ROYAL CHARITIES.

(SECOND SERIES.)

BY HELEN FARQUHAR.

The Maundy.

AMONGST the readers of the British Numismatic Journal some there may be who, having followed year by year in our Volumes XII, XIII, XIV and XV my studies concerning the history of the Healing Piece, will be inclined to turn their attention to other forms of almsgiving practised by our monarchs. Let us consider therefore "the Maundy," "the Kinge's Dole," "the Pryvy Almes," and "the Dayly Almes," as we find the various charities described in the quaint spelling of the Tudor manuscripts.

By far the most familiar to the ear of the present day is the word Maundy, because this distribution alone preserves its ancient name and much of its ancient character. But I must preface my remarks by explaining that the expression "Maundy money" at one time covered a wider field than it now suggests. To the modern mind Maundy means a charitable distribution incident to a service held on Holy Thursday in Westminster Abbey, and to the numismatist it recalls a certain series of small silver coins. I purpose therefore to give a short sketch from the historical point of view of the Maundy-Thursday ceremonial, the most picturesque of our royal charities, reserving to a later volume the discussion of the other monetary distributions which more constantly claimed from the monarch's privy-purse a liberal supply of small silver pieces.
The current literature on the Maundy, apart from books of devotion or Church ordinances, although interesting, is not very extensive. Mr. W. J. Hocking gave us valuable information in his *Mint Catalogue* in 1906. A scholarly essay on the subject by Mr. Cornelius Nicholls appeared in 1907. A couple of popular letters were addressed to lads by the Rev. Edgar Rogers in 1914. Mr. William C. Stone in 1915 read some notes on this charity before the Springfield, Massachusetts, Stamp Club. In 1917 a useful paper was contributed by the late Mr. William Charlton, shortly before his death, to one of our learned Societies. Much interesting information concerning the charities of the Scottish kings was ably extracted by Monsieur Louis Barbé in 1919 from the *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland*. But so far as I am aware no one has endeavoured to separate the Maundy with its initial service, the pedilavium, from the other doles or royal benefactions incidental to Holy Thursday and Good Friday, and the daily gifts to the “Poor at the Gate.” There was published in April, 1893, a valuable article from the pen of Mr. H. J. Bidwell, then secretary of Her Majesty’s Almonry, to Queen Victoria, explaining the various royal charities, but the subject is not there treated from the numismatic point of view. I, however, owe my thanks to the late Canon Edgar Sheppard, K.C.V.O., D.D., Sub-dean of the Chapels Royal, to the late Mr. Arthur Wallace, who, as successor to Mr. Bidwell, lent me the manuscript in the Almonry Office, and to the succeeding Secretary, Mr. T. Norgate who died in 1922, for further elucidating the

---

1 Appendix III, *Royal Mint Catalogue*, vol. i, pp. 422-424.
2 Maundy Celebrations Ancient and Modern, originally printed in *The Home Counties Magazine*.
3 *The Scout Message*, April and May, 1914.
4 *The Numismatist*, September, 1915. See also correspondence in the following November number.
5 *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, vol. xxxiv, 1917.
The Maundy.

Evolution of the royal almsgiving. I have derived invaluable assistance from the pyx lists of Mr. Henry Symonds, and from the kindly help of Mr. W. J. Hocking and of the Rev. Edgar Rogers respecting the numismatic side of the Maundy question. With regard to the ceremonies, Dr. George Williamson has procured for me important information concerning the pedilavium as still performed in the Catholic Church.¹ Setting aside, as known to all readers, such useful books as Brand’s Popular Antiquities,² Hone’s Everyday Book and Chambers’ Book of Days, I would still attract attention to other literature, including descriptions of the Maundy amongst Church or biographical matters. Amongst these I refer the reader specially to Dr. Edgar Sheppard’s,³ Mr. H. J. Feasey’s,⁴ Dr. Adrian Fortescue’s,⁵ and Father Herbert Thurston’s⁶ books. From the above we gather the various ceremonials practised. They differ materially in the Roman and Anglican Rites, the former having in many countries preserved almost the full symbolism of the "pedilavium" performed by royal princes and by those of the Church assisted by the lesser dignitaries, whilst with us most of the oldest part of the services has been laid aside in favour of a larger charitable distribution more suitable to the times in which we live. It is with the British side of the question that I purpose to deal, not forgetting that, until the Reformation, or rather until after the death of Mary I, our practices ran on the same lines as those of our foreign neighbours. We may go yet further and say that it was not until a strong feeling arose against the attempts of James II to re-establish in positions of

¹ I am indebted to Dr. Williamson for accounts of the pedilavium as still performed in Italy, and he tells me that in London the Cardinal Archbishop, girded with a towel, still kisses and washes the feet of the poor on Maundy Thursday in Westminster Cathedral.

² John Brand’s Popular Antiquities was published in 1813 after the death of the author, under the editorship of Sir Henry Ellis.

³ Old Palace of Whitehall.

⁴ Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial, 1897.

⁵ Rites of Holy Week in the Holy Week Book compiled from the Roman Missal, 1916.

⁶ Lent and Holy Week, pp. 274-325, published 1904 by Herbert Thurston, S.J.
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trust—a procedure at that time illegal—the professors of the more ancient form of worship in England, that an ultra "Protestant" King William III abandoned the yearly washing of the feet of the poor by the monarch in person.¹

With regard to our pre-Tudor history, the constant courtesy tendered to me both in the Manuscript and Medal Rooms in the British Museum, and in the Research Room at the Public Record Office, have rendered my task easier. But the uncertainties of obsolete Norman-French Manuscripts and the contracted Latin of others have, prior to the time of Henry VIII, occasionally presented insuperable difficulties to me. I have consequently largely restricted the earlier portion of my history to matter contained in printed books, or have confined myself to reliance on the courteous help extended by my friends. But the Exchequer Rolls and Wardrobe Books of the Tudors are mostly in English, and from these I have gleaned new evidence, so that it is in studying their reigns and those of the succeeding monarchs, that I hope to disentangle the Maundy from other royal charities.

Mr. Feasey, in his Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial,² tells us that the rite can be "traced back to the pedilavium (lavenda) of the fifth century which followed the Holy Communion on Maundy Thursday." He explains that in the Early Church the ceremony of washing the feet of the poor was not limited to that day alone, and states that prior to the Norman Conquest the "pedilavium" was performed daily in some monasteries, and that this was the custom of St. Oswald.³ But in course of time it became usual for our monarchs to celebrate the day preceding Good Friday in particular commemoration of the Cœna Domini. Gradually a generous accompaniment was established on that day to the ordinary ceremony in gifts of clothes, food or money, to which the name of Maundy was

¹ We shall see later that the ablutions were not invariably performed by the King in person, but this was the more usual practice in Tudor and Stuart times.
² Feasey, p. 108.
³ Ibid.
given. This name eventually superseded that of Shere-Thursday as applied to the Thursday in Holy Week, but sometimes both appear in one and the same manuscript of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Occasionally I have found an account of the items needed for the ablutions and the accompanying gifts noted in the Tudor manuscripts under the date of Good Friday, and in Scotland Monsieur Barbé calls attention to the transference under James VI in 1580 of the presentation, to the King's birthday, June 19, his guardians disapproving of the "pedilavium" which had been discontinued from the time when Mary Queen of Scots had ceased to reign. But these exceptions need not at present trouble us, because for some centuries both Catholic and Protestant countries have chosen the Thursday in Holy Week for the day of the Maundy observance.

