ROYAL CHARITIES.

(SECOND SERIES.)

PART IV.

BY HELEN FARQUHAR, F.R.HIST.S.

The Maundy Coins.

T is now more than a decade since I took up the study of "Royal Charities" and was privileged to publish in the twelfth volume of the British Numismatic Journal my first lecture on the Royal Gift of Healing. Throughout the ensuing volumes I followed the development of a current coin, the Angel, into the token purposely struck to take the place, as the King's gift, of an obsolete gold piece. This token was known as the Touchpiece. The Series having ended, it was suggested to me that a similar instance of special coinage, replacing a silver piece long current, but no longer available, lay in the "Maundy." In our sixteenth volume, therefore, I began a second Series, telling of the various royal charities which called for the half-groat and the silver penny, and even for the fourpenny and threepenny coins now included under the name of Maundy. But it was the silver penny alone, which really was necessary under the Tudors and Stuarts for the special ceremony on Holy Thursday, when the Monarch gave a penny for each year of his age with an added year of grace, to as many poor persons. Thus when a sovereign was —let us say—twenty-nine years old, he or she would give thirty pence to thirty persons, the royal donor being in his or her thirtieth

2 Ibid., vol. xiii, pp. 95-163; vol. xiv, pp. 89 to 120; and vol. xv, pp. 141 to 183.
year. This was so definitely the rule, as we know from the Tudor Account Books and other manuscripts, that we have been tempted to try to compute the exact date of a painting by counting the numbers of recipients portrayed in a wonderful miniature of which, by the kindness of Lord Beauchamp, I am able to reproduce an enlargement as my frontispiece. This marvellous painting, by Nicholas Hilliard, shows Elizabeth followed by Blanche Parry, her principal Lady-in-Waiting, with various members of the Court. The officiating Clergy, the Children of the Almonry, and finally a large number of poor persons are here delineated. So excellent is the portraiture that Blanche Parry is recognizable by comparison with her picture at Hampton Court and her monument in St. Margaret’s, Westminster; and yet the whole hundred or more figures are represented in a space measuring only $2\frac{3}{4}$ by $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches, as shown above in the actual size.

1 Miniature of Elizabeth dispensing Maundy. In the collection of Earl Beauchamp at Madresfield Court.
The Maundy Coins.

This miniature has been approximately dated to the year 1560, and with this assumption the style of dress corresponds. Lord Beauchamp kindly lent the portrait to the Brussels *Exposition de la Miniature*, in 1912; and there, as No. 181, it was provisionally dated "vers 1563." But this date, as Dr. George Williamson kindly informed me, was probably a misprint, and it is thought to represent the almsgiving on April 11, 1560, described by Nichols in his *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*. The years 1563 and 1564 were, as I find, so beset with plague that Elizabeth was prevented from making her presentations in person. The plague was rife from January, 1562–3, to December, 1563, and although it had almost ceased by Easter, 1564, a proclamation of March 23, 1563–4, announces that the Queen will not distribute her alms herself, but they will be given by the Almoner to the poor in Windsor and Eton.¹

Concerning the dates we must confess to feeling puzzled. There were two distributions in 1558 according to Old Style, one on April 7, 1558, and one on March 23, 1558–9, which we should now call 1559. The distribution² in 1560 was on April 11, and it is clear that Nichols meant 1560. But in this case why does he speak of only twenty women, when Elizabeth (who was born on September 7, 1533) must have been aged twenty-six and reckoned as in her twenty-seventh year. Possibly only twenty women were present and the gifts for the others would be sent, as is so often the case to this day, many of the recipients being very infirm and unable to attend the service. Possibly again it is a printer's error,

¹ Lord Crawford's *Stuart and Tudor Proclamations*, No. 593. See also Nichols, vol. i, p. 147 to p. 149, *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*. Also *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1564, p. 236, March 23, 1563–4.
² Nichols, *u.s.*, vol. i, pp. 83–84, ed. 1823.
a slip of the pen, or Nichols misread his authority, reading 0 for 6, a not infrequent blunder. He gives no reference to the original source, whilst in March, 1572–3, he quotes Lambarde's MS. in full. But if Nichols was right, one can only say that so far as one may count the tiny figures of the bedeswomen depicted in the two front ranks in the miniature, their number appears to agree with the above. The women are seated in rows; the ladies wear their aprons to protect their fine dresses in the washing of feet. Elizabeth is seen preceded by a lady with a basin for the office, or an alms-dish containing the purses.

