THE SOVEREIGN REMEDY: TOUCH-PIECES
AND THE KING'S EVIL

PART II

NOEL WOOLF

The Silver Touch-Piece—James II—Made in France

When James II landed in France on Christmas Day 1688 we begin the story of the silver Touch-Piece; a story that was to continue for another 119 years. From that moment James became no more than a pensioner of the French king, dependent on him for everything from the loan of a palace at St Germain to the support of his greatly reduced court of penurious exiles. But because he could no longer afford gold for his Touch-Pieces that was no reason to abandon one of the last rites of royalty left to him. He would make do with silver.

Unfortunately we lack the documentary evidence that could tell us when the new Touch-Pieces were ordered, who made them, and how many. There is information to be found in the Stuart Papers concerning patterns for new coins, but no mention is made of Touch-Pieces or Touching. The old angel had been a coin with a currency value; its status as an amulet was additional. The English Touch-Piece, though not a coin, had continued to be gold and to be made under the same conditions at the Royal Mint and subject to the same accounting system. These new French-made pieces were something less than coin, and little better than medalets. They were probably not considered worthy of mention, especially as their intrinsic value had been reduced from 5s. to 3\text{d}.

From the accounts of his flight it hardly seems likely that James could have taken any gold Touch-Pieces with him; and there is nothing to tell us how he came by any of the new pieces except conjecture guided largely by a process of elimination. The new pieces could hardly have been made by John or Norbert Roettiers who were both still in London working at the Royal Mint. It was of course John, probably assisted by his son in later years, who had made all the gold Touch-Pieces since 1664. John and his family had been brought to England by Charles II at the Restoration to work as engravers, and the Roettiers' loyalty to the Stuarts was enduring. The most likely candidate to be the maker of the new pieces must be John's brother Joseph who had worked in London and was now Engraver General to the French mint.

It may seem strange that James should Touch at all on French soil, where it was the prerogative of the French king to do so. But Louis XIV was another monarch who believed in the Divine Right, and in his eyes James's powers of healing among his own expatriates would not have been reduced because of his misfortunes. Louis showed the greatest tolerance of his English cousin, so much so that he even raised no objection to the kingship of France being included among James's royal titles on the new Touch-Pieces made in the French mint.
The first thing that strikes us about the new Touch-Pieces is the design of the ship (Pl. II, 1). Gone is the Sovereign of the Seas seen in elevation, and instead we have a still more realistic representation of a ship sailing away from left to right (JII 01 see Appendix G). This is The Prince, a vessel of 100 guns built in 1670 (Pl. II, 8). It was appropriate to use this ship as she had been James's flag-ship when, as Duke of York and Lord High Admiral, he commanded at the battle of Sole Bay in 1672. Her three lanterns and the decoration on the stern, including the royal arms can all be identified. The shape of her quarter gallery is also distinctive.1

But was this change of design entirely the work of Joseph? In the Royal Mint museum there is an unfinished puncheon for a ship (Hocking 108) listed as having been intended for a Touch-Piece (Pl. II, 6). It shows the stern view of a ship under full sail. Comparison with the ship that appears on John Roettiers's medal commemorating the Peace of Breda in 1667 (MI 535/185-6) (Pl. II, 7), and another on his Naval Reward medal of 1665 (MI 503/139-40) suggests this unfinished puncheon could have been his work also. If this were an experiment by John, or even Norbert whose work was very similar, and if it were abandoned because of damage or because it was considered unsuccessful, it could at least suggest that the engraver's mind was working towards a new design.

The fact that an English ship has been used as the model, and has been so accurately represented, does, however, suggest that the design may have been supplied to Joseph from across the Channel.

There is every indication that the puncheons for the ship used for JII 01 and 02 were both made in France (Pl. II, 2). Had they been made in England by John or Norbert they would have carried all the detail of the design—the hull, masts, spars, sails, even the flags and the water. Only the finer rigging lines would have been left to be engraved directly on the dies. That the puncheon for the new ship used for JII 02 was clearly limited to the hull is apparent as it is among the Roettier puncheons and dies presented by Matthew Young to the British Museum in 1828.2 The same puncheon can be shown to have been used later for both the French-made Touch-Pieces of James's son. On all the dies made from this puncheon everything above and below the hull of the ship was individually engraved on them, and varies from die to die.3 The same considerations apply to JII 01, but a different puncheon was used for the hull of that ship. On the French-made silver pieces another important difference is that the sails are indicated by no more than a couple of curved lines, while the English engravers of the gold pieces had subtly modelled them.

The same ship is also featured in Norbert Roettiers's medal of the young Prince James struck in 1697 (MI 192/500) (Pl. II, 9). Norbert had left England in 1695 and was by then working at the Paris mint. The royal arms have been left off the stern but all the other details are repeated. The medal is larger than the Touch-

---

1 The aid of the National Maritime Museum in identifying the ship is acknowledged. The illustration is of the builder's original model now in the Science Museum, London.

2 Miss Farquhar described this puncheon as 'unfinished' ('Royal Charities', BNI XV (1922), 164-5). Evidently she was unaware of the differing techniques used by members of the Roettier family working in London and Paris. There is also some inconsistency in stating that it was both unfinished and used for the die of the IAC 8 Touch-Piece.

3 A description of the Roettiers's technique used on the Continent is given in J. Bingen, Les Roettiers Graveurs en Medaille de Pays-Bas Meridoniaux (Brussels, 1952), pp. 51-3.
Piece and consequently the rigging is able to be more detailed. The workmanship is much finer.

Unlike the ship the figures of St. Michael and the dragon are very close replicas of those that appeared on James's gold pieces. Indeed they are so close that one is tempted to wonder whether the punchen could have been the work of John or Norbert. The latter is supposed to have left the mint over-hastily in 1695 and fled to France: reputedly he had abstracted some of his work, possibly for the benefit of the exiled James. Joseph, then, faced with the task of making Touch-Pieces to a traditional design on James's arrival in France in 1689, quite likely sought guidance from his English relatives.

The only evidence we have concerning James's use of the silver Touch-Pieces and his exercise of the Royal Touch while in exile derives from two meagre references, and a recorded Touching.

The Age of Louis XIV

Voltaire describes James's arrival in France, and Louis's reception of him, his wife, and the infant prince. He continues: 'Amid the humiliations of this fugitive king and the generosity of Louis XIV, it was a noteworthy sight to see James touching the scrofulous at the little English convent; perhaps the English kings claim this singular prerogative as pretenders to the throne of France, or else the ceremony has been established since the time of the first Edward.'

The temptation should be resisted to extract too much information from this short passage. Admittedly it immediately precedes Voltaire's account of James leaving for Ireland; and while James may have Touched, and may have used Touch-Pieces, so soon after his arrival in France, it hardly constitutes proof. Voltaire's book was not published until 1751, though it had been started about 1730, and that was some forty years after these events. There can be no certainty that the sequence of events was accurately recorded.

It is of course possible that James may have Touched during the six weeks between his landing in France and his departure for Ireland without the use of any Touch-Pieces. In fact, if Voltaire actually witnessed the Royal Touch being bestowed, as could be implied from his account, and if a Touch-Piece had been hung around a sufferer's neck, it would have been surprising if Voltaire had not described the act in some detail. The French kings did not use Touch-Pieces, and Voltaire would surely have been sufficiently intrigued and impressed by the English practice to have expressed his own cynical views.