Like the Healing Piece, the subject of our earlier articles on the Royal Charities, the money gift offered at the Maundy celebration was at first, as it still is in some Catholic countries, at all courts only a token of the donor's goodwill, part of the hospitality tendered in the symbolical service in which washing the feet of the guests was the most important part. It is interesting to find that the money given in 1504 by Margaret, daughter of Henry VII, after her marriage in the previous year to James IV of Scotland, was still the current coin of her own country of origin, thereby making a gift which was probably preserved by the recipients.

1 Shere, Scher, Shir, Skyre, Skire, or Skye Thursday, as it is variously spelt in manuscripts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, owes its name, according to a book of homilies in the handwriting of the earlier of these centuries, to the cleansing preparation for Easter. See Brit. Mus. Harl. MS., 2247, p. 85: "Faders in olde dayes had an custom wh: was for to scher ye heer that day of hedes and beredis so to make them honest wh oute forth agaynst Estyn day, for on Godes-day they wolde not be shrave."

2 Sidelights on the History of Scottish Industries, etc., p. 270, and Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, vol. i, p. ccciii, Appendix iv to Preface.

3 Margaret's gift was in "Inglis Penneis," at that time the equivalent of the Scottish threepence, and James IV presented Scottish shillings equalling the English groat. The usual dole of James III and his queen had been in Scottish pence. Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, vol. 1, p. 71, and vol. ii, p. 259.
English money was, however, current in Scotland and worth, as the Lord High Treasurer's Accounts of that date prove, three times the value of the coin of the same name in Scotland. The pennies may have formed part of the first instalment, which was paid in the previous September, of the dowry of £10,000 which Margaret brought to her husband.¹

James IV, not to be outdone in generosity, in lieu of the Scots pence of his forebears, presented his 32 bedeimen with 32 Scottish shillings each, so that his donations cost him £51, and he later, as is shown by the Treasurer's accounts for 1511, caused "twelf penny grobris" to be specially made, giving for the purpose a "gret silver stopis to be coined."²

It is indeed clear that certain "merelli" or jettons with suitable inscriptions but no spending value, were sometimes distributed to the priests and others who assisted at the ceremony.³ In some foreign countries medals were, nay are, given in remembrance of the occasion, even a book being deemed a suitable gift in the Roman Church.⁴ The Papal and Austrian distribution included a medal on a gold chain. On the other hand the late Monsieur H. de la Tour once showed me at the Bibliothèque Nationale, in the Cabinet des Médailles, a very rare and interesting, although artistically worthless little jetton of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, upon which is represented a leg with the foot immersed in water, and which he naturally believed to have some connection with the pedilavium at the French Court.

¹ See Samuel Bentley's Excerpta Historica, p. 130: 5,000 "crownes of soleills" and a further sum of £2,333 6s. 8d., of which the specie is not mentioned. According to the marriage treaty, the money was to be paid in 30,000 angels, or other English money in three installments. The term 'English' here may refer to value, not specie.

² Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, vol. iv, p. 532.


⁴ Information supplied in 1915 by Dr. George Williamson, who heard from his Eminence Cardinal Gasquet the details of the distribution at Westminster Cathedral. There 13 choir boys, who represent the Apostles, sometimes receive small pieces of silver, sometimes books.
The custom of washing the feet of the guest was one of great antiquity and is often mentioned in the Old Testament. In the East, where the barefooted traveller was always thus refreshed when welcomed on entering the house or even the tent of his host, either water was brought and the guest himself washed his feet, a custom still preserved by the Mussulman before entering a mosque, or the host’s attendants performed the office. This symbolical cleansing was utilized by Our Lord to impress upon his disciples the desire to serve all and sundry, and is dwelt upon by St. John as taking place after supper. This purification then completed the feast which had terminated with the breaking of bread and the passing round of the cup of fellowship, the theme of the other three Evangelists. A Syrian writer, Abraham Mitrie Rihbany, in his recently published book on the gospel narrative, explains the words used by Our Lord, “This do in Remembrance of Me,” as the gracious formula in use in Syria, and says: “At our feasts we always drank the wine out of the same cup. . . . To us the one cup meant fellowship and fraternal communion.” This symbolic “loving cup” used to mark the conclusion of the Maundy service, being called for by the King’s Almoner when the feast was at an end, and thus, although this in time became a mere formal drinking of the royal health, it preserved the nature of a thanksgiving and much of the original prototype remained. To our forefathers the whole service represented a ministry to the pilgrim, to the traveller, and to the indigent, in the necessaries of life; and just as the participator in the feast in Biblical

1 See Genesis xviii, 4; xix, 2; xxiv, 32; and lxiii, 24.
2 Gospel of St. John xiii, 4-17.
3 Matthew xxvi, 26-29; Mark xiv, 22-26; and Luke xxii, 14-20.
4 The Syrian Christ, published 1919, pp. 44, 45.
5 Old Palace of Whitehall, by Canon Sheppard, p. 369: “At the end of the order of service used in the year 1709, after the Blessing, the Lord Almoner calls for Wine and drinks to all ye poor the King’s health and bids them be thankfull to God and pray for the King.” The service thus quoted is p. 26 of a Register of Chapels Royal. See also Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 6305: “A cup of claret to drink the King’s health as far as it goes; some people have drink in the vestry.”
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days would be readily accommodated with a robe or change of garments, so the clothes distributed gradually assumed an important part in the benefits bestowed. It is even possible that Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sign He gave to His disciples for the selection of the room wherein to keep the feast, had in His thoughts the preparation for the purification in the washing of feet, for He told them to follow "a man bearing a pitcher of water."

In the mind of the Early Church the prominent idea lay in the symbolism of cleansing from the pollutions of the world, combined with the natural hospitality of the East, as shown forth with humility by Our Lord in taking upon Himself the duties of service: "If I then your Lord and Master have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet; for I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you." Mr. Abraham Mitrie Rihbany, in his *Syrian Christ* before quoted, lays special stress on the fact that "to the Orientals the feet were unclean in a ceremonial sense." "They are not," he tells us, "honourable members of the body; therefore to touch them in an act of devotion, marks the deepest depth of humility. . . . It was in this sense," says the writer, "that Jesus humbled Himself as an example to His disciples by washing their feet."

