

Wages in Late Twelfth- and Early Thirteenth-Century England

Paul Latimer

Studying the English economy of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, historians have, for good reasons, paid much more attention to commodity prices, particularly those of food and livestock, than to wages. Given a very large degree of subsistence production in the economy, and many producers who could dispose of at least part of their own production, waged labour represented only a relatively small part of the economy. Additionally, the evidence for wages is both more fragmentary and more problematic than the evidence for commodity prices, incomplete and difficult as that often is.¹

Nevertheless, wages are a subject worthy of study. Wage rates represent a particular class of prices and therefore knowledge of them helps to establish the overall pattern of price changes. It is against this pattern that hypotheses concerning the causes of price changes need to be tested. The main debate on these causes, for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, has been whether monetary factors brought about changes in the general price level or whether demographic growth, faster than the growth in food production, resulted in an increase in food prices relative to the rewards of labour.² As a contribution to this debate, this

¹ D. L. Farmer, 'Prices and wages', in *The Agrarian History of England and Wales, II: 1042–1350*, ed. H. E. Hallam (Cambridge, 1988), 715–817. This only partially supersedes his earlier articles: 'Some price fluctuations in Angevin England', *Ec.H.R.* 2nd ser. ix (1956–7), 34–43; 'Some grain price movements in thirteenth-century England', *ibid.* 2nd ser. x (1957–8), 207–20; 'Some livestock price movements in thirteenth-century England', *ibid.* 2nd ser. xxii (1969), 1–16. For wool prices of the period specifically, see T. H. Lloyd, *The Movement of Wool Prices in Medieval England*, *Ec.H.R. Supplement*, 6 (Cambridge, 1973).

² M. M. Postan, *The Medieval Economy and Society* (London, 1972), 235–41, 248–9; *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe, II: Trade and Industry in the Middle Ages*, ed. M. M. Postan and E. Miller (2nd edn., Cambridge, 1987), 215–16; P. D. A. Harvey, 'The English inflation of 1180–1220', *P. & P.* lxi (1973), 3–30 at 25–30; E. Miller and J. Hatcher, *Medieval England: Rural Society and Economic Change, 1086–1348* (London, 1978), 68–9; J. L. Bolton, *The Medieval English Economy, 1150–1500* (London, 1980), 72–8; A. R. Bridbury, 'Thirteenth-century prices and the money supply', *Agricultural History Review*, xxxii (1985), 1–21; N. J. Mayhew, 'Money and prices in England from Henry II to Edward III', *ibid.* xxxv (1987), 121–32; Farmer, 'Prices and wages', 718–26; J. L. Bolton, 'Inflation, economics and politics in thirteenth-century England', in *Thirteenth-Century England, IV: Proceedings of the Newcastle upon Tyne Conference 1991*, ed. P. R. Coss and S. D. Lloyd (Woodbridge, 1992), 1–14 at 1–6.

article seeks to determine, as far as possible, what happened to wage rates in the second half of the twelfth century and the first half of the thirteenth century.

Existing studies of wages do not provide an adequate answer to this question. There has been a lack of consistency in the approach adopted by historians, partly as a consequence of the different sources that are available for different periods. For the period up to and including the reign of King John, the subject of wages in general has received little attention, though the wages of soldiers, particularly knights, have attracted considerable, if unsystematic, study, mostly based on evidence from the Exchequer Pipe Rolls and often primarily concerned with the relationship between knights' wages and scutage.³ With regard to the first half of the thirteenth century after 1208/9, however, discussion of wages has been dominated by data extracted from the Winchester Pipe Rolls concerning certain wages on the estates of the bishopric of Winchester.⁴

Changes in the nature and quantity of sources that are available do represent a real problem, but not such an intractable one as existing studies would suggest. Although nothing can be done about the lack of Winchester Pipe Rolls or any equivalent before 1208/9, and although the Winchester Pipe Rolls are the only major non-governmental source before 1250, the Exchequer Pipe Rolls do not stop after King John's reign and from the beginning of the thirteenth century they are supplemented by an increasing number of other government records. This article has taken account of printed editions of records and no doubt even more could be gleaned from those yet unprinted. From harvest workers to bailiffs, from building labourers to master craftsmen, from Irish foot soldiers to Flemish knights, from gaolers to chaplains, from falconers to the keeper of the king's lion—there is a considerable volume of material that relates to a wide variety of types of labour or service.

This material admittedly does present serious problems. Much of it is of limited usefulness. For many of the types of labour or service for which wages are recorded, instances where wage rates can be determined are too few and too isolated, while in other cases the types themselves encompass too much diversity

³ T. K. Keefe, *Feudal Assessments and the Political Community under Henry II and his Sons* (Berkeley, CA, 1983), 37–40; A. L. Poole, *Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087–1216* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1955), 371–2; Harvey, 'English inflation 1180–1220', 13–17. I am grateful to the late T. K. Keefe for having allowed me to see his very helpful notes on soldiers' wages in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

⁴ W. H. Beveridge, 'Wages in the Winchester manors', *Ec.H.R.* [1st ser.] vii (1936), 22–43; Farmer, 'Prices and wages', 731–3, 760–72, 811–17.

A note on dates. In this present article, dates in the form 1180/1 will be used to indicate a period from Michaelmas (29 September) to Michaelmas. The reason for this is that most price and wage data occur in accounts that concern this period and cannot normally be allocated to a particular calendar year. This convention is in accordance with that used by Farmer in 'Prices and wages', but in his earlier articles he dated most prices by 'harvest year'. In these, a price in an account for 1180/1 would normally be dated as 1180. For Farmer's definition of 'harvest year', see 'Some price fluctuations', 35–6.

in the quantity or quality of the labour or service performed. There are few useful examples of payments to agricultural workers in government records, references usually being in the unhelpful form of totals of wages for a manor or group of manors.⁵ Neither government records nor the Winchester Pipe Rolls offer any useful data concerning urban wage-earners. There is also clearly some risk in assuming that the king, the king's officials or the bishop of Winchester behaved as typical employers. We cannot ignore these problems and they require us to be cautious in our conclusions. Nevertheless, cautious and limited conclusions are both obtainable and useful.

Another major difficulty is that, except when occasionally the sources are more than usually forthcoming, we cannot know anything like the full circumstances surrounding the record of a particular wage. Payments might sometimes include money for servants or assistants to the principal recipient of the wage without specifying this. The provision by the recipient of equipment for the job, or the need to provide and feed horses could influence the wage paid. Money might be paid more as a retainer than a wage and in any case the recorded wage did not necessarily include everything received. Some jobs, for example those of porters or park-keepers, could provide opportunities for additional income beyond the wage paid. Not all payments in kind necessarily find their way on to the records, nor would we necessarily know whether the recipient of a wage had previously paid to obtain his job or office. It is for these reasons that this article concerns itself with wage rates rather than with income, an altogether more problematic subject.

Two groups of wages can be distinguished in the sources. The first comprises wages paid to persons who occupied what might loosely be called permanent positions of employment, while the second comprises wages paid to persons employed on a casual or temporary basis. Wages belonging to the first group were regarded as fixed outgoings that would normally be repeated unchanged from one year to the next for as long as the wage continued to be paid. Instances of this group of wages were often explicitly recorded as fixed wages.⁶ Sometimes this status has to be inferred from the position in the accounting record or even from the fact of repetition, though in the latter case there is some risk of mistaking merely constant wages for fixed wages.

The Exchequer Pipe Rolls contain a great number of these fixed wages, but

⁵ For example, *Pipe R. 18 Henry II*, 86; *Pipe R. 27 Henry II*, 63; *Pipe R. 28 Henry II*, 103; *Pipe R. 30 Henry II*, 108; *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the First Year of the Reign of King Richard I*, ed. J. Hunter (Rec. Com., 1884), 6.

