ROYAL CHARITIES.

(SECOND SERIES.)

PART III.

BY HELEN FARQUHAR.

Largesse and the King's Dole.

In the *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. xvi, pp. 195-228, we passed in review the subject of Maundy, the name given to a special distribution of charities on Holy Thursday in particular. But we saw also that many other Royal benefactions came, whether rightly or wrongly, to be included under this designation. I therefore thought it well, before giving actual details of the Maundy, connected with the service of washing the feet of the poor, to clear the ground of other distributions—the Daily Alms, the Poor at the Gate, and the Privy Alms. This I did in the latest volume of the *British Numismatic Journal* (vol. xvii, pp. 133-64).

There remains yet another form of almsgiving, making a call on the small currency, which, on passing through the hands of the Royal Almoner, may have sometimes necessitated a special issue of groats and half-groats. This general almsgiving may be called "Largesse," a part of "The King's Dole," being money thrown to the crowd on the Royal journey, as on the travels of other great personages. But the "King's Dole" proper was given by fixed rule at Eastertide to the general public, whether by the Monarch himself or by his Almoner as the circumstances of the moment dictated. The "Largesse" in particular, although the least important of these distributions, shall take precedence because it requires little explanation.
Largesse.

At all times of particular pageantry, such as a coronation, a marriage, or a progress, money was always given to the poor, and this "Largesse" was often dispensed by our early kings on a very large scale. Holinshed, writing of William II's visit to "gratifie the people" at Winchester in 1087, after his Coronation, chronicles his munificence.

It appears that he "found greate treasure which his father had laid vp there, for his owne vse, this he freelie spent in large gifts and all kinds of prinselie largesse."1

It may be objected that we have here probably very much larger benefactions and more individual than the scattering of small coin, which would at that date, and throughout the reign of the Norman Kings, take the form of single pence. But William's prodigality, like John's feasts, of which we gave examples in our last volume,2 no doubt proceeded from a desire to buy the goodwill of a reluctant populace rather than a charitable wish to ease the burdens of the poor.

We have noticed that the money laid aside for distribution in Mary Tudor's first regnal year3 exceeded that dispensed in any ordinary year of her late brother's reign. We must therefore take into consideration that a liberal scattering of small coin would be desirable

---

1 Holinshed's Chronicle, ed. of 1807, vol. ii, p. 27. The Coronation had taken place on September 26, 1087.
3 Trevelyan Papers, part ii, published by the Camden Society in 1862, pp. 35-7.
"Office of Thresaurer of the Quenes Majesties Chamber viij Marcij Anno primo Marie Reginae."
at her Coronation, her accession to the throne being by no means universally approved. There was no time to be lost, and having been proclaimed Queen on July 13, a week after her brother's death, she was crowned on October 1, 1553. The conduits at Cornhill and Cheapside ran freely with wine, and, as Strype tells us, "all was resolved to be very splendid and glorious." The Queen was presented by the City of London with a purse containing 1,000 marks of gold. The mark was money of account, and it is not specified in what form the offering was made; most likely it would take the shape of two thousand angels of the late King. But there is no evidence to show that such presentations aimed at uniformity. Mary's own gold was not available. The groat, which gives us the first numismatic portrait of the Queen, was figured in our last volume, but at her Coronation it is not recorded that she personally scattered coin to the people.

The first indenture between the "Sovereign Lady Mary" and her money-makers at the Tower, is, as Mr. Henry Symonds has shown us, of August 20, 1553; but it seems unlikely that groats bearing her portrait should have been ready for "Largesse" by the Coronation day, although angels for her "Healings" were specially prepared for her in the following February.

Before her marriage, which was not until the ensuing July, her silver consisted in small coins, groats, half-groats, and pence

1 Quoted by Planché in *Regal Records*, p. 10.
2 *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. xvii, p. 156.
only, and, therefore, she may on progress have been in a position to present her portrait to the people. Money thrown to the crowd, if a coronation did not immediately follow the accession, might bear the royal effigy, but was in Stuart times replaced by a coronation medal. We know that when Charles I was crowned at Edinburgh, the Bishop of Moray, who had been constituted Almoner, threw out among the people certain silver pieces struck in honour of the occasion.¹

CHARLES I SCOTTISH CORONATION MEDAL.

These medals are by Briot. But under this King the thin silver medalet of little or no intrinsic value had already made its appearance, and took the place of the scattered coin on special occasions such as a coronation or marriage. Not, however, on progress was this the case, for the old custom still prevailed of giving actual coin to the poor. Nevertheless, so late as 1762, when Catherine of Russia was crowned, we read that she was ostentatious in her generosity. "The merry making was prolonged," says her biographer, "for weeks, the fountains ran with wine, bread and roast meat were given for the asking, and silver roubles were thrown to the people."² Here, again, we have an instance, when it was deemed prudent to buy popularity. At a coronation the distributor of alms was the Hereditary Grand Almoner, who claimed the silver dish in which they were carried as his fee.³

² Catherine the Great, by Katherine Anthony, p. 180. Catherine was crowned on September 23, 1762, at Moscow, not quite three months after her succession.
³ Glory of Regality, by Arthur Taylor, p. 117.
It was the custom of all great banquets, such as those at Yuletide and not at a coronation only, that the cry of "Largesse" should be raised by the Heralds. The entries in the Tudor accounts are minute as to this "Largesse," and we might think at first sight that we have the opportunity of calculating exactly how much money was needed for the Royal distribution. But this is not the case, for the "Largesse" claimed by the Herald was his own perquisite, and not for distribution, and the "almes," although regularly administered by the Royal Almoner, were frequently given to any passer-by at the hands of the King's retainers. Thus, in the accounts of Henry VIII, we read, under date October 7, 1532: "The same daye paiied to Thomas foteman to dispose in Almesse by the way towards Shepay iiiig iiiijd. This is a sum which, although probably distributed in pennies, is divisible into groats or demi-groats. Or, again, in April, 1501, "Itiūn to Hugh Denes for Almes at ij tymes xv," under Henry VII. Hugh Denes or Denys was probably a Gentleman-in-Waiting on the King, for we often find small payments made to him, such as "ixs iiiijd," or "x," or "xiiij iiijd for the King."