The second reference is to be found in Numismata Antiqua in tres partes (1746), which illustrates a silver Touch-Piece described as 'The Healing Piece of K. James 2 struck in silver in Ireland' (Pl. II, 3). But without further support this statement should not really be taken to mean more than 'believed to have been struck in silver for use in Ireland'. Certainly the drawing is too imprecise for the illustration to help us to decide which of the two Touch-Pieces it might have been intended to represent.

The recorded Touching concerns a child of five-and-half. Maria Windfreda

---

Francesca, daughter of Sir Nicholas Shireburn and his wife Catherine, was sent to the exiled Court at St Germain-en-laye 'to be tutched for ye King's Evil by King James ye 2nd 8th May 1698'. A member of an ardent Jacobite family, descended on her mother's side from Sir Edward Widdrington, Maria later married the eighth Duke of Norfolk. The campaign in Ireland was well documented and had there been any Touchings there it seems unlikely they would have escaped mention. None have been found. It does, however, seem reasonable to suppose that James may have had some Touch-Pieces, whether made there or in France. Miss Farquhar, noting that JII O1/R1 was by far the rarer of the two silver pieces, put forward the theory that the dies and the puncheons were taken to Ireland, where the strikings were made, and were left behind when James fled after the battle of the Boyne.  

Whether the dies were lost or only damaged, there seems to be no doubt that they must have become unusable or unavailable at an early date, and have been replaced by JII O2/R2. That the puncheon for the hull of the ship also became unusable is also obvious from its replacement by a new one which continued to be used for as long as Touch-Pieces continued to be made in France by a member of the Roettier family. 

There is reason to believe that the puncheon for the reverse was not lost or damaged. A remarkably complete identity of the lines on R1 and R2 can be observed if enlarged photographic transparencies are made and superimposed. There are four places where differences occur: the feather pattern on the right wing, the dragon’s tongue, its two teeth, and the barbed tip to its tail. All are slight and could perhaps be accounted for by tooling on a die. Obviously, if this tooling did take place, it must have been on R1 as it does not appear on the later dies made from the same puncheon for James III. 

Members of the Roettier family were in the habit of regarding all dies and puncheons, other than those made for coins, as being their personal property. This is apparent from the correspondence in 1728 between James III and Norbert’s widow concerning the ownership of the engraver’s dies and puncheons, which we know must have included some of his uncle Joseph’s work. This offers further support to the idea that if Joseph did send any dies for striking in Ireland he retained the puncheons from which they were made in his own keeping. 

The Silver Touch-Piece—James III—Made in France 

The only information we have that James III exercised the Royal Touch on French soil comes from Blount’s Annotated Book of Common Prayer (1866) in which it is stated that ‘. . . power of touching was exercised by the son of James II as James III in the hospitals of Paris’. We know that two Touch-Pieces were made for him while he was in France (Pl. II, 4, 5). Miss Farquhar considered that the one with his English title was probably made about 1708 because in May of that year Norbert Roettier had been directed to prepare puncheons and dies for an English coinage; and that the one with the Scottish title was as probably made in 1715 at the time when puncheons and dies for a Scottish coinage were ordered. 

James landed at Peterhead on 22 December 1715. On his way from there to Perth he spent two nights, 4 and 5 January, as the guest of Lord Strathmore at Glamis Castle.

Thomas Hearne, writing in his diary nearly a year later, recorded that Strathmore had just told him that ‘the king touched many for the evil in his lordship’s house and that they recovered’. It is reasonable to infer from this that James had with him some Touch-Pieces, and even that they were in all probability of the Scottish type. It would be interesting to know how many were regarded by Strathmore as ‘many’. This, the only record of James’s Touching in Scotland, gives some support to Miss Farquhar’s dating.

But is it likely that James would have waited seven years after his father’s death before having Touch-Pieces of his own struck? One of them at least is likely to have been made earlier than 1708. But when we place the two side by side we find that they are so exactly alike in workmanship that it is hard to imagine they were not made at the same time. We even find the same letter punches being used on both obverses (Pl. II, 10, 11). Two of them were damaged and the faults are apparent on both pieces, and all the others can be shown to match when enlarged photographically. That some of them can be found to have been used on JII O2 shows they were among the letter punches belonging to Joseph, and because all of them were not used on that die it is clear there must have been alternative characters in the same fount that could have been selected for use.

By a warrant dated 9 November 1695 James II appointed ‘Joseph and Norbert Roettier to be makers of all instruments, tools, and engines fit and necessary for edging and milling all sorts of gold and silver to be coined in the Mint for the Kingdom of England in such manner as they shall be from time to time ordered.’ And by another warrant of the same date John and his sons James and Norbert were appointed to be Engravers General to the Mint for the Kingdom of England. Both these warrants were renewed by his son James III on 6 June 1703. It is therefore clear that Joseph was still working for the young king shortly before his death in September 1703, at the age of 71. John died in London, also in 1703, and James had died in 1698, so that after Joseph’s death Norbert was left to work on his own. Both IAC3 and IAC8 are clearly copied from JII O2/R2 but the workmanship is very inferior. The flags are void and faceless, and the billows of the sails are somewhat angular with their curves lacking sureness. One must hesitate to attribute them to Norbert, whose work they would have had to be if they had been made as late as 1708. It seems more likely they were the work of Joseph in the last months of his life, copying his earlier pieces, with failing eyesight and a less than steady hand. This of course cannot be claimed as more than a theory, but for what it is worth it is put forward.

The same inferior workmanship is noticeable on the reverse die used for both IAC3 and IAC8. The figures of St. Michael and the dragon are satisfactory because the earlier puncheon used for JII R2 has been used again; although even here there is a deficiency: the cross at the top of the lance has been left as a straight line instead of having its ends broadened out on the die to form a cross patee as was done on both dies made for James II. The letters of the word ‘Gloria’ have been weakly sunk, and this applies also to some of the letters on the obverse. It is not reasonable to suppose any of this could be the work of Norbert Roettier who was then only about 40 and had another twenty years work left in him.

James departed from tradition in having a Touch-Piece struck with his Scottish title, and one must wonder why he did it. Any Touching he might have done in Scotland
would have been as King of England. Ian Stewart makes this same point in connection with Briot’s angel which exhibits the English arms and not the Scottish.⁹

The Silver Touch Piece—James III—Made in Italy

After the failure of the '15 the British Government made it clear they could no longer tolerate the presence of James on French soil. The Regent had little choice; France needed peace, her Exchequer was empty, and James, no longer an asset but a liability, was soon on his way to the Papal city of Avignon, where he arrived on 2 April 1716.

