

Ancient and modern in the medallic series of Louis XIV

Alan M. Stahl

THE SERIES OF 286 MEDALS issued in 1702 to document events in the life of Louis XIV had an enormous impact on the development of the medium, establishing the struck medal of small module as the standard and setting a precedent for national medals promoting governmental activities as dominant over personal medals celebrating individuals. The series was explicitly inspired by what numismatists of the day referred to as the *Historia Augusta*, the series of issues of gold solidus, silver denarius, and especially bronze sestertius coins of the first twelve Roman emperors (fig. 1).¹ A noteworthy precedent for this emulation was the series of medals made for Cosimo de' Medici in the mid sixteenth century, struck pieces inspired by coins in the duke's numismatic cabinet.²

Scholars of the seventeenth century sometimes understood the Roman pieces accurately as circulating coinage and sometimes considered them erroneously as constituting a strictly commemorative series equivalent to contemporary medals. In either case, they viewed them as representing a conscious attempt to leave to posterity a physical record of the glories of that age, one well worth emulating for the current reign, viewed as a the inevitable successor to the *Pax Romana* of the first century.³ The technology and economics of the day precluded following the Roman example of high relief and multiple reverse types for the circulating coinage, and in the end similar considerations forced those in charge of the medallic series to reduce the size of each piece to one barely larger than the Roman sestertius and to standardise the obverse portraits and reverse formats.

In sixteenth-century France there was a sharp distinction between coins and medals. Coins were in low relief, with either a profile bust or a cross on the obverse and usually a heraldic image on the reverse. With the exception of an experiment in machine milling in the middle of the century, coins were hammer struck. Medals were frequently large, cast bronze pieces, but by the end of the century, the Paris mint had

several screw presses capable of striking medals fifty millimetres in diameter and of reasonably high relief. At the beginning of the seventeenth century a separate mint for striking medals was set up within the Louvre, across the newly constructed Pont Neuf from the coin mint on the Left Bank.⁴

In 1602, following the dispersal of the numismatic collection brought to Fontainebleau by Catherine de' Medici, Henri IV gave the mission of reconstituting a royal collection of antiquities and coins to a Provençal specialist in ancient numismatics, Antoine de Rascas, sieur de Bagaris. In 1608 Rascas published a manifesto on the necessity of re-establishing the usage of 'Médailles dans les Monnoyes'.⁵ In this, he called for the return to the ancient practice of creating a tangible *histoire auguste* through the issue of 'médailles-monnoies', that is, coins that would carry images illustrating the glories of Henri's reign, as ancient coins had celebrated the achievements of the Roman emperors. Henri instructed Rascas to write a history of his reign in which he would indicate the appropriate events to be celebrated on medals, to suggest designs for them based on ancient prototypes, and to come up with occasions on which to issue such pieces; however, the king stopped well short of encouraging the redesign of the circulating coinage along these lines. Following the assassination of Henri two years later, Rascas published an enlarged version of his treatise, but, finding no favour in the court of Louis XIII, returned to Provence, where the principal achievement of the remaining ten years of his life would be the training of Nicolas-Claude de Peiresc, one of the great numismatists of the next generation.

The medal created by Guillaume Dupré in 1603 to celebrate the birth of Henri IV's heir is typical of those of the age in being cast privately at the artist's initiative and, at 67.5 millimetres, being about twice the module and higher in relief than ancient sestertii (fig. 2). Its obverse style is modern in the dress of the royal couple,



1. *Sestertius of Nero*, AD64,
bronze, 37mm.,
British Museum.

though the use of jugate busts for a married couple had classical antecedents. The reverse legend and general disposition are based on that of an ancient coin celebrating the marriage of the emperor Caracalla and Plautilla (fig. 3), but on the French medal the royal couple are garbed as classical deities while on the Roman coin they appear in contemporary dress. On the medal the image of the child standing between the couple and the eagle descending with a crown are additions to the ancient prototype, as is the date in the exergue, which is rendered in Arabic numerals.

