ROYAL CHARITIES.

PART IV.—Conclusion of TOUCHPIECES FOR THE KING’S EVIL.

BY HELEN FARQUHAR.

ANNE AND THE STUART PRINCES.

In the last volume of our Journal we studied the vicissitudes of “Healing” between 1685 and 1702—following the busy crowds that flocked to the Court of James II to be touched, and obtained the symbolic token, be it of gold or silver—and also again the disappointed few who asked, but received no help from William and Mary.

Let us now turn to the resumption of the full ceremonial by Anne, whether from policy or from the kindness of heart for which she was renowned.

It may well be that the Queen merely followed the precedent set by her great-grandfather, James I, of whom his biographer and contemporary, Arthur Wilson, wrote that he healed from political motives. “He was King in understanding and was content to have his subjects ignorant in many things: As in curing the King’s Evil which he knew a device to ingrandize the Vertue of Kings when miracles were in fashion, though he smiled at it, in his own Reason, finding the strength of the Imagination a more powerfull Agent in the Cure than the Plaisters his Chirurgions prescribed for the sore.” #1 However this may be, there is no doubt that Anne recommenced healing against her own inclinations. Throughout her reign she expressed a strong dislike to any words implying that her “right” was “Divine.” The Duke of Shrewsbury wrote on October 20, 1710, to Robert Harley, saying that on his reading to the Queen an address which was shortly to be presented to her

---

#1 The History of Great Britain, being the Life and Reign of James the First, p. 289, by Arthur Wilson, published in 1653, the year after the author’s death.
by the City of London, "she immediately took exception at the expression that her right was Divine, and this morning told me that having thought often of it, she could by no means like it, and thought it so unfit to be given to anybody that she wished it might be left out; if it can be, I find she would like it much better."¹

The address to which Shrewsbury refers was published in the London Gazette under date October 23, 1710, and the offending expressions were altered to "We own your Right to be Indefeazable, your Person sacred and your Throne to be Hereditary."

"Nevertheless," says the author of the ninth volume of the Political History of England, in referring to this matter, "she continued to touch for the King's Evil."²

Oldmixon, however, imputes Anne's adoption of the popular practice of healing to entirely political motives. "The Wiseones of the party put the Queen up to curing the King's Evil according to the Divine Gift descended on all the Hereditary Kings from the Confessor."³ It is indeed said that Harley⁴ anxiously pressed on Anne the desirability of performing a rite, which her father, as dethroned King of England, had continued to practise throughout the reign of William and Mary. James being now dead and his son uncrowned, Anne might consider herself free from the scruples which may have swayed her sister. Be this as it may, it is certain that Anne, like her great-grandfather James I, did not long persist in a refusal to heal.

There is every reason to suppose that Anne touched from almost the beginning of her reign. The announcements of Healings in the London Gazette are by no means infrequent. The earliest I have met

¹ Bath Manuscripts, vol. i, p. 199.
³ Oldmixon's History of England during the Reigns of William and Mary, Queen Anne, etc., p. 302.
⁴ Robert Harley was Speaker of the House of Commons at the commencement of Anne's reign and did not become a Privy Counsellor until April 27, 1704. He was appointed Secretary of State for the Northern Department on May 18 of the same year and from this time onwards had great influence with the Queen, but it is of course possible that even as Speaker he may have advised the desirability of asserting the "Divine Right."
with notifies, under date March 15, 1702–3, that “Whereas the new Guardchamber, joining to the Banqueting House in Whitehall, is appointed as an Office for Her Majesty’s Sergeant Surgeon to examine all Persons who desire to be touched for the King’s Evil, Mr. Charles Barnard, her Majesty’s Sergeant Surgeon, doth hereby give notice, That he will give his Attendance there and deliver Tickets every Friday at Three in the Afternoon during the time that Her Majesty shall please to touch for the Evil.”

Nevertheless, almost the following number of this official organ complains that “great multitudes of people do daily resort to the Sergeant Surgeon’s House in a very disorderly manner to be viewed for the Evil.”

It is then announced that “it is her Majesty’s Pleasure that all those who are proper Objects do repair only to the Office appointed at Whitehall for the purpose, where Attendance will be given at convenient times of which Public Notice will be given, Her Majesty having at present thought fit to put off healing for some time.”

Probably this order caused disappointment, and the Queen therefore reconsidered the matter, for the Gazette a few days later informed the Public that Anne would receive the sick. “It is Her Majesty’s pleasure that all who have received tickets for the next healing do attend at St. James on Saturday the Third of this instant April by Eleven of the Clock.”

Oldmixon describes the Queen as touching at Bath on the 6th of some October, but whether of the year 1702 or 1703 is not clear. In 1702 Anne was in Bath during October, leaving on the 8th and

---

1 Charles Barnard is mentioned as “Chirurgeon” to Anne in all the editions of Anglia Notitia published in her reign. See also list of King’s Surgeons or Sergeant Surgeons to the Sovereign, in Thomas Pettigrew’s “The History of the Barber Surgeons of London,” p. 129 of Journal of the Archaeological Association, vol. viii, where he is noted as Master of the Company in 1703.

2 The London Gazette, No. 3896.
3 Ibid., March 29, 1702–3. No. 3898.
4 Ibid., March 29, April 1, 1703. No. 3901.
5 Ibid., 1702. No. 3853.
returning on that day to Windsor, but almost the same programme was observed in the following year, the only difference being that she journeyed home on the 7th.¹ The page-heading of Oldmixon is 1703, but he refers to matters such as the publication of Clarendon’s history and Sacheverell’s “Political Union,” two events of the year 1702, in the same paragraph as his disquisition on healing. Our author says that according to “the Publick Prints” a great number of people coming to Bath to be healed, “Her Majesty commanded Thomas Gardener,² her chief Surgeon to examine them all particularly, which accordingly was done by him, of whom but 30 appear’d to have the Evil, which he certified by Tickets as usual and those 30 were touch’d that day privately by Reason of her Majesty’s not having a proper Conveniency for the Solemnity.”

Miss Strickland believed that it was during one of the royal visits to Bath that Anne endeavoured to cure Samuel Johnson in 1712, but Dr. Crawfurd points out that according to Johnson’s original manuscript it was in London that he was received by the

¹ The London Gazette, 1703. No. 3956.
² Oldmixon’s History of England from the reign of William and Mary to George I, p. 302. The author apologises for his confusion of dates in grouping his subjects rather than following exact chronology. The publication of Clarendon’s first volume to which he alludes was in June, 1702, and Henry Sacheverell’s Political Union appeared in Oxford in the same year. Oldmixon’s reference to Sacheverell seems to have led J. H. Burton and other writers on Anne’s reign into the mistaken idea that she did not begin to heal until 1709, the year of the Doctor’s famous sermon on non-resistance. See Burton’s History of the Reign of Queen Anne, vol. ii, p. 203.
³ Under William III, Thomas Gardener appears in Mieg’s New State of England as Surgeon to the Household in 1693, p. 394. Sir D’Arcy Power, in his Serjeant Surgeons of England, noted his appointment to this higher office in 1697. See also T. G. Pettigrew’s “History of the Barber Surgeons of London,” published in the Journal of the Archaological Association, vol. viii, p. 129, where he is mentioned amongst Surgeon Surgeons elected together with Henry Rossington as joint Masters of the Company of Barber Surgeons in 1695. Turning to the time of Anne, Gardener was in 1702 “Chirurgeon to the Household.” See Angliae Notitia, p. 516, 20th edition, and the following issue also. In 1707 he retained this position, but is also entered, p. 556, as “Surgeon General to the Land Forces.” In 1710, p. 544, we find him in this latter office and “Mr. William Gardener” as Surgeon to the Household.
Queen. We learn that as a child, at the age of thirty months, he was taken to the metropolis by his mother, on the advice of Sir John Floyer, an eminent physician of Lichfield, to obtain Anne's touch, and vaguely remembered her as "a lady in diamonds and a long black hood." It appears that Johnson was himself no great believer in the royal gift of healing, and we know that he did not long wear the token presented by the Queen, for, as we see it in the British Museum, it is in fine condition. Perhaps his mother lost patience on finding little improvement, and as Anne was the last monarch who healed in England, she could not repeat her effort for the cure of the child. Be this as it may, the soft white hand was powerless as regards Johnson; and Boswell, alluding to this failure, told his friend that "his mother had not carried him far enough, she should have taken him to Rome," then the residence of the exiled Stuarts.

But our interest in the great lexicographer has carried us far beyond the end of Anne's reign, and there are many other records of her healings, to which we must refer.

Dr. Crawfurd, under date March 30, 1712, quotes a singularly large attendance at St. James's Palace, when two hundred persons were received by the Queen. Usually the receptions were small,

1 The King's Evil, p. 145, quoting a manuscript at Lichfield. This manuscript, "An account of the Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson from his birth to his eleventh year," was published by R. Philips in 1805, see Boswell's Life of Johnson, vol. i, p. 31, note 1. See also quotations from it by Boswell as above, p. 36, and note r. John Nichols, in his Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century, vol. ii, p. 502, gives the date of Johnson's healing as March 30, 1714. Mr. Sparrow Simpson, in the Journal of the Archæological Association, vol. xxvii, p. 292, attracts attention to this discrepancy of date and remarks that, if correct, the recollection of the event would be that of a child of 4½ rather than 2½ years. One cannot but think that the early manuscript was unlikely to be incorrect.

2 Boswell's Life of Johnson, ed. 1826, vol. i, p. 36. Boswell says that scrofula injured Johnson's "visual nerves so much that he did not see at all with one of his eyes, though its appearance was little different from that of the other." It seems that it did eventually improve, for Boswell tells us, "There is amongst his prayers one inscribed 'When my eye was restored to its use.'" Ibid., p. 35.

3 The King's Evil, p. 144. John Nichols, in his Literary Anecdotes, vol. ii, p. 502, gives the date of this healing as 1714—but I have personally been unable to find the notice of it in the Gazette of either date. As Nichols believed that this was the
and again we may cite Oldmixon, quoting the newspapers on a certain 19th of December of undated year, but apparently either in 1702 or 1703. "Yesterday," quotes this rather captious historian, who was no believer in healing—"Yesterday about 12 at noon her Majesty was pleased to touch at St. James' about 20 persons afflicted with the King's Evil."