But we must not let our interest in this wonderful picture delay us from taking a general view of the subject, and want of space and the great mass of matter at our command, published and unpublished alike, preclude my giving detailed extracts from contemporary accounts such as that in 1572 of the historian, William Lambarde, who became Keeper of the Records later in the reign. This account of the 1572 Maundy has been more than once quoted in various publications. Less well known is the shorter note by Guzman de Silva, of the Maundy on April 19, 1565. Also from itemised accounts of her Almoner in 1582, where it is expressly stated that "by Her Highnes owne handes" she gave to 48 women "fortie eight pens in memorye of Her Matc aige." Moreover, it is said the money was given "to every pore woman in a whyte purse and to the said women in a redd purse Twentye shillinges in liue of Her Matc owne gowne, the purses costing the unusually large sum of 13½ a doz." We also find a very detailed description by an eye-witnss on the 17th of April in 1595, when the office "of the Queenes Maundaye was performed" by "Dr. Mathewes, Bisshop of Durhm," the prelate "washing the right foot of 57 severell wome" and giving to each a "redd purse and a
whyt, as they say 40° therein." If the date be correct the number of the women should have been sixty-two, and the two gifts of money should have totalled £1 5s. 2d.

The Venetian Calendar gives a long account written by Cardinal Pole's Secretary, of Queen Mary's fatiguing rite, taking special trouble to find the most worthy recipient for her gown of the finest purple cloth lined with martín's fur, with sleeves "so long and wide they reached the ground."

The writer states that after going the whole length of the hall on her knees in the ceremony of washing the women's feet, the Queen returned for the third time "she gave was in fact the poorest and most aged women is given correctly as "forty-one" went round the hall "she gave to each forty-one pennies, according to the number of her own years, and which in value," writes Faitta, "may amount to rather more than half an Italian golden crown." This account is of such interest that I have been tempted to quote from it at some length although, being officially printed in the Calendar of State Papers, it is easily accessible. It has been, moreover, already utilized by modern writers. It is worth noting in the matter of the gift of the gown that Elizabeth is described on March 19th, 1572-3, by William Lambarde as substituting a money gift in a red purse for Her Majesty's gown, "which (so men say) by ancient order she ought to give to some of them at

---

1 Venetian Calendar of State Papers, vol. vi, part i, p. 434; letter under date May 3, 1556, from Marco Antonio Faitta to Dr. Ippolito Chizzuola.

2 Owing to the debasement of our currency the value of the Venetian golden sequin stood at that moment at 82 pence in English money. See Venetian Calendar, vol. iv, p. 451.


4 Brit. Mus. Addit. MS., No. 32097, f. 70; see also Brit. Mus. Harl. MS., No. 1644, in 1582: "In a redd pusse twentye Shillinges in hue of her Matf owne gown."
her pleasure." This alteration, the writer describes, was caused "to avoid the trouble of suite, which accustomablie was made for that preferment" [preferment]. She had, therefore, "changed that rewarde into money to be equally divided amongst them all, namely, 20s. a piece." In ransoming her gown, Elizabeth, who was too vain to part readily with her bejewelled raiment, was but reverting to the custom of her little brother Edward, whose childish robes were redeemed at 20s. to each of the twelve men to whom he also presented ten pence in his first regnal year.¹

So many accounts of the Maundy ceremonial under our Tudor Queens have been published that I prefer to choose in illustration of the ceremony a less well-known description from a sixteenth-century manuscript in the College of Arms. This account runs as follows:—"Ordre of the King's going to the Chapell on Shere Thursday and from thens in to the hall to the Maundy"² "First at suyche oure as shall please His Grace to appoynt at afternone a bishopp and the deane of the chapell to be their redy revested to wayte upon the Kynge w't all . . . . ³ of the Chapell in their surplusses wayting in Lyckewyse"

"Then the Kynge at his pleasure to come to the Lords and Noble men wayting on Hym w'out any Sworde to be borne afores his grace at the tyme going or coming and so to passe strayte to the hye Aulter the Chapell[ain] begyngyng suyce [service] thereto belonging the Kynge the Bysshop and the Deane to washe the Aulter and that don the Chapell[ain] the Bysshop and the Deane to passe through the . . . . into the body of the Chapell the Bysshop and these to the Aulters as before saide And this don to passe forth

