IX.—*Some further Notice of the Diamond Signet of Henrietta Maria, queen of Charles I. ; of the King's Diamond ; and of the Sapphire Signet believed to be that of Mary Queen of William III.* By C. DRURY E. FORTNUM, V.P.S.A.

Read January 28, 1886.

ON the 20th November, 1880, I had the honour of exhibiting to the Society at their meeting the diamond signet, engraved by order of King Charles I., with “o^{re} Armes” and with the “ires of the name of o^r deerest Consort the Queene on each side,” and of reading some descriptive and other notes on this interesting historical relic.

In those notes I endeavoured, as much as possible, to record all the facts I was then able to gather touching the history of this costly gem—the record for the payment in 1628 (o.s.) of £267^a to Francis Walwyn for his workmanship thereon, still existing in the Public Record Office. These notes were published in *Archaeologia*, Vol. XLVII. p. 393.

Through the kind communication of my friend Mr. Albert Hartshorne, one of our Fellows, I am now enabled to offer some additional and interesting facts in the signet's history.

“On casually looking over some letters from Douce to my grandfather,” he writes, “my eye caught sight of the sketch of the diamond signet. I think the extracts I am now tempted to send you will, if they do no more, fill up a gap in its history.”

Extract from a letter from Francis Douce to Thomas Kerrich :—

Charlotte Street, 16th June, 1817.

. “Your comparison to your father's seal prompts me to mention a seal of a different kind that has been the subject of much conversation

^a Equal to nearly £1,100 of present value.

among some of the antiquaries and virtuosos, and still remains an unsolved enigma. It is a diamond signet ring said to have belonged to Mary Queen of Scots. It is to be sold by auction next week for whatever it will fetch, having been already more than once bought in. When I say a diamond signet I mean that it bears the arms of France and England in the 1 and 4 quarters, those of Scotland in the 2nd, and of Ireland in the 3rd, engraved on a table diamond."

From the same to the same (Extract).

" 20th June, 1817.

"Curiosity led me yesterday of the M. Q. Scots diamond ring that I mentioned in my last. After a Christean historical flourish from Rapin and Henault, it was knocked down to the happy purchaser for 86 guineas; the diamond being worth about 10 of them. In the mean time and before I wrote my last I had discovered that this signet was that of Queen Henrietta Maria. The letters which I then purposely gave you as **M. R.** as they had been seen by the inspectors of the ring, stood actually thus **M R.**^a The cross stroke for the **H**^b is certainly not visible to common eyes unassisted by a glass, but it is as much there as my pen is now in my hand. I have a duplicate impression, which I would have inclosed in this letter but for the double postage. So much then for this seal. I must however tell you that on the impression I have of Lord Buchan's seal, and which he swears by all that is holy was that of Mary Q. of Scots, the cross stroke is not to be found. I find there is also another in the Signet Office at Edinburgh, of which the late Mr. Edwards's lady, who supposes herself a model of the Scottish Queen, has procured an impression and caused a seal to be cut from it, with which she seals

^a By an unfortunate error at p. 395 of my former paper this monogram was wrongly printed **M** instead of **M** as it is seen on the diamond.

^b This monogram occurs on a silver *jetton* in the possession of the President of our Society. On it two shields are represented conjunctly and beneath one royal crown; on the dexter are the Arms of England; on the sinister are those of France; beneath is the barred **M** crowned, on either side of which is a laurel spray. The surrounding legend reads **HENR · MAR · BORBON · D. G. MAG · BRIT · FRAN · ET · HIB · REG.**

On the reverse a flowering tree—a rose?—is represented rising and spreading above cypress, cedar, laurel, and other trees; the sea, on which are ships, is seen in the distance. The motto surrounding **SVPEREMINET · OMNES** explains this device.

This *jetton* is referred to by Mr. Syer Cuming as figured in Pinkerton's *Medallic History*, plate 15, and noted in my former paper at page 395.

her letters. What if these should turn out to be the signet of Mary the wife of William III.? for if they do not the difficulty about the arms remains. I will probe this matter to the bottom and examine, if there be any, the seals on the letters of the 3 maries."

