In our last volume we gave our consideration to the merits of Queen Anne’s chief-graver, John Croker, principally as a medallist, and I was permitted to promise, on the resumption of my article, that I would turn my attention to the coinage. May I, however, first exercise my privilege in saying a few words respecting the Queen’s seals?

I have several times alluded to the Alchorne manuscripts in the British Museum, and to one of these I must return, for amongst some drawings included at the end of one folio¹ and fairly attributable to Croker, although not annotated by Newton nor by either of his colleagues, we find two very graceful sketches evidently intended as suggestions for a contemplated second great-seal and counter-seal of Anne.² These drawings more nearly resemble the Queen and are also more artistic, being less crowded, than the seal and counter-seal which were chosen on the Union to supersede Anne’s original great-seal, the work of Harris. The Union seal was executed by Roos, in whose province it lay to

² The seal as designed by Croker bears a throned figure, but not the same as that already executed by Harris, being much simpler and turned slightly to the left; the pose of the head is more graceful, and the whole presents a better portrait of the Queen. Croker’s counter-seal shows Anne herself as Britannia, also in a smaller size, more completely draped, and with the hand holding the spear at a better angle. The likeness was lost in the reproduction on the matrix.
engrave the design, whether the original conception thereof was his own or based upon that suggested by Croker and elaborated by himself.\(^1\)

Fortunately the symbol of the seated Britannia was adopted for the counter-seal, poor substitute for Croker's sketch although it be, but for the obverse, with less wisdom, almost a reproduction of Harris's throned figure was selected. We notice in an anonymous memorial concerning the early coinage of George I. in 1715, that an objection was raised against Croker on the plea that he was "not an Engraver but a Jeweller, and therefore not used to Engrave Seals," the result being "that for the Seal Engraving another King's Engraver was appointed and by another since continued and the salary retracted and instead of one there are now two King's Engravers, of both which none could do the work of Engraving in general."\(^2\) We must, therefore, attribute the execution, if not the design, of the workmanship to Roos, and may congratulate him upon the counter-seal,\(^3\) the new and simpler effigy of Anne as Britannia showing great superiority over the clumsy equestrian portrait by Henry Harris on the counter-seal of the Queen's accession, which had remained in use from November 11th, 1702, until May, 1707.

According to custom the seal of William was not immediately discarded, but Wyon supplies an extract, under date November 11th, 1702, from the Privy Council Records, as follows: "Present, the Queen's most Excellent Majesty in Council; Great Seal new made, Old one Broken."\(^4\) It is possible that one Thomas Silvester may have

---

\(^1\) See Wyon's Great Seals, Plate lxi, p. 116. John Roos was recommended, as we have seen, for the post of Seal-Engraver in 1704, see our vol. x, p. 257, and I find from the MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cc, No. 17, that he is spoken of as "His Majesty's late Chief Engraver of Publick Seals," in 1716. See also Wyon, p. 190, where it is stated that reference is made in February, 1719, to James Gerrard in this office. The Mint Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 279, prints Gerrard's name from 1721 to 1726, and he was followed by John Rolles in 1727. The name of the latter appears as Deputy Engraver at the Mint in the beginning of that year, see Chamberlayne's State of Great Britain, but as we have seen in our last volume, p. 259, he relinquished numismatic work for seal engraving, and Chamberlayne gives no deputy engraver in his next volume.

\(^2\) MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cxxii, No. 75.

\(^3\) Wyon's Great Seals, Plate lxi, p. 114.

\(^4\) Wyon, p. 141, Appendix A, Extract H.
collaborated with Harris, for according to the *Treasury Papers* he was his "Assistant by Constitution of ye Treasury."¹

Anne's order, under date August 13th, 1702, for this great seal, was naturally issued as was usual to "Henry Harris, our chief Engraver of our Seales." On November 2nd, followed warrants for various minor seals such as those for the Court of Common Pleas, Queen's Bench, Court of the Exchequer and Privy Seal. Finally, on November 3rd, "stamps" were commanded for the Queen's private use, the one engraved Anne R. the other with initials, A.R. only.²

Engraving a great seal was lucrative, the charge made by the engraver generally reaching about £200 exclusive of the silver required for the purpose.³

The second seal of Anne was used until that of George I. was ready on June 17th, 1715,⁴ although the Queen died on August 1st, 1714. The great seal of George, which is not very graceful and is not equal to its predecessor, albeit differing little in technique, must, however, be attributed to the same artist, for this is made clear by references to past work, in the bills of Roos, presented for seal-engraving and similar offices performed for George, and partially discharged in 1716. The amount includes a claim of £200 for the English example, and one of the same sum for the great seal of

1 *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. lxxxiii, No. 83 "Short List of Mint Officers" reading:


3 See Simon’s charge of £200 12s. 6d., plus £29 2s. 1d. for the silver, Vertue’s *Simon’s Medals, Coins, etc.*, Appendix V, p. 86. A similar sum of £400 was claimed by John Roettier for two great seals in 1684, see *Num. Chron.*., 1st series, vol. iii, p. 173, and by Roos in 1716, £200 being charged for the work and £30 1s. 1d. for the materials.

Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

Ireland, besides lesser charges from about £10 to £60 for departmental and privy seals, reaching a total of £788 15s. 8½d. The English Treasury referred the cost of the great and privy seals for Ireland to the Sister Isle, but acknowledged the bulk of the liabilities upon receiving a report from the English Mint officers that the "Prices sett downe" for the items were "the Same with those allowed to the said Mr. Roos for the like Seals Engraved in her late Majesty's Reign, and with those paid to his predecessor Mr. Harris, and to Mr. East, Engraver to his Majesty King James." The account is rendered in the name of Roos, who must, we suppose, have been retiring from office, but for no fault, inasmuch as his superiors, whilst noting that the work is good and that he deserves the money claimed, speak of him as "His Majesty's late Engraver of Publick Seals." He must have survived July 30th, 1717, when he received this part payment, but cannot have lived many more years, inasmuch as on July 3rd, 1720, it was his widow who successfully claimed the balance of £236 18s. 10d., their Lordships being then informed by Newton that the whole liability belonged to the English Exchequer, because the Irish seals "were ordered and made here and have formerly been paid for here, as appears to us by an order of the Treasury dated September 6th, 1711, and some seals since made for Ireland have already been paid for here."  

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cc, No. 17. The charge for the silver of the Irish seals is rather less than the above, being £26 18s. 10d. The type of George I.'s Irish great seal resembles the English with the addition of harps in the field. We observe that there is no charge for a Scottish seal, but after the Union we shall see that a special seal was only used in Scotland for certain purposes, and that made for George I. is dated 1717—it may not therefore have come into the scope of Roos's employment and would not in any case be included in this bill.  

2 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cc, No. 17, minuted "30th July 1717, ordered, excepting the charge for the Great Seal and Privy Seal of Ireland which my Lords think proper to be paid by the Kingdom of Ireland."  

3 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. ccxxviii, 19a. The widow's petition is undated, but was referred to the Mint Officials on May 5th, 1720, and the report thereon minuted "To be pd here," is of July 3rd, following.  

4 I have been unable to discover whether Anne's second Irish seal, which—as appears from the above—was not paid for until after September 6th, 1711, received any material alteration beyond that in the arms necessitated by the Union. The graver would probably follow the usual custom of copying the English type with the addition of crowned harps in the field of the obverse and reverse.
THE ROSENHEIM PLAQUE.

DIAMETER, SIX INCHES AND SEVEN-EIGHTHS.
Newton prudently remarks that “Gravers may hereafter prove unwilling to make seals for Ireland if they must be sent thither for their money.”

At the moment of the Union a decorative and ornate style of dress is observable on Anne’s medals, and to this period, therefore, we may with the greatest probability attribute the largest portrait executed by Croker, a medallion which is cast in bronze, and is 6 7/8 inches in diameter. It is illustrated as our frontispiece, and must now be discussed, for it bears on the work of the seal-engravers of this period, although not itself designed by one, nor very probably for such a purpose. So strong is the resemblance to John Croker’s large medal, classed by Van Loon\(^1\) to the Accession and by other authors to the Union, that we cannot hesitate as to its attribution to this engraver.\(^2\)

This medallion, in fairly high relief, brings Anne before us almost exactly as Kneller sketched her in the oil painting which we reproduced as a frontispiece\(^3\) in the last section of this article, and is perhaps the best piece of work that Croker ever produced. Some time after the acquisition of this bronze by the British Museum, the late Mr. Max Rosenheim presented to the National Collection a companion medallion, also cast, which I am permitted to reproduce on our plate facing page 222, and which for reasons of measurement and subject should, he thought, be the reverse of the medal, but the difference in workmanship is so great that I venture to ask whether the two can be considered as the work of one artist? Neither did Mr. Rosenheim insist upon this point, for as we have seen, when studying medals in our last volume, it was by no means unusual to combine the efforts of John Croker and Samuel Bull, and in this instance it would be possible

---

\(^1\) Van Loon, vol. iv, p. 349.

\(^2\) Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 298, No. 115, illustrated in our last volume, see pp. 264–65 of vol. x, 1st series, British Numismatic Journal. The design was authorized by Newton, for sale by the engraver in anticipation of the Union, on February 20th, 1706–7, see Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18, 757.

\(^3\) Portrait in the collection of the Duke of Portland. But for the fact that the head in Kneller’s portrait has an upward turn, Croker has in the plaque more accurately reproduced it than the mezzotint discussed on p. 209 of our last volume, for Croker has copied the tucker omitted by I. Simon, the engraver of the print.
that one or other of Croker's colleagues collaborated with him in making a specially large Union medallion, for we have noticed that his reverses were not liked by all. The obverse, certainly made for a medallion, and in no way suggestive of a seal, recalls Croker's technique at its best—precise, rather hard, somewhat conventional, but not ungraceful, and not too redundant, whereas the reverse with its multitude of slightly overcrowded allegorical figures in exceedingly high relief, is more reminiscent of the design of a seal-engraver, aiming at a very deep impression. The first name that occurs to one is therefore that of Roos, the official graver of seals, but the modelling is more akin to that of Samuel Bull, who, as we believe, worked more boldly and massively than the chief-graver, and whose business lay, strictly speaking, in producing reverses for medals and coins. Mr. Rosenheim's gift is both bold and fine in its sense of depth, being more highly modelled than Croker's plaque, but not so minutely finished.

But lacking further evidence, although I was, and indeed am still, inclined to suggest an attribution to Bull, I cannot press this point, for signed specimens from his hand are not sufficient in number to establish his method definitely. We may, however, note that his Union medal is in high relief, and his employment in occasionally making obverses for coins, usually the exclusive privilege of the chief graver of the period, points to his proficiency. The work of Le Clerc need hardly be taken into consideration, for judging from his signed thaler made at Basle, circa 1685, he would not have been equal to so massive a production. The claims of Roos, the engraver of Anne's second great seal, should be more carefully weighed, for his handiwork is, as we have seen, graceful and well executed, and his signet made for the Union is specially satisfactory, but the reverse of the great seal is by comparison not quite equal to Croker's original design, if we are right in assuming the drawing in Alchorne's manuscript book of this

---

2 Readers of our last volume will remember that Gabriel Le Clerc was made assistant graver to the mint on April 7th, 1705. See British Numismatic Journal, vol. x, pp. 257–8.
3 See ante, p. 219.
MR. LAWRENCE’S MEDALLIONS, NOW IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

DIAMETER, SEVEN INCHES.
counter-seal to be Croker's rather than his own. Neither does the great seal, which we have shown that he executed for George, establish his proficiency, for in anatomy it falls short of the required standard. But we should not lay too much stress on observations made from worn wax impressions, although we may perhaps venture to criticize the design.

So far had I proceeded in my investigations, when by a curious coincidence, Mr. L. A. Lawrence kindly lent me, in 1913, for study, a recent acquisition consisting of a pair of gilt leaden medallions which he believes to be struck on a cast flan. As will be seen from our illustration facing page 224, the more ornate of the two almost exactly resembles the Rosenheim presentation, although rather larger, and yet not quite so deeply moulded and with some slight simplification of design. Upon these plaques, which were in the following year presented by the Arts Collection Fund to the British Museum, the letters of the legend are incuse instead of in relief, and although the drapery in the background is omitted, one of them is almost a replica of the Rosenheim piece. The companion plaque appeared to indicate a clue, for it is still more suggestive of a design for a great seal than is the group of allegorical figures, presenting as it does a shield with supporters, the usual obverse of the Scottish great seal. The armorial bearings are those in use in England after the Union, surmounted by a crown and supported by the lion and unicorn, whilst St. George and St. Andrew above join hands in amity, and the words beneath, Semper Eadem, Anne's motto, recall the last Scottish great seal3 and the medals and jettons commemorating this event. The

---

1 These medallions are now in the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum, and I have been permitted to illustrate them. The actual measurement is 7 inches in diameter.

2 The Scottish great seals from the time when James I. succeeded to the English throne until the Union may be found in James Anderson's Selectus Diplomatum & Numismatum Scotiae Thesaurus. The Scottish Arms, surrounded by a legend, setting forth the King's titles, and an effigy of the monarch with an appropriate motto, together with a date, decorate the two sides. Authors differ in describing as obverse and reverse the two sides of the seal, but on the whole it is clearer to speak of that bearing the titles as the obverse.

3 Selectus Diplomatum as above, Plate xciv, dated 1704.
arrangement of the design, especially the decoration in the exergue, leaving no doubt that these medallions must be a pair, I turned my attention to the possibility of finding them in the "Seal for Scotland" of Anne, although the fact that the supporters are not reversed, the lion taking the dexter side, militated against this idea.\(^1\) On the Union it had been ordered that in Scotland, in future, the great seal of the United Kingdom, which, as we have seen, was decorated with the seated Britannia by Roos, should be affixed in public matters, but a new seal, "in place of the great seal formerly in use there," was to be employed "for the authentication of all Crown writs relating to lands or offices in Scotland."\(^2\) The only chance of seeing such a seal would be upon private documents, and curiously enough, owing to the nature of the wax used in the reign of Anne, I understand that such specimens as exist are rarely decipherable. The enquiries I made in Museums\(^3\) and Record Offices both in London and Edinburgh were met with the greatest courtesy, but without resulting in the discovery of this special seal,\(^3\) and finally, by the kindness of Mr. W. R. Macdonald, a great

\(^1\) By the kindness of Mr. W. R. Macdonald, I am informed that on every one of the Scottish great seals from 1603 to the present time, with the exception of that of Oliver Cromwell and the obverse of George V's., the unicorn supporter takes the dexter side, the collar of the thistle is nearest to the coat-of-arms, and the lion rampant of Scotland occupies the first position on the shield.


