ROYAL CHARITIES.

PART I.—ANGELS AS HEALING-PIECES FOR THE KING'S EVIL.

BY HELEN FARQUHAR.

ENGLAND. A ROOM IN THE KING'S PALACE.

MALCOLM: Comes the King forth I pray you?

DOCTOR: Ay, Sir: there are a crew of wretched souls,
That stay his cure: their malady convinces
The great assay of art; but, at his touch,
Such sanctity hath Heaven given his hand,
They presently amend.

MALCOLM: I thank you Doctor. [Exit Doctor.

MACDUFF: What's the disease he means?

MALCOLM: 'Tis call'd the evil:
A most miraculous work in this good king;
Which often, since my here-remain in England,
I have seen him do. How he solicits Heaven,
Himself best knows: but strangely-visited people,
All swoln and ulcerous, pitiful to the eye,
The mere despair of surgery, he cures;
Hanging a golden stamp about their necks,
Put on with holy prayers: and 'tis spoken,
To the succeeding royalty he leaves
The healing benediction.

MACBETH, ACT IV, Sc. 3.
WRITTEN 1606–7.

SEVERAL years ago I made extensive notes for a paper on Touchpieces, but it was not until the May of 1914 that I presented the results of my studies to the British Numismatic Society. A further delay has occurred before I could offer them in printed form to our members; and for this procrastination “war-time” is the ever-present excuse.
All idea of publication had been temporarily abandoned by me in 1911, on finding that the subject of touching for the King’s Evil had fallen into abler hands than mine, and would be discussed in the Fitzpatrick Lectures at the Royal College of Physicians by Dr. Raymond Crawfurd.

The book, which embodied and amplified these lectures, was published in the same year, under the title of The King’s Evil, and it seemed to me that the last word had been said upon the matter.

But finality in research is, perhaps fortunately for those who, like myself, delight in burrowing amongst musty manuscripts, often elusive; and since the publication of Dr. Crawfurd’s interesting and, as I then thought, exhaustive treatise, I have come upon additional data. I had not renounced my interest in the touchpiece, and chance discoveries at the British Museum and the Public Record Office, aided by the keen co-operation at the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum of Mr. C. J. S. Thompson, who eagerly called my attention to new acquisitions, re-awakened my wish to put on record such things as came to light, too late for inclusion in Dr. Crawfurd’s book.

Moreover the publication by my friend, Mr. Henry Symonds, of the Pyx lists and various indentures of our Tudor and Stuart monarchs, has of late years elucidated much which has been hitherto obscure, and has rendered the task of following the angel, the precursor of the touchpiece, easier than when approached by Dr. Crawfurd. At the latter’s suggestion, therefore, I reopen the subject, but am content to leave all controversial and medical questions in his hands—writing of the angels and touchpieces proper rather than of the ceremony for which they were used.

But for the sake of those who have not followed the story of the ancient custom in Dr. Crawfurd’s pages, nor read the slighter sketches written from the numismatic point of view by Dr. Pettigrew,¹

¹ Superstitions connected with Medicine and Surgery, published in 1844, by Dr. Thomas Joseph Pettigrew.
Mr. Hussey, Sir John Evans, Mr. Nicholls and others, I will review the origin of the practice, drawing largely upon my friend Dr. Crawfurd's book for information, and especially on the useful bibliography with which he prefaced his *The King's Evil*.

The custom of healing by the royal touch is of great antiquity: Pliny and Tacitus tell of cures performed by Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, Vespasian and others. But these instances of royal healing need no more be discussed by us than the stories of miraculous cures chronicled by Bede and Gregory de Tours as having been effected by saints and prelates.

The King's Evil, with which our touchpiece is connected, is explained by Dr. Crawfurd as a definite disease, later called scrofula, the more picturesque name having gradually fallen into disuse since the abandonment of the royal healings.

The earlier records of legendary character are not specific on this point; let us therefore commence our story with Edward the Confessor, always cited as the pioneer, so far as our sovereigns are concerned, in displaying curative powers, in that he is represented, by William of Malmesbury and others, as the worker of certain miracles, among them the healing of a young woman from the King's Evil.

Edward, it appears, made the sign of the cross over his patient, personally washed and touched the sores with his hands, and ordered her to "be maintained from day to day at his own cost, until she should be restored to full health." Here we have the prototype of

---


4 It appears that Louis IX revived the practice of Louis VI, who used the sign of the cross in touching. See Dr. Crawfurd's pp. 24-5. In the description of healing by Charles VI, in the fourteenth century, washing was part of the ceremony, see p. 43, but Dr. Crawfurd deems this to have been the earliest mention of purification since the time of Edward the Confessor.
the "healing" ceremony\(^1\) although this was afterwards altered in some of its details.

I need not trouble my readers with arguments as to the origin of the gift, whether hereditary or conferred by the unction in coronation,—neither need I recapitulate the evidence of priority of the French or English in exercising the power, nor of their pre-eminence in this respect. Suffice it to call attention to the immense endurance required of the French kings; Louis XIV at his coronation\(^2\) touched no fewer than 2600 persons, and of Louis XIII, who even at nine years of age approached his mission fasting from the night before, it is said that he nearly fainted under the strain of touching 450 sufferers on one very hot day in the summer after his accession. Undaunted he went on with his work, for "his face and hands were washed with wine and he was able to complete his task."\(^3\)

With regard to priority, also, Dr. Crawfurd gives the palm to the French, for although he treats with doubtful reserve the testimony concerning Clovis in the fifth century, sometimes claimed as the first healer by French authors, he considers that the evidence preponderates in favour of Robert the Pious, who, reigning in France from 996 to 1031, healed by touch. Of Henri I, the succeeding King, we have no tradition, but in this practice Robert was followed by Philip I between the years 1061 and 1108.\(^4\) Our Edward the

---

\(^1\) Dr. Crawfurd's King's Evil, pp. 18-20, translating a contemporary Chronicle called "Vita Edwardi qui apud Westmonasterium requiescit." Brit. Mus. Harl. MSS. 526 and Rolls Series, Luard's Lives of the Confessor, No. 3.

\(^2\) It was the custom of the French kings immediately after their coronation to proceed to the priory of St. Marcoul de Corbeny, not far from Reims, to touch for the Evil. St. Marcoul, or as the name is sometimes spelt Marcouff, himself, according to one tradition, possessed the healing gift in the sixth century.

\(^3\) The Court of Louis XIII, by K. A. Patmore, pp. 270-1. See also the Making of a King, by I. A. Taylor, pp. 134 and 157, and The King's Evil, pp. 65 and 102, where Dr. Crawfurd states that Louis XIII, when only nine years old, touched great numbers of persons at his coronation, and on several occasions more than 1000. The numbers at the coronation are given by various authors as from eight to nine hundred.

\(^4\) Dr. Crawfurd says, pp. 12-14, "It is clear that Robert the Pious cured sick persons by touch, but we have no sufficient indication of the nature of their sickness. . . . both Philip I and Louis VI (1108–1137) did actually touch for the cure of scrofula . . . and as but one reign, that of Henri I (1031–1060 A.D.), intervened
HENRI II, TOUCHANT LES ECROUELLES.
Photograph by the Maison Berthaud, from the miniature in the Bibliothèque Nationale.
Confessor importing the custom from Normandy, where he had already performed cures of various kinds, comes, in point of time, between these monarchs, and must have preceded Philip as a healer in France, and at least have rivalled him in England. The questions at issue appear to be whether the disease healed by Robert was really scrofula, and the exact date of Edward's recorded cure of the King's Evil, regarded by some as having taken place shortly before his death, by others as much earlier.

Olaf of Norway also adopted the custom, as his Saga reports, in the early eleventh century, upon his return to his Kingdom from a sojourn in Normandy in Edward's company. After it had been discarded by us, Charles X, King of France, still retained the healing virtue, and at his coronation in 1824 touched 121 sick persons, and thus to our French neighbours must be conceded at least the last word in the matter.

By the courtesy of Monsieur H. Omont I have received from the Bibliothèque Nationale permission to reproduce from the Catalogue de l'Exposition de Portraits peints et dessinés du XIIᵉ au XVIIᵉ Siècle, a photograph due to the Maison Berthaud, taken from the Livre d'Heures de Henri II.

This manuscript contains the Oraisons used by the French kings in touching for scrofula, and is believed to have been executed in 1547 shortly after Henri's accession to the throne, in that it represent the ceremony at the Priory of Saint Marcoul de Corbeny after the coronation. It is of interest as giving a vivid picture of the procedure in France, showing that the Gallic king made the round of the kneeling patients, whereas with us the monarch sat in a chair of state, whilst the sick persons knelt in turn before him. Even between that of Robert the Pious and Philip I, it would seem probable that Robert's patients were also scrofulous. See also p 21, where he, moreover, calls attention to the statement in the Harleian eleventh-century manuscript No. 526, that the practice was new in England when imported by Edward from Normandy, whilst Guibert de Nogent, in his De Pignoribus Sanctorum, writes of it as already established in France.

1 See our p. 44, note x.  
2 Dr. Crawfurd, p. 161.  
Edward the Confessor is pictured in an early manuscript as seated.¹ Henri IV again, in the frontispiece of Laurentius's De Mirabili Vi Sanationis, is shown standing.

With regard, specially, to our early English history also I owe much to Dr. Crawfurd, who has studied in the original several authorities whose works are beyond my knowledge, both of Latin and abbreviated script, or are at present unavailable for research.

So far as our present information takes us, it was not until the end of the thirteenth century that the donation of a special coin during the ceremonial was substituted for the earlier order that the patient should be fed at the royal expense.

To turn then at once to the numismatic side of the question. Robert of France, we find, in visiting the sick, gave them “with his own hand a sum of pence.”² Of our Edward the Confessor a contemporary manuscript states that he caused his patient to “be maintained from day to day at his own cost, until she should be restored to full health.”³

We have no reliable documentary record of a specified coin until the reign of Edward I—but of this more anon.

¹ La Estoire de Seint Edward le Rei, MS. Ee, iii, 59, University Library, Cambridge, illustrated by Dr. Crawfurd, facing p. 18 of The King's Evil. The manuscript was printed and translated by H. R. Luard in his Lives of Edward the Confessor, pp. 1-311, Rolls Series. It was written for Eleanor of Provence, Queen of Henry III, about 1245. The account of the cure is undated, but, with other miracles, it follows immediately after Edward's embassage to the Pope of the years 1049-54, and comes before the death of Earl Godwin, which occurred in 1053. It is, however, doubtful whether any attention was paid to chronological arrangement, the incident immediately succeeding being that of the famous ring, six months only before Edward's own demise.

² The King's Evil, p. 12, quoting Helgald the Monk, who, writing a few years after Robert's death, used the words: “manu propria dabat denario rum summam.”

³ Lubet deinde earn cotidie regia stipe ali donec integre restitueretur sanitati. Harl. MS. 526, No. 3, f. 34.
Angels as Healing-pieces for the King's Evil.

No coin has ever, so far as I can learn, been designated by the French, as was our gold angel, "the healing piece," although certainly money was sometimes given. Louis XIV, for instance, presented 30 pence to each foreigner and 15 pence to each Frenchman. But as in the case of our Edward the Confessor, the French doles seem to have been more of the nature of alms or travelling expenses than as keepsakes, such as were given by the Tudors and Stuarts. I consulted the late Monsieur H. de la Tour at the Bibliothèque Nationale, asking him whether any token was so regarded in the Paris Cabinet des Médailles, and whilst replying in the negative he showed me a curious little medal portraying a leg in a basin of water, which he said he personally believed to be connected with that other kingly ceremony, the washing of feet on Maundy Thursday in the thirteenth or fourteenth century. It occurred to me, although not until after the death of M. de la Tour, that the French touching ceremony also included the personal washing of the sick by the king, with the simple formula: "Le roi te touche, Dieu te guérit."

I must pass over further details on French observances given by Dr. Crawfurd, mentioning only that when coin was bestowed it was usually given by the almoner and not, as with us, hung about the patient's neck by the king himself. Early in the sixteenth century, under François I, such vicarious presentation is recorded, and again in the reign of Louis XIV in the seventeenth century, whilst in England from the time of Henry VII onward we find the king

---

1 Dr. Crawfurd, p. 81.
2 See description given by Dr. Crawfurd, p. 43, taken from Etienne de Conti's History of France, written in the fifteenth century, where Charles VI, 1380–1422, is shown to have washed the sick persons in a vessel full of water. It is, however, more probable that the little medal commemorated the Maundy ceremonial as suggested by M. H. de la Tour.
3 Dr. Crawfurd, p. 58. See also Mrs. Henry Cust's Gentlemen Errant, p. 313. This authoress quotes the amount given by Hubertus Leodius, the secretary in the mid-sixteenth century of Frederick II, Elector Palatine. He witnessed François I of France healing whilst a prisoner in Madrid, and says the ceremony consisted of "the simple act of touching the diseased necks in the form of a cross," but was preceded by a four days' fast on the part of the king.
4 Ibid., p. 81.
personally using the coin, wherewith to make the sign of the cross and himself hanging it "about the neck" of the sick person that he might "wear it untill he be full whole."  

To our King Henry VII is attributed the elaborate and set form of the service and by most writers it is assumed that it was he who introduced the gift of a gold piece, apparently to be retained for a time at least and not used for maintenance.

But so many and so persistent have been the rumours of gold presented by Edward I, and even by Edward the Confessor, that it may be worth while to sift the evidence before we follow Dr. Crawfurd in his safer course of suggesting the possible employment of the angel for a touchpiece, so soon as it saw the light—that is to say under Edward IV. What, then, are these rumours of a golden touchpiece antecedent even to the appearance of Henry III's gold penny or Edward III's inauguration of a currency in this metal?

Although gold coins existed in England in the time of Edward the Confessor, there is no evidence that he in healing bestowed a

---

1 Brit. Mus. 3407, c. and 6 b. ro. *The Ceremonies for the Healing of them that be Diseased with the King's Evil as they were practised in the time of Henry VII.* This form was published for James II in 1686 and proves, as Dr. Crawfurd says, that the office reproduced was at that date attributed to Henry VII. The Latin office with the English rubric is printed at length by Dr. Crawfurd, pp. 52–56; also, pp. 56–7, an older exorcism from which it was said that Henry derived his service, and which contains many points of similarity. See also Beckett's *Free and Impartial Enquiry*, Appendix vi, for the service used by Henry VII.

2 A gold piece, said to be a coin of Edward the Confessor, was exhibited before the London Numismatic Society in 1837 and illustrated in the second volume of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, but was declared to be an early forgery. A genuine gold penny, however, was struck at Warwick by this king, and other examples due to Offa, Vigmund or Æthelred II, etc., might be in Edward's coffers.
Angels as Healing-pieces for the King’s Evil.

golden amulet; his gift to his patient being a food dole whilst he kept her under observation. Nevertheless, a certain statement, although without other foundation than the piercing of the upper end of the ornament, has been since the seventeenth century repeated of an early Anglo-Saxon or, according to Dr. Stephens, later Scandinavian bracteate, now in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. Edward in point of time might, of course, have possessed such an ornament, of a date some two at least if not four or five hundred years prior to his own, but there is no evidence whatsoever to connect it with him in any way, nor with healing. It was found buried in St. Giles’s Fields near Oxford, and probably formed part of the burial ornaments of an early warrior. In 1677 Dr. Robert Plot, in his Natural History of Oxfordshire, described the discovery of this bracteate, which being pierced for suspension, he believed to be a touchpiece of Edward the Confessor, whose initials he thought he discerned upon the gold piece and he said it was then in the possession of one Sir John Holeman. Round this ornament battle raged in the eighteenth century, various writers

1 The holes appear to be rivet holes by which the usual gold attachment would have been affixed.

2 Illustrated in Archaeologia, vol. lxii, p. 491, where it is simply referred to by Mr. Thurlow Leeds, as belonging “to a class of bracteates derived from late Roman coins, bearing the head of an Emperor,” and considered by Sir Arthur Evans to be of Anglo-Saxon fabric. The label at the Ashmolean Museum reads: “The design, as the remains of a debased inscription, C.O. for Constantine or Constantius, show, is derived from Roman coin types of the fourth century A.D. Specimens of this class, frequent in Scandinavia, are rarely discovered in Britain.” Mr. Andrew tells me that such bracteates are seldom found of Anglo-Saxon origin in later burials than those of the sixth century, but if the specimen be, as Dr. Stephens thinks, see Runic Ornaments vol. ii, 521, of a somewhat late Scandinavian type, it might date so late as the eighth or ninth century in a Danish burial in this country.

3 Plot’s Plate XVI, Fig. 5, and p. 352.

4 In Archaeologia, vol. i, pp. 161 to 167, published in 1770, Dr. Samuel Pegge, writing in 1752, explains Plot’s mistake and collates the views held by different writers on the subject, such as by Walker and Thoresby on their elucidation of Plate iv, No. 40, in vol. i of Camden’s Britannia, in 1722, Sir Andrew Fountain in his Epistolary Dissertation, also Thwaites and Wise, Walker alone accepting Plot’s theory. Beckett, in his Free and Impartial Enquiry, had, also in 1722, repeated the story with
explaining the design as a head of "a woman veiled," of the Christ, or of an Eastern king; but all agreeing that it was not a portrait of the Confessor, and that had the initials been E.C., which was then disputed, they would have no relation to this king, who, said they, received his saintly title years after his decease. But Dr. Radcliffe, afterwards well known as Queen Anne's physician, appears to have been a believer in Robert Plot's absurd theory, for he, in 1684, having presumably acquired it in the course of the preceding decade from Sir John Holeman, presented the bracteate, together with another so-called touchpiece, to the Bodleian Library. Mr. C. J. S. Thompson, noting the mention of a donation of an Edward the Confessor's touchpiece in Dr. Curll's Life of Radcliffe, published in 1715, called my attention to it and obtained from Mr. F. Madan, the courteous librarian of the Bodleian, an extract from the Benefactor's Register describing Radcliffe's two numismatic gifts. The one was the piece ascribed to Edward the confessor, "broad and thin with two small holes near the upper edge," and was identified by Dr. Nias in the Ashmolean Museum, whither it had been removed. The second presentation which should, both according some reserve, but quoted the views of the authors of his day and sums up against the belief that Edward the Confessor used gold for healing.

1 The letters which, as we have seen, according to the present label in the Ashmolean Museum, read C.O., the copy of a debased inscription taken from a Roman architype, are regarded by Dr. Stephens in class No. 5 in Runic Monuments, vol. ii, p. 521, as reading on the specimen he illustrates as E.C.M.U., but there is reason to believe that he based his study on the incuse side, where the lettering is reversed. Samuel Pegge read the letters as E.G.O., also studying the impression from the reverse side from an engraving.

2 It appears doubtful at what period Edward was first spoken of as Saint and Confessor, but he was only canonized by Pope Alexander III nearly a hundred years after his decease. See Beckett's Free and Impartial Enquiry, Appendix I, for the Papal bull.

to the Register and the author of Radcliffe's biography, be a coin of Henry V, can only be a sovereign of Henry VII of the third coinage, no other gold piece in the Bodleian Collection fulfilling the requirements with regard to the two holes, assuming that this description applies to both gifts. This sovereign has many lis in the field and probably the idea that they commemorated the "capture of Gaul" caused the attribution to Henry V, rather than to Henry VII. The search for a pierced Anglo-Gallic coin was vain, and to us the chief interest in the "Henricus" piece lies in the fact that it is a sovereign and not an angel.¹

But, as in the case of the bracteate, the only reason for its supposed connection with the healing ceremony lay in the holes with which it is pierced, and personally I am inclined to believe that both objects were perforated for wearing in the wars as ornaments or safeguards. In the time of Edward III it was no uncommon thing to carry a gold noble as an amulet on going into battle, the legend IHC AVTEM TRANSIENS PER MEDIUM ILLORVM IBAT being regarded as protective. The same words appeared upon Henry VII's sovereign, and the coin in question is much rubbed on the reverse, the natural result of friction when suspended, whence we assume that the piece was used as an amulet, but probably not as a

¹ I have had the privilege of personally examining the Bodleian coins, which comprise some Anglo-Gallic pieces of Henry V, but these are unpierced. There is also a Henry VII's angel, probably a touchpiece, being pierced with one small hole; but these coins appear to have no relation to the description.
touchpiece. This curious belief in the virtue of the noble as a talisman still existed throughout the seventeenth and even the eighteenth century. It is related that Mary of Modena, in her flight from England in 1689, carried with her a large casket of these coins and made gifts of them at the French court, where she found them highly prized.\(^1\) Attached to them, especially to the rose noble of Edward IV, was a legend that they were made of pure gold, but that it was produced by alchemy.\(^2\) It is said that one of these ornamental coins was considered a very valuable present, and thirty years later the Chevalier de St. George, it is reported, although apparently upon scant foundation, still made special gifts of them.

Curiously enough the tradition held by Dr. Radcliffe and Dr. Plot that Edward the Confessor gave gold touchpieces, became later confused with vague rumours concerning Edward I. Several authors—Drs. Brewer,\(^3\) Pettigrew,\(^4\) and others—have said that

---

\(^1\) Strickland's *Queens of England*, vol. vi, p. 344.

\(^2\) The fictitious memoirs of Madame de Créquy gave credence to this belief, for they contain an amusing though unreliable account of the transmutation into base metal of a rose noble, previously tested as of the purest gold, which had been given to her by the Chevalier de St. George, under the skilful management of an alchymist called Casanova. These memoirs, published about the middle of the nineteenth century, were purely imaginary, but were for many years accepted as reliable evidence, and are seriously quoted sometimes to this day. See *Les Souvenirs de la Marquise de Créquy*, tome i, pp. 147–150, chapter viii. Miss Strickland, vol. vii, p. 201, *Queens of England*, writes, however, that the Chaillots MSS. state that Edward I and Edward III kept an alchymist in the Tower "who made gold for them," and that pieces from the crucible of one Raymond Tully were devoted to healing by the kings of England, and "bound by their royal hands on the arm of each of their subjects touched in the healing office." Some confusion exists, for the authoress speaks of Angel-coins, which were not known under Edward III, still less under Edward I, and it is probable that the Dutch imitations of our nobles and angels later gave rise to imputations on the purity of our Plantagenet coinage.

\(^3\) Dr. E. C. Brewer, in his *Dictionary of Miracles*, but his *Reader's Handbook* and his *Phrase and Fable* both refer to the gift of the first gold piece as being from Henry VII, and are of later issue than the *Dictionary of Miracles*.

\(^4\) *Superstitions connected with the History and Practice of Medicine and Surgery*, p. 125: "In the Computus Hospitii of Edward I, preserved amongst the records of the Tower, a small sum of money (gold medal) as given by the King to the applicants is there frequently mentioned."
it is so stated in the records of the Tower, and in this they were followed by our member Mr. W. Charlton, who kindly, in return to my question, gave me Dr. Brewer’s *Dictionary of Miracles* as his authority. The records of the Tower are now removed to the Public Record Office, and such *Comptu Hospitii* of Edward I as were examined by Dr. Crawfurd prove conclusively that the sum given to each patient at every healing was, as we should expect from the state of the currency, one penny.

![Penny of Edward I, about 1281-3.](image)

We naturally look for evidence in the Household and Wardrobe accounts, for the Treasurer and Controller of these departments under each successive king were responsible for the correct entry of the royal gifts and oblations. Dr. Crawfurd in his *The King’s Evil*, p. 30, tells us that between the time of Edward the Confessor and Edward I he has found no absolutely direct or documentary evidence of “healing,” and the records of the last-mentioned king depend on “the mere accident of the survival of his household accounts.” It would be unlikely that anything should pass unnoticed by Dr. Crawfurd, but in corroboration I may say that Mr. W. J. Andrew tells me that he has on my behalf searched the early chronicles for any record of touching between the days of Edward the Confessor and the death of Henry III, and has found none, although the state courts are often recorded with some detail, especially in the time of Stephen. Dr. Crawfurd mentions a controversy relative to the succession, the heredity or the purely personal responsibility for Edward the Confessor’s curative powers, detailed by William of

---

1 “Touch Pieces and Touching for the King’s Evil,” *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, vol. xxxi, p. 31.