Gradually in the Middle Ages more and more attention was directed towards the humility alone, and the service was performed as an act of self-abnegation and penance. The homilies of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries especially remark on the condescension implied by the Master washing the feet of the servant, as applied to the potentates, nobles, and prelates of the day. Archbishop Cranmer, writing of the Maundy custom, says: "Our Lord did wash the feet of His disciples, teaching humbleness and very love and charity. . . . We, in like manner, should be ready at all times to do good unto our Christian brother, yea, even to wash their

1 Mark xiv, 13; Luke xxii, 10.
2 Gospel of St. John xiii, 14, 15.
3 *The Syrian Christ*, p. 162.
feet, which seemeth to be the most humble and lowly act we can do unto them."¹ Little less insistent upon the point of humility is the writer of a discourse preached on Holy Thursday in the fifteenth century, which may be read in manuscript at the British Museum: "And after soper meekely He washed His disciples feet to shewe example of mekenes."² The "mekenes" of the sovereign, the great noble, the high ecclesiastic, the Pope himself, no less than the abbot of each monastery and his subordinate brethren, impressed the mind of the multitude. Until the secular occupation of Rome the full ceremonial was performed by the Pope, and it is carried out to the present day at Monte Cassino, about 39 miles from the Papal capital, by the Abbot in his pontificals, representing the Head of the Catholic Church.³ Pius IX used to perform the ceremony in the Sala over the portico of St. Peter's at Rome, and the great nobility of the city at the Hospital of La Trinita dei Pellegrini.⁴

Dr. Fortescue points in his Holy Week Book to various different uses in foreign lands in the fourth, seventh and twelfth centuries, and writes that at the last-mentioned period "the Pope washed the feet of 12 sub-deacons after Mass and of 13 poor men after dinner."⁵ The Prior of Durham ministered, Mr. Feasey tells us, to 13 poor men, whilst the monks performed the same office for children;⁶ and the Benedictines and Cistercians "scrupulously washed the feet of their brethren, the Abbot him not being excused." . . . "The Clugniacs," he writes, on the other hand, "merely touched with wetted fingers the feet of three poor men." Concerning the custom of choosing twelve or thirteen persons, or a greater number according to the

¹ Quoted in Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial, p. 112.
³ Monte Cassino is the original foundation of St. Benedict circa A.D. 500. Benedict became a monk in 494. The poor persons, thirteen in number, whose feet are washed received the gift of a roll of bread and two lire each.
⁴ Dr. Williamson writes: "The Holy Father gave to each of the thirteen men a bunch of herbs and flowers and a gold and a silver medal."
⁵ The Rites of Holy Week, p. xxvi.
⁶ Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial, p. 109.
age of the donor of the feast, I purpose to write later; but it is well to mention now that, whilst twelve represented the Apostles, the thirteenth was sometimes taken as symbolical of Our Lord Himself, or more often as an angel who joined the selected twelve when St. Gregory, according to tradition, was performing the office. And, as Father Thurston tells, "so early as the year 694 the 17th Synod of Toledo commanded all bishops and priests in positions of superiority, on pain of excommunication, to wash the feet of those subject to them."2

In England subsequent to the dissolution of the monasteries, many charities in which ecclesiastics had taken the chief part scarcely survived outside the precincts of the Court, and possibly the condescension was considered the more impressive when centred solely in the king or queen.

It was, indeed, no longer a matter of removing the sand of the desert or the dust of the highway, as in the East, but a literal cleansing from dirt, which was unpleasant to the touch or other senses, and this demanded the "humility" of the great ecclesiastic or royal personage of the Middle Ages. But long before James II had ascended the throne—he being the last of our English kings who conformed in person to the ancient rite—the preliminary scrubbing was done by one of the clergy. In some instances it is even specified that "one of the menials of the Court" first washed the feet of the selected poor, then followed the Almoner and then the Grand Almoner, Mary I, for instance, being the fourth person to kneel, wash and kiss the right foot of those chosen for the purpose. It is noted that Mary "kissed the foot so fervently that it seemed as if she were embracing something very precious."3 But, in spite of all preliminary ablutions, the act was still regarded somewhat as a penance, and as such commended itself to James II but not to his successors

1 The Rites of Holy Week, p. xxvij.
2 Lent and Holy Week, p. 306.
of the House of Orange. *The Gentleman's Magazine*, published in 1731, speaks of the ministrations of James as the last king who personally performed this ceremony "formerly done by the kings themselves in imitation of Our Saviour's pattern of Humility."¹

My first plate shows that in 1773 by the time George III was on the throne even the distribution of clothing and money was performed by the sub-almoner, the king witnessing the presentation from the royal pew in the Chapel of Whitehall.

It is, however, evident that even prior to the Restoration the actual foot-washing was not invariably performed by "the kings themselves," for under Charles I, whose piety and devotion were undoubted, it occasionally devolved upon others. We have descriptions of the time when the king "kept his Maundy" in York in 1639, and was certainly present in the city, and apparently in the Minster, when the Bishops of Ely and Winchester presented the gifts to 39 men and washed their feet, and again, in 1642, the Bishop of Winchester is mentioned as the officiant.² It is perhaps on account of the occasional omission of the King's personal attendance that so much stress is laid on the observance of the entire rite by James II, and it was considered sufficiently important to be recorded in the *Chapels Royal Register of Births, Deaths and Marriages* now kept at Somerset House. Herein is the entry, quoted by Canon Sheppard: "On Maundy Thursday, April 16, 1685, our gracious King James ye 2nd wash’d wip’d and kiss’d the feet of 52 poor men with wonderfull humility, and all the service of the Church of England usuall on that occasion was perform’d, his Majesty being present all the time."³ But there can have been no serious lapse from the ancient custom, for Chamberlayne, in his *Angliae Notitia*, throughout the reign of Charles II refers to the "eminent Pattern of Charity and humility" presented by the Court, to all that shall see the performance of that ancient custom by the King and Queen on the Thursday

¹ *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. i, p. 172.
before Easter called Maundy Thursday." Moreover, other accounts of the time of Charles I show that the king usually conformed to the practice of his forefathers.

It is interesting to learn that all was done that was possible to render the task as pleasant as might be, and that when in the days of the Tudors sweet herbs and wine were used by Mary¹ and Elizabeth² in washing the feet of their Maundy guests, they did but follow the example of the wife of Henry VII, whose Privy Purse accounts contain charges not only for "a cowle for Water xijd." and "for iiij new bolles xijd.," but also for "a basket iiijd." and the "flowres" it contained at the price of "iiijd." to sweeten the water. We learn that "heting the watier at the kechin" cost another shilling and must have necessitated a special amount of fuel, judging by this large sum of twelve pence, as compared with the total "for cariage of the same stuff from London to Richemount iiijd. for the Quenes Maundy upon Shirthurday."³ This, however, did not include the transport at the cost of rod. of "certain stuf," obviously the clothing for presents, and the Almoner's separate "botehire," which, with his "dyner," came to 2s. 8d.⁴

Whether the preliminary cleansing was performed for Elizabeth of York we know not, but at a much later date we find Margaret, Duchess of Parma, Vice Regent of the Netherlands and sister of Philip II of Spain, following with great austerity the precepts of Ignatius Loyola, who had been her confessor in early days. "The lessons of humility," writes Prescott, "which he inculcated were not lost on her, as may be inferred from the care she took to perform the ceremony, in Holy Week, of washing the dirty feet—she preferred them in this condition—of twelve poor maidens, outstepping in this particular the humility of the Pope himself."⁵

² Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 32097, f. 70B.
⁴ Ibid., p. 5.
Had it not been for the real piety and earnestness with which the pedilavium was usually undertaken in those days of simple faith, the physical fatigue of the ministrations would have tried the patience of both active and quiescent participators in the service. To the aged and infirm the strain of carrying out the office was great, especially as to the most saintly the performance involved traversing the hall kneeling. It is indeed told of St. Oswald, Archbishop of York, that "he passed to the Lord" in A.D. 992, "whilst according to the usual custom he was observing the usual Maundy before the feet of the poor."¹

The service following on the Mass was little less fatiguing to those who filled the passive parts, tempered perhaps although it was by pride in their selection. Think of the weariness of those whose feet were thus officially washed by three or four persons before the royal hands came into play, in an age when cleanliness was more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Consequently the material benefit was a thing much to be desired, and it is possible that for this reason the money-gift and the distribution of clothing were added to the feast.

