction to find other work.\(^1\) We are told that "in the year 1693," by reason of the work falling off, "your petitioners became so poor that, several of them being forced to go to day labour notwithstanding they had served seven years apprentices and had given\(^2\) one hundred pounds each man for it," a petition which excited the Queen's compassion.

From this Memorial we learn that "they applied themselves to the then Lords of the Treasury for some succour and relief in the miserable condition they were in and to prevent their being entirely ruined, that her late Majesty Queen Mary, of ever blessed memory, having been graciously pleased to order that each fellow moneyer should have an allowance of thirty pounds per annum as a comfortable subsistence to be paid them until such time as the Mint should be in work,"\(^3\) they had work of the mint, which is beside truth, for some officers of the Mint have told, before witnesses, that formerly their Corporation was at the most 40 masters, and that at this time they are hardly 30 masters, who are all rich, have lands and houses and other ways of maintenance without the work of the Mint. And that when they had much money to coyn, they were wonted to hire some journeymen, giving to some 18 pence, to some 15, to some 12 for half a day's work.\(^4\)

\(^1\) MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xc, 126.
\(^2\) We know from the Mint Enquiry that the moneyers were permitted to "take apprentices and form themselves into a government by electing one of them a Provost," see Commons' Journal, vol. xi, p. 774. It is interesting to note that in the Mint Enquiry of 1848 it was stated that the premium then paid by apprentices was £1,000. See Num. Chron., 1st series, vol. xii, p. 34.
\(^3\) On March, 1743, a Treasury order enacted that each member of the Company was to be allowed £40 a year should the coinage fall below £500,000, "that they may not be too far exposed to temptation by their necessities." Report of the Mint Commission of 1848, and published, Num. Chron., 1st series, vol. xii, pp. 29-49. At this time the so-called Corporation had dwindled to eight moneyers and four apprentices, and a little later to the yet smaller number of five moneyers and two apprentices. The Mint Commission explains that the moneyers were "not appointed by any public authority, but form a body, continued by self-election, assuming to possess legal corporated rights, and claiming in this character the exclusive privilege of executing that part of the coinage work customarily confided to them." Ibid., p. 29. Chamberlayne, as we have seen in his State of Britain, usually places the number of moneyers as "above 40 persons," but in 1704 changes his description to "an indefinite number of persons."
accordingly enjoyed this pay "untill the beginning of the late Coynage of the Clipt and hamer'd Moneys." Then, however, the "Expediçon" required in "six several Mints"—namely at the Tower, Exeter, Bristol, Chester, Norwich, and York, had forced them to "take to their assistance about 500 Labour's," by whom they had been cheated and "were very hard put to," being forced "to make good their waste and Losses."

The position of affairs in 1704 was "that there being no manner of work at present in the Mint, your Petcion's begin to be reduced to such streights that, unless some allowance be made them for their Maintenance, their Corporacon will in all Probability fall to ruine."

The Secretary to the Treasury, William Lowndes, referred this paper to "ye Warden, Mr and Worker and ye Comptroll!" that they might say "w is fit to be don therein," 1 with the result that Sir John Stanley and John Ellis, who took their stand upon the Coinage Act, replied that Queen Mary's allowance "paid out of the coynage Duty was Irregular, and as we are advised contr'y an appropriating clause of the said Coynage Act, so that we conceive they cannot be relieved as formerly out of Coynage Mony." They further explained that "by the Indenture and Constitution of the Mint there is no provision made for salaries to the Moneyers 2 but only an Allowance per pound Weight for all the Gold and Silver they Coyn," and that in their opinion unless some other plan could be adopted "they will hardly be able to subsist" until such time as more work should present itself. The reply that "My Lord cannot create a new charge on Her Mat's Revenue for a Civill Government," 3 must have produced despair, and we have seen that it resulted in the suggestion of a copper coinage in the Tower, which was nevertheless deferred until 1714. The figures, however, with which Mr. Hocking has kindly supplied me from the Mint Records,

2 It appears from the evidence taken before the Mint Commission in 1848, that the Corporation of Moneyers claimed not only the right of exemption from taxes granted them by Edward III., and renewed by various sovereigns (See Queen Elizabeth's grant in Harl. MSS. 698), but exclusive privileges of coining by contract. They could not prove these rights, and their claims were finally disallowed in 1851.
and which I hope to print in our next volume, show a steady improve-
ment in the coinage returns to the end of the Queen's reign, and we
may trust that the evil moment was tided over.