I have looked through many copies of the old Gazettes, with faded ink and discoloured paper, to be rewarded now and again with a notice that on such a date the Queen would or would not heal. The collector of the Washington manuscripts concerning the King's Evil, to which collection I have referred in our earlier volumes, placed amongst his papers five numbers of the London Gazette of the year 1705, four of which postpone healings, whilst the fifth, under date November 5, 1705, announces that the Queen will resume her kindly ministration. "It being Her Majesty's Royal Pleasure to Heal Weekly for the Evil during the present and succeeding Month till Christmas, and to begin on Wednesday the 14th Instant, it is her Majesty's Command, that all Persons shall be viewed, and Tickets delivered the day before, at the Office in Whitehall, appointed for that purpose, and nowhere else." Then follow the usual regulations about the "Certificates signed and sealed."

Now in these "Publick Prints," as Oldmixon calls the newspapers, the same stress as of old is laid on the tickets, but I have not succeeded in picking out one from the many little medals of the time of Anne which would be specially appropriate to the subject. True it is that at first sight one is tempted to fix upon that somewhat date of Johnson's healing, and we have noted that this was probably an error, see our p. 145, note 1, I would rather be guided by Dr. Crawfurd. Anne was, however, in London in March, 1714, and therefore this date is possible. See London Gazette, No. 5213. She did, we believe, continue her healing into the last year of her reign.

1 Oldmixon's History, p. 302. Anne was at St. James's the week of the 13th of December in the year 1702 and also in 1703. See London Gazette, Nos. 3871 and 3872, and Nos. 3975 and 3976.


3 London Gazette, Nos. 4126, 4127 and 4128, May 24 to June 4, 1705; and No. 4185, December 17 to 20, 1705.

4 Ibid., No. 4172, November 1 to November 5, 1705.
inexplicable jetton which bears the words ALL FOR LOVE in the exergue, and represents a beggar, hat in hand, kneeling at the feet of a lady.¹ This inscription, ALL FOR LOVE, might be understood as meaning that the Queen’s affection for her people was shown in healing the sick, but the fact that in another version of the same medal the man and woman are both portrayed in court dress, and the male figure no longer kneels, turns us back to the not unnatural explanation of a political squib.² The man is thought to be Louis XIV, suing for peace—at least this is the tentative suggestion offered in *Medallic Illustrations of British History*.

Whatever tickets Anne’s Chirurgeon may have used, we have no difficulty in procuring an example of her touchpiece, for it is not very rare. In size it is nearer to the large than to the small healing-piece of Charles II,³ but this bespeaks no great extravagance on the part of the Queen, for, in spite of the fourteen-years’ respite from “healings,” the numbers of patients who presented themselves for Anne’s touch did not approach those in the times of her uncle and father.

Nevertheless, in the course of some eleven or twelve years, it is obvious that Anne “touched” a considerable number of persons. Beckett, writing in 1722, not more than eight years after Anne’s death, published a letter from a correspondent, whose name he does

¹ *Med. Ill.*, vol. ii, p. 416, Nos. 287-288. Horace Walpole, having presumably a rubbed specimen in his cabinet, mistook the man for a woman and believed the medal to represent Queen Anne embracing Mrs. Masham.


³ Those which I have weighed have as a rule varied from about 47 to 49½ grains. That given by Queen Anne to Samuel Johnson turns the scale at 48·7. The Mint specimen weighs only 45 grains; my own examples 45·5 and 47·4 respectively.
not give, laying stress on the kindness and success of Anne in touching. "Can we already forget the Multitudes of Cures whereby among other glorious Things, our late Queen of transcending Excellence signalised herself?" It must be admitted that, crippled with gout, healing must have been extremely painful to Anne, who even at Bath, whither she journeyed for her health, touched the sick. This fact must be advanced in excuse for the tradition that instead of following the precedent set by her sister Queens, Mary I and Elizabeth, and their successors on the throne in pressing the sores, Anne touched by means of a lodestone.

The Queen, however, was possibly an imitator of an earlier example, set by Henry VIII, in protecting the hand from coming into actual contact with the sore, for it is recorded that he wore a particular ring when healing. In the Library of the Society of Antiquaries is a manuscript account of the jewels belonging to Henry VIII at the time of his death, and amongst the objects enumerated we read the following: "Item a black vellat wrought bagge gilte ringes, conteyning three ringes . . . whereof one a Rubie that the King ware at the healing of pore folke." We cannot tell, however, whether Henry, who prided himself on his knowledge of medicine as then practised, was not rather actuated by the belief, at that time prevalent, that a ruby protected the wearer from plague, poison and fevers. This is the more likely in that the same bag contained also "a saphire lose with a chayne of gold," and the sapphire was regarded as a preservative against diseases of the skin and blindness, the latter a frequent result of the King's Evil, and this sapphire pendant may also have been worn as a prophylactic when healing. Elizabeth in the time of plague wore a diamond ring suspended from her neck, this stone also being credited with power to protect if worn next the skin. Be this as it may, in the

---

1 A Free and Impartial Enquiry, p. 5.
2 John Evelyn, speaking of Charles II's Healing ceremony on July 6, 1660, said: "Ye King strokes their faces and cheeks with both his hands at once." See Diary, ed. 1827, vol. i, p. 151.
3 List of the Jewelles, plate, stuff, etc., belonging to the late King Henry Eight, f. 170 b.
Wellcome Historical Medical Museum, whence I have obtained permission to illustrate it, there is a lodestone\(^1\) stated to have been used by Queen Anne for the purpose of touching sufferers from the King’s Evil, in order to prevent her hand coming in actual contact with the sick person. The Queen is said to have had a strong objection to such physical contact which, when suffering from gout in the hands, might cause her acute pain. The stone was in the possession of one “John Rooper, Esqre., of Herhamstead Castle,” who held the post of Deputy Cofferer\(^2\) to the Queen, and has remained in the Rooper family until recently acquired for the Wellcome Museum. It passed from John Rooper to his son, Major Godolphin Rooper, who had it mounted in silver as it now stands, and from him it was handed down to T. Godolphin Rooper, who had his initials engraved upon it. From his sister, Wilhelmina L. Rooper, who inherited it from him, it was acquired with its authentic history certified for the Museum.

\(^{1}\) There are two such lodestones in the Wellcome Museum, the second being unmounted and no tradition is attached to it, but it resembles in form and size the historical example.

\(^{2}\) The office of Cofferer in Royal Households is frequently mentioned from very early times and must not be confounded with the makers of chests who belonged to the Guild of the Cofferers in the Middle Ages. See correspondence in the *Connoisseur*, September and November, 1916, notes. The Cofferer was, says Mr. Landfair Lucas, “next under the controller . . . and his duties are now carried out by the Lord Steward and Paymaster of the Household.” I had occasion in our volume xi, p. 263, to mention the Cofferer of Queen Anne to whom application was made connected with the Maundy gifts. The salary in the time of William and Mary of “His Lordship as Cofferer” to Francis, Lord Viscount Newport, afterwards Earl of Bradford, was £100 a year, and £123 14s. 8d. as Treasurer of the Chamber. See list in *Ordinances of the Royal Household*, p. 395, published by the Society of Antiquaries in 1799. In this list the Cofferer is placed after the Lord Steward and before the Controller. Such duties were often discharged by Deputy. The Cofferer is described under Edward IV as one “whiche takyth in charge all the receytes for the Treasurer of household.” See *Ibid.*, p. 50, Liber Domus Regis Edw. IV, and under him were all the payments of the Board of Greenloth. In the time of Henry VIII we find mention of the Cofferer’s clerk, who had an allowance of 8d. a day for carriage hire. See *Ibid.*, p. 216, *Ordinances at Eltham*. The Cofferer’s board wages were 8d. a day, p. 217, and his salary was raised by Henry to £50, p. 213. Queen Anne’s Cofferers were, in succession, Sir Benjamin Bathurst, Francis Godolphin, and Samuel Masham; John Rooper, as we have seen, acted as Deputy.
That Anne believed her touch would be conveyed through the stone, which she probably held unmounted in her hand, there can be little doubt; possibly she even credited the theory that the touch would be strengthened by the magnetic influence of the stone, and she may have originally used it as a specific for the gout, from which she suffered. Mr. C. J. S. Thompson, Curator of the Wellcome Museum, tells me that mention of the use of the magnet as a cure of disease is found in the works of Aetius, who wrote on medicine in the sixth century, stating that a magnet in the hand will give relief from gout.

Whether it was for this purpose of her own relief that Anne first tried the lodestone, who shall say? Be that as it may, the tradition of its application during the "Healings" is so well substantiated that I avail myself with pleasure of the permission accorded me of placing a photograph of this curious relic before my readers.

LODESTONE OF QUEEN ANNE IN THE COLLECTION OF THE WELLCOME HISTORICAL MEDICAL MUSEUM.

1 Aetius, a Greek physician born in Amida, Mesopotamia, flourished at the beginning of the sixth century A.D. He wrote a medical work in sixteen volumes compiled from Galen and other writers. "Superstition and mysticism," says the writer of the notice concerning him in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, "play a great part in his remedies." Eight of his books were printed in the original Greek in 1534 at Venice and "a complete Latin translation by Cornarius appeared at Basel, 1542."
In mounting the lodestone care was taken not to stop the magnetic current, which is carried by worked iron damascened with silver, so that it can still be used as a magnet. It was not until 1600,\(^1\) that Dr. Gilbert of Colchester demonstrated, as Mr. Thompson tells me, the magnetic force, but the belief that it was a cure for toothache, headache, convulsions and nervous diseases was prevalent in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and Paracelsus used it in cases of epilepsy. That magnets were efficacious if applied to the body was held for truth down to the end of the eighteenth century, when the theory was exploited by several practitioners.