3 Dr. Crawfurd, p. 30.
Malmesbury.  The Chronicler would seem to have based his account of the healing by Edward, as King of England, of a sick woman on an earlier manuscript, the *Vita Ædwardi*, dedicated by an unknown monk of Westminster to Edgitha, the Confessor’s widow. The date of this biography is therefore fixed as between September, 1066, the battle of Stamford Bridge being mentioned, and 1075, when Edgitha died.

William of Malmesbury, whose *De Gestis Regum Anglorum* takes us to about the year 1125, is usually believed to have died in or soon after 1143. He carried his *Historiae Novellae*, the continuation of his chronicle, so far as 1142, but we may assume that the part referring to Edward’s “godly miracle” was written some years earlier. It is found in the second volume of the five which form the *De Gestis Regum*, and words in the prefaces of the last three of these indicate that they were written after the death of Henry I. Some expressions in the first book suggest that his reign was already closed when the preface to that portion also was drawn up. To me it seems possible that the controversy might even have reference to a contemplated effort towards the canonization of Edward which, although not granted until 1161, was advocated by Osbert of Clare about 1139–1140. Mr. Andrew admits the possibility that the healing story was not written until after Stephen’s accession, and calls my attention to a passage immediately following it, in which reference is made to David as “now” King of Scotland, proving that at the earliest it cannot have been penned prior to 1124, when David,

1 Dr. Crawfurd, p. 21, quoting *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, lib. ii.
3 *Ibid.*, preface xxxiii, by H. R. Luard, who states, p. xii, and is therein followed by Dr. Crawfurd, *King’s Evil*, p. 18, that this manuscript was freely used also by Osbert of Clare, Prior of Westminster, who completed about 1139 his Life of Edward. Osbert was in his turn quoted about a year later by Ailred of Rievaulx in his *Miracula S. Edwardi*.
4 William of Malmesbury, according to some writers, survived until 1145, but we only know that he lived long enough to revise the first draft of the third book of his *Historiae*, carrying his chronicle forward to 1142. The year 1143 is generally assumed to have been his last.
Earl of Huntingdon, succeeded his brother Alexander on the Scottish throne.

If, then, we believe that the discussion reported in the *De Gestis* was raised at the earliest in the last decade of Henry, and more probably after his death, it casts, as Mr. Andrew suggests, a strong light on the question of previous healing. Malmesbury, who dedicated his history to the Earl of Gloucester and supported the Empress’s claims throughout, would be no believer in the “divine right” of Stephen. It might be thought that Stephen would be glad to assert his powers, and had his predecessors William I, William II, or Henry I claimed the gift of healing, any question of heredity and “divine right” would have been settled long ago by ocular demonstration of the ceremony. In such a case no Norman monk would have dared to write, as did Malmesbury, in a work intended for the acceptance of Robert of Gloucester, the son of Henry I. Malmesbury’s point, taken from Edward’s earlier anonymous biographer, was that other cures had already been performed by him, whilst still in Normandy before his accession, and therefore that they could have no relation to the descent of the crown of England.

He attributes to Edward the Confessor, as does also Ailred in his *Miracles and Life* of this king, the power of healing from personal saintliness and, says Malmesbury, “it is a falsehood that some declare nowadays, who assert that the cure of that disease was derived not from his holiness, but by inheritance of his royal lineage.”

Mr. Andrew, like Dr. Crawfurd, considers that we have in Malmesbury’s argument distinct indication that no king of England exercised the healing gift between the death of Edward and that of Henry I, even Harold II being ruled out. He, however, quotes a passage, also from Malmesbury, to the effect that Henry I’s wife,

---

1. See note in Rapin’s *History of England*, vol. i, p. 15, quoting Ailred of Rievaulx in his *Vita Beati Eduardi*, whom he treated as a saint and not as a prince.

2. Dr. Crawfurd’s translation from *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*. See *The King’s Evil*, p. 20: “Unde nostro tempore quidam falsam insinuant operam, qui asseverant istius morbi curationem non ex sanctitate, sed ex regalis prosapiae heriditate fluxisse.”
the good Queen Maud," who was niece to Edgar Atheling and of the royal Saxon line, had worn haircloth in Lent, walked barefoot in the churches, washed the feet of the diseased, touched their ulcers and pressed their hands to her lips. He calls attention to the fact that as Queen Maud was Henry II's grandmother it is quite possible that Malmesbury intended to convey at least the idea of healing by this story. He therefore suggests that Henry may have claimed this power through her and her royal Saxon descent, as nephew in the fifth generation from Edward the Confessor. The more probable is this, because it was in Henry II's time, at the instance of Thomas à Becket, that the movement was renewed in England for the canonization of Edward in 1161. To this period also we owe the inception of the first of the magnificent shrines at Westminster, to which the saint's remains were transferred in 1163. But documentary support is not lacking as to the probability that Henry II revived the healing custom, and Dr. Crawfurd brings forward the letter addressed by Peter of Blois to the clergy at the court of England. It is true the allusion to the healing power of royal unction therein contained is somewhat speculative, and no direct evidence is given of its actual exercise by Henry. Nevertheless, it forms a link in the chain, and from it I think we may fairly conclude that Henry did in truth re-establish the efficacy of the royal touch, and that the revival was coincident with the formal canonization of his predecessor the Confessor.

Thus writes Peter of Blois, as translated by Dr. Crawfurd: "I admit indeed that it is a sacred duty to attend upon the lord King: for he is holy and the Lord's Anointed, nor has he received the sacrament of royal unction in vain, as if its efficacy be not known or be in doubt the disappearance of bubonic plague and the cure of scrofula will beget the fullest belief." Miss Strickland, the well-

1 *The King's Evil*, p. 24, quoting Peter of Blois in his *Epistola, cl: ad Clericos Aulæ Regiae*. Dr. Crawfurd believes that this letter was written between the years 1170 and 1180. Peter became Archdeacon of Bath, and afterwards of London, and our author brings forward evidence that the letter was certainly addressed to the English clergy rather than to those at the Norman court.

2 Fatio quidem, quod sanctum est domino regi assistere: sanctus enim et Christus Domini est: nec in vacuum accepit unctionis regiae sacramentum, cuius
known biographer of our English Queens, who curiously enough does not accept as indicative of healing the handling of the sick by Matilda Atheling to which we have already referred, is similarly sceptical concerning Henry II. But we may, perhaps, so far agree with her as to believe that "William the Conqueror and William the Hollander\(^1\) equally repudiated the claim of healing the sick: they were too much occupied with killing those who were well."\(^2\) "The uproarious sons of the Conqueror, Robert and Rufus . . ." she proceeds, "manipulated the sword, the lance and the wine cup, . . . but carefully eschewed the company of the sick. Their learned brother Henry . . . wisely married a saint’s niece and a saint’s daughter, who brought with her something like a title to the throne." . . . "Chroniclers speak," continues Miss Strickland, "of the washing and healing the wounds and sores of the poor by Matilda Atheling, but we can trace no imposition of hands."

"The first Plantagenet," and here again we are at issue with the authoress, "does not appear to have been aware of any gift of healing . . . inherited from his royal Saxon grand-dame, and as for his successor, the Lion’s Heart, it is to be doubted that, if any Saxon serf had knelt to beg the imposition of the royal hand, it would have been given with his weighty battle-axe." And so Miss Strickland carries us through a list of our kings, rejecting John also, and judging from the published Rotulus Misce\(^3\) of his fourteenth year, not without reason,\(^8\) and attributing the revival of the custom to

\[ \text{efficacia, si nescitur, aut in dubiam venit, fidem eius plenissimam faciet defectus inguinariae pestis et curatio scrophularum.} \]

\(^1\) William of Nassau Prince of Orange as William III of England did not believe in "healing" and refused to touch.


\(^3\) The Rotulus Misce of John, namely the Wardrobe book of his fourteenth year, survives and was published in Latin in 1844 by the Record Commission under the title of Documents Illustrative of English History in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, pp. 231–269, and ably edited with an English preface by Sir Henry Cole. I find in the roll, so far as my imperfect knowledge of Latin enabled me to study it in detail, no record of touching, although many of the king’s charities are noted, such as the gift of 100s. to the Canons of Barling on the burning of their house. The usual oblations appear on saints’ days, and eleven and sixpence is entered as the price of
Royal Charities.

Henry III. But, alas! she, a most careful investigator as a rule, gives no evidence for this last assertion, and repeats it again with regard to Henry VI with the same lack of proof, basing in both cases her arguments on the likelihood that so it must have been. Curiously enough the authoress, although believing that Edward I and Edward II "healed," seems less certain on the point than with regard to Henry III, whilst as a matter of fact, it is under the first Edward that Dr. Crawfurd has now obtained absolute proof of the regular dole given in healing. Let me quote the author of *The King's Evil*, who considers, however, that although there is no direct proof concerning Henry III, or his two immediate predecessors, there is strong presumption that he touched, following in the footsteps of his grandfather, Henry II, in this matter. "With Edward I on the throne we pass at once out of the region of legend and hypothesis on to the firm ground of historical fact," writes Dr. Crawfurd. He then gives many extracts from these *Household Accounts of Edward I* of the year A.D. 1277-1278, of which I will repeat a sample. "On Monday the 4th of April to brother Radolph Almoner . . . for 73 persons sick of the King's Evil 6s. 1d."  

two bezants on the occasion of the king's visit to Reading. He frequently provided feasts for 100 or even 1000 paupers. On most occasions the expense of giving food to 100 poor persons is set down at 9s. 4d., namely 1d. and about half a farthing a head if bread and fish only were provided; but if bread and meat the expense amounted to about 1 1/2d. a head. Sometimes the gift appeared to be of the nature of a penance because he had eaten flesh twice on a Friday, see pp. 231-32, etc., or as a thankoffering for a good day's hunting, see p. 253. His Maundy gift to thirteen paupers, of thirteen pence to each, is specified as amounting in all to 14s. 1d. His oblation to the Holy Cross was 13d.

1 In favour of the likelihood of healing by Henry III, we may cite his ceremonious reverence for Edward the Confessor, whose relics he laid with great pomp in the second finished shrine at Westminster in October, 1269.


3 Dr. Crawfurde, p. 33 from Computus Hospitii, 6 Edward I, P.R.O. Chancery Miscellaneous Bundle IV, No. 1, Fol. 10d, "Die lune iii die Aprilis fratri Radolpho elemosinario . . . pro lxxiii infirmis egritudinis regis vis. id. Fol. 11d, Die Lune xi die Aprilis . . . pro ciii xii egrotis de morbo regis curatis xvis. To lxii [At Easter time]. Pro ciii et viii egrotis sanatis de morbo regis xxiiiis, iiiid. Fol. 17d [at Ascension time] xvii egrotis signatis per regem xviid. Fol. 20 [at Whit-
"On Monday the 11th of April . . . for 192 sick men cured of the King's Evil, 16s." Dr. Crawfurd calls our attention to the large number touched at this date, being Easter. Or again: "For 288 sick persons cured of the King's Evil 24s. 4d.," and he here remarks on the faulty reckoning, for this should be 24s. Just one penny was obviously given to each person.

But I need not particularize further, for other and later Wardrobe Accounts of Edward I; although less definite in detail than those of the Household above quoted, inasmuch as they only give the number of pennies and not of persons, are also full of information, and we can easily by adding the sums arrive at the large healings held by the king. From this Liber Garderobe we learn that Edward between November 20, 1299, and St. John the Baptist's day—June 24, 1300, a date after which I could find no further mention of a healing within the year, disbursed a total of 80s. 10d. for 970 persons. Of this sum 58s. 4d. is entered under one head as follows: "Et pro denariis datis infirmis benedictis per Regem a festo Pasche usque Sancti Johannis Baptiste predictum 58s. 4d." Other entries

suntide] tribus egrotis benedictis de manu regis per elemosinarium regis iiiid. Thomas Carte, writing in 1747, mentions that Mr. Anstis, Garter King at Arms, had told him that he had counted 182 persons noted as healed in Edward I's Household Accounts of his sixth year, but their number is greatly exceeded by the above extracts of Dr. Crawfurd. I am indebted to Mr. I. H. Jeayes for kindly reporting to me on some of the Wardrobe books of the 22nd and 28th years of Edward I, and a book of the 30th year's accounts of this king which are in the John Rylands Library at Manchester, and he tells me there is no reference to the King's Evil, as they prove to contain the receipts and not the expenditure of the Controller of the Wardrobe.

1 Liber Quotidianus Contrarotulatoris Garderobe, 28 Edward I (1299-1300). In the collection of the Antiquaries and published in Latin with an English preface by John Topham in 1787.
are at the end of every week from November to April, sometimes for such sums as 3s. 7d. or 3s. 9d., but usually for a few pence—2d., 7d., 9d., 15d., or the like.¹

The book contains much interesting information about Edward I’s charities, which were upon a scale quite enormous for the time. There were weekly distributions to 666 paupers on Sundays, reaching the sum of £4 3s. 3d. each time, or 1½d. per head.² In one place this alms-giving is particularized as “cuilibet pauper” per diem trium quadran’,’ but the arithmetic throughout tends to show that this dole to the poor at the gate was mostly at the rate of 1½d. each, whereas the word denarius is always used with regard to those whom the king’s hand had blessed.

We must remember that some fifty years later the Statute of Labourers fixed the price of a day’s haymaking at one penny per man; presumably, therefore, in 1350 this sum, which in metal value was the equivalent of about 3½d. of our money and had a far greater purchasing value, was reckoned sufficient for a man’s keep.³ In 1300, judging from Edward I’s charity accounts, his food-dole was of 1½d. or 1¾d.; and we may therefore suppose that the penny given to his patients was as a remembrance rather than for board or travelling expenses, but of this we have no direct proof.

Of the rather scarce groats of Edward I—the first groats issued in England—which have come down to us, several have been gilded; some show traces of solder, where a brooch attachment had been added to them, and others are pierced. Gilt and pierced pennies are also found,⁴ but there is, so far as I can discover, no evidence,
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beyond the vague rumours already referred to, that Edward I gave aught other than the current penny, or used any form of gold, or gilt medal, in touching. His accounts mention the presentation, in church, of florins, that is to say of the well-known gold coins of the famous Tuscan city, the value of which is specified at 3s. 3d., and which were then accepted throughout the whole of western Europe. When gold, frankincense and myrrh were given, at the feast of the Epiphany, the offering of the precious metal, specified as “in pretio unius florini auri,” was almost certainly made in the form of Florentine coin. In the Ordinances of the Household of Edward II it is definitely stated that a florin shall be handed to the king, by the Treasurer, for his Epiphany offering, but no mention is made of its value in English money. The same king presented to the shrine of Saint Thomas “ij floreins au Floresc,” also “v florinis de florence le iour de la Purificacione de nostre Dame.” Like donations by Edward I were evidently made in actual florins, as the words run “quolibet florino valente iijs. iijd.” Edward II presented at the altar, on Good Friday, coins, which, after they had been blessed,

then was no English gold currency available, speaks in general terms, with regard to our early monarchs, of a possible silver gilt gift. He says it was “perhaps no other than the current silver monies of each prince, except gilded by distinction.” Thoresby notes that he has seen “such an one with a hole for the ribbon to be hung about the neck in the old Lord Fairfax’s Museum,” but he does not say of which king, only that he is represented in full face and with the arched crown as on his great seal.

1 Liber Quotidianus, pp. 27 and 29.
2 In Archaeologia, vol. xxvi, pp. 318–345, Mr. Thomas Stapleton published “A Brief Summary of the Wardrobe Accounts of the tenth, eleventh and fourteenth year of Edward II,” 1316–1318 and 1320–21. Amongst other items there are various transactions about florins and the loss entailed by their purchase at 3s. 2½d. and re-sale in England at 3s. 1½d. (p. 322), or again 3s. 5d. was paid for them to be afterwards presented in Florence to various persons at the value of 3s. 4d. These were required for an embassage going to Rome, but the Florentine coin was in the reign of Edward II easily obtainable in England, so that, if the King wished for some 3s. for his oblation, and gold was obligatory, he might obtain the florin.
4 “Item le roi doit offrir le iour de la Thesaigne [Epiphany] un florein a la remembrance des iij Rois, quelle offrend lui seria balle par le Tresorier.”
5 Liber Quotidianus, p. 30.
were returned to him in the form of cramp rings. The same course was pursued by Edward III, who, in the ninth year of his reign, long before the introduction of his gold currency, is reported as giving two florins for the purpose of making these rings, and consequently redeeming them with pence.

In later times we read much about the king's oblations, and the gold given on twelve "Collar days"—so called because the Garter knights attended on these days—was handed to the Almoner for the poor. Edward I's weekly "gate alms" have been only here particularized because we have such precise details of their amount. John, as we have seen, gave feasts to 1000 or more paupers at a time, but unfortunately I have no evidence as to the moment when the "gate alms," namely the daily distribution by the king's almoner of the dishes left from the royal table, became an established custom.


2 Chamberlayne's Anglica Notitia, page 140, of 1677. See also other dates.

3 Under various monarchs the sum expended naturally varied considerably, but so recently as 1893 Mr. Bidwell, giving an account of the Royal charities in The Guardian, computed these doles at £1600 a year. He stated that in 1848, by a fresh arrangement, the personal attendance of 150 recipients was abrogated, but they still received 26s. yearly, representing the allowance of 6d. a week, which in olden times was paid at the gate of Whitehall under the name of "Gate Alms," and 1300 widows and other pensioners still obtained relief. In Stuart days, besides 4d. in money, the gallon of beer and two loaves of bread were still dispensed to 24 persons daily, or in lieu thereof 3d. each. See Chamberlayne's Anglica Notitia, various dates.
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From very early times the king himself, at certain seasons, both in England and in France, offered his gifts to the poor, as on Maundy Thursday, and it is quite possible that the respective artists of the Utrecht¹ and Harleian Psalters² depicted scenes which they had themselves witnessed when they, at Hautvilliers in the ninth and at Canterbury in the eleventh century, illustrated the CXII psalm (in the Vulgate this is Psalm CXI), portraying “the man that feareth the Lord,” that “hath great delight” in his

¹ *The Utrecht Psalter* was once in the Cottonian Collection, but is now no longer in this country. It was in 1874 reproduced by the Paleographical Society. In 1873 a report had been addressed to the Trustees of the British Museum by A. P. Stanley, E. A. Bond, E. M. Thompson, and other eminent students, see *The Utrecht Psalter*, who variously placed its date from at the earliest the eighth to the tenth century, but nearly all believed it to be of the ninth. Dean Stanley, however, in his preface, called attention to the illustration of the 95th psalm as showing the jagged outlines characteristic of work in England in the tenth or even in the eleventh century, and the Rev. C. A. Swainson remarked on some drawings, not reproduced in the Harleian MS., as showing indications of this late period. These writers all then judged the manuscript from the English standards, but Mr. J. A. Herbert in his *Illuminated Manuscripts*, p. 108, tells us that the careful researches of Monsieur Durrieu have established “beyond any reasonable doubt that the book must have emanated from the same school as the Ebbo Gospels at Epernay, which were executed . . . at Hautvilliers, near Rheims, between 816 and 835,” see *L’Origine du Manuscrit célèbre dit le Psautier d’Utrecht*.

² *The Harleian Psalter*, Harl. 603, Brit. Mus. MSS., was originally catalogued by Mr. Herbert Wanley, Harley’s Librarian in 1720, as of the time of Edgar, and has been quoted by Thomas Wright as of the ninth century, but modern research has established that it is a free imitation, in colours, of the monochrome Utrecht or some similar Psalter, and was written and drawn in Southern England, perhaps at St. Augustine’s, Canterbury, about the beginning of the eleventh century. The artist reached only the 143rd psalm, and left spaces in his volume unfinished, illustrating in colours, whilst the 166 pictures of the Utrecht prototype are in monochrome brown. Some of the gaps have been filled by a different hand. Mr. J. A. Herbert, in his *Illuminated Manuscripts*, p. 115, writes: “Variations in detail suggest a long series of successive copies intervening between the Harleian MS. and its archetype. By this time, as we might expect, the classical flavour of the original has evaporated; and the Anglo-Saxon love of coloured line has substituted blue, green, red and sepia for the uniform brown ink of the original.” Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, in his *English Illuminated Manuscripts*, pp. 16-18, writes that the “later artists,” whilst “copying drawings from older and foreign models . . . would introduce certain modifications to suit the objects of their time and country.”
commandments, in that “he hath dispersed abroad and given to the poor.”

To the Harleian Psalter we owe our frontispiece, which by the fact of its coloured outline, jagged edges to the draperies, and type of script, has by the best modern authorities on paleography been judged to be of English origin and placed at the beginning of the eleventh or at the earliest at the end of the tenth century.

This particular drawing, although it has the Norman touch, has been referred to by several authors as throwing light on the architecture and manners of the Anglo Saxons. But we would accept more readily as final the latest ascription to the eleventh century of the whole Harleian MS. 603, and suggest with some diffidence that the likeness to the architecture of the Bayeux tapestry might perhaps indicate that this drawing in particular is amongst the additions to the unfinished folio, if such were made in the time of Edward the Confessor or William the Conqueror, as was deemed probable by Harley’s librarian. We must, however, bear in mind that the original as it appeared in the older, namely the Utrecht,

---

1 See Thomas Wright’s History of Domestic Manners in England, pp. 12 and 14-15, and W. Shaw-Sparrow’s The English House, pp. 40 and 43-44. Both these authors give a black free-hand line drawing taken from the Harleian MS., but not a direct copy either from it or the Utrecht archetype, as portions irrelevant to architecture, although descriptive of the psalm, have not been rendered.

2 J. A. Herbert, Illuminated Manuscripts, p. 110.

3 The Bayeux Tapestry, it is believed, was made for Odo, Bishop of Bayeux and Earl of Kent, probably immediately after the Conquest. Some authorities, amongst others the Provost of King’s College, Cambridge, Dr. M. R. James, see The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover, p. lxxi, refer generally to the Harl. 603 MS. as of the tenth century, but this is the earliest date of the now accepted dates, and even in Wanley’s time it was stated that some of the pictures might be restorations of the days of Edward or William the Conqueror, the manuscript being in some places defective, with spaces left for illustration, so that I venture to suggest that for our selected drawing we may be justified in assuming, as has been done regarding folio 3b of the same Psalter, see vol. i, Ancient and Modern Furniture in the Victoria and Albert Museum, p. 58, a rather later date, bearing in mind that if any of the pictures in the Utrecht MS. have, as we have seen that Mr. Swainson pointed out, late characteristics, this may certainly be said of the original illustrating Psalm cxi, and more strongly developed in our Harleian version.
manuscript does not vary greatly from our version, and these royal distributions as portrayed in the Harleian MS. must earlier have been witnessed by the artists of Hautvilliers, most probably at Rheims.

But may we not fancy that the Monk of Canterbury, whilst adhering in the main to the foreign picture set before him as illustrative of "Beatus vir qui timet Dominum," actually saw such distributions at the English Court? In 1042 Edward the Confessor began his reign, bringing with him from Normandy his pious customs and marrying, in 1045, Edgitha the daughter of Earl Godwin. May we not think that he is here portrayed as assisted by her in his public ministrations? Be this as it may, I take this opportunity of bringing before you a vivid presentment of charitable distribution, whether or not any king is specially intended. The basket, or "maund," in the hands of the presiding seated figure, the almoner at the side door, clothing the naked, the wine, poured out by the servants in the foreground, are all suggestive of the Maundy celebrations, whilst the recumbent man, within the house behind the noble lady or queen, showing the cure of the sick, supplies a detail not particularized in psalm cxii, in the Vulgate psalm cxi. All are indicative of a time when the poor flocked to the palace daily for "gate alms"; but not to the palace only, for we have records of Maundy distributions by bishops, priests, and even by various private persons. A little later we find Henry VII setting aside, besides daily alms at 37s. 11d. per week, £10 a month, increased to £20 by Edward VI, to be given by the royal almoner to the poor,

1 Dr. M. R. James writes in his Ancient Libraries, p. 532, "I venture to add" [to his list of Canterbury MSS.] "the Harleian MS. 603, and to regard it as a St. Augustine's book." Also in his preface, lxxi, he writes that it is "in a round hand characteristic of St. Augustine's."