The royal medals of France in the succeeding decades were mainly in the tradition of the cast medal of large size that had dominated the medium since Pisanello, while the coinage remained utilitarian. Royal medals were rarely issued during the reign of Louis XIII, who wrote to his brother Gaston, duc d'Orleans, that he had little interest in antiquities, and there is no evidence of any systematic attempt to use them for the celebration of royal achievements. Gaston, on the other hand, was an avid coin collector, and in 1660 bequeathed his collection to his nephew Louis XIV, who made it the basis of the Cabinet des Médailles at the Louvre.⁶

The next year the numismatic situation in France changed abruptly with assumption of personal rule by Louis XIV upon the death of Cardinal Mazarin and his appointment of Jean-Baptiste Colbert as Minister of State and Superintendent of Buildings. In 1661 Charles Patin, an eminent numismatist, wrote to the king advising him to look to 'médailles,' especially ancient ones as a medium for promulgating his image.⁷ By comparing ancient coins with contemporary medals, he was implicitly accepting the proposition that the Roman high-relief pieces with portraits and historical references were commemorative rather than monetary in nature, perpetuating a controversy that went back a century to the debate between Enea Vico and Sebastiano Erizzo.⁸ The following year, Colbert wrote to Jean Chapelain, a poet who

had been one of the founding members of the Académie Française in 1635, proposing to bring together a group of scholars of classical antiquity to devise a program to glorify the king with the issue of medals, poetry and history. Chapelain responded enthusiastically, noting that one could make such medals either 'à l'antique' or 'à la moderne.' Chapelain explained that ancient examples had on the reverse a figure representing an action or an event, sometimes with a word or two, but serious and without 'jeux d'esprit', while modern medals had on the reverse a *devise*, which had both body and spirit, a 'gentillesse' introduced in Europe within the past two centuries. Chapelain proposed leaving the choice between such approaches to the king.⁹

The most concrete result of Colbert's initiative was the creation in 1663 of the Petite Académie, to advise the minister on Latin devices on monuments and medals and on the decorative iconography of palaces and the mythological themes of ballets and court festivities. Chapelain was among its five members in the first decade; the others were literary figures, including Charles Perrault who served as its secretary. The numismatist Patin was not included in the group and soon left France in exile. No other expert on ancient coins appeared in the academy, though the royal historian and poet François Charpentier, considered a modernist for his advocacy of French rather than Latin inscriptions on an Arc de Triomphe, also had a reputation as an antiquary.¹⁰ The close involvement of Colbert in this academy can be seen in the fact that its meetings were held in his home, the former Palais Mazarin, to which the royal Cabinet des Médailles was transferred a few years later.

During its first two decades, the Petite Académie was responsible for the issue of thirty-seven medals celebrating events of Louis's reign. Typical of these was the one which Jean Warin, director of the medals mint at the Louvre, made to celebrate the conquest of the Franche



2. Dupré: *Henri IV, Marie de' Medici and the Dauphin*, 1603, silver gilt, 67.5 mm, British Museum.

Comté in 1668 during the War of Devolution (fig. 4). Struck in silver from dies engraved by Warin, the medal is 'modern' in the depiction of Louis on the obverse with a wig and modern attire (derived as it was from ancient armour) and the specification of the date on the reverse with Arabic numerals, but it also has 'ancient' elements on the reverse such as the appearance of a classical deity and the use of an exergue line. Its strongest evocations of sestertii are its size of fifty millimetres and the fact that it was struck rather than cast. The event commemorated on this medal was a signal one in the history of the kingdom and creation of the royal image: as a result of the victories of the War of Devolution (1667-68) the king took on the sobriquet Louis le Grand. In 1672 the meetings of the Petite Académie moved to the Louvre, and it may have been then that its name was changed to the Académie des Médailles.¹¹

The next period of significance for the royal numismatic collection and the production of medals, and for the kingdom as a whole, was dominated by the move of the court from the Louvre to Versailles. In 1684 the royal numismatic collection was transferred to the new palace, where its cabinets were placed next to the royal apartments, so that the king could look at their contents at his leisure.¹² Louis also appointed a team of numismatists to catalogue the ancient coins and is reported to have come by every day during their installation.¹³ In later years he continued to visit the collection, which had grown to over twenty thousand coins, daily after mass.¹⁴ The royal numismatic collection was entrusted to Pierre Rainssant from 1684 to 1689 and to Marc-Antoine Oudinet from 1689 to 1712. Jean Foy-Vaillant, the most active scholar of ancient coinage of the age, was not given a

chair in the Académie des Médailles until 1701, fifteen years later, in spite of his involvement in acquiring coins and medals for the king and cataloguing the royal collection.¹⁵