During the time of Queen Anne the use of the magnet as a curative power is frequently mentioned by members of the medical profession, and Sir Thomas Browne had written much concerning the lodestone. Let us therefore credit Anne with no great selfishness in refusing the actual contact with the sick, for she probably believed that she rather enhanced than diminished the power with which she was credited by the people. She, moreover, clearly did not herself hold that the healing gift was one which she actually possessed. It is suggested by Miss Strickland,\(^2\) although without giving any authority, that Anne at first used the ritual of James II, including the invocation to the Virgin Mary, and that the Pope consequently thought she had leanings towards Rome. The authoress considers that the Healing Service was Anne’s most efficacious answer to this suggestion. Hence its insertion into the Prayer-book by the Queen, a course which had been occasionally adopted by Charles I and Charles II.

It is by no means impossible that Anne did in truth at first make use of the Healing Service in the vernacular, as published by Hills in 1686, which, as we have seen,\(^3\) contained this invocation.

\(^1\) See *De Magnete*, by William Gilbert, published 1600.

\(^2\) *Queens of England*, vol. viii, p. 206. Miss Strickland says: “There are two or three letters in the State Papers Office addressed personally to Queen Anne, written in elegant Italian from the Pope, by the hand of his official, or ordinary, congratulating her in affectionate terms on her conversion to the Roman-Catholic faith. Not any notation of answer is appended to these epistles; they are dated 1706.”

\(^3\) *British Numismatic Journal*, xiv, p. 103.
Whether purposely to mark the change in the ritual or not, important alterations were made in the service when printed in 1707 in the Book of Common Prayer. More prayers were inserted than had been in use under Charles I and Charles II, and less of the Scripture was to be read; a collect from the Communion service precedes the gospel, and a portion taken from the Office for the Visitation of the Sick was introduced. On the other hand, the patient received his or her medal and the touch of the Queen's hand at a single presentation whilst the officiating priest prayed for God's blessing and the recovery of the person, instead of the double presentation during the recital of two separate gospels. The service is far shorter than that of Henry VII used by James.

Deeming that it may be of interest to our readers to see one of the versions of the ritual practised, I here illustrate the earliest which I have noticed in the Book of Common Prayer, namely a folio volume of Charles 

1

published in 1634. Although not identical in type and spelling, it differs not at all in wording or rubric from two sheets embodying the service, to be found amongst the collection of Broadside in the Library of the Society of Antiquaries. The latter service is separately printed on one side only of each leaf, and therefore we are clearly not dealing with pages cut from a prayer book. These sheets have been adjudged to be of the time of James I, and on them Dr. Crawfurd has based his opinion that James I and Charles I made use of the same ritual. Little change was made by Charles II, some slight alteration, however, in the rubric and final benediction may be noticed in the Book of Common Prayer of 1662, issued by him. With regard to republication under Anne, the

1 Brit. Mus. Liturgies, Church of England—Common Prayer 3406, f. 3, where the Healing service is placed between "Godly Prayers" and the "Form and Manner of making Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." Beckett, in his Free and Impartial Enquiry, appendix viii, prints a Form of Healing which he attributes to Charles I and Charles II, but it is that of the latter King.

2 Society of Antiquaries, Broadside, vol. i of James I, 1603 to 1622, No. 161. Placed immediately after a form for consecrating Bishops dated 1618, and deemed to be of about the same date.

3 Brit. Mus. 3406, c. 2, where the Healing Service is printed between the Communion and the Psalms.
The Gospel written in the 16. of Marke.

Thus appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and cast in their teeth their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen that he was risen again from the dead. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to all creatures: he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not, shall be damned. And these tokens shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take away serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them: They shall lay their hands on the sick, and they shall recover. So then when the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received into heaven, and is on the right hand of God. And they went forth and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the Word with miracles following.


In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by it, and without it was made nothing that was made. In it was life, and the life was the light of men, and the light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not. There was sent from God a man, whose name was John: the same came as a witness to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of the Light. That Light was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, hee was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came among his owne, and his owne received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to be made sons of God, even them that believed on his Name, which were borne, not of blood, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the
the same Word became flesh, and dwelt among vs, and we saw the glory of it, as the glory of the only begotten Son of the Father, full of grace and truth.

Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy Name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven, Give vs this day our daily bread, And forgive vs our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against vs, And lead vs not into temptation:

Answer.

But deliver vs from evil. Amen.

Our Lord save thy servants.

Answer.

Which put their trust in thee.

Answer.

Send unto them helpe from above.

Answer.

And evermore mightily defend them.

Answer.

Helpe vs O God our Saviour.

Answer.

And for the glory of thy Names sake deliver vs, bee mercifull unto vs sinners for thy Names sake.

Answer.

O Lord heare our prayers.

Answer.

And let our cry come unto thee:

Almighty God the eternall health of all such as put their trust in thee, heare vs wee beseech thee, on the behalfe of these thy servants for whom wee call for thy mercifull helpe, that they receiving health, may give thanks to thee in thy holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

The peace of God which passeth all understanding, keepe your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord: and the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remaine with you alwayes. Amen.
earliest date noted by either Dr. Crawfurd or myself is that of the year 1707. He found a quarto of that year containing the Healing use in the Lambeth Library and another in the Library of the College of Physicians, printed in 1708.

I find that the British Museum also possesses a copy issued in 1707.

The edition of 1709 is far more common, and from this Dr. Crawfurd prints the service.

We do not find it mentioned in the Table of Contents, but in Anne's Prayer Books it is introduced between the Queen's Accession Service of March 8, 1701-2, and the Articles of Religion. Miss Strickland, who had seen no copy earlier than that of 1709, judged from the Order in Council, under date February, 1703-4, that the Healing Service was included in the Book of Common Prayer at the same time as the above-mentioned Thanksgiving. She grounded her belief on the wording of the order: "Our will and pleasure is that this form of prayer and thanksgiving for the eighth day of March be forthwith printed and published."

Miss Strickland's hypothesis of the early publication seems somewhat inconsistent with her theory that the Pope's letters written in 1706 induced Anne to publish her new version of the Healing Office in vindication of her Protestantism. To me the expression "prayer and thanksgiving" appears to refer to one service only, that of March the 8th.

Curiously enough, although George I discontinued the practice of touching, some of the larger editions of the Book of Common Prayer published during his reign contain the office. It might


See Brit. Mus. 3052, e.e.e. 14, and The King's Evil, pp. 146-148. The folio edition of 1712, Brit. Mus. 3405, g. 8 is more rare, and Mr. Sparrow Simpson remarks that although he was informed that it contained the Healing Service, he had not himself met with it.

easily, without exciting our surprise, have been retained, as it was, in 1715, for it would be thought likely that the service, identical with that used by Anne, would be required by her successor. But, following the edition of 1715, we may still find the Healing use in the Oxford Quarto of 1719, after the Accession Service of August 1st and before the Articles on Religion, the Prayer Book and Bible being bound together as before. This, moreover, is not all, for it reappears in the large folio Prayer Book, printed at Oxford by John Baskett in 1721, which was bound contemporaneously with a Holy Bible dated 1723; whilst reverting to the quarto form, with a Bible bearing date 1732, it still takes its place between the Accession Service and the Thirty-Nine Articles. This quarto Prayer Book of 1732, although published five years after the death of George I, contains the service of thanksgiving for his accession on August 1, 1714, ordered in 1715, and the younger George is mentioned in the prayers for the Royal Family as Prince of Wales. From these facts it is clear that the whole must have been a direct reprint from the quarto edition of 1719, with alteration of date only, and the inclusion of the Healing Service was probably due to carelessness. This is, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the last time that it was printed in the Book of Common Prayer in English, but we can trace it yet further in Latin Service books. The *Liturgia seu Liber Precum Communium* issued by

---

1 Brit. Mus. 338, d. i, 1715. This quarto Prayer Book is bound with a Holy Bible of the same date.

2 Brit. Mus. 1411, i. 5, i-3, 1719.

3 Brit. Mus. 344 a. 2, i-3, and 3053 i. 8, i-2.

4 I have not been able to collate the two, line by line, as the British Museum contains no copy of the 1732 edition. I have, however, seen two copies of this rare book at Coker Court, from which I took careful notes and have obtained particulars of that in the Bodleian Library, and it appears that it is an absolute reprint from the edition of 1719. The Book of Common Prayer of 1721 is, so far as I can ascertain, the last time the Healing Service was included in a folio edition, whilst as regards the quarto, with the exception of the Rev. J. H. Blount, writers on the Book of Common Prayer do not appear to have noticed the inclusion of the Healing Service so late as 1732. It was not included in the slightly smaller quarto Prayer Book and Bible bound together, Brit. Mus. 3035, b. ii, in 1728, a fact which might account for this general oversight.
Thomas Parsell, Master of Merchant Taylors' School, still brings the "Forma Strumosos Attrectandi" to our notice in 1759, and for what purpose, who shall say?

Parsell first published his version of the Book of Common Prayer in 1706, but without the Healing Office, and an earlier edition by another translator had not contained it. In the subsequent editions, after Anne had inserted this service in her English Prayer Book in 1707, we find it in Parsell's Latin version in 1713, 1720, 1727, 1733, 1744, and 1759. The example last mentioned, Brit. Mus. 3408 b. 32, has hitherto passed unnoticed, the edition of 1744, Brit. Mus. 745 a. 3, being usually cited as the latest appearance of the ritual in a Book of Common Prayer in Latin. Parsell's manual adheres strictly to the Anglican rites and cannot have been designed for the use of the exiled Stuarts; for although Charles Edward's declaration of Protestantism might account for the final appearance in 1759, the uninterrupted inclusion of a service so long disused seems curious. A slight difference in the translation into Latin is noticeable as printed in parallel columns by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson in the Journal of the Archæological Association between the service of Anne in the edition of 1713 and that intended for, although unused by, the King regnant in 1727.

It appears that the collator was unacquainted with Parsell's edition of 1720, which, as I have ascertained, reads the same as the rendering of 1727—but this is a matter of small importance, and the

---

2 In 1759 Charles himself declared that he had joined the Church of England nine years previously, i.e. in 1750. See Andrew Lang's Prince Charles Edward, p. 242. But it was, as Miss Shield points out after exhaustive enquiry, in her King over the Water, p. 446, not until 1752 that the news reached France and Rome. Hume's assertion that the change of creed was made in 1753 was no doubt based on a conversation held in that year between Charles and Archibald Cameron, the latter making a statement in the June of 1753 that "the Prince bore him tell the Party that he was a member of the Church of England." See Lang, as above, p. 248.
fact remains that the Head Master of Merchant Taylors’ School thought it worth while to translate afresh an office no longer in use after the death of Anne.

