ROYAL CHARITIES.

PART III.—Continuation of TOUCHPIECES FOR THE KING’S EVIL.

JAMES II to WILLIAM III.

BY HELEN FARQUHAR.

In our last volume¹ we followed the fortunes of the “healing-piece” throughout the reign of Charles II, and we noticed that on the accession of James the new King was well situated with regard to “touching for the Evil,” insomuch as just before the death of Charles a small medal, price 5s., had taken the place of its larger prototype, valued at 9s.

On the termination of Baptist May’s account, as Keeper of the Privy Purse, he acknowledged the possession of 1905 healing-pieces, which presumably bore Charles II’s name.² But Montague, the Chancellor of the Exchequer under William III, in passing the account on May 18, 1696, endorsed the document with some words which suggest that some of these medals were recoined after the death of Charles II, for they were not issued until April, the King having died in February.

“Altho’ this Acc¹ determines the 6th Feb’y 1684,” thus runs Charles Montague’s minute, “There is allowance made for medall’s delivered the 11th April 1685 wh’ are not to be allowed in any Succeeding Acc.”²

It does not seem probable that two months and more after the death of Charles II healing-pieces should have been sent out from the Mint, bearing the name of the late King, when a very slight alteration in the die would have substituted that of his successor. Neither would May, whose responsibility ended with the life of his

² Baptist May’s second account, running from March 25, 1673, to February 6, 1684–5. Declared Accounts, Pipe Office, Roll 2796.
master, have ordered fresh medals after February 6, when he stated his possession of 1905 pieces.

On the passing of his account £4,160 11s. 11½d. was still owing to the Mint in his name from the Treasury, and this charge, allowed to him in the reign of William III, included the 1905 medals left in his custody, which must therefore have passed free of expense into the hands of Grahme, the Keeper of the Privy Purse of the new King. It seems not unlikely that some of these healing-pieces may have been returned to the Mint to be reissued on the 11th of April with altered legend. This matter is perhaps of small importance, as the greater part of this small store must have been used by James in the month of March, and it is fair to state that I have never seen a touchpiece struck from an altered die. There would, however, possibly have been time to make new dies from the old puncheons.

JAMES II'S GOLD HEALING-PIECE.

James, as we shall see, began to heal on March 4, and the appointment of James Grahme as Keeper of the Privy Purse is noted by the late Colonel Josceline Bagot in his autobiography of Grahme as "dated April 1685."¹

¹ Colonel James Grahme of Levens, p. 38. The brother of the late Colonel Bagot—Mr. Richard Bagot, kindly looked up this matter for me, but told me that the letter concerning James Grahme's reappointment to the office, which he had already held under the Duke of York, is much torn and that he cannot give me any further information respecting the precise date. Grahme had, in 1675, married a Maid of Honour to the Duchess of York. He officiated as Keeper of the Privy Purse to this Princess in 1679—see ibid., 38—and, according to the Dictionary of National Biography, soon after was acting in the same capacity to the Duke of York; but Ed. Chamberlayne, in his Angliae Notitia, p. 155, and p. 200 in 1677, and p. 201 in 1679, prints Grahme's name as Keeper of the Privy Purse to the Duke. Although he spells it Grimes, there can be little doubt that Grahme is intended. In Angliae Notitia, p. 200, of 1676, the place was held by Lord Duras, a naturalised Frenchman, and it seems probable that Grahme may have succeeded him in the course of that year or early in 1677, for the Earl of Feversham, as Louis Durfort, Baron Duras, had then become, went as Ambassador to France in 1677. Previously to his elevation, in 1673, to the English
Possibly May continued to act until then, or perhaps he handed his 1905 medals to Nathaniel Crew, the Clerk of the Closet—or his deputy Thomas Donkley, or returned some of them to the Mint to be recoined, but in any case the issue of April 11 should not, I think, be confused with a grant of £250 noted from James II's Exchequer on April 8, because this payment does not find a place in May's receipts from the Treasury, wherein the last item consists of £500 on January 9, 1684–5. Neither did May have authority in the matter, as it appears, after February 6.

Presumably Grahme entered on his new office in time for the great Easter healing, for which a large quantity of medals would be required. About 1000 would be issued for £250, and the money being only paid as an instalment, many more may have been ordered.

A letter signed by Henry Guy, the Secretary of the Treasury, is dated from the Treasury Chambers, April 8, 1685, and is addressed to the "Honble Sir Robert Howard, Auditor of his Mats Receipts of Exchange," and orders that certain moneys "to be paid this week into the Exchequer" should be at once reissued for various purposes.

Amongst many items, small and great, we read: "To the Commissioners of Mint for healing Medals by way of advance £250: 0: 0."

The next piece of evidence which has met my eye is a warrant for £500 under date July 25, 1685, again signed by Guy. This document, kindly shown to me by Mr. W. V. Daniell, concerned another advance to the Commissioners of the Mint to provide healing medals.

These two sums added together would not supply more than about 3000 gold pieces, and we must assume that a considerably greater outlay occurred in the first year after the accession of James, judging from the expenditure chronicled a little later in the reign.

Peerage, as Baron Duras of Holdenby, he is mentioned in the earlier volumes by Chamberlayne under his French title, Marquis de Blanquefort, as Privy Purse to the Duke of York, and even later, for he so appears in the issue of 1674, p. 230, but in 1675, p. 200, he is entered under his English title.

2 Easter day fell on April 19 in 1685.
3 MS. State Papers Domestic, Jac. II, uncalendared, vol. i.
But we must remember that the 1905 medals in hand bring
the number up to little short of 5000, and we might possibly add
many more, when such few papers as are to be found in the Public
Record Office, referring to the Treasury under James, have been
ably calendared for our use, as are those of Charles II. The fact
that I have found no evidence, beyond the two items mentioned
above, cannot be taken as any indication that no more money was
paid into the mint, for apart from the yet unsorted condition of the
State Papers Domestic, to which I have referred, we are not so well
placed with regard to quantity as is the case with the Treasury
entries of Charles II. A great number of documents immediately
preceding the Revolution of 1688 disappeared with James on his
retirement from England, and although some few Stuart Papers,
now at Windsor Castle, were saved from the wreck and are in process
of careful arrangement, they do not provide us with much financial
information concerning James II.¹

A very limited number of State Papers Domestic may be seen in
the Public Record Office, extending from 1685 to the end of 1688, and
these five volumes I have been permitted to examine. But these
documents being as yet uncalendared, I have not found it easy to be
certain that no item has escaped my eye.

Fortunately the "King's Warrants"² for the greater part of
James II's reign and certain Mint Rolls, also in the Record Office,
afford much help.

To the accident that the affairs of the Privy Purse were still
under discussion in the reign of Queen Anne, we owe the preservation
of Grahme's healing accounts for the year 1687, to which I shall

¹ Purchased partly in 1805 by the Prince Regent, afterwards George IV, from the
Abbé James Waters and partly in 1822, after prolonged negotiations, from Dr. Robert
Watson, who had acquired them in 1816–17, these documents, known as the Stuart
Papers, contain very little matter antecedent to 1716. The portion referring to
James II was ably calendared in 1902, and is contained in vol. i, pp. 1 to 160. The
entire collection is not yet published, but this fact does not affect the period now under
discussion.

² Public Record Office, T. 52, series, vol. x, running from February, 1684–5,
to April, 1686, vol. xi from May, 1686, to January, 1686–7, and vol. xii, January,
1686–7, to May, 1688.
later have occasion to refer. These are helpful, although somewhat confused, and not altogether in agreement with the Mint accounts, being, in truth, but the recapitulation of a statement now missing. A certain amount of correspondence elucidating them may be found in Anne's Treasury Papers. A few insignificant items in Grahme's accounts cover a longer period than others and range from February, 1684-5, to the 27th of December, 1687, whilst payments were received by him as late as 1688.

