

# THE SOVEREIGN REMEDY: TOUCH-PIECES AND THE KING'S EVIL<sup>1</sup>

NOËL WOOLF

THE study of Touch-Pieces forms a very small corner of numismatics. Excluding die variations there are a bare dozen types known; and of these one is known only by two examples. The basic research was done more than half a century ago: in England by Miss Helen Farquhar on the numismatic aspects, and by Dr. Raymond Crawford on the medical and liturgical; and in France, with a wider historical, philosophical, and metaphysical approach, by Professor Marc Bloch. It is only within recent years that Professor Bloch's work has been available in English. A great deal of the information herein obviously derives from these three sources, and much of it is a distillation of their observations. Miss Farquhar's and Dr. Crawford's researches were of course complementary, and perhaps it was because they were both so well and so thoroughly done that so little has been written on these related matters since. But fifty or more years later viewpoints and perspectives have changed and there may even be new scraps of evidence.

For the sake of clarity the term 'Touch-Piece' has been reserved for those medalets made between the Restoration of Charles II and the death of his great-nephew Henry, Cardinal Duke of York, in 1807. They were designed solely for use in Touching ceremonies and had no monetary value. The earlier pieces used in a similar manner are referred to by their monetary name 'Angels'. They are all of them, of course, classed as 'Healing Pieces'.

It is not easy to find enough specimens to make an effective and exhaustive study for the establishment of die variations, linkages, etc. and no claim is made that those described or illustrated in these pages form a comprehensive range. It is hoped that this work may encourage those who have one or more Touch-Pieces in their possession to take a new and closer look at them and hopefully enlarge on my observations—even to disagree with them—and so open up the subject to further research.

<sup>1</sup> I am greatly indebted to Mr. G. P. Dyer, librarian and curator of the Royal Mint Museum, for allowing me to examine some puncheons used for making Touch-Pieces, and for providing me with photographs of them, and for much other information. Also to Mr. Nicholas Mayhew for allowing me to examine and photograph the James 8 Touch-Piece in the Ashmolean Museum; to Mr. R. B. K. Stevenson of the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland, and to Miss Linda Deer of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine.

My grateful thanks are also due to Messrs. A. H. Baldwin & Sons Ltd. and in particular to Mr. Michael Sharp, for providing me with many opportunities to examine material, and for his interest and good advice.

Lastly I would wish to thank Mrs. Joan Martin, formerly at the Dept. of Coins and Medals at the British Museum, and Lt.-Col. J. K. R. Murray whose generous sharing of information he had collected on weights of many Touch-Pieces gave me the initial push into the subject, and to many other kind friends who knowingly, or unknowingly, supplied me with scraps of information.

Descriptions of dies and their linkages, etc. have been arranged for easy reference in appendices A to E on pages 115-19. Illustrations appear on plates xix-xxii and numbered references are given in the text. They are also separately indexed on pages 120-1. Touch-Pieces, coins, and tokens are reproduced approximately  $\times 2$ .

*The Healing Touch and the Healing Piece*

There has always been an association in men's minds between Sickness and Evil; and the particular Evil that came to be known in this country as the King's Evil, or *Morbus Regius*, and in France as *Mal le Roi*, was conveniently known by the all-embracing term *Scrofula*. In fact it covered a number of pathological conditions all of which gave rise to similar or related symptoms.

True *Scrofula* was, and indeed still is, a tubercular infection of the lymph-nodes. If allowed to go untreated it could result in suppurating sores. It was not usually fatal, but it could be disfiguring and embarrassing, and cause great distress. It is only in recent times that medicine has been able to effect a cure, though throughout history remedies have been offered, many of which were, to our ears, of a revolting nature.

Quite late in the nineteenth-century recipes were still being published for curing *Scrofula*.

1. Take as much cream of tartar as lies on a shilling.
2. Drink for 6 weeks half a pint of strong decoction of devil's bit (a herb of the *Scabious* species).
3. Make a leaf of dried burdock into a pint tea; take half a pint twice a day for 4 months, I have known this cure hundreds.
4. Mix a scruple of burnt sponge with four grains of rhubarb for a dose; take it night and morning in a cup of whey.

Being a condition in which natural remissions of the symptoms, and sometimes spontaneous healings, were by no means unknown it was inevitable that people should seek mystical and magical explanations for them.

Passing naked children three times through a hole in a tree or stone was considered a 'cure' for *scrofula* for many centuries; the symbolic act of 'rebirth' supposedly freed them of their affliction. And if a child, why not an adult too? Hanging a Healing Piece threaded on a white silk ribbon round the neck of an afflicted person may subconsciously have echoed the same symbolism. The Healing Piece was put on with prayers, and the sores were Touched by the King. It was important too that the Healing Piece should continue to be worn by the sufferer, thus making it an amulet rather than a talisman.

Professor Marc Bloch showed that Robert II of the Franks (996-1017) was the first king to practice Touching for *Scrofula*.<sup>2</sup> Robert was a man of great piety, and his subjects credited him with the gift of healing not as a king but as a priest.

From very early times leadership of a community came from two sources: spiritually from the priesthood, and temporally from the physical prowess of an individual. Only later did the two merge, and priest and king come to be one person; but even then such was the supremacy of the priest that he was needed to make the leader into a king.

It has been supposed that the belief that a prayer and the Royal Touch could cure *scrofulous* conditions grew up around Edward the Confessor, but as Professor Bloch demonstrated, although Edward (1042-66) was revered as a man of God, only one healing by him was ever recorded.<sup>3</sup> It was not until nearly a hundred years later that

<sup>2</sup> Bloch, *The Royal Touch, Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France*, English edition, 1973, pp. 12-21.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 21-7.

Henry Beauclerc (1100–35), looking to substantiate his own royalty, remembered the Sainted Edward's one recorded cure and claimed that the power of healing had descended to himself. In the process a whole history of healings was posthumously fabricated for the Confessor.

It was usual, when the Royal Touch was being administered, to give money to the sufferers. In England, during the Middle Ages, this payment was in the nature of alms, and amounted to a labourer's wages for a day, or one penny.

The Angel coin first made its appearance about 1470. It took its name from the figure on the obverse of St. Michael slaying the dragon of Evil.<sup>4</sup> There is an association here with the healing of disease and it may be significant that the value of the coin 6s. 8d., was the recognized professional fee for a doctor; or a lawyer. The reverse of the coin carried the ship familiar on so many other coins.