\(^3\) During my search for large seals, I was courteously welcomed in the library of the Society of Antiquaries, possessed of a fine collection of sulphur casts, originally in the Way Collection, and presented to the Society in 1875, to be later supplemented by additional specimens. Amongst the casts I found not only a copy of the Rosenheim but also copies of the Lawrence medallions. The words "Ireland" and "Sudbury Museum," written on the cards on which they are mounted, probably indicated the original owners of the casts or the locality of provenance, but enquiries at the Museums of various Sudburys produced no corroborative evidence, and there is no indication of Irish type in the medallions.
Scottish Seals.

authority on Scottish seals, I find that the equestrian figure as portrayed in Anderson's Diplomatum, Plate xcix, was continued in use in cases as above specified, when the United Kingdom seal was not employed, he having found fragments of it upon charters of February 13th, 1710, and July 27th, 1713, whilst Mr. Cleland Harvey has since discovered it on an early charter of George I.

We may therefore rest assured that we have in the plaques no seal impressions proper, but we may be permitted to wonder whether they are the rejected designs made by Bull or Roos for this purpose. It is possible that Croker and others competed in drawing emblematical groups for the purpose of making the English great seal, and the rendering by Roos of a seated Britannia being chosen, the more crowded design was again presented for the Scottish seal as a suitable reverse in combination with the obverse of royal arms—or was merely used for decorative purposes. The production of a finished model for a seal in some material more durable than wax is by no means unusual; for beautiful examples, carved in relief in boxwood, may be seen in the Mediaeval Room of the British Museum of the great seals both of George II. and George III. We must, moreover, bear in mind that, owing to the difficulties of hardening the dies, so large a composition can only be brought to perfection in hard metal by casting—witness the enormous expenses incurred by Pistrucci's endeavour, more than a century later, to strike a Waterloo medal, little over five and a quarter inches in diameter. Impressions in gutta-percha and electrotypes only resulted from an expenditure of £2,400.

It is therefore very likely that, before committing the extravagance

1 I understand from Mr. Macdonald that these seals are in very bad condition; and, unfortunately, Mr. Cleland Harvey, writing in the Scottish Historical Review in October, 1913, makes the same remark concerning the seal on a charter at Yester of the year 1714. But in this case the seal is entire and proves that the contemplated change was not made, the old seal continuing in use until after Anne's demise. The document which Mr. Cleland Harvey discovered in the Tweeddale charter room is a grant made by George I. to Charles, Marquis of Tweeddale, of the office of Sheriff of Haddington, on November 16th, 1714, to which is appended the well-known seal of Queen Anne, Diplomatum, xcix. See Scottish Historical Review, October, 1913, p. 119.

of making a large metal matrix, the seal engraver would make a cast in bronze from a wax sketch to submit to his patrons, and it is even possible that he would make a mould from which impressions might be taken in soft metal or wax. But we have found no dies from which the examples under discussion could have been struck, and personally, giving my opinion for what it is worth, I believe them to be casts, fortunately preserving for us the artist's rejected ideas for a seal, or more likely the designs for the centres of a pair of commemorative salvers, for presentation at the time of the Union.

No doubt the fine head of Anne by Croker in the Museum was intended to serve the purpose of a uniface decorative plaque only, and with equal probability we may hold that the Rosenheim example may also have been made in the same way as a "pièce de plaisir" by one of his colleagues and may have been afterwards subjected to some slight alteration—of lesser relief and simplification of detail, if the artist were desirous of producing the matrix for a counter-seal, and he might then also supply for the seal an arrangement of Post-Union arms. If this were the case we might, perhaps, find in the gilt lead specimens the trial pieces resulting from his effort.¹

Whilst attributing to Croker most of the designs figured in the Alchorne manuscript book,² we must remember that the division of labour at the Tower varied at different periods of the engraver's career, but—as at all times in the previous generations—the responsibility was vested in him alone. He appears to have pursued the same method as his predecessors, the Roettier family, in making puncheons for coins from which he engraved his dies by the help of his subordinates; and his detractors accused him—as Thomas Simon had been accused—of being a "puncher" rather than an engraver.³ This procedure had, however, not prevented Simon from being an expert in seal engraving, but the fact that Croker was a goldsmith and modelled by preference in relief instead of in intaglio was, as we have seen, held to militate against his

¹ If these be models for Scottish seals, they would naturally be rejected in consequence of the mistake in the arms: see p. 226.
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employment in this particular. A paper written in the reign of George I.,
to which I have already had occasion to refer, whilst laying stress upon
this matter, reflected also upon the inability displayed by Croker’s pre-
decessor Harris to “do the work of the mint.” The anonymous critic
complains that he, “in the Reign of King William, obtained from the
Court, the place of King’s Engraver for Seals and mint as usual, but
as he could not do the work for ye mint he hired such as would work
cheapest for him, to keep the more benefit for himself, which are [sic]
the present Engraver,” namely Croker. Neither does the memorialist
spare this latter artist as a maker of coins, for the portrait of George I.
calls forth his opprobrium, and he remarks that “the most part of his
subjects did never see the original, and the only idea of his S.P.”
[sacred person] “is what the coins represent them, which being done to
disadvantage, gives no satisfaction to the well affected, and creates a
contempt by the disaffected.” This adverse criticism probably refers
to the “Prince-Elector Guinea,” so called because the succeeding coins

The “Prince-Elector” Guinea of George I., 1714.

do not bear the foreign titles in full. It is the only issue of 1714, and
the bust was altered in the following year, perhaps in consequence of
these outspoken remarks.

1 See ante, p. 220, MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cxcii, No. 75.
2 It is noticeable that the delegation of such duties was not illegal, for in the draft
preserved in the British Museum of Harris’s patent as Chief Engraver to Queen Anne,
under date June 9th, 1702, it is specified that he is “by himself and his Workmen to
make frame & engrave ye Designes & Effegies of ye Images of us,” etc., and he is given a
3 The letters PR . ET . EL., standing for Princeps et Elector, appeared on this coin; in the subsequent coinage the PR is omitted and in the reign of George III., in 1801,
the foreign titles were dropped.
4 The Order in Council under date January 5th, 1714, “to coin after draughts thereto
annexed” is mentioned in a list of warrants in Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS. 18,759, f. 153,
The object of the unknown writer was to suggest the institution of a school of design—proposing that £200 or £300 should be spent in making "a collection of all sorts of antik and modern medals or impressions thereof, fine prints, antik bas relives," etc. He desired these to be kept at the Tower and recommended that an engraver should be authorized at a suitable salary to collect them, "partly att Paris & at the same time to examine all the methods in use there, . . . , and that he should bring up pupils who also might study for some years in the Academy of Drawing and Embossing att Paris." This plan would he thought, "provide the Mint with an engraver, that is able to produce ye best work both for heads and revers of medals and coin, skild in embossing of wax, as also to do all other work of engraving in steel, silver and stone to excelling." This memorial was carefully preserved and somewhat ironically endorsed with a note on October 25th, 1715, of the renewed appointment of Croker at £200, and of his two assistants at £80 "dureing pleasure" as before. It is possible we may see in this treasured suggestion the origin of the Mint museum, formed nearly a hundred years later under the direction of the Master, William Wellesley Pole, afterwards Lord Maryborough, who, in 1816, again represented the desirability of preserving specimens of dies, coins and medals. These pieces were placed in show-cases in 1874, and most ably re-catalogued and re-arranged in 1906 by Mr. W. J. Hocking, whose services to numismatics should be gratefully acknowledged by all students.

But however just may have been the critic's remarks on the first coinage of George I., that of Anne is well worthy of notice.

Let us turn, then, to the year 1702 and begin with the warrant under date March 9th, 1701-2 for coining "Gold and Silver with the old and also a fresh warrant for an "add\' F.D. to be added to ye Inscription" under date January 10th. The warrant for coining follows under date March 21st, 1714-15.

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. cxci, No. 75. This renewal of the patent had been granted by the Treasury Board on the previous September 14th, on the petition of John Croker, "a naturalised foreigner and Samuel Bull."


dyes until Puncheons and Dyes are made with our Effigies and Arms.” A large quantity of bullion being then in the Mint, Newton on the following day receives orders to “proceed to coyne the Gold & Sylver ....which if it should remain uncoyned would be to the Dissatisfaction and hindrance of the Importers.”  

On March 11, Harris is authorized to prepare “all master Puncheons, Letters & Charges” for pieces of gold to the value of £5, £2, £1, and 10s. and for silver coins represented by 5s., 2s. 6d., 1s., and 6d. No smaller denominations are then mentioned and “all Possible Speed” is enjoined. Then follows another warrant, dated May 6th, 1702, directing that on the gold and silver coins the inscription should read: ANNA DEI GRA: on the obverse, and MAG. BR. FR.: ET HIBER. REG: 1702, on the reverse. 

Next appears an order given on the 26th of the same month to the officers of the Mint to attend on the morrow at the Treasury, but the directions they received are not reported, and Isaac Newton was instructed on July 28th following “concerning a Direction from the Earl Marshall for the form of the money to attend Mr. Attorney for his opinion.” 

The pattern guinea of which we have spoken in our last volume was submitted in June, and the design being unacceptable to the Queen, was amended by a warrant under date June 30th, 1702, substituting a rose for the monogram and adding a “dress below the neck, as the meddals.”

From these entries we learn that until midsummer, or even later, the gold, and probably the silver also, continued to bear the effigy of William III. The coins dated 1702 with Anne’s portrait are guineas,

---

1 State Papers Domestic, Entry Book No. 350, p. 199.
2 Ibid., p. 216.
3 Information kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking from the Royal Mint. The majority of Anne’s coinage when actually issued read: ANNA . DEI . GRATIA . MAG . BR . FRA . ET . HIB . REG :
7 Information kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking.
half-guineas, and shillings, and a very small number of silver coins may have been struck early in the year, and must have been impressed

with William’s dies—the total silver coinage to March 24th, 1702–3, being £2,580,1 of which we know that £1,000 was struck earlier in the month of March, 1702–3, bearing the VIGO provenance mark, and, of course, the portrait of Anne. There were, moreover, shillings, both plain and ornamented with plumes, issued with the Queen’s head, in 1702.

We have noticed in our last volume that the large conversion of foreign gold pieces into our own currency under William III. was still in progress at the time of the King’s death; and we are not, therefore, surprised to hear from the Royal Mint that £91,301 was coined between March 8th, 1701–2, and the 24th of the same month in 1702–3, of which total the sum of £1,000 owes its issue to January of that year, Anne’s portrait having by that time taken its place upon the coins.

1 I notice that after Anne’s death, Newton wrote on August 2nd, 1714, to the Duke of Shrewsbury, the Lord High Treasurer, saying that “the Mint being at a stop for want of authority to proceed with the Dyes and Puncheons last in use until new ones can be made and large quantities of gold Bullion being in the Mint to be coined and more Bullion being daily expected, I have hereunto annexed a copy of the Warrant signed by her late Majesty upon the like occasion, and a Draught of a new Warrant suitable to the present occasion, and most humbly pray your Grace to lay the matter before the Lords Justices that the Coynage may proceed.” The warrants are not enclosed, but the letter is of interest as showing the course usually pursued, see MS. Treasury Papers, vol. clxxx, No 4. Moreover, in a list of warrants amongst the Alchorne MSS., Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS. 18,759, f. 1538, we read: “3rd Aug. 1714. War. of Privy Council for Coins the Gold & Silver in his Maj’s Mint with ye Dyes made from the Puncheons of her late Maj’is Reign until new Puncheons of Deys with his Maj’s Effigies & Arms shall be made.” The Order in Council for the new designs follows in January, 1714, and for coining in conformity to it on March 21st.
An order was issued on February 11th, 1702–3, that all the gold bullion sent to the Tower Mint from the capture of the galleons at Vigo should be coined, and as much silver as would make £1,000 sterling. We shall see that no such gold coinage was delivered until May, 1703; and it is, therefore, not a matter of surprise that we find no gold coins dated 1702 bearing the word VIGO, a mark which, by another warrant of the previous day—February 10th—had been commanded upon the coinage: and such portion of the thousand pounds in silver as first saw the light and was recorded by Newton on March 13th, 1702–3, must be sought on the shillings only, for neither do other pieces in the less precious metal bear an earlier date than 1703. The Commissioners of Prizes had informed the Lord Treasurer that when Newton wrote “requiring such a Quantity as was necessary in order to the coining One Thousand Pounds pursuant to my Lord Treasurer’s directions, we could not then deliver any Gold to be coined, there being but a small parcel in all brought on shore out of the Mary Man of War, and is not yet condemned by the Court at the Admiralty.”

1 See p. 234, note 1.
3 See MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxiv, No. 86, February 17th, 1702–3. See also Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS. 18,763, where it is stated that the first bullion melted from the Vigo capture in February, 1702–3, produced 701 lb. 4 oz. 19 dwt. standard silver in eleven ingots, including much of the wrought plate brought in by the Ranelagh Prize. From 321 lb. 2 oz. 13 dwt. of this silver £1,000 was coined in March, 1702–3, the remaining 380 lb. 2 oz. and 6 dwt. being reserved.
It is apparent that all the gold—of which Newton and the Commissioners of Prizes state that the quantity was not large—was therefore not immediately coined; but, as we shall see, it formed the greater part of the subsequent coinage in May, 1703. But far more curious than the postponement of the gold coinage is that of a large mass of the silver—resulting in the fact that about one-half of the coins bearing date 1703 were not really issued until April, 1704.

The history of the Vigo capture is so well known that I need only remind our readers that Louis XIV. of France, expecting a supply of treasure, had arranged with the King of Spain to send twenty ships, under Chateau Rénault, to act as an escort. The English and Dutch combined fleets under Sir George Rooke attacked and captured or destroyed the whole Spanish plate fleet and its French convoy in Vigo harbour on October 12th, 1702, and the date, as the 12th or the 23rd, according to old or new style respectively, appears on a large number of medals by English and foreign artists commemorating the event. The whole treasure of the fleet in plate and bullion was valued at 20,000,000 pieces of eight, and the merchandise at a like sum. Of this, as roughly estimated by some writers, nearly 14,000,000 Spanish

1 The gold, according to a list prepared on February 26th, 1702-3, consisted of "five pounds weight and all in Pistoles," besides some wrought plate, namely: "Four cocoanut chocolate Cups, garnished with Filigram work in gold with gold Filigram covers," M.S. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxiv, No. 108. We find, however, amongst the Alchorne MSS., Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS. 18,763, f. 4b and 18b, an official account of the Vigo coinage, and under date May 14th, 1703, we read that the pistoles were melted to the weight of 5 lb. 7 oz. 3 dwt., which "being reduced to standard, produced £267 7s. 9d." This money was delivered to the Commissioners on May 14th, 1703, as we shall see later.

The Vigo Treasure.