HENRY VII PENNY, 1500.

But this promiscuous charity was not peculiar to Henry himself. Stow, in his Survey of London, mentions that "Richard Redman, Bishop of Elie, 1500, the 16 of Henrie the seventh . . . wheresoever he lodged in his trauailling, when at his coming or going to or from any towne, the belles being rung, all the poor would come togethher, to whom he gaue eury one 6d. at least." In the curiously minute accounts of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,

1 Privy Purse Account of Henry VIII, from November, 1529, to December, 1532, edited by Nicholas Harris Nicolas, p. 265.
2 Exchequer Accounts Various. MS., Public Record Office, Bundle 475; No. 3.
Royal Charities.

we meet with entries of even one penny given to beggars by the way. The accounts, for instance, of the Duchess of Suffolk, from 1560 to 1562, reveal such charities as the following: "To the prisoners at Huntington as her grace passed throwe 20d. To a poore Woman by the waye 4d."¹

ELIZABETH MILLED GROAT AND HALF-GROAT (MINT-MARK, STAR), 1560-1.

But let us turn from this great lady of Elizabethan times to the grandfather of the Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell, one Sir Henry Cromwell, known as the "Golden Knight," on account of his prodigality. Sir Henry, who died in 1602–3, was the father of one Sir Oliver, who sold Hinchingbrooke in 1627 to the Montagues, perhaps on account of Sir Henry's extravagance. It is told of the latter that it was his wont in passing from the above residence to any other of his properties, to throw "Largesse" out of the windows of his coach to the countrymen who lined the roadside.²

A manuscript of travels³ lent me by a friend describes a journey made in 1679 by an unknown diarist in Essex. This traveller writes that "in harvest-time the people have gott a trick of largesse that if any stranger or other happen to passe by when they are sharing two or three of ye reapers follow them and beg a largesse or a piece of money . . . and when anything is given them yey gather all close together and hollow and bawl out a largesse etc., for a long time

³ Travels MSS., probably written by some friend of the Luttrells whom the writer describes as "a right worthy family."
Largesse and the King's Dole.

and this is a constant practice.” This cry of “Largesse” reminds us of the utterance of the Heralds who at all banquets and on proclaiming the creation of new knights cried “Largesse! Largesse!” But of this more anon. We are for the moment concerned with the scattering of actual pieces of money, and it was no uncommon thing to throw “Largesse” broadcast; indeed, even in the description given of a suggested “ordeal by battle,” it was noted that the would-be challenger three times threw five small coins into the arena in his gauntlet,¹ the champion on the other side doing the same. This was in the year 1638, when this method of deciding a quarrel had fallen into disuse, and the King desired the judges to hold conference and consider how the cause might be tried some other way.

But the word “Largesse” comes constantly before us in connection with the King’s Champion. He would ride into the hall and deliver his challenge at the Coronation banquet, and after the King had drunk to his health would drink from “his great cuppe,” crying “Largesse! Largesse! Largesse!”² and he obtained the gold cup itself for his fee and himself gave a money “reward” to the Herald in attendance.³ This demand was made by the Heralds headed by Garter King at Arms, not only at the Coronation but at other feasts. The Heralds, for instance, of James IV of Scotland used this cry when waiting on the King at the New Year and the Christmas feasts, and so we turn to the records of his father-in-law Henry VII, in the hope that the constantly recurring entry, “To the Heraldes at armes for thair larges,” may enlighten us as to the sum of money disbursed for alms on these occasions. But these calculations are misleading, for the “Largesse ” demanded by the Heralds was personal and for themselves, although the “poor folk of the town honoured by the royal presence at Yuletide received almes,” averaging, as Monsieur Barbé tells, “at about 5s.”⁴

¹ Local Records of Northumberland and Durham, vol. i, p. 89.
³ Ibid., pp. 25, 26: “Chester Herald had in reward of ye said Sir Edward Dymoke iiiij angels and a doublete of sattyn.”
⁴ Sidelights of Scottish History, by Louis Barbé, p. 276.
Let us take the Treasurer's Accounts of Edward VI, and the somewhat ambiguous statements arrest the eye: "Item to the Kings Harrolds at Armes for their largesse on Newyersdaye as has been accustomed Vj" and again on Eesterdaye C"; or, again, "Item to the Kinges Harroldes at Armes for their largesse on St. Georges daye C." These entries may be noticed under Henry VIII, from 1509 onward, and similar expenditure was carried on by his successors. But we must remember that the word "Largesse" signified "a gift," and it is clearly stated in the Liber Niger Domus of Edward IV that the Heralds had no wages and claimed their "Largesse" in lieu of a fee, just as the champion, the mayor, and others had their gold cups. They did indeed claim a regular fee on the proclamation concerning the creation of Knights of the Garter or of the Bath, the Knights themselves providing the "Largesse" as well as that presented by the Sovereign. Thus the accounts of Edward VI specify the sum of £6 13s. 4d. given to Heralds "for their largis for proclayming the Kinges stile" for the creation as Knights of certain "noble men" in the February of Edward's first year.

This "Largesse" of £6 13s. 4d. was, as we see in the list of charges for the Herald's attendance at a funeral of a Knight of the Bath, the sum paid to the principal officer of arms. Thus, under the head of "The funeral expenses of Sir Henry Cromwell" in 1603-4, "as given in by the Heralds," the list commences as follows: "Imprimis to Mr. Clarencieulx for his fee £6.13.4d. More to him for his owne blackes £5. Item to him for his 4 mens blackes £6. Item to him for his transportion money at 12d. the myle going and cominge £5."
The other Heralds had to be contented with £5 apiece. But it was not only at funerals that the Knights incurred these charges, they

---

1 Trevelyan Papers, part ii, published by the Camden Society in 1863, pp. 19-27. (See Brit. Mus. MS., Addit. 21481, fol. 58.)
2 Published in 1787 by the Society of Antiquaries, p. 47. (See also Taylor's Glory of Regality, p. 224.)
4 Noble's Memoirs of the Cromwells, published in 1787, vol. i, p. 22; and in Letter F in Proofs and Illustrations, ibid., p. 244.
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being called upon to give equally with the Sovereign, as we have seen, at their investiture.