We have very complete lists of the garments and provisions dispensed by Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary I and Elizabeth. The dress given by James IV² of Scotland, the contemporary of Henry VII and VIII, is described in his accounts as "a luvuray" and as Monsieur Barbé remarks,³ "this, it was actually called," and "the recipients of the royal bounty formed a class, and the ‘bedesman’ of later days, though not yet mentioned under that name, really existed."⁴ The gifts bestowed by Margaret, the wife of James IV, are no less accurately described, and we have itemised lists also of the clothes presented by Henry Percy, fifth Earl of Northumberland,

¹ *Chronicle of Melrose*, Stephenson's version.
² *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland*, vol. i, published 1877, and vol. ii in 1900, p. 229 of vol. i.
³ *Sidelights on the History of Scotland*, p. 267.
⁴ The livery gowns were changed from grey to blue at Easter, 1500–1. See *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland*, vol. i, p. ccxliv, note 1.
whose accounts are dated 1512-25.¹ At earlier periods many a chance light is thrown on the slippers, cloth and linen given by Edward III,² or the gowns and hoods which formed the gifts of James III of Scotland in 1474,³ and the cloth and shoes presented by Elizabeth of York in 1502.⁴ But it is not easy to decide which of the nations was the pioneer in bestowing an entire outfit; it is, however, noted that the Spaniards, ever a devout nation, were at least not far behind the English in generosity. It is on record that Doña Louisa Borjia, wife of Don Martín, Count of Ribagorza and Duke of Villa Hermosa, who lived from 1513 until 1560, gave "a complete suit of clothes" to twelve poor persons, whose feet she had washed and kissed, "afterwards waiting on them at dinner.⁵"

The Spanish tradition has always remained one of personal ministration, and it is told of the late Queen Isabella II, in the middle of the nineteenth century, that dropping by accident a bracelet from her wrist into the basin of water, she considered it to be thereby dedicated to charity and gave it the woman whose foot she was engaged in washing at the moment it fell.⁶

Friends of the present writer who witnessed the "Fusswaschung" in Vienna during the lifetime of the old Emperor, depict the ceremony as far less impressive than might have been expected, for although the aged monarch himself knelt a moment before each man and sprinkled his already washed right foot, the guests were not individually served by Franz Joseph according to the ancient custom. Food was indeed provided and some dishes were carried in by the Emperor, assisted by some of the Archdukes, but the recipients took them away without further ceremony.

Mrs. Henry Cust, in her Gentlemen Errant, describes the arrival of the Elector Palatine Frederick II at Bellpuig in 1533, in time

² Close Rolls, Anno 34, Edward III, March 20, 1359-60, Membrane 39.
³ Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer, vol. i, p. 71.
⁴ Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York, pp. 74 and 85.
⁵ A Playmate of Philip II, by Lady Moreton, p. 130.
⁶ Lent and Holy Week, by Father Herbert Thurston, p. 307.
to see Charles V performing his Maundy Thursday ceremonies and washing the feet of the poor, but unfortunately no details of the proceedings survive for us to compare with our own day.¹

We must return to our own country, and I crave the pardon of my readers for so long detaining them from the numismatic side of the Maundy question. I plead in excuse my anxiety to make clear the origin and gradual alteration of the ordinance from the hospitality and self-abnegation of the past to the charity and kindly consideration of the present day.

The coin, at first in no way a specially minted coin, was supplementary to the feast—garments and extra provisions to carry away were added to the banquet—and then, again, these were commuted for a money payment, a certain portion of the dole being in small pieces, which eventually had to be coined for the purpose.

---

¹ *Gentlemen Errant*, p. 364. Baron von Margutti, Aide-de-Camp to the late Emperor Francis Joseph, tells of the ceremony in his biography of his royal master. He says that the Emperor, in full-dress uniform of a field marshal, knelt before the feet of twelve old men and twelve old women, touching the right bare foot of each with a napkin dipped in a golden basin, whilst a priest read aloud from the New Testament. The Court then withdrew and the people were handsomely rewarded and driven back to the alms-houses in royal carriages. (See *The Emperor Francis Joseph and His Times*, by Lieut.-Gen. Baron von Margutti, p. 179.)

² *Rotulus Misce Anni Regni Johannis Quart Decimi*, published in *Documents Illustrative of History*, p. 258.
“D. Jovis in Cena Æni in elemos XIII paupum quo3 quil3 ëuit XIIId. apud Roffam XIIIf. r3.” By the kindness of Mr. Lawrence I illustrate a London penny of this date as showing the type then in use. It is quite possible that pennies of Rochester might have been forthcoming, for the penny of 1205 struck at that mint is known. In the same way I individually have found no specific entry of garments bestowed at the “Cena Æni” earlier than the oft-quoted slippers and cloth of Edward III in the Close Rolls of 1360. 1

The date of the inauguration of the Holy-Thursday feast is still more difficult to suggest, in that we have become involved in questions of feeding the “Poors at the Gate” and giving large banquets to indigent persons as penance for sins, or in celebration of every Saint’s day.

Dr. Thomas Dickson, quoting from Bishop Turgot’s Life of Saint Margaret, wife of Malcolm III of Scotland, writes that for forty days before Christmas and during the entire season of Lent, she daily washed the feet of the poor and served them with provisions. 2 He adds that on certain occasions, suggesting that it was “perhaps Shire Thursday, the King and Queen were accustomed to entertain three hundred poor persons, waiting on them and serving them with their own hands.” Besides these activities, she fed twenty-four persons daily, ministering to them herself, and wherever she went they accompanied her. 3 Probably Margaret, the sister of Edgar Ætheling and near kinswoman of Edward the Confessor, had, on

1 Close Rolls, Anno 34 Edward III Membrane 39.

2 “Peracto antem matutinæ Laudis officio rediens in cameram sex pauperum pedes cum rege ipso lavare et aliquid quo paupertatem suam solarentur solebat erogare” Note I, p. cccii of Appendix IV to vol. i of Accounts of the High Treasurer. Turgot was consecrated Bishop of St. Andrew’s on August 1st, 1109. See also Life of St. Margaret of Scotland, translated from Turgot by William Forbes-Leith, 2nd ed., 1886, p. 61: “When the Office of Matins and Lauds was finished, returning to her chamber, along with the King himself, she washed the feet of six poor persons and used to give them something wherewithal to relieve their poverty.” She used also to bestow on beggars some of the gold coin the King had offered on Maundy Thursday and at High Mass.

3 Ibid., p. 63.
marrying Malcolm III in 1068, introduced these customs, but Malcolm Canmore himself had passed his youth at the English Court and had no doubt seen the pious practices of King Edward the Confessor. The benefactions of Margaret in Scotland, and John and Edward III in England, quoted above, with regard to the distribution of money and raiment, have been selected at random by me as affording evidence of royal accounts which I have had the opportunity of examining. Even more particularly in the time of Edward I, for feasts were almost incessant in all three reigns. Besides Saints days almost every Sunday presented the occasion for a banquet to the poor, and wherever the King went hundreds of persons received meals gratis at the royal expense.