235 coins had been already landed, equalling about £3,150,000 of our money, and it is usually said that about half the cargo was lost or burnt in the galleons, which were destroyed in some cases by the enemy rather than surrender them into our hands. According to Oldmixon and Rapin, the Spaniards rescued a fourth part of the merchandise, but the remaining fourth of the entire treasure fell to the captors, and was shared by England with her ally. Oldmixon considered that the booty falling to the combined fleets might be reckoned at "about one million, five hundred thousand pounds sterling, which," as he sapiently remarks, "is more than ever was brought to the publick Account in England or Holland." Burton puts the capture at a lower standard. "Much life was lost," writes this historian, "and much of the precious cargo, but it would appear that the assailants carried off plunder reaching a pecuniary value estimated roundly at half a million sterling, but the loss of the sufferers was estimated at that of the attackers several times over." A more modern historian roughly gives the value of the booty secured at "about £1,000,000." Oldmixon, entering into details, estimates the prizes at "two millions of pieces of eight and five millions in goods," which fell, he tells us, "into the hands of the Confederates"; but as regards the bullion his figures do not help us very considerably, for his account is not borne out by the written and tabulated list made

1 The names of the ships captured were published by authority in the London Gazette, October 16th, No. 3,858, but the amount of the bullion is not given. The account reads: "There has been some Silver taken out of the bottoms of the Galleons that were burnt, which makes it to be believed there may be a good quantity on board those that are taken, at least that they are very rich in other valuables." Of the 17 galleons, 6 were burnt, whilst the English "possessed themselves" of the same number, and the Dutch of 5. Rapin, in his History of England, vol. iv, pp. 570-572, gives the names of the ships and a map of the harbour. His account of the capture is careful and clear.


3 J. H. Burton's History of Queen Anne, vol. ii, p. 64.


5 Oldmixon, p. 292.
out by Newton of the plate sent to be melted by the Commissioners of Prizes. In the Danny account-books, to which I have before referred, the sum set down as passing to the Treasury resulting from prizes between Michaelmas, 1702, and the same date in 1703 is £95,401 8s. 11d.; but it is, however, obvious that this represents other captures in addition to that of Vigo. The Commissioners, writing on May 29th, 1703, stated that, allowing for certain payments about to be made, or already effected, the residue they had in their hands for distribution amounted to £49,936 8s. 9d., and of this sum they suggested the partition of £30,000, as the Vigo gold could not all "yet be adjusted."

But whatever was the sum realized by the sale of the cargo, we need only deal with the precious metals which are specified by Newton, consisting of some 4,504 lb. 2 oz. of silver and, roughly speaking, about 10 lb. of gold in bullion and plate, of which a portion was sold unmelted, for this was the entire amount sent to the Mint, to form the historic coinage with which we are familiar, and we have seen that it was not the original intention of the Queen to produce so large an output as she found herself compelled to do, namely £12,473 3s. 3d. The story is not without interest, as we piece it together from various manuscript sources. After the receipt of the warrant of February 11th, 1702-3, the mint-master had written to my Lord Treasurer on the 18th about the prize money, suggesting that in order rightly to ascertain the standard and obtain the bullion for "coining one thousand pounds pursuant to my Lord Treasurer’s direction," he and

1 The Treasury Papers supply details as to the plate melted and Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS. 18,763, ff. 1 to 9 and 28, amongst the Alchorne MSS. in the British Museum, comprises a detailed list describing the pieces of plate and their various weights.
2 British Numismatic Journal, vol. ix, p. 229. This sum represents "the Queen’s moiety" only.
3 Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxv, No. 164.
4 "Besides ye altar piece . . . not weighed," ff. 7-8 of Newton’s list.
5 About half the gold was in pistoles, the rest in chains, etc., and refined gilt plate. Of the silver some 890 lb. weight was in plate, the rest in bars and pieces of eight, ff. 21-23.
6 Newton’s account of the bullion in the Alchorne MSS., Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18,763, is the most useful of these.
his colleagues deemed it to be "for her Majties Service that all the Virgin Silver Cakes and broken silver and so much of the Plate as in the judgment of the Commrs for Prizes is not valuable for its fashion, or as your Lordss shall appoint be melted into Ingots in the presence of one or more Commrs of Prizes and then weighed and assayed."¹

Many articles then rejected would now be of great interest, but sad to relate, this letter is endorsed "Agreed to"; we are, however, glad to know that the Commissioners rescued and exposed for sale² certain fine things. We are informed of this course by a document, dated February 17th, following a letter of January 28th, requesting that the Lord High Treasurer's "pleasure be further signified" with regard to a loss which might be incurred by melting "several pieces of Wrought Plate of great curiosity which are reserved for his Lordship's further consideration."³ Newton later justified the melting of such plate as was not considered "valuable for fashion," on the plea that being of various standards of purity it could not otherwise be appraised.⁴ His letters in the Treasury Papers give a detailed account of the pieces which had been brought in as booty from "the Edward and Elizabeth,"⁵ taken by "the Mary Man of War,"⁶ and other galleons captured by "the Ranalagh,"⁷ "the Royal Sovereign," "the Brothers

¹ Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxiv, No. 89, February 18th, 1702–3.
² Ibid., No. 85.
³ Ibid., No. 49.
⁵ Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxiv, No. 85.
⁶ Ibid., No. 108.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

Love," "the Dixwell," and "the Susanna," etc. The treasures contained in "the Ranalagh Prize" are calculated to make the soul of a collector quail within him, inasmuch as a good deal was destroyed, but it is with pleasure that we read a carefully tabulated list of treasures, sold unmelted by the Commissioners on August 4th, 1703.1 The plate saved seems to have been of great beauty, some of it gilt, much of it ornamented "with Philligram work," and one would be glad to trace the subsequent history of such things as "a Candlestick with 2 nozells and an Angel in the Middle"—still more of an altar-piece apparently overlaid with precious metal—"the silver in it" being valued at 5s. 6d. the oz. and described as "being 4 Twisted pillars, supporting a Cupulo wth a glory in ye Middle under it."2 We read of trinkets such as "Seaven gold Chains, 5 gold rings and other odd things" some garnished with Pearls" offered for sale "by Candle" in "one lot weighing 2 lb. 3 oz. 8 dwt. at the price of the gold, £3 8/- per oz.," and again of "Four snuffboxes, 12 Thimbles, a Purse, Hatband, a Bottle and Madona, wth odd peices of Silver put into a Bagg," at the weight of 5 lb. 10 oz. which were put up for sale at 5s. per oz.3 Four angels on stands were no more ceremoniously treated, but we rejoice in their salvation—with various pieces of "filigree work" such as "a gilt salver and Holy Water Pott garnished with do." A total of some 180 lb. 2 oz. 8 dwt. Troy weight was rescued from destruction by sale, besides the altar of which the weight was not given. It seems unnecessary to call attention to the "Wrought Baisons" and "Ewers," "Fruit Dishes," "Chocolate Cups," "Wrought" spoons, forks, cruets, salts and "perfuming potts with candlesticks," etc., which were unfortunately left on the hands of the commissioners and condemned to be melted by an order of August 11th 1703-4, resulting in the production during the following months of 6 bars of silver weighing 318 lb. 10 oz. Troy, with a very small surplus of gold from gilt plate.4

But we must return to February, 1702-3, when was commanded

2 Ibid., ff. 2 and 28b. This altar is always described as "not weighed."
3 Ibid., f. 28b.
4 Ibid., ff. 29 and 29b.
the first destruction of pieces which would now be worth their weight in gold, for producing the £1,000 in silver coinage originally ordered by the Queen. Much wrought plate out of the "Ranalagh Prize"—amounting to 391 lb. in weight—was sacrificed in March under a warrant of February 11th, 1702-3, when the bullion standardized from the various Spanish ingots, plate and pieces of eight produced 701 lb. 4 oz. 19 dwt. of which 321 lb. 2 oz. 13 dwt. was at once converted into the £1,000 desired by Anne and delivered to the Commissioners on March 13th, 1702-3; but 289 lb. 10 oz. in pieces of eight, equalling £999 19s. 11½d., had been handed in Spanish specie to "Sr Clowdesley Shovell," the remainder, namely 380 lb. 2 oz. 6 dwt., being, as we shall see, coined later. This transaction is chronicled in the Treasury Minutes as follows:—"Order Coms. of Prizes to receive from Sir Cloudesley Showl 1000l and to deliver to him ye value thereof in Spanish money at ye Current price, if they have soe much, or else to supply him with pare thereof at ye same price." This order must have been somewhat of a relief to the Commissioners who had written on January 28th, 1702-3, to the Treasury for special orders saying that: "Dollars are now risen to five shillings and ninepence an ounce" and

1 Brit. Mus. Addit. M.S. 18,763, f. 4. The "Ranalagh Prize" contained plate and valuables to the weight of 693 lb. 11 oz. 15 dwt. in silver. See Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxiv, No. 85, February 15th, 1702-3. On board this ship some slight embezzlement was reported, see Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxv, No. 2, January, 1702-3, but historians suggest that embezzlement was not limited to one ship in particular, and the precautions against "running" plate and plunder in October and November, 1702, are given at some length in the State Papers Domestic Naval, No. 117, ff. 62 and 74. But little plate and few dollars are mentioned amongst the hidden goods.

2 Ibid., f. 4.

3 Ibid., f. 7. The Admiral's Christian name, usually spelt Cloudesley by contemporary writers, is rendered Clowdisley by the Political History and the Dictionary of National Biography. It is stated in the latter that Shovell's grandmother was the eldest daughter of Thomas Clowdisley of Clay, and the Admiral himself usually signed Clow⁴, but occasionally at full length either as Cloudisley or Clowdisley.

4 Although the Vigo capture was effected by Sir George Rooke, Shovell as Admiral of the White, joined him immediately afterwards, and it was he who brought home the ships, a service of some difficulty owing to the disabled condition of many of the prizes.

5 Treasury Minutes Books, T. 29, vol. xiv, p. 73, April 19th.
suggested to William Lowndes, Secretary to the Treasury, that "the Lord Treasurer should be informed least there should be a loss in the melting of them down, which we have taken care should not be done till his Lordship's pleasure be further signified." 1

On April 21st we still find Newton enquiring what he "should do about disposing of what remains in the Mint," but he complied at once with the British Admiral's requirements, delivering to him on April 21st the nearest equivalent in pieces of eight. This money was obviously required by Shovell for foreign service—and it seems hardly credible that no part of the specie was reserved by the Commissioners of Prizes to be used commercially, for the facility with which foreign money was accepted is evidenced not only by English coin weights representing the currency of other nations, but by constant references even at a later period to the mixed contents of any trader's till. Some forty or more years later, "in consequence," as we read in a recently written history of an old English family, 2 "of the taking of plate ships notably at Vigo, during the late wars, a great deal of foreign money was current in England," and the authoress tells us of a certain Dr. Shuckford who noted that he had in his purse at one moment "a Pistole equal to 16s. 6d., a Louis d'or 20s. od., a double Louis d'or 40s. od., a moidore 27s. od." We may, however, remark that there is no mention of pieces of eight in this list, and—although in 1703, as the war was still in progress, it was a convenience to Anne's sailors to have foreign money—the difficulty of adjusting the value of the Spanish pieces was considerable owing to the differences in standard and weight of the coin as circulated in Spain and her colonies and dependencies. 3

But the decision having been made by the Treasury to "Direct

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. Ixxiv, No. 49. No Minute records the Treasurer's decision, and some of the pieces of eight were eventually melted.
2 In a recently written biography, The Betts of Wortham, by Katherine Doughty, p. 197.
3 Ruding, vol. ii, p. 61, mentions under date 1704, that pieces of eight were assayed at the Mint, and varied in weight from 14 dwt. to 17 dwt. 12 gr., and in worth from 3s. 7½d. to 4s. 6½d.; nevertheless the better pieces were then held to represent 6s. each. We have seen that they were current at the price of 5s. 9d. the oz. in 1703.
the Comm' of Prizes to sell the pieces of 8, Ingotts of Silver and Silver Plate and ye gold remaining uncoyned to ye best advantage and pay her Mat's part of the proceeds into ye Exchequer," two more warrants followed under date June 23rd, ordering respectively the sale of the ingots into which the silver residue had been melted, and the similar disposal of uncoined gold bullion from Vigo remaining in the Tower. An earlier warrant had been issued on June 2nd for appraising the goods.

Another document in the Alchorne Manuscripts shows that on August 4th, as we described on our page 238, an effort was made to dispose of "51 Barrs of silver," the amount which by that time had assumed this shape, and a mass of beautiful plate—the goods being put up for sale at the appraised price of the silver, and such things as the altar "which could not be weighed," being obviously only overlaid with silver, and some other fine pieces found purchasers. We may regret that we are not informed whether the sale "by Candle" produced any competition—but we fear not. Only the appraizers' list is available—and so much remained on hand that it does not appear that great alacrity was displayed.

It seems that this rejected plate was therefore melted on August 11th, 6 more bars of silver and 34 oz. 1 dwt. 14 gs. of gold resulting therefrom, and things again remained at a standstill until January 27th, 1703–4, when the Commissioners for Prizes stated that they had "exposed for sale at Several times and at severall prices the silver taken at Vigo, which has been melted in Barrs essay'd in the Mint and marked at Goldsmith's Hall in order to Exportation, and yesterday offered the same at Five Shillings and Sixpence per Ounce, but no person would bid anything for it." The minute attached to this declaration reads: "Order it to be coyned." Newton sums

---

2 Information supplied by Mr. Hocking.
6 *MS. Treasury Papers*, vol. lxxxix, No. 32.
up the matter thus: "The Commissioners laid a memorial before my Lord Treasurer relating to the said silver and Mr. Lowndes by his letter of the 1st of Feb' having signified his Lordship's order to the Commissioners that the said Silver should be forthwith coyned. . . . the 57 Barrs of Silver before mentioned were accordingly entered on the books of her Maj'"s Mint the 12 day of February following." Newton tells us that "Part of the aforesaid silver being coyned into moneys the 21st of March following," he paid over on the 24th of March £5,102 2s. 6d. "being in Weight one Thousand Six hundred and forty pounds, two ounces Nine pennyweight and seventeen grains being all the moneys that was then coyned. The Remainder of the said Silver (being in weight One Thousand Nine hundred Sixty two Pounds two ounces, seventeen pennyweights fifteen grains) being coyned into moneys the 26th day of Aprill 1704 and making out In Tale Six Thousand, one hundred and four Pounds, Six Shillings was likewise Paid to the said Receiver General's Deputy by Warrant of the Commissioners dated 22nd day of May 1704." We must here note that the total output of silver for the year 1703 was, as I learn from Mr. Hocking, £5,580, and we must therefore look for the residue in the rare half-crown with Tertio on the edge, but without a provenance mark, and the groat, threepence, half-groat and penny. The Mint Records assure us that in 1704, £6,842 in silver coins was minted—the Vigo coinage as we see accounts for £6,104 6s., but no