2 The differences between the earlier and later drawing consist principally in the arrangement of details in the building, notably in the tiles—the general theme and position of the figures is the same.

3 Mr. W. J. Andrew points out that, although not wearing a crown, this may well be a king, as at that time the crowns were worn only at the three great feasts, and Maundy Thursday was in Lent. The presence of the Huscarles suggests to him that the donors represent royal personages.
these sums appearing regularly in their respective accounts,¹ and during Henry's journeys we read frequently of "Alms as he cam' upon the waye." Mary I caused 5s. 5d. to be distributed daily by Dr. Bill, her Chief-almoner, "at the Court Gate," this would amount to the usual 37s. 11d. each week.² Elizabeth, in February, 1588-9, gave orders as to compensations to "the Pannyer man and undercook," so that the distributions to the Poor at the Gate at "Grey's Inne" might be continued thrice a week.³ Her distribution is specified at 5d. each to thirteen poor men a day, which explains more definitely the reason of so curious a sum as 37s. 11d. per week.⁴

But to return to our Plantagenet kings, from whom we have too far digressed.

We have noticed in the British Museum the beautifully illuminated fourteenth-century book of manuscripts, in Latin and Norman French, dealing with various ceremonial and historical matters in the reigns of the first three Edwards and Richard II.⁵ This collection belonged to the antiquary William Lambard, who in the time of Elizabeth made notes in English in the margins—and one of these notes, in a document dealing with the times of Edward II and reading, "Rings to heale the King's Evel," attracted my

¹ The Privy Purse Expenses of Henry VIII, edited by Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas: "Item the same day paid to Master Baugh for the Kinge's pryvey almes for ij moneth to be ended the last daye of December, [1532], xx li," and many similar entries. For Edward VI's monthly outlay, see P.R.O. MSS. Exchequer Various, Bundle 425, No. 5, and the Trevelyen Papers, vol. i, published by the Camden Society in 1856, Household book of Edward VI, p. 203. "Item paid to Dr. Cox, the K's alemomiser for so much money by him disbursed and employed for the Kinges majesties privie almes . . . after the rate of xx li. the monethe, the sum of clx li." This sum covered seven months in 1547.

² Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1547-80, p. 56, Jan. 1, 1553-4.

³ Nichol's Progresses of Elizabeth, vol. i, p. 28.

⁴ Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 1644, "xii pore men at Her Maiestie's gate every one of them vd. per diem." September, 1581.

⁵ This collection, to which I have already referred, see p. 59 and note 4, made by Lambard, consists of Latin and a few French documents of the fourteenth century, written in the reign of Richard II. The French portion which I quote is indexed under the head of Ordinances of the Household of Edward II, circa 1318-20. See Brit. Mus. Addit. 32097, f. 46 b to f. 70.
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attention. But the Elizabethan student's interpretation of the passage seems to me mistaken and refers only to the king's usual Good Friday's offering for cramp rings\(^1\) to heal epilepsy and not scrofula.\(^2\) The word for these blessed rings—in modern French anneaux, in Norman French aneals or anaus—is here contracted into anulx. After presenting at the cross 5s. the king offered yet another 5s. for rings "a donez pour medecine a divers gentz," with the usual reference to an extra gift in the presence of the "espine Dieu."

This is, however, a matter of small importance, for the wardrobe accounts of Edward II's tenth, eleventh and eighteenth years are in the Library of the Society of Antiquaries, and two of the earliest of these three, being those of the years 1316 to 1318, were published in *Archaeologia*, as I have stated, in 1835,\(^3\) together with an abstract of the fourteenth year in private hands.

The account of 1316, as epitomized by Mr. Stapleton, shows forth the journey of Edward II to repel a Scottish foray, and we see that the king, although on a warlike mission, found time to heal at each place where he stayed on his way, namely, at St. Albans twenty-two persons, and four days later at Kingscliff "other seventeen"; at

---

\(^1\) Andrew Borde, writing in 1542 in his chapter I of his *Introduction to Knowledge*, says: "The Kings of Englande doth halowe every yere Crampe rynges ye whyche rynges worne on ones finger doth helpe them whyche hath the Crampe."

\(^2\) Brit. Mus. addit. MS. 32097, 69b. "Item le Roi doit offrer de certein le iour de Grand Venderdis a crouce vs. queux il est accustumex receivre divers lui a le mene le chapelyn a fair ent anulx a doner pur medecine a divers genz e a revientr autre vs. si l'espine dieu y soit il doit offrer a lespine iijs.", which I would translate "The King should offer without fail, on the day of Good Friday, to the Cross which he is accustomed to receive before him at the hands of the chaplain, vs. to make rings to give for medicine to divers folk, and to redeem them another v.s.; if the Thorn of God be there he should offer to the Thorn iijs."

\(^3\) *Archaeologia*, vol. xxvi. *A Brief Summary of the Wardrobe Accounts* of the tenth, eleventh and fourteenth years of Edward II, by Thomas Stapleton, pp. 318-345. The last mentioned of those books was then in the collection of Mr. Joseph Hunton, of Richmond. John Topham, in his *Wardrobe Book of Edward I*, says that those of the fifteenth and sixteenth years of Edward II were, when he published, in the library of Thomas Astle, see *Liber Cotidianus*, p. xxi.
Clipsham, the next day, eleven, and at Wilsford fifteen. He passed a week at Lincoln, where he touched twenty-six, twenty-seven more at Bentley, or on the road thither, seventeen at Tadcaster and finally seventy-nine at York, where he remained some three months.¹

Let us turn to Edward III, and again I must trespass on the figures taken from the *Computus Gardrobe*, 12-14 Edward III, at the Public Record Office, by Dr. Crawfurd. Here we have the definite proof that one penny was the sum given to each patient: "And for 885 sick persons blessed by the King and by the grace of God cured of the King’s Evil during the time mentioned [11 July, 12 Edward III, to 28 May, 14 Edward III] to each 1d. from the King’s alms, 73s. 9d."² Dr. Crawfurd computes that our third Edward must "have touched at least four or five hundred persons in a year."³

But enough said of these early kings. In 1348 came the Black Death, followed by constantly recurring plague for the ensuing 300 years, and to this Dr. Crawfurd attributes the periods of silence by our chroniclers concerning touching, but considers that certain words in John Mirfield’s *Breviarium* of the reign of Richard II are at least

¹ *Archaeologia*, vol. xxvi, pp. 319-20.
³ Dr. Crawfurd, p. 41.
suggestive of the continuity of healing. ¹ He, however, says that Mirfield may have referred to the French kings only.

Fear of infection would be a restraining reason and perhaps accounts for the complete absence of healing items in such wardrobe or household books as have been searched by Dr. Crawfurd or are available to me of Richard II,² and Henry IV,³ of Edward IV⁴ or Richard III.⁵ "Medycinable rings of gold and silver," namely "cramp-rings,"⁶ that other form of cure pertaining to royalty,

¹ A Latin medical work, Brit. Mus. Harl. MS. 3, entitled *Breviarium Bartholomaei*, containing the words, "And if that measure be not pleasing, let us go to the King, since kings have been accustomed to cure it by touch alone." See Dr. Crawfurd, p. 42.


⁴ Liber Niger Domus Regis Anglica Edw. IV. See *Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household*, published by the Society of Antiquaries in 1790; and the *Wardrobe Accounts of Edward IV*, Anno 1480, under Piers Courtney, by Sir Nicholas H. Nicolas. The latter only mentions clothes and household articles and not charities.

⁵ *Archaeologia*, vol. i, pp. 361-380, by Dr. Milles, Dean of Exeter: "Wardrobe Accounts for 1483, 1st year of the reign of our Sovereign Lorde Richard III."

⁶ *Collection of Ordinances*, p. 23, as above. Cramp rings were much sought after abroad, and Mrs. Cust, in her *Gentlemen Errant*, mentions a request for such from Germany in the sixteenth century, then called an "English ring." They were blessed by the king and given to epileptics. The ceremony of "hallowing the Cramp-rings" by Henry VIII is given at some length in a manuscript which I have studied at the College of Arms. It is a mid-sixteenth-century collection of royal ceremonies, and describes the Good Friday function under Henry VIII of blessing the rings after "crepinge to the Cross," laid on a cushion before the altar, where the rings of gold and silver were offered. *College of Arms*, M. 7. It is also described under Mary I in the Venetian Calendar, vol. vi, p. 436, and Bishop Burnet, in his *History of the Reformation*, book II, part II, p. 414 of the edition of 1829, published the Latin service, apparently from Mary's Breviary, now in the library of Westminster Cathedral. Beckett, in his *Free and Impartial Enquiry*, Appendix V, prints the cramp ring rubric and calls attention to the statement of Andrew Borde, a physician of the time of Henry VII and Edward VI, that "the King's Majesty hath a great helpe in the matter of hallowynge Cramp Rings, and so gyuen without money or petition." See Andrew Borde's *Breviary of Health*, Chap. 327. Of Richard II and Henry IV, Dr. Crawfurd mentions, p. 42 of his *King's Evil*, evidence of medicinal rings. In
Royal Charities.

are mentioned in the reign of Edward IV in the Liber Niger Domus, 25s. being specified as spent for that purpose, but the excellent abstracts and translations of the early Household and Wardrobe Accounts prior to Tudor times usually give little information concerning charities. Many of these, however, contain only matters referring to some particular event—a royal wedding, or coronation, or details of the receipts instead of the expenditure. Other manuscripts, yet unpublished, await the laborious elucidation of those more expert than myself in reading early script or contracted Latin.

Bryan Tuke's account book, he being Treasurer of the Chamber to Henry VIII, we notice a large outlay in cramp-rings, 40 ounces of rings "of gold of the finest" at 41s. 4d. an ounce and 130 ounces of silver rings at 4s. 4d. per ounce. Robert Amadas, "Maister of the Kingis Iuelles," received £118 16s. 8d. in December, 1532, for these articles, namely, £8 more than is warranted if "gold of the finest" be correctly reckoned at 41s. 4d. per ounce. The price is somewhat puzzling, for, by the proclamation of August 22, 1526, it had been raised from 40s. to 44s., and again, on November 5 in the same year, to 45s. We should expect to find the valuation higher, rather than lower, in 1532, and, had I not seen the original manuscript, I should have thought that there might be an error in the reading adopted in the Trevelyan Papers as showing the price of gold at this period. I would suggest that the figures xli are a slip of the pen of the sixteenth-century scribe for xlv, and that gold stood at 45s. 4d. per ounce, the sum then working out correctly. See Trevelyan Papers, vol. i, p. 174, and P.R.O. Exchequer Accounts Various, Bundle 420, No. 11, f. 140. Henry VIII, in the following year 1533, gave sixty specially blessed golden rings to Hubertus, the envoy of the Palsgrave Frederick II, Elector Palatine. See Mrs. Henry Cust's Gentlemen Errant, p. 357, taken from the original narrative of Hubertus Thomas Leodius: "Annalium et vita et rebus gestis illustrissimi Principis Frederici Elect. Palat.," pub. 1624, but written in the middle of the sixteenth century. Much light is thrown on the subject in a recently published article, "The Blessing of Cramp Rings," by Dr. Crawfurd, in Some Papers on Early History of Science, edited by Dr. Singer.

1 See Mr. S. R. Scargill Bird's Guide to the Public Records, p. 246, where it is stated that it was the duty of the Treasurer of the Wardrobe and his Controller "to keep the King's money, jewels, gifts and private receipts, and make a separate roll to be returned annually into the Exchequer." In another roll were entered the daily and necessary expenses which comprised "... gifts, alms and oblations" amongst various other items. Much information concerning the Treasurer of the Chamber and his books is contained in Dr. A. P. Newton's "The King's Chamber," in the English Historical Review for July, 1917.
Angels as Healing-pieces for the King's Evil.

But in spite of the absence of direct evidence, so far forthcoming, concerning "touching" by Edward IV, Henry VI,¹ Edward V, and Richard III, Dr. Crawfurd² was struck by the introduction of the angel by the first mentioned of these kings and the fact that the legend and the figure of Saint Michael³ were as applicable to the healing ceremony as was the case under Henry VII. The angel was first ordered to be struck in an indenture of the year 1465, and its issue was continued during the brief restoration of Henry VII in


² The King's Evil, p. 49.

³ We must remember that the selection of St. Michael for the type also of the angel was suggestive of healing. Mr. G. F. Hill, in a paper recently read before the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, on Apollo and St. Michael, brought forward the analogies as healers between Apollo, the slayer of the python and sender of and preserver from plague, and St. Michael. In representations of the saint the Destroying Angel of the pestilence appears in the form of a serpent, and St. Michael figures as the healer or dragon-queller in the legends of art. It would almost seem that the type of an angel, as the healer, trampling on pestilence, taken in connection with the legend placed upon the coin by Edward IV, is strongly indicative that it was intended as a touchpiece by its originator. See Journal of Hellenic Studies vol. xxxvi, pp. 134-162.
Inasmuch as Henry VI did not re-ascend the throne until after Michaelmas, and was again a prisoner on Maundy Thursday, he is unlikely to have held an Easter healing; but the turn in his fortunes was unexpected and the angels which he coined may have been intended for the Easter-day, signalized by the battle of Barnet. Excepting the increased sums spent by Edward I at Easter, we have, however, no indication that healing was at first limited to certain periods, but rather that kings touched those presented to them on their travels. It is perhaps worth noting that an angel of Henry VI, in the fine collection kept in the Bodleian Library, is pierced with the very small hole, which we usually associate with early touchpieces. It is, however, fair to state that the aperture is far from the edge and therefore inconvenient for suspension, and it is not well to rely too much on the evidence of piercing. The words “Per Crucem tuam salva nos Christe Redemptor” on Henry’s angels and those of Edward IV are at least suggestive that Edward caused the coin to be made for use as a touchpiece. Moreover, angels were the only gold coins issued by Edward V and Richard III, a fact which gives colour to the possibility that they were connected with a religious ceremony and were specially minted for the king. All these monarchs had political reasons for wishing to accentuate their “divine right” either by unction or heredity: few had more than Edward IV, and Dr. Crawfurd is of opinion that he probably healed. But perhaps these reasons were yet stronger in the case of Henry VII, who no doubt wished to impress on the minds of his subjects his own personal right to the throne and the approval of Heaven of his assumption of the Crown, by his possession of “the imperishable gift” which, according to the belief of his age, had, to quote Polydore Vergil, from the time of Edward the Confessor, “indeed descended by right of inheritance as it were to the kings.”

1 See our p. 57.
2 Historia Anglicana, lib. viii, p. 143, ed. 1570: “Quod quidem immortale munus, iure quasi hæreditario, ad posteriores regis manauit: nam regis Angliae etiam nunc tactu, ac quibusdam hymnis non sine caerimoniiis prius recitatis strumosos sanant.” See also Dr. Crawfurd, p. 51.
It is significant also that when Henry VII changed the legend on some of his angels, adopting, as Dr. Crawfurd remarks, the words which adorned the noble of Edward III, namely "Iesus autem transiens per medium illorum ibat," he did not abandon altogether the "Per Crucem tuam salva nos Christe Redemptor" legend, but issued angels contemporaneously with the alternative texts from scripture. We find the words indifferently on coins bearing mint-marks, cinquefoil and escallop, and I would suggest, with all diffidence, that the one was made for currency and the other retaining the Per Crucem legend was primarily intended for the healing and church ceremonies. In favour of this hypothesis is the continuation, by Henry VIII and Edward VI, of the last mentioned text on the angel, whilst "Iesus autem," etc., found its place on the sovereigns.

Some of Henry VII angels bearing the words "Iesus autem" might be regarded as amulets, and pierced for wearing in battle. I can, however, only say that such pierced angels of Henry VII as I have seen, have borne the Per Crucem legend; but were it otherwise, the matter of a hole or not is no strong proof, for, as I have said, many old coins are unfortunately pierced at the present day by people who like to wear them. We have seen that this was probably the case with the sovereign in the Bodleian Collection; but putting aside this coin, it has been questioned why our first Tudor king gave

1 Dr. Crawfurd, p. 50.
2 Essex, when starting on his naval expedition to Spain in 1597, wrote to thank Elizabeth for some presents she had given him: "Above all the angel which you sent to guard me." This would probably be an angel of Henry VII, as Elizabeth's own angels bore words suitable to the healing and not to preservation from danger. See The Successors of Drake, by Julian Corbett, pp. 167-8.
3 To tell a contemporary piercing from a modern, one should look whether the hole has been punched by an instrument made for the purpose, a hollow punch which removed the surplus gold such as would be used at the Royal Mint. This rule is, however, not infallible, for the piercings in some of the late touchpieces are very rough. A drilled hole made by a jeweller, still more by an amateur, generally retains some of the gold behind, whilst that made by a punch is smooth on both the sides; some touchpieces, however, appear as if roughly drilled, especially the silver pieces of James II, which look as though pierced by a gimlet. But as a broad rule it should be remembered that until the time of James I the hole was very small.
so large a benefaction as an angel.¹  Parsimonious as Henry VII is usually said to have been, his exactions were more a matter of policy to weaken his disloyal subjects than of greed, and his privy purse expenses show that, like his son Henry VIII, he was apt to spend money in jewels, to play cards, and would be really generous on occasion. We find him distributing considerable sums in groats and half-groats “in almes,” giving 5s. to a woman who merely handed him two glasses of water, and an angel to “a Walshe man that maketh rymes,”² and such trifling donations as 3s. 4d. to another “Walsshman that com oute of Wales,” or to one that found a hare the same sum.³ His usual Sunday oblation was 6s. 8d., as it remained, in spite of the alteration in value of the angel under his son and grandson. He gave 37s. 11d. weekly to the poor at his gate,⁴ and his “Maundy” is regularly chronicled. His church gift, on St. George’s day, for instance, was sometimes 30s.,⁵ whilst Henry VIII and Edward VI at that feast usually gave only the stereotyped 6s. 8d., apparently obligatory on most Saints’ days. He paid the

¹ The purchasing power of an angel would be about three weeks’ sustenance. In The Household Expenses of the Earl of Northumberland, running from about 1512–25, edited by Bishop Percy, the editor computes the weekly disbursements for a household consisting of 166 persons as working out at £6 6s. 5½d. each per annum, or 2s. 3½d. per week, so that board wages might be assumed to stand at about 3d. a day. Henry VIII allowed 20d. a week to his under servants, 4d. a day to the more favoured, as I find in the various manuscript account books of the king.

⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Astle’s Appendix to vol. xii of Henry’s History of Great Britain.
fees of the prisoners in the gaols and also the debts for which they were imprisoned, if they did not exceed 40s., and, according to Grafton's Chronicle,1 "some he relieved that were condemned in ten pounds." Is it then so remarkable that in inaugurating a special service, calling attention with some pomp to the divine blessing on his assumption of the throne, he should use so important a coin? I am not saying that there is any certainty that the angel was not already so used by Edward IV, inasmuch as the absence of all mention of healing in certain household regulations of Edward2 may also be advanced with regard to other monarchs, witness the like silence in several account books of Henry VIII,3 who is proved to have healed by the items entered in other documents by Bryan Tuke,4 Treasurer of the Chamber. But given that, as usually believed, Henry VII was the first monarch to bestow gold, let us remember that, as Dr. Crawfurd points out, the expense, even at the then relatively high value of money, was not very great, judging from the evidence at hand in the Chamber Accounts from October 20th, 1499 to May 20th, 1502, the period selected by this author for his research in Henry's Privy Purse charges.5

Nevertheless, the angel was no mean gift; it weighed 80 grains of standard gold and, being a doctor's fee, was very suitable to the healing purpose.6 The earliest record upon which I have chanced

2 Liber Niger Domus, see ante, note 4, p. 67.
3 Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 21481 from 1509-1518, and Arundel MS. 97, from 1537–8 to 1541–2, contain church offerings, etc., but make no mention of healing. The same may be said of Exchequer Various, Bundle 420, No. 11, from 1529–1531, at the Record Office. Most of the Household books contain the Maundy expenses, and various small payments such as might be included in the Privy Purse, under which department the healing was administered.
4 Henry VIII Privy Purse Accounts, containing mention of healing between 1529 and 1532, may be found in Bryan Tuke's Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 20,030, and Le Neve's extracts from the same, Landsdowne MS. 737.
5 Dr. Crawfurd, p. 50 and P.R.O., Exchequer Various, Bundle 415, No. 3. John Heron's Account.
6 The Angel-noble, valued at 6s. 8d., was a doctor's habitual fee, and curiously enough after the coin had risen in value and been finally withdrawn from coinage, the term "noble," signifying 6s. 8d., was still used by Dr. Edward Browne,
is amongst entries from the Household Accounts of Henry VII made by Craven Ord. It is under date December 24th, in this king's seventh regnal year, 1491, and reads: "For heling of a seke body this day 6s. 8d." The same extract was quoted by Samuel Bentley in his *Excerpta Historica*, with a note to say that in the Privy Purse expenses of Henry VIII this sum was increased to 7s. 6d., the consequence of the enhanced price of the angel. At the end of his notebook Ord again quotes, under date June 28th, 1505: "For helying of 4 sekemen, 26s. 8d." These extracts were made from the series of accounts kept by the Treasurer of the King's Chamber, John Heron, now mostly preserved in the Public Record Office; but Thomas who, writing to his father in 1682, says that the salary at St. Bartholomew's Hospital where he had just been appointed physician was "quarterly nine pounds and a noble for the patients within the home and for out-patients at Easter fifteen pounds, which comes to fifty-two pounds and a noble a year." See *Works of Sir Thomas Browne*, vol. iii, p. 486, edition of 1852, edited by Simon Wilkin. This is the more remarkable as the angel had continued to be the established fee irrespective of its rise in value, and under Henry VIII, when it stood at 7s. 6d., was still paid to the doctor, 20 angels being delivered for a "physician called Doctor Nicholas," on Feb. 4th, 1532, equalling £7 10s. See *Privy Purse Expenses of Henry VIII*, p. 192.

1 Addit. MS. Brit. Mus. 7099, purchased at the sale of Ord's MSS. in 1829. During Ord's service at the Exchequer he made selections, which he entered in two small notebooks, of the Household Expenses of Henry VII and VIII.

2 See Craven Ord's Addit. MS. 7099, p. 2. I have been unable to find out whence Ord obtains this extract. We learn from Dr. A. P. Newton's "The King's Chamber, under the Early Tudors," *English Historical Review*, July, 1917, that "during Craven Ord's service in the exchequer he made selections from the payments of Henry VII and Henry VIII in an indiscriminating manner." His notebooks, Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 7099, for the reign of Henry VII and 7100 for that of Henry VIII, are useful, but being merely extracts taken somewhat at random, they give no indications of the numbers healed, and the fact that only five cases of healing are reported by him between 1491 and 1505 proves nothing, for we have evidence of many other cures, within the same period, notably in 1499-1500, and Brit. Mus. MS. Addit. MS. 21480, whence Ord made many of his extracts, whilst it extends in larger matters from 1499 to 1505, only gives the Privy Purse accounts from April to September, 1505.

3 *Excerpta Historica*, p. 87, published 1831. Bentley makes no further reference to healing.

Angels as Healing-pieces for the King's Evil.

Astle, through whose hands some of them had already passed, had circa 1790 contributed an appendix to Robert Henry's History of Great Britain, selecting a different example of healing. Astle, quoting an entry in Henry's fourteenth regnal year, 1498-9, writes: "Item for heling a seke maid 6s. 8d.", and apparently non-conversant with the coinage, adds a note: "perhaps the piece of gold given by the King in touching for the evil. Q. If there was such a piece of coin?" Dr. Crawfurd goes to the fountain head at the Record Office and searches through Henry's fifteenth to eighteenth regnal years, whence he gives many extracts. To these, I have been able to add several others from the same book, and without saying definitely that my research into even one year was exhaustive, seeing the ease with which one may miss an entry in the many pages of ornate handwriting, I find that between October, 1499, and the following July inclusive, Henry touched 26 persons, of whom seven were presented to him in one day. In the following year plague reigned, and probably this is the reason why neither Dr. Crawfurd nor I have noticed any more healing items in this manuscript volume until the February of the seventeenth year, a gap of seventeen months. The total expense required, therefore, from October, 1499,

1 Appendix v to vol. vi of Henry's History of Great Britain, ed. 1771-93.
2 Exchequer Accounts Various, Bundle 425, No. 3. See also Dr. Crawfurd's shorter extract on his p. 50, mentioning the healing of thirteen persons.
3 Henry's regnal year runs from August 22nd. The following extracts are from his fifteenth year, 1499-1500. The actual dates are approximate only, as several days are sometimes grouped together.