But we are almost in the dark as to the earlier part of James II's reign, when, according to the documents quoted on our p. 91, payments for the healing money were made directly to the Mint from the Exchequer.

We have Mint accounts running from September, 1684, to July, 1686, but these contain no mention of healing-pieces. Had the Mint Master, Thomas Neale, with his coadjutors, Charles Duncombe and James Hoare, charged on this Mint Roll for touchpieces, as Neale did in his statements of the following years, our position would have been clearer. This omission is the more unfortunate, because information concerning coronation and naval medals, equally remote from the ordinary expenses of coinage, salaries, etc., is to be found in the first Mint Roll of James II. In the reign of Charles II we have seen that it was only when rendering special details concerning money derived from the Dunkirke treasure, that Slingsby, then Master of the Mint, entered certain expenses for healing-pieces on an official Pipe Roll. But as regards James we must rest content with Grahme's explanation, given in a letter to Queen Anne, that "during the time he was Keeper of the Privy

1 Declared Accounts, Pipe Office, Roll 2797, and Ibid., Audit Office, Bundle 2021, Roll 6. These documents, excepting in some minor details, are duplicates, and as the latter is fragile, being on paper instead of parchment, I shall generally give reference to the Pipe Office Roll by preference.

2 MS. Treasury Papers, Anne, T. I, vol. lxxxiii, No. 110; vol. lxxxv, No. 82; and vol. lxxxix, Nos. 141 and 142.

3 Declared Accounts of the Master of the Mint, Pipe Office, Roll 2094, and Warden's Account, Audit Office, Bundle 1603, Roll 68.


5 MS. Treasury Papers, T. I, vol. lxxxv, No. 82.
Purse and always before, the charge of the healing was paid out of the same, but the King finding it arises to a Greater Sum than formerly was pleas'd some time before he left the Kingdom to order a Privy Seal for that p\textsuperscript{t}eal\textsuperscript{ur} service w\textsuperscript{h} past in yo\textsuperscript{r} Pet\textsuperscript{r} name."

The first official notice which has rewarded my search in regard to James Grahme as Keeper of the Privy Purse to the King, is an order for a Privy Seal, under date July 4, 1685, with a contemporary note saying that it was drawn on the 8th.\footnote{King's Warrants, P.R.O., T. 52, vol. x, p. 157.} But this concerns £20,000 per annum for the ordinary expenses of his office and no mention is made of healing. Other warrants follow on January 12, 1685–6,\footnote{Ibid., p. 268.} and on November 9, 1686,\footnote{Ibid., vol. xi, pp. 177–178.} for a similar purpose, and again on May 17, 1687,\footnote{Ibid., vol. xii, p. 110.} February 21, 1687–8,\footnote{Ibid., vol. xii, p. 403.} for the "use and service of our Privy Purse without acc", the sum not exceeding £20,000 being always specified. But under date "26 day of April 1687" we find the first order written to the Commissioners of the Treasury for a Privy Seal to which Grahme's explanation can refer.\footnote{Ibid., vol. xii, p. go.} Too long to quote in full, I note that it gives to Grahme or his assigns power to obtain "by way of Imprest upon Acc" such sums of money as "ye shall thinke necessary . . . for the provision of Angel gold or otherwise Medalls or pieces of Crowne Gold to be used by us in healing together with all other Charges attending the said service."

The Privy Seal itself is not available, but we know that the sum authorised must have been £4000, and the King's signature must have been affixed on the 30th of April, for Grahme drew £1000 "in part pay\textsuperscript{m}t of the sum of iiiii\footnote{Declared Accounts, Audit Office, Bundle 2021, Roll 6.} by Writt of Privy Seal bearing date XXXxth April in the third year of his said Mats Reigne."\footnote{Declared Accounts, Audit Office, Bundle 2021, Roll 6.} A further advance of £255 was made under these same Letters Patent. This Privy Seal of April, 1687, was in turn either reinforced or
Touchpieces for the King's Evil.

superseded by a fresh document on the 31st of October in the King's fourth year.¹

And I might venture to suggest that these documents were supplementary rather than subversive of the old allowance, made regularly to the Keeper of the Privy Purse, which was in 1667–8 granted under Charles II at a fixed sum.²

The Mint Master's account,³ running from July 22, 1686, to the last day of September in 1687, refers to this new Privy Seal of 1688, which is somewhat strange seeing that it was not issued until after the conclusion of the account. The Master, in his table of expenditure, under the head of "Money paid upon Acc⁴ for various purposes," claims for and is allowed "ye value of xiiij iiij Medalls of gold for healing delivered Mr. Grahme pursuant to sev' orders of ye Lordes Com" of ye Treasry between ye second of Febr 1686 [⁷] and ye viij of Nöber 1687; as by ye said Orders and ye Receipts of ye said Mr. Grahme appeares. The value of w⁸ said meddalls as directed by Ires under ye privy seale of King James ye second bearing date ye xxxj⁴ day of October in ye iiij year of his Reigne to be allowed to this Accomptant and to be sett in sup upon ye sd Mr. Grahme in order to his Accompting for ye same amounting to MMMCCCXLj⁷ xviij iiij⁴.

James Grahme's Declared Accounts cover this particular period and, in the evidence of expenditure which he produces, go back a little further and advance slightly beyond the Mint Roll. From Grahme himself we learn that yet another thousand medals were expended between the 8th of November, 1687, and the 27th of

¹ Ibid., and Declared Accounts, Pipe Office, Mint Accounts, Roll 2097.
³ Declared Accounts, Pipe Office, Roll 2095. 2 Febrv. 1686 being according to O.S., comes within the limits of the account, but the 8th of November overlaps its conclusion on September 30th. It was, however, not presented until May 8, 1689, when it passed the Exchequer under William and Mary.
⁴ This Privy Seal is more than once mentioned in the Mint Rolls, and Grahme gives the "tenour" of it in his accounts, but Queen Anne's auditor of the Exchequer mentions that the original was, in 1704, no longer to be found.
December following, and it is somewhat startling to realise that he actually produced evidence that 14,364 touchpieces were given to the sick in the course of one year, namely between January 7, 1686–7, and the 23rd December following.

But it will be well to return to the accession of James and see what information we can glean from the newspapers of the earlier part of his reign.

James II lost no time in announcing his readiness to touch for the Evil, a practice which commended itself to his love of self-mortification. The London Gazette gives evidence of this fact under date March 4, 1684–5. "His Majesty," runs the official account, "was graciously pleased this day to begin to Touch for the King's Evil and will continue to do so till Easter."  

Again a sidelight is thrown on the number of healings during the later months of 1685, continuing until after the Easter of 1686. James, unlike his brother, suffered an unlimited crowd of patients to approach him, but like Charles, postponed his receptions during the hot season, for fear that infectious diseases, more prevalent in summer, should be spread by the crowds of patients.

Of this recess the newspapers give notice, but attract attention to the great number of persons he has received during Michaelmas, Xmas and Lent. The King had, so reads the official declaration, under date April 8th and April 21, "been graciously pleased since September last to Heal Publickly for the Evil Weekly and many times oftener till Easter, in which time he healed several Thousands, the great part of which were Inhabitants of London and Parts adjacent." It was then announced that he would, because the "warm Weather approacheth," discontinue the practice unless required to heal urgent cases and "such as come from Parts remote." This temporary cessation was to last "until towards Michaelmas unless on Progress."