1 Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS. 18,763, f. 29b.
2 Ibid., ff. 29b-30.
Vigo coins exist bearing this date. The small remainder of £738 is easily covered by the half-crowns and shillings bearing the Welsh plumes and the shillings, fourpences, threepences and twopences with plain reverse, but these are dated as they should be, namely, 1704, whilst the Vigo coins must have been struck with unaltered dies to preserve the unity of the coinage. Had it been decided to abandon the provenance mark and to date the coins as issued, collectors would not find the present facility in obtaining specimens of the Vigo coins—whilst on the other hand the plain 1704 shilling is by no means common enough to warrant the belief that it was made from the residue of the Spanish silver. But strange as is the story of the silver, that of the gold is more perplexing. * We left Newton in February, 1702, in difficulties as to the production of a gold coinage, because the precious metal came to hand in small quantities, amounting to "little more than five Pounds weight." He particularized a crucifix, five gold chains, a whistle, an "Ear Picker" and 5 lb. 4 oz. 13 dwt. 18 gr. in pistoles.¹ These pistoles with a few more were melted, and ultimately the gold

account reached 7 lb. 8 oz. 16 dwt. 6 gr. in all, of which 5 lb. 7 oz. 3 dwt. 12 gr.—standardized as 5 lb. 6 oz. 15 dwt. 9 gr.—was converted into £267 7s. 9d., the chains and other "odd things," as we have seen, finding purchasers at £3 8s. the oz. It is somewhat surprising to find that the total coinage of Vigo gold was so small, but we have Newton's evidence that he coined on April 2nd, 1703, and delivered to the Commissioners on the following May 14th, these pieces: "10 five-guinea pieces = £53. 15. 00, 148 guineas = £159. 2. 00, 101 half guineas = £54. 5. 9," also "Small pieces of gold to make weight 1 dwt. 6 oz.," which he valued at 5s., retaining unmelted "Severall chains and other things remaining in the Mint as per particulars." When in May, 1704, the entire coinage was finished, 34 oz. 1 dwt. 14 gr. of standardized gold, resulting from the melting of gilt plate, remained on hand, and I can find no record that this bullion, which might have produced rather more than half as much as that already minted, was ever coined. We must therefore leave the gold output at £267 7s. 9d., or more correctly speaking, £267 2s. 9d., if the 5s. did not take the form of a gold crown, noting, however, that the coinage of 1703 reached £570, and that no five-guinea pieces, guineas, nor half-guineas bearing this date are known without the Vigo provenance mark. We cannot look for them in 1704, as there was no gold coinage in that year. Were it not that Mr. Hocking tells me the only issue of 1703 in this metal is registered at the Tower as taking place in May—the time when, as we have seen, the £267 7s. 9d. was delivered to the Commissioners—we might suppose that the gold

1 *Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS.* 18,763, f. 4b. It should be remembered that the value of the guinea was at this time £1 1s. 6d., so that £267 7s. 9d. represented 248 guineas and a half, with a surplus of five shillings' worth of gold which Newton specifies as remaining from this coinage. The figures are Newton's and, without the 5s. surplus, should more correctly read £267 2s. 9d.; but he makes no statement as to the form in which he delivered this remainder.

2 *Ibid.*, f. 7b. Newton mentions these small pieces of gold to the value of 5s. as making up the balance of the 5 lb. 6 oz. 15 dwt. 9 gr., and specified the chains, etc., remaining in the Mint, and afterwards sold as weighing 2 lb. 1 oz. 10 dwt. 18 gr.

3 *Ibid.*, f. 9 and 29b.

4 Information supplied by Mr. Hocking.
refined on February 12th, 1703-4, from the condemned plate, would be made ready for circulation with the silver sent from the mint on March 21st, but only the word "silver" is used, and even if the additional £134 or so which might have resulted from 34 oz. 1 dwt. 14 gr. had been made, the output of £570 mentioned in the Mint Accounts for May of 1703 is not covered, and we can only suppose that some slight overlapping of the coinage of January, 1702-3, is responsible for this money, or that some rare specimens of 1703, without provenance mark, may come to light, for no coinage of gold is entered at the mint between May, 1703, when the 34 oz. was yet imbedded in the gilt plate, and April, 1705. It is moreover apparent that in Newton's various reports he speaks of £267 7s. 9d. only, as being converted into five-guinea pieces, guineas, and half-guineas.

We might perhaps glance at the possibility that the naval medals, ordered by Queen Anne in recognition of the services rendered at Vigo, were made out of the surplus gold. This is indeed possible, and from several letters\(^1\) referring to these awards, which I have read in the MS. Treasury Papers, it appears that the decorations supplied on this occasion were of so costly a nature that 34 oz. would not go far.\(^2\) Moreover when the Queen, or rather her husband, Prince George,  

\(1\) Two of these letters were chronicled in abstract from the Calendar of Treasury Papers, 1702-7, pp. 205 and 209, by the late J. H. Mayo, in his Medals and Decorations of the British Army, pp. 87-88. He published an Admiralty minute of Nov. 16, 1703, granting the gifts. I have supplemented his account with extracts from the manuscript Treasury Papers.

\(2\) We may, however, note that the chains, which formed a valuable part of the gift, would not be made in, although provided by, the mint.
issued directions for their presentation no surplus was on hand at the Mint—this, however, was before the melting of the plate in question. The letters are worthy of attention because they afford detailed and in some cases unpublished information concerning the payment for and value of naval rewards at this period, although the bestowal of such was known and has been chronicled by Sir N. H. Nicolas, Mr. Mayo, Captain Tancred, and others. It is recorded that Queen Anne ordered gold medals and chains to be distributed to the Admirals and Flag-Captains at Vigo, each decoration representing the sum of £100, some special grants reaching £120, and also that persons of lower naval rank were registered as receiving rewards of lesser value. It is therefore unnecessary to repeat at length the story of the “Torbay” at Vigo, printed by the above authors, and the Admiralty orders of March 15th, 1702–3, for paying £240 to Isaac Newton to provide gold chains and medals for the master, and the boatswain, severally for extinguishing a fire on board that ship, a similar grant for a decoration valued at £120 having already been made to Benjamin Bryer, her gunner, but I find that, as under the Commonwealth, smaller rewards were sometimes apportioned.

In bestowing naval decorations, Anne was doing no new thing, indeed she directly copied the example of her immediate predecessors on the throne and Mr. Mayo chronicled payments for chains and medals of varying worth under William. Mary distributed medals pendent from chains to officers engaged at the battle of La Hogue, an action fought on May 21st, 1692, when we read that “Queen Mary was no sooner informed of this victory than she sent a gratuity

---

1 History of the Orders of Knighthood, vol. iv, Honorary Medals.
2 Historical Record of British War Medals, 1891.
4 Nicolas, p. 16, and Mayo, pp. 85–86.
5 See Thomas Lediard’s Naval History, p. 667. Dr. Payne, in his handbook of British and Foreign Orders, p. 247, describes the type of medal used for this purpose as agreeing in all but size with Med. III., vol. ii, p. 64, no. 266, but of slightly increased measurement, 2 inches instead of 1 ¾ inches, owing to “a plain raised double border.” J. H. Mayo, p. 79, in his description of the gold example given in 1695 with this obverse to Peter Joliffe gives the smaller measurement as in Med. III.
Naval Rewards.

of thirty Thousand Pounds down to Portsmouth to be distributed to the Seamen and Soldiers and ordered medals to be struck for Tokens of Honour to the Officers.”

It appears that William’s medals were of considerable value, occasionally reaching £100, although more usually £50. In 1695 we read of three presentations, equalling £50 apiece, when the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty awarded on June 2nd to William Thompson “a Gold chain and Medal to the value of 50l as a reward for his taking a Privateer” on the previous May 30th, 1695. At the same time a similar present was given to William Williams, master of a fishing boat, “for his having retaken from the Enemy several Coasting vessels,” and a third recipient on June 17th, 1695, was one Peter Joliffe for having caused the destruction of a French Privateer, recapturing a prize from her, and running her ashore.

The naval medals, together with their chains conferred by the Commonwealth, had ranged from £40 to £300, but the small military badges, like those of Charles I., were more signs of distinction than valuable rewards, being, as we know, often intrinsically worth but a few shillings.

But to approach nearer to the time of Anne, we must remember that Mary’s rewards were occasionally more complimentary than valuable, for I have seen an example in silver in the collection of Major Murray of Polmaise. Anne, so far as my manuscript researches have led me to suppose, bestowed no medals of lesser value

1 Nicolas, p. 13. See also Campbell’s Lives of the Admirals, vol. iii, pp. 153-154, and The London Gazette, June 2nd, No. 3,085; and on June 17th, in No. 3,089, we read: “The Lords Commissioners for the further Encouragement of William Thompson of Poole, have likewise given him the Sloop which he took lately from the French.”

2 The London Gazette, June 17th, 1695, No. 3,089. The medal granted to Joliffe, still extant, has the same obverse as the La Hogue medal, but the plain reverse was engraved with his name and services. See Mayo, p. 79.

3 Nicolas, p. 10. Chains were given to Blake and Monk valued at £300 each with their pendent medals.

4 Figured by the late Captain Tancred on p. 34 of his Record. It was, at the time he published his volume, in the collection of Colonel Murray, the late brother of the present owner. It is of the same type as that mentioned on our p. 246, Note 5, but with a slightly differing border.
than £5, but Sir N. Harris Nicolas refers to an order of the year 1744, under George II., for a recompense to the master of a privateer and his sailors as "being similar to the rewards bestowed in the reign of King William and Queen Mary and of Queen Anne to Private Ships," specifying that one Richard Hornby had "a gold medal and chain" worth £100, whilst those for his men equalled £5 and £3 to each boy. We must therefore feel no surprise at hearing that Anne issued silver naval rewards as well as gold, as had been done by her elder sister, but curiously, so far as our present research carries us, but one specimen exists in each metal, and we cannot absolutely identify the gift chosen by Queen Anne in commemoration of the Vigo captures, unless the type selected agreed with the type of a solitary specimen in gold, later given to Captain Lampriere, of which more anon. Sir N. H. Nicolas states that the account for the Vigo medals above mentioned was "to be paid out of money received by the Treasurer of the Navy for the Tenths of Prizes, appointed by the late Act of Parliament for medals and other rewards for officers, marines and seamen in Her Majesty's service," but we shall see how the Queen took up the burden, and much controversy arose between the Admiralty and Treasury as to payments required for naval rewards.

The correspondence in the Treasury Papers refers thus to diffi-
culties arising from the fact that the Queen had herself undertaken

to pay for the gift: “Her Mat’ having [by her Declaration of 1st

June]1 been pleased to direct that there shall be paid out of her Mat’s

share of Prizes such suifie or suifies of Money, as the Lord High

Admiral shall from time to time think fitt to direct to be paid for

Medalls or other Rewards for such Persons, as shall be found to

have done any Eminent or Extraordinary Sea Services.”2 Unfortun-

ately the Commissioners of Prizes, writing on March 18th, 1703-4,

informed the Lord High Treasurer that: “There is at present,

no Money belonging to the Queen remaining in the hands of the

Receiver Generall for Prizes.” They therefore suggested that

“since all Rewards are to be paid out of her Mat’s Share of

Prizes and not out of the Lord High Admiral’s Perquisites” it

would be advisable that “a certain share and proportion of her Mat’s

Moyety3 should be reserved in our Treasurer’s hands” in the future.

Otherwise they were “apprehensive that there will be some Rewards

ordered for the Marines Officers, as well as such Commanders of Ships

concerned at Vigo as are not Captains, according to the Opinions of

the Attorney and Sollicitor Generall, which we conceive may amount
to a very large Sume.” The question as to payment of rewards to the

Mercantile Marine had already called forth a protest on November

22nd, 1703, an order being signed by George Clarke, of the Admiralty,
on behalf of Prince George, the Lord High Admiral, asking the
Commissioners, under date November 19th, to pay £55 to the

---

1 The Declaration is printed in full in The London Gazette, No. 3,815, June 1st, 1702. The proportion of prize-money is therein specified, one moiety being given to officers and men. For subsequent confirmation of the Declaration see London Gazette, No. 3,890, February 18th, 1702-3, where we find the Queen’s special orders concerning a further distribution “of one-half of the Net Proceed of all the rest of the Effects taken out of our Enemies’ ships at Vigo.”

2 Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxix, No. 120, dated March 18th, 1703-4, and endorsed “read 22 March, 1703,” but not minuted with any decision as to the suggested arrangement.

3 In another letter written on March 20th, 1703, Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxix, No. 123, the Commissioners point out that the Queen has already received £6,747 14s. 7d. above her legitimate share out of a total of £218,019 8s. 6d., a sum which included other captures besides that at Vigo Bay.
Treasurer of the Navy for Newton "for enabling him to provide Medalls of that value for the Persons hereafter mencon'd belonging to a Merchant Ship the Leonora," thus exciting the fears of the Official Receivers.¹

The protest addressed to Mr. Lowndes, Secretary to the Treasury, is minuted "A l to Mr. Clarke to have this paid by Mr. Dod the Recver of ye perquisites of the Admiralty."¹

Three days later, on November 25th, Clarke asked Lowndes to explain to the Commissioners of Prizes that Prince George's order was based on the "Queens Declaration, an Order in Council and the Attorney Generall's opinion" and that he was not disposed to give way.² Moreover, the Lord High Admiral had "given up his Perquisites to the Queene dureing the Warre" and consequently had "not the power even to pay his own officers for collecting them, much less to reward anybody else, and his Receiver would be just under the same difficulties as the Receiver of the Prizes."

The matter was at this time temporarily settled by Lord Godolphin, the High Treasurer's minute attached to this letter: "Send a copy to the Comrs of prizes. My Lord is of ye same

¹ Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxvii, No. 133, Nov. 19th and 22nd, 1703. In thus referring the expenses to the tenth customarily due to the Lord High Admiral, the practice of the Commonwealth was revived. William and Mar., moreover, in 1692, set apart in the name of this official a tenth of the prizes taken by any other ship than a privateer to purchase rewards, 4 Gul. et Mar., c. 25. The Declaration of June 1st continued the grant of one-tenth of the prizes to the Lord High Admiral, although, as we have seen, undertaking the payment of the seamen's rewards by the Queen; but under date November 16th, 1703, a letter from the Admiralty quoted by Mayo, Appendix A, p. 517, debarred privateers from participation in awards of medals because of the exemption from paying tenths of prizes, "unless they do some signall service and that then it be considered of." According to the report placed by the Prize Commissioners before the House of Commons on November 11th, 1704, the total sum which had passed through their hands "from the Commencement of the War to the 7th November, 1704," amounted to £400,740 45. 10d. Of this sum the Admiral had received £3,098 15s. 8d. "for Prizes and Perquisites adjudged to him" and the Queen £145,685 3s. 2d. The £575 for medals is separately charged as paid "persuant to Her Majesty's Declaration." Commons Journals, vol. xvi, p. 411.

opinion as the letter"; but as we have seen, this led to further complication in 1704, when the Queen's share was exhausted.