It was to James at Avignon that one Christopher Lovel went to receive the Royal Touch; and Thomas Carte in his History of England gave a very full account of his case. Lovel was a labourer living in the City of Bristol, and had been afflicted for many years with scrofulous sores on his breast, neck, and arms. The tumour on one side of his neck was of such a size that it ‘forced him to keep his head always awry’. At the end of August 1716 an uncle, who had been a seaman, took Lovel ‘to Cork in Ireland, where he put him on board a ship that was bound to St Martin’s in the Isle of Re. From there Christopher made his way first to Paris, and thence to the place where he was touched, in the beginning of November following, by the lineal descendant of a race of kings, who had indeed, for a long succession of ages, cured that distemper by the royal touch.’ Carte goes on to observe ‘But this descendant, and next heir of their blood had not, at least at that time, been crowned or anointed. The usual effect however followed: From the moment that the man was touched and invested with the narrow ruband to which a small piece of silver was pendant, according to the rites prescribed in the office appointed by the church for that solemnity, the tumour dispersed insensibly . . .’ and ‘. . . he arrived in perfect health, in the beginning of January following, at Bristol, having spent only four months and some few days in his voyage.’ Carte’s History was published in 1747 and he used the story to show that such cures ‘could not possibly be ascribed to the regal unction’. In his view at least there had been no coronation at Perth in 1715. He overlooked the fact that James II had Touched a month before his coronation, and Charles II for several years before being crowned as King of England; although he had been crowned King of Scotland.

James III was not to remain long at Avignon. Fear of a Catholic succession was still an important weapon against James, and the closer he could be identified with Rome the better for the British Government. Diplomatic pressure and the threat of a naval bombardment of Civita Vecchia had the desired effect, and on 6 February 1717, with his suite of some seventy persons, James left Avignon and made his painful and slow way across the Alps to Italy. The Pope offered him a palace at Urbino. Later, after his marriage in 1719, he set up his court in Rome at the Palazzo Muti, and for the rest of his life, almost half a century, that was his home.

James’s Italian Touch-Pieces are the most common of all those used by the Stuarts in exile, and during those years in Rome he must have Touched quite a number of sufferers. There are, however, very few occasions recorded.

A pamphlet dated 21 August 1721 and written in the form of a ‘letter from a gentleman at Rome to his Friend in London’ refers to healings by the ‘Rev Father Lewis, S J’. This may have been a code name for James III, as the writer gives an account of the

history of Touching for the King's Evil and regrets that it is no longer practised in England.

The following year, in July, James's consort, Clementina, went to the Baths at Lucca for her health. James followed at the beginning of August, and the couple did not return to Rome until the end of September. James Touched at Lucca each Thursday, and a description of the ceremony is to be found in the Archives.10

The King knelt on a cushion, and the other 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.

How many people were Touched and whether they were only children is not made clear. The description of the Touch-Piece need not be taken literally: the 'three ships' is obviously intended for 'a three-masted ship', and it would not be unreasonable for anyone believing that the power originated from Edward the Confessor to imagine that the figure of St. Michael was intended for that sainted king.

Out of touch with Roettier in Paris, James turned to the Hamerani brothers, Ermenegildo and Ottone, at the mint in Rome. It is frequently assumed that all James's medallic work was done by Ottone, but both the brothers engraved medals for him and it is impossible to say which of them may have been responsible for the new Touch-Pieces. By a warrant dated 25 October 1720 Ottone was appointed to be engraver to James, but by then he had been in Rome for four years, and even if he had taken a supply of Roettier's Touch-Pieces with him it is likely he would have required more before then.

Hamerani—whichever brother it may have been—adapted the Roettier design, making important changes in the detail. On the obverse (Pl. III, 12 ff.) the ship still sails from left to right, but the wind has changed and she no longer has a following breeze. It was not appreciated, however, that this would have necessitated a change in the set of the sails, and the ship now has an awkward look about it. Perhaps this change of wind was intended to be a comment on James's change of fortune? On the reverse (Pl. IV, 24 ff.) a more vigorous St. Michael is more actively engaged in slaying his dragon, and the beast's head now lies to the left instead of to the right; it also appears to have lost its legs. On both obverse and reverse the relief has been deepened.

Four obverse and five reverse dies are noted (see Appendix I). Two Touch-Pieces, both from the same pair of dies, are known in gold. As James could not afford to use this metal for distribution we can assume that they were specimen pieces from the first pair of dies, and these have accordingly been labelled JIII O1/R1 (Pl. III, 12; Pl. IV, 24). The lack of a space in the obverse legend to show where the piece may be safely pierced could also point in the same direction. The other three obverses all have varying spaces. Generally these spaces do not appear to have been used with any degree

of accuracy; but as all the reverses have the angel's head further from the edge than the French-made pieces it usually escapes mutilation.

Apart from JIII O2 (Pl. III, 13), which is associated with two reverses, JIII R2 and JIII R3 (Pl. IV, 25, 26), the pairing of dies appears to be constant. The leg flaw on R2 does not give the impression of resulting from a cracked die as it is invariably incuse on the struck pieces. So far no piece has been identified as coming from that die without the flaw. JIII R5 (Pl. IV, 28) was later used for one of Charles III's Touch-Pieces.

All the ships vary slightly in their dimensions, and all the angels have slight variations in the spread of their wings, and in some cases in the thickness of the left knee. R1 has a different type of feather pattern to the others. These differences are mostly very small and only become explicit when the pieces are magnified some eight or ten times and their images superimposed.

The Roettiers's Touch-Pieces were reasonably close to a standard of weight—a mean of 22.7 gr. The standard deviation of nineteen silver Touch-Pieces made by Joseph and Norbert for James II and his son was 1.4 gr. By contrast, the Italian-made pieces vary widely in weight: the mean of twenty-four specimens being 51.6 gr, with a standard deviation of 8.8 gr. The lightest weighed 35.5 gr and the heaviest 74.5 gr.

Until now only two obverse and three reverse dies have been recognized for these Touch-Pieces and they have been classified as Light and Heavy types. However, out of the five types now identified none are to be found exclusively at one end or the other of the weight range. It must have been entirely fortuitous whether a thick or a thin flan was used. As an example two specimens from the same pair of dies, JIII O2/R2, have shown a difference in weight of more than 20 gr.

It seems most probable that the central design was engraved directly on the dies in intaglio, and that puncheons were not made. Had puncheons been made one could reasonably expect to find at least one of them being used on more than one die. Such evidence has not been found.

Ermenegildo Hamerani died in 1744, his brother, Ottone, early in 1761. By a warrant dated 16 May 1761 James appointed his son Fernando to be engraver in Ottone’s place, but there is nothing to show whether he did any work at all for James during the last five years of his life.¹¹

Charles III

The first Stuart king of England cast the first doubt on the royal power of healing by directing the suppliants' faith away from his own hands back to those of the Deity. His great-great-grandson carried the decline of the Royal Touch a stage further by practising it vicariously on behalf of his father.

On 17 September 1745 Prince Charles Edward entered Edinburgh and occupied Holyrood House. His father was proclaimed King James VIII at the Cross, and in the evening there was a state ball. It was thirty years since a royal Stuart had set foot on Scottish soil, and over sixty since one had been in Scotland's capital.

¹¹ Forrer omitted Fernando Hamerani, son of Ottone, thus making Gioacchino Ottone's son instead of his grandson. He was also unaware that Gioacchino had a younger brother Giovanni who became Incisore Camerale on his brother's death.
The prince stayed for five weeks at Holyrood, and there is an account of his Touching a seven-year-old girl who was brought to him there. The prince 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 . . . 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.

It is noteworthy that Charles used the French form of words and not the English: 'They shall lay their hands on the sick, and they shall recover.' His father habitually used the office of Henry VII to which James II had reverted in 1686. Charles's form of words may have been in recognition of the fact that he was only a deputy. The account is sufficiently detailed for us to expect mention to have been made of a Touch-Piece being put round the girl's neck if one had been used.