Week ending October 26th, "Item for heling of ij seke folkes, xiiij iiiijd."
Do. November 15th, "Item for heling of ij seke bodys xiiij iiiijd."
Do. November 22nd, "Itm for heling of a seke body viij viijd."
Do. February 28th, "Item for heling of a seke body viij viijd."
Do. March 1st to 6th, "Itm for heling of ij seke folkes xiiij iiiijd."
Do. March 21st, "Item for heling of viij seke folkes xlvj viijd."
Do. April 5th, "Item for heling of ij seke folkes xiiij iiiijd."
Do. April 16th," Itm for heling of iij seke folkes xxvj viijd."
Do. July 5th, "Itm for heling of a sekeman viij viijd."
Do. July 11th-16th, "Item for heling of iij seke folkes xx."

4 The seventeenth regnal year begins August 22nd, 1501. The first healing entry I found was in the week of February 26th, 1501-2, "Item for heling of a
to May, 1502, inclusive, would be covered by £11, or taking the higher average of the nine months between the first-mentioned date and the following July, when plague probably intervened, the sum would amount to £7 13s. 4d. This is not an alarming amount for the expenditure of a king who was content to scatter largess on Good Friday to the extent of £6 3s. in groats and £50 in half-groats, irrespective of his Maundy gifts of the previous day.  

All other accounts of Henry VII through which I have searched, have dealt with matters of receipts, obligations and debts on a larger scale, and only one so far as I could see of these has notices of healing, namely Brit. Mus. Addit MS. 21,480, from which, as we have seen, Ord abstracted some notes. A solitary entry concerning touching: “Item for heling of iiij Sekemen xxvj° viijd,” cast light on touching in June of the year 1505, in accounts running from April to August in that year, and alone rewarded the time I bestowed on this manuscript. So far, therefore, Ord’s untraced reference to a “healing” in 1491 alone shows that Henry by that time was bestowing 6s. 8d. on his patients, and it is with regret that we cannot be more precise with regard to the moment when he arranged his church rubric.

Instituted by our first Tudor king, the healing service was, according to William Beckett, a writer of the early eighteenth century, founded on an ancient holy exorcism which he prints in seke man vj° viijd.” March 16th, “Item for heling ij seke folkes xiiij° iiijd,” and the last was of May 20th, “Item for heling of ij seke folkes xiiij° iiijd.” The book ends at the beginning of the eighteenth year. We have thus 33 cases in rather less than three years, of which 26 are within nine months of one another.

1 Exchequer Accounts Various, Bundle 415, No. 3. Public Record Office. Henry VII, April, 1500. The following year the groats were £8 14s., and the demi-groats £21, and in the seventeenth year the groats £6 12s. 6d., the half-groats £60. Henry VIII’s Good Friday extra alms appear also on a variable scale, see Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 20,030 in his thirtieth regnal year. “Paid in Almesse by the Kinges Comandement on Good Friday xl s,” whilst in the twenty-second year we read, “Delivered to the Kinges Almosiner, to be by him distributed in the way of Kinges almes to divers pore people at the holy time of Easter C li.” See Exchequer Various, P.R.O., Bundle 420, No. 11.
Angels as Healing-pieces for the King's Evil. He attributes the introduction of the gold amulet to Henry, saying "We are to observe that it does not appear that the use of the gold was established before the ceremony of Henry the Seventh in which its manner of being used is directed." Beckett also gives the office used by Henry, and in more accessible form it may be read as printed by Dr. Crawfurd, who chooses for reproduction the version with the English rubric which was translated in the time of James II, who found the innovations of Elizabeth and James I too "Protestant" for his notions. I hope to publish the service used by Charles II when concluding, in our next volume, my account of healing, and it is only necessary to say now that at all times the ritual consisted of prayers and of portions from the scripture, and that the sick man kneeling before the king was first stroked by the royal hand, and then, after more prayers, the angel comes on the scene. "The King shall lay his hand upon the Sore of the Sick Person" reads the rubric; then follow a few versicles and a second gospel from which the words: "Erat lux vera quae illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum" are to be "repeated so long as the King shall be crossing the Sore of the Sick Person with an Angel Noble, and the Sick Person to have the same Angel hanged about his Neck and wear it until he be full whole." Here, then, in the time of Henry VII is our first absolute certainty since the reign of

1 A Free and Impartial Enquiry into the Antiquity and Efficacy of Touching for the Cure of the King's Evil, by William Beckett, published 1722, pp. 51-52, and Appendix vi, Beckett, and Dr. Crawfurd also, see the latter's p. 56, refer to the existence of another exorcism printed in Rome in 1584, which contains other points of similarity with the healing service.
2 Beckett, p. 46.
3 Ibid., Appendix No. VII and Dr. Crawfurd, p. 52, also Brit. Mus. 1037 a.18, in duodecimo in English; and in Latin, Brit. Mus. 6.b.10 and 349 c.101 in quarto and octavo respectively, but the rubric in all three is in English.
4 "In 1686 A.D. when James II was striving to lead back the erring nation to the Roman Catholic fold, the King's Printer issued two volumes slightly different in form, entitled 'The Ceremonies for the Healing of them that be Diseased with the King's Evil used in the time of King Henry VII'." See Dr. Crawfurd, p. 52.
Edward III of the numismatic side of the question, but the exact date when this rubric was first arranged is still in doubt.

Before finally leaving the period of Henry VII, let us glance for a moment at the evolution in the artistic type of the angel coinage which is noticeable in his reign. In one of the Memorabilia published by the Medici Society, Mr. G. F. Hill has shown us various renderings in statuary and paintings of St. Michael between the fifth and fifteenth centuries. The figure is mostly represented draped or in plain armour, whether as the slayer of plague, symbolized by the dragon or devil, or as the weigher of souls. It is in the latter capacity, on a fifteenth-century wall-painting in South Leigh Church, Oxfordshire, that we find the Archangel, as in the earlier coinages, with legs and arms covered with feathers. By the courtesy of Mr. Arthur Gardner, I am permitted to reproduce his photograph of this painting, as we now see it, on a slightly larger scale than it had already appeared in the Memorabilia. It is interesting to us, in that we see the English conception of St. Michael “habited,” as wrote Mr. Waller, describing, in 1873, the wall-painting then recently discovered, “in a closely fitting embroidered jupon, the arms and legs in plumose scales, a convention in very common use in the representation of the Heavenly Host in the fifteenth century.” The details of the angel, continued Mr. Waller, “are precisely similar to the treatment observed in the sculptured figures of the Heavenly Host in the Beauchamp Chapel in St. Mary’s, Warwick.” Now, in the reign of

1 Memorabilia, No. 114. “St. Michael the Archangel.”
2 This wall-painting, which occupies a space between the south entrance and a window in the south wall, measures 11 ft. by 10 ft. It was fully described by the late Mr. J. G. Waller in 1873, in the Royal Archaeological Journal, p. 35 et seq., vol. xxx. This writer also made use of Mr. Gardner’s photograph in an extra-illustrated copy of another article on the subject of wall-paintings, written two years earlier in the Surrey Archaeological Society’s vol. v, which he presented to the Society of Antiquaries for their library. He then wrote that the South Leigh paintings were restored, but that the repairs consisted principally in details concerning the Virgin’s figure, etc., and not affecting that of St. Michael.
3 Recent Discoveries of Wall-paintings at Chaldon, Surrey, Wisborough Green, Sussex, and South Leigh, Oxford, p. 53.
4 In a wall-painting in the Chapel of the Trinity at Stratford-on-Avon ascribed to the early fifteenth century, depicting the murder of Beckett, an angel is portrayed
ST. MICHAEL.

(From a Fifteenth-Century Wall-Painting in South Leigh Church, Oxfordshire.)
Henry VII these plumose scales began to give way on the angels to cross-hatching on the legs and a plain breastplate, tending towards the armour worn by Saint Michael in Italian paintings of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and whilst these feathers are seen under Edward IV, Henry VI, and in the first coinage of Henry VII, the second angel of the last-mentioned king is differently clothed. Feathers on the hips were, however, retained in an altered form and appear markedly on the coins of the immediately succeeding monarchs inclusive of James I.

The reign of Henry VIII was signalized, as Sir John Evans held, by the making of a particular angel with an annulet, not as a mint mark, but as an indication in what place the coin should be bored, without defacing the king's name or the head of the saint. From the records of touching by this pleasure-loving monarch Dr. Crawfurd gives an abridgement from Nicolas's *Privy Purse Expenses of Henry VIII*, amounting to 59 patients in various localities in three years, between January, 1529–30 and December, 1532. To these I must add two certain and six more uncertain cases which had escaped with similar plumose scales all over the body. See Plate xv of Thomas Fisher's *Stratford-on-Avon*.

From Sir N. H. Nicolas's *Privy Purse Expenses of Henry VIII*, Dr. Crawfurd, see *The King's Evil*, p. 58, obtained the following figures. "1530: January 8th, touched 2; January 27th (at York Place), touched 4; April 5th, touched 4; April 25th, touched 5; May 26th, touched 5; 1531: August 26th, touched 1; September 6th, touched 2; September 17th, touched 2; September 18th, touched 2; September 26th, touched 5; October 23rd, touched 1; 1532: April 2nd, touched 9; May 9th, touched 2; May 31st, touched 3; June 13th, touched 2; June 27th, touched 1; August 15th (at Woodstock) touched 2; August 27th (at King's Langley), touched 1; September 17th, touched 2; October 8th, touched 1; November 11th (at Calais), touched 1; December 1st, touched 2."

To these I must add one child healed on July 28th, 1531, and another on July 26th, 1532, and there are gifts "to iij sike women at Grenewiche," on May 19th, 1531, and to "a pour man that was sike in wyndesor," on the 9th July, and "iij sike men at Waltham," on the previous 1st of October. See Brit. Mus. Addit. 20,030, folios, 40, 70 b, 75 b, 78, and 122 b, and Nicolas, pp. 77, 135, 145, 150, and 237. The printed volume was edited by Nicolas from the above MS., but, as it is defective, he supplied such omissions as he could from the notes and extracts made by Peter le Neve in 1723, now pp. 109–31, Egerton MS., in the British Museum, but even thus payments of the last days of April, 1531, and parts of May are missing.
Dr. Crawfurd's notice, for though transcribed by Nicolas in copying the manuscript, now Brit. Mus. Addit. 20,030, with which I have compared the printed volume, this editor did not record these other cures in his index. By "uncertain" I mean instances where only sickness and not healing is specified, but the gift of an angel to each "sike" man or woman is significant that they were amongst those whom the king's hand had blessed, for Henry's usual response to beggars was a crown or less. If an angel, namely "vij s vj d," the sum at which it was then current, was given for other than healing purposes, the reason in "rewarde" or "by waye of almesse" is usually noted, but not in the above instances. Dr. Crawfurd shows that these healings were held wherever Henry might chance to be, at York Place, Woodstock, Langley, or Calais, and we may add Havering, Windsor, and Waltham. This practice, of touching in his royal progresses, suggests at the first glance the reason why so many as three coins were found pierced for healing in the small hoard of gold coins discovered at St. Albans in 1872, and described by Sir John Evans whilst making the above remarks on the annulet.¹ The purse must, however, have been dropped in or after 1559-60, for it contained a half-sovereign of Elizabeth of that date and type, Ruding, Plate X, Fig. 2. There seems no reason why three touchpieces of the deceased king should be found together; unless the Almoner or Clerk of the Closet of Elizabeth should have carried Henry's healing pieces. Of 29 coins in the hoard, five were angels, of the type of Ruding, Plate V, Fig. 6, or Snelling, Plate II, Fig. 18, or Ruding, Plate VI, Fig. 6, bearing three differing mint marks. Whether, however, they were distinguished by portcullis or castle, or fleur-de-lis, whether the abbreviation for France read FR' or F', the annulet was in all at the end of the legend, and three of the five were "neatly perforated with a small hole through the centre of the annulet, and were thus adapted for suspension."² In Sir John's

² Ibid., p. 190. Had the Elizabeth coin been absent, the pierced angels of Henry VIII would act as touchpieces for Edward VI, for it is by no means unlikely
opinion they were thus made in preparation for piercing, but in view of the Elizabethan coin of 1559-60 in the hoard, the theory that the pierced angels were actually touchpieces seems difficult to sustain, unless, as is quite possible, the angels of earlier sovereigns were sometimes used at this period, as they later certainly were under Charles II.

With regard to this peculiar coinage of angels, it is matter of regret that I have found at present no information of the numbers applying for healing to Henry VIII in his later years.

The collection of royal ceremonies of this period, preserved in the Heralds' College, gives no directions concerning touching, although the Maundy washing of feet and the blessing of the Cramp-ring services are described at length. The interesting Ordinances for the Household made at Eltham in the XVIIIth year of Henry VIII, published by the Society of Antiquaries in 1790, contains no mention of healing and little concerning other charities. The British Museum manuscripts, Addit. MS. 21,481, and Arundel MS. 97, Household account from 1509 to 1518 and 1538 to 1541-2, respectively, contain much charitable detail of "almes, Maundy and offrings," but so far as my search revealed no reference to touching. In the middle, however, of the reign we can have recourse to the very prolific English manuscript running from November, 1529, to December, that pending the restoration of a pure currency, Edward VI used his father's angels. The hoard contained three half-sovereigns of the types Ruding, Plate VII, Fig. 8, and Snelling, Plate III, Fig. 11, but no other coins bearing Edward's name; we must, however, accept as such ten half-sovereigns bearing Henry's title, but with the youthful head, type Ruding, Plate VI, Fig. 12, Snelling, Plate II, Fig. 21. These according to modern writers are of Edward VI's early coinage. See our note 2 on p. 94. Other coins of Henry's, notably one in the same hoard, bear the annulet as well as another mint mark, and occasionally it is so placed that it would not serve for piercing. A half-sovereign as shown by Ruding on his Plate VI, Fig. 11—weight 96 grs.—was in the collection, and we have no indication that such a coin was intended to be pierced. The Elizabethan coin, type Ruding, Plate X, Fig. 2—weight 84½ at 22 carats—should have nothing to do with touching, but there is always a possibility that even Elizabeth might still use her father's angels, which were still current.

1 College of Arms M.7. The book belonged to William Hawley, Clarenceaux Herald, who was Rouge Croix in 1509 and Clarenceaux in 1537; he died in 1557.

2 From a copy in the Harleian Library, No. 642.
1532, to which I have before referred, in the British Museum Addit. MS. 20,030, or to its still more accessible form as published by Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas in 1827 under the title of the *Privy Purse Expenses of Henry VIII*,\(^1\) and herein notices of healing abound.

We find Henry far more charitable than we should expect, and if his losses at games, £324 5s. 10d., in these three years and his outlay on jewels, £10,801 8s. 9d., besides £1517 to his goldsmith for plate, greatly exceed his almsgiving, we are yet glad to find frequent gifts to the poor. Besides the monthly £10 already noted, we follow him redeeming, as his father had done, poor persons from prison\(^2\) at the price of 10s., or giving £3 6s. 8d. to "a poore man, that had xiiij childre for ther Relief."\(^3\) Again we see him indemnifying persons "banyshed the town by reason of the plague."\(^4\) Even beggars,

\(^1\) The MS. is one of the series of Bryan Tuke's account books as Treasurer of the Chamber to Henry VIII, and extends from January, 1529-30, to the end of 1532. Sir Nicholas, in his preface, mentions various other manuscripts then in the Chapter House, but implies that he selected this as giving a particularly lucid idea of Henry's private expenditure. We learn from Dr. Arthur Percival Newton's interesting article in the *English Historical Review*, under date July, 1917, entitled "The King's Chamber under the Early Tudors," that John Heron kept an elaborate series of such account books under Henry VII and VIII until he died in 1522. These are now mostly amongst the countless other similar ledgers catalogued as Exchequer Accounts Various at the Public Record Office, where I have looked through some and had hoped to have examined a greater number, had not their temporary withdrawal from public use during the war interrupted my search. Many of those in the British Museum I have seen, but with the exception of Addit. MS. 21,480 and Addit. MS. 20,030, few of these refer to healing. Extracts were published by the Camden Society, vols. 67 and 84, amongst the *Trevelyan Papers*, from some volumes containing the accounts of Bryan Tuke (now Exchequer Accts. Various, Bundle 420, No. 11) and Sir William Cavendish (Exchequer Accts. Various, Bundle 426, Nos. 5 and 6), the successors of Heron. The original MSS. were subsequently presented by Sir W. C. Trevelyan to the Public Record Office, and throw some light on other charitable expenditure of Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary, but search in the manuscripts has produced no items of healing so far as the touchpieces are concerned.

\(^2\) November 6th, 1531, *Privy Purse Expenses*, p. 173. I give the references to the printed volume as the more convenient.


\(^4\) An entry of £18 8s. appears on October 13th, 1530: "for such persons as were expelled the towne of the Greenwiche in the time of the plague." *Ibid.*, pp. 79 and 173. It is possible that this and another outbreak of plague mentioned
discouraged as a rule by the Tudors, received help, and we read\(^1\) of the gift of 4s. 8d. to a "poure woman that asked of the King for the love of Saint George." The angel, now rated at 7s. 6d., appears in these accounts in payments for various purposes—for travelling expenses, as the price of goods, occasionally as a fee, but more often for card or shooting debts.\(^2\) We find hawks costing six angels apiece; nine angels are paid for the posting outlay of an envoy to Calais, and the servants' wages for a day's hunting frequently figure at one angel each. Occasionally disbursements of "angelottes" occur. Now and again Henry staked in "corons" valued at 4s. 8d. each and he frequently made gifts of 5s., probably the English crown of the Double-Rose, which stood at that sum. The crown-soleil at 4s. 6d. often comes into play, especially in regard to payments to ambassadors, but the king for betting or gambling usually required angels. One entry runs: "Itī the same daye" [April vi, 1530] "paid to domynge," one of Henry's boon companions, "by the Kinges Coñande, for so muche money lost at playe iii li" [£80] "in Angelles and the same daye deliūd into the Kinges graces owne handes xx li in angells = cxijli xs.\(^3\) The coins here specified as placed in royal keeping were probably needed for "dyce," "pryckes"\(^4\) in April, 1532, in reference to the expenditure of 25s. for the removal from Court of seven cases, would account for an interval of more than a year between May, 1530, and July, 1531, and of a month between April 2nd and May 9th in 1532 in any mention of healing. But the dates of the healings seemed at all times more due to the king's presence at some particular place where the scrofulous were resident than recurrent at any established seasons, unless at Easter.

\(^1\) Privy Purse Expenses, p. 150, July 31st, 1531.

\(^2\) Curiously enough the old sum of 6s. 8d. is frequently also paid "in rewarde" for "sweete oranges," "peres" or other gifts presented to the king, and so late as his twentieth to twenty-third regnal year, 1529-31, this is suggestive that the George Noble was a commoner coin than we had reason to imagine, for the angel was then at 7s. 6d. See Exchequer Accounts Various, P.R.O., Bundle 420, No. 11, Bryan Tuke's Accounts.

\(^3\) The fine gold sovereign, of which the angel, at 7s. 6d., was the third part, stood at 22s. 6d., and it is noticeable in these accounts that "c li. in angells" is always reckoned at "cxijli xs." in crown gold.

\(^4\) See Privy Purse Expenses, p. 37, also pp. 225–7, June 27th and 30th, 1532, when Henry loses large sums in angels at "pryckes" usually at "iiiij angels a shotte." The prycke was a term for a peg in the centre of the target, hit in archery.
or "pope Julius," for such items abound, and on twelfth night in 1530 we again read: "deliūd to the Kinges Grace at gamyng c li in Angelles," but there is occasionally a possibility that he required this particular coin for healing. Henry touched nine persons in the month of April referred to above, of whom four were presented to his touch on the day preceding the reception of the angels, and he might find it necessary to repay his almoner or cofferer, who it seems sometimes provided the coins. One entry is suggestive that Henry did not always himself hang the angel about the patient's neck, for we read: "Itm the same daye [August 30th, 1532] paid to Maister hennage for so moche money be him paied to a pouer woman the King heled at Langley vij s vij."3

The word paid is always used with regard to the healing gift: "paied to ij pouer folke that wer heled of the Kinges sykeness xv," "paied to a sike woman that the King heled vij s vij," and so on. But we should remember that we are dealing with a privy purse account book, where all items are naturally set down in this form, whether in payment of debts, "rewardes" to persons, who brought gifts to Henry, or "by way of almesse." Let us place it to the credit side of this monarch's balance sheet that with all his tampering with the coinage he only reduced the standard of the angels by the small extent of 3½ grains. He retained the weight of 80 grains, issuing 72 angels to the lb., but he in 1526 raised the price to 7s. 6d. in his second coinage,4 at 23 3½ carats fine. In his third coinage of

1 Pope Julius, called sometimes Pope July, was a card game for four or more persons, possibly very similar to our Pope Joan. See Privy Purse Expenses, p. 343.

2 Thomas Heneage, knighted in 1537, was chief gentleman of the Privy Chamber and uncle to another Thomas Heneage who died in 1594 and who was Vice-Chamberlain and Treasurer of the Chamber to Queen Elizabeth. The first Sir Thomas Heneage, as above, is also mentioned in the Privy Purse Expenses of Princess Mary as the bearer of money from the king, p. 238.


4 See Mint-report of October 30th, 1526, 18 Hen. VIII, quoted by Mr. Symonds in his "Documentary Evidence for the Coinage of Henry VII and VIII," vol. x of British Numismatic Journal, p. 139. In this year crowns and half-crowns of 22 c. were ordered.
1542\(^1\) he reduced the standard to 23 carats, at the same time again enhancing the price to 8s., and in this third coinage the half-angels and quarter-angels followed the angels. Were it not that the coins rose in value, and the royal church offerings did not vary accordingly, one might be tempted to suggest that the fine gold was continued for ceremonial presentation. We know that in spite of his systematic spoliation of the Church, Henry adhered to the practice of his predecessors in presenting set gifts on certain occasions, and on these festivals would give the customary pure gold. The George Noble was of standard fineness and was evidently used as a church offering, for in Bryan Tuke’s account\(^2\) for the years 1529–1532 we find the presentations noted at 6s. 8d. or 13s. 4d., and very rarely at 7s. 6d., the sum at which the angel was by this time rated.

The sum of 6s. 8d. appears usually alone every Sunday, but at Christmas or Easter separate gifts figure at different parts of the service. "Item for the Kinges offering at taking his rights vi\(^a\) viij\(^d.\)"

. . . . "Item for his offering at High Masse xiii\(^a\) iiiij\(^d.\)" and so on.\(^3\) Thus Henry’s offering, specified in his privy purse expenses, is set down on Good Friday,\(^4\) on June 10th, 1530,\(^5\) and on June 16th, 1531, or again as sent to St. Thomas’s shrine at Canterbury as amounting to xx\(^a\),\(^6\) a sum which at that time, when the sovereign stood at 22s. 6d., must have been made up of three George nobles or of foreign coins, then largely permitted in circulation.\(^7\)

The issue

\(^1\) British Numismatic Journal, p. 150, May 15th, 1442. Mr. Symonds notes that the text-books generally give the year 1543, but he shows that 1542 is correct.


\(^4\) Exchequer Accounts Various, Bundle 420, No. 11, f. 163.

\(^5\) Bryan Tuke’s Household Book, 153. This offering of twenty shillings included three items, one gift at the high altar on leaving Windsor, one to St. George and one to “King Henry of Wyndesore.”

\(^6\) Ibid., p. 173.