But the moneyers were not alone in their appeals contingent upon
the inactivity at the Tower, before the Union gave rise to alterations in
the coinage in 1707. On May 8th, 1706, a plea was put forth by the
engravers because of the want of practice in their art, and we find John
Croker, Samuel Bull and Gabriel Leclerc presenting a petition for
permission to sell medals as an outlet to their energies. They state
"that the Makeing and Engraving of such medalls will very much
contribute to the perfecting of the Art and Mistery of Graving, chiefly
at this time when there is no other employment for them in the Mint,
least for want of exercise they loose that skill they have, which is the
chief security of the Coine."1

They humbly submit to the Lord High Treasurer, that "Your
Petitioners, at the time they were appointed, did hope for the same
privileges which Mr. Harris and his Predecessors before him always
had had, of makeing frameing and Engraveing all sorts of Medalls that
might convey to posterity any mark or Character of prosperous or
Worthy successes, or great and noble Actions." They asked permission
"to make and sell such Medalls, at least, as do not relate to public
affairs, and such other Medalls as may be approved of, either by your
Lordship or such persons as your Lordship shall think fitt." The
report upon this petition, dated 20th June, 1706, signified that in the
opinion of Stanley, Newton and Ellis "good graving is the best
security for the Coin, and is best acquired by graving of Medals, and
that without such exercise in such graving the Gravers in time may loos
the skill they have acquired." The endorsement made at the Treasury
Council Board, "Read 18th Aug. 1706 and agreed," no doubt gave the
required stimulus to the large number of medallic portraits of Anne
which we find annotated by Newton in Alchorne's collection of
Croker's drawings, to which I have already referred.2 We have

---

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. xcix, No. 108.
2 Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18,757, c. 13, also 18,759 ff. 145-6 for Anne's warrant of
November 2nd, 1706, and f. 154 for renewal of the grant by George I., March 26th, 1716.
noticed\(^1\) that many of the artist's productions were issued some time after the events they celebrated, and it is evident that in consequence of the above permission, Newton and his colleagues now and again examined a number of designs submitted to them, and authorized the sale of medals. We find that amongst twenty sketches two were passed by the Mint authorities in December (5th and 30th)\(^2\) 1706, two on February 20th, 1706-7,\(^3\) one on April 8th, 1708,\(^4\) three on December 15th, 1708,\(^5\) two on October 20th, 1709,\(^6\) and one on November 9th in the same year,\(^7\) two on May 17th, 1710,\(^8\) four on December 13th, 1710,\(^9\) two on November 28th, 1711,\(^10\) and one on March 17th, 1712-13,\(^11\) the usual formula of authorization being, "lett this medall be Coyned," signed by the warden, the master and the controller. We may mention the medal for the Battle of Blenheim

---

\(^2\) Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 256, No. 49, Blenheim; and p. 284, No. 92, Ramillies.
\(^3\) Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 298, No. 115, Union; and p. 233, No. 14, Anne and George.
\(^7\) Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 362, No. 202, Mons taken. In this instance the direction of the figure was reversed when the design was carried out.
\(^8\) Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 266, No. 64, Gibraltar, and p. 316, No. 141, Attempted Invasion of Scotland.
amongst these designs as owing its belated origin to the question of the unemployment already troubling the Treasury in the time of Anne, rather than to the importance of a historical event not likely to be forgotten.

The victory was gained on August 2nd, 1704, and it was not until December 5th, 1706, that the drawing for the reverse was marked at the Mint Office with the words: "We approve of this Medall with ye Inscription in ye ring: De Gall: Bav: ad Blenheim, & at ye bottom Cap: et: cæs: XXX: M: SIGN: RELAT: CLXIII: MDCCIV." A note follows by Newton, dated December 30th: "Let a medal be made about an inch and one third part of an inch in diameter, with the Reverse above described, and on the first side her Mat'ls Effegies and the inscription Anna D. G. Mag. Br. Fra et Hib. Reg.—Is. Newton." The legend on the design, which measures 2½ inches, reads: Victoria Germaniæ, and in the exergue: Gallis et Boisi ad Danub Cæs Capt et Fug MDCCIV, and we see the care devoted by those in authority to details, the emendations of the Mint Master being almost exactly adopted.¹ In the case of another design we see the figure reversed upon execution. The reducing machine, often so unfortunate in lessening the sense of depth intended by the designer, had not yet been introduced, but nearly all the sketches were drawn about twice the size of the ultimately resulting medals. Occasionally, however, no reduction in scale was demanded, and sometimes measurements were prescribed as above, whilst the metal was also decided by desire. We see, nevertheless, that occasionally this order was either extended or infringed, for in the similarly belated medal of Anne and her husband,² the order for which was signed by Newton on the 20th of February, 1706-7, the authorization was for "fine gold and fine silver," but we notice examples in copper also, and they figure openly in Croker's list as follows: "In gold £7, silver 12/-, copper 4/-." There

¹ The medals when made were priced at £3 17s. 6d., 5s. and 1s. 6d., in gold, silver, and copper respectively.