The exception in favour of certain patients was a concession

1 London Gazette, No. 2013.
2 Ibid., No. 2128, April 8, and No. 2131, April 21, 1686. Easter fell on April 4th in 1686.
on the part of James, but we must remember that Charles also often healed privately between the usual seasons.

The weekly healings were resumed in due course, and under date September 30, and again on October 8, 1686, we find the London Gazette\(^1\) giving notice of the place where tickets for the ceremony were to be obtained. "His Majesty is graciously pleased to appoint to Heal weekly for the Evil upon Fridays, and hath commanded his Physicians and Chyrurgeons to attend at the Office appointed for that purpose in the Meuse upon Thursdays in the Afternoons to give out Tickets. Hereof all Ministers of Parishes are required to take Notice and to be careful to Register the Certificates they give in a book kept for that purpose."

The eminent surgeon, John Browne, writing in the reign of Charles II, at the end of 1683, had suggested that a blank copy of the authorised certificate should be printed and sent to "every Bishop of his Diocess and these signed by their own Hands and Sign Manual, and thence should be communicated to every Surrogate throughout his Diocess, who at their several Meetings and Visitations should acquaint their Brother Ministers thereof or distribute the same to them."\(^2\)

We noticed in the latter days of Charles II,\(^3\) that this desired copy of the official pass was placed by the King’s order in the Parish Registers, and it may be of interest to offer our readers the words of the certificate, as used in the reign of his successor. By the kindness of the Reverend J. D. Paton, Vicar of South Stoneham Church, Southampton, I am in a position to print the document, which he has been so good as to copy for me. It is pasted in the beginning of the earliest register at South Stoneham and runs as follows, differing hardly at all from the printed directions issued in the London Gazette in the reign of the late King.\(^4\)

\(^1\) London Gazette, No. 2178, September 30, and No. 2180, October 8, 1686.

\(^2\) Browne's Charisma, p. 84.


\(^4\) In the London Gazette, No. 1976, October 27, 1684, it had been notified that by the Order in Council of the previous January 9, this registration was rendered compulsory. But seeing that it was still neglected, the certificate, almost word
"The Copy of a Certificate to be given to such as are afflicted with ye King's Evil. We the Ministers and Churchwardens of the Parish of S: Stoneham in ye County of Southton doe hereby certifie that N.F. of this Parish—Aged about ___ yeares is afflicted as we are credibly informed with the desease called the King's Evil and to the best of our knowledge has not therefore [sic] been touched by His Majesty for the said desease. In testimony whereof we have hereunto set our handes and seales this ___ day of ___ A.D. ___ Vicar ___ Churchwardens ___ Registered by me ___ dated 1685."

The entry in Parish Registers of the names of those to whom certificates had been granted is by no means uncommon, but these registers also show that many sufferers were spared the expense of the journey by the King's kindness in touching at all times of the year when on progress.

The neglect of the command to register the names of the patients provoked a fresh order, published in the London Gazette, No. 2270, under date September 19–22, 1687. "His Majesty having been pleas'd in the late Progress to touch for the Evil about 5000 Persons, His Majestie's Sergeant Chyrurgion hath observed a great Neglect in the Ministers at the several Parishes in not keeping (as they ought to do) an exact Register of those for whom they have Certify'd

for word as that which I have given in our text, was set forth in the public Press. Dr. Crawfurd, in his King's Evil, p. 110, gives a slightly varied certificate of earlier date, 25 October, 1684, at Waterfall, near Leek.

1 "Therefore" in the usual copies reads "heretofore."

2 In the Gentleman's Magazine, vol. 45, pt. 1, New Series, p. 38, under the title of "More Worcestshire Superstitions," the writer, Mr. J. Noaks, mentions the entry in the register at Chaddesley Corbett, under date November 24, 1685, of the certificate granted to one Gervase Burford, and Dr. Crawfurd, p. 111 of The King's Evil, gives instances from various registers, and also publishes from churchwarden's accounts, sums of 5s. or 10s. granted for the expenses of the journey. Dr. Magrath, in his Flemings in Oxford, vol. i, p. 453, shows Daniel Fleming as noting in his private accounts a payment in 1669 of £10 to his brother, "towards his charges in going unto London to get the King's touch for ye Evil," whilst on January 3, 1684–5, he enters, vol. ii, p. 351, the donation of 6d. to a "Poor man troubled with ye King's Evil," probably a wayfarer whom he met.
in order to their obtaining Tickets to be touched. For want whereof several Abuses have been committed and many that have been Touched before, producing Certificates as if it had not been so, had New Pieces of Gold given them contrary to the established Order of which the respective Ministers therefore are required to be more careful for the future."

By the kindness of the Rev. R. S. Medlicott, now Rector of Newbury, but late Vicar of Portsmouth, I have the figures from the Register of St. Thomas à Becket’s Church in the latter town.

Isolated cases in April, 1685, suggest the usual expeditions to London, but in the year 1686 we find 7 and 63 persons respectively touched on consecutive days, namely August 29 and 30, whilst 15 had been presented to the King’s hand at another date, unfortunately undecipherable, in the same month. Again, in 1687, we notice 88 cases on August 16.

But these numbers are as nothing compared to those reported by Bishop Cartwright, who on August 27, 1687, received James in his diocese, whilst on the same journey which included the visit to Portsmouth as above mentioned.

James II touched the sick in great numbers; 5000 indeed, as we have seen on this particular progress, of a few weeks’ duration. No fatigue seemed to be too great for him. Anthony à Wood, under date September 4, 1687, writes that, visiting Christchurch, Oxford, "being Sunday he went about 9 of the Clock, into the Cathedral, where he touched that Morn, and the next about 7 and 800 People." Wood’s language is rather indefinite, and he may mean that between 700 and 800 were touched in the course of the two days, but his use of the word "and" is indicative that James received 700 on the Sunday and 800 on the Monday. Bishop Cartwright is more precise, and shows that the activities of Charles were certainly rivalled by his brother. Visits to seek a cure from James were not prompted, we must remember, as had been the case with regard

---


to his predecessor on the throne, by any excitement such as that on which Lord Macaulay remarks as being due to political reaction at certain periods of his reign. The number," writes this historian, speaking of healings under Charles II, "seems to have increased or diminished as the King's popularity rose or fell."

To what cause the unprecedented flow of patients to James was due, it is not easy to guess, but the frequency of the healings in 1687 is mirrored in the use of the King's curative powers as a simile by the Quakers in an address, thanking James II for his Declaration of Indulgence. They said that until then they had been held to be "men of seditious Principals," and this was "such a sore Evil, as could only be cured by your Majestie's Royal Hand. The gentle Touch of your Sovereign Mercy hath effectually done it and healed us not only of the smart, but the reproach of our Sufferings."

The Progress partly described in 1687 by the Bishop of Chester was not even at the beginning of the King's reign whilst he was still popular, nor was there cause for the enthusiasm which compelled Charles to touch 600 persons at one sitting immediately after the Restoration. But it may well be that the Declaration of Indulgence, whilst it alienated some of his subjects, caused a revulsion in his favour amongst the Dissenters, who equally with the Roman Catholics profited thereby.

Bishop Thomas Cartwright notes 800 persons coming to be healed in Chester, besides others at Holywell, in three days, during the visit of James, in August, 1687, to Cheshire and Wales. We find the Anglican prelate explaining that after the King's levée on August 28 he, Cartwright, "attended him into the choir where he healed 350 persons."