The inscription on the reverse, 'Per Crucem Tua Salva Nos Christe Redemptor', suggests that it may well have been intended from the first as a Healing Piece.

Because the power of healing through Touch was regarded as a part of the Divine Right of Kingship, handed down the line—more or less direct—from the Sainted King Edward, and confirmed by unction, it could have been the basis of a good piece of public relations during the Wars of the Roses, when it was important for the current claimant to establish royalty. Only the rightful king could heal. Professor Bloch believed that it may have been to encourage the sick to come to him that Edward IV introduced the Angel and at once raised the value of alms given from a silver penny to a golden 6s. 8d.

The importance of the Royal Touch to the community can be adjudged from the fact that Sir John Fortescue, Chief Justice in the reign of Henry VI, later justified his support of the Yorkists against the Lancastrian Queen Margaret on the grounds that the sick would have been deprived had there been a woman on the throne. Only a king could cure, he said, who had been anointed in the hands. A woman might not be anointed in the hands, according to his reasoning, which, if it ever had any force at all, did not deter our two Tudor Queens or the last of the Stuarts to occupy the throne of England.<sup>5</sup>

Later we find the Duke of Monmouth being accused at his trial that 'he touched children of the King's Evil and did exercise the other functions of royal dignite'. And in 1719 the Jacobites in London were being accused by the Whigs of trying to uphold the divinity of James III with stories of his having Touched and healed scores of diseased persons. Another challenger of the divine right, at least in the eyes of the College of Physicians, was an elderly gardener, one called James Leverett, who was accused and tried by the college in 1637 of pretending to cure many diseases, including the King's Evil, by the touch of his hands.

The supposed healing powers of the Stuarts were not confined to the touch of their hands or the wearing of their gold. After the execution of Charles I, blood-stained relics preserved at Ashburnham were for long a focus for Sussex peasantry suffering from scrofula.<sup>6</sup> There are many stories, too, connecting relics of this martyr-king with miraculous cures, and well into the nineteenth century his crowns and

<sup>4</sup> In heraldic terms the Beast is not a Dragon but a Wyvern having as it does only two legs.

Queens Consort and not to Queens Regnant.

<sup>6</sup> Farquhar, 'Royal Charities', *BNJ* xii (1916), 113.

<sup>5</sup> His reasoning may have been intended to apply to

half-crowns, handed down from generation to generation, were still being used in the Shetlands to effect healings.

### *The Rubric and the Angel*

It was Henry VII who codified the practices of the past into a Divine Service; thereby creating a Touching ceremony. The alms that were previously given became a Healing Piece. The coin was used for crossing the sufferers' sores, and was then hung about their necks on a white silk ribbon by the king's own hand—not, as the alms had been handed to them, after the ceremony by an almoner. This was good sound public relations. The amulet became a permanent memento of the King—A Sovereign Remedy.

Henry set a pattern that lasted with only minor changes for 160 years. His successor Henry VIII does not appear to have been very prolific in his Touching Ceremonies, but he did introduce one novelty—a small annulet placed to one side of the Angel's head—perhaps to show where the hole could safely be pierced to avoid damage both to the Angel and to the inscription on the reverse.

It is noticeable that although Henry debased the coinage, reducing the weight of the sovereign from 240 grains to 200 grains, the Angel was kept at the same 80 grains it had always been, thus raising its relative value to 8*s.*, even though the fineness of the gold had been reduced.

Edward VI restored the fineness, increasing the value to 10*s.*; a state of affairs that was maintained by Mary and Elizabeth (except between 1562 and 1572). James I and Charles I both kept the value at 10*s.*, but only by reducing the weight. This apparent reluctance of successive sovereigns to debase the Angel implies that the coin was held in unusual regard, and supports a case being made for some mystic association between angel-gold and the healing power.

It seems unlikely that there was any Touching by the young and sickly Edward VI. Mary took the ceremony very seriously, and the text on her Angels was altered to read, A DOMINO FACTVM EST ISTVD et EST MIRABILE in oculis nostris. (It is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes.) As the same inscription appears on her sovereigns and her ryls, perhaps one should not read too much into this.

Mary Tudor pressed the sufferers' sores with her two hands. Later in the ceremony she touched the places with the golden coin, making the sign of the cross with it. Then she threaded a white silk ribbon through the hole in the coin and hung it about the patient's neck. The number who received this treatment at any one time was small compared to those treated during Stuart times.

Elizabeth made no changes on the coin, other than her titles, and rather surprisingly she continued to make the sign of the cross when presenting the coins. James I was at first loath to Touch at all. Touching had never been practised by the kings of Scotland. The superstition accorded ill with Scottish Calvinism. James was persuaded, however, that to abandon what had become the Royal Health Service would be a most unpopular act. To salve his conscience he omitted the cross that had always topped the ship's mast, and the words 'et est mirabile' that Mary had included in the inscription. He may also have been less meticulous about using only Angels as Healing Pieces. Other gold coins of his are known to have been pierced, some perhaps

for use in Healing Ceremonies. It is possible of course that not all these were used by James and that some may have been used later by Charles II while in exile.

James first Touched in October 1603, and by all accounts the ceremony seems to have been a somewhat apologetic affair.<sup>7</sup> He neither wished to subscribe to the superstition nor to break with a tradition that was popularly supposed to benefit his subjects. The dilemma was resolved by treating the ritual as a prayer in which all were enjoined to take part and God was invoked to perform the healing. The Royal Touch was being handed back whence it came. It was the beginning of the end. James refused to make the sign of the cross, and he amended the rubric to cut out everything that could be considered papist.

In James's third coinage we find a complete change in the design of the ship. The stylized medieval vessel (Pl. XIX, no. 1) which had endured for a century and a half has been replaced by a new and more realistic ship (Pl. XIX, no. 2). The shield has become a wind-filled sail; a burgee, emblazoned with a lion, streams from the mast-head; and there are many recognizable pieces of rigging. High on the prow is a lion crowned holding a sword, and this motif is repeated at the stern.<sup>8</sup>

The same vessel appears on the Angels of Charles I. He changed the inscription to 'Amor Populi Praesidium Regis'. (The love of his people is the King's safeguard)—an ironic choice for this king! After 1643 there were no further striking of Angels, and Charles had to make do with such existing coins as were still in circulation. There is no evidence that he ever used base-metal Healing Pieces, even during the Civil War, though it is likely he used silver coins on occasions when gold were not available.