² Illustration on our p. 220. This design is drawn the exact size of the medal, to the advantage of the latter when made, inasmuch as the proportions of depth are apt to suffer by reduction.
George of Denmark.

must have been a fair sale for these portraits, for more than one die was used, one being like the original design, without an ornament in Anne's ear, whilst in a second she wears a pearl.

George, Prince of Denmark, had a reputation for greater good looks than for wit, and it is reported that Charles II. said of him: "I have tried him drunk and I have tried him sober, but drunk or sober there is nothing in him." His want of ambition was, however, occasionally found useful, for, although his administration of his public posts provoked much criticism, certain contemporary writers notice his moderating influence on Queen Anne, as preventing her from being carried too far by her favourites of the moment; and tell us that his loss was felt not only by his wife, who was devoted to him, but also by the nation.

He was born on the 21st of April, 1655, and married on the 28th July, 1683, and the medal, from the hand of George Bower, which commemorated the wedding, gives us a more pleasing rendering of his vaunted appearance than Croker's medal, illustrated on our page 220. However, in justice to the latter artist we must remember that in 1683 Prince George was but twenty-eight, and in 1706-7, when Croker portrayed him, twenty-three more years of increasing gout and corpulence had passed over his head.

There is a fine likeness of this amiable but uninteresting Prince, executed by Obrisset in silver, in 1708, the year of his death, in the Franks collection at the British Museum. It is, I think, copied from

1 Oldmixon, History, p. 287.
2 George, Prince of Denmark, died October 28th, 1708, o.s.
3 Illustrated in Some Minor Arts, by C. H., now Sir Hercules, Read, p. 5.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

a picture now at Kensington Palace, and—judging from the original and other sketches in the earlier years of Anne's reign, notably a small oil painting by Kneller, in the possession of Sir Spencer Ponsonby Fane, and another by Wissing, in the National Portrait Gallery—both Croker's medal and Obrisset's armoured bas-relief must have been very good, although, perhaps, not over flattering likenesses of the Queen's husband. But we need not dally over these personal questions, and must return to the state of affairs at the Mint.

It is clear that Newton felt strongly the advisability of permitting the gravers to exercise their skill upon medals, and this policy, instituted by him, was carried out by his successors; for after his death, John Conduitt, the new Mint Master, encouraged the petition, in 1728, of Jean Dassier, who wished to work at the Tower and make medals there at his own expense. Dassier's petition was endorsed "Agreed, subject to such restrictions as shall not deprive the King's Engraver of any of his advantages," the result of the report that "The only encouragement Mr. Croker the Chief Engraver has, besides his salary, is the profit he makes by the medals he coins at his own expense upon extraordinary publick occasions, which encouragement he very well deserves, by having served the Crown in an employment of so great trust and labour upwards of thirty years." Jean Dassier's rather formal series of medals cannot have interfered very seriously with

1 Newton died March 20th, 1726, o.s. The date on Dassier's medal, March 31st, 1727, is according to n.s.


3 Jean Dassier, born at Geneva in 1676, died there in 1763. He was medallist to the Republic of Geneva, and it was suggested in the above report that he should make puncheons for the coinage of our money "when occasion shall require", but that not being a natural born subject nor consequently capable of enjoying any certain salary, he should be paid for his work out of Coinage Duty. Dassier engraved his medallic series of the kings of England and was offered a Mint appointment but declined it. He must not be confused with his nephew, James Anthony Dassier, who, on the appointment of John Sigismund Tanner as Chief Engraver on the death of Croker, succeeded to Tanner's Place. See Treasury Minute Books, T. 29, vol. xxviii, p. 301, March 24th, 1740–1, and King's Warrant Book, pp. 212–3, and Cal. Treasury Papers, 1739–41, pp. 453 and 621.
Death of Newton.