¹ Public Record Office, MS. Exchequer Accounts Various, 1st and 2nd year Ed. VI, No. 426, vol. v.
² College of Arms Manuscript, M. 7, fol. 26. This manuscript is believed to be in the handwriting of Thomas Hawley, Clarenceux, who was Rouge Croix in 1509, Clarenceux in 1537, and died in 1557. I have had occasion to refer to this manuscript before in dealing with the doles. It is a book of ceremonials for every monarch, not for any one king in particular.
³ This gap should be filled with two short words, such as "the clergy" or "the choir."
to the Kyng’s closet and to wash the Altar there in like manner, and from there to the Queen’s Closet as before is said.”

“Item from thence the Chaplain with the Bishop and the Deane to go before the King into the Hall and then the King shall pause a little there. Then his grace to go into the Wardrobe of his Robes there to put on the gown which he shall give to some one of the poor men as shall like his grace and then to return into the Hall aye and then the Chaplain to begin service accustomed. And then the towel and the Apron to be brought to the King by the King’s Almoner and the Chamberlain if so be present or the vice Chamberlain in his absence to take the towel and put it on the King’s head lying the one part on one shoulder and the other on the other shoulder and to put on the Apron about his neck knotting the two corners behind him and so stand till that be done. And in the mean time the Lords and gentlemen to fetch towels and aprons for their selves. And then incontinent the Lords and Noblemen to go to the lower end of the Hall and there to receive of the officers of the Eurey and of the Amory [almonry] basins of Silver with water in them to bring to the King to wash the poor men’s feet beginning at the uppermost man sitting upon the righthand of the king as he standeth the King’s Almoners to begin first to wash and the King to follow until they have done. And the Lords and the Noble Men to receive for every poor man a gown and a hod the King beginning at the uppermost man as is aforesaid and so forth till the last man.”

“Item in like manner to receive for every poor man a pair of shoes and they to be given in like manner as afore said.”

“Item in like manner a Case of bread and mass of fish to be received in Dishes of Tree [wood] and to be delivered in like manner before rehearsed.”

“Item in like manner an ashen Cup of wine to be fetched for every poor man and to be delivered as afore is said.”

“Item this don the King shall give his Towel and his Apron to the first man that he did wash and so every man a towel and an Apron Item that don the Treasurer of the King’s Chamber for
the tyme beying shall bring to the Kyng for euery pore men an halpenny purse and as many pens in hit as there be poore men in nombre and that be delyvered as is befor sed. And this don the Kyng shall goe ageyne into the Wardrobe and put off his gowne and hit shall be delyu’d to the Almoner and he shall bere hit before the Kynge in to the hall and these the Kynge shall give to suyche one of the pore men as shall please his grace—this done the Chapell shall begyne ageyne suyce accostomd and that don the Kyng shall go to his Closset the Bisshop the Deane w’ all them of the Chapell and begyn suyce there. And that don the Kyng to retorne to his chamber.”

By the kindness of the late Mr. Keith W. Murray (then Port-cullis and afterwards Blue Mantle), I was able to follow the rather difficult and varied spelling of this document, which is almost without a stop from beginning to end.

The Herald who compiled the above was much more concerned with the ceremonial than with the money gift. But his mention of “a hal penny purse” with “as many pens in hit as there be poore men in nombre” reminds us that all through the Tudor account books careful charges are entered of sums varying from a penny to less than a halfpenny each for the little leather bags containing the money.

In these useful manuscripts preserved at the Public Record Office and in the British Museum we can follow many of the expenses, year by year, of Henry VII, and many more under Henry VIII, for they commence with the beginning of the latter monarch’s reign. In the Household Book catalogued as Brit. Mus. Addit. MS., No. 21481, running from May 1, 1509, to March 23, 1518, we find “ij dosen purses for the Maundie viii”, thus costing less than a halfpenny each. The following year again we read of “two Duzon of rede psses for the maundy viii”, and here we have an indication that the red purse was used when the donation was only in silver pence, the white purse taking that office when at a slightly later period the red bag was wanted for the 20s. gold piece or its equivalent in silver shillings given in redemption of the robe worn by the
monarch. The two dozen purses were more than sufficient at that date, and later, when three dozen were needed, the price still remains at 4d. a dozen.