The next day James started at half-past six in the morning for St. Winifred's Well in Flintshire, then called Holywell, "to

---

2 London Gazette, No. 2273, Sep. 1, 1687.
3 Diary of T. C., p. 74.
dine and heal,”1 but the number touched is not specified. After his levée “he had mass in the presence chamber, where he eat,” and from thence the Bishop again attended him into the choir of the Cathedral, “where he healed 450 people, from thence to a penthouse where he breakfasted under a state and from thence he took horse about ten of the clock.”2

A note3 appended to Cartwright’s Diary tells us that the King left Windsor on the 16th of August and went through Portsmouth, Bath, Gloucester, Worcester, Ludlow, Shrewsbury, and Whitchurch, arriving at Chester on the 27th.

We have records of the healings at Worcester4 and also, as we have seen, at Portsmouth. We are told that he held a service in Worcester Cathedral, and at Portsmouth it is traditionally said that he performed the rite “on the Ramparts above the Grand Parade.”5 According to the Registers of St. Thomas’s Church, it must have been on this occasion that James touched 88 persons. Portsmouth was a favourite resort both of Charles and his brother James, and the visit of 1687 was made further memorable by the latter’s presentation of some fine plate to the parish church of St. Thomas à Becket.6

Curiously enough, in spite of the many instances of touching for the Evil at Portsmouth in these two reigns, Charles healing

1 St. Winifred’s Well was much frequented by James II’s Catholic subjects, and miraculous cures have even of late years been reported to be brought about by bathing in its waters. A comparatively short time ago, as the effect of some draining in the neighbourhood, the well dried, but after a time the water came back and the pilgrimages have recommenced.

2 Diary of T. C., August 30, 1687, p. 75.

3 Note “a” by the Rev. Joseph Hunter, who in 1843 edited the Diary in his own possession.


6 Ibid., “Two faire Flaggons plaine and one small silver patten,” the latter still remaining in the church.
frequently there, and James receiving in the years 1685 to 1687 no fewer than 177 persons within the city, patients still visited London for relief. It is noticeable that Worcester, although included by James in his healing progress, had under Charles II countenanced the rival healer, namely Valentine Greatrakes, to whom a dinner at the expense of £10 14s. was voted by the inhabitants of the Cathedral city. This person, known as “G greatrakes the Stroker,” who for a brief period in the reign of Charles II healed by touch and prayer, used the formula: “God Almighty heal thee for his mercy’s sake.” He seems to have handled his patients much as was done by the King, but for the fact that he gave them no touchpiece or keepsake. Seeing that Greatrakes is depicted pressing the sores of a poor lad, I have borrowed a copy of William Faithorne’s plate of this “healer” as our frontispiece, although he, dying in 1683, was no rival of James, who might not have treated his claims with the same contemptuous tolerance as his brother Charles had extended to “the Stroker” and other honorary “Faith healers” of his day.

The name given Greatrakes by Dr. Henry Stubbe, in writing of him as “The Miraculous Conformist,” in contradistinction to Thomas Rodwell, a dissenting preacher, who had also professed such powers, brings us to the discussion of the attitude assumed by James to the

1 Information received from the Rev. R. S. Medlicott, obtained by him from his successor, the Rev. W. H. David, from the register of St. Thomas a Becket’s Church, Portsmouth. This volume gives, as regards James, three isolated names on April 5, 9, and 13 respectively in 1685, 1 on March 28, 1686, 15 on August 15 (?), 7 on the 29th and 63 on the 30th of the same month, and 88 as stated above in August, 1687. The large numbers in both 1686 and 1687 suggest receptions held at Portsmouth.

2 Ibid., and Notes and Queries, June, 1864, p. 489.

3 This plate was originally engraved by Faithorne the Elder for his “Brief Account of Mr. Valentine Greatraks and Divers of the Strange Cures By him lately Performed Written by himself in a Letter addressed to the Honble. Robert Boyle Esqre. 1666.” It has been several times reproduced and my thanks are due to Mr. W. V. Daniell for the copy of the plate in this volume.

4 Much controversy was raised, resulting in the defence mentioned in our last note, which was published as an answer to David Lloyd’s Wonders no Miracles, which was itself a reply to the Miraculous Conformist, by Henry Stubbe, 1665–6.

5 Rodwell was condemned to death by Judge Jeffreys, but the sentence was revoked by King Charles. See The King’s Evil, p. 120.
Protestant or Catholic rendering of the healing service which, as we have seen, was usually performed in our cathedrals or churches.

White Kennet, made Bishop of Peterborough by George I, but already in Holy Orders at the time with which we are dealing, and therefore to be trusted because speaking from personal observation, wrote in his *Registers Ecclesiastical and Civil* in the margin of Charles II’s healing service, “This, I think was the only Office changed by K. James II and performed by his popish priests.”

Dr. Crawfurd, in his *King’s Evil*, points to the simultaneous appearance in 1686, in Latin with English rubrics and wholly in English, of two editions of the pre-Reformation Healing Prayers. This ritual is according to the usage of Henry VII, and contains the invocation to the Virgin Mary, omitted in the services of Elizabeth, and the three Stuarts, who preceded James II on the throne.

Whilst Dr. Crawfurd considers that this publication justifies White Kennet’s remark about the change in the form of the office, he found no evidence of the attendance of the Catholic clergy. He, on the contrary, brought forward much valuable testimony concerning the ministrations of the Protestant bishops, quoting the *Diary* of Cartwright of Chester, to which we have referred, and that of Simon Patrick, Dean of Peterborough and afterwards Bishop of Chichester and Ely successively. “On Ash Wednesday the King was pleased to touch,” writes Patrick, discussing the attitude of James on his accession towards the Anglican Church, “and the chaplains of

---

2 Published by Henry Hills, the Court Printer. Copies may be seen in the British Museum wholly in English, 1037. a. 18, and in Latin with English rubrics, 3407. c. 101 and 6. b. 10. The latter, in the King’s Library, passed through the hands of George III and was rebound for him with his royal monogram, but was, of course, not used by this monarch. For the English version see the *King’s Evil*, pp. 132–136.
3 *King’s Evil*, p. 136.
5 This was the Ash Wednesday immediately after the accession of James—ergo March 4, 1684–5, see our p. 96.
our religion attended and read the prayers as usually has been done.”
Dr. Crawfurd also instances the ministrations on one occasion of
Thomas White, Bishop of Peterborough.¹

It has been left for Dr. Magrath, Provost of Queen’s College,
Oxford, to explain to us that James did indeed at times, so early
as the second year of his reign, dispense with the services of the
Anglican clergy.² I have, moreover, found proof in the Treasury
Papers and Pipe Rolls, that Father Petre, the Confessor of James II,
officiated at healings from October, 1687, onward as Clerk of Closet.

Dr. Magrath, editing the private correspondence of the House
of Fleming, quotes a letter written by Dr. Thomas Smith, Bishop
of Carlisle, and addressed to Sir Daniel Fleming, under date June 3,
1686, which definitely proves that before the appointment of Petre,
James called in his Catholic clergy to his assistance at Healings.
But the words of Smith point to the fact as an innovation of recent
date.

“Last week,” wrote the Bishop of Carlisle, “his Majesty dis­
missed his Prot: Chaplains at Windsor from attending at ye Ceremony
of Healing wth was performed by his Romish Priests: ye service
in Latin as in Hen: 7th time . . . I pray Sir, that not anything
of ye News above be known to come from me.”³

Dr. Magrath, in the preface of his interesting second volume,
refers to the following passage in Luttrell’s Diary of slightly earlier
date, that is to say in May, 1686.⁴

“The 23rd,” writes the industrious collector of news, Narcissus
Luttrell, “being Whitsunday the King touched for the evill, but
had not as usual any of the bishops, but his own priests.”