Both James I and Charles I Touched in London only at Easter and Michaelmas. They also Touched on Progresses. Charles I was the first monarch to Touch in Scotland. In 1633, a few days after his Scottish Coronation, he Touched about 100 sufferers from the Evil.<sup>9</sup> Special Angels had been struck for the occasion by Nicholas Briot (Pl. XIX, no. 4). The puncheon for the obverse is in the Royal Mint Museum (Pl. XIX, no. 3). Briot made the beast a true heraldic dragon, adding a second pair of legs. Only four specimens of this Angel are now known. One in the British Museum is unpierced; another, pierced, is in the Hunterian.

While Charles was in Oxford in 1643 the Committee of Safety allowed sick children to pass up river, through their blockade of the Thames, to be Touched by the King. There is a likely link between this action and a petition 'To the Kings most Excellent Majesty' of 'divers hundreds of the Kings poore subjects, Afflicted with that grievous Infirmitie called The Kings Evill' who 'have no possibility of being cured, wanting all meanes to gain accesse to his Majesty, by reason of His abode in Oxford'. This

<sup>7</sup> Bloch, p. 191.

<sup>8</sup> These changes must have reflected the influence that Phineas Pett, the master ship builder, was having on the design of ships in the early part of seventeenth century. His first ship, the *Prince Royal*, had been launched in 1610, and twenty years later is to be found on Charles I's medallion *The Dominion of the Seas* (M1 256/41).

<sup>9</sup> 'The 24 of Junij, be St Jhone Baptists day, his Maiesty went to his chapell royall in stait, and ther made a solemne offertorey, and thereafter tuoched aboute 100 persons

that wer troubled with the Kings eivell, putting about eurey one of ther neckes a pice of gold, (coyned for the purpois) hung at a whyte silk riband.' This account by Lord Lyon Sir James Balfour of Denmylne and Kinnaird is quoted by Ian Stewart who convincingly identifies the 'pieces of gold' with Briot's Angel. *Proc Soc Antiq Scotland*, vol. XCVIII, Sessions 1964-5, pp. 270-5. But see also H. Schneider in this volume for a dissenting opinion.

petition which was undoubtedly a piece of Royalist propaganda was published in February 1643 for John Wilkinson. During his captivity many people came to Charles to be Touched. They brought their own coins and ribbons to be used as none were available to the King.<sup>10</sup>

### *Controlling the crowds*

Before moving on to the Touch-Pieces proper there is an aspect of the Touching ceremony worth looking at. The number of people attending at any one time could be very considerable, and it was usual for them to be seen the day previously by the Serjeant-Surgeon, whose duty it was to pass them as suitable subjects for treatment. Also by a proclamation dated 18 June 1626 they were required to bring with them a certificate that they had not been Touched before. Many sufferers would try to come more than once just for the gold. In Charles I's time those judged fit to be Touched were given a ticket of admission to the ceremony. This took the form of a metal token just over  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch in diameter.<sup>11</sup> It was made by a Freemason and was either struck or cast. The first mention of these tokens occurs in 1635, when new ones were being ordered to be struck at the Tower Mint. One may assume that the Freemason's issue had got out of hand, and that there were many spurious tokens about. The new tickets were to be the size of an Angel,<sup>12</sup> and there was to be some form of accounting between the number issued, the number collected at the door, and the number of Angels used at each Touching. In 1635-6 the Mint supplied 5,500 of these copper or brass tickets for admission to the Touching ceremony at a cost of 2d. each.

No contemporary description of the Freemason's tokens is known, but Miss Farquhar identified them with the piece illustrated (Pl. XIX, no. 5). On the obverse a hand from heaven hovers over the heads of four people; the legend reads 'He touched them . . .' and this is continued on the reverse ' . . . and they weare healed'. The reverse design is completed by a rose and a thistle linked under a crown.

The token is obviously too small to be one of those ordered from the Mint, of which more than 8,000 were made between 1635 and 1639. None of these latter have apparently survived, and we know nothing about their form.

The possibility should be considered that this Freemason's token may have been of even earlier date. We do not know whether James I used any tickets or tokens of admission to his Touching ceremonies. But if he did could the Freemason's issue have been one of his? The linking of the Rose and Thistle under the Crown could have been indicative of James's attempted union of the two kingdoms in 1604. The symbolism can be found on some pattern coins of this monarch. Certainly it seems to have little or nothing to do with Touching for the King's Evil.

On the other hand, the token does have some kinship with a small group of medals by Thomas Simon (MI 282-3/90-4) (Pl. XIX, no. 6). These commemorated Charles I's victory in 1639 over rebellion in Scotland. In both we find the Hand from Heaven, and the linked Rose and Thistle, and the same leaves on the stems. If there is any significance in this, it seems odd that Simon's medals were struck to commemorate an event that occurred in the same year that the tokens went out of production.

<sup>10</sup> Bloch, p. 210 and Notes 177-8.

<sup>11</sup> 'Royal Charities', *BNJ* xii. 124.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 121.

*The gold Touch-Piece—1—Charles II*

During his exile Charles II had Touched in the Low Countries. He used 10s. pieces, and possibly other small gold coins—any that were available—and it may have been during this time that some of James I's coins other than Angels came to be pierced and used as Touch-Pieces. But it cannot be assumed that all the gold coins of Charles I and James I that are pierced were necessarily used for healing. During the weeks after the battle of Worcester we are told that Charles relieved the tedium of concealment by boring holes in gold coins which were given as keepsakes to the friends who had helped him.<sup>13</sup>

In September 1660 Thomas Simon was ordered to prepare sketches and dies for a new Angel (Pl. XIX, no. 7).<sup>14</sup> In his design it will be noticed that instead of the cross being replaced at the mast-head we now have the royal cipher, while on the obverse he has followed Briot's lead and given the Beast two pairs of legs. The legend perpetuates the unfortunate choice of Charles I. Obviously there was an initial intention to bring back the coin, if only for Touching needs, but it was soon abandoned and only one trial piece of the reverse was struck.

Charles first Touched at Whitehall on 23 June 1660, less than four weeks after his return and ten months before his coronation as King of England.<sup>15</sup> Obviously he could not use any coins of Cromwell or the Commonwealth, and for a while he had to continue, as he had in exile, using whatever gold pieces were available from previous reigns. It was another four years before his own Healing Pieces were ready.