In the edition of Parsell’s *Liturgia* of 1713 at the British Museum, a curious little side-light is thrown on the fact that Anne continued her healings at least until the date of publication of this particular volume.

A manuscript note in the margin of the Healing Service runs: “Geo. Bp. Lincoln Thursday,” meaning that George, a pupil in the Merchant Taylors’ School, was to be taken by Bishop Wake, Deputy Clerk of the Closet in 1689, and Bishop of Lincoln in 1705, to be healed on some Thursday in 1713 or 1714, that is, between the publication of the book and the Queen’s death.

Anne was noted for beneficence and piety, and it is interesting to learn from a manuscript account-book entitled *Queen Anne’s Establishment,* in the Library of the Society of Antiquaries, that the expense of her chapels at Whitehall and St. James, including the “wages and Board wages” of those officiating there, came to £3260 18s. 4d. a year. On her accession she ordered that Doctors John Younger, William Graham and Samuel Pratt should “remain our Chaplains and attend as Clerk of our Closet in ye sev’l Waitings” at a fee of £6 18s. 

Throughout the reign of Anne the office was held in commission, although we learn from Chamberlayne’s *Angliae Notitia* that the usual custom, revived by George I on her death, had been to have but one Clerk of the Closet at a fee of 20 nobles

---

1 William Wake held the Office of Royal Almoner until January, 1715-16, when he was translated to Canterbury.

2 MS. *Queen Anne’s Establishment,* pp. 19 and 20.

3 Dr. John Younger and Dr. William Graham, Dean of Carlisle, are mentioned in Chamberlayne’s *Angliae Notitia or Present State of England,* as Chaplains to Princess Anne in 1700, at which time Mr. Charles Lucas was her Closet Keeper. Samuel Pratt, also chaplain to Anne before her accession, was sub-preceptor to her son, the little Duke of Gloucester, under Gilbert Burnet, and was in 1706 made Dean of Rochester. Chamberlayne in 1702, 1704, 1707, 1708 and 1710 gives these clerics as holding the office of Clerk of the Closet in common, whilst the next edition in 1716 returns to the usual form, George I appointing one Clerk of the Closet only—see 24th ed., p. 551.
a year. This official was described in the days of Charles and James, as "commonly some Reverend discreet Divine extraordinarily esteemed by his Majesty, whose office is to attend at the King's right hand during Divine Service to resolve all Doubts concerning Spiritual Matters, to wait on his Majesty in his private Oratory or Closet."\(^1\)

We have seen that this post was held successively by Dr. Earle,\(^2\) Dr. Blandford and Dr. Crew under Charles II—by Crew and Sprat under James II until he preferred the services of his own confessor, Father Petre.

The appointment of the latter is not noticed by Chamberlayne, for the compiler of this guide to "the Present State of England" only printed his volumes at irregular intervals, two editions appearing sometimes in the twelve months, followed by a gap of two or more years. The issue of 1687 gives Sprat as the holder of the office, and the succeeding edition in 1691 enters the name of John Tillotson\(^3\) as Clerk of the Closet to William III. *Angliae Notitia* in 1692, on p. 110, leaves a blank space where both Clerk and Keeper of the Closet should be mentioned, filled in on a subsequent page, 171, with the name of William Wake.\(^4\) In 1694 we have Thomas Burnet,\(^5\) Master of the Charterhouse, serving King William, and Dr. William Stanley\(^6\) attending Queen Mary as Clerk, a post the latter appears

---

2. For Earle, see our vol. xiii, p. 101, note 4, and for Crew and Sprat, see vol. xiv, pp. 91, 106-8.
3. Dr. John Tillotson, who had in 1672 been chosen Dean of Canterbury by Charles II, was made Clerk of the Closet by William in March, 1689, in which year he was given the deanship of St. Paul's. He was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in May, 1691, and died in 1694.
4. William Wake was Deputy Clerk of the Closet from the time of William III's accession. He held various preferments, being consecrated Bishop and finally Archbishop in the two subsequent reigns. See note 1 on p. 156.
5. Thomas Burnet, 1635?–1715, made Master of the Charterhouse in 1685, became, after the Revolution, Chaplain in Ordinary to William and his Clerk of the Closet, but was never promoted to a see. He died at Charterhouse September 27, 1715.
6. William Stanley, 1647–1731, Archdeacon of London, was made Dean of St. Asaph's by Anne in 1706. He was Chaplain to Mary as Princess of Orange. According to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Mary gave him on her accession £200 a year as Clerk of the Closet, a fee usually reserved for the Dean of the Chapel.
as holding already in 1692 at a salary of £6 13s. 4d. Donkley, who was Keeper of the Closet to Charles and James, received, according to the Treasury Papers of the former King’s reign, £8 per annum, but Chamberlayne sets down the fee at £5 yearly, and this sum is corroborated by the accounts of Anne. This Queen gave her Closet Keeper, one Gilbert Thornburgh, who had filled this post under William III, £5 wages and £36 ros. board wages at Whitehall, whilst the board of the Keeper of the Closet at St. James’ is set down at £45. These officials of course attended Anne when healing.

The Queen died on August 1, 1714, and after this date we find the rite carried forward by the exiled Stuarts, but not by the Hanoverian succession. Anne’s gold touchpiece therefore is the last that we may look for in that metal, with the exception of a pattern made for her half-brother under the title of ‘James III.’

I have failed to find any financial information which would determine either the name of the maker of Anne’s healing-pieces, or the number that were struck. Probably the engraver of the dies would be Croker, for the lettering with the square topped A agrees with the coinage, but although, on account of the increased size, fresh dies must have been made, the puncheons both of the ship and the angel appear to be the same as had been employed for the gold specimens under the Queen’s father. I speak with hesitation, for all touchpieces are worn and it is difficult to be certain excepting with regard to the measurements. The payment for touchpieces continued to be made to the Keeper of the Privy Purse, a post held by women in the reign of Anne, firstly by the Duchess of Marlborough and afterwards by Abigail Masham. In the name of the latter runs a warrant, which I noticed in Messrs. Christie’s

1 On November 17, 1670, Donkley’s wages, at £8 yearly, were stated, see Calendar of Treasury Books, vol. iii, p. 688, November 17, 1670, as due, four years amounting to £230. The Calendarer has written “sic” after “£8 per an” and although it was specified that “183l. ros. 6d. more” was owing for journey money and expenses, we must agree that no arithmetic can explain this sum correctly.

2 Abigail Hill, bedchamber woman to the Queen, married Samuel Masham in 1707. She became Keeper of the Privy Purse in succession to the Duchess of Marlborough in 1711, and in January, 1711-12, her husband was created Baron Masham. He was in May, 1711, made Cofferer of the Queen’s Household.
Red Cross sale in 1915.  

It is countersigned by Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, under date January 8, 1712-3, and authorizes the payment of £26,000 "for the service of our Privy Purse and for Healing Medals." Sarah Marlborough, in her vindication of herself, states that the allowance of £20,000 was augmented to £26,000 two years after she left office. She had resigned in January, 1710-11; this warrant is therefore for the first payment after the sum set apart for private expenditure was increased, but we must remember that such warrants supply no definite information, for the Duchess tells us that these Privy-Purse expenses included not only "healing gold and charities," but "many pensions were paid out of it," and the Queen's personal wants had also, as we know, to be provided.

It is interesting to find that after the death of Anne, when the royal touch was no longer available, unless the sick persons were prepared to resort to the exiled Stuarts, the belief revived in the efficacy of the touchpiece as itself a cure. Edmund Betts, writing under date March 1, 1714-15, recorded that his mother "lent Coz. Mary Betts ye piece of toucht gold with Britaine and this motto on one side Gloria Soli Deo and on the other ye ship with this motto ANNA· D· G· M· BR: F· ET· H· REG: Received it back 28 June, 1715." "Ye piece of toucht gold," continues the biographer of the Betts family, "without the personal healing touch however failed to cure Coz Mary Betts; her death coincided with its return on 28th of June, 1715."

We find in the History of the Rebellion, by Robert Chambers, a story of George I's attitude towards healing. It is said that a partisan of the Hanoverian succession brought his son to the new King and asked that he might be touched; George told him to "Go over to the Pretender," and the father of the sick child changed his politics on the satisfactory cure performed by the son of James II.  

---

1 Monday, April 26, 1915, lot 1516.
3 Ibid., p. 281.
4 The Betts of Wortham in Suffolk, by Katharine Doughty, p. 167.
William Whiston, who in his *Memoirs* prints Anne’s service for healing, and discourses at some length on a subject which was, in the middle of the eighteenth century, under considerable discussion,\(^1\) records his opinion that George I never touched: “I think,” writes Whiston, “neither King William, Queen Mary, nor George the First or Second ever done it, while yet I suppose they might have done it with the like Success as our former Kings.”\(^2\)

There were, however, still believers in the royal touch, when George II was upon the British throne, and amongst writers like Thomas Hearne, who had no sympathy with the Hanoverian party, we may find without surprise allusions to the successful healing of the past. Hearne,\(^3\) writing under date August 3, 1723, shows that amongst friends such topics were freely discussed. He tells of his meeting with one “Mr. Gilman,” “a lusty, heartish, thick, short man,” who told him that he was “in the 85th year of his age and that at the restoration of K Charles II being much afflicted with the king’s evil he rode up to London behind his father, was touched on a Wednesday morning by that king, was in very good condition by that night.” Neither was this all, for “by the Sunday night immediately following” he was “perfectly recovered and hath continued so ever since.” Hearne ends by telling us that “he hath constantly worn the piece of gold about his neck, that he received of the king, and he had it on yesterday when I met him.”

As regards George II, of the same mind as Whiston was William III’s former Physician, Sir Richard Blackmore, who believed cures to be “the Strength and Power of Imagination,” for writing in 1735, he said: “It is a mark of wisdom in William III of gracious Memory and his present Majesty, that conscious of the Vanity of this Power of healing the Evil, pretended to be annex’d to the Crown,

---

\(^1\) The publication in 1747, by Thomas Carte, of a note on healing in connection with the coronation unction in the first volume of his *History of England* gave rise to this controversy.