It was in this period, forty years into the reign of Louis, that the academy began to take a more systematic approach to the production of royal medals. Colbert's successor, the marquis of Louvois, charged Claude Molinet, librarian of Sainte-Geneviève, with the production of a complete inventory of modern medals in the royal collection. The impetus for this may have been the listing of medals of the reign published independently by the outsider Claude-François Ménéstrier in 1689. At the death of Louvois in 1691, the king gave responsibility over all the academies to the Comte de Pontchartrain, who passed the Académie des Médailles on to his son, who changed its name to the Académie des Inscriptions. The young Pontchartrain then gave responsibility for the medals programme to his cousin, the Abbot Jean-Paul Bignon, whose uncle Thierry Bignon belonged to a numismatic society that met weekly at the home of the duc d'Aumont and later at his own town house. It was Bignon who would direct the project that led to the production of the series of medals widely known as the *Histoire métallique de Louis le Grand*.

In 1692 the Academy set out to issue 'Les médailles de la grande histoire', a uniform series of bronze medals seventy millimetres in diameter (about twice the size of a Roman sestertius) illustrating the major events of the reign up to 1678; it was soon decided to bring the series up to the current year. The playwright Jean Racine, a member of the Académie des Médailles since 1683, was asked to write up a list of significant events and to signal those



4. Warin: *Louis XIV / Conquest of the Franche Comté*, 1668, silver, 50mm., British Museum.

3. *Aureus of Plautilla*, AD202-05, gold, 20mm., British Museum.



that had not yet been commemorated in a medal; he came up with thirty-nine new subjects for medals.¹⁶ A companion book was also undertaken, for which four plates were engraved as an essay for the approval of the academy. The version of the medal for the 1668 capture of the Franche Comté in this 1692 series, engraved by Joseph Roettiers, differs from Warin's earlier version not only in its larger diameter, but in the representation of the king on the obverse wigless (as he almost never was in life) and in Roman garb (fig. 5). However, these classicising aspects are balanced by the identification of Louis as *REX CHRISTIANISSIMUS* (Most Christian king), not only a distinction from the pagan Romans but also a claim of universal rule. A distinct break from the past is the use of the letter U rather than V in the Latin legend. The reverse follows the earlier Warin medal very closely, including the use of V rather than U in the exergal legend.

Roettiers, one of eleven engravers who contributed to the medallic series of 1692, was among the few engravers at the Monnaie des Médailles who also engraved dies for coins at the royal mint on the Left Bank. He is documented as having produced dies for 130 medals, mostly of the seventy-millimetre size; his standard fee was one thousand livres for the engraving of a punch (*poinçon*) and a die (*carré*).¹⁷ The usual procedure at the time was for the engraver to carve images in relief in a softened (annealed) steel punch or hub, which was then tempered to harden it and impressed in intaglio into an annealed die, which would then be tempered and used to strike the actual medals. Generally letters and small devices were engraved into the dies using separate

punches that were part of the personal tool kit of the engraver.¹⁸

In January of 1695, as the series was just getting underway, the king's representative Bignon made a surprise announcement that effectively scuttled the undertaking. He showed the members of the Academy a sheet of designs for medals drawn up secretly by the painter Antoine Coypel on instructions from Bignon's uncle, the First Minister Pontchartrain. Not only were these not the work of the Academy, but they were forty-one millimetres in diameter, which was then decreed to be the size at which all medals of a new series would have to be struck. The new medals were to be chiefly in bronze, with only occasional strikes in silver and gold. In addition to the 130 medals that Roettiers had produced in the large size, his colleague Michel Molart had made dies for large size medals for about one hundred events dated from 1638 to 1697, and as many as nine other engravers had contributed to the large size series.¹⁹

The members of the Academy were not offered an explanation for this radical change in their programme, but it can probably be traced to the economic circumstances of the kingdom and of the medallic enterprise itself. Unlike the earlier triumphs, the wars of the end of the seventeenth century were inconclusive and left the state's treasury deeply in debt, as did the increasingly elaborate construction and furnishing of Versailles.²⁰ One of the principal purposes of the medallic series was to serve as diplomatic gifts: in the decade following its completion, at least twenty-two sets were distributed to envoys from European principalities with a lavish accompanying folio volume, sumptuously bound and printed, in which