Mr. Arthur Taylor, the early nineteenth-century author of *The Glory of Regality*, a book dealing chiefly with the Coronation ceremonies, quotes a roll of the time of Richard II, when the "Largesse" given by the King to the Heralds appears to have been £5. "Quant le roy est coroné... de auncient accustomez aux roys de armes et heroldes appartient notable et plentereuse largesse, comme de C," etc.¹ The accounts, as we have seen, of the Tudors generally mention this sum at Easter, Christmas, and other feasts.

We notice in the Tudor Household Accounts that the gifts to the Heralds are placed with the Sunday offerings—not in the lists of wages; just as under Edward IV the Heralds claimed their money not as a salary but as a gift; not "upon the Thesaurere of the household," but "they take theyre largesse of the jewel-house." They waited upon the King at "five festes in the yere" and "after the laste course, they crye the Kinge's largesse shaking theyre grete cuppe."²

The King's Almoner was invariably an ecclesiastic of high rank, through whose hands passed the King's offerings in church besides Daily Alms and Privy Alms, as shown in our last article. Although, therefore, at the Coronation it was the Hereditary Grand Almoner who distributed the alms, taking for himself as his fee the silver dish in which he carried the monies,³ yet, on special occasions a Herald might not only receive, but dispense the King's bounty; or the "foteman" running before his master might pave the way for his coming to still the murmurs of the poor, to whom the suppression of the monasteries had been a bitter blow. The Almoner, however, attended the King at important religious ceremonies, such as Healings and the Maundy Services. A long procession passes before us of Bishops as Almoners in Tudor and Stuart times, and naturally all through the

¹ *Glory of Regality*, pp. 224-5, note 61.
³ *Glory of Regality*, p. 117.
Accounts of the early Edwards the money is given by priests, no doubt because they as clerks were best calculated to keep accounts. Let us, therefore, look up the duties of the Subalmoner, as described by our good old friend Edward Chamberlayne in his *Present State of England*, and we shall see that it lies in the Subalmoner’s province to scatter the King’s “Largesse” on His Progress. After writing of the Almoner, invariably a Bishop who controlled the weekly, daily, and yearly charities of the King, he turns to the Subalmoner, “who,” says he, “is also to scatter New coyned Twopences in the Towns and Places, where the King passes through in his progress, to a certain sum by the year.” Unfortunately the exact sum is not mentioned by Chamberlayne or any of the other old guide-books to which I owe this information. They are all rather indefinite and no very hard and fast line is drawn between the practices of the reigning monarch and those of his predecessors. Chamberlayne began his record in the time of Charles II; the *Anglice Notitia* appeared first in 1667; Miege and Delaune took the field in their turn with their *New State of England* and the *Present State of England*, respectively, and all three repeat the same information in a parrot-like manner. Chamberlayne continues to mention the scattering of half-groats from the time of the first issue of his *Annual* in 1667, under Charles II, when he treats of it as an established custom of long standing, throughout the various reigns so late as in his edition of 1755, when this silver piece, if so distributed, must have been coined for the purpose, as it was no longer used in ordinary currency, and of this special coinage we have

1 *Anglice Notitia*, or *The Present State of England*, ed. 1667 and the following years to 1755. Also Thomas Delaune’s *Present State of London*, 1690, and Miege’s *New State of England*. These books appeared at intervals, Chamberlayne preceding the others by some twenty years.
no evidence. Indeed, quite the contrary, for, as far as we are at present aware, there are no half-groats of this precise date, although the silver penny is not very rare.¹

It is really easier to find instances of gifts dispensed by the way in early times than a record of alms systematically doled out at twopence per head in Georgian times. Miss Hilda Johnson, for instance, brings this fact before us in her admirably edited transcript of the expenses between February 8, 1273, and October 27, 1274, of little Prince Henry, son of Edward I, who died in the latter year, not having reached the age of seven. The last words in the roll read pathetically of the money given by the Almoner as the little corpse was carried from Guildford, where Henry died, to the place of his burial at Windsor: “Item in elemosina distributa pauperibus inter Gildeford’ et Westmonasterium ij° iii°.”²

We have said that the most natural scatterers of small coins would be the Almoner, or the Heralds, and it is clear that the latter did accompany their Royal masters on some expeditions. For instance, under the heading of “Extraordenary Paymentes” in the first year of Mary I, there is a charge for “the Harrouldes at Armes for their dyetts in the progresse tyme” of no less a sum than £168 16s. 8d., besides a special allowance for the three principal Heralds, i.e. “the King at Armes Chester Harrould at Armes and Rouge Dragon for their dyetts and poste money,” coming to £331 7s. 4d.,³ their “Largesse” of £70 in the year being in the “Ordinary Payments,” with the other provisions for “daily Almes,” “privy Almes,” etc. The editor of the Trevelyan Papers suggests that the special gift was on the occasion of a “solemn embassaye” sent by Mary to the King of France, in order to present him with the Order of the Garter, in which all the persons mentioned by name

¹ It is perhaps not generally known that the half-groat is legal tender, although not used in general currency. See Mint Catalogue, by W. J. Hocking, vol. i, p. 422. The Coinage Act of 1870 specified Maundy as legal tender.


³ Trevelyan Papers, part ii, p. 38.
in the list are known to have taken part. But the scattering of small coin by the Subalmoner in an ordinary Royal progress seems to account for the demand for half-groats, nay, even for groats.

HENRY VII'S HALF-GROAT, 1505.

Take an entry in the month of August, a frequent time for a Royal progress, when in the year 1505, John Heron debits Henry VII's exchequer as follows: "Item to the Kinges grace in newe grottes by thandes of Hugh Denys at Ryngwode lxvi\(^4\) viij\(^d\)." On the other hand a somewhat curious entry is seen on the previous July 12, which suggests that the King had sometimes a larger supply of small coins than he needed, but did not, unless they were in Mint state, care to use them for Largesse: "Delyuerd to Bartelmewe Rede in grotes and pence for to be change in gold at iiiij termes in the yere, at Michellmasse next to begynne M\(\text{v}\)." These words probably refer to the calling in of clipped coin, as Bartholomew Rede was the King's goldsmith and, therefore, banker; but being with Sir Giles Daubeney, from 1485 to 1492, keeper of the exchange, it is possible that it was his duty to supply the Almonry with small coins for daily and other doles as needed. He was master and worker of the Mint, and was succeeded by Robert Fenrother and William Reed in 1505. Bartholomew served as Sheriff\(^3\) in 1497 and Lord Mayor in 1502,\(^4\) and was often employed on the King's business.