\(^2\) *Life and Writings of William Whiston*, part ii, p. 442, under date February, 1747-8.

they never regarded or practis’d that superstitious and insignificant Ceremony.'"1

THE STUART PRINCES.

But the collector of touchpieces need hardly be told, like the father in the preceding story, to turn from George I to his rival in order to be rewarded in his search.

Let us see what light can be thrown on the healing-pieces bearing the title IAC · 3 · D · G · M · B · F · ET · H · REX2 or the variety with Arabic numeral 8 instead of 3,3 and the later type made in Rome, reading IAC · III · D · G · M · B · F · ET · H · R.4 The first thing which strikes us is that young James, like his father, kept the French title, although at the moment it was only by the courtesy of Louis XIV that he assumed the kingly designation at all.

On James II’s death in September, 1701, the King of France had promised to declare Prince James King of Great Britain, and, against the advice of his ministers, he kept his word two days later. The Prince was thirteen years old, too young to take active measures towards regaining the throne, and the earliest medal we have asserting his pretensions is of the year 1704.5

We have no absolute evidence showing that James as a child demonstrated his claims to healing, but the Reverend John Blount, in his annotated Prayer-book, records that the "power of the touching was exercised by the son of James II as James III in the hospitals of Paris."6

If this be so it must probably have been before the Treaty of Utrecht had provided for his removal in 1713 from France, a situation which resulted in a prolonged visit to Bar-le-Duc as the guest of the

1 Treatise of the King’s Evil. Preface, pp. ix and lxviii. Blackmore was Physician to William III and his name is still printed in Chamberlayne’s first issue after the King’s death, namely in 1702, but not in the next edition of 1704.
3 In the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum in Wigmore Street. I am not aware of any other specimen.
5 Med. Ill., vol. i, p. 270, No. 71. There is another medal commemorating his succession to his father’s title on the latter’s death in 1701. See Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 216, No. 540, but it was not designed until 1712.
Duke of Lorraine. Even before this time his service with the army in Flanders with the French troops had restricted his periods of residence at St. Germains, his health, moreover, was very bad, and when Mr. Blount speaks of Paris one cannot help thinking that these Healings were held probably before his first expedition to Scotland, that of March, 1707-8, or shortly after its failure.

The young Prince did not stay openly in the French capital after his return from his unsuccessful invasion of Scotland in 1715-16, making but a hasty and secret visit to his mother at St. Germains, and therefore this tradition of the Paris hospitals must, at the latest, have reference to "healings" before he set out on the second effort at regaining his late father's crown. This would imply that the touchpiece with the Arabic numeral 3 preceded that marked by the figure 8, which must of course have been designed purposely for the northern venture, just as the coinage with the English title preceded that with the Scottish.

The third place must be assigned to the Italian example with Roman lettering reading IAC . III, for this must have been made after James had left France and have been struck after the failure of the Scottish expedition in 1715-16 and his subsequent residence at Avignon. Most probably it was not required before October, 1719, when he finally settled down in Rome, after various short sojourns there and in other Italian towns.

In 1715-16 part of the equipment for the expedition required by the young Prince in his effort to regain the British crown consisted of dies for a projected coinage, but as the appointment of the Roettiers as engravers to the Stuart court in France, originally conferred by James II, was confirmed in the name of this monarch's son in 1703,

1 It is to be regretted that in a correspondence concerning healing in Notes and Queries, 6th Series, vol. vii, Mr. W. Frazer states that he has lost certain notes which he made respecting touching for the evil by Prince James in France, and he consequently gives no dates. James visited France in 1714 on hearing of the death of Anne, and again in 1715 and 1716, but only secretly.

2 Calendar of Stuart Papers, vol. i, p. 109, and Entry Book 3, f. Ixxviii, Note of renewal to John and Norbert Roettiers, June 6, 1703, of the original patent conferred on John Roettiers and his two sons James and Norbert. Also to Joseph and Norbert, f. lxxix, the latter grant being revived in favour of Norbert alone, May 6, 1710.
we have no proof that the dies for the earliest touchpiece were not engraved before those for any of the coins, including the pattern piece of 1709.

The English title IACOBVS III. was used on the dies prepared by Norbert Roettiers in 1709 according to orders issued in 1708 for an intended currency, but only one example, a silver crown now in the British Museum, was actually struck, so far as we are aware. The identical bust, but with altered legend, IACOBVS. VIII, was utilized on crowns intended in 1716 for use in the second expedition directed against the Northern Kingdom, where James would be the eighth king of that name. The English pattern crown, then, bearing the numeral III is the earlier.

---

1 MS. Stuart Papers, Entry Book 4, p. 81, noted in Calendar of Stuart Papers, vol. i, p. 223. See also British Numismatic Journal, vol. iii, p. 248. “Patterns and Medals bearing the Legend ‘JACOBUS III,’ or ‘JACOBUS VIII,’” by Helen Farquhar.

2 Ibid., pp. 261–62.
For this there are two finished puncheons and one die for the obverse, and also one unfinished puncheon of the arms for the reverse, amongst the collection of the Roettiers' dies presented by Matthew Young to the British Museum in 1828.¹ No die for the touchpiece bearing the title IAC. 3 is in this collection,² neither is it mentioned in the order for coinage under date May 4, 1708, but it may nevertheless have been made before this date, although Mrs. Norbert Roettiers apart from medals mentions only crowns, half-crowns and guineas in the list of the dies in her keeping in 1728, shortly after her husband's death.³ Neither does she in this document allude to the die for the touchpiece of the Scottish series, and yet in Matthew Young's collection we find not only a completed obverse die, but a punch for the hull of the ship intended for this Scottish touchpiece of the younger James.

Careful comparison of a matrix made from this punch with five or six examples of the smaller of James II's two silver touchpieces, and with the die engraved IAC. 8. brings us to the conclusion

¹ General George Hamilton wrote to James from Paris in February, 1715-16, when the Prince was on his retreat, and said that he was sending him a pattern of the new coinage then being designed for Scotland by Roettiers and also "a crown designed for the English coin of 1709"—whether this be the solitary specimen now in the British Museum, is not known. See Calendar of Stuart Papers, vol. i, p. 502.


³ In Medallie Illustrations it is stated that the obverse die is in the Museum—this is wrong, the die being confused with the variety with the 8 instead of the 3, and Dr. Parkes-Weber, writing to The Lancet on June 27, 1914, fell into the natural error of repeating this assertion. He suggested that the engraver of the rarer piece with the 8 made a mistake. Dr. Crawfurd, in reply—Lancet, July 4, 1914, called attention to the likelihood "that it was struck for use in Scotland perhaps during the 1715 campaign."
that the punch was made for the younger James and not for his father. The differences although minute are decided. But the unfinished punch fits exactly the die bearing the Scottish titles as "James VIII," which in its turn shows some slight disparities of engraving when compared with his ordinary touchpieces bearing "James 3." It must be noted that an alteration from the Arabic 3 to the number 8 might easily have been made, but the touchpieces show no signs of altered dies and are not line for line the same. It is, however, possible that the same punch was used in making the new die with the figure 3, the alterations applying to details outside the compass of the punch. Unfortunately, the only known complete specimen bearing the figure 8 is somewhat worn, but the numeral is quite legible, and the die in the British Museum is in perfect condition. I have caused an enlarged photograph to be made from this die for our frontispiece.

I think we may safely assume that this touchpiece distinguished by the Scottish titles was contemporaneous with the coinage designed in 1716 for the second invasion.

The crown and other pieces bearing the title IACOBVS VIII are only known to us through Matthew Young's restrikes, and the dies now in the Museum. Some of these, I cannot help thinking, Young mistakenly combined with medal dies, but we are fortunate

1 The list is in the Stuart Manuscripts at Windsor Castle. The medal dies formed the subject of a correspondence after the death of Norbert Roettiers in 1727, between his widow and Prince James. See Ibid., "Concerning some Roettiers Dies," p. 126.

2 In the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum.

3 James arrived in Scotland on January 8, 1715-6, and only retired to France on the 10th of the following February, leaving the port of Montrose on board a French vessel on the 4th. The coins made in France, and for use in Scotland, naturally bore the date according to new style, 1716.
in having in the Wellcome Museum this isolated, but contemporaneously struck, example of the touchpiece, a specimen which has clearly been worn and rubbed by suspension from the neck of the patient.

Can this be taken as evidence that James really touched for the Evil in Scotland?

Yes. Miss Shield and the late Mr. Andrew Lang, in *The King over the Water*, have supplied the following contemporary evidence that James, when in Forfarshire in 1716, was looked upon as a successful healer, "Had not his very looks showed him to be a King, he had proved his claim by touching for the King's Evil, while at Strathmore's own house [Glamis Castle], for all the patients recovered."¹ Thus writes Miss Shield, epitomising the account given by Thomas Hearne, the Antiquary, in his diary, written at Oxford under date December 2nd, 1716. He reported a conversation he had just held with young Lord Strathmore, who had been the host of James at Glamis in the previous January, and whose description of the Prince is well worth quoting in full. Hearne noted from what Strathmore told him: "that the king lay at his house and that he is very pious and cheerful, of great and uncommon understanding. He said the king was a very fine gentleman and a lover of dancing. He said the king touched many for the evil in his lordship's own house and that they recovered."²

**TOUCHPIECE BEARING THE LEGEND IAC. 3.**

The touchpiece with the legend IAC. 3. is rare, sufficiently so to have been unrepresented in the Sisley collection, containing thirty-five pieces, and Mr. Baldwin tells me that he remembers

¹ *The King over the Water*, by Alice Shield and Andrew Lang, p. 247.
having seen but very few specimens—nevertheless we have enough of them to show that some demand was made of the powers of James as a healer. Thomas Carte, the historian and intimate friend of Norbert Roettiers, the maker of the touchpiece, records the cure of a labouring man, one Christopher Lovel. This sufferer from the King's Evil started in August, 1716, for the Court of Prince James, and returned to Bristol in the beginning of the following January, having in November obtained the assistance of "the eldest lineal descendant," writes Carte, "of a race of Kings, who had indeed, for a long succession of ages, cured that distemper by the royal touch."