Angel gold had been of a standard of 23 carats 3½ gr. By a warrant dated 25 February 1664/5 special Healing Pieces were ordered of 22-carat fine gold. 1 lb. troy was to make 106 pieces, giving them a weight of 54.3 grains each.

The dies were almost certainly the work of John Roettiers. The first striking was about 6,700 pieces; enough to last a year and a half. These were the new Touch Pieces. They had no mark of value, and were not intended to be coin of the realm, though of course they had a bullion value—about 10s. It has been suggested that some of the early Touch-Pieces may have been hammered, owing to the spread of the edges on some specimens. But one of them shares a die with a Pattern Farthing (Peck 493/4) which is undoubtedly a milled piece and one must conclude therefore that the Touch-Pieces, for all their irregularities of shape, were also milled. A certain amount of distortion obviously resulted from the crude method of piercing.

Although the same emblems were still used on the new Touch-Pieces as had been traditional on the Angel, the design was very different, with a further move towards a representational ship. The biggest change lay in the whole piece being turned over, as it were. What had been the reverse now became the obverse. The royal titles were now placed around the ship, and a simpler, more direct, legend appeared around St. Michael—the words 'SOLI DEO GLORIA', an inscription that reflected the influence of James I. Henry VIII's annulet disappeared; but to mark the area for piercing a space was now left in the obverse legend. The ship can be identified with 'The Sovereign of the Seas'. It is probable that Simon's design was also based on the same ship, though he had made no attempt to reproduce the rigging, but followed the stylized sail plan of the earlier Angels.

<sup>13</sup> 'Royal Charities', *BNJ* xiii. 105.<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 96 f.<sup>15</sup> Pepys Diary, 23 June 1660.

'The Sovereign of the Seas' originally named 'The Royal Sovereign', was by far the largest ship then afloat, and the most expensive ever built. She cost over £65,000—ten times as much as any other man-of-war. She was launched at Woolwich in 1637, and coincidentally had a burden of 1,637 tons. (It was ironic that Charles should have chosen to adorn his Touch-Pieces with the ship that had contributed so much to his father's downfall through the unpopular Ship Tax.) The vessel was accidentally destroyed by fire on 27 January 1696. John Evelyn wrote a few days later 'The R: Sovraigne burnt at Chatham, that ship, which built in 1637 was perhaps the original Cause of all the after trouble to this day'—a judgement written seven years after 'The Glorious Revolution'.

At least six obverses and six reverses of these first Touch-Pieces can be identified. The obverse dies vary considerably in the amount of detailed rigging that has been engraved directly on the die after the puncheon had been sunk. The puncheon, as can be seen, carried only the structural parts of the ship, the spars, sails, and pennants (Pl. XX, no. 13). This particular puncheon (Hocking 105) does not appear to have been used for any of the six obverses noted here. Neither was it used for the tokens or the pattern farthings mentioned below. Another, damaged, puncheon (Hocking 107) also in the Royal Mint Museum (Pl. XX, no. 14), is interesting because the artist has adopted a point of view slightly above the deck line, consequently the design shows a perspective of the deck. This puncheon also does not appear to have been used for any known piece. The pattern farthing (Peck 398) also shows the deck in perspective, but to a markedly less degree.

It seems reasonable to place the obverse dies with the greatest amount of detail among the earliest in date order. One can imagine the engraver becoming less and less enthusiastic about his work as he makes more and more replacements for damaged dies. In terms of detail two dies (O1 and O2) stand out exceptionally (Pl. XXI, nos. 17, 18). Both are from the same puncheon, but there are slight differences in the added rigging lines. Both show the shrouds carried down correctly on the outside of the hull to their attachment to the channels. Both have what appears to be a tall 'pillar' visible just forward of the main mast.<sup>16</sup> Also both have burgees on the starboard ends of the main-lower and main-topsail yards.

A more substantial reason for dating these two dies among the earliest is that one of them (O2) is the same die that has been used for the reverse of the so-called 'pattern farthing' (Peck 493/4) (Pl. XIX, no. 9). This piece, obviously a mule as the royal titles appeared on both sides, had no mark of value. The ship side was described as the reverse. In fact the die was probably made for the Touch-Piece; there would be no point in leaving a space in the legend for piercing a pattern farthing. 'The Sovereign of the Seas', first appears on another pattern farthing of 1662 (Peck 398) (Pl. XIX, no. 8), and is taken from the engraving by John Payne (Pl. XX, no. 10).

Of the remaining four dies so far noted, two have the letter 'M' with its outside legs spreading outwards (Pl. XXI, nos. 19, 20), and the other two with them parallel (Pl. XXI, nos. 21, 22). None of these four show the shrouds outside the hull. The rigging gets progressively simpler. One of them (Pl. XXI, no. 20) appears to be the commonest of all, being found ten times among twenty specimens examined.

<sup>16</sup> The 'pillar' appears to have been a misinterpretation of a piece of lifting gear.

The twenty specimens showed three variations in the punctuation of the legend

1 CAR. II. D. G. M. B. FR. ET. HI. REX.

2 CAR. II. D. G. M. B. FR ET. HI. REX.

3 CAR. II. D. G. M. B. FR. ET. HI. REX.

All six of the reverses noted (Pl. XXI, nos. 23–8) show slight differences in the detail of the feathers of St. Michael's wings, in the shape of the flying end of his cloak, and in the portion of the dragon's wing showing between his legs. Again the Beast is a Wyvern. On one of the reverses (R4) (Pl. XXI, no. 26) the Beast's tail has a shorter barb than on the other five. This is by far the commonest reverse, and is most usually linked with the commonest of the obverses, but not invariably. A damaged puncheon for a reverse (Hocking 106) is shown (Pl. XX, no. 16). Transparencies of this and R4 when superimposed are a perfect fit—as far as the puncheon is complete.

The following variations in the legend were observed

1 SOLI. DEO . GLORIA .

2 SOLI. DEO . GLORIA

3 SOLI. DEO GLORIA

With nearly 80,000 people receiving this first type Touch-Piece it would be reasonable to expect more than the six obverse and reverse dies noted here to have been needed.