The great difference between the Easter celebrations and those of other seasons lies less in the feasts than in the services, notably that performed on Holy Thursday.

The use of the older name, Scher-Thursday, has been set aside in modern parlance, but it is well to bear it in mind, for we may look sometimes in vain for the word "Maundy" in the Tudor account books. Wynkyn de Worde's _Festial_, printed in 1493, whilst giving the same explanation for the term Sher as that quoted from the manuscript homilies, _Brit. Mus. Harl. MSS. 2247_ states that it was so called "in Englysch tonge." Nevertheless the writer of the manuscript homilies, of about the same date, gives the alternative name of Schir Thursday as being "ye day of Christes Maundy."

On the other hand, the origin of the present name, Maundy—or, as it was usually spelt in the sixteenth century, "Maundye," and

---

1 For explanation of the name Scher, see Note I, p. 199. A writer in the _Gentleman's Magazine_, July, 1779, vol. xlix, p. 349, suggests that it refers to the cleansing of the Apostles' feet, the word _char_ being interpreted pure. Others mention another explanation, _Skier_, signifying pain or affliction (see Feasey, p. 95). See also _Lent and Holy Week_, p. 88, where Father Thurston tells us that, according to John Belat, Shere Thursday was the occasion when "a priest should shave his crown, so that there be nothing between God and him, and men should make them clean within their souls and without."

2 See _Barbé_, p. 265.
in the seventeenth and eighteenth, "Maunday"—is still much in debate, some writers affirming that it comes from Maund, the basket in which the gifts were carried, and others more directly to the command of Our Lord, at one time written "commaund," or from the Latin as mandatum. The above reference to "Christes Maundy" indicates that the writer in the fifteenth century accepted the derivation of Maundy from "mandatum" rather than "maund," and John Brand quotes More in his answer to Tyndal on "The Souper of Our Lord," as saying, "The Maundy of Christe with hys' Apostles upon Shire Thursday." The gifts bestowed varied much under different monarchs, and with this point I purpose to deal later in discussing the coins required for the occasion.

It is, however, time to explain the nature of the various calls made upon the Privy Purse and their present development.

The Charities distributed by the Royal Almonry Office are now divided into the Maundy and Discretionary Bounty, the Minor

---

1 A maund is a large basket or hamper capable of containing eight bales or two fats (see *Book of Rates*, f. 3). Brand, in his *Popular Antiquities*, vol. i, p. 124, inclined to this explanation, and quotes various writers, one of whom, in the eighteenth century, carried the origin back to the French for begging, *mandier*, or *maundiant*, a beggar. The *Book of Rates*, quoted above (see *The Charter of London*, published 1738, p. 159, giving the rates in the time of Charles I), in the "Balleage Duties Outward," sets forth: "For a great Maund or great Basket 3d. For a small Maund or Basket, poiza C weight or under 3d."

2 "Mandatum novum do vobis."

3 The Discretionary Bounty is a gift of £3 to certain specially selected persons, now about 50 in number, at Easter, and is paid by cheque. The recipients are of the same class of persons as those on the Maundy list, to which they might if necessary be transferred. Queen Victoria, on her Accession at the age of 18, found many persons on the list of her uncle William IV, for whom her distribution, limited as it was by her age, had no room. She consequently ordered that they should be paid as before. They did, of course, not attend the Maundy Service, but received their money at the Almonry. See *The Times*, April 16th, 1838–9. I understood in 1920 from the late Mr. Norgate, then Secretary of the Almonry, that "there are now no superfluous members of the Maundy list from Queen Victoria's and Edward VII's reigns. They have either died or been absorbed into the present list of recipients."
Bounty,\(^1\) the Common Bounty,\(^2\) Gate Alms,\(^3\) and certain educationary and other donations,\(^4\) and of these only the Maundy distribution is personally attended by the Monarch, or members of the Royal family. The King, as we have said, is not an officiant in the service, but a spectator only.

---

VICTORIA HALF-GROAT AND PENNY, 1875.

A rapid and very clever sketch in water-colour, given to the late Sir Spencer Ponsonby-Fane in 1875 by an artist-friend, and signed W. J. Colville, shows the Maundy distribution as it was performed in the reign of Queen Victoria. Excepting in the portraiture of the officiant, then Dean Stanley, it might serve equally as a picture of the present day. Reproduced on our next page.

The nosegay carried by the royal almoner, representing as it does the "sweet herbs" of the olden times, no less than the brilliant uniform of the Beefeater holding the great dish containing the bags of money, takes us back to Tudor days. The same vicarious

---

1 This and the other bounties are dispensed by the Secretary of the Royal Almonry, as he kindly informed me, in two half-yearly remittances about five days before Christmas and Easter Day respectively. According to The Times of April 2nd, 1920, the Minor Bounty, and others as above, were distributed to some 700 people.

2 The Common Bounty was described by Mr. Bidwell in 1893 as consisting of donations of 10s. each to 1,300 persons.

3 "The annual sum of 26s. granted to 150 persons, and denominated Gate Alms, represents," wrote Mr. Bidwell, "the allowance of 6d. a week which in olden times was paid at the gate of the Palace of Whitehall."

4 See The Guardian, April 5th, 1893, where certain pensions were also noted as yearly paid to old servants and others, varying in amount from £1 to £16. Mr. Bidwell mentioned that the pensioners were, in 1723, as many as 150 in number; but the list was revised in 1811 and again in 1838, when it was reduced to 40 persons, 20 having £5 and 20 £10 per annum. There are besides grants for professorships and similar purposes.
presentation in the presence of George III and Queen Charlotte, a little more than a hundred years earlier than the above, was delineated by S. H. Grimm in 1773. A print after his drawing was engraved by James Basire and has been lent me for reproduction as my first plate by our member Mr. Richard Ponsonby-Fane, to whom also I owe the permission to illustrate the Victorian scene below.

In Tudor and Stuart days that which corresponded more or less with the Discretionary Bounty was called the "King's Dole," distributed usually in person upon Good Friday, or very occasionally on Holy Thursday, after the Maundy, whilst the other benefactions were known as Gate Alms, Privy Alms and Daily Alms, and these latter were not connected with Easter.

The Good Friday dole was dispensed with some ceremony and followed certain services peculiar to that day—the creeping to the Cross, which is still practised in the Catholic Church, and the
blessing of cramp rings, now fallen into disuse. The King’s offerings before the Altar on Good Friday had from early days been devoted to the manufacture of cramp rings, and from the accounts of Edward II,¹ Edward III,² and Edward IV,³ this is clear; a special ritual in blessing them was followed, but from the vast number required from foreigners and others in the reign of Henry VIII, we are prepared to find, as indeed we do, many charges for extra production.⁴

In describing the service as performed by Mary I, Cardinal Pole’s secretary, Faitta, explains that there were two basins of rings—the one containing those both of gold and silver provided by the Queen for distribution, whilst the other held those of private individuals labelled with their owners’ names."⁵

The rites practised on Good Friday are all described at some length in a manuscript book of ceremonies of the early sixteenth century in the College of Arms, and from it we see that the distribution of the King’s dole followed on these other services.