Carte states that the Prince "had not, at least at that time, been either crowned or anointed."

This seems indicative that the historian did not believe the coronation to have taken place at Perth, a point on which writers still differ. But it is clear that the healing was performed in "the beginning of November," 1716, at Avignon, although the town is not named, Carte merely saying that the man "made his way first to Paris and then to the place where he was touched."

The dates supplied, however, make this place easy of identification in that James remained at Avignon from April until the following February. Sad to relate, according to subsequent report, Christopher Lovel relapsed and died of the same disease on his way to seek a second "healing" at the hands of the Prince.

Carte writes that "the man was touched and invested with the narrow ruband to which a small piece of silver was pended, according

---

1 Carte's History of England, vol. i, pp. 291-2. The story of Christopher Lovel gave so much offence to the Corporation of London that they withdrew their yearly subscription of £50 towards the expenses of Carte's History. He explained that the unlucky note concerning Lovel was inserted to prove that the cure was not necessarily dependent on the Coronation unction and that he intended no political offence. See Whiston's Memoirs, part ii, pp. 438-41, reproducing Carte's letter to the General Evening Post, February 20-23, 1747-8, and other correspondence of January 7-16. See also Nichol's Literary Anecdotes, vol. ii, p. 497. This writer gives a long account of Healing, pp. 495-504, as a note to his Life of Carte.

to the rites prescribed in the office appointed by the church for that solemnity." This small piece of silver must have been either the healing-piece bearing the legend IAC. 3. or, as James had just returned from Scotland, he may have used one of the touchpieces designed for the expedition thither, namely the medalet with the numeral 8, such as he must have bestowed at Glamis.

It is quite possible that James touched also for the Evil in Perth, where preparations were made for his coronation, the day being fixed for February the 3rd, 1716, new style.

Whether the ceremony was ever performed is doubted by the majority of historians, amongst whom, as we have seen, was Carte. According, however, to the careful researches of Martin Haile, James was crowned, but the coronation was "a scant and hurried ceremony shorn of all splendour, although many of the great ladies of Scotland lent their diamonds to adorn the crown." On what occasion later than this of the visit to the North, Carte can possibly have thought a coronation could have been attempted, it is hard to say, but his "at least not at that time," when speaking of the November of 1716, is somewhat ambiguous. From this time forth the Prince's hopes were small and we need hardly discuss the possibilities of the Spanish and other expeditions. All efforts to regain the crown failed.

Louis XIV was dead; Louis XV was a child: his guardians were not inclined to renew the contest, and the titular king became

---

1 *James Francis Edward*, by Martin Haile, p. 210. This writer, a most trustworthy historian, believes that the coronation actually took place, and tells us that some years later the Bishop of Rochester refers in a letter to the anniversary "of your Majesty's Coronation." Most authorities, however, hold that no coronation ceremony was performed, the day fixed being that on which the abandonment of Perth was decided. Mr. T. F. Henderson, author of *The Royal Stuarts*, published in 1914, one of the latest writers on this dynasty, states, p. 474, that he has found "no record of it." Amongst the preparations for the coronation, the Earl of Mar, under date, Perth, January 15, 1715-16, speaks in one of his letters of ordering "a crown in pieces at Edinburgh and bringing it over here to be put together . . . in case there be occasion for it here, as I wish there may; bullion gold is what I'm afraid will be wanting, but it will not take much." See Thomson's *Memoirs of Jacobites*, vol. i, p. 157.
a burden. We need not follow James to Commercy and Chalons, whence he made his way to Avignon, then a Papal city, where he stayed some months, for I find no record of healing at either of the first-named places, and the story of the adventures of Lovel at Avignon have already been recorded at some length as above by Carte.

At this temporary refuge his Jacobite court, numbering 150 persons, included ten doctors and chirurgeons, two Protestant chaplains and two Catholic priests, so no difficulty would have stood in the way of a full ceremonial. By the middle of February, 1716–17, James was in Italy, and there he lived during most of his remaining years, for it was nearly half a century later when he peacefully expired in Rome on January 1, 1765-6. Under date “Rome, January 5, 1751”—Edgar, Secretary to James, writes to the Abbess of the Benedictines at Ypres, a letter which shows that whilst the titular king did not revive the ancient custom of blessing “cramp rings” as a remedy for epilepsy, he within the last fifteen years of his life practised healing. “Madam,” writes Edgar, “I have the honour to send Your LaP here inclosed the King’s answer to the letter you sent me in yours of the 7th Decem’, which I layd before H.M. who was pleased to tell me upon the question you ask me, that he never blessed Rings on Good Friday, nor any rings at all at any other time as far as he remembers . . . I cannot but here tell Your LaP that as the King touches oft for The Evil, he blesses little Silver Medals, which fastened in a Ribon he puts upon the touched person’s neck, but these medals are never employed but for The Evil only.” 2 In Italy he undoubtedly held public healings, and judging from the fact that the Italian medalet, distinguished by Roman instead of Arabic figures, is not uncommon, he must have touched frequently, and we have a record of the service he used. 3

1 James Francis Edward, by Martin Halle, p. 223.
2 The Irish Dames of Ypres, by the Rev. Dom Patrick Nolan, O.S.B., published 1908.
The archives of Lucca tell of his visit to the Baths in 1722, and of his touching for the King's Evil every Thursday. Under date August 1 an Italian document states that "the King knelt on a cushion, and the assistants, including the children of both sexes, who were to be touched, on the ground. The King’s Confessor an Irish Dominican . . . wearing cotta and stole recited certain prayers, to which His Majesty responded. The priest then read the Gospel of Christ’s ordering his disciples to go and teach all nations, and when he came to the words ‘Super egros manus imponent et bene habebunt’ one of the King’s aides-de-camp led the children one by one to his Majesty, who was now seated, and who laid his hand upon each, the priest meanwhile repeating ‘Super egros, etc.’ The King then knelt and recited certain prayers, after which resuming his seat, he hung a silver medal, bearing St. Edward on one side and three ships on the other, round the neck of each child. The King performed the ceremony in a saintly manner with great devoutness and recollection of mind."1

The description of the touchpiece is not very convincing, but for St. Edward we must substitute St. Michael and reduce the three ships to one—probably the Italian writer meant a three-masted ship.

This touchpiece2 which bears the legend IAC. III. D. G. M. B. F. ET. H. R. is probably the work of Ottone Hamerani, medallist to the Papal Court. He worked much for James from 1719 onwards.

1 James Francis Edward the old Chevalier, pp. 290-91, by Martin Haile, quoting the Archives of Lucca, Doc. N. VI., F. Acton.
2 Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 316, No. 140. These touchpieces are considerably heavier than their predecessors and vary from about 45 to 62 grains, whilst the earlier type by Norbert Roettiers does not weigh more than 23 to 26 grains.
The medal is in high relief and differs greatly in workmanship from the type with the Arabic numeral. A specimen of the Italian touchpiece exists in gold in the British Museum—it weighs 97 grains and is probably an isolated pattern, and although struck upon a somewhat larger flan it appears to be from the same die as the ordinary silver specimens. I say isolated, because there is no golden example in the collection at Keir, which belonged to the son of James—Henry, Cardinal York, who himself caused touchpieces to be struck under the title of “Henry IX.” Had James often presented gold touchpieces it seems likely that one would be found in the beautiful book-shaped box in tooled red morocco, which contains the family medals of the exiled Stuarts, but we must admit that no specimen of Cardinal York’s own touchpiece is there.

One more variety of a touchpiece under James presents itself. A letter dated Lausanne, May 1, 1897, signed by Dr. C. F. Trachsel, was published in Messrs. Spink’s Numismatic Circular, vol. v, p. 2257, in which the writer announced himself as the possessor of a brass example of the Hamerani type of medal.

I wondered whether this could be a pattern, an admission ticket, or a restrike such as will meet us again under “Henry IX.” But my question was answered by the appearance, in the late Mr. W. Talbot Ready’s sale of a brass touchpiece of approximately the size of the gold specimen in the British Museum. Although with fractured edge, this base-metal example is in mint condition, a fact

1 For medal with Arabic 3, see Med. Ill., vol. ii, p. 316, No. 139.
2 In the collection of Brigadier-General Stirling-Maxwell of Keir, Dunblane.
3 Lot 789, Messrs. Sotheby, Nov. 19, 1920. It is above the average size and certainly from the same die as the gold specimen.
which strengthens my belief that the gold medal mentioned above is a pattern and the brass example a trial-piece. It is now in my possession and may or may not be the actual medalet from the cabinet of Dr. Trachsel. If poverty had reduced James to brass as the material for a touchpiece, it is curious that no more examples should have been forthcoming in these many years; and if it was actually intended for presentation, it is likely that the brass would have been coated with silver, a subterfuge later demanded by his reduced circumstances from Cardinal York.

It hardly seems likely that James Francis Edward, as "James III," touched a sufficient number of persons to render an admission ticket in the form of a metal pass a necessity, and it appears more probable that this little base medal was a contemporary trial-piece.

We have seen that it is distinctly stated that the titular king, "James III," touched without the sacred unction to which many attributed the healing power. In this he was no pioneer, for it was not necessarily the custom that our kings should await their coronation before beginning to heal. James II, for instance, was crowned in April, 1685, and began to touch for the Evil in the preceding March. Charles II had, it is true, been crowned in Scotland in 1651, but it was as King of England that he claimed the healing gift and he exercised it throughout his exile, and for nearly a year after his restoration—his English Coronation taking place in April, 1661.