⁶ *Liberationes constitutae* or *liberationes statutae* are the terms used, apparently with no difference in meaning between them, both indicating a fixed, established status. For convenience, *liberatio* will be translated as wage throughout this article, though the words are not precise synonyms. In the concept of *liberatio* and its English derivative 'livery' the idea of a payment or other provision that would allow the task to be performed in an appropriate manner by the person was conflated with payment for the performance of the task to a much greater extent than is the case with the modern word 'wage'.

they are sometimes difficult to interpret with confidence. The first and last occurrences of a fixed wage on the rolls cannot automatically be assumed to coincide with the beginning and the end of a particular office or position of employment. The recording of a fixed wage on the rolls or its absence from the rolls might instead indicate only the result of a decision as to what should or should not be allowed as a credit against the farm of a shire or the issues of an estate.

It is often difficult to distinguish what we would now consider to be wages from pensions granted to the retired servant, or from payments made to retain an individual in readiness for service, or from payments made without a specific return in mind. It is correspondingly difficult to determine from records little concerned by these differences the point at which one of these payments might pass from one category to another. In particular, the distinction between alms and wages is sometimes treated casually by the exchequer. For example, in 1185/6, there is the following entry on the Exchequer Pipe Roll: 'As fixed wage to Wulfstan the carter 60s. 10d., by writ of the king, of the alms which belonged to Hervey the forge-master.' In the same year, another entry raises questions about the use of alms: 'To the nuns of St. James of Huntingdon 22s. 10d. of the alms which belonged to Druard, for half a year, by writ of the king. And to Boland the greyhound-keeper 22s. 9½d. of the same alms for half a year and now all (the alms), by writ of the king.' This is equivalent to 1½d. per day. Was it a wage, a pension, or charity? A few years later these alms were transferred: 'And as fixed alms to Thomas the hunter £4 11s. 3d. of the alms which belonged to Boland the greyhound-keeper concerning 2 years.'⁷

Some fixed wages could have a very long life. For example, the payment made to the king's vintner at Windsor of 30s. 5d. per year (1d. per day) was first recorded in 1161/2 and was still being paid in 1229/30, though in a slightly altered form.⁸ Another example, this time from the Kent shire farm, was the credit 'as the wage of the porter of the city [of Canterbury] 20s. because he carries out the sentences (*facit iusticiam*) of the county [court]'. This first appeared in 1155/6 and was still being recorded in 1241/2.⁹ The exchequer itself seems to have been extremely conservative with the regular payments to its own officials.¹⁰

Such stability cannot always be taken at face value. In 1158/9 there was a payment from the Essex shire farm of 45s. 7d. to Ralph the park-keeper 'who looks after the houses of the king at Havering' (Havering atte Bower, Essex).¹¹ In

⁷ *Pipe R.* 32 Henry II, 20, 159; *Pipe R.* 3 Richard I, 105.

⁸ In 1161/2 the entry reads 'vinitori 30s. 5d.': *Pipe R.* 8 Henry II, 29. In 1181/2 the entry changes to 'procuratori vinee 30s. 5d.': *Pipe R.* 28 Henry II, 106; *Pipe R.* 14 Henry III, 5.

⁹ *The Great Rolls of the Pipe for the Second, Third and Fourth Years of the Reign of King Henry II, 1155–58*, ed. J. Hunter (Rec. Com., 1844), 65 (where he is called *janitor* rather than *portarius*); *Pipe R.* 26 Henry III, 143.

¹⁰ *Pipe R.* 5 Henry III, p. 1v; *Dialogus de Scaccario: the Course of the Exchequer* by Richard Fitz Nigel and *Constitutio Domus Regis: the Establishment of the Royal Household*, ed. and trans. C. Johnson with corrections by F. E. L. Carter and D. E. Greenway (Oxford, 1983), 129–35.

¹¹ The payment should strictly be 45s. 7½d. or 1½d. per day, but the halfpenny is sometimes included, sometimes omitted: *Pipe R.* 5 Henry II, 4.

1169/70 Ralph was succeeded in his position by his son Geoffrey, and a Geoffrey the park-keeper still received the same payment in 1219/20.¹² But at some time before 1229/30 the arrangement had changed. In that year there was a payment of 45s. 7½*d.* to a William the park-keeper, 'for the custody of the park of the king at Havering', but there was also a separate payment of 60s. 10*d.* (2*d.* per day) to a William Markedic, custodian of the king's houses of Havering. This second payment seems to have been made at least since 1226/7 when an equivalent payment appeared on the Liberate Rolls to Philip the forester, custodian of the king's houses and park at Havering.¹³

It is difficult to reach behind these bald financial statements to the duties of the officials. For instance, Ralph and his son were not paid explicitly for custody of the park, although their name 'the park-keeper' (*parcarius*) would suggest a connection with the park. Certainly it is likely that the management of the king's houses and park at Havering, a favourite residence of Henry III, was a more complex assignment in 1230 than it had been in 1160, but ostensibly the king was paying 3½*d.* per day for what he had previously paid 1½*d.* per day, albeit through two officials rather than one.¹⁴ The difficulty of answering the question how much or how little this represents a true increase in wage rates illustrates the problematic nature of this kind of evidence.

Most fixed wages did not continue to appear on the Exchequer Pipe Rolls for such long periods, and well into the thirteenth century there were new instances to replace those that dropped by the wayside. In respect of some of the more common kinds of functionary, the rates at which fixed wages were set when they first appear on the rolls may provide some clues as to wage rates prevailing at the time.

There seems to have been a standard rate for the fixed wages paid to chaplains out of the farms of shires or of other long-established royal honours, for all payments initiated before the reign of King John. Chaplains at Southampton, Worcester, Windsor and Oxford, together with one paid from the farm of Essex and Hertfordshire, all received 30s. 5*d.* per year (1*d.* per day).¹⁵ Only at Westminster, perhaps understandably a special case, was a payment of 60s. 10*d.* per year (2*d.* per day) allowed for the chaplain.¹⁶ This consistency did not extend to escheated lay honours or to ecclesiastical vacancies, where rates both lower and higher than 30s. 5*d.* per year were paid.¹⁷

In 1202/3 there were two notable changes. Firstly, many more chaplains began

¹² *Pipe R. 16 Henry II*, 103; *Pipe R. 4 Henry III*, 106.

¹³ *Pipe R. 14 Henry III*, 162; *Cal. Lib. R. i.* 15. The payment is also made for the years 1227/8 and 1228/9, but the custodian is not named: *Cal. Lib. R. i.* 155.

¹⁴ D. A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990), 94, 241, 258–9, 305.

¹⁵ *Pipe R. 5 Henry II*, 50; *Pipe R. 9 Henry II*, 4; *Pipe R. 27 Henry II*, 102, 140; *Pipe R. 4 Richard I*, 268.

¹⁶ *Pipe R. 23 Henry II*, 197. See also *Pipe R. 16 Henry II*, 14.

¹⁷ *Pipe R. 14 Henry II*, 77; *Pipe R. 28 Henry II*, 60; *Pipe R. 29 Henry II*, 33; *Pipe R. 31 Henry II*, 10; *Pipe R. 33 Henry II*, 13; *Pipe R. 34 Henry II*, 11.

to be accounted for on the Exchequer Pipe Rolls. Secondly, although there were plenty of exceptions, the standard rate for these newly recorded chaplaincies was not 30*s.* 5*d.* per year, but very clearly 50*s.* per year.¹⁸ Furthermore, this new standard remained in place at least to the middle of the thirteenth century.¹⁹

As the case of the king's houses at Havering demonstrates, it is not a simple matter to interpret correctly the fixed wages granted to custodians of the king's houses. Because the office might vary in workload or status or both, the custody of different sets of royal houses, or even of the same set of royal houses at different times, cannot be treated as completely equivalent in terms of the quality and quantity of labour. Nevertheless, because of the number of such offices, the evidence of their fixed wages does deserve some attention.