1 Brit. Mus. M.S., Addit. 21480, fol. 25 \(\text{bis}\), August 29, 21st year, 1505. John Heron's Accounts extending from 1499 to 1505.
2 Ibid., 1505, fol. 20, 20th year. The years of Henry VII run from August 22 to August 21.
3 See British Numismatic Journal, vol. x, pp. 127, 129 and 131. See also Stow's Chronicle, p. 244, and abridgement published 1607.
4 Ibid., p. 245.
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Similar transactions with Robert Amadas, the jeweller of Henry VIII, show that large quantities of bullion were sent to him for melting purposes. In this King’s third year we notice “2497 lbs. and 16 ozs. of Refuse grotes and di gro” delivered to Amadas, valued by him at £1,322 14s. 7d.¹ It seems not improbable that silver sent to Amadas to refine may have been returned to Henry in the form of cramp-rings which were required in increasing quantities. Mention is made in 1529 of 40 ozs. of these rings in gold and 130 ozs. in silver purchased from Amadas at £118 16s. 8d.² But I have dealt with this subject in the first series of “Royal Charities,” and Professor Marc Block has since published, in 1924, under the designation of Anneaux Magiques, an exhaustive account of this interesting charity.³ I desire, therefore, merely in passing, to call attention to the fact that as “Maester of the King’s Iuelles” Amadas received payment for making such rings both in gold and silver.⁴ Transactions between Henry and this jeweller, and also between Wolsey and Amadas, are frequently noted in the Privy Purse Expenses in Collectanea Curiosa, for he worked also for the Cardinal, receiving and delivering plate and making an exchange, so that, according to one account, the sum due to the goldsmith of £500 2s. 9½d. was balanced against his debt to the prelate of £3,301 18s. 10½d.⁵ In the Letters and Papers of Henry VIII,⁶ under date July, 1533, we find a note concerning Amadas showing that of the plate at that moment under his charge, over £1,771 in value was lacking. A great quantity of cramp-rings figures in the list of Henry’s jewels at the time of his death.⁷ "Item

¹ Brit. Mus. MS., Addit. 21481, fol. 81 bis, February 26, 1511-12.
² Bryan Tuke’s Accounts of the Exchequer Various, Bundle 420, No. II.
³ Les Rois Thaumaturges, par Marc Block, Professeur à l’Université de Stras­­bourg, Rite des Anneaux, pp. 165-83.
⁴ British Numismatic Journal, vol. xii, p. 67, note 6. See also pp. 60, 64, 65, 68, 81 and 95 in vol. xii, and p. 169 in vol. xv, for more information about cramp­­rings given by the King as a cure for epilepsy.
⁶ Letters and Papers, p. 183.
⁷ Juelles, Plate Stuff, etc., belonging to the late King Henry Eight—MS. Library of the Society of Antiquaries, p. 169.
Silver Crampe Ringes lxiiiij ozs. wt. Item in gold Crampe Ringes xxv oz. wt."

It is obvious that the amount of bullion presented by the Sovereigns at the Cross on Good Friday did not cover the amount of rings required. They were much sought after, and, even in the reign of Edward VI, we find Gardener writing to Bishop Ridley that "the late king used to bless these crampe ringes which were much esteemed everywhere and when he was abroad they were often desired from him." Just as King Henry’s jewel list embraces purses filled with angels for healing, others may have had groats and half-groats for scattering and for other presentations to and from the King, and also money for play, so much as £100 for "gaymyng" being mentioned at Christmas, 1529. Some of these purses contained as much as £100. It appears from a Proclamation given by Mr. Symonds in the British Numismatic Journal, that on April 27, 1505, "clipped coins were received by weight at the Exchange in Leden Hall at the rate of 3s. 2d. the oz., and would be paid for in gold pennies." A second Proclamation, undated, shortly after offered "gold penny and twopenny pieces." The word "penny," Mr. Symonds suggests, was used only in a generic sense as denoting a piece of money; "for instance," says he, "Grafton speaks of the gold florin of Edward III, as 'the penny.' Therefore, when we

1 The Life of Anne Boleyn, by Philip Sergeant, p. 93.
3 Vol. x, p. 133.
read that Henry VII, in his 14th year, received “farthings of gold,” i.e. “Delivered to the King’s grace in farthings of gold 20s.,” we may assume that we have here the quarter-ryal, a coin which, although not recorded in the pages of *Kenyon’s Gold Coins of England*, is mentioned in an Act passed five years later, the 19th of Henry VII anent defective money. The quarter-ryal is amongst the currency specified in this Act as still ordered to pass in 1503-4 at the rate at which it was coined. We may therefore conclude that the gold farthings sought and obtained the King’s approval. Sometimes the “newe grottes” reserved for the King were, as we have said, for play—“gayming” being responsible for coins used as stakes or as counters, especially at Christmas time. Card games were allowed at palaces at all times, but by a law of the first year of Edward IV, 1461, card-playing was prohibited in private houses, excepting within “the XII dayes of Christmasse,” and a couple of years later the importation of the cards themselves was forbidden. Even at the Court of Henry VIII, where the King constantly betted on archery and played dice, and certainly would not suffer the curtailment of his pleasures by the laws of the land, we see that card-playing figures more largely at Christmas than at other seasons.

We find Anne Boleyn in 1530 obtaining £5 in “grottes” for

---


3 Appendix by Nicholas Harris Nicolas to *Privy Purse Expenses of Henry VIII*, p. 306.
“playing money,” and when we see that William Compton in December, 1509, takes charge of £33 6s. 8d. (probably a hundred angels) for the King, we are inclined to surmise that the coins were used for amusement rather than charity, for even the far more economical Henry VII lost £27 in groats, besides £20 in gold, playing at cards in one day.

The King’s Dole.