These letters help materially to fill in the *hiatus* of the signet's history between the time of Astle's paper in 1792, where he states, "this seal is in the French king's collection at Paris," and the exhibition at Holyrood in 1843. By them we have direct evidence of the engraved diamond being sold by auction in June 1817, some twelve years previous to Earl David Buchan's death, who then, it would seem, was still in possession of a signet which he persisted in believing to be that of Queen Mary. Unfortunately, no mention is made of the form and ornamentation of the mounting of the diamond, more than Douce's statement, that it was "a diamond signet ring" in "gold setting;" and, what is still more to be regretted, the material of that other signet, then in Earl Buchan's possession, is not stated. In regard to the latter we have, however, the evidence of a letter from Monsignore Searle (communicated to me by Dr. Munk), that the signet formerly belonging to Cardinal Wiseman was a "ruby;" that it was given to the Cardinal by the Misses Nutt; and was that formerly in the possession of Earl Buchan.

Dr. Munk writes:—

"40, Finsbury Square, E.C.

"Dec. 6th, 1880.

"MY DEAR SIR,

"My friend, Mons. Searle, for many years private secretary to the late Cardinal Wiseman, writes to me as follows:—

" 'At as early a moment as possible I reply to your inquiries about the signet ring.

" 'The one that was in Cardinal Wiseman's possession was given to his late eminence by the Misses Nutt,^a and, thinking to make the present "nicer," they had the stone removed from its setting, and reset as a modern ring. This was the one in the collection of the late Earl of Buchan, and was a *ruby*, not a *diamond*; it is still in the possession of the Cardinal of Westminster.

" 'In the summer of 1843 I was in Edinburgh, and saw, among the treasures of Holyrood, the "signet ring of Mary Queen of Scots, from the collection of the

^a Purchased for them, as I have since learned, by a person named Harris, their brother's tutor. (C. D. E. F.)

late Earl of Buchan;” and facsimiles of the seal in glass were sold to the tourists at the palace. I bought one, and with the then purchase seal this letter, as well as enclose another impression. When in Cardinal Wiseman’s collection it was shown to Mr. Turnbull of Edinburgh, who called attention to the cypher H.M. blended **M** and said it was the cypher of Henrietta Maria Queen of Charles I. *Some time* before Cardinal Wiseman’s death Mr. E. Waterton, the ring collector, called on me and said he wished for my assistance to find out *who* had got the signet ring in question, he having ascertained from the dealers in antiques, &c. that it had passed into the hands of some Catholic ladies, and that there his information ceased. I answered him by going up stairs and bringing him down the relic; and by assuring him that it was not to be added to his collection. So much for the history of the ring, as known to myself.”

“Mons. Searle adds, in a P.S. in reference it will be seen to the ring in your possession and the glass copies of it :

“‘The exhibition of the original at Holy Rood in 1843 can be readily ascertained; my facsimile was bought there, and has never been out of my possession.’

“These particulars will doubtless interest you. They show that your signet was not in the Cardinal’s possession; but that it was at Holy Rood in 1843, and that it, or its glass facsimile, was recognised years ago as pertaining to Henrietta Maria.

“ Believe me,

“ Yours very truly,

“ Drury Fortnum, Esq., F.S.A.,
&c. &c.”

“ W. MUNK.

It would thus appear that in 1817 there were two signets; one then in Lord Buchan’s hands, and believed to be the “ruby” given subsequently to Cardinal Wiseman; and the diamond sold by auction under Mr. Douce’s eye. That keen antiquary in his second letter says, he will “probe this matter to the bottom;” and Mr. Hartshorne, having in his possession much of Douce’s correspondence with Mr. Kerrich, kindly took the trouble to look through it, but, unfortunately, found “no further mention of the seal.”

The Douce papers at Oxford are chiefly historical MSS.; of his private correspondence there is none, and I am indebted to my friend Mr. Arthur Evans for looking them over and vainly searching for further information. It would appear, however, from Mr. Douce’s will, “that his note books and other MS. collections, presumably containing his private letters, were left to the British

Museum, in a chest to be opened in the year 1900." In that chest, therefore, it is not unlikely that the result of his further research in the matter, if ever made, may be preserved.

The question immediately arises, what was the signet possessed by Lord Buchan, if it were not this diamond? and how came it that the glass copies sold at Holyrood, as made from that in the late earl's collection, correspond so accurately with the diamond signet which is the main subject of our inquiry?

It is a curious fact that, although the Earl of Buchan was the original founder and ardent supporter of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, a liberal donor of objects to their museum, and a constant contributor to their proceedings, no mention is to be found in the volumes of *Archæologia Scotica*, from its commencement to the notice of his death, of the signet in his possession which he believed to be that of Queen Mary, and which we are led to believe was exhibited at Holyrood in 1843, and which, it is said, subsequently passed into the hands of Cardinal Wiseman.