Croker’s profits, and the most interesting to us at this moment is the memorial to Newton, exhibiting on the obverse a fair portrait not unlike that by Vanderbank\(^1\) in the National Portrait Gallery, and a presentment of the tomb in Westminster Abbey, from the hand of Rysbracht, on the reverse. The National Portrait Gallery also contains a bust by Edward Baily, after an original by Roubillac. It is probable that the medallists, Jean Dassier and James Roettier, the son of Norbert Roettier, based their work upon Vanderbank’s and other contemporary portraits, for it is not likely that they were personally acquainted with Newton. This remark may possibly also apply to Roubillac, for although some authorities give the date of his arrival in England as 1720, by others it is considered more probable that he did not settle in this country until after the death of Newton. Croker’s medal\(^2\) is therefore the more worthy of attention, because he portrayed the Master of the Mint in 1726 either in the last year of his life or immediately after his death, for Sir Isaac died in March, 1726–7, and Croker had been employed under him at the Tower for over thirty years, and must have been well acquainted with his features. Another contemporary portrait may be found in a very charming bust carved in

\(^1\) John Vanderbank was born in England about 1694, and painted a considerable number of persons whilst residing in London. He died in 1739.

\(^2\) Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 469, No. 83. This medal appears in Croker’s list at £15 in gold, 18s. in silver, and 6s. in copper.
ivory by David le Marchand,\(^1\) dated 1718, in the Mediaeval Room of the British Museum.

It is hardly too much to say that we find in Newton not only a steady policy of encouragement towards his subordinates at the Mint, but also a sympathetic attitude towards the medallic coinage so apparent in Anne’s reign, for we have seen that under William III., from the period when Isaac Newton had the direction of affairs, the tendency towards high relief became more marked. The importance he attached to the post of Chief-Graver is set forth in a long answer to the Lord High Treasurer’s request, on the death of Henry Harris, for the Mint Master’s opinion of the qualifications of “Coll Parsons, Mr. Croker, Mr. Rose, Mr. Fowler and Mr. Le Clerk to succeed Mr. Harris in ye Place of Graver of the Mint.”\(^2\)

According to the gossip of the day Parsons ran a good chance, for we read in Narcissus Luttrell’s *Diary* under date, Saturday, August 5th, 1704: “Capt. Harris, her Majestie’s engraver of money and medalls at the Tower is dead, and ’tis said will be succeeded by Colonel Parsons.”\(^3\) Hear, however, Newton’s pronunciation: “As for Coll. Parsons and Mr. Fowler they do not grave themselves, and for y’s reason we cannot judge them fitt for the service of the mint.” It is clear that the responsibility for the decision lay with Newton, for although signed by Sir John Stanley, Ellis and himself the memorandum states that the Master “considering the inconvenience the Mint suffer’d by having Cutters of Seals in the Chief Graver’s Place, did upon his succeeding Mr. Neale obtain a clause inserted in the Indenture of the Mint, whereby the Graver’s Salary of three hundred and twenty five pounds p. Ann should cease upon the next voidence of the place in order to a new Establishment, the Rotiers having bred up no new Gravers, and Mr. Harris, succeeding them being only a Seal cutter

\(^{1}\) David le Marchand carved medallions in ivory and wood, though little is known concerning him, but he died in 1726.

\(^{2}\) *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. xci, No. 143, October 12th, 1704.

\(^{3}\) *Diary of Narcissus Luttrell*, vol. v, p. 453. We have already noticed that Luttrell always gave Harris the misleading title of Captain, notifying his appointment in these terms: “Capt. Harris is made sole engraver of the Mint in the room of Mr. Roteer, who is turned out and his dyes, tools, presses, etc. seized upon Tues. March 2, 1696–7.”
and Employed Mr. Croker to do the business of the Mint, with an allowance of only one hundred Seventy five pound p. Ann, who is at present a very able Artist. It is therefore humbly proposed for the Advantage and security of the Coyn against Counterfeiting that there should be a set of Gravers constantly brought up in the Mint, who may keep to the same way of working and propagate their Art to Probationers or Apprentices and be succeeded by them, for which we humbly propose that Mr. Croker be made first Graver of the Mint with a Salery of 200 th pr. Ann. That Mr. Saml. Bull and Mr. Gabriell Le Clerk, who we find to be a good Artist, may be made Assistants to the Graver with the Salerys of Eighty pounds p. Ann each. That Mr. Croker's and Mr. Bull's Salerys may commence from the time Mr. Harris determined, they having been employed in the service of the Mint, but that Mr. Le Clerk's commence only from Christmas next." Then follow regulations for refilling the places if required, and "that the graver and his assistants should from time to time make such draughts and Embossments, Puncheons and Dyes as the Master Worker of the Mint shall direct." The report ends with the following information concerning the place of graver on Seals: "We find Mr. Rose desires to succeed Mr. Harris only in that place, and by a Seale he shewed us for the Dutchy of Lancaster he seems qualified for it." A long and curious memorial disparaging the work of the engravers at the beginning of George I.'s reign is minuted: "John Croker appointed 10th March 1704-5 to be first graver of the

1 Samuel Bull had been paid a salary of £50 a year as under graver since Christmas, 1698. See Brit. Num. Journal, vol. viii, p. 268, note 1.