We may note that Thomas Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, had
on the 29th of the previous December, namely at the end, according

¹ The King’s Evil, p. 139—quoting Letters from the Bodleian
Oxford Historical Society’s Publication. Dr. Magrath’s first volume appeared in
1903 and the second in 1913.
³ Letter written from Rose Castle, Cumberland, June 3, 1686.
⁴ Narcissus Luttrell’s Diary, vol. i, p. 376, and The Flemings in Oxford, note 5
to p. 159, and preface, pp. xiv, xv.
to new style, of the year 1685, been sworn Clerk of the Closet to James II, and, according to the statements of the Declared Accounts of James Grahme, he, as Privy Purse, delivered 12,492 medals into the hands of that Prelate between January 7, 1686-7 and October 28, 1687, whilst his entries against Father Petre only extend to 1872 pieces from the latter date to the 23rd of the December following.

Edward Petre, second son of Sir Francis Petre, came of a devout Catholic family, and belonged to the Society of Jesuits. He enjoyed the entire confidence of James, who on his accession to the throne summoned the priest to Court and shortly afterwards gave him the superintendence of his Chapel. In 1686 the King conferred upon him the name of Privy Counsellor, but this honour, although not revoked, was, owing to public dissatisfaction, suspended for a time; the title was, however, finally bestowed on him in 1687.¹

The *London Gazette* of the 11th November makes the official announcement: "This day the Honourable and Reverend Father Petre, Clerk of the Closet to his Majesty, was sworn of his Majesty's most Honourable Privy Council, and accordingly took his place at the Board."² The historian, John Lingard,³ speaks of Petre as appearing in Chapel on November 6, the Sunday preceding this event, in the dress of a secular priest, as Clerk of the Closet to the King, but it seems that he had already officiated at Healings a week earlier, and I might even suggest that when James was on progress the service was probably conducted by Petre at Holywell, whither obviously Bishop Cartwright did not accompany his royal master.

We must, however, call attention to the fact that all the prelates

¹ Petre fled to France the night before his royal master left Whitehall, and never saw James again. He finished his life in 1699 as Rector of the College of St. Omer, a post he had held since 1698.


in attendance on James were, with the exception of White, very complaisant to the King’s wishes. Cartwright was notorious for his subservience to James, and although he died in the Protestant faith in Ireland, whither he had followed his master in 1689, and held Anglican services at St. Germains, it was said that he did more work for the Roman Church in England before the Revolution than if he had actually adopted its tenets.2

Sprat, like Cartwright, was a tool of James and was imprisoned for a short time on suspicion of conspiracy for his Restoration, but did not carry his advocacy to the length of following the King into exile.

Crew, who was already Clerk of the Closet under Charles, and who had been promoted by the new King at the end of the year 1685–6 to the office of Dean of the Chapel Royal, was more mean-spirited than either Cartwright or Sprat, and deserted James, voting for his abdication. It was reported that, even in the lifetime of Charles II, Nathaniel Crew, second son of Lord Crew of Stene, Bishop of Oxford and afterwards Bishop of Durham, owed such favour as he possessed to the Duke of York, who had procured for him his original appointment as Clerk of the Closet in 1669 in succession to Walter Blandford, Bishop of Oxford.

Whilst all went well with James, Crew was the most servile of all his followers. In December, 1685–6, Henry Compton, Bishop of London, was suspended from all duties connected with his see, for his steadfast opposition to James’ innovations in Church matters.4 He was not deprived of his revenues, but in September, 1686, Sprat of Rochester, Crew of Durham, and

---
1 Thomas White of Peterborough, a man of strong and honourable character, was one of the bishops who, with Sancroft, incurred the enmity of James by opposing the second Declaration of Indulgence in May, 1688.
2 Burnet’s History of His Own Times, vol. iii, p. 144, ed. 1833.
3 Compton was reinstated under William and Mary, and amongst other offices resumed his attendance as Dean of the Chapel.
4 Luttrell enters in his Diary, vol. i, p. 368—“18 Dec. 1685. His Majestie hath dismissed the Bishop of London from his place as dean of the chappell royal. The 29, the Bishop of Durham was sworn dean of his Majesties chappell royal and the Bishop of Rochester, clerk of the closet to his Majestie.”
White of Peterborough, were appointed to administer his see. These three, together with Cartwright, are noted as attending the Healings of James, and as concerns Sprat, Crew, and Cartwright, it seems likely that the King would have met with little opposition if he wished the service conducted according to pre-Reformation rites. It seems, therefore, certain that at times James did use the ministrations of the Anglican bishops and at others those of his own confessor. The English or Latin version, published by royal command in 1686, would be in requisition according to circumstances, the former read in the Cathedrals by the Bishops, the latter in private chapels such as Windsor and Holywell.

The fact that Sprat succeeded Crew as Clerk of the Closet in December, 1685–6, possesses the following element of interest as regards touchpieces.

Grahme, in his accounts, makes a separate charge for 662 medals, “which when ye said Accompt was stated remained in ye hands of Thomas Dunckley, Dep’t to ye R’t Reverend Father in God Nathaniell Bishop of Durham late Clerk of our Closett for ye service of Our Healing.” Grahme states that these medals cost £164 17s. 4d., and it is difficult to place them with regard to date, for they are not included in the 14,400 healing-pieces, or, to be more arithmetically accurate, 14,364, for which Sprat, Petre and “James Pearse Esqre. Our Sergeant Surgeon” were made to vouch as expended in 1687. The allusion to Nathaniel Crew of Durham instead of the Bishop of Rochester, if it be not a slip of the clerk’s pen, points to the pieces as the residue from some former

1 The total is given in the Declared Accounts as 14,400, but the separate items for which Sprat and Petre were responsible—12,492 and 1872 respectively—make 14,364.

* I have been unable to find the date of Pearse’s appointment, but it must have been made in the time of Charles II, for Chamberlayne mentions him as “Chirurgeon to the King’s person and Chirurgeon General to all his Majesties Army and Navy” in 1684—see Anglia Notitia, 15th edition, p. 180. He reappears as “the first Chirurgeon” in 1687, ibid., 16th edition, p. 159. The 17th edition gives us, in 1692, William Van Loon in his place, and Luttrell, writing on October 19, 1693, says, “Mr. Pearse, Surgeon Generall to the late King died lately”—Diary, vol. iii, p. 208, and Miege’s New State of England in 169; associates Thomas Gardiner with Van Loon.
account, not now extant, of the first year of James II's reign, for Thomas Dunckley, or Donkley as his name is more frequently spelt, served the successor of Crew as well as himself, so that we should have expected at the end of 1687, at which time the "Accompt was stated," to find him designated as Deputy to the Bishop of Rochester.\footnote{Donkley's name still appears as Keeper of the Closet in Chamberlayne's 
Anglica Notitia, p. 138, 16th ed., of the year 1687, at a fee of £5 per annum. 
In 1692, 17th ed., no name is printed as the holder of this office of Clerk, p. 110. 
Chamberlayne's useful publication appeared about every other year, but not regularly, 
being sometimes printed two years in succession, whilst it occasionally missed a 
longer period.} His service dated from a time antecedent to that of the Crew of Durham, for the latter came in 1669 into the place of Clerk of the Closet, whilst Donkley already kept the books as Keeper of the Closet in 1667, if not before. It is possible that Donkley was superseded in his duties by Fergus Grahme on the appointment of Father Petre, for his brother, James Grahme, Keeper of the Privy Purse, writing many years later to Queen Anne about her father's healing medals, told her that he could not "render a regular account" because "the care of that matt" had been in the hands of his brother Fergus then in exile.\footnote{MS. Treasury Papers, T. I, vol. lxxxv, No. 82.}