It is well known that Monmouth touched for the Evil, basing his powers on his heredity, although but a left-handed scion of the House of Stuart. A long account of a cure, said to have been wrought in 1681 by this illegitimate son of Charles II, may be read in the Wellcome Museum. To go one step farther, Mr. Allan Fea, in his King Monmouth, mentions that "for years after the duke's execution," a silver buckle, now preserved in the Taunton Museum as having been worn by that unfortunate claimant to the crown, "was touched for King's Evil."1

But in Prince Charlie we find the lineal and legitimate aspirant

1 King Monmouth, published 1902, by Allan Fea, p. 393.
to the throne touching at Holyrood in 1745, whilst his father, in whose
name he was advancing his pretensions, was still alive. The act
appears to have been unpremeditated and rather unwillingly per-
formed; it is therefore not likely that Prince Charles Edward
was armed with his father’s touchpieces, and no mention of a special
medal is made in the report of the ceremony as given by Robert
Chambers concerning the details of this extraordinary occasion.
Chambers¹ tells the story at some length, and mentions that the
Prince was first approached at Perth, but “excused himself, pleading
want of time.” However, a little seven-year-old girl “dreadfully
afflicted with the disease ever since her infancy,” was brought to him
at Edinburgh, where at Holyrood “he was found in the Picture
Gallery, which served as his ordinary audience chamber, surrounded
by all his principal officers and by many ladies. He caused a circle
to be cleared, within which the child was admitted together with
her attendant and a priest in his canonicals. The patient was then
stripped naked, and placed upon her knees in the centre of the
circle. The clergyman having pronounced an appropriate prayer—
perhaps the office above mentioned,² Charles approached the
kneeling girl, and, with great apparent solemnity, touched the
sores occasioned by the disease, pronouncing at every different
application the words, ‘I touch, but God heal.’ The ceremony
was concluded by another prayer from the priest, and the patient,
being again dressed, was carried round the circle and presented
with little sums of money by all present.” We need not follow the
historian’s description of the child’s subsequent recovery, but may
draw attention to the words spoken by Charles as belonging to the
French and not the English use in healing. Prince Charlie’s change
of religion was of later date,³ and therefore had he used any office

² On the previous page Robert Chambers spoke of the Office introduced into the
Book of Common Prayer by Anne.
³ See Andrew Lang’s *Prince Charles Edward*, p. 242, where the date of his declaring
himself a Protestant is proved to be 1750 from his own words in a letter addressed to
Sir John Pringle. Hume believed that he only renounced Catholicism in 1753,
but the evidence produced by Andrew Lang is incontestible. See p. 155, note 2.
it would have been that revived by James II from the text of Henry VII, which was, as we have seen, chosen by James Francis Edward in Italy.

We have further records of Healings¹ held by Charles in his later years, namely in 1770, and again in 1786, but judging from the words used by Sir Horace Mann,² the British Minister in Florence, the service had at the latter date been some time in abeyance. The English Envoy mentions the arrival of Prince Charles, under the designation of “Count of Albany,” at Florence, where he stayed a short time on his way to Pisa. He did not call himself Charles III, and “nobody,” remarks Mann, “gives him the title, which perhaps he expects, and he refuses every other.”³ Nevertheless he exercised the royal function of healing when he arrived a few days later at Pisa.⁴

At Rome Prince Charles had been presented by his brother “under a private name” to the Pope,⁵ and at Florence Sir Horace tells us that “the common people showed him a certain respect and gave him the title of Majesty, which title at Rome, excepting by his own immediate domestics, is totally disused.”⁶ At Pisa on September 8, 1770, Mann is anxious that the Secretary of State should understand that it is only the poor and ignorant who acknowledge the Prince. “Two or three very low persons have applied to him to be touched for scrofulous disorders, which ceremony he performed.”

Writing on August 8, 1786, Mann, seemingly forgetting his former mention of this “healing,” says: “He has lately assumed the folly practised by his father and grandfather to touch people who are afflicted with scrofulous disorders.”⁷

¹ The King’s Evil, p. 158.
² The Decline of the Last Stuarts, published by Lord Mahon for the Roxburgh Club in 1843, consisting principally of letters from Sir Horace Mann, who was British Minister at the Tuscan Court, representing George II and George III from 1740 to 1786.
³ Ibid., p. 39, August 21, 1770.
⁴ Ibid., p. 39, September 8.
⁵ Ibid., p. 35, June 30, 1769.
⁶ Ibid., p. 36, August 11, 1770.
⁷ Ibid., p. 93.
The Prince was then at Albano, and the British Minister, speaking of the type of the patients healed, says “many old women and children have been presented to him for that purpose—to whom after some ceremony he gives a small silver medal, which they wear about their necks.” The excessive rarity of Prince Charles’s touchpieces corroborates the impression left by Mann that the healings were not many nor often.

The medals are usually much rubbed, owing to the high relief, and often carelessly pierced. Of the seven or eight specimens known to me, three hang with the archangel’s head downward, no care being taken to avoid injury to the design or to the title which the Prince had assumed on the death of James as CAR · III · D · G · M · B · ET · H · R ·

On the demise of the old Chevalier in 1766, it is probable that Ottone Hamerani was employed to make the new obverse, as he himself survived until 1768. The medal of Charles is fractionally larger than that earlier in use, but the old puncheons, both of ship and angel, again did duty, so far as I may judge by the most perfect specimen that I have seen, namely the example in the Wellcome Museum.

In the case of Cardinal York, the brother and successor of Charles in the titular kingship, Dr. Crawfurd has also been able to bring forward documentary as well as numismatic evidence of healing.¹

¹ The King’s Evil, p. 159; also Notes and Queries, 6th Series, vol. vii, p. 412. Letter from Hartwell Grissell. In 1883 Mr. Grissell had in his possession a silver touchpiece given him nine years before by Cardinal Santovetti of Frascati, with a written affidavit that it was used by Cardinal York in touching Santovetti’s brother, as a child, and that he was cured by the touch,
It is somewhat curious that although Prince Henry is said to have effected cures at Frascati, less is told of his performances as a healer than concerning his brother, and yet his touchpiece is incomparably the easier to obtain. One can only suppose that what the one did publicly, the other, living simply as a Prince of the Church rather than as a would-be monarch, carried out with little ostentation. Charles died in 1788 and Cardinal York thenceforward no longer styled himself, "Henry, Duke of York and Cardinal," but substituted the words "Henry, called Duke of York." He continued to sign Henry Cardinal, and did not adopt the regal designation, Henry R.¹ He desired not to embroil the Pope with other states by assertions of a shadowy claim to a throne which he had no power to substantiate. Moreover, after the French Revolution, matters became additionally complicated, for he experienced great pecuniary loss and even sacrificed some of his family jewels to enable Pius VI to meet the tribute demanded by Napoleon from the Papal See. His residence at Frascati was wrecked by the French in 1799 and he fled first to Padua and then to Venice, where he was temporarily reduced to something very like destitution. His position became known at the British court, and it was arranged that George III should allow him a pension of £4000 a year. In acknowledgment of this favour he, on dying in 1807, bequeathed to the Prince Regent some of his remaining crown jewels, although curiously enough by his will, dated July 15, 1802, he asserted his right to the regal title which he had so seldom used.² Only upon his medals did Henry Benedict, Cardinal York, put forth his title as "Henry IX" after the death of his brother. Already in 1766 Filippo Cropanese, in making a medal for the Cardinal, had used the words: NON.

¹ See Letter written in 1784 to the Pope at a time when Henry believed his brother to be dying, published in Browne's History of the Highlands, vol. iii, p. 408. "We mean still to retain the title . . . of Duke of York . . . as a title of incognito." Henry explained that in so doing he did "not prejudice, much less ever renounce" his "rights of succession to the crown of England." See also Henry Stuart, Cardinal York, by A. Shield, p. 265.

² Henry Stuart, as above, p. 301.
DESIDERIIS HOMINVM • SED • VOLVNTATE • DEI.¹ This pathetic acknowledgment of the state of affairs tempered the assertion of his claim to the British crown, when, after the death of Charles, Gioacchimo Hamerani executed two inferior copies of the above on which Henry announced himself as HEN·IX·MAG·BRIT·FR·ET·HIB·REX·FID·DEF·CARD·EP·TVSC.² And to this artist we may probably attribute the touchpiece bearing the legend H·IX·D·G·M·B·F·ET·H·R·C·EP·TVSC. The work of Gioacchimo Hamerani is never equal to that of his father Ottone—and the healing-piece is both poorer and coarser than that of either James or Charles. The angel has his garments somewhat differently arranged; the dragon’s mouth is closed; the edge of the medal is of a rougher grain. The ship also is in higher relief; slight changes are visible in the rigging, and the lettering is necessarily


² Num. Chron., vol. iii, p. 150, Nos. 72 and 73. Mr. Haggard describes, p. 152, a similar medal bearing the kingly titles and reading HENRICVS·NONUS·ANGLIAE·REX, but it was unknown to Mr. Cochran Patrick, and I also have not met with it. It is, however, mentioned in the Annual Register of the year 1807. The reverse inscription is described as reading GRATIA•DEI•NON•VOLVNTATE•HOMINVM. Yet another variety must have existed, for Lord Cloncurry mentions in his memoirs the gift from the Cardinal of “the large medal struck in honour of his accession to his unsubstantial throne. Upon one side of this medal was the royal bust, with the Cardinal’s hat, and the words ‘Henricus nonus Dei gratia rex’; and upon the other the arms of England with the motto on the exergue, ‘Haud desideriiis hominum, sed voluntate Dei.’” Personal Recollections of Lord Cloncurry, 1st ed., 1849, p. 200. This medal is also described in The Book of Days, by R. Chambers, vol. ii, p. 235.
smaller to allow space for the longer legend describing the Cardinal as Bishop of Tusculem as well as king.

There are two differing dies of "Henry IX's" touchpieces, of which one type is extremely rare. They differ slightly in detail, especially in that of the dragon's mouth, which is open in the rarer and closed in other examples. I have indeed seen but one specimen of the rare variety, of which the workmanship is the finer. The figure of the archangel in this example is thinner, the dragon's ribs are distinctly visible and the beast is more ornate, more scaled, and shows its claws. The ship on the obverse has finer lines and a slightly varied flag. On the whole I should be inclined to think that the maker of the respective puncheons was not the same man. If Henry, however, employed but one artist, the engraver produced a better result in the rarer touchpiece. It varies more from its prototype under the titular "Charles III" than does the commoner healing-piece of the Cardinal. It is therefore likely that the rare die is the later of the two.

The Reverend J. H. Blount, in his annotated Prayer-book, mentions "two silver touchpieces" as being struck, bearing the title of "Henry IX," and it is possible that he had seen the rarer variety.