At Charles's first Touching in the Banqueting House in June 1660 over 600 sufferers presented themselves.<sup>17</sup> A month later it was decided to limit the number to 200 at a time. A pattern was soon established, and Touching took place on Fridays from 1 November to 18 December, then during the months of January and February, and for a month at Easter. It was suspended during the hot weather to lessen the risk of spreading infection. The number to be Touched in a twelve-month was therefore limited to about 4,000, which is approximately the figure that is found. It did not include those who might be Touched on Progresses. The majority of those Touched at Whitehall would have come from London and the home counties.

It would therefore appear that scrofula affected something approaching 1 per cent of the population of the urban area. This compares with the estimated 3 per cent of Londoners who became victims of smallpox each year. There are stories of people travelling great distances to receive the benefit of the Royal Touch. In Portsmouth, New Hampshire, a petition has been preserved addressed to the local assembly by a sufferer who wanted assistance (presumably monetary) to travel to England to be Touched.

That the disease not only attacked the impoverished classes is evident from the fact that in 1686 six pupils from Eton College were Touched, one of them being the Hon. Charles Cecil, brother to the 4th Earl of Salisbury.

An advertisement dated 14 May 1664 declared that the King will continue healing his people of the Evil during that month, but will then 'give over till Michaelmas next'. People were thereby advised not to 'come up to Town and lose their labour'.

<sup>17</sup> Crawford, *The King's Evil*, p. 119. Quoting from *Mercurius Politicus*, 21–28 June 1660.

It was through such notices in newspapers that the populace was kept informed of the dates of Touchings.<sup>18</sup>

In August 1684 the size of the Touch-Piece was reduced from 54.3 grains to 30 grains.<sup>19</sup> One must presume this was an economy measure, but it could also have been influenced by a present need for new dies.<sup>20</sup>

There were no significant changes in the design. The obverse shows the same ship, now made from a smaller puncheon, and the same legend (Pl. XXII, no. 29). The quality and the amount of detail in the additional engraving done on the die are similar to the work on the later pieces of the first type. There are, however, some noticeable differences on the reverse (Pl. XXII, no. 30). For the first time the dragon has been given a barbed tongue, and St. Michael's right wing no longer has its tip hidden behind his body; it is now curved outwards towards the barbed end of the dragon's tail, also the top of his lance now forms a cross patee. Specimens of this second type were only in use for a few weeks before the King's death. It is unlikely that more than one pair of dies was used, but not impossible.

Records, quoted by Miss Farquhar, show that three payments were made for the new pieces: £176. 10s. on 13 August 1684, £500 on 16 October, and £500 on 9 January 1684/5. The first of these payments would have provided 700 pieces, and the other two 2,000 each. Between 1 November and 4 February, when Charles was taken ill, some 2,800 of these new pieces were used. When he died on 6 February there were 1,905 unissued.

During the twenty years from 1664 to 1684 approximately 79,200 people received the first, larger, Touch-Pieces; adding these to those who received the second, smaller, type and a further 23,000 who received coins from previous reigns, we get a total of about 105,000 people being Touched during the twenty-five years of his reign.<sup>21</sup>

#### *Further controls*

The system of control used by Charles I was again adopted by his son. Charles II's ticket-tokens, which were milled, were of copper (Pl. XX, no. 11), of copper with a brass centre, of brass with a copper centre (Pl. XX, no. 12), or wholly of brass. These variations were presumably intended to distinguish between various sessions of Touching, and thereby to make fraud even more difficult.

The design of the Token was identical with that of the new Touch-Pieces, except that it was required to fill a somewhat larger space, 29 mm. diameter instead of 22 mm., and has a six-pointed star on obverse and reverse at the bottom dividing the end from the beginning of the legend.

Whether any of the same puncheons were used for the ship or the angel as were

<sup>18</sup> See Appendix F. A typical notice is quoted.

<sup>19</sup> 'Royal Charities', *BNJ* xiii. 154.

<sup>20</sup> Mr. Dyer has drawn my attention to an isolated account in the Mint records dated 16 Jan. 1684/5 listing good and defective dies in the possession of the Mint, in which appears 'Healing / 3 Dies with the Shipp / 2 Dies with the Angell'. These are recorded as defective. There is no mention of any good dies. The date was five months after the smaller Touch-Piece was introduced, and only three weeks before the King died. There is no indication

whether these defective dies belonged to the first or second type, or to a mixture of both, but it does seem to suggest that at that moment no usable dies of either type existed. This conflicts with the observed fact that the reverse die for Charles's Type B Touch-Pieces continued for a while to be used for James's.

<sup>21</sup> 'Royal Charities', *BNJ* xiii. 163. (Burns, *History of Parish Registers*, p. 144, claims that 92,107 persons were Touched between 1660 and 1682.)

used for any of the Touch-Pieces is open to question. At first sight it would appear not. The ship on the Token does not show any ties where the sails are bent to the yards; a feature which is usual on the Touch-Pieces, and can be detected on comparatively worn specimens. The angel on the Token also has a slightly different spread of wings and a simplified feather pattern. However, specimens of both Touch-Pieces and Tokens are hard to come by and there is a need for many more to be compared.

Tokens appear with one, and sometimes two, notches filed in the edge at the top (Pl. XX, no. 15). The filing has been done with accuracy, and is not haphazard. It has been suggested that it may have been a further method of establishing the validity of a token for a particular session. It would be useful to know the relative frequency with which these notched tokens occur.

There is no positive information to show when these tokens first came into use. As they precisely echo the information on the new Touch-Pieces they most likely followed them. As early as July 1660 there is mention of 'Tickets' being issued, but they could have been hand written, or, less likely, have been tokens carried over from the time of Charles I.

A further attempt to control the flow of patients, and to make sure they only attended once for healing, and not more often for the gold, was the requirement that they should bring with them a certificate from their parish where the minister was supposed to maintain a register of their names.

The form of one such certificate is recorded at South Stoneham written on the title-page of the Parish Register.

The copy of a Certificate to be given to such as are afflicted with ye King's Evil.

We the Minister and Churchwardens of the Parish of S Stoneham in ye County of Sothton doe hereby certifie that N F of this Parish Aged about ..... yeares is afflicted as we are credibly informed with the desease called the King's Evil and to the best of our knowledge has not therefore been touched by his Majesty for the said desease. In testimony whereof we have hereunto set our hands and seales this ..... day of ..... AD 1685

The Minister and Churchwardens of St. Martins-in-the-Fields evidently considered the demand for certificates was sufficiently great and had theirs printed.