When James III died in 1766 at the age of 78 neither of his sons was present, and he had not seen Charles for twenty-two years. Charles's movements, as he had wandered about Europe, had been, and continued to be, kept under surveillance by Sir Horace Mann, the British minister in Florence. Late in August 1770 Charles went to Pisa for the waters, and on 8 September Mann reported that he was 'still at the Baths at Pisa, from which it is said he finds great benefit. He lives exactly in the same manner as he did here; but I must not omit that two or three very low people have applied to him, to be touched for scrofulous disorders, which ceremony he performed.'

The next time Mann reported any Touching was on 8 August 1786; 'The Pretender with his family has retired to Albano. He has lately assumed the folly practised by his father and grandfather to touch people who are afflicted with scrofulous disorders; 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.' It would be wrong to assume that these were the only occasions on which Charles Touched. But Mann's surveillance was pretty thorough, at least after James's death when the new king had settled in Italy, and the rarity of his Touch-Pieces certainly indicates that the number of people who sought healing from Charles III must have been quite small.

Charles's Touch-Pieces follow the same pattern as his father's. A new die CIII O1 was of course needed for the obverse (Pl. III, 16) and was presumably the work of Fernando. The existing reverse die, JIII R5, was still usable and now becomes CIII R1 (Pl. IV, 29). Specimens from this pair of dies are rare, and both those seen have been pierced conventionally above the Angel's head. A second pair of dies, CIII O2/R2 (Pl. III, 18; Pl. IV, 30), was made later, and Touch-Pieces from these dies are commoner. They all show the same flaws: on the obverse there is a pellet, almost central, on the shrouds, and there are two more beneath the reefed main-sail. On the reverse a flaw links the s of SOLI to the angel's right ankle, and another links the top of the L to the border.

12 R. Chambers, History of the Rebellion in Scotland in 1745, 1746 (Edinburgh, 1828), i. 184.
13 Mahon, The Decline of the Last Stuarts (1843), pp. 39, 93.
Pieces from these dies, CIII O2/R2, are more often than not pierced at the bottom below the angel’s feet. This does not harm the legend on the obverse but does mutilate the dragon; it also means the piece hangs upside down when worn. They are also found pierced additionally at the top, and sometimes with a third hole as well. Some of those with multiple piercings have had one of them plugged.

We do not know at what point the French- and Italian-made Touch-Pieces were pierced, or by whom. Dr Schnieder has expressed the view that the angels of Charles I were pierced by jewellers more or less at the time of use, and not by the mint at the time of issue, and that the gold removed became the perquisite of the jeweller. Presumably the same system was continued with the gold Touch-Pieces of Charles II, James II, and Anne, and could account for the varying sizes of the holes, and also explain why they were not accurately placed in the space made for them. But whether the same arrangement was adopted on the Continent for the silver pieces is unknown. Generally we find the holes in the silver pieces are considerably smaller and more uniform; perhaps because the return from punching a hole in silver was so much smaller than in gold.

A random sample of Touch-Pieces has provided the information in this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of hole</th>
<th>Size of hole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>Per cent of surface area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR II (type A)</td>
<td>IAC II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(type B)</td>
<td>IAC 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAC II</td>
<td>IAC III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>CAR III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H IX</td>
<td>H IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Henry IX

When Charles III died leaving only his natural daughter, Charlotte, as issue, the de jure succession passed to Henry, Cardinal Duke of York. Unlike his elder brother Henry made no overt claim to the throne but was content to style himself Henry IX on a Touch-Piece and on a medallion struck in the same year.

The medallion is copied from an earlier one ordered by Henry on the death of his father in 1766 and made by Filippo Cropanese. The full legends reads HEN.IX.MAG.BRIT.FR.ET.HIB.REX.FID.DEF.CARD.EP.TVSC. Henry had been made Bishop of Frascati in 1761. The diocese was known as the see of Tusculum, the name being taken from the ruins of that nearby ancient city. The Touch-Piece, being very much smaller, has the legend abbreviated to H.IX.D.G.M.B.F.ET.H.R.C.EP.TVSC.

The obverse of the medallion is signed G.HAM.F., and this is generally assumed to refer to Gioacchino Hamerani (1761-1801). But it could also indicate his younger brother Giovanni (1763-1846). Another possibility is hinted at in Forrer’s Dictionary where the medallion is included in the lists of work both of Gioacchino and Tomasso Mercandetti. For many years Mercandetti (1758-1821) worked uneasily as a junior partner with the Hamerani brothers at the Zecco, where engraving may have been performed—and even signed—in the name of Hamerani regardless of whose hand had actually been responsible.

Henry's first Touch-Piece, although following the traditional pattern, is inferior in detail (PI. III, 19; Pl. IV, 31). It could have been the work of either of the Hamerani brothers, or even of their father Fernando in the last year of his life. The proportions of the ship are slightly changed and the ports are no longer rectangular but are indicated by rough-drawn circles. On the reverse the dragon's tongue is missing. A curious feature is that both the Hs in the obverse legend appear to be unbarred. This may have been the result of a faulty letter punch: both show signs of the same diagonal fault running downwards from left to right across the letter. However, the unbarred H is repeated on another Touch-Piece from a later die (Pl. III, 22, 23), but only for the H of Henry's name, and not for Hibernia. Did the possible use of a faulty letter punch give rise to a belief that there was some special significance in the malformed letter so that it was deliberately copied by the later engraver?

Specific reports of Henry administering the Royal Touch can be found in a fragment of his diary for part of the year 1788. There is an entry for 1 July showing that Henry 'Signed' two people for the scrofula that morning in the chapel of the Seminario at Frascati. Since there is a gap in the diary between January when his brother died, and July it is unlikely that this was the first Touching of his 'reign'.

The diary, under the date 10 August, states that a specimen of 'the grand medal' had just been received by the cardinal from 'Signor Amerani', and was shown to a few friends. The medal is described in some detail. Somewhat earlier, on 13 May, Henry's niece, Charlotte, Duchess of Albany, had written to her mother in Paris saying that she was sending her one of the 'medals' bearing her uncle's title of 'Henry IX'. This apparent inconsistency can be explained if we assume (and it would seem to be a fair assumption) that what Charlotte sent was in fact a Touch-Piece. These were frequently referred to as 'medals', and indeed the diarist later writes of the 'usual medal' (consueto medaglio) being put around an infant's neck. This would indicate a date early in May for the delivery of the first Touch-Pieces. There is no reason to suppose Henry would have waited another two months before using them. It is much more likely that he had been Touching even before he had any Touch-Pieces of his own, and not impossible that he used some of his brother's.

Considerable importance was evidently attached to his Touchings by the writer of the diary, Monsignor Cesarini, the cardinal's chaplain and secretary, as they are signalled each time by the word 'Segno' placed on a line by itself; a distinction shared only by benedictions, consecrations, and like events.

Altogether the diary enumerates nine people who received the Royal Touch: a steady two or three each month. Not as many as might have been expected in view of Henry's known interest—unusual in a highly placed churchman of the time—in the unemployed and destitute.