But if this rare variety was not the second specimen known to Mr. Blount, can he perhaps have seen a striking of later days, a hard and unpleasing little jetton which exists in three metals, although but rarely in gold? I have never seen an example of this modern reproduction in the latter metal, but a specimen is mentioned in Mr. Forrer's invaluable Dictionary of Medallists under the name of the engraver Stuart. Personally I think that although not unlike the very mechanical work of this artist, the bronze and silver jettons copying the touchpieces of "Henry IX" are suggestive of the mid-nineteenth rather than the late eighteenth century.

1 Sold at Messrs. Sotheby's in a miscellaneous sale on July 27, 1917. Lot 188.
2 Annotated Book of Common Prayer, published 1866, p. 520. "Two silver touchpieces for distribution at the healing were struck by him as Henry IX."
Moreover, during the life of the Cardinal, with whom Stuart, so far as we know, was more or less contemporary,\(^1\) no object could be attained by reproducing in so unfaithful a manner a medal still being issued. Mr. Forrer, with his customary courtesy, tells me that his attribution was founded on a traditional ascription offered with the gold specimen to Messrs. Spink, but the firm did not, he believes, make the purchase, and no further trace of it can be found beyond the note made by Mr. Forrer at the time. The technique of the silver specimens which I have seen might possibly justify such a solution of a difficult question, for Stuart was in the habit of making copies with a hard decision of outline, which makes it easy to distinguish his rendering from their prototypes. Stuart, moreover, if he still lived in 1799, might possibly have made new dies for Henry's own use, to supply the place of those lost in Rome. But this is highly improbable, and these hard little pieces, all unpierced as they are, seem to me of later origin. Tradition\(^2\) states that medals and such memorials were sometimes struck at the Papal mint to give pleasure to English visitors, and when the dies became worn they were frequently replaced by copies, a fact to which Dr. Parkes-Weber was so good as to call my attention. I can only say that, kindly assisted by Mr. Baldwin, who made enquiries for me of one of the largest Italian firms of medallists, I find that the jettons are unknown at present in the Italian capital, and we have therefore been unable to follow this clue at Rome. It is clear that these so-called touchpieces cannot take rank as ordinary restrikes of the real touchpieces bearing the title "Henry IX," for such specimens as I have examined, whether in silver or bronze, are unpierced and struck from quite different dies from the original medal, and are not on a cast flan; they are, therefore, in no sense intended to deceive. But

---

\(^1\) Little is known of Stuart excepting that he worked for the *Society of Arts* so early as 1759. The Cardinal survived until 1807 and his own dies must have been available until that date or at least until his flight in 1799, and possibly after his return to Frascati in 1801.

\(^2\) See *The Lancet*, June 27, 1914, where Dr. Parkes-Weber states his belief that so late as 1870 visitors at the Papal mint were able to obtain restrikes from certain medallistic dies at fixed charges.
it is a pretty tradition suggestive of the affection in which Henry's memory was held, that in recent times anyone should think it worth while to strike a medal to his honour.

My attention was attracted by Mr. A. H. Baldwin to the fact that certain base-metal touchpieces were made and worn in the time of this unfortunate Prince. He showed me two cast specimens, the one in copper plated with silver, the other in pewter or tin. They differ slightly in design, and have probably been cast from examples of the varieties mentioned above. They are somewhat worn, and in the case of the pewter piece it appears that a defective medalet, perhaps struck from a broken die, was selected from which to make the casting, for the same flaw may be noticed on a similar base-metal specimen in the British Museum. In the state of the known pewter examples, it is not easy to recognise the fine lines of the superior jetton struck in silver, but the copper touchpiece, in spite of its light coating of plate, is clearly seen to be of the normal type. Probably we have in these base-metal healing medals the last resource of the impoverished Cardinal who, if the official dies were lost or left behind in Rome, might easily have caused casts to be made from touchpieces in his possession, using for the purpose the original types mentioned on our pages 177 and 178.

That Henry's power as a healer was held in reverence is evidenced by a curious story reported by a correspondent of The Rambler within the last twenty years. A personal relic of him was treasured at an Irish country seat as a specific against scrofula, and even so late as in 1901 was begged to be used for one suffering from the King's Evil.

Just as the angel or touchpiece was held to be in itself a specific against the King's Evil, so in the fourteenth century, and doubtless long before, the coins of St. Helena were regarded as prophylactics

---

1 From a sale, "Property of a Baronet," by Messrs. Sotheby, November 2, 1920, lot 391, now in the writer's collection.
in case of epilepsy, and enormous quantities of Byzantine *solidi* with the emblem of the Cross were pierced and thus worn.¹

In the Irish case we have a survival of the belief in the royal healing power, irrespective of the wearing of the actual amulet which had been given with a special blessing and prayer. And as proof of the belief in the medal as a talisman, we may quote the seventeenth-century letter of a minister and student of medicine who braved the dangers of the Plague in 1665, and writing to a friend, attributed his immunity partly to his keeping in his mouth an angel of Elizabeth whilst he was in contact with the sick, on the ground that it was “phylosophical gold,”² and advised his friend to follow his example. Nearly a century later, namely, in the lifetime of the titular king “James III,” it is clear that much importance was attached to the touchpiece itself, when the actual touch was not available, for among the interesting letters from James’s secretary Edgar, published by Dom. Patrick Nolan from the archives of the Benedictine convent at Ypres, is one to the Abbess Mandeville concerning a touchpiece which had been sent to a Dame Malony.³ James caused his secretary to write that “Those medals being only designed for such as are affected with the Evil ... His Majesty would not have given one ... to send to your scribe, Dame Malony, unless he had thought she might have had the Evil or wanted it to be applied to some friend of hers who had it. Dame Malony is therefore desired to dispose of it that way as soon as she can.”

My story draws to a close. With the death of Henry, Cardinal York, we have reached an hour in the world’s history when the credulous spirit of the Middle Ages was dead and the belief in cures by the touch of the hereditary King had almost ceased. Dr. Crawfurd tells us that the “Paris of the Age of Reason seems to have formally

² *Unknown London*, by Walter George Bell, p. 227—“Letters from London” of John Allen to his friend M. Fryth at Rye.
investigated the cases of the 2400 patients touched by Louis XVI with the result of only five assured cures." Nevertheless, at the Coronation of Charles X in 1824, this monarch still touched and received 121 persons, presented to him by the accredited surgeons.

How far such cures in early years as were really sometimes effected were due to mental suggestion, how much to enforced cleanliness or to the change of air or change of diet, above all, how many relapses may have occurred unrecorded, are questions that have been sifted by abler hands than mine. It is not for me to enquire. Courtly doctors were no doubt ready to believe the records of cures which were written in good faith. Many of these chronicles remind us only of the superstitions prevalent in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when it was thought that the touch of the seventh son of the seventh son had this same mysterious power, or even later in time when the sick still sought contact with the dead hand. The charming lines written by the late Lord Strangford in the mid-nineteenth century, put forth a plea for reverence towards the customs of the past:

"You have spoken light word
Of the Touching of old,
But you never have heard
Of the good Angel-gold!
For it was not alone
The monarch's kind eye,
Nor the links that are gone
'Tween the low and the high.

1 The King's Evil, p. 161.
2 John Aubrey, in his Miscellanies, pp. 129–30, writing so late as 1695, gravely reports such cures, in some of which he firmly believed, although he quoted Lord Chancellor Bacon as saying "That imagination is next kin to Miracle working Faith." In an article written in The Gentleman's Magazine, in 1867—Part I, pp. 307–322, on "Suffolk Superstitions," the writer, Hugh Pigott, reports the belief in cures effected by a dead hand as still existing in that county. The imposition of a bishop's hand was also believed to possess healing power. I am informed by the Rev. J. D. Paton that the late Dr. Woodford, Bishop of Ely, had told him that rustics in the Fen Country asked him to confirm them a second time, because they were suffering from ague, and believed that they would be cured by the imposition of hands.
Touchpieces for the King's Evil.

No, not for these only,
Though these they were much,
Came the stricken and lonely
To kneel to the Touch.
The soft hand was put out
And the soft solace said:
Few mourners could doubt
Their evil had fled.

* * * *
Oh, blame not their blindness,
'Twas the blindness of love
Made them think that this kindness,
It came from above.
And when 'twas thus given
To those who had need
That something of Heaven
Was Majesty's meed.'

* * * *

But belief in the royal touch survived century after century—and although certain healers, like James Philip Gandre in the time of Charles I,\(^1\) or like Valentine Greatrakes in the reign of Charles II, rivalled the King,\(^2\) we can but echo the words on the angel used as the touchpiece of Charles I, "AMOR POPVLI PRÆSIDIVM

\(^1\) James Philip Gandre, a French Knight of the Order of St. Lazare, was sent to prison by Lord Chief Justice Richardson on June 7, 1632, for committing a contempt worthy of punishment in taking upon himself to cure the King's Evil. See Parish Registers in England, by R. E. Chester Waters, p. 82.

\(^2\) Valentine Greatrakes, b. 1629, d. 1683, in 1662 conceived the idea of touching for the King's Evil, stroking his patients with some success and continuing to practise for some years. For further details concerning him, see p. 102 in our last volume. He did not himself call his cures miraculous, but Dr. Stubbs, a physician of Oxford, attributed his success to miraculous agency, see The Miraculous Nonconformist, and much controversy resulted from his book, of which our plate in British Numismatic Journal, vol. xiv, is the frontispiece. By an unfortunate misprint on the same page, I mentioned as Rodwell, one Thomas Rosewell or Roswell, who was accused of urging the people to come to himself for cure, rather than to the king. Roswell produced evidence that he spoke of the soul and not of the body, and although the jury returned a verdict of guilty of high treason, he received "the king's pardon" from Charles II.
If the first Charles deemed that "the love of his people is the King's safeguard," may we not also say that the love of the King is the safeguard of the people?

This inscription was on the current angels of Charles the First, and also on the rare pattern piece made by Briot. On p. 126 of vol. xiii of our Journal, I referred to a punch, at that time unidentified, in the Royal Mint Museum. Owing to the temporary closing of the Museum in war-time, I was unable to see the punch, but Mr. Hocking, with his usual kindness, has since shown it to me, and although differing in some slight matters of detail in the dragon's scales, it may be safely pronounced to be one of Briot's punches for the projected angel figured on p. 135 of our vol. xii.