Among the early examples, the most common rate was 30*s.* 5*d.* per year (1*d.* per day). At Dunstable (Beds., 1129/30), at Gillingham (Dors., 1155/6), at Clarendon (Hants, 1155/6), at 'Cnot' (Staffs., 1158/9) and at Southampton (1160/1), custodians of the king's houses received this rate.²⁰ At Havering (Essex, 1158/9), as we have already seen, the rate was 45*s.* 7*d.* (1½*d.* per day) and may have included responsibility for the park. In two rather special cases the rates were higher, the one modestly, the other markedly so. At Windsor (Berks., 1129/30) the rate was 60*s.* 10*d.* per year (2*d.* per day), while at Westminster (1129/30) the rate was £10 12*s.* 11*d.* per year (7*d.* per day).²¹ The large fixed wage at Westminster was received in 1129/30 by Geoffrey the engineer and later by Ailnoth the engineer. Only in 1189/90, when it was received by Osbert de Longchamp, was it made clear that it was 'for the custody of the houses of the king', but it seems likely that it was the description rather than the office that had changed. With reference to what 'the engineer' (*ingeniator*) might mean as the name given to Osbert's predecessors, the supervision of building works at Westminster was presumably part of the holder's function.²²

Custodianships of houses on estates that were temporarily in the king's hand show more variation. The custodian of the houses of the archbishop of Canterbury received 50*s.* in 1164/5 and 1183/4, while the custodian of the houses of the bishop of Bath received 15*s.* in 1166/7.²³ Of course, in such cases, because the records do not recur over many years and because the period of account itself is

¹⁸ *Pipe R. 5 John*, 13, 52, 89–90, 123, 139, 150, 162, 164, 176, 187, 224. For other new rates, see *ibid.* 41, 176.

¹⁹ See, for example, *Pipe R. 26 Henry III*, 2, 14, 22, 124–5, 129, 190, 258–9, 304, 306, 326 (for rates other than 50*s.*, see *ibid.* 6–7, 143, 281); *Cal. Lib. R.* iii. 3, 9–10, 13, 18, 33, 36, 41, 48–9, 54, 61, 71, 75, 78, 87–8, 91, 97, 101, 103, 115, 118, 127, 136, 138–9, 152, 166, 172, 174, 177, 193, 196, 202, 204, 208–10, 212, 220, 223, 233, 239–40, 242, 249, 251, 260–1, 263, 274, 278, 284–5, 289, 299, 301–3, 309–10, 330–1, 323, 342, 345, 347, 351, 353, 370, 383, 385 (for rates other than 50*s.*, see *ibid.* 21, 112, 162, 208, 234, 242, 311).

²⁰ *Magnus rotulus scaccarii de anno 31^o Henrici I*, ed. J. Hunter (Rec. Com., 1844), 100; *Pipe R. 2–4 Henry II*, 32, 56; *Pipe R. 5 Henry II*, 28; *Pipe R. 6 Henry II*, 49; *Pipe R. 7 Henry II*, 59.

²¹ *Pipe R. 31 Henry I*, 127, 143.

²² *Pipe R. 5 Henry II*, 1; *Pipe R. 1 Richard I*, 224; *Pipe R. 2 Richard I*, 156.

²³ *Pipe R. 11 Henry II*, 109; *Pipe R. 13 Henry II*, 202; *Pipe R. 30 Henry II*, 151.

sometimes uncertain, it is much harder to be sure that fixed wages are involved or even sometimes of the wage rate.

Of these early examples of custodianships of houses, two, in addition to Havering, appeared later under an altered arrangement. At 'Cnot', from 1162/3 the canons of Llanthony took over the custody at the very low rate of 6s. 8d. per year, while from 1166/7 the custodian of the king's houses at Clarendon received 60s. 10d. (2d. per day).²⁴

Taking this group of early examples as a base, it is difficult to see any clear trend evidenced by the fixed wages of custodians of royal houses that were set, or at least first appeared in the records, later in the twelfth century. A custodianship of the king's houses at Winchester surfaced briefly in 1175/6, apparently at the rate of £6 1s. 8d. per year (4d. per day), but the custodian of the king's houses in Winchester castle received only 60s. 10d. per year (2d. per day) in 1239/40. This was perhaps a lesser and possibly additional office. Interestingly, this custodian had to pay for repairs costing less than 6d. himself.²⁵ At Kings Cliffe and Brigstock (Northants.) from 1176/7 two custodians received 60s. 10d. (2d. per day) between them. From 1181/2 a custodian received 2d. per day at Clipston (Notts.) and from 1184/5 one received 4d. per day at Feckenham (Wores.), but from the middle of 1186/7 the custodian of the royal houses at Oxford received only 1d. per day and was still receiving that amount in 1239/40.²⁶

Honours temporarily in the king's hands again provide a mixed set of examples. The custodian of the earl of Norfolk's houses and warren at Hollesley (Suff.) in 1177/8 received 45s. 6d., or 1½d. per day for a year of 364 days. The custodian of the king's houses in Rayleigh castle (Essex) of the honour of Henry of Essex in 1180/1 received only 8s. 8d. The custodian of the houses of Aaron the Jew in London in 1186/7 received 1d. per day, while the custodian of the houses of the bishop of Exeter in 1191/2 received 10s.²⁷

Few new custodianships of royal houses were recorded in the first half of the thirteenth century. Hugh de Neville received £4 4s. 'for the custody of a certain house' at Lydford (Devon) and Geoffrey Salvagius received £15 'for the custody of the king's houses' at Woodstock (Oxon.) in 1202/3. Both, particularly the Woodstock example, seem high by previous standards, but the Lydford entry is somewhat unusual in form and it would be dangerous to regard a royal residence as important as Woodstock as at all typical. Furthermore, in neither case is it clear that these were fixed wages.²⁸ In 1240/1, when the honour of Chester was in the

²⁴ *Pipe R.* 9 Henry II, 27; *Pipe R.* 13 Henry II, 176 (actually 60s., but for the more usual 60s. 10d., see *Pipe R.* 14 Henry II, 175).

²⁵ The deduction from the farm of Hampshire in 1175/6 was 30s. 5d. for a quarter of a year: *Pipe R.* 22 Henry II, 188; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 431.

²⁶ *Pipe R.* 23 Henry II, 89; *Pipe R.* 28 Henry II, 15; *Pipe R.* 31 Henry II, 168; *Pipe R.* 34 Henry II, 149; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 489.

²⁷ *Pipe R.* 24 Henry II, 26; *Pipe R.* 27 Henry II, 108; *Pipe R.* 33 Henry II, 39; *Pipe R.* 4 Richard I, 280.