These account books give year by year the rise in numbers with Henry's advancing years. Thus, in "Anno Primo Hen. VIII," on Good Friday, March 29, 1510, we find the entry "Item to XX almsmen at the Kyngf Mandye evry of them having xx the piece, xxxiiij iijd."

"The next year the number of pore men at the Kingf Mandye upon Thuresday evry of them recuing xxi the piece." The total amount "xxxv iijd." And so we run on to the eighth year of Henry's reign, "ij iiijd per pers lx ix and iij doz purs at xijd." Notice that the first entry is for Good Friday, the third for Maundy Thursday. But we have seen in Hawley's Book of Ordinances that the hour was to be "as it should please His Grace to appoynt," and until later the ceremony was not invariably fixed to be on Thursday, but if omitted was performed on the Friday.

It is not necessary to repeat these details year by year, but we see in the various Household Books that the sum progressed with the years. Thus in another manuscript at the British Museum—catalogued as Arundel 97—extending from the 29th to the 33rd year of the King's reign, we read in the 29th regnal year, i.e. in March, 1537-8, that he gave "xlvij pore men to eufy of them xlvij pens total ix viijd."

We find that in both this manuscript and the preceding the year of grace is always reckoned, and a few more entries will suffice us, chosen at random. Take the 32nd regnal year total, £10 8s. 1d., or let us glance at Brian Tuke's Manuscript at the Public Record Office, numbered Hen. VIII, Bundle 420, No. 11, and read "Maundy Thursday at Grenwch. Item to xlj pore men at the Kingf Mandye this Thursday."

1 Easter Day, 1510, fell on March 31.
4 Henry was born on June 28, 1491, and ascended the throne on April 22, 1509.
Glancing backwards to the reign of Henry VII, we shall find that the purses are really appraised at \( \frac{1}{4} d. \) each. In this King’s 15th regnal year we read “Item to xliiiij pore men in almes viij\( \frac{1}{10} \) x\( \frac{1}{10} \) d. Item for xliiiij small purses xxij\( d. \)” or the following year 1501, under the head of “Sheirs Daye,” we have “xlv pore men for eury of them iij\( v \) d. in all viij\( vi \) viij\( ix \) d. Item for xlv smale purses for there Mondy ij\( v \).” But a truce to these figures, which become wearisome, and I will only mention that little King Edward VI, in the tenth year of his age, on succeeding his father, presented his gift of ten pence each to twelve men—it being evidently considered that twelve was the minimum, seeing that the apostles were the prototype. “Item more to said xij pore men at the same Maundy. Any [of] them xx\( s \) in a purse instede of the Maundy gown.”

The following year the number of the men remains the same, but each received \( \text{II} d. \). In another volume, where the amounts of the third year are noted, the twelve men each receive twelve pence, with, of course, the extra 20s. to each man as before.

Mr. Symonds kindly tells me that he has seen in the Acts of the Privy Council, the warrants to Sir William Cavendish in 1547 and 1549 for the “£12 disbursed to twelve poor men on M. Thursday last.”

Presumably, when in 1550 Edward had reached the thirteenth year of his age, the number of the men would rise accordingly, but excepting a warrant to pay Edward’s Chaplain, Tutor, and Almoner, Dr. Coxe, 200 marks for alms on Maundy Thursday, I have found no account for this year.

1. MS. Exchequer Accounts Various, P.R.O., Bundle 415, No. 3, April 18, 1500. See also Ord’s “Household Expenses of Henry VII.” Brit. Mus. Addit. MS., No. 7099, in the King’s seventh regnal year, when 38 poor men received 38 “smale-purses” at the price of 20\( d. \). Henry VII was born January 28, 1456-7 and came to the throne on August 22, 1485.

2. Edward VI was born on October 12, 1537. He succeeded his father on January 28, 1547.

3. MS. Accounts of Sir William Cavendish, Knight Treasurer of the King’s Chamber. Public Record Office, 1st and 2nd Ed. VI, Bundle 426, vol. 5.