Clarke's first letter is of interest because, instead of the large gold medal attached to a chain, valued at £100 as ordered for the Vigo Captains, or even at £120, as for the officers of the "Torbay," the required gifts varied, the sum of £5 being granted to the youngest recipient of the royal favour. The document reads:

"To Thomas Hedges, the Master—a Medall, value 20s is 20
For John Pimble,
Philip Devonshire and Daniel Lawley,
Mariners—a Medall to each of them, value 10s is ... ... 30
To Thomas Stubbs, a boy, Medall, value 5s is ... ... 5

in all ... ... 55

as a reward to them for their courage and Resolution for having (after being taken in the aforesaid ship by Three French men of Warr and made Prisoners) Sett upon thirteen Frenchmen which were ordered to sail her to France, whom they obliged to Surrender the Ship to them."

Of the type of these medals we have at present no certain trace, but Captain Tancred\(^1\) describes the gold decoration to which I referred on page 248 as being given rather later to Captain James Lampriere and to Sir Robert Fairfax for services rendered under Rear-Admiral Dilkes at Concalle on July 27th, 1703.\(^2\) And possibly the

\(^1\) Historical Records, pp. 37 and 38. Captain Tancred describes the medal as having a crowned bust of Queen Anne on the obverse, with the legend: "Anna : Dei : Gratia : Mag : Britan : Fra : et : Hib : Regina," and on the reverse a long inscription concerning the services rendered, surmounting a shield with the recipient's arms and the motto: "True to my Trust."

\(^2\) The action commenced on July 22nd, Dilkes and his fleet pursuing and overcoming the enemy. The Queen commanded that gold medals should be given "to the Admiral and the principal Officers" engaged in this affair. See Tancred, pp. 37 and 38, and Naval Chronicle, vol. v, p. 471, also Campbell's Lives of the Admirals, vol. iii, p. 376, and Lediard's Naval History, p. 773. For an official account of the battle see The London Gazette, August, 1703, No. 3937.
same design would have figured at Vigo, namely the Queen's bust on the obverse and an inscription with the recipient's arms on a shield on the reverse. If used for the mercantile marine the device must have been modified to suit the rank of him to whom each medal was given, for not all those who received the gift were entitled to bear arms.

Lampriere's medal is figured on Plate 12, No. 1, of Mr. Mayo's book. It has the same obverse as Croker's large Union medal, illustrated in our last volume facing p. 264, and in diameter measures 2¾ inches. This is a matter of interest, as corroborating Van Loon's suggestion that this bust was first designed at the time of Anne's accession, although we have seen that Newton only authorized its issue in 1707. The idea presents itself that the obverse in the form of a naval reward preceded the Union reverse of Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 298, No. 115, by several years. I may remind my readers that Croker valued the large Union medal at £30 in gold, and this affords some information as to the relative cost of chain and pendant in the total of £100.

With regard to the Queen's portrait in 1702, we can only say that we have no evidence that the gift chosen for services at Concalle in July, 1703, was already in use at the time of the Vigo capture; let us, therefore, glance for a moment at the medals struck in celebration of the Vigo incident. The official design here illustrated was specially issued from the Tower Mint by Croker to the public in gold for

MEDAL ON THE EXPEDITION TO VIGO BAY. MED. ILL., VOL. II, P. 236, NO. 18.

1 See ante, p. 223, note 2, and also vol. x, p. 210, note 2.
Purchasable Medals.

£4 5s. od., and at 6s. and 2s. in silver and copper respectively;¹ or so he states in his price list—although an example in gold is yet to seek.

If this portrait appeared on any of the naval medals granted in memory of Vigo treasure, it must probably have been distinguished by its reverse from such as were purchasable.

In a report concerning the desire of the engravers of the Mint to sell medals on their own account, we come upon some slight indication of an arrangement suggested in 1706 for distinguishing medals designed for presentation, from those intended for sale.² The Mint officials recommend that “upon the edge of such medallls as are made for rewarding persons by her Matv for their good Services to enscribe the words DONVM REGINÆ with ye Date.”

The Queen’s warrant under date November 2nd, 1706, is quoted in granting leave to the gravers “to sell such medals of fine gold and Silver as did not relate to State affairs,”³ enjoining upon them that upon medals given for “good Services to us” they were “to Impress the Service for which the said Medals are given with the date.” We should therefore feel confident that these instructions were carried out, and such inscriptions will now be looked for and perhaps found⁴ on the edge or reverse of some medals subsequent to the year 1706—but not necessarily on the Vigo reward medals, which were issued before permission to sell was granted to the engravers.

We may also notice that the bust of the Queen on the Vigo medal, designed for a field of less than 1½ inches in diameter, would not have answered to the requirements of a medal, which, together with its chain.

¹ See Croker’s list “On taking and destroying the galleons at Vigo: £4 5s., 6s., and 2s.”
³ Ibid., No. 154. See also No. 146 “the warrant for graving Medals of fine gold, fine silver and fine copper with plain Historical Designs and Inscriptions in memory of great actions.”
⁴ We must, however, bear in mind that the decorations were often bestowed upon very poor men, to whose heirs the money represented by a gold medal was of more value than the memorial itself, and that the melting-pot is responsible for the disappearance of these, as of so many other relics described in old books and catalogues, and only known from the descriptions.
was intended to represent the sum of £100, and Captain Lampriere's medal has shown that the design later used was of a more suitable measurement. Even thus it is evident that at least two-thirds of the gold was concentrated in the chain.

It is, however, possible that any difficulty with regard to value might be surmounted by encircling the portrait with a heavy cable border, such as surrounds another and much smaller medal in Major Murray's collection which, accompanied by the original chain from which it is still pendent, was the gift of George III. to Captain Woolridge at a similar cost.¹

When I state that Croker appraised his Vigo medals for sale in gold at £4 5s. apiece, I do not necessarily suggest that this represents their exact cost to the Queen, if she adopted this design for small naval rewards, for we learn from a manuscript in the British Museum² that the expense of producing the gold medals made for her personal distribution at her Coronation was 3s. each, plus the weight of the precious metal. Such Coronation medals as were struck in silver were smaller and heavier than those made for Vigo, and in gold weighed—or were intended to weigh, for theory and practice varied considerably on either side, 288 grs. The Vigo commemoration medal is, as we have said, not known to us in gold, but the difference of 20 to 30 grs. in weight between the silver examples in the British Museum and the official Coronation medals in this metal agrees with the distinction in price in Croker's list—for he charged the public only £3 15s. for examples of the Coronation medal, as against £4 5s. for the Vigo commemoration.³ For this slightly increased weight the poundage

¹ Illustrated by Captain Tancred, facing p. 74, in his Historical Records of Medals.
³ The 862 medals ordered at 351 grs. by Anne, for distribution on the Peace of Utrecht, agreeing approximately in weight with Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 400, No. 257, cost the Queen £2,754 6s. 11d., or roughly speaking £3 3s. 10½d. each. This medal is one for which Croker charged the public the same price as the gold Coronation medal, that is, £3 15s. It may therefore be assumed that each medal cost the Queen about one-sixth less than the general public.
might be proportionately increased, but the evidence concerning some medals made for George I. does not suggest this course.¹

We must now return to the consideration of the ordinary affairs of the mint.

In the succeeding year, 1704, there was no gold issue, perhaps owing to the large recoinage of this metal² which, as we have shown in our description of William III.'s reign given in our ninth volume, was in progress when Anne ascended the throne, and which, between the date of her accession in the March of 1701-2 and the production of the Vigo coins, amounted to £91,301. However, as we have noted, "the Queen's effigies" were not prepared for a considerable time, and we must look for the majority of these gold coins amongst the large and handsome pieces bearing King William's portrait in high relief, struck from dies of 1701, only guineas and half-guineas being known of Anne's first year.³

What between complaints from the moneyers in times of dearth and from overworked officials in times of plenty, Anne's Treasury Board was constantly bombarded with appeals, and during this recoinage of gold we find the clerks at the mint praying unavailingly for an increase of stipend on the plea that "the Extraordinary Coynage in her Maiesty's Mint obliges your Petitioners not only to Constant but more than Ordinary attendance."⁴ Their petition, based upon their "sallarys being but forty Pounds per Annum without any Fees or Perquisites whatsoever out of which they pay Taxes," is unsympathetically minuted "15 July, 1702, not granted," and we see that although the Treasury officials found no reasons for indulging the clerks' requests, the activity of the members of the staff at the Tower was still great, and also that, unlike the moneyers, they were required to

¹ The Coronation medals weigh from 226 to 250 grs.; the official weight being 262 grs.; and the Vigo medals in the British Museum vary from 254 to 283 grs. We see, therefore, that the heavier specimens are as much as 21 grs. above the intended 262 of the Coronation issues, and about 30 grs. in excess of the average examples.
³ See ante, pp. 231-2.
⁴ Treasury Papers, vol. lxx, No. 147.
pay taxes. Mr. Hocking has placed at my disposal the list of coinages in the years of Anne, from the death of William in March, 1701–2, to that of his successor in August, 1714, and I notice that in three years only did the silver output exceed £10,000, whilst that of the gold constantly increased from the year 1705 until 1714, when upwards of £700,000 was coined in six months.  

![Five-Guinea Piece of 1714](image)

1 For the grant given by Elizabeth to the Moneyers in confirmation of similar charters from the time of Edward III., see Harl. MSS. 698, fo. 29. An exemption from taxes, attendance on juries, etc., was conferred on the “keepers, Laborors or Workemen, Moniemakers or Coyners and other ministery deputed or appoynted unto those thinges which touche the office of Chaundges.” The moneyers were thus a privileged body, but they claimed also as a “Corporation” the exclusive right of coinage by contract, and, being unable to produce a charter to this effect either at the “Mint Enquiry” of 1697 or on subsequent occasions, their privileges were withdrawn on the recommendation of the Parliamentary Commission of 1848, and the practice of contract with the “Company of Moneyers” terminated finally in 1851. See “Report of the Commission,” Num. Chron., 1st series, vol. xii, pp. 29–49. Information has also been kindly supplied by Mr. Hocking.  

2 March 25th, 1702, to March 25th, 1703, presumably dated 1702 on the coins—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Watts</th>
<th>Total Rands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>£1,301</td>
<td>£2580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>£570</td>
<td>£580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>£14,531</td>
<td>£1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>£25,091</td>
<td>£2,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>£44,996</td>
<td>£7,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>£10,022</td>
<td>£10,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>£107,864</td>
<td>£7,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>£231,499</td>
<td>£2081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>£337,074</td>
<td>£76,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>£267,360</td>
<td>£7,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>£698,516</td>
<td>£5,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714 March, 1713, to Aug., 1714</td>
<td>£747,834</td>
<td>£1,336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total—N, £2,628,758; R, £207,092.

The effigy of Anne continued in use for a time after her death—just as that of
With regard to portraiture little alteration is to be seen, and we may be permitted to wonder why distinctly fresh puncheons should have been required so often as four times, exclusive of the coinage issued by the Scottish mint, in the shillings of a reign in which the silver output was comparatively small. The head upon the second shilling, as seen on the Vigo coins, is perhaps the most pleasing, and the fourth bust of the Queen, in use from 1710 to 1714, the least so.\(^1\) Peculiarities of reverse were designed to indicate the different provenance of the silver, such as roses and plumes, or plumes only, between the shields as portrayed below, both constituting interesting varieties.

It is somewhat curious that the date April 5th, 1706, should be that of the Order in Council authorizing the first-mentioned mark on the silver, namely, roses and plumes, pertaining to a certain company entitled the "Company for smelting downe Lead with Pit-coale and Sea coale," seeing that shillings and sixpences bearing date, 1705, exist so

William had appeared on the majority of the coins really minted in 1702. See pp. 231 and 232 and note 1 on p. 232.

\(^1\) Illustrated in our last volume, p. 214.
decorated. Whether the coinage which, as I am courteously informed by Mr. Hocking, was performed in March, 1705-6, was thus adorned in immediate anticipation of the permission, who shall say? We may, however, notice that a Mint Report upon the subject of coining for this company and the use of "a Marke of Distinction" contains a request for a warrant so early as January 2nd, 1705-6, mentioning that the company had brought in to the mint from 55 to 60 lb. weight to be coined during the past five months and a new bar of silver "every three weeks or thereabouts." The authorities stated that "several thousand ounces of such silver" awaited coining, and that "her Majesty and her Royal Predecessors have been graciously pleased from time to time to grant a Mark of Distinction to be stampt on such coyns." There are no shillings nor sixpences with roses and plumes dated 1706, but the coinage was that year continued with crowns and half-crowns, and was carried out in 1707 in all four denominations. Another curious fact with regard to the obverse type of the shillings with this provenance mark is observable

CROWN OF 1707.

2 Treasury Papers, vol. xcvii, No. 5, 1706. The petition to be allowed a mark of distinction, preserved in Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18,759, f. 142, is undated, but as it was referred to the mint officials for their consideration on December 21st, 1705, and the report is dated January 2nd, 1705-6, it is suggested that the Mint officials coined the bullion knowing that the authorization would follow. The petitioners enclosed a suitable sketch of the roses and plumes device, stating that they had refined silver from lead "both in England & Wales."
3 See Hawkins, p. 403.
in 1708, for thereon the pre-Union bust of Anne was still occasionally used although discarded on all other specimens, excepting in Scotland.\(^1\)
The Queen's early portraiture to me seems more graceful than the busts after the Union. A slight change of bust upon the gold is observable in the guineas of 1708, and the two varying examples are set before you from the cabinet of Mr. Spink, to whose courtesy I owe several of our illustrations.

![Guineas of 1708. Old and New Types.](image)

The increased output of gold in 1709 was signalized by the production of the two-guinea piece, a handsome coin, which had not before made its appearance bearing Anne's bust. On the reverse, as upon the other coins after the Union, the star of the garter replaced the rose, which had succeeded the arms of Nassau—the escutcheon of William III. —in the centre of the gold pieces, at the junction, cross-fashion, of the four shields of England, Scotland, France and Ireland. The arms also were differently arranged, those of England and Scotland being impaled in the upper and lower shields and—promptly enough—upon the five-guinea piece this alteration appeared before May 1st, 1707, the

\(^1\) See Burns's *Coinage of Scotland*, vol. ii, p. 534.
day fixed for the Declaration of the Union. We find the new arms so early as 1706, having clearly been instituted in the actual month in which the Act of Union received the Royal Assent, namely March, 1706-7, the treaty having been ratified in Scotland in the previous January. The same change in heraldry was of course necessary in the silver, but the smaller coins, bearing no arms, alone experienced no alteration, unless we regard as such the abbreviation of the word Britain, which reads BRI, instead of BR, after the Union, an additional letter which appears in nearly all other cases for the first time in 1708. There seems, however, no reason to connect the change in the legend with the Union, for it is not invariable upon the larger coins, and sixpences exist of 1707 reading BR with the arms in use both before and after May 1st, at which date the Act of Union came into operation. No groat of the year 1707 has met my view. Whilst speaking of these little coins I may say that I have found no reference to any proposal in Anne's reign to carry out the desired scheme for coining small currency in Ireland, which had been mooted under her sister and brother-in-law in 1693, and again in 1698 and 1701 after Mary's death. Our writers on Irish subjects note that although proclamations were issued they refer only to the current value of English and foreign moneys for which, as we have seen, coinweights had been supplied under William III. in 1697. It is, however, clear that in England attention was given to the matter of small change, and I find it difficult to agree with the late Mr. Hawkins, who gave the name of Maundy money unreservedly to the mass of little silver pieces from the middle of Charles II.'s reign onwards, an ascription which his careful editor, Mr. R. L. Kenyon, saw no reason to revise.