²⁸ The payment to Geoffrey Salvagius may represent 10d. per day over 360 days: *Pipe R.* 5 John, 72, 188.

king's hands, the wages of the custodian of the king's houses and garden at Chester were set at $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day 'if his predecessors used to receive it'.²⁹ This would indeed not have been a surprising wage for his predecessors to receive in the 1150s. Overall, there is little evidence of any general inclination to change the level of fixed wages of custodians of royal houses, though there are two examples from episcopal honours that may hint at a change occurring beyond the reach of a conservative royal exchequer. In 1242/3 the custodian of the bishop of Bath's houses in London was receiving $3d.$ per day, as was the custodian of the bishop of London's houses in 1247/8.³⁰

Watchmen and porters (or janitors) were sometimes employed for long, continuous periods, their wages being treated as fixed, recurring outgoings. However, like the castle garrisons of which watchmen and porters often formed part, they could also be employed for much briefer terms, determined by particular and temporary circumstances. Compare, for instance, the porter and watchman at Shrewsbury, whose employment was recorded from 1158/9 at least until 1220/1, or the porter and watchman at Worcester, whose employment was recorded from 1162/3 until 1213/14 and 1202/3 respectively, with the new or additional (*de novo*) watchman and porter at Worcester whose employment was recorded only in the year 1174/5 and which was presumably related specifically to the aftermath of the 1173–4 revolt.³¹

Although their wages were far from always explicitly of the fixed kind, no clear example exists from the twelfth century where the rate changed for a particular office that was held continuously. That the job of porter could be regarded as an office can be seen in 1129/30 with the payment of 40s. 'to be porter of the castle of Appleby' (Westmld.).³²

The earliest examples of the wages of porters and watchmen are found in the 1129/30 Exchequer Pipe Roll and all concern the lands of Roger de Mowbray that were in the king's hands. These examples, concentrated as they are in one year, on one honour and in one region, and with no explicit period of employment, are difficult to interpret with certainty and are quite possibly untypical. Making the dangerous assumption that the record actually concerns a period of one year, the entries seem to suggest that, at least in the case of three of the four castles mentioned, $1d.$ per day sufficed to pay both the porter (actually *janitor*) and the watchman, each of them most likely receiving $\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day.³³

A fairly clear and apparently stable pattern emerges of the wages of porters and watchmen from the 1150s up to and including the reign of King John. The most common wage rate of both watchmen and porters was $1d.$ per day. In cases where the wages of porters and watchmen were recorded in combined form, the

²⁹ *Cal. Lib. R.* ii. 53.

³⁰ *Ibid.* ii. 168; iii. 173.

³¹ *Pipe R.* 5 Henry II, 62; *Pipe R.* 9 Henry II, 4; *Pipe R.* 21 Henry II, 127; *Pipe R.* 5 John, 52; *Pipe R.* 16 John, 107; *Pipe R.* 5 Henry III, 96–7.

³² *Pipe R.* 31 Henry I, 143.

³³ *Ibid.* 137–8.

precise distribution of the wages and sometimes the number of watchmen, which was not always specified, has to be inferred from contemporary examples where the wages were recorded separately.³⁴ The porter at Worcester was exceptional in receiving $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day from 1162/3 to 1213/14, though an entry in the Close Rolls for 1205 suggests that the porter at Peak castle was by then receiving $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day rather than the $1d.$ per day he had received up to 1202/3, the total payment for one porter and two watchmen being $3\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day instead of $3d.$ per day.³⁵ The archbishop of Canterbury's porter, presumably at Canterbury, received 50s. per year, equivalent to a little more than $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day, while the temporalities of the archbishopric were in royal hands from 1164/5 to 1171/2.³⁶ It is also possible, because of some doubt about the number of watchmen, that the porter at Dover from the early 1160s received $2d.$ per day.³⁷ Porters or watchmen who received less than $1d.$ per day were all, or at least almost all, related to lands temporarily in royal hands.³⁸

By the 1220s and 1230s there are signs of a change that becomes even clearer in the records of the 1240s. In 1221 a porter at Bamburgh (Northumb.) was in receipt of $2d.$ per day.³⁹ In 1222 a watchman at the building works at Winchester castle was receiving payments apparently based on the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day, with a further $\frac{1}{2}d.$ per night. In 1226/7 a porter at Windsor (Berks.), together with an assistant, was paid $4d.$ per day and four watchmen received first $3d.$ then $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day each, while at Odiham (Hants) a porter received $2d.$ per day and a watchman received first $2d.$ then $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day. In 1232/3 six watchmen at Devizes (Wilts.) received $3d.$ per day each, while in 1238/9 the porter of the 'lower castle' of Chester received $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day.⁴⁰ In the 1240s many porters were recorded as receiving $2d.$ per day each and two as receiving $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day each. Among watchmen in the same decade, most received $2d.$ per day each while a minority received $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day each.⁴¹ The days when it was common for a porter or watchman to receive $1d.$ per day were gone. A porter and a watchman at Bolsover (Derb.) in 1226/7 did receive $1d.$ per day each, but for the custody of a wood.⁴²

Presumably the most numerous group of workers who received fixed wages were those employed on such terms in agriculture—both *famuli* (the permanent, unfree, household-based estate servants) and, stretching the definition of wages,

³⁴ *Pipe R.* 5 Henry II, 16, 50, 52, 62; *Pipe R.* 6 Henry II, 30; *Pipe R.* 9 Henry II, 4; *Pipe R.* 13 Henry II, 72; *Pipe R.* 20 Henry II, 55; *Pipe R.* 21 Henry II, 127–8; *Pipe R.* 5 John, 157; *Pipe R.* 16 John, 126.

³⁵ *Pipe R.* 9 Henry II, 4; *Pipe R.* 16 John, 107; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 23a; *Pipe R.* 5 John, 166.

³⁶ *Pipe R.* 11 Henry II, 109; *Pipe R.* 18 Henry II, 139.

³⁷ *Pipe R.* 8 Henry II, 53; *Pipe R.* 9 Henry II, 69; *Pipe R.* 10 Henry II, 39; *Pipe R.* 5 Henry III, 200.

³⁸ *Pipe R.* 14 Henry II, 77; *Pipe R.* 25 Henry II, 109; *Pipe R.* 31 Henry II, 6, 8; *Pipe R.* 33 Henry II, 29; *Pipe R.* 34 Henry II, 11, 199; *Pipe R.* 1 Richard I, 12; *Pipe R.* 16 John, 67, 83.

³⁹ *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 451b. For this office, see also *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 104, 252; *Pipe R.* 14 Henry III, 260; *Pipe R.* 26 Henry III, 14.

⁴⁰ *Building Accounts of King Henry III*, ed. H. M. Colvin (Oxford, 1971), 96–7, 106–7; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 10–11, 233, 422–3.

⁴¹ *Cal. Lib. R.* ii. 52, 94, 162, 177, 182–3, 197, 276; iii. 13; *Pipe R.* 26 Henry III, 9, 122.

⁴² *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 19–20.

tenants in base serjeanty receiving an allowance against their rents in return for performing their duties. Unfortunately, wage data on such workers are very limited. Entries concerning payments to servants on estates in accounts on the Exchequer Pipe Rolls only rarely make it possible to calculate individual wage rates. For example, in 1186/7, an entry reads: 'as the wage of the servant who oversees (*exercet*) agriculture 30s. 5d.'⁴³ From 1208/9 the Winchester Pipe Rolls provide more information, but only after the middle of the century is this supplemented by records from other estates.

For the Winchester *famuli*, the most important part of their remuneration took the form of grain, though they usually received an amount of cash each year as well. Both the grain and cash portions seem to have changed little in the course of the thirteenth century. The receipt of a major part of the wage in kind meant that the total wage was not fixed in terms of its monetary value, but provided instead a degree of automatic adjustment to changing grain prices. For the tenants in base serjeanty, both the allowances and the rents against which they were set showed only rare changes, a pattern of stability generally matched by the later evidence from other estates.⁴⁴

Overall, one might say that the system of fixed wages, in spite of its inbuilt inertia, did not completely prevent changes in wage rates. Amongst chaplains and amongst porters and watchmen, there were clear signs of a rise in wage rates in the first half of the thirteenth century as compared with the second half of the twelfth, though this is not clear of the wage rates of custodians of royal houses. Our lack of knowledge concerning the fixed wages of agricultural servants in the second half of the twelfth century is a major difficulty, but it seems likely, at least as far as *famuli* were concerned, that because of the element of their wages received in kind, the notional money value of their total wage was generally higher after 1200 than it had been before.