2 Gabriel Le Clerc, or Le Clerk as he is sometimes called, was described in an extract kindly sent to me by Mr. Hocking from the MS. Mint Reports, as formerly in the service of the Duke of Zelle. He worked at Basle, Cassel and Berlin, and for some time was mint master at Bremen, and designed a medal of George William, Duke of Brunswick, in 1700. See ante, page 244, also Forrer's Dictionary of Medallists and the Mint Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 18.

3 John Roos or Ross is mentioned in the Mint Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 279, as engraver of royal seals of England from 1704 to 1720. His widow received as his administratrix a payment still due to him in 1720, but in our next volume we shall see that there is reason to think he vacated the post, or at least discontinued his work, before August 27th, 1716. See MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cc, No. 17, and vol. ccxxviii, No. 194.
Mint, sal. 200\textdegree{} p. a\textdegree{} for self, and 80\textdegree{} p. a\textdegree{} for two assis\textdegree{}, continued 25\textsuperscript{th} Oct 1715 during pleasure." I understand, however, from Mr. Hocking and Mr. Symonds that the actual patent of Croker, Bull and Le Clerk is dated April 7th, 1705.\textsuperscript{1}

We have before discussed the great difficulty of disentangling the work of the men now appointed. Le Clerk left the mint in 1709,\textsuperscript{2} Bull must, we believe, have died or resigned before the end of the year 1726. Croker, as we have seen, survived to engrave for George I. and George II., and in the reigns of both these sovereigns we have documents explaining his position with regard to his share of the work and to that allotted to his subordinates. We know from the manuscript Mint Records under date January 13th, 1701–2, kindly communicated to me by Mr. Hocking, that a list of head puncheons made by Samuel Bull comprises those for five-guinea pieces, guineas, half-guineas, shillings, halfpence and farthings. We know also that at a later period the reverses for coins were sometimes entrusted to the assistant graver, for on January 30th, 1728–9, a petition\textsuperscript{3} was presented for permission to bind Sigismund Tanner as apprentice to John Croker on payment of £80 a year, on the score that the latter "is advanced in years," and that he, "his mat\textdegree{} first graver," is "the only one now living who has hitherto made puncheons for the heads on the coins," his assistant "Mr. Ochs who graves the puncheons for the arms being also advanced," etc., etc.\textsuperscript{4}

It is clear from the above that by this time Bull was dead, and we

\textsuperscript{1} MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cxccii, No. 75, and Pat. Rolls, 4 Anne, Part 1, No. 10.
\textsuperscript{2} Mint Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{3} King's Warrants, T. 52, vol. 36, pp. 281–3. The warrant was granted March 5th, 1728–9.
\textsuperscript{4} Johanne Rudolph Ochs was born at Berne in 1673. He was a seal-cutter and engraver of precious stones. He visited England several times and died in London, circa 1749 or 1750. See Dictionary of National Biography, Forrer's Dictionary of Medallists, and Nagler, Book ro, p. 300. His name appears as second mint engraver under Croker from 1735 onwards. The fact that two members of the family bearing the same Christian names, father and son, succeeded one another as engraver to the mint, has caused confusing statements on the length of Ochs' service, especially on the part of Hawkins (Silver Coins, p. 406); but it appears from Chamberlayne that Ochs senior was still in office as second engraver in 1745, whilst the Mint Catalogue says that the name of Ochs junior is on the Mint Books as third graver in 1757, see vol. ii, p. 23.
remark that Tanner had been a candidate for his apprenticeship since Christmas, 1728, from which time it is notified that he had been "making specimens by way of Tryal." Bull’s name still appears as Second Graver in 1726 in Chamberlayne’s *State of Great Britain*, but in 1727 that of "John Rolles Esq. Deputy-graver" is substituted, whilst the years 1728 and 1729 disclose a blank space against the words "Assistant Engraver." Bull must still have been active at the time of Queen Anne’s death, for we find a petition under date September 14th, 1715, concerning his office, when his patent, together with that of Croker, was renewed, and a somewhat later memorial concerning the division of labour at the beginning of George I.’s reign refers, as we have seen, to this appointment as "continued 25th Oct. 1715 during pleasure." It is unlikely that his services would have been retained under a new monarch unless he were still efficient.