By the courteous permission of His Eminence Cardinal Manning, in whose keeping, at the archbishop's house at Westminster, the reputed ruby signet, presented by the Misses Nutt to the late Cardinal Wiseman, now remains, I have had an opportunity of carefully examining it, in company with Professor A. H. Church. There can be no doubt that it is a copy in red glass taken from Henrietta Maria's diamond. The intaglio is poor, and evidently moulded, the cross-bar of the **M** being but weakly indicated, though unquestionably there; in fact, it is a red replica of one of the Holyrood pastes, set in a heavy, plain, man's ring.

This examination removes one pretender to the royal line of those we thought might be original and rival signets. Our diamond and Miss Hartshorne's sapphire yet remain.

It seems to me probable that some of the glass copies of the diamond had been taken long before its sale by auction in 1817.^a That of these earlier glass copies one, of red colour, had been imposed upon Lord Buchan, who believed that he had acquired Queen Mary's signet. If so, it may well have been that exhibited in 1843, after his death, and casts taken from it would yield glass copies equal in sharpness to those sold to visitors at Holyrood.

^a Tassie, the well-known maker of glass pastes from the antique, &c. may have been the author of some of these. In 1783 he made a cameo portrait of the Earl of Buchan.

It is stated that one Bulters, an old engraver at Edinburgh, was the producer of some of the copies engraved on hard stones.

We may also presume that Douce, although possessing a (perhaps imperfect) impression, had not, at the time he wrote those letters, had an opportunity of examining Lord Buchan's seal-ring, or, if it were really that subsequently acquired by the Misses Nutt, so shrewd an observer could hardly have passed it as a real stone.

It is also possible that the hearsay evidence of the enamelled gold setting of the diamond having been made for the Duke of Brunswick is incorrect, and that it may have been sold in that setting in 1817, for Douce and the catalogue both state it was a diamond signet-ring, and of gold. This setting was evidently made to enhance its interest and value by bearing the initials and emblems of the Scottish queen.

To return to our history. Acting upon Douce's information as to date, on making inquiry of Messrs. Christie, Manson, and Woods, at whose house it seemed probable that the signet had been sold, with their courteous assistance, I have had the satisfaction of finding the sale Catalogue of the 19th June, 1817, in which the diamond is fully described, but wrongly attributed to Mary Queen of Scots.

The following is a copy of the Catalogue title and of the description of the lot :—

A Catalogue
Of the following valuable articles
viz^t
The original diamond signet ring
of
Mary Queen of Scots
Engraved with the arms of England
Scotland and Ireland quartered
as also
A few Books and prints
of the late
Barrington Pope Blachford Esq^{re}.
which will be sold by Auction
(by order of the Executors) by
Mr. Christie
at his great room Pall mall
on Thursday 19 June 1817
at three o'clock.

Lot 7. The original diamond ring of Mary Queen of Scots *upon which are engraved the arms of England Scotland and Ireland quartered*, and of which the following well-authenticated history

was communicated by that correct and learned antiquary the late Richard Gough Esqr. as cited in letter from — Brooke Esqr. to Miss Martha Browne which will be delivered to the purchaser.

“That it descended from Mary to her grandchild Charles I. who gave it on the scaffold to Arch Bishop Juxon for his son Charles II. who in his troubles pawned it in Holland for £300 where it was bought by Governor Yale and sold at his sale for £320 supposed for the Pretender. Afterwards it came into possession of the Earl of Ilay, Duke of Argyle & probably from him to Mr Blachford.

“This seal-ring appears to have furnished evidence that was fatal to Mary Queen of Scots.”

[Bought by Dr. Curry, 90*l.* 6*s.*]

The signet was purchased by a Dr. Curry, probably James Curry, M.D., born at Antrim, 13th September, 1784. He was a licentiate of the College of Physicians of London and physician to Guy's Hospital. He died on 26th November, 1819.

It was probably sold again at Christie's after Dr. Curry's death, and then bought, as stated in my former paper, by one Van Prague.

I may here record two other seal-stones, or pastes, which have not been before referred to, having the royal arms between the letters **M** and **R**, with the cross-bar to the first letter.