I have in a former volume drawn attention to the kindness displayed by Queen Anne towards James Grahme.\footnote{British Numismatic Journal, vol. xi, pp. 281-2} It is obvious that the hurried departure of King James left the Keeper of the Privy Purse with his affairs in disorder. But enough evidence was available to satisfy Anne, who acted on her father's letters of Privy Seal which, as was averred in 1704, "cannot now be Executed without further Directions which Her Present Majesty has been pleased by Lrēs under her Privy Seale bearing date ye xxvj day of April in ye Third year of Her Reigne to give." Consequently Grahme was in a very awkward position, being, as Edward Harley and Robert Bridges, the Auditors of the Exchequer, expressed it, "upon his Accompt" for £1250 advanced him by the Exchequer "and
also for the value of £4,400 Medalls received at the Mint 3592 17s. 9d."¹

The matter had presumably been already brought into Court in the reign of William, for we find a significant entry in the King’s Warrants under the heading “Mr. Grahme Stop of Process.”² Addressed to “the King’s Remembr in the Exchequer or his Dept” in the Whitehall Treasury Chamber under date “29 Jaý 1691,” a warrant directs this official “to forbear making out or issuing forth any Process at the King’s suit against James Graham Esqr. or his Security and in case any Process be already issued you are immediately to superseed the same till further Order.” It is possible that this mandate refers to Grahme’s temporary imprisonment on charges connected with Jacobite risings, he having surrendered on his own recognizances; but he was never very deeply in William’s black books, and ultimately took the oaths, acknowledging his sovereignty on the death of James II. Be this as it may, we find Grahme writing both to Queen Anne³ and to the Lord High Treasurer⁴ concerning the sum of £1250 for which a distringus was out against him.

These appeals met with a certain amount of sympathy, Lord Godolphin writing a minute: “Disch ye Issues and Stay process till first day of next term, he having promised ye acct shalbe finished in ye meantime—if not proceed without further order.” The Queen’s comment was “1250l imprest do be discharged by a Tally.” The Danny manuscripts show that on December 10, 1703,

² King’s Warrants, T. 52, vol. xiii, p. 493. Presumably the allusion to the Exchequer refers to the sum of £1255 which had been paid to him for healing-pieces, but other references in the Treasury Papers of William concern only the affairs of Bagshot Park, a grant of the Royal Lodge there having been made to Grahme by James II.
³ MS. Treasury Papers, T. I, vol. lxxxv, No. 82, minuted April 19, 1703.
⁴ Ibid., vol. lxxxiii, No. 110. In this undated letter addressed to the Rt. Honble. Sidney Godolphin, Lord High Treasurer of England, Grahme says that “his indisposition had obliged him to return into the Country for the Recovery of his Health,” but that he intends “speedily to return and finish the said Acco’ agt next Terme.”
Anne actually gave the money to Grahme of her "freegift and Roy" bounty.”¹

The Keeper of the Privy Purse himself sets down that he paid £1250 back into the Exchequer on 9th of December, 1703, and £5 on the 9th of February following—a total of £1255—the sum which he stated that he had received in two payments between Michaelmas 1687 and 1688 of £1000 and £255 respectively.²

But he, as we have seen, was not the loser, and his entire charges, inclusive of £934 12s. 6d. still owing to himself at the conclusion of his term of office, were allowed by Anne—Edward Harley suggesting that as the certificates cited in the document could no longer be found, words must be inserted in Anne’s warrant accepting the evidence—and this was done.³

By these letters of Privy Seal under date April 26, 1704, Grahme was released from his liabilities, and his Privy Purse Account was declared on the 14th of July following and amounted to £5782 10s. 3d., some of the money having passed through his hands so late as November 14, 1688. The account terminates with words clearing Grahme from the debts “for ye Service of his said late Mats Healing begun ye vij Jan 1686 and ended at Xmas 1688.”

His receipt for the £934 12s. 6d., owing to him upon it, is affixed to the audited account,⁴ under date 23rd August, 1704. The price of the medals works out at 5s. each. From the intricate details of his statements we glean that he expended, besides the actual touchpieces, £157 10s. on 540 pieces of ribbon at 6s. 6d. each roll, that the salaries of persons he employed in the service were rated at £200 a year and reached £575 6s. 8d. between February 7, 1684–5 and December 24, 1687—and that the passing of his account came to £46 13s. 4d.

¹ Danny MS. in the collection of Colonel Campion.
² Such small discrepancies between the Mint, Exchequer, and Grahme’s own accounts are to be found in several places.
⁴ Declared Account, Audit Office, Bundle 2021. No. 6. The receipt is not on the Pipe Office document.
Let us see whether the Mint Accounts cast any light on the later expenditure.

The *Declared Accounts* of the Mint Master from September 30, 1687, to the same date in 1688, again refer to the delivery to Grahme of 13,400 medals “psuant to sev" orders from the Lords Comrs of ye Treasury” and this time the value is only noted at £2748 16s. 8d. The fact that the dates of the Mint series do not cover exactly the same period as the *Declared Accounts* of Grahme, the one overlapping the other, makes it difficult to disentangle the issues. But it is strange that if this consignment be, as there appears reason to believe, a fresh delivery of medals and not a restatement concerning pieces partly foreshadowed in the account running from July, 1686, to Michaelmas, 1687, they are not, with the exception of about 1000 medals, charged for in Grahme’s Account which runs on in certain items to 1688. Nevertheless, the price of the first 13,400 being allowed to Neale, it would seem that he could not successfully bring forward the charge a second time unless these were different medals. The change in price also is puzzling, but cannot, I think, indicate the making of a cheaper medal, but rather that part payment had been made, for we know that to the end of James’ sojourn in England about 5s. covered the expenses of each healing-piece.

True it is that many of James II’s gold touchpieces are lighter than others, some weighing little more than 261/2 grains, but the last entry in the Mint Accounts of his reign determines the price so late as November 14, 1688, as being just over 5s. apiece.

The *Declared Accounts* running from the end of September, 1688, to the 30th of the same month in 1689, embrace the conclusion of James II’s medal expenditure, and both receipts and output refer to 1000 healing-pieces delivered to “James Grahme Esqre by order of the Lords Com of ye Treasury signified by Henry Guy ye Xiiiij November 1688 which said Meddalls amounted in money to y^2^ said Sume CClj. ijs. vj.”

1 *Declared Accounts*, Pipe Office, Roll 2096, which passed the Exchequer May 13, 1690.
3 *Declared Accounts Mint*, Pipe Office, Roll 2097, declared April 6, 1693.
The unsatisfactory nature of such disjointed accounts, unsupported by any lists of Treasury payments such as were available under Charles II, leaves us in doubt as to the total of James II's activities as a healer. But it is safe to believe that he cannot have spent less than about £3000 a year on healing. I learn from Dr. Clippingdale that he, several years ago, in looking through manuscripts of James II's fourth year, namely February to December, 1688, noted a statement that in these last months of his reign £23,000 was expended for the "Privy Purse and Healing Medalls." This should imply, deducting the usual £20,000, allowed for the general needs of the office, that the touchpieces came to £3000. Dr. Clippingdale thought that he had taken his note from the State Papers, but, unfortunately, neither he nor I have been successful in finding it again. But if we add £2748 17s. 8d., or the major portion of it, from the Mint Accounts running from Michaelmas, 1687, to September 30, 1688—a portion only, in that some of the healing-pieces must belong to the concluding months of 1687—to the £251 2s. 6d. expended in November, 1688, we attain much the same result. If, on the other hand, we believe that the charge for 13,400 medals in the Mint Accounts between September, 1687, and Michaelmas, 1688, to be only a repetition of the Mint Master's statement concerning the money advanced in the earlier months of 1687, we are left with a very small supply for the last year of the King's reign. The affairs of the realm no doubt distracted the thoughts of James by the Michaelmas of 1688; William was already planning his invasion and there was little time for ritual and ceremonies, nevertheless Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte, in his History of Eton College, refers to a healing by James II at Eton on September, 1688,¹ and