We are, of course, well aware that the Maundy distribution was large, amounting to about £200. The whole presentation, however, was not in the form of small coins, but included a piece of gold besides various incidental expenses, such as payments for choir children and other gifts, besides the clothing and provisions which accompanied the purse containing the Maundy coins. We find in account-books, before mentioned as being at Danny, some notes which cast sidelights on Anne’s private expenditure, such as an item under the Treasurer of the Chamber’s Household Accounts concerning the Maundy doles, and we read therein under date March 5th, 1702–3, “To compleat the allowance of £200 for her Maty’s alms on Monday [for Maundy] Thursday, 100.” The corresponding entry is to be found in the Treasury Papers at the Public Record Office in almost the same words: “Due to compleat ye 200l on the Establish. for her Mat’s Almes on Maundy Thursday next 100.0.0.” This item figures in a list of “bills due in the Treasury of the Chamber Office since March 8th, 1701–2,” therefore since the death of William. The Duchess of Marlborough tells us in her memoirs that the expenses of the Queen’s Privy Purse included “healing gold and charities besides many pensions that were paid out of it,” and we find numerous entries concerning sums “paid to diverse persons of her Maty’s Royal Bounty,” such as £1,000 in February, 1702–3, to be distributed to the poor of the city through the hands of the Lord Mayor, and £500 a year to the Lord Almoner “for her Maty’s daily Alms,” and another sum of £54 15s. for the “Poor at the gate.”

The ancient custom of giving special doles on the day before Good Friday had been continued by William, who had rejected the more personal act of touching for the King’s Evil. Anne, in her pride of Stuart birth, had, at the instance of Harley, resumed the practice

1 Danny MSS. The Maundy Thursday indicated fell on March 25th, 1703.
3 Account of the Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough, p. 282.
4 Danny MS. Account Books. The “Gate Alms” consisted of an allowance by the day or week to various poor persons, which in older times was paid at the gate of the Palace at Whitehall. See Guardian, April 5th, 1893.
of "healing," in which her ancestors had taken an especial pride, and which, in spite of gout and other infirmities, must be performed by the sovereign in person, whereas the washing of feet, preceding the distribution of gifts in Holy Week, a penance which had commended itself to the piety of James II., might be omitted from the charitable ritual, or undertaken as proxy by a church dignitary.  

The Maundy distribution, which for hundreds of years has taken place on the day before Good Friday at the hands of our monarchs, has since its institution been subjected to many alterations, and I read before this Society, last April, a paper which I hope to be permitted some day to place at the disposal of my readers, giving various details concerning these changes. For the moment, suffice it to say that at the present time the gifts of clothing and food which formed part of the benefaction have been commuted for a money payment, so that the total expense as regards each male recipient amounts to £4 15s., whilst the women receive £4 5s., with the addition in each case of a purse containing small coins representing the year of the sovereign's age—or, rather, the age he will attain in the current year, for this is the practice of King George V., as it was of most of his predecessors, the extra months being reckoned as "the year of grace."

Without directly asserting, therefore, that from £4 to £5 was

---

1 Anne, although she, for political reasons, exercised the grace of "touching," objected to the expression that "her right" was "divine," as used in an address presented to her by the City of London on October 10th, 1719, saying, as Shrewsbury informed Harley, that she "thought it unfit to be given to anybody, and that she wished it to be left out." See Political History of England, vol. ix, p. 168.

2 James II. was the last English monarch who washed and kissed the feet of Maundy recipients. It is believed that after his departure, one of the Archbishops performed the more disagreeable part of the work, and in 1736 this function was abandoned and only the money distribution remains to this day. See The Guardian, April 5th, 1893. Article by H. J. Bidwell, at that time Secretary of Her Majesty Queen Victoria's Almonry, and kindly communicated to me by his successor in office.

3 The full ceremonial in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century included, besides the distribution of the bags of small moneys, a gift of shoes, stockings, linen and other garments, various forms of food and even drink, and a further sum of £1 each, as a fine in redemption of the sovereign's own robe, given in pre-Elizabethan days to the pensioners.
required by Anne for the dole to each of those who benefited by the Maundy gift, we can understand the necessity of providing in her time £200 for the total expenses, and this sum is specified, as we have seen in the Treasury Papers of 1702–3, although in actual small coin in the year of her accession at the age of thirty-seven, little more than £6 for all the men and the like sum for the women—total £12—would be required for the silver distribution of pennies besides £76 in gold, whilst the larger half of the moneys would be expended upon gifts in kind. We can but regret that an entry in the Treasury Books under date March 19th, 1701–2, takes the form of an unanswered question, for no sum is noted in reply to the following enquiry: “Send to the wardrobe to know how much the Charge of Maundy for 38 poor men will come to in the office. Send to the Coferer and Trr [Treasurer] of ye Chamber for ye List.”

Let me, however, reserve my arguments on the vexed question of “Maundy” gifts until such time as I can explain them more thoroughly, and let us by your courtesy treat the small coins as part of the ordinary currency, claiming their place in any description of Anne’s coinage.

Let us turn to the Treasury Papers, and we shall find a long report signed on July 7th, 1702, by Sir John Stanley, the Warden, Isaac Newton, the Master, and John Ellis, the Controller of the Mint, on the respective values of foreign and English money. They herein suggested the possibility of increasing the size and consequently reducing the standard of the smaller coins, and this suggestion alone

---

1 Although Anne was only in her 38th year, the amounts of her benefactions were calculated on this basis, which included the “year of grace” as before explained. We must remember in calculating the average expenditure that the number of recipients, as well as the amount of the gifts, was determined by the age of the sovereign.


seems all-sufficient to prove that they were issued as currency. Whilst opposing any proposal for changing the alloy of the larger pieces, they deemed "that if small money, which by continual use wears away fast and is apt to be lost, were coined of coarse alloy, as is done in several countries, provided it were well coyned to prevent counterfeiting, such money would wear longer and be less apt to be lost than the small money now in use. By small money we understand Groats, Threepences, Twopences and Pence, unless the penny by reason of its smallness be made of copper."

Until the year 1797 no substitution of a copper for a silver penny was made in consequence of the above suggestion, but I may, perhaps, be permitted to refer my readers interested in the copper coinage to the illustrations of some of Anne's halfpence and farthings in our last volume, and the many discussions resulting from proposed issues.¹

Before closing this review of the currency issued by Queen Anne, may I add a slight sketch of the man to whose careful and thorough technique is due so much of its academic beauty so ardently admired by Ruding.²

Born at Dresden on October 21st, 1670, the son of a distinguished wood carver and cabinet maker to the Electoral Court of Saxony, "Johann Crocker" was early left fatherless. His mother educated him

¹ *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. x, pp. 239–256.
well, but being overburdened with younger children, confided him to the care of a relation, who was a goldsmith and jeweller in his Saxon birthplace.  

He devoted his leisure to medal engraving, and after terminating his apprenticeship, he travelled in Germany and Holland, coming thence to England, where he arrived in 1691. “After working some time exclusively as a medallist, John Croker, as he was called in this country, became known in that capacity to many influential persons,” as his biographer in an early number of the Numismatic Chronicle quaintly phrases it, “particularly those who had the administration of the Royal Mint.” Whether to influence, therefore, or whether to the fact that, like many of his countrymen, he was willing to work for small remuneration, as is hinted by the Georgian memorialist I earlier quoted, he obtained a place at the Tower. But we need not review his career from 1697 onward, for we have followed it closely under William III. Neither is it within our limits to pursue his course to its end, further than to mention that he loyally fulfilled the conditions imposed upon him both as an engraver himself and in instructing his subordinates, and when he died, full of years, in 1741, he had trained his assistant and successor, John Sigismund Tanner, to such precision in his manner that the change of hand is barely discernible. But even in his old age we still find him complaining “that he hath been at the Expenses of paying a Filer 36 years, which computing at 25½ per annum only, amounts to 900£,” and that his own services met with less remuneration than was his due, for he instances that his predecessor, Henry Harris,  

1 Nagler, vol. iii, p. 207.  
3 See our page 229.  
5 John Croker died on March 21st, 1740—1, and already on March 24th, the Treasury Minute Books inform us that John Sigismund Tanner is “to be chief Engraver to the mint in the room of Mr. Croker, dec’d. James Anthony Dassier to succeed Tanner.” Minute Book, T. 29, vol. xxviii, p. 301. The warrant for a sign-manual to pass the great seal granting the appointment to Tanner, on April 9th, 1741 speaks simply of John Croker as “lately deceased.” King’s Warrant Book, pp. 212-213.
although he received a higher salary, was paid £6 14s. per term for his fillers.¹

Almost as much difficulty seems to have been experienced under Anne as under most of her predecessors in obtaining overdue payments, and Mr. Law, in his History of Hampton Court, tells pathetic stories of the answers received soon after her accession by petitioners. We read of a bill from a London merchant for seven statues and a bust purchased in Italy for William, meeting with the response from the Queen's Treasury, "He may have the statues again," and even the master bricklayer at the Palace was informed that "There is no money at present for arrears."²

The work at Hampton Court was carried forward by Anne, and although some of the debts, which she found it so difficult to meet, were incurred by William, much of the rather florid decoration was due to his successor. We may instance the ceilings painted by Verrio in which an apotheosis of Anne bears a conspicuous part,³ and the frescoed walls of the Queen's drawing-room, which latter have remained undimmed by time, in that for many years they were covered by green damask which was then in turn superseded by a red flock paper. Recent removal of the superincumbent canvas and paper has again brought to light Prince George of Denmark and his wife, painted in the all too vivid colouring usual to Verrio. This artist, who had with great reluctance been persuaded to work for William, made no difficulties with regard to Anne, the Queen being indeed accepted as a Stuart by many old Jacobites, because her brother, Prince James, was too young to assert his claims in a manner which could demand action on their part, until the Queen had been for some years firmly established upon the throne. The unpopularity of the Union in Scotland gave the opportunity for the first call to assert the cause of the exile—but it is noticeable that after the expedition of 1708-9 had failed, and possibly that of 1715-16 also, a medal, which was issued by the Jacobites, bore young James's effigy on the one side, and Anne's upon the other.

² History of Hampton Court Palace, vol. iii, pp. 175 and 176.
emphasizing his right to succeed his sister rather than his wish to enforce his more immediate claims.¹

Anne and Prince James.

I bring before you an example of this bust portraying the aspirant to the throne, reproduced from a medal engraved by Norbert Roettier in 1708,² with the portrait of Anne as she was represented by Croker after the capture of Douay in 1710.³ A well-known authority, Sir Henry Ellis, in a list printed by him for private circulation, writes:—"This medal and two or three others of similar workmanship were executed by desire of some partisans of the exiled family to form a series of medallic portraits of its members."⁴ The bust of James was also used on the medals made in commemoration of the death of his sister Louisa in 1712,⁵ and was in such demand that a copy was eventually required for the above purpose. Peculiarities in the chasing of the brooch on the Prince's shoulder in the medal just illustrated seem to identify this example combined with Anne's portrait with the specimen described on p. 389 of the first volume of Medallic Illustrations as No. 242 which is unsigned, rather than with the signed medal No. 241, and

³ Med. III., vol. ii, p. 369, No. 213. The capture of Douay was effected in June, 1710. The medal was authorized on December 13th of the same year, to be sold at £10, at 15s. and 5s. in gold, silver and copper.
⁴ List of Medals illustrative of the Abdication of King James the Second, by Sir Henry Ellis, p. 6, No. 43, printed in 1833, and kindly lent to me by Mr. W. J. Webster.
we can only say that this combination of busts is of early eighteenth century issue, but not prior to 1712, and that it is probably the work of a copyist, but may even be due to Roettier himself and may have been contemporaneous with his presentation of Princess Louisa—the artist casting the reverse portraying Anne from Croker's original.

Another still rarer badge also in my own collection, known, I believe, in pewter only, combines a head of Anne with another member of the Stuart family, namely, her grandfather Charles I., and was probably made about the time of the Queen's death to revive the loyalty of the people to the exiled House as against that of Hanover.

This badge is approximately dated by the fact that Anne's bust is taken from the Peace-of-Utrecht Medal and cannot therefore have been cast before 1713.

Another small medallion insisting on this relationship is illustrated below from the collection in the British Museum, but this by its
likeness to the rejected guinea of 1702 bespeaks an early assertion of Anne's claim to the throne in right of her descent from her grandfather rather than by the will of Parliament.

Yet one more curiosity may be mentioned, a copper badge, made by the combination of two heart-shaped pieces of rough execution. The design bears a doubtful political significance, for on the one side we see a thistle, a ship and the map of Scotland, with the words “I flourish,” whilst the Queen is depicted on the other, with the crown poised above, but not upon, her head and the enigmatical phrase, “If you please.” Whether the inscription should be read, as suggested in *Medallic Illustrations of British History*, as “I, Scotland, flourish, if you, Anne, please to favour my cause,” or whether the wish expressed is that Anne

![Anne, a Jacobite Badge. Med. Ill., Vol. II, p. 381, No. 231.](image)

should abdicate and hand over the kingdom to her brother, or on her deathbed declare him her heir, it is hard to say. To me, it appears that James in the form of the Scottish emblem offers to sail across the sea and reside in the heart of his kingdom, saying that the thistle, the well-known badge of country, will flourish and he will reign in Scotland, if the country please to lift the crown from the head of Anne. Be this as it may, it is clear that such curious little pieces were intended for distribution in connection with a Jacobite invasion—perhaps those in which James took an actual part, in 1708 and 1715.

The fact that Anne had no surviving children contributed to the exile's hopes for a peaceful succession, hopes which were only dispelled at the Queen's death. In the interval we find Anne providing work for noted Jacobites, amongst others; for Antonio Verrio, the old servant of Charles II., who was also "Chief Painter to his late Mat'el King James
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

2nd up to Xmas 1688, at "a salary of £200 pr Aın." His name appears often in the Treasury Papers, and we notice payments for work performed in the private oratory at Windsor, also arrears for paintings at Hampton Court, and his requirements come before us still more frequently in the manuscript account books of 1702-3 at Danny, to which, by the kindness of their owner, Colonel W. H. Campion, I have been allowed frequent access. This artist was so fortunate sometimes as to receive money in advance towards his expenses, and we read under date January 15th, 1702-3, "For Seigr. Verrio on acct of his painting in the great Staircase at Windsor Castle 200" and again on the following 27th of March, £100, whilst the payment in full was completed with £300 more on November 5th.