The French Revolution was to alter dramatically Henry's life. In 1796 Napoleon's army invaded Italy and a huge indemnity was demanded of the Pope. The cardinal contributed to the sum through the sale of his family jewels. Later in 1798 French troops entered Rome and the Pope was taken a prisoner to Valence. Henry himself fled the day before to the Court at Naples. Later he travelled by way of Messina and Corfu to Venice—a journey that was fraught with discomfort and danger. Not only did he

---

15 Diario per l'Anno 1788 de Enrico Benedetto, Cardinale Duca di York, a fragment of the cardinal's diary (1876).
lose the income from his many benefices but also all his personal property, with the exception of a small amount of plate which he was able to take with him. Soon even that was sold and the old man—he was 73—was virtually destitute.

It must be to this period in his life that the base-metal Touch-Pieces belong (Pls. III, IV, 20, 32). These have been recorded in lead or pewter, in copper, and in copper plated with silver, some perhaps from moulds taken from a silver piece. Hamerani's dies must have been inaccessible, or perhaps even lost, for it is doubtful if they were used again.

A silver Touch-Piece (HIX O2/R2) (Pls. III, IV, 21, 33), which is in the British Museum, may also have been made after Henry left Rome. It has the appearance of having been cast from damaged moulds; there is a flaw in the reverse, and an excess of metal on the edge of the obverse where the characters HIX should be. This is particularly unfortunate as it prevents one from knowing whether the H is barred or not. The colour of the metal is poor, which may indicate a low grade of silver, and it could easily be suspected of being cast in base metal. It has obviously been copied from the traditional pattern, but the border has been omitted and St. Michael has become rather squat with his legs too wide apart. Was the piece perhaps made locally in Naples? It is pierced, which suggests it may have been used. Henry was in Naples from February to December 1798, and in those early days after his flight from Rome he would still have had some resources left. By the time he reached Venice early in 1800, his fortunes were at their lowest ebb, and if he could then have afforded any Touch-Pieces at all they would surely have had to be in base metal.

In August 1799 Pope Pius VI died, still a prisoner in Valence. By November the conclave to elect his successor was able to assemble at Venice. It took rather longer for the choice to be made and it was March 1800 before the new pontiff was named. During this time friends of the cardinal had seen to it that George III knew of the old man's destitution. Unhesitatingly the king granted him an annuity of £4000. (For the previous ninety years the Stuarts in exile had been denied their rightful income of £50,000 annually from the jointure of Mary of Modena!) The following year, 1800, saw improved relations between the papacy and the French government and in June a return was made to Rome. Much to the joy of his flock Henry was soon back in his beloved Frascati. That year he was made Dean of the Sacred College of Cardinals, and in 1803 was translated to the bishopric of Ostia and Velletri. This should have meant a move from Frascati, but owing to his age and his attachment to the place he was allowed to remain there.

The first £2000 of the annuity from King George was paid through the British ambassador in Vienna on 9 February 1800, with promise of an equal sum in July. But there was some administrative delay in this, and it was not until the end of March 1801 that the payments were established on a regular footing. On 12 June 1801 we find Henry being billed for the engraving of two dies, 'on one the figure of St Michael the Archangel, on the other a ship floating on the sea'; also 123 flans, 100 Touch-Pieces, and 3 oz. of silver. This is one of several extant bills for the period 1801-3, which also include other medallic items. They are reproduced in Appendix J. The bills were submitted by Giovanni Hamerani, who styled himself 'Incisore camerale'. His elder brother who had held the office since 1794 had presumably died earlier in the year. Further supplies of the Touch-Pieces were made, 122 in August, 300 in May 1802,
and 300 in September 1803. It would seem from these regular quantities that the
demand for the Royal Touch had grown considerably since the first year of Henry’s
‘reign’.

The 3 oz. of silver bought on the first of these accounts would not have been enough
to make the first hundred Touch-Pieces. The single available specimen weighs 50 gr.
We must assume that the cardinal’s account was a running one. There may have been
other bills during the period which have not survived. The cost of the dies is small—
about £4. 5s. is the contemporary equivalent.

It is reasonable to equate HIX O3/R3 (Pls. III, IV, 22, 34) with these new Touch-
Pieces, and to go further and suggest that they were engraved not by Giovanni but by
Mercandetti. Although copied from the earlier pieces the style is very different and the
workmanship superior.

The ship is more realistic—though it cannot be identified. It has a different stern; the
shrouds are visible on the outside of the hull, and the channel where they are attached
is shown in some detail. The gun ports are more numerous and are represented
by squares, with pellets inside alternate ones to indicate the muzzles of the guns.
While less elaborate, the detail of the rigging is reminiscent of the early Touch-
Pieces of Charles II. Again the initial H for Henry is unbarred, but this time the
other H in the legend is not, so that the missing bar would appear to be quite deliberate,
the letter being made up of two is placed together. On the reverse we have a some-
what emaciated angel with rather exaggerated wings. The dragon is little more than
a pattern of ribs and scales; its mouth is open and its barbed tongue thrust out. On
both sides the beaded border has been replaced by one of radial lines between two
circles.

A closely related piece is the gold one HIX O3a/R3a (Pls. III, IV, 23, 35) which is
from an identical pair of dies. The only difference being a raised edge instead of the
radial border. In addition to the gold piece illustrated, two other specimens from
the same dies are known, one in silver and one in copper, both of which are in the
Wellcome Museum. All three are unpierced and show no signs of wear. The relief is
much deeper and sharper than on any of the earlier Touch-Pieces, and it is particularly
noticable that there is a considerable amount of detail within the wind-filled sails.
Without these specimens it would have been impossible to build a proper description of
the worn silver piece HIX O3/R3.

Miss Farquhar mentioned, but did not describe, ‘a hard and unpleasing little jetton
which exists in three metals, although but rarely in gold’.17 She had herself seen
specimens in silver and bronze, but she did not state how many, and she had only been
told of one in gold: all were unpierced. She thought they might have been mid-
nineteenth-century souvenirs. Almost certainly her ‘jettons’ can be equated with
O3A/R3A. Unfortunately she had no opportunity of placing a ‘jetton’ against a
specimen of O3/R3, which she did describe, otherwise she would surely have noticed
the relationship.

Writing in *The Lancet* (27 June 1914) Dr F. Parkes-Weber described one of these
‘jettons’ in the Wellcome Museum:18 dismissing it as ‘probably an early modern

---

18 The copper ‘jetton’ was acquired by the museum, together with several pierced Touch-Pieces, at the sale of
the John Hodgkin collection (Sotheby, 22–3 April 1914, lot 125). The silver ‘jetton’ was a separate acquisition.
impression, either from original dies very much "touched up" or from dies made in imitation of original ones.'

He adds, 'I believe that, at least up to 1870, visitors could obtain impressions, at fixed charges, from medallic dies preserved at the Papal Mint at Rome, and that when the dies of interesting and much sought for medals became worn out they were frequently replaced by copies.'

The theory that these 'jettons' could have been later souvenirs is not really tenable. Had that been the case one could expect them to be tolerably common and to turn up from time to time in worn condition. The Hamerani medallion of 1788, for which five pairs of dies can be identified, is quite common. There are many specimens struck from dies showing considerable degrees of rust. At least one mule exists with the obverse of Cropanese's 1766 medallion and the reverse of Hamerani's. It too is struck from dies that were badly worn and rusty. These medallions must have been struck over a long period and some may well have been sold as souvenirs after the cardinal's death. In contrast even his commoner Touch-Pieces are rare, and the 'jettons' and the silver Touch-Pieces (HIX O3/R3) are very rare indeed.