The presentation of the King’s dole by Henry VIII in person, is fully described in this manuscript, College of Arms. M. 7.

The expression used in this document is that “the Master of the Juell House shall be there” [in the Chapel] “with the Crampe rynges in a basin or basons of Silver.” In the MS. list of Henry’s jewels and plate in the Library of the Society of Antiquaries, many basins are mentioned such as might have been used for this office,

¹ Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 32097, f. 69b, in Norman French, for which see British Numismatic Journal, vol. xii, note 2 on p. 65. See also The Blessing of Cramp Rings by Raymond Crawfurd; pp. 166–187 of Studies in the History of Medicine. Dr. Crawfurd suggests that Coronation offerings were devoted to the same purpose. See also Mons. Bloch’s Les Rois Thaumaturges for Les Anneaux Guérisseurs.
² The Blessing of Cramp Rings, as above, p. 169. Eleemosyna Roll of Edward III, 9th, 10th and 11th years of Edward III.
³ Ibid., p. 171. Eleemosyna Roll of 8 Edward IV, and Liber Niger Domus Regis Edward IV.
⁵ Venetian Calendar of State Papers, vol. vi, p. 436.
or for the Maundy service, and we also notice, “Item Silver Crampe Ringes Ixiiij oz. wt. Item in Gold Crampe Ringes xxv oz. wt.”\(^1\) Certain basins provided for King John’s Chapel at Lambeth in January, 1208, may have been for this purpose or for Maundy.\(^2\)

Rarely, as I have said, was this dole given to the poor on the same day as the Maundy reception—the one in the morning the other in the afternoon—and as a rule the distribution was conducted on successive days. In no case must the two benefactions be confused, for not only did each have a separate ceremonial, but the expenses for the two appear distinctly in the Privy Purse accounts of the English monarchs.

Nevertheless, orders were sometimes given for special coinage, occasionally rendered necessary by the lack of small specie, and possibly the predilection of the royal donors in favour of handling clean bright money, and the generic term “Maundy” is sometimes used for the Easter dual distribution. Hence much confusion has arisen. Many people believe that all silver coins under the value of sixpence, with the exception of the threepenny piece, can be fairly called Maundy from the reign of Charles II onward, a further exception being made in favour of the “fourpenny bit” during a short period under William IV and Victoria. When, however, we now speak of “Maundy money” we mean a certain proportion of a specific gift bestowed by the reigning monarch on one particular day and at a particular service, upon a number of chosen recipients determined by the donor’s age.

We should, however, not include coins required for currency under the title of Maundy. Moreover, many persons are not aware of the existence of that other ancient custom named the “King’s Dole,” or, as it is now called as we have just seen, “the Discretionary Bounty.” Still less do we bear in mind that one of the royal charities consisted in a regular daily distribution of food and small

---

1 Juelles, Plate, Stuff, &c., belonging to the late King Henry VIII, f. 169.
2 Bentley’s *Excerpta Historica*, p. 398.
coins given at the gate of the palace, and that this food was in its
turn commuted, in the reign of Charles II if not before, for a diurnal
money payment, and called "Gate Alms." And yet, as I shall
endeavour to explain, special coinage might be required for such
purposes.

The food distribution, for which this dole was a substitute,
was a survival of the feasts given by our early kings to which I
have alluded. The accounts of Edward I, for instance, show that
he fed at least six hundred and sixty-six or more poor persons
every week, on special Sundays or Saint’s days as many as a
thousand or even seventeen hundred at one time. The expenses
of feeding them are noted by Topham as being "1d quadran,"
—namely 14d.—but they work out really at 16d. a head,1 and
in the twenty-eighth year of Edward’s reign totalled £655 3s. 31d.
in one year. The money thus spent reaching from £5 18s. 3d.
to £26 15s. 9d. a week, cannot come under the head of Maundy
unless by confusion arising from the fact that many writers,
as we have said, derive the word from the Maund or basket in
which the scraps from the royal, noble, or ecclesiastical tables
were always collected and handed to the poor. If, on the other
hand, we, as other writers affirm, connect the name of the Holy

1 Liber Quotidianus Contra Rotulartoris Garderobae, pp. 16–46. A facsimile
illustration shows that the editor, Mr. Topham, misread the contraction for obolus
as "quadran," and therefore erred in his computation of 14d. a head, but the
weekly totals agree with the higher charge of 16d. as above.
Thursday distribution with the command of Our Lord at the Cena Domini, spelt by the people of the Middle Ages "command." "The Dayly Almes" in money or food remain quite distinct from the Easter charities.

GEORGE V PENNY, HALF-GROAT, GROAT AND ThREEPENCE.

The special coinage, which is now struck year by year for Maundy Thursday, keeps alive the tradition that from the reign of Charles II onward a similar output on the part of the Mint was always distinct and necessary, but a study of the manuscripts and coins of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries has led me to believe that this impression requires modification, as I shall endeavour to explain. Above all, let us bear in mind that in the reign of Charles II—nay, in the whole of the seventeenth century—neither groat nor threepence was needed for Easter distribution. So far as our present knowledge takes us, these larger denominations were not part of the Maundy dole until the reign of George II in 1731. Silver pennies for Maundy and half-groats for Good Friday held the field, the latter being used at all seasons on Progress for largesse, and these were still current coin during Charles II's reign, as they had been in past generations from the time of Edward the Confessor and Edward III respectively.

These coins passed freely from hand to hand, unsupplemented by a sufficient copper coinage of halfpennies under royal authority, until the second decade after the Restoration was well advanced.

1 Gospel of St. John, chapter xiii, verses 14 and 15: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet: ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you."

upon its way.¹ The farthing was the subject of constant controversy and legislation, and was proclaimed as lawful currency in the time of James I and Charles I, but the small and worthless coins did not meet with public approval, and the less the people liked the authorised supply of these tokens the greater the need for silver half-groats and silver pence, so that even the silver halfpenny continued to hold sway throughout the days of the Commonwealth.

If Charles II for some years, as we have strong reason to believe, issued silver halfpennies, they are indistinguishable from those of his father, but the dies for this coin appear in Simon’s list of his works,² and it finds its place in the trial of the pyx taken on July 9, 1663. Inconvenient as were such small pieces, there can be no doubt as to their use in general currency, and it was therefore possible to fall back upon the regular issue from the Mint, where the desired half-groats and pennies were constantly part of the yearly output, or if none were on hand, the dies used for currency could be requisitioned. It was, therefore, only occasionally that the monarch had not a supply of small silver coins at his command. It is undoubted that special orders for pence and even for half-groats were issued by most of our Sovereigns as Easter approached, and during the unrolling of my story, I hope to give my readers several instances of such sudden demands, some of which appear in the writings concerning the coinage of James I, published by Mr. Symonds in our ninth volume,³ and others in the State Papers Domestic. But it is worthy of attention that until the eighteenth century the coin used for charitable purposes was such as was current at the moment, and at periods when groats were not part of the ordinary output of the Royal Mint, we find no mention of their special coining or employment for the Good Friday dole, much less for the Maundy distribution. Henry VII and VIII gave groats

¹ The proclamation making the new halfpenny and farthing legal tender was dated August 16th, 1672.
² Appendix of Vertue’s Medals, Coins, Great Seals, and other Works of Thomas Simon, edition of 1780, p. 89.
as well as half-groats at the dole, but at that time the groat was easily obtainable, being in regular currency.