¹ History of Eton College, p. 261, ed. 1889. "Roderick [the Headmaster] allowed six of his pupils to be touched for the King's Evil at Eton on the 7th of September, 1686, with other parishioners, but when James II again went through the ceremony there just two years later, none of the scholars required the exercise of his reputed powers." Sir Henry gives reference to Brit. Mus. Addit. Sloane MS. 4843, folio 396, where it is stated that by entries on a leaf in the Eton Parish Register it appears that "no less than 54 of the School and Parish were touch'd for the Evil from Sep. 7th 1688 to Sep. 6, 1688. Of the School were John Juxon, Rob'. Lee, Edw'd Smith, Rich'd Gore, The Honble Mr. Charles Cecill, Mr. George Cecill."
we moreover have seen that medals for healing were actually in request so late as November 14, by which time William was already on English soil, and these were gold medals at 5s. apiece.

We may, I think, therefore safely dismiss once for all any theory that James II reduced his healing gift to an insignificant silver token until driven from his Kingdom, and it would seem hardly necessary to give any further details on this question were it not that they embrace such history of the silver piece as is known to us. But the suggestion made by certain writers that the steady increase of the number of patients drove the King into further economies before his exile is scarcely fair to this much abused Monarch. He reigned but a very short time and yet his gold touchpiece is by no means rare. He had an immense reverence for all religious services, and so long as his seignorage on the gold coinage continued, he did no more than profit by his brother's reform in the reduction in size and weight. His gold touchpiece usually turns the scale at about 29 grains. I have handled specimens as light as 26 6 and as heavy as 30 5, and no doubt the rule of 30 grains decreed by Charles II continued in force. We have not the precise date when the silver piece was made, but it must have been fairly soon after James vacated the British throne. Lord Pembroke, in his Numismata Antiqua, implies that it was struck during the Irish Expedition of March, 1688–9, to July, 1690. He illustrates the silver touchpiece of this king with the words: "The Healing Piece of K. James 2 struck in silver in Ireland," and in the Pembroke Sale Catalogue of 1848 it was entered amongst "Irish Coins, Tokens etc."

Neither Lord Pembroke, nor the compiler of his index, gives his authority for supposing the medal to be of Irish origin, but

---

1 Curiously enough, in spite of this fact, there is no gold touchpiece of James II included in the collection at Keir made by Cardinal York. It therefore seems likely that only the silver examples were accessible to Prince Henry Stuart living in exile.

2 Part 4, t. 12, of Numismata Antiqua in tres partes, with an Index by Joseph Ames, Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries, published 1746: Plates of the collection of Thomas Herbert, 8th Earl of Pembroke.

3 Lot 210, costing 11s with a Lennox farthing token of James I and a St. Patrick's farthing.
it is figured in this illustrated catalogue of his cabinet in company with the gun-money, which has always been attributed to a member of the Roettiers family.\(^1\) John Roettiers was, at the moment of James II’s effort at holding Ireland, crippled in the hands\(^2\) and there is great probability that Norbert Roettiers, who in 1695 followed his king to France, may have been responsible both for gun-money and touchpiece. It was said that he “fled to France,”\(^3\) and it is quite possible that he had supplied James II with dies from London and feared discovery.

I have found no record of a “Healing” in Dublin, but Voltaire, in his *Siècle de Louis XIV*,\(^4\) implies that it was before the Irish expedition that the exiled King commenced touching in Paris. We may rather incline to the belief that in this case it was Norbert’s uncle Joseph Roettiers, who had formerly served Charles II in England, and was in 1682 made Engraver General of the French mint, who would more easily supply the English Monarch’s need, being upon the spot. In view of the change in workmanship and design from the gold touchpiece of 1685, copied from that of Charles II of 1684, to the new silver substitute, there is every probability that either Norbert or Joseph, and not John, is the maker of the latter, but there is great similarity in the technique of all the Roettiers, and it is unsafe to dogmatise. We may, however, carry the matter further and draw attention to the strong resemblance between this final touchpiece of James II and the first healing-piece used by his son, to whom Norbert Roettiers was official engraver, so that the balance of evidence is in Norbert’s favour.

But to return to the earliest notice of James II as a healer in Paris. Voltaire, no believer in miracles at any time, naturally

---


\(^3\) Commons’ Journals, vol. xi, p. 776. See also British Numismatic Journal, vol. viii, p. 211, for various rumours concerning the members of the Roettiers family.

scoffed at the want of tact displayed by an exile dependent on his French cousin’s bounty, in touching for the King’s Evil in France, whether he derived his powers from his Gallican ancestry or from Edward the Confessor.\(^1\) It was immediately after describing his arrival in Paris that Voltaire speaks of this ceremony, and before his mention of the preparations for the Irish invasion. It is evident that James II, who continued to call himself King of France, as did also his son on the death of the elder James, was treated by Louis XIV with kindly toleration in this respect as in all others.

This courtesy must have been considerably extended towards healing, for the silver pieces are not abnormally rare, although not so common as they would have been had they been used in the weekly ceremonies in England. They exist, as did the gold, struck from varying dies, but there is more change in the design for the silver than in the gold, and it is by no means improbable that the larger and rarer silver variety may have been used for healing in

---

\(^1\) *Ibid.*, "Au milieu des humiliations de ce roi fugitif et des libéralités de Louis XIV envers lui, c’était un spectacle digne de quelque attention de voir Jaques toucher les écrouelles au petit convent des Anglaises, soit que les rois anglais se soient attribué ce singulier privilège comme prétendants à la couronne de la France, soit que cette cérémonie soit établie chez eux depuis le temps du premier Edouard.” Later Voltaire again refers to the English custom of healing, and speaking of James, says: “On a poussé le ridicule jusqu’à dire que, ses reliques avait guéri un évêque d’Autun de la fistule.”—*Ibid.*, p. 306, note 3. A manuscript in the British Museum, Addit. MSS. 20311, ff. 8-12, records this reputed cure at the convent at Challiot on September 26, 1701, where the heart of James II had been recently buried. The Bishop, aged eighty, had suffered for forty years from an ulcer in his eye which had recently become much inflamed, but was suddenly cured after his saying Mass at the convent. At the grave of James, another miracle was reported by the Curé of Pouvain as vouchsafed to a lame youth on November 25, 1701.—*Ibid.*, pp. 13-15. Such stories were no doubt circulated with a view to procuring the late King’s canonization.
Ireland, as Lord Pembroke suggests, and struck in Dublin from dies sent from France, whilst the smaller and slightly thicker pieces were made on the King's return to France to replace the original dies, which may easily have been left in the Emerald Isle when James again retired into exile in July, 1690.

![Small silver touchpieces of James II.](image)

Seeing the difficulty of reproducing a medal in very low relief, I have caused a plate to be made from a magnified photograph of the larger and rarer piece, that our collectors may by comparison place their specimens. Without such magnification the differences are not sufficiently marked as to be visible in the ordinary illustrations in our text.