Let us now turn to a much more systematized charity than the gifts on Royal Progress, and we shall find ourselves on surer ground in treating of the distribution at Easter, usually on Good Friday, known as “The King’s Dole.”

We shall even be able to establish the amount thus given under the Tudors. The scattering of small coin at Easter, quite separately from the Maundy, became so much a matter of custom that it eventually crystallized for a considerable time at a fixed sum, namely, £133 6s. 8d. This sum, however, was not decided in the time of Henry VII, and it would seem that although the King himself, as we believe, gave the Dole in person the distribution was purely arbitrary, and the chosen day was not invariably Good Friday, but at the Royal convenience. Occasionally it was on Holy Thursday, after, but not in connection with, the Maundy gifts to the chosen few, that the more general distribution was effected. It is even possible that the £133 6s. 8d., which we find noted in the accounts of Bryan Tuke in the 33rd year of Henry VIII’s reign, a sum confided to the Almoner, a sum which meets us again under other monarchs, even in Stuart days, may have been set aside apart from the haphazard distributions by the King himself, as part of, or supplementary to, the organized charities dispensed by the Almoner.

We find Henry VII obtaining a yearly supply of “grotes and di-grotes,” the latter expression being the contraction of demi-groats, namely, twopence. The accounts for this King’s 15th year are

3 Samuel Bentley’s Excerpta Historica, p. 108.
available in manuscript,¹ and bring many charitable gifts before us, and I had occasion to study them carefully when looking for evidence for "the Healing," as touching for the King's Evil² was called. This is no scattering along the road on Progress, but an organized distribution on Good Friday; for instance, on April 18, 1500, we read "Item geven in grotes at the dole vj" iiij. Item geven in di-grotes at the dole lvij." This donation follows immediately on Henry's Good Friday offering of "10s" in the Church, and is preceded by, and entirely distinct from, the Maundy distribution. Again, in Henry VII's 16th year—1501—we have "geuen in almes in grotes viii" xiiij. Item geven in di grotes xxij." The 17th year, 1502, demanded "£6 12s. 6d. in grotes and £40 in the twopenny pieces."¹ Now let us pass to the first year of Henry VIII, and we shall find the same system continued: "Item dole in almes upon Good Friday aforesaid to pore folkes in grotes xji, in di grotes xli." This follows after the Maundy, given on this occasion on Friday,³ instead of Holy Thursday, although the various Good Friday services, which included the blessing of cramp-rings and the "creeping to the Cross," must have made the day arduous enough. In his second regnal year we have £45 in groats and £15 in half-groats;⁴ in the third year £20 and £50, respectively;⁵ and in the fourth year £30 and £55.⁶ It is not necessary to repeat these details year by year, but, besides the Maundy gifts to "26 pore men" in the seventh year of his reign, the King being in the twenty-sixth year of his age, we find the additional entry of the dole thus: "Item also in almes to pore pepell at the Kinges dole upon this Good Friday xx \[x^{iiij}\] x" [£90 10s.]⁷; and in the next year, the eighth of his reign, the sum was less, only £86.⁸ Again, we may

¹ Exchequer Accounts Various. MS., Public Record Office, Bundle 415, No. 3.
² British Numismatic Journal, vol. xii, p. 75 et seq.
⁴ Ibid., fol. 58.
⁵ Ibid., fol. 88.
⁶ Ibid., fol. 119.
⁷ Ibid., fol. 216 bis.
⁸ Ibid., fol. 255.
take an instance from a later manuscript, this of the King's twenty-first year, 1529: "Delivered to the King's Almouner to be by him distributed in the way of King's Almes to d'ves pore people at the holy tyme of Easter—C\\(^{ii}\)" and compare it with Henry's thirtieth year, from another manuscript, when an insignificant sum is shown, namely, "Paid in Almesse by the King's Commandement on Good Friday xl." Yet again, in 1545–6, when Henry's reign was drawing to a close, an item appears in a general account of money to be paid by the Treasurer, "To the Kinges Almenor upon good friday C\\(^{ii}\)." But although I have quoted passages taken at random amongst the various manuscripts, would that I had time or strength to renew the more systematic search made in my earlier years. I would draw attention chiefly to the mention of a specified sum in Henry's thirty-first and thirty-second years, when to the poor on Good Friday the Almoner distributed the sum of £133 6s. 8d., probably, as we shall see later, based on 200 marks: "Item pd to the Revnd. fader in God Nicholas Bishop of Rochester by the Kings ward dated viij Aprilis Anno xxxij to be employed and bestowed in the K's Almes uppon Goodfryday in full of the same ward the somme of cxxxiijli vj vijd." So runs the latter of these entries, and the payment is exclusive of the Maundy, which appears on an earlier page.

The Exchequer Accounts of Edward VI, so far as I have studied them, throw little light on a special Good Friday Dole. We have the items of his Maundy, of his Privy Alms dispensed by Dr. Cox, his "Almosiner," and his Daily Alms of 37s. iId. a week. His Good Friday offering in Church was twenty shillings, and on Easter Day an

---

1 Exchequer Accounts Various. MS., Public Record Office, Bundle 420, No. ii.
3 Trevelyan Papers, part ii, published by the Camden Society in 1863, vol. 84, p. 6.
4 Brit. Mus. MS., Arundel 97, fol. 69.
5 Ibid., fol. 185.
6 Ibid., fol. 183 bis.
7 Exchequer Accounts Various. MS., Public Record Office, Bundle 426, Nos. 5 and 6; and Miscellaneous Books, 439. These are printed in the Trevelyan Papers, to which I have so often referred, and I have collated them in the hope of finding more details, but in vain.
angel, just as on other Sundays, and on the Monday and Tuesday in Easter week he added a special offering of a mark (13s. 4d.) when he was present at "High Mas." There are in these Exchequer Accounts many allusions to Dr. Cox concerning the "Pryvie Almesse" at £20 a month. But a reference kindly copied for me by Mr. Henry Symonds from the Acts of the Privy Council, under date "10 Apr, 1552," brings the Easter Dole before us in a particularly interesting form, for, instead of the usual cxxxiiij vi viii, the wording is changed to 200 marks, which explains the origin of so curious a sum as £133 6s. 8d.—"Warrant to Mr. Cavendish to pay to Dr. Cox 200 marks for alms on M' Thursday." We shall notice that at a later period, under Charles II, £200 took the place of the 200 marks, the mark—two-thirds of £1—being money of account; but of this more anon. That Maundy Thursday is here mentioned instead of Good Friday emphasizes the fact, as appears later under Mary, that the choice of the day was optional at the Royal convenience.