Turning to wages paid to people employed on a temporary or casual basis, it is probable that again agricultural labour constituted the largest sector in terms of numbers employed. But just as in the case of permanent agricultural workers employed for fixed wages, we know next to nothing about these wages before the intermittent series of Winchester Pipe Rolls begins in 1208/9, and this remains the principal source for the rest of the first half of the thirteenth century. For casually employed agricultural workers, direct information on wage rates per person per day does not become commonly available before the fourteenth century, but on piece-rates some data do become available right from the beginning of the series of Winchester Pipe Rolls.

The pattern of piece-rates on the bishopric of Winchester's estates for threshing and winnowing and for reaping and binding is well known.⁴⁵ From

⁴³ *Pipe R. 33 Henry II*, 15. See also *Pipe R. 26 Henry III*, 119. For an interesting example, splitting the total cost of manorial servants between payments in cash and payments in kind, see *Pipe R. 31 Henry II*, 11.

⁴⁴ Farmer, 'Prices and wages', 760–3.

⁴⁵ See fig. 7.9 and table F in *ibid.* 767, 811–12.

towards the end of the second decade of the thirteenth century the rates for threshing and winnowing display remarkable stability, while those for reaping and binding, though more variable, mostly fluctuate within a fairly narrow range. One should of course note the apparently lower rates at the very beginning of the two series, but it is difficult to take them too seriously, based as they are on so little information.⁴⁶ Even subsequently, with relatively more plentiful data, some caution is obviously necessary in drawing general conclusions from only one lordship. Nevertheless, as will be shown below from the evidence for other wages, there is good reason to believe that the stability during most of the first half of the thirteenth century, demonstrated by these series, is not altogether illusory.

The reaping and binding series serves an additional purpose. A rough formula, given in the treatise on husbandry known by the name 'Walter of Henley' and confirmed by D. L. Farmer's calculations from fourteenth-century evidence, allows us to assume that the day-rate per man for reaping and binding was equivalent to around two fifths of the piece-rate per acre.⁴⁷ Most by far of the annual averages between 1211/12 and 1250/1 thus suggest a day-rate per man of between 1½*d.* and 2*d.* per day. This is a useful benchmark for the cost of agricultural labour at harvest time in the first half of the thirteenth century and for some time beyond.⁴⁸

Just as we are ignorant of wage rates for agricultural labourers before 1208/9, wage rates for non-specialist building labourers are likewise unknown before the 1220s. Although summary accounts of building works are common on the Exchequer Pipe Rolls from an early date, it is only from the 1220s onwards that detailed accounts for building works survive. From the 1220s to the 1250s, although wage rates for building labourers vary from less than 1½*d.* per day to 2½*d.* per day, by far the most common rate for labourers employed in any number throughout the period was 1½*d.* per day.⁴⁹ It is interesting that, during the building works at Winchester castle in 1258, labourers were hired at 2*d.* per day during the harvest and 1½*d.* per day at other times of the year, figures which sit easily alongside the estimates above for reaping and binding day-rates.⁵⁰

These thirteenth-century rates for agricultural and building labourers can tell us nothing directly about the rates for such workers in the twelfth century, but it is hard to believe that such labourers in the 1160s and 1170s were receiving more than the 1*d.* per day normal for ordinary foot soldiers at that time (see below). If this assumption is correct, there must have been at least a 50 per cent increase in labourers' wage rates between the 1170s and the early thirteenth century.

The wages of craftsmen present a similar problem to that of labourers, in that

⁴⁶ Beveridge, 'Wages in Winchester manors', 24, 38.

⁴⁷ D. Oschinsky, *Walter of Henley and other Treatises on Estate Management and Accounting* (Oxford, 1971), 444–5; Farmer, 'Prices and wages', 767, 769.

⁴⁸ See table F in Farmer, 'Prices and wages', 811–12.

⁴⁹ *Building Accounts of Henry III*, ed. Colvin, 38–9, 68–9, 96–103, 106–7, 110–11, 160–81, 184–7, 312–13, 344–9, 352–3, 356–7, 360–73, 376–85.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 176–81

we are largely uninformed as to wage rates in the twelfth century, while building accounts, the Exchequer Pipe Rolls, the Winchester Pipe Rolls, the Close Rolls and the Liberate Rolls provide only occasional indications of rates during the first half of the thirteenth century. There is also an additional difficulty. Whereas labourers can perhaps be assumed to be equal in terms of the quality of their labour, this is not true of craftsmen.

Three Exchequer Pipe Rolls entries from 1172/3 that indicate wage rates for carpenters make up the meagre evidence for twelfth-century craftsmen's wages. These show wage rates of 2*d.* per day, with 3*d.* per day for a master.⁵¹ It is not clear whether the military context of these wage rates—the campaigns and sieges of the 1173–4 revolt—might make them untypical, though one might suspect that they were more likely to be untypically high rather than the opposite.

There are interesting entries concerning carpenters on the Close Roll for 1207 which illustrate some of the difficulties involved in craftsmen's wages. The first of these entries shows two named carpenters who received 6*d.* per day together with three other named carpenters who received 4*d.* per day. A second entry shows two named carpenters who received 3*d.* per day with three more who received 2*d.* per day, together with eight others, unnamed but still probably carpenters, who received only 1½*d.* per day. The exact nature of these payments is thrown into doubt by a subsequent entry. This records three named carpenters who received 3*d.* per day, together with five unnamed carpenters who received 2*d.* per day, but with the stipulation that when work actually began, they were to receive 6*d.* per day and 4*d.* per day respectively.⁵²

It is clear that by the early thirteenth century some particular carpenters were very highly valued. In the Exchequer Pipe Roll for 1214/15 one named carpenter was being paid 9*d.* per day and three other named carpenters were being paid 6*d.* per day.⁵³ In 1218, twenty carpenters received 3*d.* per day each, while in the building accounts from Dover castle and Winchester castle in the 1220s, wage rates for carpenters were usually between 2*d.* and 4*d.* per day, with 3*d.* per day the most common.⁵⁴ Rates on the bishop of Winchester's estates in the first half of the thirteenth century ranged mostly from 2*d.* to 3*d.* per day.⁵⁵

On the Liberate Rolls and Close Rolls in the first half of the thirteenth century wage rates recorded for carpenters are frequently for named individuals, most of whom were clearly not ordinary carpenters, but even some of these received only 3*d.* per day.⁵⁶ Such scattered and confusing evidence is capable of bearing only

⁵¹ *Pipe R. 19 Henry II*, 58, 73, 173. In the last entry, the amount 62*s.* 6*d.* seems to be a mistake for 42*s.* 6*d.*

⁵² *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 80a, 96a, 97a.

⁵³ *Pipe R. 17 John*, 13.

⁵⁴ *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 365a; *Building Accounts of Henry III*, ed. Colvin, 30–81, 94–111 *passim*.

⁵⁵ See table F in Farmer, 'Prices and wages', 811–12.