A signet-ring set in gold, belonging to the Rev. W. Bentinck Hawkins. On this the cutting is flat, evidently copied, but differing in the form of the crown and otherwise from the diamond, apparently on hard stone (crystal or white topaz?). The **M** is barred. The form of the shield also differs from Mr. Franks', on which the cutting is more concave.

Another, seemingly engraved on a crystal (?) foiled to resemble sapphire, and adapted to a setting of the later years of the last century, was sold by auction at Messrs. Sotheby's, on 14th April, 1885 (Lot 101), for 5*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

The correct attribution of our diamond signet by Mr. Douce to Henrietta Maria,^a and the suggestion, so long since as in 1817, that the signets on which the **M** occurs without the cross bar may have been those of Queen Mary II., the wife of William III., are remarkably corroborative of the conclusions to which I had come and which were expressed in my former paper.

It is further remarkable that he refers to another seal in the Signet Office at

^a On a letter of instructions to Mr. Denham, 10th May, 1649, Henrietta Maria signs in a monogram formed of the letter **M**, with **R** on the last limb, and crossed by a bar to form the **H**. *Mus. Brit. Jure Emptionis* 19,399, fo. 72.

Edinburgh, which was copied by her wish for a certain vain lady, Mrs. Edwards, to use as a seal.

Of those signets on which the letter **M** is without the cross-bar, Miss Hartshorne's beautiful ring has every claim to originality as a royal signet, not of Mary Queen of Scots, nor of Henrietta Maria, but, probably, of Mary the Queen of William III.

Of massive fine gold, a half-round hoop, widening to the bezel, on which is a table sapphire of oval form and pale colour, slightly raised, and with faceted back; the shoulders are decorated with a rose of England on its leafy stem, worked in intaglio on the metal, and which has been filled in with enamel, now only showing traces, red on the flower, green on the leaves. The fashion and ornamentation of the ring would almost point to an earlier period than the style of the heraldry engraved would corroborate; there is no doubt however that it is the original setting. Incised on the sapphire is the royal shield between the letters **M**, (without the cross-bar,) and **R**, surmounted by the Queen's open crown.

Could this be the ring referred to by Douce in his letter as being then at the office of the Signet in Edinburgh?^a

Gold signet ring of Mary, queen of William III., in the possession of Miss Hartshorne (full size.)

It is a curious circumstance that almost at the very time when Mr. Hartshorne communicated Douce's letter to me, he purchased, by mere chance, at a jeweller's in Vigo Street, an elegant gold seal set with a red carnelian, engraved with the royal arms, the **M** and **R**; of careful workmanship and of the earlier years of this century.

It is no strain of probability to suggest that this seal may be the copy made by order of the vain Mrs. Edwards from an impression of that in the Signet Office. The cutting is concave, the tinctures indicated by incised lines, the only example

^a Up to 1815 there was a Secretary of State for Scotland, who had possession of the Great Seal, &c. &c. When that office was abolished the clerks (who were lawyers) formed themselves into the "Signet." The Scotch regalia, hidden till 1818, was then placed in the regalia room.

I have seen, and suggesting carefully executed work to order, rather than one made for chance sale; the **M** is without the cross-bar.

Among these imitations or copies, perhaps the most manifest forgery that has come under my observation is one which was foisted upon its present owner, Sir Richard Wallace, under the veil of charity. It is a seal formed of carnelian, of elongated quadrilateral baluster shape; on the square face of one end, placed lozenge-wise, is the royal shield between the plain **M** and **R**, surmounted by the crown; at the other end, on a face of oval form, is the Thistle. Both are deeply incised in a manner clearly indicative of modern work, and the seal was evidently made to be that passed for the seal of the unfortunate Queen Mary.

KING CHARLES' DIAMOND SIGNET.

On searching among the letters written by Charles, when Prince of Wales and when King, which are preserved in the British Museum among the Harleian, Lansdowne, Egerton, and other MSS., some of which are of comparatively recent acquisition, I have been fortunate enough to find a wax impression of the princes' diamond signet, which is preserved among the Queen's private collection of gems at Windsor Castle, and which was figured and described by me in *Archaeologia*, Vol. XLV., p. 26, and again referred to and figured in my former paper on the Henrietta Maria diamond. With it he sealed a letter addressed to his father, King James I., beginning "Dear dad and gossope,"—the wax impression on which is well preserved. There is no date to this letter.