We have earlier evidences of Bull’s activity in other branches, for we find him on the 26th of June, 1711, co-operating with “Mr. Roos,” a form of spelling more frequently employed than that of Rose or Ross for the seal-engraver. Bull, Roos and others, of whom Rollo, the future Chief Seal Engraver, was one, suggested inventions for some "new form of dies for stamping vellum, parchment and paper" to prevent counterfeiting; and three days later the Treasury officials announce their desire to “further consider the devices of Mr. Rollo and Mr. Bull for making new dies,” apparently for this purpose. This is the first time the name of Rollo, mentioned above, has attracted my attention in the *Treasury Papers*, but between 1727 and 1745 he held the position of Engraver of Seals, and Mr. Hocking informs me that on his appointment as assistant to Croker at the Mint in September, 1726, it

---

2 *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. cxcii, No. 13, minuted “Renew the pat.”
3 *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. cxcii, No. 75. See also our p. 258.
5 John Rollo, Rolles or Rollos, was appointed assistant to the Chief graver on September 29th, 1726, a post which he vacated in about a year because of the pressure of seal work. He figures in Mr. Hocking’s List of Seal engravers as holding that office from 1727 to 1745, see *Mint Catalogue*, vol. ii, p. 279; and Ruding, vol. i, p. 45.
was stated that for several years the chief graver had "lacked the services of a skilful artist." This suggests that Bull, although not dead, had been non-operative for some years before 1726, and it is regrettable that so little is known about him, for reference to the medals of the early eighteenth century proves that he was no mean artist. Various reverses signed by him appear with obverses by Croker, and I place one of these before you as evidence of his skill, and as an example of the high relief of his style.

MEDAL, UNION OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND. MED. ILL., VOL. II, P. 296, NO. III.

Less uncertainty is attached to the division of labour at the Mint in Croker's old age. In an undated memorial among the Alchorne Papers, the engraver writes defining the arrangement for die-sinking under George I. This document is remarkable for the spelling, which is even worse than that usually tolerated by our forefathers, and the German accent of the writer is discernible in the phonetic rendering of some of the words. Croker makes various suggestions concerning a contemplated Irish currency, basing his statistics upon a recent similar output in England, which had been three years and nine months in coining, and had consisted of one hundred tons of copper pieces. Reference being made in it to Tanner, we know that it cannot have been before 1728, and it was probably written about 1735, or 1736, shortly before the Irish coinage was struck. Croker suggests a

3 Croker in this memorial says that "Those pieces made for Ireland are to be lighter and of less substance," and because "more pieces go upon a tun," a greater quantity of dies
partition of the sum allowed "for each tun or weekes expenses." He says that the allowance per ton is £2. 6. 8, and asserts that a share of this must be given to one "Mr. Child,"¹ as it was in the last coinage of 100 tons of copper, "for adenting the press in Sinking the Dyes at 2s. 6d. per tun," and that "other less expenses" would amount to 2s. 2d. Again he writes "the charges to a workman to adent the moneyes, to clean ye Dyes, to deliver em out and receiving back again, and in assisting to Sink and polish Dyes for 180 weeks att 15 per week comes to 135." Deducting therefore 19s 8d for these weekly expenses, he explains that there "remains for engraving £1. 7; to split this between Mr. Tanner and myself is 13-6, but ye Question is who shall dispurse the laborers's wages and other expenses, and keep account and beare all the differenses which may and will occur. Therefore to make all as easey and save labour," writes Croker, "in keeping accounts i doo propose to allow Mr. Tanner for making ye reverse Dyes for each Tunn 12 shilling, and for ye remainder part of ye money i'll make the Dyes for ye heads and discharge all expenses and wages for ye Sayd work." Croker finally pleads that "if the Master of ye Mint could be prevailed upon to git an allowans of 35 or 40s a year for a workman to ye Engravers office, it would make things extraordinary easey to both