The officials, and still more the moneyers, of the Mint disliked the extra labour of making small coin, and constant legislation in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was necessary to enforce an adequate production for the needs of the public, and consequently coins of the same type had to be commanded for charitable purposes. Moreover, for the general good of the people, special coinages of small pieces had to be ordered. An instance of this dilemma may be found in the days of William and Mary in 1692, when, owing to the high price of silver, the total output was so small that the legal proportion to which the moneyers had assented, of four pounds weight of small pieces to the hundredweight of silver, did not cover the demands of the community. Some of the special orders issued by James I in 1619 and 1620 may, as Mr. Symonds remarks, have been due to a similar scarcity of silver, for the indenture of 1604 had provided that "in every 100 lbs. of coined silver there should be 2 lbs. in half-groats, 1½ lbs. in pence and ½ lb. in halfpence," and this proportion, if observed in a year of large coinage, covered probably the general requirements. But to return to William and Mary. Orders had been issued in 1689 that "for the good of our People ... some Quantity of small monies be coyned," and the discussion with regard to sizing the little pieces led to the suggestion, which was, however, rejected, that half-groats and pennies should be made of "coarse silver, whereby their bulk will be enlarged to such size as will be fitt for common use." 

Inconvenience was felt from the probability that so small a

---

coin as the penny would be lost, and the first indenture of Charles II, dated 1660,1 which agreed with that of James I, already noted, had been subject to alteration, the silver halfpenny being, as we have seen, later eliminated.

In the first eighteen months after the Restoration, Charles II followed the rule of his immediate predecessors who made no coin for currency between the sixpence and the half-groat at the Tower Mint. But possibly the addition of groats and quarter-shillings by Charles I in his Civil-War mints eventually commended itself to his son as a useful revival of Elizabeth’s measures.2

The rate of pay enjoyed by the foot soldiers in Ireland of sixpence a day is contrasted by Thomas, Lord Wentworth, in a letter to Charles I under date 1638, with the eightpence usual in England, and he suggested that if sent to this country they should have the additional 2d.3 Their provisions had cost hitherto 8d. daily, but in an earlier estimate sent, Wentworth only requested 6d. for “the diet of mariners or marines on shipboard.”4 Mary I had raised the English pay from 6d. to 8d., thereby granting the increase for which the foot soldier had mutinied in the time of her father.5 There seems reason to believe that during the Civil War the foot soldier continued to receive 8d., although in certain cases 10d. was allotted to these men and two shillings and sixpence was given to each horseman. These latter scales of pay are specified by Chamberlayne in 1672,6 and

2 We must, moreover, bear in mind that Elizabeth’s coins remained in circulation until withdrawn by the “Great Recoinage” under William III. The calling in of silver at the Restoration referred only to the Harp and Cross of the Commonwealth, naturally distasteful to Charles II.
5 History of Mary I, by Jean Mary Stone, p. 490.
6 Angliaæ Notitia, 1672, 6th edition, Part II, pp. 156 and 159. Chamberlayne says that in garrison towns the soldier had 8d. a day, and in London 10d. The men of the Life Guard, being formally established by Charles II in January, 1660-61, on the disbanding of the Regular Army, had 4s. a day, and the Militia, during their annual or bi-annual muster, 12d. per diem to each foot soldier and 2s. for horsemen.
we see in the daily 8d. and 1rod. or weekly 4s. 8d. or 5s. 1rod. a definite reason for the revival of the groat in the reign of Charles II, no less than for the appearance of these coins and the plethora of half-crowns in the war issues of Charles I. Be this as it may, clearly Charles II saw a use for the groat, and in the beginning of the year 1662 this coin, with its mate the quarter-shilling, was again established as general currency. These coins, ordered on January 19th, 1661–2, appeared in the pyx trial of July 9th, 1663, and were of the hammered type, as is proved by the fact that these denominations were not in the first assay of pieces struck by the mill and tried on July 4th, 1664.

Mr. Edward Hawkins, struck by the special manufacture of a certain output of the four small denominations which, in the light of the above-mentioned pyx lists, we should now regard merely as milled coins, placed them in a class by themselves, with the suggestion that they were intended for Maundy money. Custom has so far accepted his views as to include under this head, even the output of groat to penny produced by the Roettiers, in succession to Simon’s beautiful little coins, which were, according to his own account, prepared for the mill in April, 1665. Evidence does not lack that these pieces, like the hammered issue which preceded them, were all intended for general currency, although exceptional coins of great rarity amongst the half-groats and pennies exist, with which

1 Warrant dated January 19th, 1662, for the striking of groats and threepence which were not ordered by the indenture of July 20th, 1660.
3 Ibid., p. 347.
5 Appendix V of Gough’s edition, 1780, of Vertue’s Medals, Coins, etc., of Thomas Simon, p. 89. I have been privileged to see the original manuscript of Simon’s bill in the collection of Mr. F. W. Cock. The margin at the last date-entry—that immediately preceding the charge for the dies of these coins—is slightly torn, but sufficient remains to make it clear that the transcript from it for publication was correct.
I hope to deal later, deeming that in them we may perhaps find coins made for royal gifts.

A proclamation under date August 16th, 1672, ordering the "making Current His Majesties Farthings and Halfpence in Copper," contains the statement that Charles had caused "many thousands of pounds of good sterling Silver to be Coyned into Single pence and Twopences, that so there might be good money current amongst the poorest of our Subjects and fitted for their smaller Traffic and Commerce."¹ Neither does this assertion that the small coins were made for the use of the public stand alone. In the year 1674–5 some discussion had arisen concerning the payment of an extra penny on every pound weight of coin, and before this demand was finally granted it was insisted that a minimum of 18 ozs. of small silver should be produced in every 100-lb. weight—a much smaller quantity, be it noted, than the indenture of 1660 had specified. We must bear in mind that the copper halfpence and farthings had largely relieved the requirements of the currency, and the amounts now considered necessary were: "in pence ½ an ounce, in 2 pences 3 ounces, in 3 pences 6 ounces, in groats 8 ounces and a half."² Concerning the output since the introduction of the mill and screw, which should entitle the moneyers to an extra penny on their pay, Danby, Lord Treasurer to Charles II, writing in the January of

² Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18759, f. 76. An alternative was suggested of nine ounces instead of eight and a-half in groats, if pence were not required, but reference to this order in the reign of William and Mary shows that the pennies carried the day—see Ibid., f. 104—where the decision of Charles II in 1675 is set out, when the matter of small moneys was again in question in 1692.
1674–5, states that between December the 20th, 1666, and the 21st of the same month in 1673, “Lwt 242,978 and 4 penny weight of silver” had been coined by this process, and “the moyoners had by the new way of ye mill and press” made “two thousand, two hundred and eighty four pound weight in small mony w’out any other allowances than for the great monies.”¹ We must realize that a penny weighed but 7 grains \( \frac{3}{4} \), and a groat 1 dwt. 6 grains \( \frac{3}{4} \), and although an extra remedy was allowed on making such small coins, even 100 lbs. weight of silver would, at a very rough computation, produce about \( \frac{3}{3} \), and that each \( \frac{3}{4} \) sterling would contain 240 pennies, or 120 half-groats, or 80 quarter-shillings, or 60 groats, as the case might be.