5. Roettiers: *Louis XIV / Conquest of the Franche Comté in 1668*, 1692, bronze, 70mm. (Photo: Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Osnabrück, and Lübke & Wiedemann, Stuttgart)

an engraving and description of each medal received its own large page. These were not all complete sets and not all made of the same metal, but the presentation to the papal nunzio in 1705 of a set including eighty-six strikings in gold and 195 in silver with a value of 12,065 livres indicates how expensive such a gift could be. Had these medals been struck at a diameter of seventy rather than forty-one millimetres, the surface area would have been more than three times as large and hence the metal used would have cost that much more.²¹

Another saving achieved by the reduction of the module for the medals in the series was in the die engraving. In a letter of 1703, Bignon explained to his patron Pontchartrain the costs of the production of the series.²² He noted that each medal needed two dies and that most dies needed a custom punch, all of which broke often, either in the tempering or in the striking. In passing, he noted that the modern method of striking had an advantage over the ancient, in that they could get hundreds of medals from each die while the Romans had been able to strike only a single piece from each die – a mistaken inference apparently based on the observation that different specimens of a single ancient coin issue were recognised as having come from distinct dies. Bignon boasted that to produce the series of small module medals he had negotiated a contract with Jean Mauger to engrave by himself, or with his workshop, 250 of the dies for a fee of 150 livres each, compared to the fees ranging from 250 to 400 livres that the other engravers were getting for each of the small dies and the 500 to 1,000 that they had received for the larger ones. Moreover, instead of each engraver receiving his fee upon delivering the die, Mauger agreed to be paid only for

those dies that lasted twelve strikings without breaking. It is likely that Mauger agreed to this condition because the more compact forty-one millimetre dies were less likely to break early in use than the larger ones.

Upon the announcement of the change in diameter by Bignon, the Academy undertook the reformulation of all of its planned medals, to adapt them to the new module; it also decided to standardise such features as the presence of the name and date of the event in the reverse exergue. A new list of events to be commemorated was established, going up to the year 1699. Each member charged with composing the reverse device for a particular event had to defend in a presentation to his fellow members the appropriateness of the classical imagery he proposed. Of the more than three hundred devices reviewed, a total of 286 were eventually struck in the new series. The Academy reviewed twelve royal portraits made in the course of Louis' reign and narrowed the field down to eight progressively ageing images, which were then drawn by Coypel and engraved by Mauger, who supervised the striking of the whole series. It was originally proposed that the obverse legends would change from a normal format giving regnal titles to LUDOVICUS MAGNUS REX CHRISTIANISSIMUS (Louis the Great, most Christian king) for medals commemorating events after the War of Devolution, when the king adopted that epithet, but after debate it was decided that the legends for the early years would be the same but without the MAGNUS.²³

The medal in the forty-one millimetre series for the conquest of the Franche Comté, with both dies engraved by Mauger, follows the general composition of its two predecessors and, like them, mixes ancient and modern



6. Mauger: *Louis XIV / Conquest of the Franche Comté in 1668*, 1702, bronze, 41mm., British Museum.

elements (fig. 6).²⁴ The obverse portrait of the king, though bewigged, has a truncation of the bust in the classical style; the legend uses U rather than V, but the artist's signature uses V. On the reverse the circular legend has been shortened, dropping the word *INCREDIBILIS* from the earlier *VICTORIÆ CELERITAS INCREDIBILIS* (Incredible speed of victory). In the exergue the conquered territory is identified by its Roman name, 'Provincia Sequanorum', rather than as the Burgundian County, the specification of the ten days for the victory is expanded, and the year is given in Roman numerals. While it is clear that ancient prototypes were in the minds of the members of the Academy, the designer and the engraver, there was no real attempt to make the medals of this series more or less consistently classicising than those of the preceding two versions.