will be spoiled in the process. George II.'s first Irish coinage was struck in 1736 and issued from 1737 to 1755 in halfpence, and from 1737 to 1744 in farthings. The halfpenny weighs on an average 134 grains, the English coins, on the other hand, whether of the first type in 1729 or the second in 1741, were issued at the rate of 46 halfpence to the pound aroidupois, or 152 grains, as against the Irish 52 to the pound aroidupois which should weigh about 134 grains. These Irish coins were therefore lighter than those of George II. in England, but heavier than the English coinage of George I., whose halfpence weighed 56 to the pound aroidupois. Croker’s memorandum probably refers to the beginning of this Irish coinage, at which time 50 tons of copper were ordered to be struck for Ireland. Tanner would be just coming out of his apprenticeship to be third graver in 1735. 100 tons were ordered in 1741, but this is the year of Croker’s death, and it is more likely that the question would arise on the first issue, being based on calculations of the English coinage only. Croker lays stress on this, and adds a postscript to his paper "this proposal I make only in case the contract for ye English copper Coynages should be renued and goe forward, but in case it should not, i shall be a great looser by what i have proposed above."

¹ Mr. Child is mentioned from 1727-43 as "deputy-surveyor of the Meltings" in Chamberlayne’s State of Britain.
partys, for ye time present and for ye time to come." I crave your indulgence in wandering outside the limits of our subject, which should be restricted to the coinage under Anne, in discussing this copper issue of George II., on account of our interest in knowing that the allowance for coining one hundred tons was £232 6s. 8d. and that a large number of dies were injured in the process. Croker says, "Setting ye Puncheons aside which I made, there has been Dyes worne and spoild, 352, wich was made and furnished by me, wich are all in being still, wich according to my Computation does not come much more then 4 Shillings p. Dye for ye engraving."

I must apologise for detaining my readers, and for carrying them so far into the eighteenth century, but I plead in excuse that from this memorial it clearly appears how Tanner, like Ochs, engraved the reverses only, whilst Bull had, it seems, exercised his skill upon the head puncheons also, although, as a rule, the obverse dies and the puncheons for the arms as well, had been within the province of the Chief Engraver.

Pardon me if I stray to a yet later period, and call attention to a letter written by Johann Natter to a minister at the Dutch Court, and quoted by Mr. Forrer in his Dictionary of Medallists. Natter, having accepted the post of Chief Engraver to the Mint of Utrecht, complained that he had not enough leisure to devote to gem engraving, and regretted the practice followed in London, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and France. He said that in England, whence he had just come, the Chief Graver made the original stamp or die for medals, the second copied the portrait for the obverse of the coins, and the third was responsible for the reverse dies; but it is clear that in the reign of Anne

1 A report dated February 6th, 1733–4, sent by the Mint Master, John Conduitt, to the Treasury on an appeal from Croker for payment of a "Filer" (see Treasury Indices 4, vol. xi, p. 20), recommends the appointment of a "surveyor of the presses at £40 a year," whose duties were to include the polishing of dies. John Conduitt, who had married the niece of Sir Isaac Newton in 1717, succeeded the latter as Master of the Mint in 1727. He retained the position until his death in 1737. See Mint Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 234.

2 Il y a ordinairement trois graveurs : le premier Médaillieur a le titre de Esquire, sa pension monte jusqu'a 300£. an, maison, charbon, chandeles, tout franc; chaque coin
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it was still usual that the affairs of the coinage should take the precedence of medal engraving.

It is, moreover, certain that at the beginning of the eighteenth century the Chief Engraver was not invariably provided with two subordinates for, besides instances already cited, we notice in the Alchorne manuscripts the great economy practised in 1712, when the rules respecting the apprenticeship of Francis Beresford were laid down. ¹ We have seen that on July 10th in that year,² articles were arranged to bind "Fran§ Beresford to Jno Croker at £35. o. o. p. Ann, for the Support and maintenance of ye said Fran§ Beresford, and for his Care and training up in the Art and Mystery of Graving." The period of payment was to commence from "Xmas last" and to run for a "term of 6 years in Case the said Fran§ Beresford doth so long live and continue under his Care, Maintenance and Tuition as an Apprentice." But see the parsimony of the Treasury! "It's hereby meant and intended that for and during the said terme of 6 years, or such part thereof as the said allowance of 36" p. Ann shall Continue to be paid as aforesaid, the pay"mt of 80" p. Ann, which hath been some time sav'd to the Crown, and was heretofore paid to Gabriel Le Clerc as an Assistant Graver, shall not be Reviv'd." The name of Beresford is not unknown in Mint annals, for we find "Mr. Beresford" in Chamberlayne's State of Britain in the position of Deputy Controller under Anne, and one John Beresford later served as Clerk to the Warden.³ These persons were no doubt relatives of Francis, the