If 100 lbs. weight, therefore, represented some 70,044 pennies, as the indenture of 1660 tells us, 2,284 lbs. weight, even although spread over some seven years, would not be required for anything but currency. The usual grant for the total expenses of the Maundy, as the Treasury papers prove, at this period was of \( \frac{3}{4} \), and but a very small portion of this was distributed in the form of small coin. Moreover, as I have said, so far as our present research carries us, only pennies were used for the Holy Thursday distribution by Charles II and his immediate successors. Although other charities demanded a modified expenditure of groats and quarter-shillings, and still more of half-groats for “largesse,” we are aware of no order for a private coinage of the two larger pieces in Stuart times, nor, indeed, even of half-groats and pennies—in the days of Charles II, in particular. I am not arguing that small coins were not useful to the king in all royal charities, and we shall see that in the Tudor

¹ Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 18759, f. 5 bis.

² The price of silver varied considerably, but by the Act of Parliament for encouraging coinage in 1665 it was arranged that every merchant should receive 62 shillings for every pound Troy of bullion. Chamberlayne, writing in 1672, states that “12 Ounces of pure Silver without any allay” was at that time worth \( \frac{3}{4} \) 4s., and “with allay but 3 li.” A table published for the convenience of traders weighing money, in 1696, gives the product of 32 lb. 3 oz. 1 dwt. 22 grains \( \frac{3}{4} \) as \( \frac{3}{4} \) in sterling silver, this metal being at the time 5s. 2d. an ounce.
reigns, whilst the groat and half-groat were required for the Good Friday dole, the latter coin was also in great request for largess.

The entries in the accounts of Henry VII and Henry VIII of definite sums in groats and half-groats for distribution on Good Friday, after the consecration of cramp-rings, will occupy our attention in a later section of our series. But we also find mention of groats for gaming purposes, and Anne Boleyn, in 1630, received as much as £5 "in grotes for playing money" on one occasion, namely, on the day before Christmas Eve—a favourite day for cards, as is evident from all private accounts of the time. We must therefore not run away with the idea that all orders concerning small coin for the King's use must necessarily be for almsgiving, and we know Henry VIII received angels or crowns with which to cover his playing losses and bets when shooting at a mark. The new groats might serve as gifts, counters or curiosities, and it is clear that this was sometimes the case. We even find Henry causing the master of his jewel house, Robert Amadas, to deliver money to one "Rasmus for to guylde," and in the list of contents of this jewel-house we find not only "counters of Latten" in silver-gilt boxes, but also silver

1 *Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 20030*, f. 51b. See also *Privy Purse Expenses of Henry VIII*, p. 98. Nicolas in the same volume, in his Notes on Cards on p. 306, says that in 1461 Edward IV enacted that cards should not be played in private houses "oute of xij dayes of Christmasse."

2 *Privy Purse Expenses of Henry VIII*, pp. 37, 226 and 227, etc.

Royal Charities.

and even gold counters, and it seems not improbable that Henry used gilt groats for counters. Sixpences were used as playing or reckoning counters in the days of Elizabeth—the milled sixpence attracting attention by its beauty—so why not groats in the time of her father and grandfather, when the new portraits probably took the fancy of the owner of a reckoning-board? In Henry VII's reign the word "newe" is applied to 6s. 8d. in "grottis delivered to the Kinges grace on the 29th August 1505," but no indication is given with regard to mint-mark or type, which might show us whether any alteration of pattern was put forward, or whether these were merely pieces consonant with the great re-coinage ordered in the preceding year, the King desiring clean coins for a Progress or what not.

In accounts of Henry VIII's first year, in December, 1509, we again find the "new grottis" at a time of year when the Easter dole would not be in question. These coins were, we have no doubt, part of the issue ordered under the indenture of the preceding August 6th, which followed the type of the late King's reign, but with the numeral VIII substituted for VII. The amount handed to Henry by William Compton, £33 6s. 8d., suggests coin for presents, not patterns submitted for inspection.

In spite of the fact that Elizabeth ordered no half-groats, she certainly used them for "largesse," for we have the description preserved by Nichols of Elizabeth going into St. James's Park in April, 1560, after the Maundy service, and presenting twopenny pieces to young and old to the number of two thousand. Of Mary I, the before-quoted Faitta mentions that this was also the day chosen;

---

1 Manuscript list of jewels in the jewel-house, etc., at the time of Henry VIII's death, in the Library of the Society of Antiquaries.
5 Progresses of Queen Elizabeth, ed. of 1789, p. 53, or ed. 1823, p. 85.
but does not say whether the Queen herself gave the dole. When the fatiguing nature of her Good Friday service in 1556 is considered,

ELIZABETH HALF-GROAT, MINT-MARK MARTLET.

it seems not unnatural, that if she in person threw alms to "upwards of 3,000 persons," she preferred Holy Thursday afternoon for this distribution in the open-air.¹

But some of the entries concerning special coinages are definite. We have seen that James IV of Scotland caused groats to be made on purpose for distribution, and Mr. Symonds has published Mary I's similar action in melting her jewels to produce Maundy pence. We know, moreover, that Elizabeth required £13 in "new pence for Maundy" from the Master of the Mint on March 18th, 1577–8, but no mention is then made of any order for half-groats. On the other hand, we definitely can state that James I, in the last year of his life, caused half-groats as well as pence to be struck against Easter, probably for the Maundy distribution and the Good Friday dole, and perhaps, had not death prevented him, he would have personally given them to the poor according to the good old Tudor custom.²

But there appears no reason to associate the name of Charles II with a distribution of coins of the value of three and four pence respectively at the Maundy service, and it is safer to admit that Charles I's Civil-War coins and Elizabeth's groats were reduced to a small residue after many years of wear, and did not suffice for general currency, so that Charles II thought their renewal expedient. The need for this revival had indeed been strongly impressed upon the elder Charles by Briot long before the Civil War, as the numerous patterns testify. The French engraver had been the advocate of as many as,

¹ Venetian Calendar, vol. vi, p. 437.
² M.S. State Papers, Domestic, vol. clxxxv, No. 63.
or of more denominations than were in use under Elizabeth, whose nineteen different coins included a silver-piece of three-farthings in value.

Briot went further and presented designs for five farthings in silver, and was in favour of "brass or copper coins in pieces of 2, 1 and a halfe farthing which he said might be made "six times more heavie and strong than the farding web now are currant." ¹

But these matters must await a more detailed description in another volume, for in this introduction I have only aimed at showing that our Tudor and Stuart monarchs required, apart from the general demands of the currency, a considerable amount of small money for gifts at all seasons of the year, and it was possibly partly for this reason that the rule concerning a proportion of little pieces in each hundredweight of silver was strongly enforced.

This question of the small currency will absorb our attention later, and I have too long trespassed upon the hospitality of our Journal to follow at present the intricacies of the winding and narrow path between the necessities of the general community, and the requirements of the King's poorer subjects. I hope, therefore, to resume the discussion of the Royal Charities in our next volume.

¹ MS. State Papers, Domestic, Carl. I, vol. cxxiv, No. 68.
THIN SILVER MEDALLION OF CHARLES II, IN MR. BURNETT'S COLLECTION.