A new impetus for the completion of the project was given by the announcement in one of the meetings of the Academy in 1699 that Ménestrier had issued a new edition of his medallic history. Pontchartrain responded to this challenge by getting the king to forbid Ménestrier to give his book the title *Histoire de Louis le Grand par les médailles*, or to illustrate pieces struck from the Academy's designs.²⁵

Finally, in 1702 the entire series was ready for issue, and with it a deluxe volume entitled *Médailles sur les principaux événements du règne de Louis le Grand*, illustrating and explaining each of the pieces. The book was the only official history of the reign to be published during the king's lifetime, and its issue had been considered integral to the medallic project since the outset.²⁶ In the folio volume, the medals were illustrated at seventy-two millimetres; it appears that the engravings for these illustrations were

made before the reduced size drawings were approved, as illustrated in the case of the medal commemorating the 1663 renewal of the Swiss alliance (no. 76), which includes nine witnesses rather than the three that appear on the medals of the forty-one millimetre series.²⁷

This folio volume included a preface by the Academy's secretary, Abbé Tallemant, explaining the theory behind the composition of the medals. Tallemant begins the preface with an introduction to ancient coins and medals, in which he considers coins with reverses remaining unchanged over time, including most Greek issues, some issues of the Roman Republic, and a few early imperial coins with the names of mint officials on the reverse; to these he contrasts the imperial bronze issues of the *Historia Augusta*, which he considers commemorative medals – the dispute between Vico and Erizzo was still alive at the dawn of the eighteenth century. Much of Tallemant's preface, however, centres on a more contemporary dispute, the quarrel between the ancients and the moderns.

In his illustrative comparison of the difference in taste of the ancients and the moderns, Tallemant analyses a medal of Diane de Poitiers, lover of king Henri II in the middle of the sixteenth century (fig. 7).²⁸ Whilst he considers the general idea of representing the modern Diana as the goddess of the same name, who conquered Cupid, to be among the five or six best modern medals, he faults the reverse legend, which translates 'I have conquered the conqueror of the world', as lacking in gravity, presumably because it is written in the first person, and as being more appropriate for a *devise* or emblem than for a medallic legend. He also considers the physical subjugation of Cupid to be overly literal and in poor taste, given that



7. Attributed to Philippe Danfrie: *Diane de Poitiers*, early 17th century, silver, 52mm., British Museum.

the conquered god represents the king.

The folio edition of the *Médailles sur les principaux événements du règne de Louis le Grand* was issued with the medals in 1702, but apparently early in the print run Tallemant's preface was suppressed, as it is lacking in most extant copies. The suppression is usually seen as coming from royal direction, but various reasons for it have been advanced. Some accounts say the preface gave the Academy too much credit, while others accuse it of being too flattering to the king or for containing too many historical errors.²⁹

Publication of the folio book without the preface continued, joined by a less lavish quarto edition, but so many mistakes were found in both editions and in the medals that the Academy spend the next twenty years revising the medals and the book in which they were presented. In the end, a second edition of the *Médailles* appeared in 1723, eight years after the death of the king. In the meantime, both the size and the scope of the Academy had been enlarged, and in 1716 its name was changed to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres and the composition of medallic legends and devices was relegated to a minor role in its concerns.³⁰

After a long, complicated and contentious process, the Académie des Médailles fulfilled its goal of emulating the coinage of the Roman emperors by producing a series of medals celebrating events in the reign of Louis XIV that were royal in theme, classical in style, and struck in a small module. This format would be followed in France through the Napoleonic period, and became a dominant paradigm for the national medals of other countries until well into the nineteenth century. M