\(^7\) A number of payments are noted in “crownes soleil,” or “crounes of the sonne,” valued at 4s. 6d. each, but mostly on foreign affairs, embassies to Rome, etc. bid., pp. 142, 150-1, but “ix angelles” also appear in this connection as paid to an envoy from Calais to Paris, p. 142.
of a sovereign of 23 carats, valued at 20s., suffered, in 1545, a further debasement to 22 carats and finally, in 1546, to 20 carats, but this degradation, as we have seen, was not shared by the angel. Two angels and an angelet at 8s. and 4s. respectively would still make up the sum, if 20s. were required for presentation. But Henry did not despise to make gifts of his 22-carat gold, for we find him giving his new crown at 5s. to "our lady in the walls at Calais." At certain times, however, greater gifts were required,¹ and Henry at his coronation offered £24 and subsequently on the same day £16² at "ye masse."

At the Epiphany, with myrrh and frankincense, a special gold offering was made, and in the reign of James I it took the form of the beautiful bezant designed by Charles Anthony³ at the price of £47 7s. 7d. We may wonder whether the rare six angel piece of Edward VI, Ruding, VIII, 3, worth, according to the date of coinage, from 40s. to 48s., was an Epiphany gift, but of this we have no evidence. Henry VIII's presentation on "twelfth day" was, for his 22nd regnal year, 33s. 4d., namely five times his usual Sunday offering of 6s. 8d. Only gold could be offered on All Saints' Day, Michaelmas, Trinity Sunday, New Year's Day, Candlemas, Annunciation, Ascension, Corpus Christi, Christmas, Easter-day, Whitsunday, and the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin.⁴ From such privy purse expenses as I have had the opportunity of studying

¹ From very early times we find certain days specified in which it was the Royal practice to offer gold only in church. Miege, Chamberlayne and other chroniclers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries prove that these days, then called "Garter days" because the king and queen were attended by the knights in Garter dress, were always so distinguished. See Chamberlayne's Anglica Notitia or Present State of England at various dates, also Miege's New State of England.


³ State Papers Domestic, vol. x, November 4th, 1604. According to Chamberlayne's Anglica Notitia, a bezant was also given at Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide and All Saints.

⁴ The patron saint's day of the sovereign was sometimes so celebrated, and some authorities add Saint John the Baptist's day and the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.
I see that the Tudors Henry VII, Henry VIII and Edward VI always on Sundays offered "vi viijd" or more in church, and I have somewhere seen it stated of Mary that she always gave gold after her accession to the throne, but I cannot trace the reference and only mention the memory for what it is worth, with the suggestion that herein possibly lies an explanation, apart from the predominating questions of foreign exchange, of the fact that from the time when Henry VIII introduced crown gold to the days of Charles II, when the angel gold was replaced by a touchpiece, the lower standard never completely drove the higher out of the field. My suggestion has special reference to the continuance of the coinage of the angel in the time of Charles I, for with regard to the Tudors the position is by no means clear. Curiously enough, the church offerings specified in account books of various treasurers throughout the reign of Henry VIII remain unchanged at 6s. 8d. on Sundays and 13s. 4d. or 20s. on more special occasions, although the George noble was no longer issued under the indenture of 1542, and no other coinage corresponded with these sums.  

In the healing ceremony we have the necessity for the angel and in the lesser church offerings for its parts. For instance, we know that for this purpose Edward IV "on Christmas day, Easterday, Whitsonday and All Halowen-day at eche of thees festes" gave "vis viiid, called a noble of golde"—or as we should now designate his newly-established coin, an angel. Other days, as mentioned above, also called forth the gift of his new "noble," but the king's daily offering was 7d. a day, amounting annually to only £10 3s. 8d., because of the special donations on 17 days out of the 365, and this presentation took the form of "greete presees of a greete plate of golde" given to "the Dean of the King's chapell of household."  

At St. Thomas's shrine at Canterbury Edward IV offered "three florynes of golde" from his "privy coffers, yerely."  

1 See British Numismatic Journal, vol. x, p. 151.  
2 Liber Niger Domus Regis Edw. IV, p. 23.  
3 Ibid., it is perhaps somewhat hazardous to suggest the possibility that Edward III's rare florin, half-florin and quarter-florin, with their very short career, may
In Edward VI's reign we have very minute details of the king's Good Friday offering of xx; and a succession of gifts at Easter "on the Resurrection," namely vj viij as an offering. Again "vj viij at the high mass this Sunday," the same sum "at taking his rights," and again during some later portion of the service, xiijs iiij. The daily alms of Edward VI, like those of his grandfather, father and sisters, are represented by the sum of 37s. iid. per week, besides the monthly privy alms which increased to £20 under Edward as against the £10 of Henry, whilst Mary's reached in "prevye almes" £1800 besides £75 16s. 8d. for daily alms, £178 19s iid. on Maundy Thursday, and £200 as church offerings paid "To the Dean of the Chapel," in the course of one year, according to Sir William Cavendish's accounts, from July, 1553, to the same month in 1554.

But enough of these early oblations; we must return to the healing question; and it is a matter of regret that no mention of the King's Evil is found in the latest privy purse accounts of Henry VIII, which I have seen, namely those extending from May to September, 1542. The angel had by this time reached 8s., and we should have been glad to ascertain whether the items concerning healing tallied with the Exchequer accounts.

have been used in church offerings, possibly redeemed again in current money, and re-offered at the altar as the royal gift. The half-florin represented the little florin of Florence, valued under Edward I at 3s. 3d., which either in fact or kind was given at the Epiphany by this king and his successors. Gold, frankincense, and myrrh are still offered at this feast; the gold now takes the shape of 25 new sovereigns, which are subsequently distributed to poor and deserving persons in the parishes near St. James's Palace.

1 Sir William Cavendish's accounts for the year 1547, in the Trevelyan Papers, Part i, p. 192, extracted from P.R.O., Exchequer Various, 426, No. 5.
2 Ibid., Part II. Camden Society's vol. 84, p. 36.
3 Stowe MS. Brit. Mus. 554.
4 In Henry VIII's coinage in 1544-45 the text-books ascribe to him an issue of gold of 22 carats, but Mr. Symonds has shown from the Exchequer Accounts that 5761 lbs. Troy at 22 carats fine were coined between June, 1544, and March 31st, 1545, and none of 22 carats, although the coinage of the previous year had been very large. The 22-carat coinage became general in March, 1545, and the 20-carat in April, 1546, but no angels are mentioned by Mr. Symonds of the reduced standard.
It is somewhat doubtful whether to Henry VIII or Edward VI belongs the coin with which we must now deal. It seems hardly fair to Henry or Edward to base an accusation of issuing a false touchpiece, in imitation of the gold, on a silver-gilt angel, to which my attention was drawn by our member, Mr. A. Baldwin, and which is illustrated below.

We know, however, from Mr. Symonds,¹ that silver angels were coined between 1546 and 1548–9, and the coin in this metal may in truth have been struck with no thought of fraud, for this example in particular may owe its gilding to any passer of false currency, who had obtained a genuine silver angel. The piece in question differs slightly from those to which Sir John Evans referred, in not having the annulet either in the legend or as "gunhole" on the ship, which should be present with the mint-mark lis. There are, moreover, mistakes in the legend, which give colour to the idea, that though contemporary, this coin may be a deliberate forgery. Be this as it may, Henry VIII, or the advisers of his successor, did undoubtedly coin, though they may not have issued, silver angels, and what more likely design would be used than the type of the outgoing piece, which Henry did not reproduce either in 22-carat or 20-carat gold?

See British Numismatic Journal, vol. x, pp. 156–161. The latest Household Accounts of Henry VIII which I have searched are at the British Museum—Arundel MS. 97 of the 29th–33rd year, 1537–8–1541, and at Public Record Office—Exchequer Various, Bundle 420, No. 11, Bryan Tuke’s account for the 20th, 21st, 22nd and 23rd year, 1529–33; and the same Treasurer’s MS., Stowe 554, running from May to September in Henry VIII’s 34th regnal year, 1542, and these make, so far as I could see, no mention of healing.

 But are we justified in believing that a silver angel was used for touching, instead of the pieces, still current, at 23 carats fine?

The gilt angel bears the mint mark lis, which would naturally be used by a forger of Henry VIII’s last fine issue. On the other hand, this mint mark lis is equally suggestive that, like the “young-faced” sovereigns, some of which bear the same mark, the silver angels were made for Edward VI. But what is the story of this curious and unexplained issue noticed by Mr. Symonds amongst the Bristol coinage between the 1546, at the earliest, and 1548–9 at the latest? The researches of Mr. Symonds led him to tell us that when Sir Thomas Chamberlain was, at the last-mentioned date, putting order into the mint affairs, mismanaged by Sir William Sharington, “among sundry items of bullion found in the mint, were three parcels of sterling silver weighing about 43 lbs., which, ‘being coined with the print of angels’ and valued at 4s. 10d. the ounce, amounted to £125.”

No charge was preferred against Sharington for uttering false angels, we must therefore believe that the coinage was authorized. But for what purpose would the king make a coin, which could easily be gilt and passed as a true angel? Mr. Symonds says that the suggestion has been made to him that the king may have required touchpieces, but has himself an alternative theory that these silver pieces were struck as reckoning-counters, then much in fashion. This, indeed, is not improbable, although such pieces were not usually made in the English Royal Mints, and to me it seems also possible that Henry or Edward, in default of gold coins of pure standard, being unwilling to disappoint the people who came to him for healing, produced a silver substitute with no thought of gilding or imposing on the public. For whatever purpose made, we must conclude that someone had the sense to offer objections, pointing out how unwise it would be to circulate a piece so easily turned into false currency, and the parcels remained in the mint, there to be

1 Kenyon’s *Gold Coins*, plate ix, fig. 62.
found by Chamberlain and returned to the melting pot. Mr. Symonds calls my attention to the fact that the adjoining entries in the accounts drew a distinction between the gilt and silver plate, and if the illustrated coin be a derelict from one of the three parcels, the gilding, old as it appears, could not be of original intention, for silver-gilt plate was valued, not at 4s. 10d., but at 5s. 8d. the ounce.¹

The fact that the coin is not pierced carries little weight, as the operation was not necessarily performed immediately after coining, but the large number of pieces in the parcels, reckoning them at the least at a shilling² apiece and therefore at some 2500 in number, does not appear suggestive that they were designed for touching—but rather for largess at the coronation or some such occasion of scattering jettons or as "casting-counters."³ I must leave my readers to decide whether in these circumstances the story of the silver angel may be regarded as indicating that Edward VI intended to meet a considerable demand for "touching."

We have seen that the accounts⁴ of the Treasurer of the Chamber for the first three years of the reign give no evidence of healing, though the Maundy is mentioned. Very little documentary evidence appears available on this subject, for in the reign of Edward VI we must regret the omission of all reference to the King’s Evil in the young king’s diary, filled as it is with information about his coinage, and his "remouings" from place to place.⁵ He speaks of an outbreak

¹ Numismatic Chronicle, p. 339.
² The piece illustrated is about the size of a sixpence, but much thicker, and weighs very nearly the same as a shilling of Edward VI.
³ Mr. Symonds treats of this possibility in the English Historical Review, July, 1917, pp. 438–9, in reviewing Mr. T. P. Barnard’s The Casting Counter and the Casting Board. These counters were used for reckoning, but were more frequently made abroad than in England.
⁴ I have usually referred to these documents in their more accessible form as printed in Trevelyan Papers, Parts i and ii, but they are to be seen at the Record Office under the heads of Exchequer Various, Bundle 426, No. 5, and 426, No. 6. Almost a duplicate but less complete of No. 5 is there catalogued Aug. Mis. 439.
⁵ King Edward’s Journal, Cottonian MSS., Nero CX, pp. 10-117, was printed by Dr. Burnet in his History of the Reformation, vol. ii, part ii, ed. of 1829, pp. 1-100. The Bishop modernized the spelling, and I have preferred to quote from the original in the British Museum.
of "the old sweat," as he termed the sweating-sickness in July, 1551, causing him to be "remoued to Ampton Court with fery few with me," whilst his own illness of "mesels" and the "small pokkes" in the following April, 1552, would account for the absence of any Easter "Healings." It is by no means unusual in the young king's accounts to find "nil" written in the place where the Sunday church offering should figure, probably denoting his absence owing to ill-health. Nevertheless, it is clear from a passage in Hamon L'Estrange's *Alliance of Divine Offices*, written in 1659, that Edward VI did touch for the Evil. "All along King Edward the Sixth, and Queen Elizabeth, hir reign, when the Strumosi, such as had the King's Evil, came to be touched," says this author, "the manner was then for her to apply the sign of the Cross to the Tumour." This curiously ungrammatical pronouncement, together with a reference to the continuity of touching from the times of Edward the Confessor in Holinshed's Chronicle, written in 1577, decided Dr. Crawfurd in believing that sometimes at least Edward healed. Certainly the issue of an angel during the latter part of his reign in its pristine purity, is in favour of this theory. We learn, moreover, from Mr. Symonds's "English Coinages of Edward VI" that an

1 Edward's Diary, 37 (b) and 58 (b).
4 *The King's Evil*, p. 66.
5 In favour of the assumption that Edward VI touched may also be advanced the words of Andrew Borde, medical attendant to Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, Anne Boleyn's uncle. Borde wrote his *Breviary of Health* in the lifetime of Henry VIII, but it was published under Edward in 1547 and 1552, and again under his two sisters. Speaking of the King's Evil, Borde says: "For this matter let every man make frendes to the Kynges Majestie for it doth perteyne to a Kinge to helpe this infirmitie by the grace the which is given to a Kynge anoynted." See edition of 1552, chap. 236. I have not seen the issue of 1547 quoted by Dr. Crawfurd, p. 59, and it is fair to mention that Borde died in 1549, so that he had no long opportunity of studying the practices of Edward. Slight alterations in the spelling in the many posthumous editions of the work show that they are not mere reprints, and any alterations thought desirable might have been made in 1552, '57, '75, '87 or '98, when the book reappeared.
6 *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. xi, p. 130.
abortive effort was made by the young king in or about June, 1547, to coin some fine gold. "An order was given to the Tower authorities to mix bullion of 23-carat fine gold and 10 oz. fine silver respectively, but no money was wrought therefrom 'by reason of the King's urgent affairs,'" and the consequent waste in remelting the metals and converting them into lower standards, as Mr. Symonds tells us, "cost the Exchequer £73." This appears to me possibly indicative of a wish on Edward's part to coin angels bearing his own title at the rate and standard used by his father before his final debasement of the gold.

The angels struck in the name of Edward VI were ordered and might, therefore, have made their appearance, as is indeed commonly reported, on December 18th, 1550, 1 but Mr. Symonds gives reasons for believing that although they were projected at that date they did not see the light until 1551. As coined under the order of October 5th, 1551, they retained the weight of the angels issued in 1542 by Henry VIII, but whilst re-establishing a currency of 23 carats 3½ grains fine, the value was raised to 10s. Half-angels were also coined at 5s. 2 As ordered in 1550 the angels would have been issued at 8s., the value which they had finally attained under the late king, and Dr. Kenyon believed that those bearing mint-mark ostrich head were thus valued.

We have seen that the question of Edward's church offerings is somewhat puzzling, for we still find 6s. 8d. entered on Sundays and Saints' days, and unless he made use of the George noble of his father, which by this time must have been very rare, or some foreign coin, the sum must have been made up by the help of silver. There is always the possibility that, as has been suggested with regard to the gold florins of Edward III, if a rare coin was given it might

---

1 Kenyon's Gold Coins, p. iii. To the order of December 18th, 1550, we might venture to suggest may belong the six angel pattern weighing 473 grains, namely 7 grains short of the desired 480. The roses in the legend are indicative of this period, being frequently used as stops so late as the year 1549.

again be redeemed for subsequent use, and this was most likely the procedure with the Epiphany bezants.

We may call attention to the fact that though the pure gold was re-instituted by Edward VI, the sovereign, crown and half-crown at 22 carats were still coined under the order of September 25th, 1551.

It is now generally received that Edward preferred the base coins of his earlier years to run in his predecessor's name. We have, however, no evidence of angels struck at 20 carats nor 22 carats fine under either king. Even the better of these standards, the 22-carat pieces, were sovereigns, half-sovereigns, crowns and half-crowns only.

We have seen that Sir John Evans called attention to the minute holes made in the centre of the annulet in the coins of Henry VIII. Small as were the perforations, it is recorded of Mary I at a private healing, that she, when touching a man and three women, herself threaded the angels, and passing a ribbon through the tiny aperture, she hung the keepsake, thus slung, "round the neck of each of the patients, making them promise never to part with that coin save in case of extreme need." Here we have the distinct indication of the coin itself being regarded as an amulet or at least as a keepsake.

1 British Numismatic Journal, p. 152.
4 Numismatic Chronicle, New Series, vol. xii, pp. 190-192. In connection with the suitability for piercing in the centre of an annulet, I may draw attention to the mint-mark with a pellet enclosed, in the angels of Edward IV. A pierced angel of this king is in the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum, but the hole is rather roughly made and not in the annulet.
The Italian chronicler of this ceremony, which took place on April 4th, 1556, shows that she was very particular in not only touching, but pressing the spot where the sore was, "with her hands in the form of a cross," and also touching the place where the Evil showed itself with the gold piece, she "signed with this coin in the form of a cross." This sign was, as we have seen, continued by her sister Elizabeth,\(^1\) but Hamon L'Estrange describes James I as "eminently and most remarkable" in "the great Prudence" he displayed "in this concernment."\(^2\) He writes that the holy sign "raising cause of jealousies, as if some mysterious operation were imputed to it, that wise and learned King, not only (with his son the late King) practically discontinued it, but ordered it to be expunged out of the Prayers relating to that Cure, which hath proceeded as effectually, that omission notwithstanding, as it did before."

The office used by Mary is contained in her manual, preserved in the Library of the Roman Catholic Cathedral, Westminster, and is illustrated by pictures of the Queen touching for the Evil, and blessing cramp-rings.\(^3\)

Whether or not Henry VIII specially designed his angels for piercing,\(^4\) it is certain that Mary not only caused her offerings to

---


3. Dr. Crawfurd obtained permission to reproduce the picture of "Healing" in his *The King's Evil*, facing p. 68, and splendid enlarged water copies have been made for the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum, of the miniatures representing both these royal ceremonies.

4. Sir John Evans's proposition that the annulet marked the place for piercing is borne out by the fact that a space was left in the touchpieces for a hole, when these later medals replaced the angels. Henry VIII's annulet marked the only space where an aperture could be made without obliterating the saint's head or interfering with the legend or mint-mark. In some coins this objection was obviated by placing St. Michael's head within the surrounding letters, quite out of harm's way, but even so the king's name might be defaced by the puncture. Mr. G. F. Hill drew my attention to the frequency with which angels are pierced at the
be minted for bestowal, but made thereunto the sacrifice of her personal adornments. Mr. Symonds published, in 1912, in his "Coinage of Mary Tudor," in the eighth volume of our Journal, some extracts from the Declared Accounts, denoting Mary’s generosity. He tells us that the Queen "by hir hignes owne hands" delivered two chains to the high treasurer of all the mints, weighing together some 128 oz. at 58s. 6d. the ounce, "which being converted by Her Grace’s commandment in the mint within the Tower did make in angels less coinage, the sum of £375 5s. 3½d." "Also," writes Mr. Symonds, "the proceeds of ‘two crownettes’ of gold, about 30 oz., and ‘one standing bolle of golde with a cover,’ about 54 oz., in all about 84½ oz., at 55s. 11d., were likewise delivered to him the same day ‘by the quenes majesties owne handes’ and coined into angels making £236 3s. 6½d."

Mary issued sovereigns and a ryal of fine gold as well as angels and half-angels, before her marriage, but although the repetition of this coinage was ordered, the name of her consort, Philip, appears only on angels and half-angels. The value of the angel and half-angel, raised as we have seen by Edward in 1551 to 10s. and 5s. respectively, so continued throughout Mary’s reign, but the legend was changed to "A Domino factum est istud, et est mirabile in oculis nostris" (Psalm cxviii, 23; in the Vulgate Psalm cxvii), which was variously abbreviated on the different gold coins.

The angels, pierced or unpierced, of our first Tudor Queen are now extremely rare, although the jewels mentioned above must alone have produced over £600, or to be more exact, some 1223 coins, but unfortunately for two reasons these figures give no precise lower, instead of the upper edge, and suggested that this was probably deliberately done to avoid injury to the head of the archangel. It has occurred to me that the coin being suspended from a ribbon, the figure of St. Michael, hanging head downwards, was better seen by the patient.


2 Mary married Philip of Spain on July 25th, 1554. His title, as King of England, was placed on the coins, by virtue of a Proclamation of the 26th of the December following, but the coins with the new legend are rare. See Kenyon’s Gold Coins, p. 119, and British Numismatic Journal, as above, p. 187.
Angels as Healing-pieces for the King's Evil.

indication of the numbers of persons "healed" by Mary. Firstly, we know not over how long a period the angels were intended to last. Secondly, it is possible that she used the coin for her church offerings as well as for "healings," and we do not know whether these angels were pierced. I have not been able to search systematically the accounts of this queen to find details of church gifts. Mary, like her father, continued to use the service in Latin, a language of which the sick persons probably understood little, and to them the most intelligible part was the contact first with the Queen's hands and then with the gold.

Elizabeth, as she adopted the second prayer-book of Edward VI, would, in all probability, keep closely to any ritual used by her brother, but as Dr. Crawfurd points out, we have no record of Edward's service. He, however, notes that Mary's liturgy with its invocation of "the blessed Virgin and all the Saints" would not be likely to commend itself to Edward's Protestant guardians.²

If, therefore, the young king did touch for the Evil, to his time we may possibly owe the ritual of Elizabeth, shorter indeed, but in its purpose and rubric much the same as those which preceded it.

We owe our knowledge of Elizabeth's service to Dr. Tooker, who gives it in Latin, but as his book is written entirely in that language, Dr. Crawfurd translated it into English in his The King's Evil,³ deeming it more likely that the Reformers would insist that this, like other services, should be in the vernacular.⁴

1 "Confiteor Deo beate Marie Virgini omnibus sanctis et vobis quia peccavi nimis in cogitacione, locutione, et opere mea culpa. Precor Sanctam Mariam et omnes sanctos dei et vos orare pro me."

² The King's Evil, p. 64. ³ Ibid., pp. 72-74. ⁴ Ibid., p. 71.
Dr. Tooker, chaplain to Elizabeth, was officially present at her healing ceremonies and lays great stress on the fact that she stroked the affected part with her bare hand. Nevertheless, he does not conceal that in the case of a running sore the examining doctors put on an innocuous plaster to prevent the contact from being too disgusting. Still, he again dilates in another passage on her personal touching of the sores “with her very beautiful hands, shining as white as snow,” not merely touching them with her finger-tips, but actually pressing them whilst she uttered the prayers. He incidentally throws some light on the number of persons presented to her at one healing in her old age, saying that at the previous Easter, that is to say in the year 1597, she touched thirty-eight persons to her extreme fatigue. It has been said of Elizabeth that she did not believe in her own power of healing and only gave way to the desires of her people to show that the Pope’s excommunication had not robbed her of her divine gift. Drs. Beckett and Wiseman both say that the Catholics alleged it was by the virtue of the sign of the cross that she healed, but these

1 William Tooker was subsequently Dean of Lichfield. He died in 1620.
2 Tooker’s Charisma, p. 95. During the reading of the Gospel of St. Mark, on coming to the words, “Supra egras manus imponent: & bene habebunt,” Tooker says: “Ad illa verba cum ventum est, serenissima eius Maiestas aegris & strumam patientibus vtrinque manus imponit siue maxillis siue gutturi siue loco affecto & nudis manibus tangit morbidas partes quas deinceps sanat.”
3 Ibid., p. 94.
4 Quoties vidi illam perpulchris manibus & dealbata niue candidioribus, audaciusculè absque vlo fastidio, non summis digitis tangentem, sed prementem & contrectantem salubrius & apostemata eorum, & vicera: quoties vidi ipsam quasi seipsam defatigantem, cum vno die in parasceue paschatis superioris triginta octo strumosos curaret.” Tooker’s Charisma, pp. 99-100.
5 Easter fell on March 27th, 1597, and in that year Tooker published his book.
6 Dr. Henry Stubbe, writing in 1666 in The Miraculous Conformist, p. 9, said: “Queen Elizabeth did, for some time, discontinue the Touching for the King’s Evil, doubting either the Success or Lawfulness, of that way of Curing. But She soon quitted that Fitt of Puritanisme, when the Papists defamed her, as if God had withdrawn from her the gift of Healing, because she had withdrawn herself from the Roman Church.”
7 Beckett’s Free and Impartial Enquiry, published 1722, p. 27, and Richard
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Surgeons deny that the sacred sign had anything to do with cure, and Beckett remarks, that "her Successors discontinu'd it till the Reign of James the 2nd, when it was revived and practised by him yet it has never been thought the success has been ever the less for the Disuse of it."