4. Ibid., Bundle 426, vol. 6.
But the acts of the Privy Council may be examined with profit in considering the question of the necessity for a special coinage, or at least the delivery to the Almoner of the ready coined money, and Mr. Henry Symonds has kindly supplied me with the following data.¹

On April 2, 1574, 10 lbs. of silver, roughly speaking enough to make £30 worth of small coin, was ordered to be coined into “single pennies” at the rate 720 to the pound Troy, and of 11 oz. 2 dwt. fine silver for Elizabeth’s private use. And it is well to remember that Maundy Thursday fell on April 8th in that year. My esteemed friend further tells me he has found other orders for the penny-halfpenny and three-farthings, but they were not ear-marked with the above reservation. Thus we notice, in the year 1576, in the Acts of the Council, “18th April, Mr. Martin officer of the Mint to deliver £12 in pence for H.M.’s service on Maundy Thursday.”² The order must have been designed to meet the requirements of the following day, April 19th, and shows that the money must have been in some already preserved stock. And yet again, nearly two years later, March 18, 1577–8, Mr. Symonds has kindly supplied me with this entry: “Warrant to Warden of the Mint for delivery of £13 in new pence for Maundy.” In 1578 the day of distribution fell on March 27th. From these orders it is apparent that about 10s. worth of pence were added year by year to meet the increasing age of Elizabeth, who would in 1578 require £8 8s. 9d., that is to say, 2,025 pennies at 45 times 45, as against 43 times 43 in 1576, namely, 1,849 pennies amounting to £7 14s. 1d.

We published in our last volume a letter³ from the Bishop of London, requesting the Secretary of State to command small coin to be delivered for the Maundy of James I; and we know from

² Ibid., pp. 78–79.
Mr. Symonds' article on mint-marks that this monarch had several times to order special coinages, and had in the year 1624 to set aside a considerable amount of silver for that purpose at the Mint. The Bishop speaks of it as a "thing of course and done every yeare." But James did not live to give away this money. Indeed, the letter was written on March 17, 1624–5, when the King was dying. He actually expired on March 27, and the Maundy fell on the following April 14. We know from the State Papers that the coins were charged to the account of Charles I, and obviously no effort could be made to change the name of the Monarch from I.D.G. to C.D.G. on the obverse. Certainly such altered coins of James I type are not known to us. Hawkins calls attention to the fact that "within a week after the death of James a commission was granted to continue the coinage according to the last indentures of the king; but these coins were probably struck from unaltered dies of James I and are not now distinguishable."

When Charles issued his pence the following year with the mint-mark lis, he changed the reverse type from the thistle to the rose, identifying himself rather with his British throne than with that of Scotland, which preserved its separate coinage. He was, when he came to the throne, in his twenty-sixth year, and would only require £2 16s. 4d. in single pence, plus £26 gold pieces, or more probably, 520 silver shillings. Justin Pagitt, in his manuscript notebook, describing a later celebration of Maundy on April 18, 1633, writes of "two purses, one containing 20 shillings in new silver and the other 33 new single pence."

We know that, during the Civil War, Charles I did not fail to "keep his Maundy," and if at York we find no smaller coinage than the three-penny piece, then known as the half-sixpence, the Tower.

1 *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. ix, p. 227, and information supplied by Mr. Symonds from Signet Office Documents under "Maundy, 2nd April, 1625."

2 There are two issues bearing mint-mark *lis*, one with the *lis* on the obverse only (mentioned by Hawkins), and one with the *lis* on both sides, in my collection; but it is not possible that either of these could be ready for the first Maundy.

coins were still available. Christopher Hildyard chronicles the King’s visit to York on March 30, 1639, on his way up to Scotland. But the distribution was made “for” the King, not by him, on April 11th. “On Maundy Thursday Doctor Curle, Bishop of Winchester, the King’s Almoner, kept the Maundy in the Minster, giving as the King’s gift to nine and thirty Poor men each of them four yards of Holland three yards of Broad Cloath, a pair of Shoes, a Wooden Platter with a Jowle of Leng and another of Salmon, six Red Herrings, two Loaves of Bread, a Scale of Wine, twenty shillings in Money, nine and thirty single Pence, and washed their feet.”