⁵⁶ *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 470; ii. 7, 150, 167, 225, 301; iii. 26, 115, 194, 205, 232, 259, 285, 310, 353, 384. Note the four king's carpenters who were paid 5*d.* per day on days they worked and 3*d.* per day otherwise. Others receiving 7½*d.* per day, 9*d.* per day and even 12*d.* per day can mostly be associated

the most tentative conclusion: that there may have been a modest increase, perhaps no more than 50 per cent, in the wage rates of ordinary carpenters between 1173 and 1250.

Evidence of the wage rates of other craftsmen adds little to this vague picture. In 1206/7 some miners and masons were receiving 3*d.* per day, with a master miner who received 6*d.* per day. In 1214/15 miners and stone-cutters were being paid 3*d.* per day or more (nine at 3*d.*, three at 4*d.* and two at 6*d.*). On the other hand, in 1218/19, out of 30 miners in one Exchequer Pipe Roll entry, not more than three can have been receiving more than 2*d.* per day.⁵⁷ On the Close Rolls of the 1220s there is one entry that shows a single named miner who received 5*d.* per day, together with three colleagues who received 4½*d.* per day, and another entry showing eleven miners who each received 3*d.* per day.⁵⁸

Given the fact that, even excluding rates that were exceptionally high or low, the numerous masons whose wages appear on the building accounts of the 1220s received wage rates that varied considerably between around 2½*d.* per day and 4*d.* per day, we have to admit that any clear picture of changes in craftsmen's wage rates may be irretrievably obscured by variations due to particular skills and circumstances.⁵⁹ However, bearing in mind what we know of other, primarily military, wage rates from the 1160s and 1170s, the level of craftsmen's wage rates in the early thirteenth century would nevertheless suggest that there had been some increase.

The evidence for the wage rates of sailors and steersmen, while still only intermittent and while usually in military or semi-military contexts, presents a clearer picture than for any of the above groups. In the Exchequer Pipe Rolls of 1170/1 and 1172/3, by far the most common rates were 1*d.* per day for sailors and 2*d.* per day for steersmen.⁶⁰ There are some exceptions worth noting. On one occasion in 1170/1, a steersman appears to have received 3*d.* per day. In 1172/3 there are two examples of steersmen being paid at 3*d.* per day with their sailors receiving 1½*d.* per day.⁶¹ In the same year sailors sent to increase the complement of the king's ship, the *Esnecca*, which was carrying treasure, were paid at 2*d.* per day. Also in 1172/3, armed men, put on board the chamberlain's ship to guard treasure, were paid 2*d.* per day, while men on another treasure ship were paid 1½*d.* per day. It is not clear why the terms *homines armati* and *homines* are used here rather than the usual terms of either *nautae* for sailors or *servientes* for soldiers.⁶²

with the construction of siege weapons: *ibid.* i. 81, 128, 135; ii. 26, 56, 94 (see also *Pipe R. 26 Henry III*, 9, 122), 119; iii. 376.

⁵⁷ *Pipe R. 9 John*, 54; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 178b, 185a; *Pipe R. 3 Henry III*, 8. It is not clear whether the fact that in the last case the miners were receiving expenses rather than wages is significant. In another case from 1218, two named miners received 3*d.* per day each: *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 365a.

⁵⁸ *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 617a; ii. 23b.

⁵⁹ *Building Accounts of Henry III*, ed. Colvin, 30–81, 94–111 *passim*.

⁶⁰ *Pipe R. 17 Henry II*, 2, 12, 19, 24, 34, 82, 84, 89, 92, 96–7, 113, 119, 125, 128, 131, 148; *Pipe R. 19 Henry II*, 2, 13, 43, 117, 134.

⁶¹ *Pipe R. 17 Henry II*, 84; *Pipe R. 19 Henry II*, 31, 143.

⁶² *Pipe R. 19 Henry II* 54

Between 1172/3 and 1189/90 there is only one example of the wage rates of sailors and steersmen. In 1184/5 master sailors and sailors on the *Esnecca* of the king's son were paid 5*d.* and 2*d.* per day respectively, an example that perhaps cannot be treated as typical.⁶³ In Richard I's crusading fleet of 1190 the standard rate for sailors was 2*d.* per day and that for steersmen 4*d.* per day, and it is interesting here that sailors and steersmen on the *Esnecca* were paid at the same rate as the others.⁶⁴ It would be possible to regard these rates again as exceptional on the grounds of the unusual length of service (a whole year), but with regard to later rates it seems sensible to take them at face value. In 1195/6 two hundred and eighty 'men' on board ships were paid at 2*d.* per day, though these are apparently later described as soldiers (*servientes*) who went to Flanders.⁶⁵

By the time of King John's 1206 expedition to Poitou the wage rates for sailors and steersmen had increased again to 3*d.* and 6*d.* per day respectively. The wage rate of 3*d.* per day was also paid to sailors sent to the Channel Islands in 1207/8, though an example from Northumberland in 1209/10, probably relating to King John's Scottish campaign, suggests that the new rate may not have been universal. There is a change in terminology in the Exchequer Pipe Rolls of John's reign to *marinellus* and *magister esturmannus*, or *galiotus* and *magister galiotus*, but there is no difference in the rates of those for whom the terminology implies that they were serving on galleys.⁶⁶ In 1213/14 there are other examples of sailors paid at 3*d.* per day, with their masters or steersmen paid at 6*d.* per day.⁶⁷ Examples before 1250 from Henry III's reign suggest that these rates were generally maintained for the rest of the first half of the thirteenth century.⁶⁸

There can be no doubt from this evidence that the wage rates of seamen, both ordinary sailors and their steersmen or masters, did increase between 1170 and 1250. Indeed generally they seem to have trebled. It is interesting too that two thirds of this increase had occurred by 1190 at the latest and that the whole of it had occurred before the end of the first decade of the thirteenth century.

From 1159/60 to 1171/2 the only rate for wages paid to ordinary foot soldiers

⁶³ *Pipe R.* 31 Henry II, 154.

⁶⁴ *Pipe R.* 2 Richard I, 8–9.

⁶⁵ *Pipe R.* 8 Richard I, 19–20; *Pipe R.* 9 Richard I, 164.

⁶⁶ *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 69a; *Pipe R.* 8 John, 148; *Pipe R.* 9 John, 168; *Pipe R.* 10 John, 171. The example from the Scottish campaign reads 'for the equipment of one galley and to sustain 52 sailors (*galioti*) for 15 days towards Norham £8 12*s.*'. Without deducting anything for the cost of the equipment, this would imply a wage rate of something like 2.6*d.* per day. Allowing for the equipment, the most likely rate would be 2*d.* per day: *Pipe R.* 12 John, 107. Note also the three *galioti* waiting at Southampton in 1205 who were receiving 6*d.* per day: *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 39b.

⁶⁷ *Pipe R.* 16 John, 55; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 152b–153a. There is a possibility that in two of these cases the steersman was paid at 7*d.* per day, but there is a strong suspicion that this odd rate derived from a mistake in addition.

⁶⁸ *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 59, 68, 90; iii. 76. This last example concerning the king's galley at Chester actually states that the *galioti* received 2*d.* per day, but the addition confirms that the rate was 3*d.* per day. Note also the 32 *homines*, paid 3*d.* per day, who were with the king's *galioti*: *ibid.* ii. 259. For other rates that occur rarely. see *ibid.* ii. 201 (2½*d.* per day), 260 (2*d.* per day).