The mystery of the admission ticket used by James II during his reign remains to be solved. At a time when passes of brass, tin, or lead were used in every theatre and place of amusement, it seems improbable that a paper or cardboard ticket should have been substituted for the Soli Deo Gloria admission piece. I might put forward the suggestion that James continued the use of his brother's tickets, whilst in England, marking them with a nick in the edge. There was no particular reason for melting them on the accession of James, save the change in the King's name. But none has been seen by me struck from altered dies, although many tickets must have been almost immediately required. Possibly some fresh

---

1 The gold pieces, Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 611, No. 19, are made from two differing dies, the rarer having no pennant to the ship. The salver, Med Ill., vol. i, p. 611, No. 20, shows two pairs of dies, the one about 2 millimetres larger than the other. The smaller, although a trifle thicker, weighs usually about one grain less. The larger has no dot after REX, and the water under the ship and the rigging show different treatment. Lord Pembroke's plate portrays the larger piece.
MAGNIFIED PHOTOGRAPH OF THE LARGER SILVER TOUCHPIECE.
copper token was issued and may yet be found, the rarity of survival being explained by the fact that the copper coinage of William would readily absorb any such passes left in the Mint, when no longer in use. If, however, "Sergeant Chirurgeon Pearse" had the tickets in his charge they would naturally find their way into the Irish melting-pot to be converted into gun-money.¹

In Ireland the touchpiece itself being reduced to the value of 3d. it would have been a senseless extravagance to use a pass which might be made, over-struck as gun-money, to do duty for half-a-crown. In France, as in Ireland, it is unlikely that the patients were so numerous at each healing as to necessitate tickets—and we must remember that the supreme attraction of the gold piece was now at an end.

But a truce to speculation; let us hope that the problem may yet be solved, though it will confront us again in the time of Anne. Under William such passes were useless, for the King would not touch, and Mary was too loyal a wife to put forward a claim either of heredity or unction superior to her husband's.

Nevertheless, for the sake of continuity, it is well to report and sift such rumours as are current concerning healing in the days of James II's immediate successors.

No collector of touchpieces need be told that neither William nor Mary impressed their name upon a healing-piece. It was, therefore, with some surprise that I noticed the date 22 February, 1691, in the published report of the Washington MSS. amongst the King's Evil items.² A receipt from Baptist May appeared to be so dated, but May, although he lived until 1698, was not, as we have seen, Keeper of the Privy Purse to James, and William Bentinck, Earl of Portland, was in 1691 holding this post under

¹ Whether Pearse accompanied the King in his flight, I have no evidence, but he was not employed by William and Mary (see our page 197, note 2). Copper was, however, smuggled over to Ireland to make money, and Pearse would, no doubt, supply any pieces in his possession.
Royal Charities.

William III, whilst Mrs. Ann Van Goldstein was serving Mary in the same capacity. This entry, therefore, could neither refer to money expended for James, who before 1691–2 had failed in his Irish venture and was receiving the hospitality of Louis XIV at St. Germain, nor to his successors on the throne. The matter was explained, by Colonel Garrison’s courteous reply to my enquiry, as a misreading of the original manuscript. The figures, he said, should have been printed 1681, and I should hardly call attention to this clerical error, but that it might have been accepted as evidence of healing performed by William or Mary.

It appears that the afflicted were unprepared for the blank refusal of William to touch at Hampton Court at Easter, 1689. He saw the crowd awaiting his coming, the sick having travelled twelve miles from London to obtain his help, many of them halt and lame. “It is a silly superstition,” said the King; “give the poor creatures some money and send them away.” Lord Macaulay wrote that on one occasion William was importuned into touching a single patient, but he only said these words: “God give you better health and more sense.”

1 Chamberlayne’s Anglica Notitia, 17th edition, 1691, p. 145. The office was later taken up by Casper Frederic Henning. See Treasury papers, T. 1, Anne, vol. 79, No. 86, where, in May, 1702, he is described as “keeper of the Privy Purse to the late King, William III.” Chamberlayne, in 1700, 19th edition, p. 494, leaves the office blank, and Miege, in his New State of England in 1701, does the same, but he mentions a deputy, “Mr. Sayers,” p. 84. It seems likely that the post was for a time vacant after Portland had sent in his resignation.

2 Chamberlayne’s 17th edition, p. 171.

3 James returned to France after the battle of the Boyne, fought on July 1, 1690, and arrived at Brest on the 10th of that month.


5 Macaulay, as above, quoting Paris Gazette of April 23, 1689. I have been unable to find a copy of this paper.
Touchpieces for the King’s Evil.

Whether William’s charity in this solitary instance took the form of the crown piece, the value of his father-in-law’s gold touch-piece, we cannot say, but the blessing was characteristic of his usual bluntness, and perhaps as devoutly spoken as the ordinary formula of the French King, “Le roi te touch, Dieu te guérisse,” or even the words of the prisoner Charles I in a moment too hurried for any ritual: “God bless thee and grant thee thy desire.”

Macaulay gives reference to Whiston’s biography as proving that the latter credited William’s touch as successful in the single instance in which it was applied. But although Whiston professes a general belief in the efficacy of healing, I have been unable to trace this statement, and it is not in agreement with his remark in his Life and Writings, published less than half a century after the death of William III, wherein he asserts his belief that neither this monarch nor his wife ever attempted to heal. The Athenian Mercury, a periodical which filled, in the reign of William, the place of the Notes and Queries of to-day, in answering the question raised in the year 1691: “What are we to think of the Kings of England who by their touch, only, cured the Evil?” gave a short dissertation on healing which clearly relegated the practice to the past as one which had already died out.

The monarch’s whole heart was set on the defence of Holland, and he cared not to waste his energy and feeble health on a ceremonial in which he did not believe, and with him popularity counted for naught.

“Mary II,” says Miss Strickland, “dared not, and her spouse would not, perform the ceremony.”

1 Browne’s Charisma, p. 135. Browne tells a story of a man whom the Guards prevented from coming near the King, who was being removed from the Isle of Wight. Charles is reported to have said: “Friend, I see thou art not permitted to come near me, and I cannot tell what thou wouldest have, but God bless thee and grant thee thy desire.”


3 Life and Writings of William Whiston, published 1749, part ii, p. 443. Although himself a clergyman of the Church of England for many years, Whiston became a Baptist in 1747, and had at all times been a curious critic in Church matters.


It is certain that the adherents of James were delighted at this, and Macaulay reports that "the parents of scrofulous children cried out against his cruelty," and that the "Jacobites sarcastically praised him for not presuming to arrogate to himself a power which belonged only to legitimate sovereigns." Rapin de Thoyras, in his *History of England*, wrote: "The late King William III of glorious memory was so persuaded he should do no injury to persons afflicted with this distemper by not touching them that he refrained from it all his reign." Dr. Crawfurd calls attention to the fact that William's own physician also asserted that no such attempt was made by this King.

It may well be that Mary was unwilling to put forward her claim to the "Divine Right" of healing, whilst her father was still touching the sick at St. Germains, and it is said that Anne was at first held back by a feeling that the throne was not rightfully her own, but should by inheritance belong to her young brother. Mr. R. E. C. Waters, to turn to more modern writers, remarks in his *Parish Registers of England*, that "the expense and superstition of this practice were equally distasteful to William III," and he believes that "he was the first King of England who positively refused to touch patients." His refusal, however," he proceeds, "was interpreted as a confession that he was no rightful King; and Queen Anne's Ministers thought it politic to revive an ancient observance, which was calculated to confirm the people in their loyalty to their sovereign."

But, with the permission of our readers, we must postpone the discussion of the resumption of healing in the reign of Queen Anne until the pages of our next volume again extend their hospitality to my researches into the "Royal Charities."

---

1 Macaulay, p. 480.
3 Sir Richard Blackmore's Preface to *Treatise on the King's Evil*, quoted by Dr. Crawfurd, p. 139 of his *King's Evil*.
4 *Parish Registers of England*, p. 82.