All three of the 'jettons' show the same double striking of certain of the letters in the obverse legend. The displacement of the double striking is not constant and must therefore have occurred when the individual characters were being punched into the die. Although very worn there is still some evidence of this double striking on the used Touch-Piece (HIX O3/R3). The usual step has of course disappeared completely through wear and the letters are almost flat. But one character in particular—the letter R—still shows elements of both strikings where the deeper one was displaced upwards and to the right. The inside serif of the vertical stroke of the R belongs to the deeper striking (marked A in the photograph, Pl. III, 17), while what remains of the tail of the letter (marked B) clearly belongs to the shallower striking.

From the accounts rendered by Giovanni Hamerani (Appendix J) the idea cannot be excluded that Henry used both silver and copper Touch-Pieces, or debased silver ones, after 1800. The copper piece illustrated on Plates III and IV, nos. 20 and 32 is of the type HIX O1/R1. Could this mean that it was this type that was made in 1801 and that the 'jettons' and their associated Touch-Pieces, HIX O3/R3, were made in 1788? Stylistic evidence suggests not. It is more probable that the continuity of style would have been carried on in 1788 and the change made on the return from the exile of 1798–1801. Giovanni is credited with very little work of his own and new Touch-Pieces were being made very shortly after the death of his brother: Mercandetti is the most obvious candidate, and the most likely to have introduced a new style.

The 'jettons' can be explained if we regard them as specimens submitted by a new engraver who had made a pair of dies without the traditional borders and offered the new style Touch-Piece struck in a collar for approval. That approval not being forthcoming, puncheons were raised from the dies and new dies sunk, this time with added borders, and used to strike the more familiar style of Touch-Piece without a collar. This sequence of events might also account for the apparently low cost of making the dies. The engraving and the striking of the specimens being charged on an earlier account and the charge of 20 scudi on the invoice for June 1801 being only the cost of sinking the new dies.

Henry, Cardinal Duke of York, died at Frascati after an illness of four days'
duration on 13 July 1807. He was laid to rest in the crypt of St. Peter's beside his parents and his brother. With his death the story of the Touch-Piece comes to an end, and a practice that had endured for almost eight hundred years passes into history. But the belief that had sustained it was slow to die out completely, and the faith lingered on in places even into the twentieth century.

Touching for the King's Evil began with kings who were also priests: it ended with a priest who became a titular king.

APPENDIX G

THE SILVER TOUCH-PIECES OF JAMES II

Two pairs of dies are known, with no recorded cross-pairing.

Obverse 1. Ship, The Prince a first-rater, sailing away from left to right, with a following wind. Sails set are spritsail, the foresail and foretopsail, maintopsail and mizzentopsail. Flags are worn at each masthead, at the Jack-staff, and the stern. The Royal Standard, the Admiralty Flag, and St George's are clearly distinguishable. There is a pennant at the foremast.

Legend: IAC.II.D.G.M.B.F. ET.H.REX.
(Note: there is no stop after REX. The ship sits rather high on the medalet and the mainmast and standard cut into the line of the legend at the top)

Reverse 1. St. Michael standing, both feet on the dragon. His lance, thrust through the beast’s open mouth, the point projecting at the back of its neck. The dragon’s barbed tongue is thrust out and two teeth are visible. The top of the lance forms a cross patee.

Legend: SOLI . DEO . GLORIA.
(Note: The stop after DEO touches the cross of the lance)

Obverse 2. Ship as O1, but sitting lower so that the mainmast and standard are below the line of the legend. The transom is differently decorated, and there are minor differences in the rigging.

Legend: IAC.II.D.G.M.B.F.ET.H.REX.
(Note: The space between F. and ET is greatly reduced, and there is now a stop after REX)

Reverse 2. As R1, but the legend is differently spaced and the stop after DEO is separate from the cross of the lance. The dragon’s tongue is missing. There is a slight difference in the feather pattern on the angel’s right wing.

Comparative measurements of two unpierced specimens of O1/R1 and O2/R2 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Over-all Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diameter thickness (grains)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1/R1</td>
<td>19.72 mm 0.7 mm 23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2/R2</td>
<td>19.02 mm 0.67 mm 21.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX H

THE FRENCH-MADE SILVER TOUCH-PIECES OF JAMES III

Two silver Touch-Pieces were made for James III and VIII in France, one with his English title and one with his Scottish.

English

Obverse. Ship The Prince, sailing away from left to right with a following breeze. Flags are worn at each masthead, at Jack-staff, and stern.

(Note: An Arabic figure has been used. The flags are empty rectangles devoid of any detail. The hull of the ship is from the same puncheon as JII O2.)

Reverse. St. Michael and the dragon from the same puncheon as JII R2.
Legend: SOLI. DEO. GLORIA.

Scottish
Obverse. Ship The Prince similar to English obverse. Hull from same puncheon, but remainder of vessel engraved with slight differences in angles and proportions.
Legend: IAC. B. D. G. M. B. E. T. H. R. E. X.
(Note: Use of Arabic figure)

Reverse. From same die as English reverse, above.

The dimensions of the Scottish piece in the Ashmolean Museum and an English piece in comparable condition are as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean diameter</th>
<th>Over-all thickness</th>
<th>Diameter of hole</th>
<th>Weight (grains)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>19.2 mm</td>
<td>0.75 mm</td>
<td>1.4 mm</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>19.2 mm</td>
<td>0.75 mm</td>
<td>1.5 mm</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX I**

THE ITALIAN-MADE SILVER TOUCH-PIECES

Obverse. A ship sailing away from left to right against the wind. Mainsail and topsail on foremast, topsails only on main- and mizzen-masts, sprit sail. Flags worn at all mastheads, on Jack-staff, and at stern. All gun ports are square.

Reverse. St. Michael standing with left foot on the dragon. Right foot on the ground beside the beast’s head which lies to the left; its barbed tail curls upwards to the right. The lance is poised about to enter the dragon’s mouth which is open with the tongue out.

These descriptions are general for all the Italian-made Touch-Pieces. Variations that distinguish the dies are noted below.

**James III**

Obverse 1. A single gun port forward of the foremast; three more between fore- and main-masts; four between main and mizzen, with three above. Mizzen yard terminates in a bead. Legend: IAC. III. D. G. M. B. E. T. H. R. E. X.

Obverse 2. Two gun ports between fore- and main-masts, unsymmetrically placed; four between main and mizzen, with three above. Mizzen yard terminates in a bead. Legend: IAC. III. D. G. M. B. E. T. H. R.

Obverse 3. Two gun ports between fore- and main-masts, with a stop between them; four between main and mizzen, with three above unequally spaced. Mizzen yard terminates in a sharp point. Legend: IAC. III. D. G. M. B. E. T. H. R.
Obverse 4. Two gun ports between fore- and main-masts, symmetrically placed; four between main and mizzen, with three above, right one being shaped like a question mark. Mizzen yard terminates in a bead. Legend: IAC.III.D.G.M. B.F.ET.H.R.

Reverse 1. Three stops in legend. Angel's wings have shallow curves each side of head. Right wing rises higher than left. The barb on dragon's tail is well defined and symmetrical.

Reverse 2. No stops in legend. Wing curves each side of head are more pronounced. Wings rise to equal heights. A flaw across angel's left leg extends across the calf, his lance and the lower part of his garment.