Again, in 1642, Hildyard briefly states, “This year His Majesty kept his Maundy in the Minster upon the seventh of April.” Charles was then in his forty-second year. If difficulty arose as to transport, we may note that the Aberystwith mint had not yet been moved to Oxford, and also that Briot might have had access to his own private dies. Drake, in his *Eboracum,* describes the procedure in 1639 in much the same words, but at rather greater length, adding that “the men drank off the claret wyne, and so, after a few prayers read, the ceremony ended and the poor men carried away all that was given them.” Drake specifies the gift as “xxs in money and so many single pennies as the King was years of age, being thirty nine.” Of the second visit in 1642, Drake says: “The King kept his Maundy in the Cathedral, when the Bishop of Winchester performed the usual ceremonies,” and we learn from Mr. Symonds that, in March, 1641–2, Charles I gave his orders for the service of Maundy and

---

1 *Antiquities of York,* p. 51, ed. 1664.
2 *Ibid.,* p. 53. Charles I was born November 19, 1600. He was 41 on November 19, 1641.
3 Drake’s *Eboracum,* p. 137. Note to chapter v, which Drake states to be “an old writing.”
Wardrobe of Robes as noted in the *Pells Order Book*. This distribution at York was on April 7th, as we have seen.\(^1\)

I am further indebted to Mr. Symonds for some interesting notes, from the Signet Office Docquet Books, on Oxford in the Civil War. Among other unpublished matters, I learn from him that Maundy preparations were made so early as on February 23, 1642–3. I quote from his notes as follows: "Maunday Warrant to Master of Wardrobe to deliver to George Kirke the usual necessities for this year to be brought to the place where it shall be kept." The "necessities" then ordered must have been intended for the Maundy service at Oxford on March 30, 1643. We know that the plague which forbade the entrance to the city at Easter, 1643, to the public, did not hinder the Maundy, the recipients being within the walls. Charles was in Oxford at Easter in 1644, as well as in 1643, and again Mr. Symonds tells me of a "Warrant to Sir Bevis Thelwell to deliver parcels of stuff for this year as was the custom." This warrant for "Maunday" is under date January 19, 1643–4, and the "stuff" would be required for Holy Thursday, April 18, 1644. No coin is mentioned at either date, and the Signet Office Docquet Books do not refer to Maundy in 1645 or '46. The rare Oxford Declaration Penny bears date 1644, and here I believe we have in truth a coin which may be definitely stated to be a Maundy issue. Here no doubt we have the coin of which 44 times 44 specimens must have been the King's gift on April 18th. It seems bewildering to suggest that 1,936 Oxford "Declaration" pennies ever existed, but Colonel Morrieson has noted no less than three varieties with this reverse, proving that several dies were used. When, however, we reflect that it is nearly 300 years ago and that the coin was so small it was apt to be lost, it seems possible. There is, of course, the alternative of Aberystwith-Oxford mules, which we have in some variety, and these must have supplied the Maundy on March 30, 1643, assisted by any Tower pence of mint-mark, triangle-in-circle,

\(^1\) Drake's *Eboracum*, p. 144, and *Pells Order Books*, Nos. 40 and 41, March 22, 1642, £250 for service of Maundy Wardrobe and Robes.
or of the milled anchor coinage with which Briot might have been able privately to supply the King.

Is it too hazardous to glance at the possibility that Queen Henrietta Maria, who began her journey from Oxford to Exeter on the Wednesday in Holy Week (the 17th of April, 1644),\(^1\) may have been expected a few days sooner? If so, the Exeter penny of great rarity might have been designed for her use on April 18th. This is indeed a mere guess, for although we know that in Tudor and earlier times the Queen-Consorts gave their Maundy, we have few detailed records of the wives of the Stuart Kings performing this office. One of the tyrannical acts of Henry VIII was to forbid Katherine of Aragon to "keep her Maundy," and on "the Princess Dowager," as she was termed, declaring her intention in 1535 of doing so "in spite of the King's order last year to the contrary," we read of

Henry's qualified consent. "The King is content if she does not keep it as Queen; if so, she and others would be guilty of High Treason."\(^2\)

It was quite usual for other than Royal personages at that time to give Maundy doles, as we have seen with regard to Wolsey and

---


\(^2\) *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, March 22 and 23, 1535.
other Prelates, and great noblemen such as the Earl of Northumberland. But generally this was a distribution to twelve persons only, to represent the apostles. Or if, like Wolsey, the donor celebrated his age in the number of his chosen poor, he gave 2d. to each man. In this, Northumberland, who lived the life of a great chieftain in almost more than royal state, was an exception, for, like the King, he bestowed as many "Purses of Lether after ob. the pece" [i.e. halfpenny purses], "with as manny Penys in every purse to as many poore men as his Lordship is yeres of Aige and one for the yere of my Lordf Aige to come." He also bestowed similar gifts in the name of his wife "to come awte of my Lordf Coffueres if sche be not at hir own fyndynge." Moreover, for his eldest son he raised the gift to "as many Pens of ij Pens to as manny Poure Men as his Lordshipe is yeres of Aige," and so on, even the younger children presenting their "pens." 