Beckett was amongst those who believed that Elizabeth at one time abandoned healing,¹ and no doubt the outbreak of plague in 1562 would give rise to such a cessation. Moreover, the tradition that she did so was probably founded on Tooker's story of her exclamation when the sick flocked about her at Gloucester on one of her progresses:² "Would that I could give you succour and help. God is the best and greatest Physician of all . . . He will relieve your sickness—pray ye to Him."³

Sir John Evans,⁴ quoting Fuller's Church History, gives the words as "Alasse poor people, I cannot, I cannot cure you, it is God alone that can doe it,"⁵ and I find that Dr. Fuller, writing in 1662, was at some pains to explain that it was to elevate the minds of the sick

Wiseman's Several Chirurgical Treatises, published 1676, Book IV, a Treatise on the King's Evil, p. 246.


² The King's Evil, p. 75. Dr. Crawfurd remarks that John Browne in his Charisma, p. 124, "states, without giving his authority, that before quitting the place she admitted to a general Healing."

³ Tooker, p. 105: "Vtinam, vtinam (inquit) possem vobis opem & auxilium ferre: Deus, Deus est optimus & maximus medicus omnium, ille, ille est Jehova sapiens ac sanctus, qui opitulabitur vestris morbis, ille comprecandus est."


⁵ Dr. Fuller's Church History, Book II, Cent. xi. Sec. 35.
that she spoke, and not from any distaste to healing. But in point of fact, as Dr. Crawfurd truly says, this is but a rendering into the vernacular of the legend of her angel: "a Domino factum est istud et est mirabile," words which in the days of her sister Mary had superseded the "Per crucem tuam salva nos Christe redemptor" of Edward VI and his immediate predecessors. Beckett speaks of this inscription on the "Rose Nobles" of Elizabeth given at the time of touching as being: "A Domino factum est istud, et est mirabile in oculis nostris," but the qualifying word "Rose" is probably there a slip of the pen for Angel-Noble.

It is obvious that she ordinarily made use of an angel, and Clowes, "one of hir Maiestie's Chirurgeons," who wrote in 1602, mentions being shown by one of the healed "the Angell of Golde, which her Maiesty did put about his neck, truely a cure." Nevertheless, the words used by Tooker are less binding, specifying, as they do, "a gold coin to the value of ten shillings," and this is not without interest in view of the fact that for many years of Elizabeth's reign the price of the angel was 6s. 8d.

Tooker, however, writing in the year 1597, would be right in assuming that an angel would be understood, when he spoke of a coin worth 10s. Under Elizabeth's first indenture the price fixed was 10s., but by the proclamation of March, 1561-2, the current angel resumed the position it had originally held when first coined under Edward IV, namely 6s. 8d., and no evidence has been found of its resumption of the value of 10s., until the indenture of 1572.

By the proclamation of 1561-2 the fine gold ryal, having similarly been decried from 15s., held the position at 10s. hitherto

1 Beckett, p. 47.
2 "Angel Noble" is the expression used in Henry VII's service. The sovereign as well as the angel of Elizabeth bore the "a Domino factum" inscription in her fine standard coinage.
3 A Right Fruteful and approved Treatise for the Artificiall Cure of that Malady called in Latin Struma and in English the Evill, cured by Kings and Queens of England, p. 50.
4 Tooker, p. 96, "acceptoquè aureo numo solidorum decem, perforato, actena reunito numismate." See our note 1, p. 95.
occupied by the angel. Mr. Symonds has found no direct evidence of the coining of angels\(^1\) between the mint-mark cross-croslet and mint-mark crown, that is to say for about eight years, and he is inclined to think that the pyx of the latter mint-mark, in 1570, still held angels at 6s. 8d. Whether Elizabeth in this period gave any angels already existing or substituted the 10s. ryal\(^2\) or drew entirely on her first issue, I cannot venture to say, but if she used those of her father the presence of the three pierced coins in the hoard described by Sir John Evans is easily explained.\(^3\) Even after her angel had resumed its 10s. value, it experienced some vicissitudes, for its fineness was reduced from 23 carats 3\(\frac{1}{2}\) grains fine to 23 carats 3\(\frac{1}{4}\) in 1578, and on its resumption of the old standard, in 1601, it was slightly reduced in weight, 73 angels instead of 72 going to the pound weight of gold.\(^4\)

\(^1\) The existence of a quarter-angel with mint-mark rose is indicative that some fine gold was issued and should have been in pyx of February, 1566-7, but none is specified in this pyx trial. See Numismatic Chronicle, 1916, p. 100. Dr. Kenyon gives a quarter-angel, in the Evans Collection, and there is a specimen in that of Major Carlyon-Britton.

\(^2\) The ryal, which presented the figure of the Queen standing in a ship, might have served as a touchpiece, but the legend: "Iesus autem," etc., is, as we have seen, in discussing the alternative legend on the angels of Henry VII, less applicable to the healing service than "A domino factum est istud et est mirabile," which Beckett, writing in the early eighteenth century, quoted as the legend on her gift.

\(^3\) See our pp. 80-81.

\(^4\) For the most complete information concerning Elizabeth's indentures and pyx lists, see Numismatic Chronicle, Fourth Series, vol. xvi, "The Mint of Queen Elizabeth and those who worked there," by Henry Symonds. Details of the pieces struck are not always available, but angels, half- and quarter-angels are specified in
In Kenyon's *Gold Coins of England* we read that no angels were known to this author struck after the reduction of weight in 1601, but since the publication of his book an example bearing the mint-mark, weight 79 grains, has come into notice. Mr. Symonds, in his "Mint of Queen Elizabeth," has shown that in the pyx trial of June 7th, 1603, containing coins of 23 carats 3½ grains fine, the sample pieces, each coin representing one "journey" of gold, amounted to £3 12s. 6d. in angels, half-angels and quarter-angels. He sends me, moreover, a note from the Declared Accounts as follows: "Angel gold under indenture of 29 July, 43 Elizabeth (1601) 35 lbs. 4 oz. 17 dwts. 8 grains." This would be the quantity of fine gold struck between the date specified above and the end of the reign. The fact that angels were struck does not of course prove that the Queen in her last days touched, but they would be available for James I, before he struck them in his own name. Ruding mentions a complication which had arisen and been dealt with early in Elizabeth's reign, in October, 1561: "A foreign piece of gold, printed like an English angel," coming from Holland and Tournay in the shape of an imitation of the angels of Henry VIII, was proscribed by proclamation in that it "was paid for ten shillings of silver, being not worth nine shillings and three-pence, and for distinguishing the same the prints of the English angel and of the others were given in the margent." In June, 1565, the warning was repeated with respect to foreign angels, in regard to another issue of worse alloy "not worth seven shillings, though paid for ten shillings of silver."
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At first sight this suggests that the English angel had then resumed its 10s. value; but the proclamation of the following December refers to the ryals still at their reduced rating, and we have seen that we have no evidence of the 10s. angel until it appears in the pyx of October, 1573, with the mint-mark, issued under the indenture of 1572, "powdered armeyn." 1

Queen Elizabeth issued a great quantity of fine gold and we need not enter into the various denominations. Her pyx lists, although they tell us the amounts of the angel gold examined at the trials, do not dissociate the halves and quarters from the whole, so we can make no computation as to pieces used for the Queen's healing. Moreover, we must not forget that the angel was current, so that unless we get, as we did under Mary, the assurance that the coinage was for the royal private use, the pyx lists, the publication of which we owe to Mr. Symonds, cannot always solve our difficulties.

Nevertheless, with regard to the coinage of James I, 2 they are extremely helpful, for sometimes the angels are mentioned alone. 3 The pyx of May, 1609, is the first in which the angel is specified by name, but pieces of 10s. of 23 3/4 carats, marked with the "flower de lewce," appear in the pyx of June, 1605, and are chronicled in this form in July, 1606, in July, 1607, and again in the November of that year. In 1609 and in the succeeding years the sequence of angels, with or without their halves and quarters, is unbroken.


2."Mint Marks and Denominations of the Coinage of James I," in British Numismatic Journal, vol. ix, pp. 207-227, by Henry Symonds. Mr. Symonds explains that the practice during the first quarter of the seventeenth century was to take for the pyx one piece out of every 15 pounds of coined gold.

3. For instance of mint-mark key, angels amounting to 40s. were in the pyx of the 11th of May, 1610. This should represent 60 lb. Troy, as the angel at that time weighed 71 3/4 grains. This weight was ordered by James until 1612, when it was raised to 72 grains. But in 1619, when its value was again reduced to 10s., having risen to 11s. in 1611, the king lessened the weight to 64 1/4. At this weight, 64 1/4 grains, namely, and valued at 10s., the angel remained, until discontinued by the Parliament, after the seizure of the Tower Mint in 1642. It was still mentioned as current coin in a proclamation of Charles II, although not re-issued, and in 1661 the value of James I's 11s. angel was set down at 11s. 8d. and the 10s. angel at 10s. 8d.
The earliest angel scheduled by Dr. Kenyon under James I was that bearing the mint-mark rose, which in the year 1605 succeeded the lis, but since the publication, in 1884, of his *Gold Coins of England*, the majority of the missing dates have been filled in, and Mr. Symonds tells me that he has seen an angel of the first coinage with the mint-mark lis. We have reliable evidence that angel gold was coined before James I, in October, 1604, assumed the title of King of Great Britain, in contradistinction to King of England and Scotland.¹

Mr. H. A. Grueber, in describing the quarter-angel given by Mr. Alexander Mann to the British Museum in 1910, which bears the early legend IACOBVS D'G'AN'SC'FR'ET • HI'REX.,² mint-mark lis, brought interesting evidence to light.³ He points out that this quarter-angel must have been issued between May 22nd, 1604, when the mint-mark lis succeeded the thistle, and October 20th of the same year, when the title was changed ; and he procured from Mr. Hocking the information, gathered from official documents at the mint, that “36 lbs. of Angel coin was struck in 1603–4 and 9 lbs. in 1604–5, making 45 lbs. in all.” At first sight this is suggestive that angels were struck in 1603 and that some will be discovered bearing the mint-mark thistle with the first legend, but this is not borne out by the pyx lists, for the entire amount appears to be represented by the appropriate coins in the “flower de lewce” trial of 1605. It has been somewhat plausibly suggested that the king, on a visit he paid to the mint when he coined some pieces for presentation on March 13th, 1603–4, struck some angels, but this would not solve the pyx difficulties concerning the mint-mark,

¹ The thistle and lis were twice used as mint-marks by James I, but the several issues are differentiated by the first legend IACOBVS . D . G . ANG . SCO . FRAN . ET . HIB . REX and the second IACOBVS . D . G . MAG . BRIT . FRAN . ET . HIBER . REX.
² It had been thought that no fine standard gold coins were issued with the first legend, the coins in James I's pyx of June, 1603, containing pieces struck with Elizabeth's titles and her mint-mark “The figure of two,” whilst the pyx of May, 1604, contained 22-carat gold only.
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unless the lis was used in anticipation. We can only say that if angels were, in 1603, made by the king's order for touching, the pyx lists at present to hand give no evidence thereof; but the mint report is in favour of it. Possibly, for healing, James used coins of the late queen, for it is undoubted that he touched in October, 1603. It appears, however, that he only suffered himself to be reluctantly persuaded into so doing, and it is not likely that he had already ordered coins for the purpose. It is, nevertheless, worth noting that under the indenture of May, 1603, fine standard gold had been authorized.

An Italian letter, translated by Dr. Crawfurd, under date 8th October, 1603, proves that prudence conquered James's diffidence, and afraid of risking his popularity he "resolved to give it a trial, but only by way of prayer, in which he begged all present to join him and then he touched the sick folk." He is reported by Carlo Scaramelli, the Venetian Secretary, to have said that "Neither he nor any other King can have power to heal Scrofula, for the age of miracles is past and God alone can work them." "However he will have the full ceremony," continues the Venetian, "so as not to lose this prerogative, which belongs to the Kings of England as Kings of France." This decision was taken in the face of the desire

1 James came to the throne on March 24, 1603, but plague was rampant in the succeeding months, so that the king had a good excuse for refraining from touching. See proclamations of June, July, August and September, 1603, in the Library of the Society of Antiquaries. The plague was again serious from September to November, 1606, and people were once more prohibited from coming to Court for the same reason in November, 1607. Another outbreak is noted in 1609.

2 Dr. Crawfurd, p. 83, quoting the Vatican Archives. "Se risolveva di provarlo, ma solamente per via d' oratione, la quale pregava a tutti volesseno fare insieme con lui, et con questo toccava alli infermi."


4 The attitude held by the literary world towards the healing ceremony at the beginning of James I's reign is brought before us by Shakespeare in the scene from Macbeth, laid at the English Court, and I have therefore placed the lines at the beginning of this article. Shakespeare was probably unaware that the gift was not claimed by the Scottish kings, but knew that James had begun to practise it after
he had expressed on first coming to England “not to touch for
scrofula, not wishing to arrogate vainly to himself such virtue and
divinity as to be able to cure diseases by touch alone.”

James retained upon his angels the text used by Elizabeth and
Mary, contracting it to A.DNO.FACTVM. EST. ISTVD: The words

were consonant with the principles which, in common with the late
queen, he expressed, but he so far altered the service of the latter
as to omit the sign of the cross, which now disappears from the
rubric. He also omitted the cross which stood at the ship’s mast on
his accession to the throne of England. 

Macbeth was written circa 1606 and the king
described as healing is Edward the Confessor, the contemporary of Macbeth, who died in
1057.

1 Roman Transcripts, General Series, vol. 88, letter 8, p. 9: “Di non toccare
le scrofole, non volendosi vanamente arrogare tal virtu e divinita di potere col solo
tatto guarire le malattie.”

2 Dr. Crawfurd, pp. 84–5 and 88, has gone carefully into the matter of the aban-
donment of the sign of the cross, which was still used in Catholic France, quoting
Heylyn for its discontinuance in England and also a letter from Mr. Povy to Dudley
Carlton, whilst Sir John Finett, see Nichols’s Progresses of James I, vol. iii, p. 494,
in relating the healing of a Turk by the king, says that he used “the accustomed
ceremony, of signing the place infected with the crosse, but no prayers before or
after.” Povy says, “His Majesty laughed heartily and as the young fellow came
near him, he stroked him, with his hande, first on the one side, and then on the
other; marry without Pistle or Gospell.” The balance of evidence, including that
of Hamon L’Estrange already cited, see our p. 95, and that of Wiseman, Chirurgical
Treatises, p. 245, who, writing in 1676, says that the cross was not used by three
generations of kings—to wit James I, Charles I and Charles II—is in favour of the
discontinuance of the sign, until resumed by James II, in whose rubric the words
“crossing the sore of the sick Person” reappear. Elizabeth had no objection to the
cross as a symbol, and retained a crucifix in her private chapel. See Martin Halle’s
the Elizabethan angel, whether by design or accident we know not.

It is noticeable that the piercings in James I's angels are very large and this may be due to the clumsiness of the king, who distrusted his powers of threading a tiny aperture, as Mary had done, in public; but it is more probable that with the increased number of those coming to be healed, this portion of the ceremonial had been abandoned by Elizabeth.1 We may fairly suppose, with Sir John Evans,2 that the reason for the larger holes lay with those who enriched themselves by punching them, without any orders being given respecting the size of the aperture.

We cannot quite determine how many persons were healed by James, but we have evidence that angels were specially struck by his order for healing purposes. Mr. Symonds, in his "Mintmarks and Denominations of the Coinage of James I,"3 mentions the year 1607 as the earliest in which he has found such an account under this king, and for this delay the plague may have been responsible.4

"George, Earl of Dunbar, the keeper of the privy purse, had," he tells us, "received angels of fine gold to the value of £370 at the times of his Majesty's healing of the King's Evil. Similar entries recur throughout the reign, the smallest sum being £100 in 1608, while the heaviest payment was £960 in 1622. The average expenditure under this heading in the space of twenty-one years works out at £435 per annum." I have thought it an unnecessary waste of time to make further researches into these accounts, so ably epitomized by Mr. Symonds, who is much better versed in these matters than myself. But I would call the attention of those who are interested in the wording of the old documents to that of April 11th in the year 1611, printed in full by Mr. Cochran-

1 The words used by Tooker in his Charisma, p. 96, give one to understand that the angel was presented to the queen by the attendant chaplain ready slung on the ribbon, for he speaks of the coin as "auro numo solidorum decem, perforato, actena renincto numismate."
4 See note 1 on p. 105.
Patrick in the *Numismatic Chronicle*. The warrant directed “to the Treasurer and Under Treasurer of our Exchequer for the time being” begins with the king’s statement that he had “lately had occasion to use certain Angel gold in healing and curing of a certain disease called the King’s Evil, which hath been provided by our right trusty and right well beloved Thomas Ld Knyvett, and Edmund Doubleday Esqre, Wardens of our Mint, part whereof hath been delivered already and the residue to be delivered unto the Keeper of our Privy Purse.” “And for that,” continues this document, “we may have like occasion to use some great quantity hereafter, which we would not be unfurnished of, We have given direction to the said Ld Knyvett and Edmund Doubleday that they shall cause new Angels to be coined for our use within convenient time after notice thereof given to them, by you our Treasurer or Under Treasurer or either of you.” Then follow provisions for paying merchants for the gold and the refiner for adjusting the standard, the payment being made in coined silver. The wardens had, according to this document, already expended “the sum of one hundred and twenty pounds sterling . . . for Angel gold for our service.”

Mr. Cochran-Patrick quotes another warrant, under date September 15th, 1624, which I had also noticed in the State Papers Domestic, “to cause as many angels of gold to be coined as shall be required for the keeper of the Privy Purse for His Majesty’s use in healing the King’s Evil.” This is probably the last order for

---


2 The mint-mark “bell” superseded the “key” on May 9th, 1611. The coins here mentioned therefore under date April 11th of this year would belong respectively to these two issues. The angels in the “bell” pyx were three in number, pointing, if the proper proportion was placed in the pyx, to an issue of 45 lbs. Troy. For the “key” pyx see our p. 103, note 3. During a part of the time covered by the mint-mark key the plague was prevalent. A letter in Lady Newton’s *House of Lyme*, p. 88, under date September 26th, speaks of the “sicknes” as “much increased,” and also mentions it at Oxford at the same period.

Angels as Healing-pieces for the King’s Evil.

Angels given by James I, for he died in March, 1625, and Easter, the great season for healing, fell in April after the accession of Charles I.

James, like his predecessor Elizabeth, touched during his progresses.¹ Drake, in his *Eboracum*, tells us that on August 10th, 1617, the King came to York on his way to Scotland,² “and on the 13th, being Sunday, his majesty went to the cathedral, where the archbishop preached a learned sermon before him. After sermon ended he touched about seventy persons for the King’s Evil.” Dr. Crawfurd³ quotes an earlier instance in the same year when on Sunday, March 30th, 1617, James “healed to the number of fifty persons of the King’s Evil” after morning service at Lincoln Cathedral, and on the following Tuesday, April 1st, in his Chamber of Presence, “in the Priory of St. Catharine, Lincoln, he touched fifty-three persons,” a total of 103 in two days.⁴ The output of angels, of which James must then have been making his gifts, would naturally bear the mint-mark “booke,” which came into use on November 15th, 1616. The pyx-trial of May 18th, 1618, included angels and half-angels, with other gold of the fine standard, to the value of £4 13s. 6d. of this mint-mark, and £2 9s. 6d. of the “halfe moone,” both these “privie marks” being then tried,⁵ but we labour under the difficulty of being unable to divide the denominations.

¹ Browne, on p. 124 of his *Charisma Basilicon*, mentions that Elizabeth held a healing in Gloucestershire, and Dr. Crawfurd, p. 78, refers to Laneham’s account of nine persons having been healed by Queen Elizabeth during a visit to Kenilworth on a progress in 1575. See Nichols’s *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. i, p. 459: “By her Highnes’ accustomed mercy and charittee nyne cured of the peynfull and dangerous deseaz called the King’s Evil; for that Kings and Queens of the Realm without other medicin save only by handing and prayers only doe cure it.”—Robert Laneham’s letter to his friend Martin. See also the account of Edward II healing on our pp. 65–6. Henry VIII also touched in his travels. See also Dr. Crawfurd, pp. 36, 58, 75 and 77 for various kings.

² *Eboracum*, by Francis Drake, ed. 1736, p. 134.
³ *The King’s Evil*, p. 89.
⁵ See Henry Symonds in *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. ix, p. 218. A second pyx on the same day, mint-mark “halfe moone,” contained £2 9s. 6d. in “Angels and
The frequency with which the angels of James I are found pierced points rather to their continued use under Charles II, who bought old angels until the introduction of his touchpiece, than to any great number of healings in the time of James himself, and we still find constant references to the angels as a current coin in the letters of this period; two such I am suffered to quote from the interesting manuscripts lately published by Lady Newton in The House of Lyme.¹ A college Tutor, writing in 1612, says that "some young gentlemen can hardly be kept in any order, let them but have an angell or two in their purse." Again a lady, writing somewhat later, says that her husband "would not take a pype of tobacco yf a man would geve him a gold angle," and there is no doubt that under James the angel was still coined for currency together with its parts. His fine gold coinage was, although small as compared to Elizabeth's, about thrice as large as that of his son, and we must assume that two-thirds of the coins, probably including angels, were made for ordinary currency, the entire issue of standard gold being quite three times in excess of his requirements for touching.²

On the other hand we must remember that the yearly issue of fine gold coin, to the amount of about £1500, included other denominations as well as angels in various years; namely, rose-nobles, spur-ryals, half- and quarter-angels—thereby limiting greatly the output of the latter.

We have as many records under Charles I as we had under James of sick persons coming to be healed during the King's progresses. James had forbidden his people in his proclamation of 1616 to repair for healing "to his court" between the feasts of Easter and Michaelmas, expressly stating that "the former Kings of this Realme" did not receive the sick in the summer months, but angellets," but Dr. Kenyon shows that the "booke" preceded the "halfe moone" or crescent which was introduced on August 23rd, 1617, therefore after the date of these healings.

¹ The House of Lyme, pp. 71-2 and 93.
² According to Snelling, p. 37. James I's fine gold coinage was 734 lb. 10 oz. 11 dwt. 19 grs. between 1603 and 1625, that of Charles I extending to 1642 was 284 lb. 5 oz. 9 dwt. 9 grs.
that the "order hath bene of late neglected." Nevertheless, we have seen that on progress he healed in August, 1617.

Charles I, whilst stating that Whitsuntide had at one time been a "Healing" season, repeated his father's injunctions that after Easter none should "presume to repayre to his Majesties Royall Court to be healed, before the Feast of St. Michael now next coming." This and similar proclamations of various dates sometimes postpone the ceremony for a season or altogether on account of the plague. In June, 1625, access to Court was forbidden, in July the Parliament was removed to Oxford and a fast proclaimed; in August the proclamations show that the violence of the contagion was increasing. In the last mentioned month it was "very farre dispersed into many parts of the Kingdome already," and consequently the keeping of Bartholomew Fair and of Stourbridge Fair was prohibited. On the 11th August we hear of the "Plague now raging in those parts, in the Suburbs of London and Westminster and in the outlying parishes adjoining," and on the 4th September and 11th of October "the Michaelmas Tearme" was adjourned, whilst on the 17th the prohibition of intercourse between the infected parts and the court was again insisted upon. At last on 30th December, 1625, these orders were rescinded, but a proclamation of 17th January, 1625–6, explained that the coronation would not take place until May, 1626, owing to the dislocation in trade caused by the late plague, and a thanksgiving was ordered to be held on 19th February for the relief from the sickness. It appears that once the plague was stayed, Charles received some of his subjects for healing, and a proclamation of 18th June, 1626, tells us that "his now most

---


2 Proclamation in the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum, 18th June, 1626.

3 Dr. Crawfurd prints a large collection of these proclamations in the Appendix of his *King's Evil*.


7 *Ibid.*, No. 34.