At Petworth a list was kept between 1683 and 1688. It is notable that on occasions more than one member of a family went at the same time for Touching.

In March 1683	2 sisters were sent together
In January 84/5	2 brothers
In March 86	a brother and sister
In March 87	apparently a mother, her two daughters, and a son
And in April 88	a husband and wife? or perhaps a brother and sister

In all there are 38 names of which 9 are men and 29 are women.

The continual collection and reissue of the tokens, would help to account for their comparative scarcity. Some of course must have gone astray. Tokens have been found pierced, and this may have given rise to the idea that Charles II sometimes used base-metal Touch-Pieces. But it would seem most likely that some people attributed to tokens that had escaped collection the same healing power as Touch-Pieces and pierced them themselves.

*The gold Touch-Piece—2—James II*

According to the *London Gazette* James II first Touched for the Evil on 4 March—just four weeks after his brother's death.<sup>22</sup> The first delivery of the new Touch-Pieces bearing the new King's name was not made until 11 April. It is therefore most likely that for the first five weeks James was using some of the 1,905 Touch-Pieces left over from the previous reign.

James was far more prolific in his Touching than his brother; the number of sick brought to him being as many as 14,364 in one year. As before, Healings were weekly on Fridays in London, except during the hot weather. Again tickets were given out on Thursday afternoons by his Physicians and Surgeons to those whom they judged bona fide sufferers from scrofula, and free from any contagion. But the nature of these tickets is not known. Is it possible that he continued to use those of his brother?

Again the new Touch-Pieces were the work of John Roettier. A new obverse die was necessary to show the new King's titles (Pl. XXII, no. 31), but for some while it was possible to use the old reverse die (Pl. XXII, no. 35). Later, at least three more obverse (Pl. XXII, nos. 32–4) and two more reverse (Pl. XXII, nos. 36, 37) dies were made. The size and weight remained the same. James was spending at least £3,000 a year on healing pieces, so he must have been Touching not less than 12,000 in a twelvemonth on average. In the first year of his reign he started off at a higher rate; 14,364 pieces were delivered between 7 January 1686/7 and 23 December 1687.<sup>23</sup> James put no limit on the numbers he was prepared to Touch at each session, unlike his brother, and we find as many as 800 coming to him on a single day. On a progress that lasted several weeks he might have Touched as many as 5,000 people.

It is noticeable that the standard of engraving on James's Touch-Pieces is not as high as on those of his brother. Among the four obverses illustrated here we can detect a distinct falling off. Rigging lines that should be straight are now not always so; sometimes a curve takes on an angular quality; and we find that the shrouds are often carelessly positioned in relation to the masts. Does this deterioration in the work indicate a deterioration in the workman? John Roettier reputedly declined to work for William III after James's flight, on the ground that he suffered 'a lameness in the right hand'.<sup>24</sup> The Roettiers family had a particular loyalty to the Stuarts, and it is possible that he was making the most of an affliction to avoid working for the 'usurper'.<sup>25</sup> If indeed he did suffer, possibly from arthritis, it could account for a falling off in the quality of his work.

At first James had continued to use the Anglican clergy to officiate at his healing ceremonies. But in mid 1686 he began replacing them with his own Romish priests, and also reverting to the original popish ritual of Henry VII. Late in 1687 Father Petre, the much-hated Jesuit who was James's confessor, was made Clerk of the

<sup>22</sup> 'Royal Charities', *BNJ* xiv. 96.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> Farquhar, 'Portraiture of Our Stuart Monarchs on their Coins and Medals', *BNJ* vi. 231–2.

<sup>25</sup> *Medallic Illustrations* lists only three medals under John Roetter's name after James fled to France (11 Dec. O.S. 1688). One of them, a comment on the abdication, was abandoned when the obverse die cracked; another was an unofficial coronation medal for William III; and

the third, on the death of Mary, may or may not have been his work at all. His son, Norbert, was then working at the Royal Mint and it is possible he may have rendered assistance to his father. John continued to occupy the Graver's House at the Tower at least until after he was removed from office about 1697. He then moved to Red Lion Square. He died in 1703 and was buried in the Tower.

Closet. While these changes undoubtedly contributed to the increasing unpopularity which finally overtook him after the birth of his son, they do not appear to have affected the numbers coming to be Touched. If you were suffering from scrofula and believed the King could cure you by his Touch it mattered very little to you whether he did it in Latin or in English.

Less than three weeks after the birth of the infant prince on 10 June 1688, a letter had been dispatched to William of Orange inviting him to come to England. William landed on 5 November, and by Christmas Day James was in France, having abandoned his throne. For the next fourteen years there was no official Touching for the King's Evil in Britain.

### *William and Mary*

William and Mary refused to Touch. They were both grandchildren of Charles I and could have claimed the Royal Touch in their own right. But William had been brought up as a Calvinist, like James I, and such 'superstition' was anathema to him. Unlike James I he was not prepared to concede to any popular demand. Mary may have been encouraged to refuse out of respect for her husband's wishes, but she may also have had some misgivings about practising the rite during her father's lifetime.

It must also be remembered that the Divine Right, which had helped to sustain the Monarchy for so long, was now becoming increasingly shaky as the Crown became more and more subject to Parliamentary control. That the dividing line between a successive Monarchy and an elective one was at this time rather thin is shown by the debate between the two Houses of Parliament on the 'vacancy' of the Throne left by the flight of James II;<sup>26</sup> a flight that had been influenced no doubt by memories of his father's fate at the hands of an earlier Parliament. It was part of the tragedy of the Stuarts that for them Monarchy was absolute and they could not adapt to the new ideas that were heralding the Age of Reason; ideas that were being embraced more enthusiastically in England than in France where the *ancien regime* had another century to run.

No doubt many people felt they were being denied a long-established right, and William suffered some unpopularity in consequence. For the Jacobites his refusal to Touch was an admission that he had no right to the throne.