But our general interest in the old customs must not lead us too far from the royal coinage, and whilst we may wonder whether Elizabeth "was minded" (to use the expression of the document), to command her special Maundy "single pennies" to be of any particular type in 1574, we cannot say. No milled pence of hers other than patterns are, so far as I am aware, known. There is a dated penny in 1558, which may have been specially coined for the distribution of March 23, 1558–9.

We have just glanced at the probability that Briot's beautiful pence with mint-mark, anchor, of 1638, might have supplied the desired coins at York in 1639. Briot was the king's favourite engraver, and though associated with the mint and responsible for the York and Scottish coinage, he was not a persona grata at the Tower, and his suggestions for the multiplication of small denominations

1 Cavendish's Life of Wolsey, ed. 1828, p. 309.
2 Henry Algernon Percy, fifth Earl of Northumberland, born 1477–8, died 1527.
3 Northumberland Household Book, edited by Thomas Percy, late Bishop of Dromore, published in 1727, from the manuscript in the possession of the then Duke of Northumberland.
were not encouraged there. He advocated and illustrated by patterns not only the revival of the threepence and penny-halfpenny in use in the days of Elizabeth, but even pieces of five-farthings and six-farthings, whilst his threepence, mint-mark, bell, in 1634, is accompanied by a groat. These coins might have been desired by the King to be added to the currency or for his doles to the poor at the gate; and the half-groat (of which there are many patterns), for the scattering of small coin called "largesse," with which we have dealt in our last volume.

But the penny alone would be suitable to the Maundy, and I diffidently suggest that Charles might so use the milled coins of Briot. We must, however, remember that a Maundy coin, in order to be useful to the recipients, must be a current coin, and not a pattern exclusively; therefore the patterns with the crowned C would be less suitable than Briot's received run of milled coinage, which is not of such rarity, and was obviously circulated.

I may be accused of falling into the error that a Maundy coin must needs be beautiful. Not so. I hope to show in our next volume that I believe some of the worst-struck coins of Charles II to have been used for Maundy, but I must not anticipate. That which I wish to suggest is that, whilst new coins were desirable, and any monarch might be pleased to give specially attractive pieces such as Elizabeth's carefully reserved fine silver issue, or under Charles I Briot's coins, the important matter was that the gift should be spendable. The ordinary coinage of correct date, if available, would be eminently suitable. But the larger the issue of currency on special occasions, such as a succession or an alteration in the types, the more the moneyers sought to postpone the resultant quota of small pieces; they claimed the permitted six months' grace. On the other
hand, whenever the price of silver was high the general coinage was small and very few little pieces were made. We must therefore search for specially ordered dies in times of scarcity of silver, or in times of a very hurried re-coinage. In times of a small output, as was the case in the reign of James I in 1619 and 1620, this King, as Mr. Symonds¹ points out, "had to purchase silver specially for his Maundy, because the enforced coinage of four pounds in small moneys in proportion to every hundredweight of larger coins did not suffice for the ordinary currency to buy small wares."

In 1692, for instance, before the Great Re-coinage was necessitated by the disgraceful state into which the general currency had fallen, we find the Master of the Mint commenting upon one of the many petitions from the moneyers for increased pay.² He explains that "the great Price which Silver hath been at for two or three years past above the Rate of the Mint hath been the occasion that soe little Silver hath been coyned and consequently little small money hath been made, besides what silver hath been purposely brought for that use." Mr. Rogers has called my attention to the penny of 1692, frequently altered from 1691, and all four small coins of 1693 altered from 1692, showing that the dies of '92 had received little use. I have, however, also found these coins struck with fresh dies, showing that a certain quantity of pennies was ultimately made for the use of the public, for whose benefit various reforms had so greatly occupied the mind of the King's favourite, Briot. This engraver proposed to his master that he should make "little pieces of Mony cutt upon 66 [shillings] to the pound weight as greatly necessary for the Commodiousness of the People and Trade," and for this reason advocated, as we have seen, the production of the threepence as well as the groat, the half-groat, and the penny.³

¹ "Mint Marks and Denominations of James I," by Henry Symonds, British Numismatic Journal, vol. ix, p. 227. In March, 1619, James purchased 61 lbs. of silver and 50 lbs. in 1620, "to be coyned into small money for the Maundy." "It will be remembered," writes Mr. Symonds, "that in these two years the coinage of silver was extremely limited in extent."