As regards Mary I, I have several times referred to a computation of the probable expenses of her first regnal year—"The Queenes Almese on Maundy Thursday next comyng are set down at clxxviij xix xjd," and this is suggestive that the usual £133 6s. 8d. and the Maundy expenses are here massed. In the poverty of her

---

1 Exchequer Accounts Various. MS., Public Record Office, Bundle 426, No. 5, fol. xi.
2 Ibid., fols. xii, xvi, etc.
3 Trevelyan Papers, part ii, p. 36.
youth in 1536–7 Mr. Madden finds “Item geuen amonges pore people vpon good Frydaye xij.’” With this we may contrast the account given by Marco Antonio Faitta, secretary to Cardinal Pole, writing to Ippolito Chizzuola, and describing Mary’s Easter in 1556. After a lengthy description of the Maundy Thursday washing of feet and the blessing of cramp-rings on Good Friday, he returns to the exhausting ceremonial of the Thursday: “I will not omit telling you that on Holy Thursday were distributed here in this Court to a great amount, to upwards of 3,000 persons.” He goes on to say that “the Lord Legate gave provisions to 2,000 persons at Canterbury besides other alms,” and it is not clear whether Mary herself took part otherwise than in providing the money for this Easter Dole.

We have seen from the sum set aside in the above provisional lists of money likely to be needed at Easter, 1554, namely, £178 19s. 11d., that the Maundy gifts may have been included with the usual larger Dole to be distributed as the Queen’s Dole. Mary was born on February 15, 1516, and came to the throne on July 6, 1553; therefore, at her first Easter Pedilavium in 1554 she would be in her thirty-ninth year, and the pence demanded for 39 women for her actual age plus the year

1 *Privy Purse Expenses of Princess Mary* (edited by Frederick Madden in 1831, from an old MS., fol. 14 bis), p. 22.
2 *Venetian Calendar*, vol. vi, part i, pp. 428–37.
of grace would be covered by £6 6s. 9d. To this we must add the gold in redemption of her robe, £39, and the white and red bags to contain the pence and the twenty shillings respectively, and the money above the usual £133 6s. 8d. is fairly represented, as the purses cost about 1d. each.¹ Marco Antonio Faitta says that Mary bestowed her robe on the poorest of the women when he witnessed the Pedilavium in 1556, two years after the above computation was made, but it appears that each recipient had £1 in redemption of the robe, and Mary, in addition, gave the furred gown to the poorest. The beautiful new sovereign figured above cannot have been used, as it was valued at thirty shillings; but her brother’s twenty-shilling sovereigns were available, or two angels, or his half-soleigns.

But we are on much surer ground when we come to the time of Elizabeth, whose eleemosynary accounts are set down in great detail by Sir Thomas Henneage, her Treasurer of the Chamber, month by month, from her twenty-third to her twenty-fourth regnal year, namely, from Michaelmas, 1581, to the same date in 1582.² From these accounts we see that, apart from the Maundy, the expenses of which Charity are particularized as amounting to the sum of £58 5s. 4d.,³ there was a further distribution at the hands of “The Right Reverend Father in God, John Pyers, Bishop of Sarum,” the Queen’s Almoner, as follows:—“cxxxiiij liij viij” to be by him distributed and given by way of Her Highnes’ Almes to dyvers pore people on Maundye Thursdaye Good Friday and in the Tyme of Ester next day.” This amount is stated to be “by virtue of a warrant under the Prvye Signet dated at yr Majs Mannor of Greenwch primo Marcij Anno xxiiij of yr Ma’y.” It is particularly stated that Elizabeth gave the Maundy “by Her Highnes owne Handes,” and that she gave to 48 women “fortie eight pens in memorye for Her Matys aige,” coming to £11 12s., “in single pence and to every of the said women in a redd purse Twenty Shillinges in lieu of her Matys owne

¹ It would work out exactly if six and a-half dozen purses were ordered in the two colours, white for the silver, red for the gold.
³ Ibid., fol. 4, April 6, 1582.
gowne." The total, including the payment for purses, was, as we have seen, £58 5s. 4d. Elizabeth's sovereign, of £1 value, was of later date, and her gift was probably of two angels. In 1564, owing to the present time of contagious sickness, i.e. the plague, the Queen did not herself hold the usual Maundy celebration, but, said the Proclamation announcing this fact, "Alms will be given to the poor of Windsor and Eton."¹

We have, however, another account of Elizabeth's distribution of Largesse on Holy Thursday, and on this occasion we notice that the almsgiving was personally performed. Nichols,² after describing her Maundy service in 1559-60, proceeds: "The same afternoon she gave unto poor men women and children whole and lame, in St. James' Park being two thousand people and upwards, 2d. apiece."

A fine manuscript on vellum, kindly shown me in 1914, when in the possession of Mr. Walter V. Daniell, then of 33, King Street, St. James's, brought before me a much larger sum than the ordinary £133 6s. 8d., and by his permission I describe this oblong folio on vellum. It was dated St. James's, it bore the Privy Seal, and it assigned to the Bishop of Worcester as chief Almoner, under date April 10, 1593, certain sums, and bore the Queen's signature and portrait. Elizabeth in this document addressed an order to the Chancellor of Lancaster to pay for this distribution "on Maundy Thursday, Good Friday and the Easter week ensuing the sum of £433 6s. 8d."³ We may, I think, fairly assume that the usual

¹ Calendar of Miscellaneous State Papers, 1564, p. 236.
² Nichols's Progresses of Queen Elizabeth, ed. of 1825, vol. i, p. 85.
£133 6s. 8d. is included, and the remaining £300 covered the other charitable grants such as the "Privy Almes" at £240 and the Maundy gold, for we may notice that the grand total mentioned in the Bishop of Salisbury's list in 1581-2, inclusive of the Daily Alms at 37s. 11d. a week, Privy Alms at £20 a month, Maundy and Easter Dole reached £530 2s. 1d.