Some of the letters from King Charles I. are sealed with a signet, which I think there is every reason to believe must have been that "diamond seal cut with great curiosity, and fix'd to the Gold Watch by a Gold Chain," referred to by Mr. Herbert as having been temporarily lost by the King at Windsor.^a

Diamond signet of King Charles I. from an impression in the British Museum (full size).

One is a letter to the Earl of Newcastle, dated Oxford, 28 April, 1643. (Harley 6988, fo. 135.) This is sealed with red wax; the impression from a signet of lozenge form, bearing the royal shield between the initial letters C and R. The cutting is very similar in character to that on the queen's, Henrietta Maria, diamond, and is probably the workmanship of the same hand, that of Francis Walwyn, who is recorded as the artist employed by King Charles to cut the signet for his queen. In size it is about similar; the

^a See my former paper, *Archaeologia*, XLVII. p. 407.

form of the shield is somewhat more square, having longer straight sides; the crown differs in form, the surmounting orb and cross being held by four supporting bands which spring from behind the fleurs-de-lis on the circlet or coronal.

This seal occurs again on Harley 6988, fo. 194, with the king's initials.

Again: two impressions on the outside of a letter addressed, "For Mr. Nicholas, one of the Clarkes of my Englishe Councell." (Egerton MS. 2546, fo. 31.)

Again, it is found on a letter from Carisbrook Castle to General Fairfax (Egerton 2618, fo. 21-22), dated 26 Nov. 1647; and on one of the next day's date from Carisbrook to Fairfax. (Egerton 2618, fo. 23-24.)

I have caused a cast to be taken from this, the king's seal, by Mr. Ready, that it may be compared with impressions from the queen's diamond.

Another extremely interesting fact was revealed by an examination of the numerous royal letters in the British Museum, viz. that the same signet was subsequently used, and is to be seen on several of the letters written by Charles II.^a thereby, in part, corroborating the curious statement in Mr. Palmer's MS. Life of Dr. Baldwin Hamsey (see the last page of my former paper), who had presented to Charles II. "on the restoration, a diamond ring on which were curiously cut the arms of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland; and which had cost the doctor 500*l*."

That part of Gough's statement that King Charles I., when on the scaffold, gave it (a diamond signet) to Bishop Juxon for his son Charles II. is corroborated by its impressions being found on the letters of both those sovereigns. In my former paper, at p. 396, I showed that Mr. Syer Cuming had alluded to an impossible myth, connecting it with Mary Queen of Scots; and in Mr. Gough's "well-authenticated history," as quoted in the sale catalogue description of the diamond sold at Christie's in 1817, it is referred to as the signet so given by King Charles I., whereas there can be no doubt that the king gave his own diamond signet, which we find used by him on his letters, and afterwards by Charles II., and was doubtless that temporarily lost by the former when at Windsor in 1648 (p. 407).

The following letters, written by Charles II. are sealed with this his father's signet:—

^a Some of the letters published by the Marquis of Bristol in the *Camden Miscellany*, vol. v. 1864, are sealed with the same signet, an engraving of which, with fac-simile of the autograph, are given.

Lansdowne Royal, &c. Letters, 1236, fo. 114, written from Collen, Aug. 6, "to the Queen of Bohemia," "my dearest Aunt."

Do. do. 1236, fo. 116.—Letter from Bruges, 15 June, 1656.—"For my dear cousin, Prince Rupert."

Do. do. fo. 124.—Letter "For the Chancelour," describing his Queen on his wedding-day, 21 May, 1662.

Do. do. fo. 130.—To the same, 25 May.

Do. do. fo. 142.—To the Duke of York.

Do. do. fo. 158.—To Prince Rupert, 1673.

Do. do. fo. 199.—To Prince Rupert, 12 May.

Do. do. fo. 201.

Do. do. fo. 223.—26 August. to Prince Rupert.

Royal Letters, &c., 18738, fo. 37.—To his sister, 11 September.

The letter dated from Bruges of the 15th June, 1656, a few years before the restoration, written and addressed to Prince Rupert, "Deare Cousin," in Charles II.'s own handwriting, and being sealed on the same sheet of paper with this same signet, would show that if that was the stone given by Dr. Hamey, some error or omission must have occurred as to the date of its presentation to Charles II.; and, further, that the diamond then given is stated to have been in a *ring*, and not a *seal*, in which form it was set when in the possession of Charles I. Unfortunately, the initials are not mentioned.

Charles II.
landed in
England.