I cannot pause to give many extracts from the lists of fees contained in these manuscripts, such as £2,000 a year to the Duchess of Marlborough as "Groom of the Stole and 1st Lady of the Bed Cha," £1,000 each to her ten subordinate ladies-in-waiting, £500 to Abigail Hill and three other women of the bedchamber, and £300 respectively to the six maids of honour. There are various entries of payments made to the Duchess for the Privy Purse, to the Duke as "Ma' General of ye Ordenance;" and one small item referring to our particular branch of finance reads: "To Isaac Newton Esqre, Ma' and Worker of Her Mat's Mint upon Acct for the Use and Service of the Same Mint, vizt., Out of Coynage Duty 22nd January 1702-256. 3. 11d."

From the point of view of Anne's desire to beautify her various

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxiii, No. 91.
2 According to Walpole, Anne renewed this pension of £200 a year to Verrio for life, because his eyesight failed whilst he was at work for her at Whitehall. See Anecdotes of Painting, vol. ii, p. 121. The portrait of the artist painted by himself and illustrated, facing p. 117 of Wornum's edition of the above, depicts him in glasses.
4 Verrio was one of the few artists who, by persistence, always obtained his money, and these prices are as nothing compared to those paid him for decorations at Windsor during the lifetime of Charles II. See Walpole's Anecdotes, vol. ii, p. 119. Nevertheless, many payments are chronicled in the year 1702 for work done, and often money on account is set down in the Treasury Minutes, T. 29, vol. xiii, pp. 17, 57, 64, 74, 84, 120, and 187.
Artists and their Fees.

abodes, we may quote from these manuscripts the evidence of her employment of Christopher Wren, who besides his £45 12s. 6d. as "Surv' General of her Ma"s Works" had £66 13s. 4d. as Clerk of the Works. Thomas Highmore, it is true, only received £10 yearly as Sergeant Painter, but this office, in spite of its high-sounding title, was connected more with the-decoration of carriages and barges than with portraiture. Grinling Gibbon, here spelt Grimling Gibbons, had a regular salary of £27 7s. 6d. as Master-Carver, and special entries are here for particular services. The sum of £38 paid to "Mr. Cousens in full for Gilding the pipes and Carved worke of ye Organs of her Ma"s Chappell Roy" in Windsor Castle" on November 12th, 1703, supplies a date for the completion of his order, if not any reliable information as to the total expense, seeing we know not how much money he had already in hand. On December 24th, 1703, we find £258 14s. 6d. laid down as the total charge "For new making and planting the Coach Court at Kensington into a Garden, cleaning the Mudd out of ye Cann there and raising wth Earth and new Laying with Turf severall walks."

But we must turn to the portraiture of Anne for a moment before leaving the subject of these manuscripts, and note with interest the item: "To Queen's picture set with Diamonds to Count Forger, Envoy from ye Emperour £1,000" and we wish that some details were supplied as to whether this gift took the form of a miniature or a medal. The most frequent presentation was a ring, and several such, at sums varying from £300 to £400, were provided for less important visitors, the total paid to "Sir Stephen Evans, Knt. Her Maty's Jeweller" on January 8th, 1702-3, for these trifles being £2,650. The list of envoys mentioned, suggests congratulatory visits on Anne's accession or

1 In the time of James I., the usual presentation appears to have taken the form of a gold medal and chain, see Nichol's Progresses of James I., vol. i, p. 606; and no fewer than 50 such gifts are noted in one year in Devon's Issues of the Exchequer during the Reign of James I., pp. 299 to 301. Nevertheless medallic portraits with attachments of this king are very rare, but their intrinsic value probably condemned them to the melting pot under Charles I. It is, however, noticeable that under Anne hardly any such medals with loops for suspension exist, a finger ring having superseded the fashion.
coronation, and possibly memorial rings on King William’s death, for the custom of presenting these was at its height, and it was quite usual to make special bequests for this object. On the death of Samuel Pepys in 1703, for instance, 123 persons are mentioned to whom such keepsakes were to be given.¹ The mourning rings, worn by the ladies of her household in memory of Anne herself, took the form—not of the royal portrait, the favourite type of presentation in the days of Charles I.—but of a lock of the Queen’s beautiful chestnut hair, which at the time of her death was slightly tinged with grey, set in a heart-shaped crystal surmounted by a jewelled crown.² Queen Anne, indeed, made little use of miniatures as gifts, but possibly this was owing to the fact that during her reign few artists specially excelled in this branch of painting. Although of the more able miniaturists of her uncle Charles II’s court, some still survived, such as Laurence Cross, we look in vain for the masterly touch of a Samuel Cooper. There were indeed enamellists—I may name the younger Petitot, whose portrait of Anne is in the Duke of Portland’s collection, whilst of lesser fame is Charles Boit, who portrayed her with her husband, and who attempted the difficult process of producing enamels on an unusually large scale.³ I may call attention to his pupil, Christian Zincke, who, arriving in England in 1706, soon surpassed his master in skill: but on the whole the smaller forms of portraiture were suffering a temporary eclipse in the beginning of the eighteenth century. Anne’s little pictures, however, and those of her brother James, are better than the miniatures of her nephew, Prince Charles, who was very poorly portrayed in the ’45, a period which, unfortunately for his admirers, was just too early in the eighteenth century for this art to attain its zenith in Cosway, the Plimers, and their comppeers.⁴ Cameo portraits modelled in wax were half a century later popularized by James Tassie’s invention of reproductions in

¹ See Appendix to Memoirs of Pepys, vol. v, p. 479, ed. 1828, where the list is given of the persons to whom rings were given, 16 at 10s., 62 at 15s. and 45 at £1 each.
⁴ Richard Cosway, Nathaniel Plimer, James Nixon, Ozias Humphreys, John Smart and several other eminent miniaturists were born in the years between 1740 and 1760.
vitreous paste, but at the time under consideration were somewhat rare. There is, however, a finished waxen medallion at Welbeck Abbey representing Anne in a helmet, resembling exactly that worn by William III. in the puncheon, which I ventured in our volume IX, on page 270, to attribute tentatively to James Roettier. We do not know whether the Roettier family prepared their medal-dies originally, as did the brothers Simon, by a preliminary waxen sketch. If this was their method, we may perhaps believe that this medallion was intended by John Roettier for some medallic purpose.\(^1\) Sometimes we meet with the work of inferior artists who represent the Queen in a rough and ready style, and fairly characteristic are some little portraits such as an enamelled watch in the Franks Collection in the British Museum. Inartistic although it be, we like the familiar simplicity in the lack of jewels,—saving a few small clasps and the almost inevitable crown, which relieves the darkness of her chestnut hair. The face of Anne was seldom used by her subjects in personal adornment, but there are keepsakes in which the Queen's bust takes a prominent part, such as seals, snuff-boxes, and small cases for counters, which, not unknown under previous sovereigns, became quite common under Anne.

\[\text{SILVER SEAL BEARING THE BUST OF QUEEN ANNE.}\]

\[\text{ENGLISH COUNTER-BOX OF 1703 AND COUNTER. MED. ILL., VOL. II, P. 413, NO. 280.}\]

\(^1\) John Roettier, as we know, was working for Anne at the time of his death in 1703. His son James Roettier predeceased him in 1698.
Of no great beauty at the best, some of these little keepsakes and their contents were executed abroad and bear the letters NU for Nuremberg: whilst others, as that just illustrated, are of rather better workmanship, and have the English hall-mark.\(^1\) The jettons are mere clichés, fragile, and no doubt at the time of issue, cheap mementoes of the accession or coronation, but most of those made by Lazarus Gottlieb Lauffer\(^2\) and his school are really too ugly for illustration, whilst the portraits on the coin weights are a disgrace to their era. The counters fulfilled a duty in being of daily use, for every evening was consecrated to play.

Far more artistic are the snuff-boxes with which we associate the name of John Obrisset, whether Frenchman or Irishman by extraction remains in doubt, for little that is definite is known about this artist.\(^3\) He revived the method of stamping softened horn employed in the time of Anne's grandfather by an Englishman,

\(^1\) The counter-box illustrated bears the Exeter hall-mark of 1703, the assay office of that city having been re-established in 1701, after an interval of a few years, during which provincial offices were abolished. See *Connoisseur*, September, 1914, p. 35.

\(^2\) L. G. Lauffer worked at Nuremberg in the early part of the eighteenth century. Several artists of the name flourished in that city.

\(^3\) The fact that his usual signature is O.B. is suggestive that the name was the Irish O'Brisset; he, however, occasionally signed Obrisset in full, and it was not unusual for an artist to sign his work with the first two letters of his surname.
John Osborn, or adapted that of Müller, Brunner, and other foreigners who, in the time of William and Mary, had made draughtsmen and embossed portraits on wood by means of dies. Obrisset produced attractive plaques and box-lids in tortoiseshell, occasionally embellishing his backgrounds with piqué work, as in a specimen in the author's collection. He also obtained variety by making at times the entire top of his boxes in silver, or casting in this metal a bust, as in the illustration given below—a half-length or even an equestrian figure in fairly high relief, and applying it to the shell. He usually copied well-known medals for this purpose, and in type his busts mostly recall Croker's large Union medal, and one on the taking of Lille, here illustrated, and ordered on December 15th, 1708.

An interesting leaden medallion marked by Obrisset, with his familiar signature, O.B., is decorated with the bust of Anne on one side and, upon the other, with an emblematic design of a winged and crowned heart, pierced by sceptres in saltire. It was perhaps the trial piece for the badge of some Society or for a horn box, intended to commemorate the Union and the peace which should ensue therefrom. One of the snuff-boxes in my collection, bearing this bust, is of much finer workmanship, and examination of unset uniface pieces proves that
the majority were cast and chased, a great variation in finish naturally resulting from this procedure. Of six in my cabinet only two are signed by Obrisset, and both are of the obverse type illustrated above.

Obrisset's chief period of activity lay between 1705 and 1727. Boxes made by him in memory of Drake, with the artist's full name, "John Obrisset, Fecit, 1712," are, in spite of this signature and date, sometimes confusedly thought to be mementoes given by Sir Francis to his admirals in the time of Queen Elizabeth.¹ Many of his pieces are dated, but curiously enough, boxes, undoubtedly genuine, exist which bear two dates, as may be seen on a snuff-box in the British Museum, which shows us Anne on the one side and George her husband on the other, dated respectively 1705 and 1708, the latter year being that of the Prince's death. Unlike the majority of Obrisset's medallions the portrait of George is different from any known medal, so in default of a prototype it may be held to originate medallically with this artist—being probably taken from a picture at Kensington Palace. That representing Anne, which is of much the same type as another silver box-top and a tortoise-shell plaque in my own collection, although agreeing with the Union medals, like the naval reward accorded to Lampriere of which I have spoken,² is of pre-Union date, and all may, of course, like these medals, have been adapted from Kneller's picture, now at Welbeck, and illustrated as the frontispiece to my last article, an oil painting which, as we have seen, set the fashion, as regards the portraiture of the Queen, from the very commencement of her reign.

Anne was devoted to her husband,³ whose presentments by Dahl,⁴ Verrio,⁵ Kneller, and other contemporary artists,⁶ show us a tall man,

¹ See Some Minor Arts, Article on Impressed Horn, by Sir C. Hercules Read, p. 5.
² See ante, pp. 248, 251-2.
⁴ At Kensington Palace.
⁵ At Hampton Court Palace.
⁶ To Riley, Mr. Collins Baker, in his Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters, vol. ii, pp. 18 and 27, attributes the original of the portraits of Prince George until recently catalogued as by Wissing. The example in the National Portrait Gallery to which I referred in our last volume as the work of Wissing is now labelled "after Riley." This artist, on the death of Lely in 1680, shared Kneller's popularity until his own decease in 1692. William Wissing had a considerable vogue about the same time as Riley, but did not so long enjoy it, as he died in 1687.
massive and rather stolid in physiognomy, and somewhat fairer in colouring than his Queen, to whom he was content, quite unlike his late brother-in-law, to play a subordinate part. Of her many children one only survived infancy, the young Duke of Gloucester, a manly little fellow, who had won his way into the heart of William III. by his devotion to warlike games, and the resolution with which he battled with his own delicacy of constitution. Curiously enough, no medal, so far as we are aware, records the incidents of his short life. He was born on July 24th, 1689, created a Knight of the Garter on January 6th, 1695-6, by his uncle, who hoped in him to find a successor to his mind, but he died on July 30th, 1700, five days after his eleventh birthday. The little Prince thus predeceased both uncle and father, and Anne, left on the death of George in October, 1708, a childless widow in her 44th year, disregarded the advice of Parliament to marry again in the hope of giving an heir to the kingdom. To the early demise of little Gloucester we may attribute the silence of the medallists, for during the greater part of King William’s reign the Mint officials were fully occupied with the coinage, and the influx of medals under Anne, after 1706, was, as we have seen, owing to the stagnation in coining of the succeeding years—when neither gold nor silver money issues were needed.

The child with his regular features is brought before us by Huysmans at Hampton Court Palace,¹ and in another portrait by Godfrey Kneller at Kensington Palace. He is noticeable for his fair curls,² fairer than the majority of the Stuarts, whose auburn hair had assumed an almost dark chestnut tint on the head of his mother. When herself a child, Anne had been less attractive than her sister Mary, and her dull brown locks—short and straight—contrast unfavourably

¹ This picture, No. 214, at Hampton Court Palace was attributed in the catalogue to Lely, but this artist died in 1680, some nine years before the birth of the Prince. Mr. Collins Baker, in vol. i of his Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters, p. 219, suggests that it is a late work of Jacob Huysmans, dating the picture approximately 1695, the last year of this artist’s life.

² Another and earlier picture by Kneller hangs at Hampton Court, but in this a wrap nearly covers the child’s head. The hair in a miniature at the British Museum is so faded that it looks almost white.
ANNE AS PRINCESS, BY KNELLER. NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

Photograph by Emery Walker.
with the latter’s dark reddish curls in a striking picture at Ditchley,\(^1\) and hold out no promise of the luxuriant tresses of later years.\(^2\) Lely, the painter of her childhood, was dead when Anne came to the throne, but she was frequently painted by Kneller with success, and to Michael Dahl we owe one of the most pleasing pictures of her, in which we are again struck by the charming simplicity of her dress and pose.\(^3\) Dahl was not so renowned an artist as Kneller, and we do not see him at his best in another portrait of Anne and her little boy, judging by the copy, No. 325, catalogued as “after Dahl” at the National Portrait Gallery—nevertheless there is a certain grace about it, in which this Queen was not lacking. She was of middle stature with small bones, well-formed limbs and good features, the weakness of her eyes, from which she suffered even as a child, and her ever increasing obesity as years advanced, being her chief defects. We see her well portrayed whilst still in her youth, as Princess, by an unknown artist, No. 1,674 in the National Portrait Gallery. In the same collection as No. 1,616 hangs the original of our accompanying plate, a more recent acquisition of great attraction and a splendid example both of colouring and technique, which must have been painted shortly before Anne’s accession. It was purchased with a traditional attribution to the hand of Kneller, but Mr. Collins Baker suggests an alternative in Dahl.\(^4\) Whether to Kneller or to Dahl is

---

\(^1\) In the collection of Viscount Dillon, at Ditchley, where this picture is catalogued as by Lely. Mr. Collins Baker, however, on p. 213, vol. i, of his *Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters*, expresses the belief that it is by Huysmans, to whom a very similar portrait group of the Duke and Duchess without the children is catalogued at Clumber. It is, however, noticed that at Euston another version of the Clumber picture is attributed to Lely. Jacob Huysmans, according to the latest authorities, was born about 1633, and died in London in 1696.