It seems fairly certain there was no positive rule that the distribution should immediately follow one or the other fatiguing ceremonials at Eastertide, but the more usual day was Good Friday in the afternoon. A manuscript written in the time of Henry VIII, by Thomas Hawley, Rouge Croix in 1509, and afterwards Clarencieux, a rank which he held in 1539, was probably written somewhat before this date. This manuscript gives us the certainty that Henry superintended, if he did not actually handle, the Dole. After describing the "Seruyce hallowing of the Cramp Ringes" on Good Friday morning, followed by the "Creeping to the Crosse" of the King and Queen and the whole Court, Hawley proceeds thus: "Item at afternone at such tyme and place as shall please the Kyng to Appoynt the Almoner shall have the pore people redy to receave the kynge's Dole and the gentilmen hushers shall cause a place to be made redy for the Kynge to stand in at the Dole that to be garnyed and Carpettes and Cusshyns layde for the Kyng to lene upon the Tresurer of the Kynges Chamber for the tyme byeing to be there redy w' mony for the dole. And the Kynges Almoner to be there in lykewyse redy to deluyer hit to the pore people."

Unfortunately the Herald does not give the amount or form of the Dole, but, as we have seen, the amount varied, and the specie used was either the groat or the half-groat; whereas in the times of Elizabeth and her successor James, only the latter coin appears to have played a part in this scattering of small coin.

We have several times in our earlier articles referred to the special

---

1 College of Arms MS. 7, by Hawley, who became Clarencieux in 1539, and died in 1557. The late Mr. Keith Murray, Bluemantle, who kindly looked through this manuscript with me, told me that he thought from internal evidence it was compiled between 1517 and 1534. It includes the christening of Elizabeth in 1533.
striking of coins to meet the needs of the royal Doles,\textsuperscript{1} and although, so far as our present knowledge takes us, James I gave only single pence with his gold at the Maundy Service, there is evidence that half-groats were struck by his order for the Easter Dole. A letter from the Lord Almoner to Conway, Secretary of State, written in the last month of the monarch’s reign, makes it clear that both “pence and twopences” were required for this distribution.\textsuperscript{2}

\textbf{JAMES I HALF-GROAT.}

“My Lord,” writes the Bishop of London, “ye Maundy Thursday draws on and ther wilbe I suppose some difficulty to gett ye Kings Hand whilst his Ague holds him w\textsuperscript{h} I hope in God shall not be long. I am bold therefore to goe ye ferst way beseeching yr Ldp to gett his hand as soone as it shall please yr Ldp for ye money gotten by warrant must be coyned into pence and twopences for ye Maundy distribution to ye poor w\textsuperscript{h} will require some tyme, it is a thing of course and done every yeare, but ye indisposition of ye King requires such a Mediator as yr Lordship. So w\textsuperscript{h} my harty prayer for yr Ldp’s health and happinesse I remayne ready for your Comandements.

"GEO. LONDON.

“Mr. Subalmoner will wayte uppon youe w\textsuperscript{th} ye bill,
“London House, March 16, 1624.”

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{British Numismatic Journal,} vol. ix, p. 227; \textit{ibid.,} vol. xvi, “Royal Charities” (second series), part i, p. 219.

\textsuperscript{2} Public Record Office MS., \textit{State Papers Domestic,} vol. 185, No. 63, directed “To the Right Honorable Sir Edward Conway, Kt. Principal Secretary to his Ma\textsuperscript{t}es at Court or elsewhere,” and endorsed “March 16, 1625—Bishop of London for his Mat Warrant for Maundaie money.” This is March, 1624, according to the old style, and 1625 according to the new.
James died on March 27, 1625, eleven days after the Bishop had written the letter, and the coins must have been distributed by or for Charles I on April 17 following. It is clear that they were charged to the latter King's account, in so much as a Signet Office warrant of the 2nd of that month was delivered to the Treasurer of the Chamber "to pay £133 6s. 8d. to Lord Almoner or his Subalmoner to be distributed this Easter in Alms."

Moreover, on the 7th another warrant to the Master of the Wardrobe provides for the clothing. Of this sum, even if £212s. for the Maundy pence and £26 in golden unites were included, which, as I have shown, was not usually the case, a large sum remains for the King's Dole. The Signet Office Docquets show that £133 6s. 8d.

CHARLES I UNITE (MINT-MARK, LIS).

was the sum usually bestowed by Charles I, and Mr. Symonds has been so good as to call my attention to an entry under date of April 20, 1641, and in one or two other adjoining years, of a Warrant to the "Treas of Chamber to pay to Bishop of Winton, Chief Almoner, or to the Subalmoner £133 6s. 8d. to be distributed in alms on Maundy Thursday, Good Friday and Easter week next, as hath been accustomed." At this date Charles I must have used his father's gold coin, as his own unite as figured above was not yet made. The Pells Order-Books also show on March 22, 1642, "£250 for the service of Maundy and Wardrobe of robes." This sum would no doubt

1 Signet Office Docquets, vol. 52.
2 Pells Order Books (40 and 41).
include the £42 in gold and £7 8s. in silver, as well as the clothing and the Good Friday Dole.

Whether Oliver Cromwell continued the Dole, I have not been able to ascertain. That he was charitable we know, and that he aped Royalty we know; and, possibly, had I delved more deeply into his accounts I might have discovered more; but, as I am dealing with Royal Charities, I will pass on to the Restoration, and give an extract from the Treasury Books under date March 19, 1662–3.¹ "Money Warrant for £169 14s. 9d." we read: "To Sir Edward Griffin Treasurer of the Chamber to be by him paid to the Lord Almoner or his deputy for the allowance usually distributed every Maundy Thursday and Easter following." Here we have obviously the £32 in gold and £4 5s. 4d. required by a King in his thirty-second year, the money for the bags at about 1d. each, and our old friend the £133 6s. 8d. for the Dole.² Turn we to the year 1664, we shall find a somewhat larger sum, namely, "200" for the usual distribution,"³ and so forth, when Charles, in his thirty-fifth year, would need £40 and 2d. for the Maundy besides the Dole, and, therefore, the surplus of some £27 must have gone to the expenses of the Wardrobe or to a charity now called the "Discretion Bounty" (of which more anon), unless, as I have suggested, the 200 marks or 400 angels of the Tudors had been no longer used as a basis of reckoning after the Restoration, a fact corroborated by the Treasurer of Chamber’s Accounts under Queen Anne,⁴ as follows: Due to "compleat the allowance of £200 for her Ma’tys alms on Monday [sic for Maundy] Thursday, £100."