(*servientes*) seems to have been 1*d.* per day. And during the 1173–4 revolt against Henry II, most by far of those specified as foot soldiers continued to receive this same rate.⁶⁹ However, there was at least one example from 1172/3 of foot soldiers who received 2*d.* per day.⁷⁰ In 1184/5 two problematic entries suggest that foot soldiers could still be paid only 1*d.* per day.⁷¹ However, from 1185/6 and for the rest of Henry II's reign, the wage rate for foot soldiers was clearly 2*d.* per day.⁷² Indeed, the standard wage rate for foot soldiers remained at 2*d.* per day at least until near the end of John's reign.⁷³

At this point things become less clear. In March 1216 John announced that the custom of his court was to pay all foot soldiers at 3*d.* per day.⁷⁴ This clearly did not last as a universal rule, even if it was intended as such. Foot soldiers continued commonly to receive 2*d.* per day, particularly where large bodies of Welsh or Irish troops were concerned, up to the middle of the thirteenth century and beyond.⁷⁵ However, in Henry III's reign, there is plentiful evidence that some foot soldiers did receive more than 2*d.* per day. 3*d.* per day was the most common of these other rates.⁷⁶ It is clear that a variety of factors—circumstances, duties, equipment and perhaps ability—were by this time capable of influencing the wage paid and it is

⁶⁹ *Pipe R. 6 Henry II*, 2; *Pipe R. 8 Henry II*, 53; *Pipe R. 9 Henry II*, 69; *Pipe R. 10 Henry II*, 46; *Pipe R. 11 Henry II*, 2; *Pipe R. 12 Henry II*, 59; *Pipe R. 13 Henry II*, 72, 208; *Pipe R. 14 Henry II*, 124, 222; *Pipe R. 15 Henry II*, 107; *Pipe R. 16 Henry II*, 134; *Pipe R. 17 Henry II*, 33; *Pipe R. 18 Henry II*, 112; *Pipe R. 19 Henry II*, 58, 97, 102, 107, 109; *Pipe R. 20 Henry II*, 67, 94, 111, 138, 140; *Pipe R. 21 Henry II*, 39, 91.

⁷⁰ *Pipe R. 19 Henry II*, 108. It is perhaps noteworthy that these eighty soldiers were destined for overseas service. It seems safest to assume that soldiers at this time who are paid at 2*d.* per day, but are not specified as on foot, are mounted soldiers, as the rate coincides with that paid to some of those who are specified as mounted soldiers in this period: *Pipe R. 20 Henry II*, 26, 139, 142. See below for mounted soldiers' rates.

⁷¹ *Pipe R. 31 Henry II*, 5, 7. Although these entries are unclear, it is difficult to reconcile either of them with foot soldiers receiving more than 1*d.* per day.

⁷² *Pipe R. 32 Henry II*, 150; *Pipe R. 33 Henry II*, 63, 131, 215; *Pipe R. 34 Henry II*, 8, 9, 95, 210. There is one example of some soldiers paid 3*d.* each in total for two nights: *Pipe R. 34 Henry II*, 8.

⁷³ *Pipe R. 3 Richard I*, 1, 112; *Pipe R. 5 Richard I*, 2, 13, 57, 83, 86, 99, 132, 133, 148, 165; *Pipe R. 6 Richard I*, 141, 251; *Pipe R. 7 Richard I*, 159; *Pipe R. 8 Richard I*, 41, 42, 76, 88; *Pipe R. 10 Richard I*, 172; *Pipe R. 1 John*, 133, 214, 242, 247, 274; *Pipe R. 2 John*, 250; *Pipe R. 3 John*, 137; *Pipe R. 7 John*, 14; *Pipe R. 12 John*, 110; *Pipe R. 14 John*, 88; *Pipe R. 16 John*, 146; *Rotuli Normanniae in Turri Londinensi asservati Johanne et Henrico Quinto Angliae Regibus*, ed. T. D. Hardy, i (Rec. Com., 1835), 53; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 28a. There are occasionally lower rates: *Pipe R. 5 Richard I*, 13 (1*d.* per day), 86 (1½*d.* per day); *Pipe R. 10 Richard I*, 108 (1*d.* per day); *Pipe R. 1 John*, 56 (1*d.* per day), 133 (1½*d.* per day).

⁷⁴ *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 250b.

⁷⁵ *Pipe R. 26 Henry III*, 122; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 72, 95, 113, 117, 121, 130, 148, 175; ii. 177, 178, 203; iii. 193; iv. 129; *Cal. Pat.* iii. 461. Twopence per day was the standard amount paid to ordinary footsoldiers in Edward I's reign: M. Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I* (London, 1972), 41.

⁷⁶ For 3*d.* per day, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 503a, 510b, 524b, 538b; ii. 22a, 43a, 50a, 85a, 93a, 102a, 104a, 116b, 129a–b, 133a, 142a; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 11–12, 19, 25–6, 34, 40, 46, 61, 68, 72, 74–5, 79, 85, 97, 119, 138, 233, 395; ii. 139, 161, 173, 305; v. 296. For 2½*d.* per day, see *Cal. Lib. R.* ii. 177, 201. For 3½*d.* per day, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 93a, 102a, 116b, 133a, 142a; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 11–12, 19, 25.

interesting that it is during this period that the term *serviens ad arma* begins to appear commonly in the sources, suggesting perhaps a particular level of equipment.⁷⁷

When mounted soldiers first appear on the Exchequer Pipe Rolls, in connection with the 1173–4 revolt against Henry II, by far the most common wage rate is 2*d.* per day, though there is one example of 2½*d.* per day, and another that suggests something over 3*d.* per day.⁷⁸ In 1184/5 there are three entries concerning mounted soldiers. Although none of them is easy to interpret with certainty, they suggest a wage rate of 3*d.* per day. In one of these entries at least the mounted soldiers each had two horses.⁷⁹

From 1185/6 to 1198/9, while there were some exceptions, it is clear that two principal wage rates coexisted for mounted soldiers—4*d.* per day and 6*d.* per day—and that the main determining factor was whether the soldier had one or two horses.⁸⁰ One example explicitly states that the rate is 6*d.* per day because the men had two horses.⁸¹

From almost the beginning of King John's reign, there was another shift in mounted soldiers' wage rates, though the structure of wage rates continued to depend, as before, primarily on the number of horses possessed by each mounted soldier. The normal rates became 7½*d.* per day for a mounted soldier with one horse, 12*d.* per day with two horses and 15*d.* per day with three horses.⁸² These

34, 40, 46, 57. For 4*d.* per day, see *Cal. Lib. R.* ii. 310. For 6*d.* per day, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 99b; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 11. For 7½*d.* per day, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 626b; ii. 12a.

⁷⁷ *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 133b; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 379; iii. 199, 314; iv. 129, 296.

⁷⁸ *Pipe R. 19 Henry II*, 97, 101–2; *Pipe R. 20 Henry II*, 34, 94, 139; *Pipe R. 21 Henry II*, 127–8. Another entry, which does not state that the soldiers concerned were mounted, seems to imply a wage rate of 4½*d.* per day, but the entry involves a mission to Ireland and there is clearly something unusual about it: *Pipe R. 19 Henry II*, 143.

⁷⁹ *Pipe R. 31 Henry II*, 5, 7, 206.