NOTES

1. Pierre Antoine Rascas, Sieur de Bagarris, *De la nécessité de l'usage des medailles dans les monnoyes* (Paris, 1611), pp. 5-6, quoted in Joseph Jacquot, *Médailles et jetons de Louis XIV d'après le manuscrit de Londres Add. 31.908*, 4 vols (Paris, 1968), i, pp. lxxxv-lxxxvii, no. 1.
2. Philip Attwood, *Italian medals c.1530-1600 in British public collections*, 2 vols (London, 2003), pp. 36-8, 54-5, nos 776, 798, 800, 812-14, 853-66.
3. Hubert Gillot, *La querelle des anciens & des modernes en France* (Paris, 1914), pp. 312-22.
4. Mark Jones, *A catalogue of the French medals in the British Museum*, i, AD 1402-1610 (London, 1982), pp. 9-10; J.-J. Guiffrey, 'La Monnaie des Médailles', *Revue Numismatique*, ser. 3, ii (1884), pp. 465-89; iii (1885), pp. 82-115, 188-209, 432-60; iv (1886), pp. 86-100; v (1887), pp. 281-320; vi (1888), pp. 306-34; vii (1889), pp. 267-312, 429-57; ix (1891), pp. 315-53; ser. 3, ii (1884), pp. 466-76.
5. Jacquot, *Médailles et jetons*, i, pp. vi-vii, lxxxvi-vii, no. 7.
6. Ernest Babelon, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines*, i, 1, *Théorie et doctrine* (Paris, 1901), cc. 134-5; Thierry Sarmant, *Le Cabinet des Médailles de la Bibliothèque Nationale 1661-1848* (Paris: Ecole des Chartres, 1994), pp. 17-34.
7. Charles Patin, *Epistre au roi* (Paris 1661), p. 6, quoted in Mark Jones, *A catalogue of the French medals in the British Museum*, ii, 1600-1672 (London, 1988), p. 16.
8. John Cunnally, *Images of the illustrious: the numismatic presence in the Renaissance* (Princeton, 1999), pp. 134-8; Federica Missere-Fontana, 'La controversia «Monete o Medaglia»'. Nuovi documenti su Enea Vico e Sebastiano Erizzo', *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, cliii (1994-95), pp. 61-103.
9. Jacquot, *Médailles et jetons*, i, pp. i-v, lxxxvii-xc, no. 2.
10. Gillot, *La querelle*, p. 435; Jacquot, *Médailles et jetons*, i, p. ix, n. 5.
11. Jean Leclant, 'Histoire de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres', in Henri Amouroux, ed., *Histoire des cinq académies* (Paris, 1995), p. 104. For the suggestion that the name did not change until 1701, see Joseph Jacquot, 'Pourquoi l'Académie s'est-elle appelé Académie des Inscriptions?', *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, cxi (1967), 1, pp. 134-49.
12. See Robert Wellington, 'Louis XIV's medal cabinet at Versailles', at p. 12 below.
13. Babelon, *Traité*, cc. 144-4.
14. Christophe Piccinelli-Dassaud, 'Les antiquitez de sa majesté: le cabinet du roi au XVIIe siècle', in Alexandre Maral and Nicolas Milovanic, eds, *Versailles et l'Antique* (Paris, 2012), pp. 86-8.
15. Christian Dekesel, 'Jean-Foy-Vaillant (1632-1706): l'antiquaire du roy', in Christian Dekesel and Thomas Stäcker, eds, *Europäische numismatische Literatur im 17. Jahrhundert, Wolfenbüttler Arbeiten zur Barockforschung*, 42 (Wiesbaden, 2005), pp. 69-87.
16. Jacquot, *Médailles et jetons*, i, p. xlii.
17. Guiffrey, 'La Monnaie des Médailles', iii, pp. 196-201; ix, p. 321.
18. Jones, *A catalogue*, i, pp. 9-10; cf. Guiffrey, 'La Monnaie des Médailles', vii, pp. 434-6, for the inventory post-mortem of the toolkit of the engraver Michel Molart.
19. Guiffrey, 'La Monnaie des Médailles', iii, p. 196; vii, pp. 438-40.
20. Peter Burke, *The fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven and London, 1992), pp. 107-9.
21. Robert Oresko, 'The Histoire métallique of Louis XIV and the diplomatic gift', *Médailles et Antiques*, i (1989), pp. 49-55.
22. Guiffrey, 'La Monnaie des Médailles', vii, pp. 298-301.
23. Jacquot, *Médailles et jetons*, i, pp. xlvi-xlix; Burke, *The fabrication*, p. 67.
24. Jean-Paul Divo, *Catalogue des médailles de Louis XIV* (Zurich, 1982), p. 45, no. 106.
25. Jacquot, *Médailles et jetons*, i, p. cxii, nos 31, 33.
26. Burke, *The fabrication*, pp. 97, 118-19.
27. The large number of witnesses is retained in the quarto publication, for which the engravings were reduced to forty-one millimetres.
28. *Médailles sur les principaux événements du règne de Louis le Grand avec des explications historiques* (Paris, 1702), folio c verso – cii recto; published in Jacquot, *Médailles et jetons*, i, pp. cxii-cxiii, no. 52. The medal is now considered a restitution of the first half of the seventeenth century, perhaps by the mint engraver Philippe Danfrie. Jones, *A catalogue*, i, no. 231.
29. James Mosley, 'Médailles sur les principaux événements du règne de Louis le Grand (1702): the making of the book', *Bulletin du bibliophile*, ii (2008), pp. 311-14.
30. Leclant, 'Histoire', p. 109.