Reverse 3. No stops in legend. No leg flaw. The spread of the wings is greater and the left one is more pointed at the top. Lance is slightly longer.

Reverse 4. Stop after SOLI. Further slight difference in the spread of the wings. On the right-wing the short fifth feather closest to the body is ill defined.

Reverse 5. No stops in legend. The top of the left wing is blunter, with less of an inside curve than R2 and R3. The right wing is longer and rises higher.

Die-linkages and frequencies of 22 available specimens were:

\[
\begin{align*}
O1 &= R1 \times 11 \\
O2 &= R2 \times 7 \\
O2 &= R3 \times 2 \\
O3 &= R3 \times 1 \\
O4 &= R4 \times 1
\end{align*}
\]

Charles III

Obverse 1. On lower deck, 2 ports between fore- and main-masts, 4 ports between main- and mizzen-masts. Under poop deck, 3 ports. All ports are square.

Legend: CAR.III. D.G.M.B.F.ET.H.R.

There is no break in the inscription for piercing, but rather too much space has been left between ET. and H. The stop after R is close to the edge of the sail under the bowsprit.

Obverse 2. The same arrangement of ports appears on the hull as on O1 above, but a different puncheon has been used. There are two die flaws: one forms a pellet under the furled sail on the main yard, slightly right of centre, the other a pellet slightly below centre on the port side shrouds.

Legend: CAR.III.D.G.M.F.ET.H.R.

The inscription is more evenly spaced than on O1 above. The stop after R is well spaced from the sail under the bowsprit.

Reverse 1. The same die has been used as JIII R5.

Legend: SOLI DEO GLORIA

Reverse 2. St. Michael's wings have deeper re-entrant curves each side of his head, and the left wing curves outwards where R1 has been straight. A die flaw links the L of SOLI to the beaded border, and another links the S of SOLI to St. Michael's right ankle.

Legend: SOLI DEO GLORIA

Henry IX

Obverse 1. There are five ports on the lower deck and one under the poop-deck. They are annulate, and are not spaced to avoid the shrouds. The mainmast points directly to the stop after ET. The stop after TVSC is level with, but clear of, the point of the spritsail.

Legend: II.IX.D.G.M.B.F.E.T.II.R.C.E.P.TVSC.

The beaded border is wider than on previous pieces.

Obverse 2. The ship has been copied, but with shorter masts, and a more upright bowsprit. Such ports as are visible are formed by pellets.

Legend: - IX . D.G.M.B.F. - T.i(?) — TVSC.

The inscription is badly aligned, especially at the top. The C of TVSC falls within the curve of the spritsail. The piece has no border.
Obverse 3. The ship has been redrawn with more accuracy and nautical detail. There is more rigging and the lines are sharper. The shrouds are carried down to channels on the outside of the hull. The ports are indicated by a row of squares along the line of the lower deck, with each alternate square filled with a pellet. The sea is formed with small choppy waves.

Legend: II.IX.D.G.M.B.F.E.T.H.R.C.E.P.TVSC
There is no stop after TVSC. The mainmast points to the T of et. The usual beaded border is replaced by a border of radial lines between two circles.

Obverse 3A. Identical with 3 and from the same die but without the border.

Reverse 1. The figures of St. Michael and the Dragon are from the same puncheon as C III R1. and JIII. R5.

Legend: SOLI DEO GLORIA
The L and I of SOLI are badly aligned.

Reverse 2. St. Michael is shorter and squatter than usual, with his legs spread rather wide apart. His head appears very low on the piece. His wings are long and narrow and the feathers are drawn with chevron-shaped strokes. The dragon’s wings are scaled with a honeycomb pattern instead of an underlying skeletal structure.

Legend: SOLI — GLORIA
(The A of GLORIA appears to be unbarred.) The piece has no border.

Reverse 3. St. Michael is tall and skinny with thin arms and legs and a long neck that almost disappears. The wings are high, coming down to long points. The dragon’s mouth is open; its tongue is out, but not barbed; its ribs are clearly showing.

Legend: SOLI DEO GLORIA
The border, as on the obverse, consists of radial lines contained between two circles.

Reverse 3A. Identical with 3 and from the same die, but without the border.

APPENDIX J
ACCOUNTS FOR THE MAKING OF TOUCH-PIECES
1801-1803

(These accounts are included by kind permission of the Right Reverend Mervyn Alexander, DD, Bishop of Clifton. My thanks are also due to Mr Michael Sharp who led me to the finding of them, and to Mr J. G. Pollard who helped me in their understanding. N.W.)

1
Account 12 June 1801*
The engraving and striking of medals by me Giovanni Hamerani, Staff Engraver in the service of His Royal Highness the Most Reverend Signor Cardinal Duke of York as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>Ba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dies cut, on one the figure of St. Michael the Archangel, on the other a ship floating on the sea</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Medalets for the scrofula at 10 each</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Blanks, filed, blanched complete except for being annealed at 7½ each</td>
<td>9 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. 3 Ounces of silver of 11:21 good quality at 1:16 the ounce | 3 48 |

* The account is rendered in scudi and baiocchi. 1 scudo = 100 baiocchi.
Only on this account is a charge shown for the preparation of blanks. The total cost of producing each Touch-Piece (excluding the cost of the dies, and without the metal) came to 17½ baiocchi. The only available specimen of these Touch-Pieces weighs 50 gr (English) or 66 gr (Roman) and the cost of the silver would therefore have been just over 13 baiocchi, making the total cost of each piece 31 baiocchi or Is. 3½d. in English money of the time.
I the undersigned have received from Signor Giuseppe Agitati Treasurer to S A R the Most Reverend Signor Cardinal Duke of York 39 scudi in current money and 3 scudi 48 in silver money to which I give my hand on 12 June 1801.

Giovanni Hamerani Incisore Camerale

On reverse (presumably in the hand of the Treasurer)
3:48 in fine money which is calculated at 1:42½ per scudo formena
4 95½
39 —
43 95½

2
I the undersigned have received 3 scudi worn money from Signor Giuseppe Agitati, Treasurer to S A R the Most Reverend Signor Cardinal Duke of York for having only struck 122 medalets for the scrofula to which I give my hand 4 August 1801.
I say 3: 05 in worn money.

Giovanni Hamerani Incisore Camerale

Note. From the evidence of the previous account we would expect the striking of 122 medalets to have cost 12: 20 scudi. Possibly this was only part payment and there may have been a previous bill that included the cost of preparing the blanks.

3
Account 15 May 1802
The striking of medals made by me Giovanni Hamerani Papal Engraver in the service of S A R the Most Reverend Signor Cardinal Duke of York as follows

One pound and two ounces of silver of 11: 20 good quality at 13: 92 the pound
Two pounds four ounces of copper for alloy(ing?)
No. 300 medalets for the scrofula struck at 10 each one made
That is piastre

I the undersigned, have received from Signor Giuseppe Agitati Treasurer to S A R the Most Reverend Signor Cardinal Duke of York, the amount described in the above account in the sum of 46 piastre 56 to which I give my hand 15 May 1802

Giovanni Hamerani Papal Engraver

( ? ) seven scudi on account of the amount for making the ( ? ) medalets ( ? ) 39 scudi 56 in fine money ( ? )

Giovanni Hamerani

On reverse
To Giovanni Amerani
39: 56 in moneta reale(?) which is calculated at 1: 60 per scudo formano

Notes. The charge for copper would appear to be very cheap. The price in England was about 2s. per pound (of 16 oz.) against 5s. 2d. an ounce for silver. The scudo was reckoned at approximately 4s. 3d. so that Hamerani was paying about 5s. an ounce for silver and about 7d. a pound (of 12 oz.) for this lot of copper.