Excellent Majestie in no lesse measure then any of his Royall predecessors, hath had good successe herein."¹ Again "the sicknesse" devastated the kingdom in 1630 and we have the same postponement of fairs and term in August and September, whilst the healings were discontinued and the Michaelmas ceremony put off firstly until December and then till Lent. Again, in June, 1632, we find the King stating that the people had had access to him at Lent, but he could not receive them again until Christmas.² Always at the approach of hot weather it was considered wiser to stay the possible spreading of infection, and we shall find this rule ever more strongly enforced. From June, 1626, onwards, those who had access to the King could only do so asbearers of "Certificates under the hands of the Parson, Vicar, or Minister and Churchwarden of those severall Parishes where they dwell, and from whence they come, testifying according to the trueth, that they have not any time before bene touched by the King, to the intent to be healed of that disease."³

Wherever the Monarch might be residing this certificate was required to act as a pass in travelling, but whether equal formalities were observed when he came to various towns on his travels, and the people came from the immediate neighbourhood, we have less evidence. We know that Charles, even before his constant change of residence in the Civil War, touched in his progresses as did his predecessors. We have Drake's record at York in April, 1639: "Upon Good-Friday the King touched for the King's Evil in the

¹ Ibid., No. 45.
² Ibid., No. 160. See also Appendix of the King's Evil, where Dr. Crawfurds, pp. 172-178 and 184-185, gives proclamations of the years 1631, 1632, 1634, 1636 and 1638. One of the proclamations of 1634 refers to an outbreak of smallpox as a reason for postponing the healing. See Dr. Crawfurds, p. 178, quoting State Papers Domestic, Various, 10. 187. See also proclamation in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries, No. 194.
³ These words are in most of the proclamations from the time of Charles I onward throughout the reigns of the succeeding monarchs. Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas, in a note on healing, p. 353 of his Privy Purse Accounts of Henry VIII, mentions that amongst the MS. Conway papers there is an order for a proclamation under date 13th May, 1625, stating that for the future all shall bring certificates "for that many being healed have disposed of their pieces of gold otherwise than was intended and thereby fall into relapse."
minister two hundred persons. Upon Easter Sunday the King
received the sacrament at the cathedral. On Monday he ordered
seventy pounds to be given to each of the four wards of the city,
to be distributed amongst poor widows. On Tuesday and Wednesday he touched each day an hundred persons for the evil. At his leisure hours, his usual diversion, during his stay in York, was to play at the game called Balloon.”¹ At this time Charles was on his way to Scotland, and a former visit to that country had been signalized in the same manner. Dr. Crawfurd writes of his healing ceremony at Durham Castle in 1633² and also at Holyrood, where we find that he “after the offering heal’d 100 persons of the cruellies of Kyngis evil, younge and old.”

William Guthrie, in his General History of Scotland,³ gives scoffingly an account of this event, which he found described amongst Sir James Balfour’s manuscripts. Guthrie, speaking of Charles I’s visit to Edinburgh in 1633, tells us that “On the twenty-fourth of June, St. John the Baptist day, he went in great state to his Chapel royal, and after making a solemn offertery at the altar, he performed the ridiculous ceremony of touching a hundred persons for the King’s evil; putting about every one of their necks, as says Balfour, a piece of gold coined for the purpose hung on a white ribband.”⁴

Sir James Balfour’s⁵ remark that the coin used was made “for

¹ Francis Drake’s Eboracum, p. 137. In a note (i) to the above Drake gives descriptive details taken from old manuscripts, lent to him: “During the tyme the King touched those that had the disease called the evil, were read these words: ‘They shall lay their hands upon the sick and they shall recover.’” During the tyme the King put about every of their necks an angel of gold with a white ribben, were read these words: ‘That Light was the true light which lighteth every man which cometh into the world.’”

² The King’s Evil, p. 97.

³ Guthrie, vol. ix, p. 213.

⁴ Guthrie, quoting Balfour, states that the King left London on May 11th. The expedition was made for the Scottish Coronation, it is therefore small wonder that Charles took with him the large train of persons mentioned. These included all the attendants usually present at a “Healing”: the “master of the prince’s purse, two bishops, a clerk of the closet . . . six chaplains, two physicians, two surgeons,” besides countless other persons. He quitted Scotland on July 10th.

⁵ Sir James Balfour, 1600-1657, author of The Annals of Scotland from
the purpose” is not without interest, and strengthens me in the belief that by this time Charles I coined the angel for presentation almost exclusively, although it remained in circulation after the Restoration. It may be regarded as an indication that the King who, after the seizure of the Mint by Parliament in August, 1642, was obliged to bestow as healing money any coin which came to hand, continued the coinage of the angel for healing purposes alone throughout the latter part of his reign. During the Civil War the only angels obtainable were those earlier coined by Charles himself or by his predecessors, and in his straitened circumstances these would not be easy to procure, although his father’s angel coinage must still have been fairly common or Briot would not have made a coin-weight representing it for commercial purposes so late as 1632. 

The details of the pyx lists of gold of Charles I, which Mr. Symonds published at my urgent request some years after he had gone into the question of this king’s silver currency, mention the angel in every pyx until after the trial of May 20th, 1643, when the mint-mark (P) superseded the triangle-in-circle. “This latest of the angels,”

Malcolm III to Charles II, left many writings in manuscript, mostly preserved in the Advocates’ Library at Edinburgh.

1 The sequestration of the royal estates and revenues was directed by Parliament on September 21st, 1643; but Mr. Symonds informs us that it appears from an account which runs from November 25th, 1642, furnished by a Parliamentary receiver of mint revenues, that the Tower Mint was actually seized as from August, 1642. See Numismatic Chronicle, Fourth Series, vol. x, “The Gold Coinage of Charles I,” by Henry Symonds, p. 365.

2 The coin-weights made by Briot for Charles I in 1632 include the 11s. angel and half-angel at 5s. 5d., and the 2s. 9d. quarter-angel of James I.


5 The triangle-in-circle mint-mark began in or after July, 1641, following on the star, which was tried on the 15th of that month. Dr. Kenyon, writing in 1884,
writes Mr. Symonds, "was in fact struck before November 25, 1642, on which day the Parliamentary receiver of the Tower revenues began a new account, which mentions that no angel gold was used during the period of about two and a half years covered by that document."

This angel, with the triangle-in-circle mint-mark, is the last available for healing purposes, but we know that Charles I continued to touch during the Civil War. According to Mr. Symonds's pyx lists we find that the amount of angels issued with the mint-mark star was about the average, whilst that of the triangle-in-circle was much below it. If, then, Charles had no great reserve of angels—and how could he have many of these in a war-chest—what was his healing-piece? The pathetic answer of an anonymous contemporary writer shall speak for him: "Small pieces of Silver was his gift, for alas he could not arrive at others; 'twas not the golden age with him."

chronicled no angels later than those with the mint-mark bell; but of late years the entire sequence of mint-marks to the triangle-in-circle have been filled in, agreeing with the evidence of the pyx lists.

1 Such pieces of the triangle-in-circle mint-mark as I have seen are on both sides struck from dies altered from the star; of such is my specimen and both those in the cabinet of Major Carlyon-Britton. This is of course as much an indication that fresh dies had to be made late in the star period, as it is of the rarity of the triangle-in-circle; but we have seen that relatively the issue of the latter mint-mark was small. The angels in the star pyx, June 26th, 1640, to June 15th, 1641, were seven in number; those in the succeeding triangle-in-circle pyx only three. This should mean that 45 lbs. of the latter were struck as against 105 lbs. of the star; but there is reason to believe, as we shall see presently, that with regard to small coinages of angels, the rule was not exactly observed of 15 lbs. of gold to one sample coin, but that one piece must have been held up from every lesser "journey."

2 Near the manor of Wooburn, Bucks, there was discovered late in the eighteenth century "a quantity of gold angels to the value of 50l." It was believed that these coins were buried during the Civil War, Philip Lord Warton having concealed £60,000 in a wood, which he recovered after the Restoration with some difficulty. Cooke, in his Topography (Bucks, p. 138), describes this incident, but unfortunately does not give any details concerning the angels, which apparently were not found with the rest of the money. We should have been glad to know whether these 100 angels were pierced in anticipation of a healing or were currency either of the time of Charles I or of his predecessors.

3 Page 8 of a volume called Xειρεγοκινη, or the Excellency or Handywork of
Dr. John Browne always lays stress on the touch and not the gift, and relates how "the good King," going a prisoner from Windsor to London and asked by a blind woman for his help, "tells her he has no gold; she still begs for Jesus Christ's sake he would grant her his gracious touch; which she having received, within three days after grew well and recovered." Dr. Wiseman says, that Charles, "in his extremity of Poverty had not gold to bestow, but instead of it gave Silver and sometimes nothing."

Browne explains that when Sir John Jacobs sent his little girl to be healed by the King, then a prisoner at Holmby House, the child took her own piece of gold with her, "which the good King was pleased to put over her neck." He also tells us that a man reduced to crutches brought with him to the Isle of Wight a shilling for the purpose of suspension, and arriving quite lame, was so rapidly healed "that in three days he quitted his Crutches . . . in three weeks he was able to play nine pins and run after his Bowl, and in less than a year he went to Newfoundland as a seaman."

This courtly chirurgeon, Browne, gives another instance of a cure performed by Charles as a prisoner, "a Silver twopence, struck in a white silk Ribband" being his gift at Hampton Court, and adds optimistically, "All people, which did here come to be touched had only Silver given to them and yet most of them known to be cured."

the Royal Hand, published in 1665 by T. A., and variously ascribed to Dr. Thomas Allen, Fellow of the Royal Society and College of Surgeons, and to Dr. Harris, who was Burgess of St. Albans in 1661. An old manuscript note in the British Museum copy refers it to Harris, with the amusing information that it was so much disliked by "his father, old Harris, the old Chirurgeon there [St. Albans] that he bought up all the copies and burnt them."

1 Charisma Basilicon, p. 143.
2 Richard Wiseman, Several Chirurgical Treatises, book iv, A Treatise of the King’s Evil, p. 247.
3 John Browne’s Charisma Basilicon, p. 148. Third book of his Adenochirodelogia, pub. 1683-4. John Browne was Chirurgeon in Ordinary to Charles II and Surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital. For details concerning him see Dr. Crawford’s The King’s Evil, pp. 123-125.
4 Charisma, p. 146.
5 Ibid., pp. 141-2.
Angels as Healing-pieces for the King’s Evil.

It is not without interest in connection with this gift of 2d. that I hear from our member, Mr. Baldwin, of a find, brought to him some years ago, consisting of a bag containing about fifty pierced half-groats and a few pierced pennies. This purse had been discovered, buried on a common near Watlington\(^1\) in Oxfordshire. The condition of the pieces showed that they had not been tampered with, and that the holes must have been made before the coins were lost. He tried to clean them, especially the rarer varieties of Aberystwith, but they were so corroded that he kept but few, of which one, by his courtesy, passed into my collection of touchpieces. It seems beyond doubt that these little coins must have been pierced for an Oxford “healing” and the purse was dropped by the Clerk of the Closet or Almoner or Keeper of the Privy-Purse, or the goldsmith to whom the coins had been entrusted for perforation. There is no doubt that persons in the town would have taken advantage of the King’s presence to obtain his touch. Nevertheless such evidence as we possess concerning healings at Oxford is negative rather than affirmative. On February 20th, 1642-3,\(^2\) we find the people of

\(^1\) Watlington is about 2 miles south-east of Chalgrove, where a battle was fought June 18th, 1643, and some 12 miles from Oxford, where the King resided, making it his headquarters during a great part of the Civil War. This coin is a mule between a Tower half-groat and an Aberystwith type, but not all the pieces were, as I understand from Mr. Baldwin, of this rare variety.

\(^2\) Thomason’s *Tracts, E.* 90, 6. “Petition to the King’s most Excellent Majesty of the King’s poore Subjects afflicted with that grievous Infirmitie called the King’s Evill, of which by his Majesties absence they have no possibility of being cured, wanting all means to gain access to his Majesty by reason of his abode at Oxford.” Dr. J. C. Cox, in his *Parish Registers of England*, illustrates on p. 180 the title-page of this petition, showing that the printed date, 1643, has been early annotated as 1642, probably by Thomason, and I find that the petition is bound with other matter of 1642-3. A preceding paper, also dated February, 1643, deals with subjects of 1642-3, proving that although unusual at this time the new style of reckoning was sometimes adopted in contemporary prints.
London issuing a pathetic appeal for assistance, and complaining that so long as Charles resided at Oxford "environed with so many legions of soldiery, who will be apt to hinder our access to your Court and Princely Person," they could not obtain his touch.

They asked him to "consigne some way whereby we may be enabled to approach your royall presence." But the King, it appears, was unable to accede to this request, for in spite of the twenty days' truce, which had just been decided upon between him and the Parliament, it would have been impossible for him to come to London, and for obvious reasons it was not considered safe or desirable that the sick should resort to Oxford. We can only say that a month later The Mercurius Aulicus of March 26th, 1643, p. 154, mentions that Charles caused a notice to be put up at the entrances into Oxford forbidding any to come and be healed until the following Michaelmas. The writer of this newspaper comments on the order that it was "upon excellent reason and very much conducing to the health and benefit of this place and to the safety of His Majesty and the two young Princes, considering the infinite multitudes of people (many of which are very poor and indigent persons) which usually resort unto the Court at the Feast of Easter under this pretence."2

This notice is, perhaps, indicative that the King had intended to hold a healing ceremony at this time, and we believe that he did indeed distribute the Maundy money at Easter as usual. I have found no postponement with regard to the September reception in such newspapers as I have searched, but the same objections would still have applied then, and it was, moreover, inconvenient, for military reasons, to allow free access to the city.

Although when the petition from London was issued the King's

1 Easter Day fell on April 2nd, 1643. Lord Crawford, in his Bibliotheca Lindesiana, Catalogue of the Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, vol. i, No. 2393, quotes this order of March 25th, on the authority of the newspaper of the following day, but states that he has not found the proclamation itself.

2 The plague did in time penetrate into Oxford, for Anthony a Wood mentions under date May, 1644, that "the infection was then in Oxon," and he and his brother had to undergo quarantine after leaving the town. See Lives of Ireland, Herne and Wood, vol. II, p. 21.
residence at the University had been of short duration, it dragged on intermittently from this time forward until 1646, and the memorial of necessity failing to recall Charles to the Metropolis, those suffering from the King's Evil had to await the Restoration for healing, or proceed to the Continent to seek the help of Charles II after his father's death. I have not succeeded in finding evidence as to any withdrawal of the prohibition against visiting Oxford, whither Charles, after a short absence, had returned before Michaelmas, 1643, came round.¹

We have said that Charles was sometimes allowed to hold his healings whilst in prison; and to the discontinuance of this indulgence our attention is attracted by Whitelocke, who records that letters were sent under date, April 22nd, 1647, to the House of Commons by the Commissioners at Holmby House, speaking of "the great Resort of People to the King to be cured of the King's Evil," whereon the House ordered a declaration to be drawn "to inform People of the superstition of being touched by the King for the Evil"² and also "a Letter of Thanks ordered to the Commissioners at Holmeby."³

Whilst on his way thither on February 9th, 1646, he arrived at Leeds and healed those who came to him, as Lady Denbigh tells us in her family record, compiled from private papers at Newnham Paddox.⁴ "A little before dinner many diseased persons came bringing with them ribbons and gold and were only touched without ceremony." The same thing had happened at Durham, and the authoress remarks: "we cannot wonder that the Commissioners

¹ The battle of Newbury was fought on September 20th, 1643. The King returned to Oxford, after throwing a garrison into Donnington Castle, and I have found no indication of his leaving again for some little time.

² Memorials of the English Affairs, ed. 1682, p. 248, by Bulstrode Whitelocke.

³ See Commons' Journals, vol. v, p. 151: "Anno 1647. 22 Aprilis. Ordered that it be referred to a Committee to prepare a Declaration to be set forth to the People concerning the superstition of being touched for the healing of the King's Evil." The House also ordered "that the Resort of People thither [Holmby] to be touched for the Evil may be prevented." See also The Perfect Diurnall, No. 195, p. 1564.

⁴ Royalist Father and Roundhead Son, by the Countess of Denbigh, p. 249.
then sent a petition to Parliament begging that this custom might be stopped, as so many of the people were suffering from maladies, which made them unfit to come into his Majesty’s presence.” Be this as it may, the fear of a rescue or an increase in the King’s popularity were equal motives for forbidding the access of the populace to Charles, and the legend on his angels brought by the patients, AMOR . POPVLI . PRÆSIDIVM . REGIS: perhaps unpleasantly reminded his guards that the “love of his people” might still prove to be “the King’s defence.”

We have here collected ample evidence that Charles, so long as he had gold, gave it, and then substituted silver, and of nineteenth-century writers Mr. Edward Law-Hussey alone suggests that even in his worst extremity he used brass.¹

Dr. Pettigrew,² it is true, figured amongst touchpieces a small medal of obvious appropriateness, believing it to be a touchpiece, but he did not attribute it to Charles I. It is a jetton belonging, as we shall see, to the mid-seventeenth century, but he placed it later, and, apparently unfamiliar with the touchpieces of the later Stuarts, he vaguely attributed it as “probably a touchpiece of the Pretenders.”³ The type of this piece shows on the one side a blessing hand, touching one of several heads, with the legend HE • TOUCHED . THEM ., and on the other a crowned rose and thistle with the words AND . THEY . WERE . HEALED. A freehand drawing of the obverse and reverse of this base metal jetton was placed without comment amongst a collection of data, mostly of the 17th and early 18th century, treasured by an antiquary named Robert Cole. Possibly the drawing was made by himself or a friend with a view to a publication in the early 19th century. I may be right in identifying him with a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, whose communications and presentations to that Society show him to have been

¹ *Archaeological Journal*, vol. x, 1853, pp. 187 to 211 and 337.
² *Superstitions connected with Surgery and Medicine*, Frontispiece, figures 7 and 8.
³ *Ibid.*, p. 126. The form of the letter A (see page 125) is that commonly used by such engravers as Greene, Briot and Simon, of the first half of the seventeenth century. It is figured in the illustrated edition of *Medallic Illustrations*, Plate XXXIII, No. 23, and also in Boyne’s *Seventeenth Century Tokens*, Plate XXXVI, No. 11.
TOKEN USED AS PASS OF ADMISSION TO HEALING CEREMONY UNDER CHARLES I.
(From a Drawing in the Surgeon-General's Library, Washington, U.S.A.)
Angels as Healing-pieces for the King's Evil.

interested in Stuart subjects. So far as we can ascertain, the collection, now in the Surgeon-General's Library at Washington, remained unpublished until quite recently, when the MS. attracted the attention and activity of Dr. Fielding Garrison, who published an account of these papers in the Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine. I am here able to illustrate the drawing by his kindness. But, although unknown to Dr. Garrison before the publication of his paper, some curious facts had come to my knowledge about this little medal, which for a short time had been mistakenly believed to have ranked actually as a touchpiece under Charles I.

In 1910 my friend Mr. Symonds, as a result of his search amongst the Audit Office Accounts in the Public Record Office, discovered evidence, which appeared to point clearly to the use of a base touchpiece by Charles I, before the Civil War began. He found that a payment was made to the chief engraver at the Tower mint in 1635-6 "for making of Tokens, used about the healing of the disease called the King's Evil." These tokens were delivered to William Clowes, Sergeant-Chirurgeon, at 2d. the piece; the number of the first

1 The name "Robt. Cole," in a fine Italian hand, is embossed in relief stamping on each sheet of the collection. Dr. Garrison tells me that the sketches are of such ink and on such paper as were used in the first half of the nineteenth century, and we may suppose that they and other drawings of Charles II's touchpiece are probably by Mr. Cole. There is no evidence as to what he proposed to say about them. The manuscripts were bought by the Surgeon-General's Library at the Edward Hailstone Sale in 1891, and formed the basis of Dr. Garrison's paper. Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine, vol. vii, No. 6, April, 1914. His article is not illustrated.


3 This William Clowes, Sergeant-Chirurgeon to Charles I, must not be confused with the William Clowes who in 1602 wrote a short book on healing called The Fruitful and Approved Treatise for the Artificial Cure of that Malady called in Latin Struma and in English the Evil cured by the Kinges and Queenes of England. He was then one of Elizabeth's surgeons, and was spoken of by Wiseman, writing in 1676, as "old Mr. Clows." See Chirurgical Treatises, p. 247. Wiseman probably wished to differentiate between William Clowes the elder and the junior, who would be known to the public of his day. Clowes the elder, 1540-1604, served with Leicester in the Netherlands in 1585, and was in the fleet opposed to the Armada in 1588. The younger, 1582-1648, was Sergeant-Surgeon to James I before he entered the service of Charles. See Shakespeare's England, vol. i, p. 427.
consignment being 5500. "This," wrote Mr. Symonds, "is an interesting discovery, proving, as it does, that Charles used a touch-piece of base metal, when the gold Angels had become too valuable to be distributed at such ceremonies." "This," he continues, "is the first mention of copper or brass touchpieces, but similar entries recur in later accounts. There are also frequent references to the striking of 'healing Angels.'"

This came as a matter of great surprise to me, for apart from the above allusion to the continuance of the angel series, I had these coins with mint-marks of later date. Also I, myself, had made extracts from several mint papers, which proved that the angels ran contemporaneously with the issue discovered by Mr. Symonds of the token, which he and Mr. Grueber conjecturally identified with the medal to which I have referred. Not only so, but we have seen that already in 1633, two years before the appearance of the token, Balfour said that the angel was purposely coined for healing. To what end therefore should Charles continue the making of a coin not required for circulation?

However, the evidence seemed absolutely convincing, in spite of the unbroken record of the issue of "angell-golde," and Mr. Symonds was so good as to show me, at the Public Record Office, some of the warrants, notably one under date April, 1635, speaking of a letter addressed to Sir William Parkhurst on the subject. The document runs thus: "Tokens for the Euell. 'A like' [letter] to Sir Wm. Parkhurst to cause such number of tokens to be made as the Seriant Surgeon shall give direction for, for the use of such as the said Surgeon shall find to have the King's Evill and to allow the graver 2d. a token." Another warrant for the year 1638-9 reads: "Paid to the sd Edward . . . [Greene] for providing and making of Tokens used about the Healing of the disease called the King's . . . [Evil] by virtue of a Warrant dormante under

---

1 "The like" refers to a letter to Thomas, 19th Earl of Arundel, who was Earl Marshall from 1622 to 1646.
2 Signet Office Docket Book, Carl. I, 1634 to 1638.
3 Audit Office Dcts., 1599, Roll 37.
Angels as Healing-pieces for the King's Evil.

Warrants of other years mentioned by Mr. Symonds show that in 1637-8, 1830 tokens were produced and, as already specified, 5500 in 1635, amounting, with the above 1557, to 8887 between 1635 and 1639. But it is unnecessary to quote further, for I have shown how fully Mr. Symonds was justified in believing that the base piece had taken the place of the gold, and although I could not reconcile to my satisfaction the double issue, I, having for the time being laid aside my research into the healing traditions, dismissed the question from my mind. Fortune, however, favoured me, for whilst searching in the State Papers Domestic on another quest, my eye fell upon a contemporary copy of a letter addressed to Sir William Parkhurst, which explains the whole matter.

This document is in substance, if not in form, the "warrant dormante" to which one of the orders just quoted refers, and is in truth a draft for the letter to the Mint Warden specified in the other.