From the time, 29th January, 1648-9, when the king (Charles I.) gave to his children, the Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Gloucester, "all his jewels save the George he wore,"^a this precious seal would doubtless have been treasured by one or other member or friend of the family, to be restored to the elder son of the royal house at the time of his probable restoration.

Is it not possible, however, that before the restoration of Charles II. the king's diamond may have been deposited as security for some loan of money, which he so much needed immediately before his embarkation for England,^b and that the loyal Dr. Hamey may have redeemed the pledge for 500*l.*, as stated, presenting it to his royal master on his restoration or accession?

^a This George, worked in cameo on a superb onyx, is now in the possession of the Duke of Wellington.

^b In the *Edinburgh Evening Courant* of 16th June, 1817, is a copy of a letter written by Charles II. from Brussels, 28th May, 1658, borrowing 50*l.*, sealed with an oval (? lozenge) about three-eighths of an inch long.

We may, from these impressions on the letters, conclude that King Charles I.'s diamond signet, used by him, was also subsequently in the possession of and used by Charles II. from 1656 to 1673 and onward; and that, therefore, the diamond engraved with the royal arms of England, which was in Tavernier's hands in Persia in 1664, could not have been the king's, but may, with greater probability, have been the queen's, Henrietta Maria, signet, as previously suggested. Although then living, that unhappy queen was reduced to great want, having first pledged some of her jewels, &c. and subsequently sold everything she possessed.^a

^a In the *Memoire de Madame de Motteville* (Camden Miscellany, vol. viii. p. 23), we read: "*Elle mit toutes ses pièreries en gage, et de cet argent,*" &c. and again, p. 27, "*Nous luy avons veu vendre toutes ses hardes l'une après l'autre, ces meubles et le reste de ses pièreries, et engager jusques aux moindres choses pour pouvoir subsister quelques jours de plus.*"

POSTSCRIPT.

15th June, 1886.

During a recent visit to Vienna I was enabled, by the kindness of Dr. Friedrich Kenner, the courteous and learned director of the Imperial Cabinet of Antiques at the Hofburg in that city, to examine more minutely and to enjoy more thoroughly many of the choicer objects preserved in that rich collection.

My attention was, naturally—from my interest in the subject—directed to any engraved diamonds that might be found among the many gems of the *renaissance* and more recent time ; and I was rewarded in my search by finding two, one of which is of English historical interest.

The less important is a small, high table diamond, on the face of which a double-headed eagle, not crowned, is incised in a somewhat scratchy manner of shallow *intaglio*. It is set in a small gold ring, the bezel and shoulders of which are enriched with black enamel. It is probably of the early seventeenth century, and is numbered 134.

The other is a diamond of irregular quadrate form, facettèd on the sides, but having a tabular face, on which a profile male head is deeply cut, but of indifferent execution ; it shows that the material was too obdurate for the sculptor's power of manipulation ; and, although the general form of the bust is fairly rendered, the features are but ill defined. The bust faces to the left, in the impression (which I send herewith), and is between letters difficult to define, but which may be intended for the Greek Π and Δ , and possibly the initials of the person's name who is represented in the *intaglio*.

It was on turning the ring that I discovered its chief interest ; for at the back of the bezel, painted in enamel on the gold, on a ground of turquoise colour, the plume of three white ostrich feathers and the well-known motto of a Prince of Wales are represented between the initial letters **C.** and **P.**

The feathers are tied and shaded in dark blue; the motto **ICH . DIEN** is in gold letters, on a dark blue ribbon. The ring is small, a simple hoop enamelled dark blue upon the shoulders; the stone, held in silver casing, is backed by the enamelled gold bezel.

There can be no doubt that this ring belonged either to the unhappy Charles I. when Prince of Wales, or perhaps, but with less probability, to his son; the fashion of rings not varying sufficiently during the intervening period to mark with certainty the former or the later date. I should, however, be disposed to think that the *intaglio* on the diamond may be of earlier execution than its setting in a ring.

It has no history in the octavo Catalogue of Antiques, &c., in the Imperial Cabinet prepared by the late Baron von Sacken and the present able director, Dr. F. Kenner, in 1866, in which it is described merely as a diamond engraved with a head in *intaglio*. Its number is 141.

Whether the original owner was the luckless first Charles, as is more probable, or his son, or, indeed, both—for it may well have passed from the former to the latter in his youth—this ring is interesting as another relic of the royal Stuarts, and notice of it and of the other engraved diamond may form a not unworthy *addendum* to my last paper on the Henrietta Maria signet.