The Maundy Coins.

May we not, therefore, feel that the dividing line is a mistake which gives the name of Maundy to these little coins after the introduction of the mill under Charles II? Especially is this the case, because it was not until the time of George II that, so far as we can ascertain, the groat and threepence were used at Holy Thursday distributions.¹

One word more concerning the small coins themselves. It is obvious from the regulations requiring a percentage of two pounds weight in half-groats, and one-and-a-half pounds in pennies, that the latter were more in demand for general currency, and more pennies must have been struck than half-groats. In the time of Charles I, however, judging from a collection I have made in the course of about twenty years, the half-groats are the more varied. This collection embraces (exclusive of patterns and country issues), twenty-nine differing pieces, of which four are of the rose type and twenty-five are varying busts, beginning with the mint-mark, plume. Very few pennies bear a mint-mark other than one or two pellets, but Colonel Morrieson has succeeded in classifying them according to the busts. Amongst those bearing the mint-mark harp, when there was a large coinage there are several varieties. Of these I illustrate a good specimen of a bust, which might be that used for the distribution described by Justin Pagitt in April, 1633.

ΧΑΡΛΟΎΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΕΝΝΙΩΝ (ΜΙΝΤ-ΜΑΡΚ, ΗΡΑΡΠ).

On the other hand, I have six rose half-groats and thirty-eight with busts. These, however, extend from mint-mark, lis, to sceptre, and therefore include six issues after the Tower mint had ceased to

¹ Gentlemen’s Magazine, vol. i, p. 172, April 15, 1731, on which occasion King George gave “leather bags with one-penny, two-penny, three-penny, and four-penny pieces of silver and shillings to each about £4 in value.”
coin for the King, although his effigy was in use. This should be taken into our calculations when we are considering coins for Royal Charities. Reducing then the Tower issues from twenty-three to eighteen, we shall find that I have many more varieties of both half-groats and pennies than the years require, denoting a very considerable output of dies.

In Colonel Morrieson's most useful "Table of the Silver Coins of the Tower Mint of Charles I,"1 thirty-six half-groat types and the same number of pennies are chronicled in the reign of twenty-three years. He has either seen them or noted them in the Pyx trials. But in some of the Pyx-trials, of which Mr. Henry Symonds has given us exact accounts,2 very small quantities of pieces are represented. The necessary procedure was to place one coin out of every 30 lbs. weight of silver in the Pyx-box, so that, if pennies were present in each trial, they must sometimes have been specially ordered, and not of the compulsory proportion to every hundredweight.

It appears, therefore, not unlikely that in years of small general coinage, such as Blackmoor's Head, Heart and Plume, special pennies were made for the King, and beautiful patterns are very suggestive of a special issue when busts first appeared on these tiny coins. Mr. Symonds is of opinion that three particular Pyx-trials at Westminster in 1628-29 and 1630 were concerned with Briot’s activities; although, as he says, Briot’s anchor coins, bearing the Tower mark of 1639, were probably included in the large coinage of that year.

But if we turn for a moment to Charles I’s country coinages, we have still greater reason to believe that pennies were commanded, for in the great press of work in providing money in the Civil War, when the Aberystwith dies were removed to Shrewsbury and Oxford, we have seen that a special penny was produced—indeed, I may mention that I myself have five different pennies which must owe their origin to the University City, having either the Oxford bust on the obverse, or the Oxford plume on the reverse.

---

The Maundy Coins.

Be it, moreover, noticed that more than one reverse die was employed on the type figured below, which exists with and without mint-marks, both mullet and lis, and is combined with four different busts.\(^1\) The inscription presents *Hiberniae* either as H. or HI.; and the King’s name as CARO. or CAROL.

![VARIETIES IN OXFORD PENNIES.](image)

The Oxford Declaration Penny, of which probably about two thousand specimens must have been struck, deserves pre-eminence as a Maundy coin.

I hope to resume the discussion of Charles II’s small coins in our next volume.

---

\(^1\) See Colonel Morrieson’s list, *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. xvi, p. 171.