I need not say that Mr. Symonds was as pleased as I could be when I showed him the letter, proving, as it does, that the brass pieces were only admission tickets and relieving the unfortunate monarch from the imputation of giving so poor a present to his patients, whilst the Tower Mint was still in his hands.

The draft runs as follows: "To Sir Wm. Parkhurst Knt, Warden of our Mint. Trusty and well Beloved, Wee Greete you well. Whereas by our Proclamations wee have signified our pleasure that the poore People and other your loving subjects that are troubled with the desease commonly called the King's Euill, shall not presume to resort to our Court to be healed, but only twice in 1 State Papers Domestic, Carl. I, vol. cclxxxvi, No. 1, April 1.

1 The y, spelling your instead of our, is a mistake made by the original contemporary writer of the draft, who ran his pencil through it, the rest of the document being in ink. Although an unsigned draft, Mr. Symonds considers the evidence of this paper absolutely reliable, it being in truth the draft of the "warrant dormante" of April 1st, 1653.
the yeare (vizt Michas and Easter)\(^1\) by reason whereof the number hath allway been so greate that the Sergeant Chirurgion, whose office it is to view, and prepare them for the Royall touch, hath been accustomed to give every one a token, thereby to know and distinguish those that are approvd and allowed for every healing day appointed, from those that are not. And whereas wee are informed by our Sergeant Chirurgion, that there hath been a great abuse committed by dissolute and ill-disposed People, who to gaine the Gold only have counterfeited his tokens, wch were cast in a mold made by a Freemason, whereby wee have not only been deceaved of so many Angells, but also hath many times encreased the number to be more then was appointed for the day, and many that was appointed wanted their Angells and our Royall presence disturbed by their outcry, in consideration and prevention wherof, our pleasure is and wee doe hereby will and command you, to giue present order unto our Servant Edw\(^d\) Greene, chief Graver of our mint, to make both presently and from time to time such number of tokens of bras Copper and such other mettall as our Serjant shall give directions for under his handwriting, every one of wch to be in bredthe the compasse of an Angell and that the said Tokens be returned to the warden of our Mint whereby he may know what number of Angells have been expended in this our said seruice, also that you allow or pay unto our said Graver for the workmanship and mettall of these the summe of 2 pence for every such peece, being made and delivered to our Serjant chirurgeon, and whereas wee are informed that there hath been some allready made, and delivered unto him, our pleasure is that you allow unto our Graver the same price for those that shall appeare unto you hath been made, and not allowed for, as also from time to time for those that are to be made

\(^1\) The proclamations of James had already established this rule, and that of Charles I in June, 1626, had repeated it. The dates were sometimes altered owing to plague or other distempers, and this was notably the case in 1634, the year preceeding the order for the tokens. The proclamation of 1635 re-asserts the King's willingness to touch at Easter and Michaelmas, but again in 1636 the healings were postponed. See Dr. Crawfurdf's Appendices and various proclamations mentioned on our pp. 110-11.
and delivered (as aforesaid) and this our warrant shall be your sufficient discharge to be allowed upon the account of the Mint. Given under our signet at.

Dated at Westm' the first day of April, 1635."

From this document it will be seen that the token here ordered was to be "in breth the compasse of an Angell," that is to say \( \frac{1}{10} \) inch, whilst \( \frac{3}{4} \) of an inch covers the piece which by universal consent—witness Thomas Pettigrew, Robert Cole, Mr. Grueber and Mr. Symonds—has been judged to be applicable to the healing ceremony. Is not this, therefore, the old admission ticket which the new token was to supersede? Again, are some specimens Clowes's original pieces? Are not others the counterfeits which caused their supersession? The wording of the document is peculiar; for we are told that Clowes caused his tickets to be cast by a "Freemason" rather than struck, as are some of the known tokens. In Stuart times, however, it was no unusual thing to multiply by casting a medal for which a pair of dies had been made by some skilled engraver, and the first tokens, in this case, may originally have been struck. Considerable difference of opinion, moreover, has been expressed as to the fashioning of various examples, and I can only say that the few specimens I have examined or followed up have been according to my own opinion or the report of their owners as follows. That in the British Museum and Mr. Symonds's piece, after due consideration, are both adjudged struck. About my own I am doubtful, but I think it may be an extremely fine cast, although the experts to whom I have submitted it pronounced it struck. Mr. J. O. Manton purchased one at the Hodgkin sale which belongs undoubtedly to the cast category and is rougher than
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those above mentioned. I might be tempted to suggest that if some of the cast copies were counterfeits, this is amongst the earlier of them. I hear from Dr. Parkes-Weber, that his specimen, which he presented to the Boston Medical Museum, is undoubtedly a contemporary cast, very fine and covered with green patina. Mr Symonds tells me that of four he examined, three were holed, one of these being in another private collection, but he could not say from memory whether this last-mentioned specimen was cast or struck. Dr. Weber informs me that his example is not holed; the same may be said of Mr. Manton's, of mine, and of that in the British Museum. So far as I have been able to compare these pieces they have been uniform in size, and personally I have seen very few pierced specimens. Had the tickets been cast successively one from another, they would naturally decrease in size from the shrinkage of the metal in each case, but the fine cast specimens must have been taken directly from one of the struck originals, and if the "Freemason" was lawfully employed for the purpose only of multiplication, we should expect the uniformity in size which we meet. On the other hand, smaller pieces by the forger are likely to be found, and although Mr. Manton's rough piece may be an early example of these, another seen and described to me by Mr. W. J. Webster was undoubtedly smaller and poorer in every respect and may be the latest survivor of the fraudulent copyist's successive although contemporary forgeries.

But how about the new piece of 1635—"in bredthe the compasse of an Angell"? It is obvious that these official tokens, which after use were to be returned to the Warden of Mint, would, however often they might be reissued, be ultimately melted down by the Parliamentary authorities as so much copper or brass, on the cessation of the service for which they were required.

It is to be hoped that discussion of the subject may lead to the discovery of specimens of a copper or brass medal measuring an inch and one-tenth, the size of Charles I's angel, and of the type either of the blessing hand, or perhaps the precursor of Charles II's Soli Deo Gloria pattern halfpenny (?) in the form of a copy of the current angel or touchpiece. But of this more anon when we discuss
the touchpieces of that king in our next volume. Sufficient alteration to preclude danger to the currency from the base metal copy of an angel would, of course, be expected, and possibly some other design might be preferred. By a strange coincidence Dr. Parkes-Weber, occupied with the discussion of Dr. Garrison’s paper, which had just come out, wrote to the Lancet on the subject of these so-called touchpieces just two days after I had cleared Charles I’s memory from the aspersion of meanness by reading my paper at our Meeting on May 25th, 1914.¹ He had not noticed the newspaper reports of the proceedings, but suggested various reasons for believing the medal to be no touchpiece, regarding it as having some other connection with the ceremony, such as a pass or ticket. A friendly correspondence in the Lancet² ensued between Dr. Parkes-Weber and myself, in which I stated that I had already produced documentary evidence to this effect. I need not go over this ground afresh, but it is desirable, with all deference to so well-known an authority on seventeenth-century jettons, to repeat my reason for not assenting to Dr. Weber’s suggestion that this gap might be filled by the small medal with the legends: obverse, Pray . for . the . King . and reverse, Lord-give Thy-Blessing.³

Whilst agreeing that this might be a pass to some ceremony, I feel that in this instance there is only one instruction clearly put before us, namely, the change of size, a condition this little medal does not fulfil. The same objection applies to another jetton suggested by Dr. Weber, namely, the ROSA : SINE : SPINA & pattern of Elizabeth which is, he thinks, mistakenly placed under the name of this Queen by Mr. Montagu.⁴ Whilst personally supporting

³ Boyne’s Tokens, ed. 1858, Plate 36, No. 6.
⁴ Montagu’s Copper Coins, p. 4, No. 6. Obverse a rose crowned within an inner circle. ROSA : SINE : SPINA & ; Reverse Shield bearing the cross of St. George, PRO LEGE REGE ET GREGE. Mr. Montagu tells us that this piece has been some-
the argument used by Dr. Weber, that both legend and workmanship are more suggestive of Stuart than Tudor times, I nevertheless glanced for a moment at the possibility of finding in this, or indeed in the pattern half-groat of 1601, illustrated below, an admission ticket to Elizabeth’s healings, relying on Mr. Montagu’s tentative attribution of the Rosa Sine Spina piece to the days of this Queen, and on Dr. Pettigrew’s assertion that tickets were required by her. The legend on the pattern half-groat, Montagu No. 1, although it alludes to the Queen as a benefactress, appears to refer rather to the intended unification of the English and Irish coinage than to her healing powers, but as this also might be cited as a possible ticket I here illustrate it.¹

ELIZABETH’S PATTERN HALF-GROAT.

Pettigrew says, quoting Tooker, that those admitted had “to take with them a ticket from a physician or surgeon by whom they were examined.”² He gives a long account of Elizabeth’s precautions in healing, to all appearance intended as a direct translation from Tooker’s Latin work, but I think, by a printer’s error, the quotation marks must be misplaced, for although he gives the times attributed to Charles I or to Charles II, and his tentative attribution to Elizabeth is on the strong ground of the similarity of this pattern, and another pattern bearing the initials E.R.

¹ Ruding XV, 9, where it is called a sixpence, and Pembroke’s Numismata Antiqua, Plate 20, p. 287, where it is regarded in copper as a “trial piece.” Montagu places it as a half-groat in his Copper Coins, p. 2, but thought it more probably a jetton. It is usually catalogued as a groat in silver or half-groat in copper, but is very rare in the latter metal. The silver struck piece is rare, but is common when cast as a medal, for the cast pieces surely cannot be considered as patterns for currency. It has rarely been seen in gold.

² Superstitions connected with Surgery, p. 131.
sense of the chaplain’s description, the translation is very free, and the nearest approach to the "certificate under their hands," also specified by Dr. Pettigrew, consists in the words "commendantur regiae Maiestati," and shows only that the doctors took the names of the patients and passed on these names to the Queen. No mention of a tangible metal pass or ticket is present,¹ nor have I found any until the time of Charles I. Nevertheless, the bare possibility presents itself that such might have been used by James I. If so, "Pray for the King" and "Lord give Thy Blessing" would bear suitably on the subject. A copper piece mentioned by Mr. Christmas with BEATI PACIFICI on the obverse and HOC OPVS DEI on the reverse would be still more appropriate as regards the last words,² whilst the blessing on the "Peace-Maker" was a favourite motto with this King and one with which he was indeed sometimes taunted.

It hardly seems necessary to warn my readers that not every jetton bearing the image of St. Michael killing the dragon is connected with touching for the King’s Evil. The Archangel was the patron saint of Brussels, and several small medals were struck in the seventeenth century with varying obverses and mottoes by the Marselaer family in the Low Countries portraying Michael, but also charged with the arms of Marselaer—see Van Loon, vol. ii, pp. 399-400, and Dugniolle’s, Le Jeton Historique des Dix Sept Provinces, tom. iii, No. 3804.

We have no direct evidence as to the moment when Clowes, the surgeon of Charles I, issued his first metal pass, but it is possible

¹ Tooker’s Charisma, p. 93. “Scrophularij isti nomina dant Chirurgis regijs nomina sic data commendantur regiae Maiestati.” The sense of the long passage, with the precautions taken to be sure that the disease was really struma, is correctly given, and proves that great care was already taken both against infection and fraud; also that a preliminary examination took place.

² See Montagu’s Copper Coins of England, p. 5. Mr. Montagu, quoting the Rev. Henry Christmas, calls this piece “a numismatic puzzle,” but attributes it to the reign of James I and regards it as “a medalet or jetton only.” The Beati Pacifici motto was used by James on one of Simon van de Passe’s portraits, executed in about 1616. See Medallic Illustrations, vol. i, p. 215, No. 61.
that in the years 1631, 1632 and 1634, when frequent proclamations postponed the healings, fresh precautions were adopted to make sure that no infectious person approached the King.¹ In 1635, when the regular dates for touching were re-established, the rush of patients was all the greater and the scenes which disturbed his Majesty arose.

It might have been hoped that the numbers of tickets required by Clowes in each year would agree with the amount of angels issued, and thus prove that the coin was always ordered purposely for each healing season, but this is not the case. On reflection, moreover, it is obvious that the first issue of tokens would be large, but that tickets returned to the Mint would not require recoinage. It is not surprising, therefore, to learn that the issue of fine gold corresponding in point of date with the 5500 tickets made between April 1st, 1635, and the following March 31st, should be but 20 lb. 9 oz. 2 dwt. 18 grs. —equalling at most about 1850 angels.² It is, however, somewhat puzzling to find that in this year £1214, namely 2428 angels, were handed to Lord Arran, Keeper of the Privy Purse, for the healing, and it becomes obvious that either a certain unused surplus existed from previous years, or else some angels were purchased from goldsmiths, as was the case at a later period, and re-issued without recoinage on coming into the Mint. It is certainly apparent that taking the amounts paid to the Keeper of the Privy Purse and specified as for "healing," they have in nearly every case exceeded the amount set down as coined in fine gold in the same period. It is, however, matter of no surprise that the issue of tickets should, on the contrary, be smaller than that of the angels, excepting in the first year. In a careful examination of the accounts for 1636, I found no mention of tickets, and both gold issue and the payment to Lord Arran were

¹ An interesting letter, under date November 28, 1631, shows how prevalent was the plague. Richard Parr, writing from the Isle of Man, describes the island as being "still under God's frowns and rods; death still sits on our thresholds, death comes into our windows and is entred into our palaces." See The House of Lyme, by the Lady Newton, p. 134.

² Information kindly supplied by Mr. Symonds from Declared Accounts Audit Office, Bundle 1598, Roll 34.
inconsiderable.¹ In 1637 the fine gold coinage almost balanced Lord Arran's receipts, which amounted to £1500, whilst Clowes received 1830 tokens.² In 1638, Robert, Earl of Arran, had £500, and his successor, "James Levington, Esqre, now keep. of his Highness Privy Purse," £873 10s., resulting in a total of £1373 10s., whereas the gold output only amounted to about £1070.³ In this year 1557 tokens were demanded. Thus taking one year with another we have in four years £4382 10s., namely about 8765 angels, passing through the hands of the Keeper, against a gold coinage of 80 lb. 2 oz. 5 dwt. 6 grs., which should have produced only about 7135 angels, whilst 8887 tickets were issued. It is, perhaps, unprofitable to go into these minutiae, for unless we had a complete table of all the years of Charles I's reign we could arrive at no definite approximation. But these figures are enough to show that, allowing for a slight surplus, to which I have already referred, the King must at this period have been spending at least £1000 a year in healing and probably more, for the very low output of 2 lb. 2 oz. 8 dwt. 18 grs., and the delivery of only £295 to Lord Arran in the year 1636–7 is accounted for by the plague, to which proclamations between April, 1636, and September, 1637, call our attention.⁴ Roughly

¹ Declared Accounts, Bundle 1599, Roll 35. The fine gold weighed 2 lb. 2 oz. 8 dwt. 18 grs., and the payment to Lord Arran was £295. There is a further sum of £4 for "provision of fine golde with other chardg incydent to the making of healing Angells for the disease called the King's Evill."

² Declared Accounts, Audit Office, Bundle 1599, Roll 36. Kindly communicated to me by Mr. Symonds, 33 lb. 1 oz. 19 dwt. 2 grs.

³ Declared Accounts, Audit Office, Bundle 1599, Roll 37. 24 lb. 15 dwt.

⁴ See Appendix of Dr. Crawfurd's The King's Evil, pp. 180–183, and proclamations Nos. 214, 217, 219 and 220, at the Society of Antiquaries, under date April 7th, 1636,
speaking, an expenditure may be reckoned of at least £1000 to £1500 a year at this period, whilst the early years of the reign show a very much smaller coinage of angel gold.

I think we may assume that Snelling was accurate in giving the total of fine standard gold coined in the reign of Charles I as 285 lb. 5 oz. 9 dwt. 9 grs. I cannot lay claim to having examined in the Audit Rolls these exact figures throughout, but as in eleven years out of the seventeen specifying angel coinage, which as we have seen was carried only to 1642, I found the output to be about 210 lb., we may roughly place 75½ lb. to the remaining six years. Basing, then, our calculation on Snelling, we have an average of a little under 17 lb. a year, or about £740, to dispose of, but the low coinage of the earlier half of the reign, and especially between 1630 and 1633 and in 1636 owing to plague, would lead one to suppose that in his early years Charles touched about the same number of persons as his father had done and in the last six or seven years double the amount or more.

The amount of fine gold issued in the years I have mentioned bears no relation at all to that of crown gold, which was largely coined in the very years when fewest angels were made, and I think April 22nd, May 27th, and October 18th. Dr. Crawfurd gives one of March 1st, 1636-7, from Lord Crawford’s library, and one of September 3rd, 1637, from the State Papers Domestic. Angels with the mint-mark crown, of which this delivery would consist, are very rare.

1 Snelling’s View of the Gold Coin and Coinage of England, p. 37. The money in tale resulted in £12,658 5s.; this would represent 25,317 angels, or if the cost of coinage, 9s. in the lb. troy, were deducted, about 25,031 angels to be distributed in seventeen years.

* To give an idea of the average issues of Angel as against Crown gold, I give a table from one of the Mint Papers at the Public Record Office. " 1629. Angel gold 26 lbs. 00 oz. 05 dwt. 16 grs. Crown gold 4806 lbs. 03 oz. 08 dwt. 00 grs. 1630. Angel gold 5 lb. 9 oz. 12 dwt. 12 grs. Crown gold 8219 lb. 6 oz. 1 dwt. 6 grs. 1631. Angel gold 13 lb. 2 oz. 16 dwt. 12 grs. Crown gold 3544 lb. 1 oz. 15 dwt. 00 gr. 1632. Angel gold 10 lb. 10 oz. 15 dwt. 00 grs. Crown gold 2556 lb. 2 oz. 15 dwt. 00 grs. 1633. Angel gold 29 lbs. 1 oz. 4 dwt. 14 grs. Crown gold 2076 lbs. 11 oz. 07 dwt. 12 grs. State Papers Domestic, Carl. I, vol. 256, No. 50. The figures which I have been able to find in various years range from little more than 2 lb. 2 oz. of fine gold as the lowest coinage to over 33 lb., and all the years of smallest output appear to correspond with the seasons of plague.
this is an additional proof that the coin was specially minted—at least during the last decade, when it is almost always pierced—solely for the King’s use, and if owing to plague or for any such reason there were few healings, few angels were struck. Strange to say the number of coins in the rose and the harp pyxes is large, but the details of the portcullis pyx show that with regard to angels the rule of 15 lb. of bullion to one sample coin was not observed. Although seven angels were reserved between July, 1633, and June, 1634, only £935 18s. 10½d., or 21 lb. 0 oz. 7 dwt. 19 grs., represented the total portcullis coinage. If, on the other hand, we were to base our calculations on the angels found in the pyx boxes, on a basis of one angel to 15 lb. weight of gold coined, we should in this reign have a total of 1755 lb. of the fine standard to account for, whereas we have seen that it reached about 284½ lb. The pyx details of this portcullis trial, however, which I found in State Papers Domestic, prove that this general rule cannot have been strictly observed, and Mr. Symonds, to whom I referred the question, agreed with me in thinking that an angel must have been put into the pyx however small the parcel of gold coined, and we rely more safely on the figures taken from the Audit Office Accounts and State Papers Domestic. A certificate of money issued at the Exchequer contains amongst other items, between March 28th and April 11th, in the year 1635, an entry which must refer to the Easter ceremonies: "Sir William Parkhurst for Angel Gould for healing 600 li." 2

One of the seventeenth-century sheets in the Washington MSS. Collection 3 amplifies this statement and reads "Moneys issued at

1 State Papers Domestic, Carl. I, No. 42. "A note of the Coyned Monies of Angell Golde, Crowne Golde and Silver within the Pyx (the Privie Mark being the portcullis from the tryall of the pix of xvi of June 1634. Coyned in Angell monies 21 lb. 00 oz. 7 dwt. 19 grs. at xliii, x the poundweight Cometh to in monies by tale 935 li 18° 10½ 19 grs. There is in the Pyx of Angell gold iiij li xu." This estimate of seven angels in the pyx of June, 1634, corresponds with the £3 10s. in Mr. Symonds’s list, Numismatic Chronicle, 1914, but this amount of angels should stand for 105 lb. weight of gold on the principle of one coin to 15 lb. of bullion.

2 State Papers Domestic, Carl. I, cclxxxvi, No. 74.

the Receipt of the Exchqr for Angell Gold for the King's Healinges
By virtue of his late Ma's Lres of Privy Seals Dormant, dated the IXth day of June in the iiiij yeare of King Charles the first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Termino Michls</th>
<th>Pascha</th>
<th>Michls</th>
<th>Pasche</th>
<th>Pasche</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>600. o. o.</td>
<td>110. o. o.</td>
<td>200. o. o.</td>
<td>550. o. o.</td>
<td>350. o. o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>600. o. o.</td>
<td>110. o. o.</td>
<td>200. o. o.</td>
<td>550. o. o.</td>
<td>350. o. o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>600. o. o.</td>
<td>110. o. o.</td>
<td>200. o. o.</td>
<td>550. o. o.</td>
<td>350. o. o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>600. o. o.</td>
<td>110. o. o.</td>
<td>200. o. o.</td>
<td>550. o. o.</td>
<td>350. o. o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>600. o. o.</td>
<td>110. o. o.</td>
<td>200. o. o.</td>
<td>550. o. o.</td>
<td>350. o. o.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have here a total of £2410 in eight years, and the same amount is noted in the State Papers Domestic, in an abstract of Tower Accounts.¹ This Mint-roll gives slightly different dates, each item being recorded one year later than the above, but the entry of £600 paid to Parkhurst in 1635 appears more consonant with the Washington paper than with this abstract and exceeds the payment to the Keeper of the Privy Purse in 1636. The one is probably the date of the Exchequer entry, the other the date of the receipt at the Mint. We may conclude that the supplies of fine gold coined in these years were, as I have suggested, carried forward, meeting the deficit in the ensuing issues to "the Privy Purse."

The angels of Charles I are often carelessly struck, with no due relation of the one side to the other; so that, even if the piercing be correctly done with a view to the preservation of St. Michael's head, the ship hangs sideways, to right or to left as the case may be. The holes, present in the majority of examples,² are large, but this may be partly due to the wear to which they were subjected, they having been repurchased and used again and again for a considerable time after the Restoration. One very beautiful pattern for an angel


² Unholed pieces are naturally preferred by collectors, and of Mr. Montagu's eight angels six were unpierced, of which that bearing mint-mark bell was the latest, the succeeding mint-marks are almost always pierced.
Angels as Healing-pieces for the King's Evil.

exists in the British Museum. It was made by Briot,¹ but was apparently not acceptable to the authorities at the Mint, although if this coinage was effected for the use of Charles only, it is somewhat surprising he did not select the milled work of his favourite engraver. But this would have led to complications in workmanship, excepting in the few years when Briot was suffered to use his own inventions at the Tower, and if made during this period might have come into use with the coinage of 1631–2 or 1638–9. We must, however, remember that Briot was working privately for the King from 1626 onwards, and made patterns at various times, notably in 1628 and 1634. The great rarity of the piece and its condition point to its being a pattern which would have served just as well for an admission ticket, since it was not selected for the coinage, and the question presents itself whether it was a design for the token in "breath the compass of an Angell"? The fact that the only known specimen is in gold militates against this hypothesis.

With its slightly effeminate St. Michael it forms a link between the ordinary angel and the touchpieces of Charles II, the chain being perfected by the design figured in Vertue's Medals of Thomas Simon as a pattern by this artist.² But we must wait for our next volume before we can discuss the "Healings" after the Restoration.

¹ The weight of Briot's pattern angel, which is of gold, is 64.9 gr., and therefore slightly in excess of the current coin, which adhered to the 64 3/4 grains of James I's last angel. It was valued at 10s. and 89 went to the pound troy.

² Medals, Coins, Great Seals and other Works of Thomas Simon, by George Vertue, with appendix by Richard Gough, ed. 1780, Plate XXXIX, Figures D and E.
BASE COINAGE OF THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI.

Issues with his father's name and portrait.

PLATE 1