The changing attitude to Faith Healing is exemplified in the comparison between Shakespeare's reference to the King's Evil in *Macbeth* (1605-6), and Farquhar's in *The Beaux Stratagem* (1706). In *Macbeth* Malcolm, who earlier had fled to England and who has been living at the Court of Edward the Confessor, explains to his visiting countryman Macduff

Tis call'd the Euil.  
A most myraculous worke in this good King,  
Which often since my heere remaine in England,  
I haue seene him do: How he solicites Heauen

<sup>26</sup> *The Debate at Large between the House of Lords and House of Commons at the Free Conference Held in the Painted Chamber, in the Session of the Convention*

*Anno 1688. Relating to the Word Abdicated, and the Vacancy of the Throne, in the Common's Vote, J. Wickins, 1695.*

Himselfe best knowes: but strangely visited people  
 All swolne and Vicerous, pittfull to the eye,  
 The meere dispaire of Surgery, he cures,  
 Hanging a golden stampe about their neckes,  
 Put on with holy Prayers, and 'tis spoken  
 To the succeeding Royalty he leaues  
 The healing Benediction.

*Macbeth* was written in honour of James I and VI who traced his descent from Duncan, and derived his healing powers from Edward the Confessor through the marriage of his great-grandfather, James IV, with Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII. The passage is obviously intended to be in praise of James's Touching, and not Edward's.

In *The Beaux Stratagem*, Mr. Bonniface is explaining to his friend

My Lady Bountiful is one of the best of Women: Her last Husband Sir Charles Bountiful left her worth a Thousand Pound a Year; and I believe she lays out one half on't in charitable Uses for the Good of her Neighbours; she cures Rheumatisms, Ruptures, and broken Shins in Men, Green Sickness, Obstructions, and Fits of the Mother in Women;—The King's Evil, Chin-Cough, and Chilblains in Children; in short, she has cured more People in and about Litchfield within Ten Years than the Doctors have kill'd in Twenty; and that is a bold Word.

There were exactly 100 years between the writing of these two passages.

William's refusal to Touch was in keeping with the developing scepticism of the age. But there may also have been other, and practical, influences. The structure of society was changing; a new fiscal system was being formed; and there was the pressure of a recoinage. It was time for the Doctor to stop paying his Patients.

### *The gold Touch-Piece—3—Anne*

When Queen Anne came to the throne in 1702 she had no desire to Touch at all. She claimed no Divine Right. But her ministers advised compliance with tradition. With no known cure for scrofula, indeed with no known means of alleviating the symptoms, it would have been politically unwise to have continued to refuse its sufferers the only hope they had.

Reluctance on Anne's part may have accounted for the fact that the first announcement that she would Touch for the Evil did not appear in the *London Gazette* until 15 March 1702/3,<sup>27</sup> a year after her succession and almost eleven months after her coronation. The first Touch-Pieces of the reign had been delivered in February and amounted to 200 pieces.<sup>28</sup> The announcement instructed sufferers to present themselves to the surgeons who would give tickets to those passed for treatment. A week later the *Gazette* announced a postponement owing to the great numbers.<sup>29</sup> Evidently the 200 pieces would have been

<sup>27</sup> *London Gazette*, 15 Mar. 1702. 'Whereas the new Guard-chamber, joining 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.'

<sup>28</sup> See Appendix D.

<sup>29</sup> *London Gazette*, 22 Mar. 1702. 'Whereas 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 Her Majesty's Pleasure that all those who are proper Objects do repair only to the Office appointed at Whitehall for the purpose, where

insufficient. A further 200 were delivered on 1 April and the Touching took place on the 3rd.<sup>30</sup>

But this was not the first Touching of the reign. On 6 October 1702 the Queen had Touched thirty persons at Bath.

A great number of Persons coming to this place to be touched by the Queen's Majesty for the Evil, her Majesty commanded Dr Thomas Gardiner, her Chief Surgeon, to examine them all particularly, which was accordingly done by him, of whom but 30 appeared to have the Evil, which he certified by Tickets as is usual, and those 30 were all touched privately that day by reason of Her Majesty not having a proper conveniency for the solemnity.

The lack of 'a proper conveniency' indicates that the Touching was unpremeditated and the result of popular clamour, and without the benefit of Touch-Pieces. It could have been among the influences that decided the Queen to subscribe to the practice.

At first sight there appears to be evidence of an even earlier Touching in a pack of playing cards, advertised in January 1704/5. The cards are generally numbered in chronological sequence, but not invariably. No. 14 shows the Queen Touching for the Evil. The previous card, no. 13, illustrates the Queen and Prince George at Oxford on their way to Bath. They were at Oxford on 27 August 1702 and at Bath on the 29th, and did not leave there until 8 October. The two following cards, nos. 15 and 16, refer to Ormonde's landing of troops in the Bay of Bulls and the sacking of Porta Santa Maria. The landing occurred on 15 August but the first report appeared in the *Gazette* on the 29th. No. 17 refers to the Queen's visit to Bristol on 3 September. There is an implication that she Touched at Oxford during this visit; but no record of the event is to be found. Some of the later cards in the pack are very definitely out of chronological order and one cannot discount the possibility that no. 14 could have referred to the Touching at Bath on 6 October.

Anne Touched on Saturdays at 11 o'clock at St. James's; sometimes in the courtyard. When a figure is mentioned it is usually 100 or 200 persons. Tickets were issued every Friday at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, at the New Guard Chamber in Whitehall. But again there is no description of these tickets. It is most unlikely that any of the old copper tokens were still available for use. Had new metal ones been struck one could reasonably expect a few at least to have survived. It seems probable therefore that printed tickets, or even hand-written ones, were used, and that they were carefully collected and probably destroyed to prevent them being used a second time. Even so it does seem unusual that no descriptive mention of them occurs among the diarists of the time or has been found noted in any private correspondence.

Among those Touched by Queen Anne was Dr. Johnson. He was brought to her as a child of two-and-a-half. Coming from Lichfield, as his family did, this meant a journey of three days and a stay of several nights in London. The most likely date for this event was 30 March 1712. His Touch-Piece is in the British Museum. It shows little or no signs of wear, although his biographers have said he wore it all his life. According to Boswell he was never cured and the sight of one eye was seriously affected.

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.

<sup>30</sup> *London Gazette*, 29 Mar.-1 Apr. 1703. '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.'

Unlike previous sovereigns Anne did not touch the sufferers' sores with her own hand. She used a lodestone.<sup>31</sup> This may have been due to fastidiousness; but there was also a current belief that there were curative qualities in the magnetic properties of the stone. *Soli Deo Gloria?*

It is premature to attempt to classify the Touch-Pieces of this reign until many more specimens have been examined than have been available so far. An unexpectedly large number of dies was used for what was a comparatively small issue. However, a small beginning has been attempted by listing the variations so far noted in the punctuation. This has not been made easier by the fact that very large holes were frequently pierced in this Monarch's Touch-Pieces, and these more often than not obliterated any stops there might have been after the letters BR. Fortunately in some cases it has been possible to find the missing stops on other pieces from the same obverse dies.