The quantity of silver bought would have made about 120 Touch-Pieces of 50 gr (English) each. The Touch-Pieces, of both types, appear to be of high quality silver with specific weights in excess of 10 gm per cm². The purchase of so much copper is puzzling unless it was for use in striking other medals. It is unlikely that the cardinal, whose fortunes were now restored, would have issued base-metal Touch-Pieces alongside silver ones at this time.
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Account 26 September 1803

The striking of medals by me Giovanni Hamerani Staff and Papal Engraver in the service of His Royal Highness His Eminence Signor Cardinal Duke of York as follows

No. 6 Small papal medals (?) in silver of 11:20 good quality of weight 2:18:12* at 1:15 the ounce

Making the medals at 50 each

No. 6 aforesaid medium size for prizes at the Capitol of weight 10:21 at 1:15 the ounce

Making the medals at 1:50 each

For the composition of medalets for the scrofula silver from carlinos 1 pound 2 ounces at 12:60 the pound

For the aforesaid medals 2 pounds 4 ounces copper at 30 the pound

Making as usual 300 medalets for scrofula at 10 baiocchi each

I the undersigned have received from Signor Agitati scudo seventy (—) money in balance of the above account to which I give my hand 8 October 1803

Giovanni Hamerani Incisore Pontificio

*2 ounces 18 denari (or scrupoli) 12 oboli

On reverse

To Hamerani

72—

Notes. The price of the copper this time is more reasonable. It is difficult to get away from the implication here that the copper was being used, at least in part, for making Touch-Pieces.

In this account, and the next, Hamerani addresses the Cardinal Duke as ‘Eminence’. In September 1803 his friend Cardinal Albani, Dean of the Sacred College and Bishop of Ostia and Velletri, had died. In consequence the office and the See devolved on Henry as the senior cardinal.
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Account 8 October 1803

The engraving by me Giovanni Hamerani Staff Engraver in the service of His Royal Highness His Eminence Signor Cardinal Duke of York as follows

Seal of office engraved with the coat of arms of His Highness as agreed

Three lesser (seals) of office as above at 8 each as agreed

Two (seals) of the third size at 5 each as agreed

I the undersigned have received from Signor Giuseppe Agitati scudi forty-two money in soldi described in the above account to which I give my hand 8 October 1803

Giovanni Hamerani

Note. The Cardinal Duke’s new office called for new seals. He displayed the royal arms. He was formally translated to the superior See on 20 November 1803.
AND THE KING'S EVIL

« Conto 17 Giugno 1401 »

Di grazioni e donazioni di Madrepore fatta da ma Giovanni Amerani
Infante Comemate per inviamento di S.A. Duca de Bardi. Il def. C.
Duc de Bardi come in appresso

Sono stati ricevuti in un soleggiato del Mercoledì, nell'altare una Nave di Marzo in mezzo al fiore

Sono Madrepore della crescia che è del Lun

Sono state date in mense e onorificenze non ne mancando alcuno che di

opere messe sotto al Terzo de S. Luca

Sono state al giorno della bolla di coverenzi che a 7:16 P.M.

Sono stati ricevuti dal Sig. Giorgio Agostì Teoccles

Sono state unite a Santa Maria e Santa Lavinia di Monteforte e Sandona

in Monte d'Argento in fede e giure del 17 giugno 1401.

Gio. Amerani

— A.D.'d. Lug. 1801 —

A. D. Amerani — — — — — — 43:95 ½

— 3.10 in man fond, che ragguaggia 2 — 1:48 ½ per

— denaro formato — — — — — — — 4:95 ½

E poi' rapporti di mia cort. — — — — — — — 3.9

— 43:95 ½
Account 4 August 1801
Account 15 May 1801

Conto del 15 Maggio 1802

A conti di: 

Giuseppe Antonio Giovanni Matteo Reuni 

Il 10 giugno 1802 

Due libri e due danari di Augusto della Ricerca di Pistoia 

Le libbre importa 

18.24

Firra due, danari quattro d'oro per lega importa 

52

3630 Modena l'anno d'oro importa che si dà l'una di frà 

va importa

vero P' 

48.53

Si dichiara che viaggiati dal sopracitato Giuseppe Antonio Giovanni Matteo Reuni 

il Signor L. B. di Pistoia importo del sopradetto conte alla somma di P' Essequia e con il 25 d'oro 

in forte di questo di 18 Maggio 1802 — Giovanni Matteo Antonio Giovanni Matteo Reuni

Che avuto fanno 

la somma della somma delle cattive delle Madre 

che restano 

la somma che si riconosce e si dichiara 

che si riceve dal 

1. B. Agnati Giovanni Matteo

—

A D. 15 Maggio 1802 —

L. Giovanni Agnati — — — —

Account 15 May 1801
Account 26 September 1803
Account 8 October 1803
PLATE II. French-made Touch-Pieces
1 Silver Touch-Piece of James II. O1/R1
2 Silver Touch-Piece of James II. O2/R2
3 Illustration of James II Touch-Piece in Pembroke collection
4 Touch-Piece of James 3
5 Touch-Piece of James 8
6 Unfinished puncheon of a ship (for a Touch-Piece?). Hocking 108
7 Detail of ship on Peace of Breda medal by John Roettier
8 The Prince
9 Detail of The Prince on Norbert Roettier's medal of 1697
10 Detail of characters on IAC 3 and 8 and JII O2
11 Detail of characters on IAC 3 and 8

PLATE III. Italian-made Touch-Pieces—obverses
12 Touch-Piece of James III. O1
13 Touch-Piece of James III. O2
14 Touch-Piece of James III. O3
15 Touch-Piece of James III. O4

PLATE IV. Italian-made Touch-Pieces—reverses
16 Touch-Piece of Charles III. O1
17 Double striking on HIX. O3a and O3
18 Touch-Piece of Charles III. O2
19 Touch-Piece of Henry IX. O1
20 Copper Touch-Piece of Henry IX. O1
21 Silver Touch-Piece of Henry IX. O2
22 Touch-Piece of Henry IX. O3
23 Gold 'Jetton' of Henry IX. O3a
24 Touch-Piece of James III. R1
25 Touch-Piece of James III. R2 (leg flaw)
26 Touch-Piece of James III. R3
27 Touch-Piece of James III. R4
28 Touch-Piece of James III. R5
29 Touch-Piece of Charles III. R1
30 Touch-Piece of Charles III. R2
31 Touch-Piece of Henry IX. R1
32 Copper Touch-Piece of Henry IX. R1
33 Silver Touch-Piece of Henry IX. R2
34 Touch-Piece of Henry IX. R3
35 Gold 'Jetton' of Henry IX. R3a
WOOLF: TOUCH PIECES (Touch pieces x 2)
WOOLF: TOUCH PIECES (Touch pieces x 2)
WOOLF: TOUCH PIECES (Touch pieces × 2)