² See our p. 244.
³ We find "Mr. Beresford's" name as Deputy Controller between 1708 and 1716, and that of John Beresford, Clerk to the Warden, in 1727 and many succeeding years, in Chamberlayne's State of Britain.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

apprentice, but as an engraver, under Anne, we know him no more, and it is matter of regret that neither he nor Le Clerk, who signed some of his work abroad, initialled any of our British medals. Le Clerk must have made medals in England between his appointment in 1706 and his departure in 1709, and it is possible that reverses executed by him may be included amongst those preserved in the Alchorne manuscript, and submitted by Croker as Chief Engraver to the Mint officials.

We have noticed that, although all the drawings appear to proceed from the same careful hand, they comprise reverses unsigned in the sketch, but bearing the initials S.B. for Samuel Bull in the realization.

Nagler says of Croker that the heads he engraved were admired, but that the reverses met with disapproval on account of the faulty drawing, and in this we might find an explanation of the anomaly of medals produced by two medallists, the portrait by the Chief Graver, and the symbolical decoration by his assistants. If Croker’s reverses were not admired—and certainly, if that of the Coronation Medal be taken as a type, we are not surprised—he may have had recourse to his subordinates in future, although, judging from such signed work as I have seen by Le Clerk, his performances did not compare favourably with those of his master. But we may be permitted to wonder whether the failure of the allegorical reverses be always attributable to the German artist, for in the book of designs, the figures, presented at about double the size of the medals made from them, are beautifully drawn, and often the rejected sketches are simpler and almost as graceful as those selected, notably an alternative reverse for the medal commemorating the Peace of Utrecht. Curiously enough, the accepted version of this reverse—although it was distributed to the Members of both Houses, and is included in the book of sketches, as figured below—

---

1 Ruding, vol. i, p. 45, mentions Beresford as an engraver to George I. See also *Royal Mint Catalogue*, vol. ii, p. 23.
2 Nagler writes:—Man rühmt seine Köpfe, tadelt aber die schlechte Zeichnung der Reverse.
4 Van Loon states that the larger medal with a seated figure of Britannia—*Med. Ill.*, vol. ii, p. 399, No. 256—was that distributed to the House of Lords, but no specimen being found in gold, this is hardly probable, as is proved in *Med. Ill.* But Croker, in his list, offers this medal in gold at £20; and it is, therefore, possible that some few examples were made.
and not very rare, is not officially countersigned. Possibly the explanation of this fact lies in the possession, by the Duke of Portland—amongst the papers of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford and Lord High Treasurer—of the same drawing, sent by Sir Isaac Newton to him, to be submitted to the Queen. By the Duke's courtesy, I reproduce it facing page 262, and it will be seen that it agrees with the medal illustrated below. This brings before us the careful touch of Croker's pencil, and in size and manner recalls the drawings in the Alchorne manuscript. The far less common reverse, bearing the helmeted Britannia and the legend Bello et Pace, figured on our p. 199, is marked in this book of designs, "Let this Medall be made," on March 11th, 1712-13. The care bestowed upon all details is clearly shown in alterations prescribed as to the legend, and we could wish the precaution had been taken of signing the designs; some of which were never carried out, but which the collector, in binding together, has assumed all to be "Original Designs of the Medals engraved by John Croker." We can, of course, have little doubt as to the fine medal¹ in celebration of the Union, namely, the large and yet simple representation of Anne standing as Pallas, with the legend NOVAE PALLADIVM TROLÆ. This sketch appears first in Mr. Alchorne's book, and I illustrate the medal as Croker's masterpiece on the accompanying plate. Newton authorized the issue of this design on the 20th of February, 1706-7, in anticipation of the Union

¹ Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 298, No. 215. A picture at Welbeck, by Michael Dahl, of Edward Harley, 2nd Earl of Oxford, the son of Anne's Minister, depicts the eminent collector holding an example of a large medal, representing Anne, in his hand. It appears to be the above.
of England and Scotland which came into force on May 1st, 1707. The rejected pattern for the reverse shows the figure in a somewhat different pose. If, as we believe, this medal which Croker advertised at £30 in gold, and £1 17s. in silver, and 17s. in copper, is entirely his work, his power of making a satisfactory design is vindicated. I hope to be permitted in our next volume to call attention to his numismatic work.
THE COLOURS OF THE 45TH.

PLATE 1.