Mint records show that from February 1702/3 to May 1707 a total of 8,087 Touch-Pieces was delivered; and between March 1711 and April 1714 a further 4,260. These incomplete figures give us an average of about 1,760 each year. If we assume the same average for the missing years between 1707 and 1711 we arrive at a total issue of the order of 19,400 pieces.

In Appendix D there is a list of these known strikings. It will be seen that on many occasions only a very small number were struck. In fact out of the twenty-nine strikings listed, on only three occasions did the number reach 1,000. Such usage would have been very hard on the dies and must have contributed to the large number of varieties to be found.

The old Roettiers' puncheons for the ship and the Angel that had been used for James's gold Touch-Pieces and for Charles's smaller one were again used, but this time very little additional engraving is to be found on the dies, far less than when John Roettiers used them for the earlier Monarchs. Anne reverted to the larger flan used for Charles II's first issue, but it was thinner, with a weight of about 47 grains. The increased space was filled with the inscription in larger bolder lettering (Pl. XXII, nos. 38, 39). Not only is the style of this lettering indicative of John Croker, but also there is a link between three of the dies for the Touch-Pieces and Croker's medal of 1706, commemorating the Relief of Barcelona (MI 280/86). In each case the Queen's name has been given the same swash N's. On two of the Touch-Pieces they are inverted. These are illustrated (Pl. XXII, nos. 37-42). It looks as though the same letter punch has been used throughout, but it has not been possible to check this yet. These swash letters have not been observed elsewhere among Croker's medals.

Out of nineteen specimens thirteen obverses were noted. The variations in punctuation are listed in Appendix E.

The nineteen specimens provided only two pairs sharing the same reverse dies. Obviously variations in the punctuation of the reverse are strictly limited, and only three were found.

1. SOLI DEO GLORIA.
2. SOLI DEO GLORIA.
3. SOLI DEO GLORIA.

<sup>31</sup> 'Royal Charities', *BNJ* xv. 148.

The reverse illustrated (Pl. XXII, no. 46), has the final stop so far divorced from the A of GLORIA that it has become joined to the dragon's head. This specimen, which is in the Wellcome Museum, may have given rise to the suggestion that a reverse exists without a stop after GLORIA. Other typical reverses are illustrated (Pl. XXII, nos. 43-5).

Little more can be done with this series until more Touch-Pieces have been examined. Variations in the letter punches used, and in the spacing of the legend, may subdivide the variations in punctuation. Good photographs or the facility to place pieces side by side is needed for this further study.

The last time a reigning Monarch Touched on British soil was on 27 April 1714. Three months later Queen Anne died. The history of the gold Touch-Piece, which had been in existence for just fifty years, came to an end with the last Stuart Queen. The Hanoverians would have none of it. In France the practice was carried on until the death of Louis XVI in the French Revolution. After that there was one brief revival—or rather half-hearted attempt at revival—on 3 May 1825 at the hands of Charles X. But if the practice stopped, the malady lingered on, and the superstition too.

[To be continued]

## APPENDIX A CHARLES II

### *Type A*

#### *Obverses*

- O1 Legend divided between B and FR. Stops throughout.  
Rigging exceptionally detailed.  
Shrouds visible on outside of hull.  
Tall 'pillar' on deck forward of mainmast.  
(A hint that the additional burgees noted in 2 below may be present; but the specimen is too worn to be certain.)
- O2 Legend divided between FR and ET. Stops throughout.  
Rigging exceptionally detailed.  
Shrouds visible on outside of hull.  
Additional burgees from the starboard ends of the main-lower and main-topsail yards.  
Tall 'pillar' on deck forward of mainmast.
- O3 Legend divided between FR and ET. No stop after FR.  
No 'pillar'.  
Rigging lines becoming fewer.  
Pulley blocks appear between foremast and Jack-staff.  
2 pulley blocks below maintop burgee.  
2 pulley blocks behind mizzen topsail.  
Small cramped M.  
Shrouds stop at deck line.
- O4 Legend divided between FR and ET. Stops after every word.  
No 'pillar'.  
Rigging less detailed.  
No pulley blocks.  
Shrouds stop at deck line.

- O5 Legend divided between FR and ET. (Not possible to verify punctuation after FR as both specimens seen are pierced at that point.) The first part of the legend is somewhat condensed and the line of the foremast bisects B. In most other cases it passes through part of M. Outside legs of M parallel instead of sloping outwards.

The letters H, D rise progressively.

The E of ET is low.

One pulley block between foremast and Jack-staff.

Two pulley blocks below maintop burgee.

Two pulley blocks forward of starboard shrouds.

One pulley block aft of port shrouds.

Two pulley blocks aft of mizzen topsail.

- O6 Legend divided between FR and ET.

Outside legs of M parallel.

Line of foremast cuts right-hand leg of M.

Right-hand serif of A almost lost, and tucked in above left-hand serif of R.

- O4 would appear to be the commonest, occurring ten times out of 20. O2 and O3 occurred three times each, O5 twice, and O6 and O1 only once each.

#### *Type B*

Legend: CAR . II . D . G . M . B . R . ET . HI . REX

Diameter reduced to about 18 mm.

#### *Type A*

##### *Reverses*

- R1 No stop after GLORIA.

Long barb to tail.

- R2 Stops before and after GLORIA.

Long barb to dragon's tail.

O of DEO slightly low.

- R3 Long barb to tail.

A of GLORIA has serif joined to dragon's head.

- R4 Dragons' tail ends in short barb.

- R5 No stops before or after GLORIA.

Long barb to tail.

O of DEO too low.

I of SOLI too low.

Spacing between E & O of DEO too close.

- R6 Long barb to tail.

I of SOLI too low.

Uneven spacing between L and I.

The space between E and O of DEO is less than on R5.

- R4 seems to be the commonest, occurring 9 times out of 20. R2 occurred 4 times and R3 occurred 3,

R5 twice, and R1 and R6 once each.

#### *Type B*

St. Michael's wings given more pronounced outward curves at the bottom. Dragon has barbed tongue.

Top of lance forms a cross patee.