The reign of James II was short, and the available State Papers are comparatively few. Of his devotional exercises both in England and abroad much has been written, and we know that he was the last of our Monarchs to wash the feet of the poor in person—a thing

¹ Treasury Book IV, fol. 152, and Calendar of Treasury Papers, 1660–7, p. 508.
² The Treasury Books prefix the certificate of Jon Clark, clerk of the Treasurer of the Chamber Office, of the amount paid for the above.
³ Calendar of Treasury Papers, April 6, 1664, p. 594.
⁴ Danny MS., March 5, 1702–3.
that, as Pepys remarks, Charles II, after a while, did by deputy. But, as regards the Good Friday Dole, Pepys and Evelyn are silent, and we have no evidence beyond the monthly payments made to the Almoner and the continued accounts of Chamberlayne, Miege, and Delaune, that the twopenny dole went on. These writers take us through the days of James II, of William and Mary, of Anne, even of George I and George II; but it is a parrot-like repetition, and we look in vain in the newspapers then coming into being for a description of personal Largesse in the Parks by Charles II and his successors.

As regards the money grant, it is clear that by the time of Anne £200 had taken the place of the 200 marks, and, besides the private manuscript already quoted, the official Treasury Papers immediately after the death of William contain almost the same words. Amongst "billes due in the Treasury Office since March 8, 1701–2," we read "Due to compleat ye 200i on the Establish1 for her Ma't's Almes on Maundy Thursday next 100 : 0 : 0." Anne must have used William's coins, for her half-groat, figured below, was not struck until 1703.

A manuscript collection made by Lady Banks, the wife of the well-known Sir Joseph Banks, contains useful references to many old news-sheets. The Collection commences with a letter from Sir Richard Kaye the Almoner, dated November 5, 1800, in which a careful description is given of the Maundy Service as then performed, but no mention is made of the supplementary Dole. Another paper, however, under date March, 1798, bound in with the above, states

1 Mercurius Politicus, of April 23, 1663, and April 18, 1667, notes the King performing the rites in person. Pepys, in 1667, notes that "on March 4 in that year the King did not wash the poor people's feet himself," thereby suggesting a departure from usual rule (Pepys, vol. iii, p. 188).


that "Petitions are received at the Almonry Office during the last Fortnight in November when the Lord Almoner has allotted to each Petition their respective Proportion of the King’s Alms, the money is paid on the Monday preceding Christmas Day.¹ Petitions are again received in the same mode during the last Fortnight in February and the Petitioners receive his Majesty’s alms on the Monday in Passion Week and on Maundy Thursday. The sums given to the Different Petitioners at Christmas are 5s to some, 10/6 to others, and a guinea to very few. At Easter the same mode of Distribution is followed, but with this Addition that as many men and as many Women equal in number to the years which the King has lived adding a year of Grace are admitted as Maundy men and as many Maundy women.”

The writer, apparently by the endorsement a Mrs. Gaunt, then proceeds to give a detailed account of the Maundy ceremonial, with distribution of clothes, money and provisions, ending with the drinking of the King’s health by each recipient in “a very small wooden Cup.”

It is of interest to learn from a manuscript kindly lent me from the Royal Almonry Office,² that the food dole was not commuted for money until 1837, whilst the gifts of clothes continued until 1882. But I am wandering into the province of the Maundy proper as distinct from the King’s Dole, which now takes the form of several allowances known as “Bounties,” called, respectively, “The Discretionary,” “The Minor,” and “Common” Bounties. Mr. Bidwell, writing in 1893, explained that the “Common Bounty” was at the time he wrote distributed in sums of 10s. each to 1,300 persons annually in two moieties, one at Christmas, the other at Easter, together with other Doles, called the “Minor Bounty” and the “Discretionary Bounty,” of varying sums.³

¹ A Fund now called “The Common Bounty,” and clearly a survival of the King’s Dole.
² Royal Almsgiving, by H. J. Bidwell, kindly communicated to me by Mr. Bidwell’s successor in office, at the request of the late Sir Edgar Sheppard, and also published in the Guardian, April 5, 1893, No. 2470, pp. 545 and 546.
³ The “Discretionary Bounty” consists of payments of £3 a year to certain persons who may at any time be transferred to the Maundy list or had been on the list of a former Monarch. The “Minor Bounty” also supplied various pensions.
Largesse and the King's Dole.

Mr. Bidwell, then Secretary to the Almonry, tells us that at the above date £1,600 a year "out of the Queen's dotation" was paid to the Lord High Almoner, part of that sum being a commutation of certain fines and fees, the Monarch's Special Alms and so forth, and partly from "about £400 a year" which he believed had "always been a direct money grant" for the Maundy to the Lord High Almoner, eventually rising to £800. Possibly £400 may be a doubling of the Dole, consequent on a distribution at Christmas as well as Easter, but probably Mr. Bidwell included in these sums not only the £133 6s. 8d., plus the Maundy expenditure, which, as we have seen, rose from 200 marks to £200, but also the "Privy Alms," which by the time of Edward VI stood at £240 a year, for certainly these were "direct money grants." The "Daily Alms," as we saw in our last volume, was succeeded in due course by a Bounty still known as "Gate Alms," being an allowance of 6d. a week to 150 persons.

VICTORIA NEW TYPE SIXPENCE, 1893.

Hence we may assume that the "Common Bounty" to which I have just referred, and the "Discretionary" and "Minor" Bounties are the survival of the "King's Dole" in a more sensible and systematic form.

I do not propose to enquire beyond the year 1893, when Mr. Bidwell published his article on "Royal Almsgiving." Since then two generous and wise Monarchs have passed away, and one not less generous and wise than his predecessors graces the Throne.

Long May He Reign!