\(^2\) Mr. Collins Baker dates the Ditchley group “*circa* 1663,” but Mary was born in April, 1662, and Anne in February, 1664–5, so that judging from the apparent ages of the two little girls, the picture cannot have been finished earlier than 1669 or 1670.

\(^3\) At Kimnel Park in the collection of Colonel Henry Hughes. Michael Dahl, a Swede, was born about 1659, came to England in 1682, on a two years’ visit, and finally settled in London in about 1688–9. He became a fashionable artist, the rival of Kneller, and died in London, in October, 1743.

\(^4\) See *Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters*, vol. ii, p. 97.
due this charming portrait, it certainly possesses the marked stateliness and grace which Sir Godfrey usually imparted to his pictures, and Anne was perhaps fortunate in inheriting his services from the courts of her uncle, father, and brother-in-law. In the early years of William and Mary's reign, he had shared with John Riley the £200 a year paid to the "Chief Painters," but on the death of the latter, Kneller became "sole principle painter." It appears, however, from a report on the position of affairs at the time of Anne's accession, that "his name upon regulating the Establishm'," in 1690, had been "left out of the same." This mistake was not at once rectified, but the manuscript note further informs us that "in June, 1695, he obtained his Mat' Warrant under the Sign Manuall for Inserting him on that Establishm' at the Pd Salary of 200li p ann, w'h was accordingly done and the Payment made to him to X'tmas 1700, as are the rest of the Servants payable there, together w'h the Allow' of 50li for every picture drawn at whole Length by vertue of Lord Chambl's Warr' from time to time as Occasion hath required ever since."1

The fact that Anne had finely modelled hands, a characteristic often mentioned by her historians, is specially emphasized in one of her portraits by Kneller, and it is traditionally stated, as Miss Strickland informs us, that the artist selected the pose—the Queen holding the George attached to the Garter ribbon about her neck—because it gave him "an opportunity of painting the most beautiful hand in England."2 In the fine picture in the National Portrait Gallery reproduced opposite our page 278, we notice that the position of the arm again shows off this beauty to the best advantage.

The royal touch, that is, touching for the King's Evil, to which so much virtue was imputed, has formed of late the theme of an important contribution to the literature of numismatics from the pen of Dr. Raymond Crawfurd,3 and a paper on this subject which I read before this Society in May, 1914, will shortly be published in our

1 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxiii, No. 91, dated by the calendarer "about 1702 or later."


3 The King's Evil, published in 1911.
Journal, so that I will not enlarge greatly upon its history here, excepting in the light it very specially casts on the Queen's character. If Anne continued a practice—always fatiguing and at times distressing—the explanation must have lain partly in the obligation to insist on her hereditary gift, and partly in her inherent kindness of heart, for even Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, admitted that she was "religious without affectation." The rare quality of gratitude was noticeable in Anne's conduct—excepting towards her unfortunate father, and even in this one lapse from the path of charity we find evidence of a certain repentance after her accession in her kindness to those who had befriended James. Those who appealed to her in the name of services rendered to him met with mercy at her hands, and one such petition relating to touch-pieces is of sufficient interest to justify quotation here. It is addressed to "The Queen's most Excell' Majestie" by James Graham, "late keeper of the privy purse to your Royal Father" and states that whilst he held that office "and always before, the charge of the healing was paid out of the same, but the King finding it arises to a greater Sum than formerly was pleas'd some time before he left the Kingdom to order a Privy Seal for that particular Service, Wch past in yo' Mats name and upon w'h was imprest £250." Graham proceeds to explain that there is "now a Dist-ringus" against him "in the Sherrif of Westmoreland," for this money, and that his brother who "had the care of that Mat" has "attended his Royal Master into France and cannot Return without yr Maj'z's Licience, so it is impossible for yr Petition' to render a regular account thereof in y' Majestie's Exchequer." He therefore prays "a privy Seal may pass for the aforesaid sume" or that "the proress may be stayd by a noli pross till his Brother can give in his accts." The case was arranged by a Treasury minute,

1 Inscriptio on the Blenheim Statue, illustrated in our last volume facing p. 212.
2 MS. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxxv, No. 82. For earlier notice of this affair see ibid., vol. lxxviii, No. 110.
3 Colonel James Graham or Grahme, as he more commonly wrote it, was the owner of Levens, in Westmoreland, and was Privy Purse to King James II. He was the second brother of Richard Graham, Lord Preston, Keeper of the Wardrobe to the same King, and with Fergus, a third brother, was the son of Sir George Graham, of Netherby in Cumberland, gentleman of the Horse to James I., and a devoted adherent of Charles I.
which proves that Anne's personal attention was given to this request. "Red to the Q. 19th Apr. 1703. 1250 Imprest to be discharged by Tally" and the interesting manuscripts at Danny supply the information that in the year "1703 Dec" there was paid to James Grahme Esqr as of her Mats free gift & Roy bounty to him 1250. Mem this was granted with Intent to discharge the like Sums and Imprest at the Exchequer to the sd Mr. Grahme in ye Reign of King James 2 for healing medalls."

It is with some satisfaction that we see Anne discharging her father's debts for healing pieces, nor was she niggardly concerning the expense of her own, for she not only herself always made use of gold for distribution, a metal discarded by James II. in the poverty of his exile, but reverted to a larger size than were the tokens he bestowed. Her touchpieces are not uncommon, which is somewhat strange, for her bad health prevented her from holding constant receptions, and we read principally of private healings comprising at most some thirty persons. She did, however, also receive the sick in public, occasionally even 200 patients at a time, as had been done by her uncle Charles.

brothers were involved in various Jacobite conspiracies in 1690–92, and Colonel Graham was again in trouble in 1696. Lord Preston was arrested and condemned to death, but reprieved, and he died in England in 1695. It is therefore clear that the brother to whom James refers was Fergus, who was in exile with James II., having fled the country soon after the accession of William and who had not obtained permission to return at a much later period, that is, in 1709. Colonel James Graham also escaped to France and received a pardon, was again proclaimed, surrendered, was admitted to bail, and finally committed for a short time to the Fleet Prison, but he afterwards returned to Levens and took the oaths to William's Government in 1701, and was even considered likely to obtain an appointment under the Crown in 1704. See Colonel James Graham of Levens, by Jocelyn Bagot, and Luttrell's Diary, vols. ii, iv, and v, at various dates.

Anne's Charity

She was the last of the reigning Stuarts to perform this ceremony, although her brother and his sons in their exile continued the practice. It is even said that Charles Edward during his adventurous visit to Scotland in the '45 exercised the royal privilege, although during the lifetime of his father he had not assumed the title of King, and going yet further, the left-handed scion of the House of Stuart, the Duke of Monmouth, claimed to possess the same gift.

We commented in our last volume upon Anne's charity in giving to the church the firstfruits and tenths due to the crown, a bounty for which to this day many a poor parish owes gratitude to "good Queen Anne," and even the Duchess of Marlborough, who was not always fair to her mistress, calls attention during the time of her management to the smallness of "the privy purse, the yearly allowance for which was £20,000, not half the sum allowed in King William's time," and the amount the Queen disbursed out of it for the good of others. It is indeed calculated that the average of Anne's yearly household expenses reached but £83,710 12s. 0d., being considerably lower than those of her father and brother-in-law. Ailesbury speaks of her as "that excellent and pious Queen, a princess of high vertue, merit and sweetness of temper," and tells us that she "was endowed with great good nature and most charitable principals, and that during her reign she shed not the blood of one single person save that of common felons and suchlike." He remarks that on coming to the throne she won the

1 The King's Evil, by Raymond Crawfurd, p. 157.
2 Ibid., p. 137.
4 The Duchess, however, states that "the allowance was augmented to 26,000 two years after I left office." Sarah resigned in January, 1710-11. See Account of the Conduct of the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough, p. 282. Her assertion is corroborated by an autograph document under date January 8th, 1712-13, signed by Anne and countersigned by Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford—this was sold at the Red Cross Sale at Christie's, on Monday, April 26th, 1915, lot 1516—authorizing the payment to Lady Masham, of £26,000 "for the service of our Privy Purse and for Healing Medalls."
5 Archaeologia, vol. xii, p. 88.
7 Ibid., p. 595.
8 Ibid., p. 649.
Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs.

estee of both Lords and Commons, for "this good Princess had a grateful heart, and she had fresh in memory the merit those had of both houses towards her, that stuck by her on their proposing that separate maintenance of seventy thousand pounds yearly when she fell in disgrace with her sister the Queen and her brother-in-law." ¹

That Anne was generous to those who appealed to her is well known, and have we not given ample evidence of this?² But in her private expenses she was most moderate, and when the Duchess of Marlborough, who was no eulogist, caused a statue to be erected to her memory by Rysbrach, at Blenheim, she vaunted in the inscription on the pedestal the liberality with which Anne herself contributed £100,000 out of her Civil List towards the war expenses, that the burden might not fall upon her people.³ Even upon such an event as her coronation, we find the estimate of proposed expenses lower than that of her sister, but it is fair to explain that in the case of the latter the disbursement had been apparently made to include some past debts of the supplanted King James, which the creditors despaired of calling in by any other means. It is really amusing to record Lord Montagu's explanation on being asked the reason of a mistaken calculation put forth. He had been required to estimate "what the charge of the late King's funerall might come to and the charge of her present Mat'冠ation both to be pformecl in less than a moneth." He had at first understated the one by upwards of £2,700, and overstated the other by almost as great a sum,⁴ and he explains that "the Estimate for ye funerall, as neer as could then be judged, was like to amount to 3,500"; it being then

¹ Ailesbury's Memoirs, p. 532. At the beginning of the new reign Anne had a pension of £30,000 a year charged on the Civil List, besides money settled upon her on her marriage. A motion was brought forward in December, 1689, for raising the grant to £70,000, and after some debate in the House of Commons the matter was decided by the grant of an annuity of £50,000 on the Civil List.

² See ante, pp. 261 and 281-2.

³ The statue, which we illustrated in our last volume, see British Numismatic Journal, vol. x, p. 212, shows the figure of the Queen, as elaborately dressed as the Mistress of the Robes could wish upon any occasion of rejoicing, and is not unlike the much reprobated statue by Bird.

⁴ M.S. Treasury Papers, vol. lxxix, No. 100.
designed from the Prince's Chamber next ye House of Commons." It being, however, decided to conduct the procession from Kensington Palace, which had to be hung with black,—the Queen providing "a Chariot that cost 3001," and other mourning—the expenses must be considered of items "not thought of before, which has neer doubled the first Estimate which now amounts to £6,268.07. 6½."

Here follows his excuse, namely: "The Coronation Estimate was judged accord to ye last Provisions about Ten Thousand pounds. But there being then Several Tradsmen in the Office put in by Ld. Preston,¹ who had Grt Sūmes owing to them, so put down higher prices and they since discontinued, more care was now taken and it now amounts to 743918s. 5¼d."

On the authority of the Duchess of Marlborough we have it that in nine years, including these coronation expenses, Queen Anne spent but £32,050 in the office of the robes, that is, in personal matters; and the assistance she extended to soldiers and sailors, wounded in her service on land and sea, is all brought before us in other contemporary accounts.² Besides these natural calls upon her purse, "she paid out of her Civil List many pensions granted in former Reigns which have

¹ For Lord Preston see note 3 on pp. 281–2.
² MS. Danny Account Books.
since,” wrote Sarah Marlborough, “been thrown upon the Publick.”

Artistic she was not, but we may rejoice that many minor arts flourished in her day. The era was one not likely to be forgotten, and if Marlborough’s victories were commemorated by the medals which I have placed before you, Anne’s artists were equally employed in celebrating the peace which followed before the Queen’s death in the track of war, and one of the most agreeable of these, I here set before you. In the eyes of Anne it was the Union with Scotland of which she had a right to feel proud; and it was the conclusion of the war, the Peace of Utrecht, unsatisfactory although it was in many respects, which crowned her last year with happiness.

As is so often the case, the country flourished during the time of war, stimulated to effort by the issues at stake, and the first decade of the eighteenth century brings a galaxy of brilliant names before us in literature and in science, and the era of the journalist had commenced. Art there was, of a certain type, and although the immediate circle of Anne was one of dullness and of incessant intrigue, the personal nullity of the Queen did not prevent the frequenters of her court from taking a part in the brilliant talk of the coffee-houses, whilst the connoisseur found congenial gossip at the tea-table—a newly discovered delight with its finely modelled silver and fragile cups and saucers—the table itself a marvel perhaps of the lacquerer’s handicraft. The love of bric-à-brac in the reign of Anne rivalled the furore now so noticeable, and a scoffing letter in The Spectator of February 12th, 1712–13, might be that of a writer of to-day, in his description of a room “planted every corner with such heaps of China that,” thus complains our satirist, “I am obliged to move about my own home with the greatest caution for fear of hurting some of our brittle furniture.” Anne’s age was the age of the coffee-house—the age of conversation; but the Queen herself was no conversationalist, and to Sarah Marlborough we owe the remark whilst comparing her to her sister Mary that “it was indeed impossible

1 Inscription on the base of the statue at Blenheim.
2 This medal, Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 399, No. 256, is therein stated to be unknown in gold, but it figures as such in Croker’s List at £20.
they should be very agreeable companions to each other, because Queen Mary grew weary of anybody who would not talk a great deal, and the Princess was so silent that she rarely spoke more than was necessary to answer a question.”

But if Anne was a decidedly stupid woman, her reign will still remain great in the annals of history, and if the last of our Stuart monarchs had not the artistic or lovable qualities of her grandfather, Charles I., or the brilliant powers of her uncle, Charles II., she yet shared the love their people bestowed on them, and they revived in her honour the title given to the first wife of Richard II., so that she lives in our memories as “Good Queen Anne.”

This is not the time to speak of the medallic portraiture of the three remaining princes of this line; I have already treated in our volumes of the coins and medals issued by Prince James, bearing the title of “Jacobus III. and VIII.”, and I may perhaps be some day permitted to write a slight sketch of the Jacobite mementoes issued by Bonnie Prince Charlie and his less romantic brother, Cardinal York, but although these last scions of the House may reign in our hearts, we cannot technically include them in the Portraiture of our Stuart Monarchs on their Coins and Medals.

1 Account of the Conduct of the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough, p. 25.
2 This epithet, originally applied to Anne of Bohemia, first wife of Richard II., was bestowed upon the Stuart Queen in consequence of her benefactions to the clergy. See Strickland’s Queens of England, vol. i, p. 614.