⁸⁰ For 4*d.* per day, see *Pipe R. 34 Henry II*, 8 (with horses and hauberks: 8*d.* in total for two nights); *Pipe R. 3 Richard I*, 1, 112 (with horses and hauberks); *Pipe R. 4 Richard I*, 253 (with arms); *Pipe R. 5 Richard I*, 13, 132 (with one horse and without hauberks), 133 (with hauberks), 165 (one horse); *Pipe R. 6 Richard I*, 13 (one horse), 251; *Pipe R. 7 Richard I*, 247 (one horse); *Pipe R. 8 Richard I*, 19 (one horse); *Pipe R. 10 Richard I*, 108; *Pipe R. 1 John*, 60, 133, 242, 243. For 6*d.* per day, see *Pipe R. 32 Henry II*, 150 (with horses and hauberks); *Pipe R. 33 Henry II*, 63, 215; *Pipe R. 34 Henry II*, 95, 210; *Pipe R. 1 Richard I*, 130; *Pipe R. 2 Richard I*, 75; *Pipe R. 4 Richard I*, 207 (with two horses and hauberks); *Pipe R. 5 Richard I*, 2 (two horses), 57 (two horses), 83, 99 (with two horses and hauberks), 132 (mounted with hauberks); *Pipe R. 6 Richard I*, 141 (two horses); *Pipe R. 7 Richard I*, 244; *Pipe R. 8 Richard I*, 19 (two horses), 42, 76 (two horses), 88 (two horses); *Pipe R. 1 John*, 22, 27, 133, 247, 274. For other rates, see *Pipe R. 33 Henry II*, 131 (5*d.* per day); *Pipe R. 5 Richard I*, 86 (one horse, 12*d.* per day; two horses, 18*d.* per day); *Pipe R. 1 John*, 129 (one horse, 9*d.* per day).

⁸¹ *Pipe R. 5 Richard I*, 165–6.

⁸² The earliest reference to this new structure is in the surviving early Liberate Rolls. The entry's arithmetic seems faulty, though the new rates operated more clearly in the parallel case of mounted crossbowmen (see below): *Rot. de Lib.* 6. For mounted soldiers at 7½*d.* per day, see *Pipe R. 16 John*, 123; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 28a (one horse), 53b. For mounted soldiers at 12*d.* per day, see *Pipe R. 16 John*, 123–4, 146; *Pipe R. 17 John*, 13 (two horses); *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 28a (two horses), 42b, 107a (with good horses), 113b (two horses), 195b (two horses), 214b. For mounted soldiers at 15*d.* per

rates continued to be paid to mounted soldiers for the rest of the first half of the thirteenth century, though the number of horses is not normally stated. Around the middle of the century, 9*d.* per day also became a common rate, in some cases apparently as an increased rate for those who had previously received 7½*d.* per day.⁸³

Evidence for the wage rates of archers and crossbowmen is fragmentary before King John's reign. Two *arbalistarii* were paid at 4*d.* per day each in 1162/3. If these were simple crossbowmen, which seems unlikely, they were very highly paid indeed for that time. Two entries in 1172/3, each concerning ten archers, do not provide a clear indication of wage rates, one entry approximating to 2*d.* per day and the other to 1*d.* per day. This leaves it unclear whether they were being paid more than ordinary foot soldiers at that time.⁸⁴ A single *arbalistarius* received 6*d.* per day in 1183/4. The entry does not state whether he was mounted, but this is shortly before the time when soldiers with two horses were receiving 6*d.* per day. Towards the end of Henry II's reign and in Richard I's reign, the evidence becomes a little more informative. The thirteen archers paid in 1186/7 received 6*d.* per day, and that archers might have two horses each is demonstrated by an entry from 1192/3, where 40 archers with two horses were paid at 6*d.* per day. This, it should be noted, is equivalent to the contemporary rate for mounted soldiers with two horses. Other examples of mounted archers in 1197/8 and 1200/1 give rates of 5*d.* per day and 6*d.* per day.⁸⁵

From soon after the beginning of King John's reign, the evidence becomes much more plentiful, but concerns crossbowmen exclusively. Some confusion can be caused by the fact that the word for crossbowman, *balistarius*, applied equally to a person involved in making, repairing or guarding crossbows as to a soldier armed with a crossbow. This is explicitly the reason for some of the more

day, see *Pipe R. 17 John*, 13 (three horses); *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 28a (three horses), 195b (three horses). There are exceptions to the new structure: *Pipe R. 2 John*, 250 (4*d.* per day); *Rot. Norm.* 53 (8*d.* per day); *Pipe R. 16 John*, 124 (9*d.* per day); *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 243b (two horses, 15*d.* per day; one horse, 12*d.* per day).

⁸³ For 7½*d.* per day, see *Pipe R. 26 Henry III*, 9, 122; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 547a–b, 553b, 582b, 587a, 592a; ii. 8b, 9a, 22a, 50a, 58b, 85a, 104a, 111a, 116b, 129a–b; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 26, 46, 57, 61, 74–5, 97, 119, 138, 232; ii. 94, 136, 140, 165, 167, 177. For 9*d.* per day, see *Cal. Lib. R.* ii. 139, 161, 165, 167, 173, 213, 247, 279; iii. 14, 97, 111, 130, 152–3, 208, 216, 235, 356, 377. For 12*d.* per day, see *Pipe R. 4 Henry III*, 122 (afterwards 8*d.* per day); *Pipe R. 26 Henry III*, 9, 122; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 382b, 389b, 390a, 582b, 585a, 585b, 587a, 591b, 597a, 597b, 626b; ii. 8b, 9a, 12a, 58b, 67b–68a, 111a, 116b, 144b; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 57, 231, 235, 255, 260, 267, 273, 379, 382, 383, 389, 395, 434, 461, 482, 497–8, 501; ii. 16, 31, 62, 88, 90, 94, 100, 135, 139, 325, 326; iii. 23, 52, 133; iv. 129. For 15*d.* per day, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 382b, 389b, 390a, 597a. For other rates, see *Pipe R. 4 Henry III*, 122 (8*d.* per day, but earlier 12*d.* per day); *Pipe R. 26 Henry III*, 122 (7*d.* per day); *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 43a (6*d.* per day); *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 10 (5*d.* per day and 6*d.* per day), 245 (10*d.* per day), 255 (10*d.* per day); ii. 177 (6*d.* per day and 7*d.* per day), 201 (6*d.* per day); iv. 129–30 (6*d.* per day).

⁸⁴ *Pipe R. 9 Henry II*, 69; *Pipe R. 19 Henry II*, 107.

⁸⁵ *Pipe R. 30 Henry II*, 53; *Pipe R. 33 Henry II*, 21; *Pipe R. 5 Richard I*, 148; *Pipe R. 10 Richard I*, 172; *Pipe R. 3 John*, 137. An isolated example of slingers (*eslingatores*) in 1192/3 gives a rate of 2*d.* per day, the ordinary rate for foot soldiers at that time: *Pipe R. 5 Richard I*, 99.

unusual wage rates found.⁸⁶ Although a considerable variety of wage rates can be found, the general picture is clear. The most common wage rate for a crossbowman on foot in King John's reign was 3*d.* per day, 1*d.* more than the normal rate for foot soldiers.⁸⁷ Mounted crossbowmen, however, seem to have enjoyed no such advantage over mounted soldiers. Like their fellow soldiers, the wage rates of mounted crossbowmen depended on the number of horses they had, 7½*d.* per day being paid to those with one horse, 12*d.* per day to those with two horses, and 15*d.* per day to those with three horses.⁸⁸ These rates, both for crossbowmen on foot and for mounted crossbowmen, do not seem to have changed during the rest of the first half of the thirteenth century.⁸⁹

Knights received 8*d.* per day in the earliest examples of their wage rates on the Exchequer Pipe Rolls and this continued to be the usual rate until 1172/3.⁹⁰ There

⁸⁶ For example, for *balistarii* involved in the making and repairing of crossbows paid at 4½*d.* per day, see *Rot. de Lib.* 79, 100; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 259, 470. For similar examples at 7*d.* per day, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 9b; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 74, 81. For examples at 9*d.* per day, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 44a, 70b, 76b, 102b; *Pipe R.* 8 John, 170; *Pipe R.* 13 John, 176.

⁸⁷ *Pipe R.* 14 John, 47; *Pipe R.* 16 John, 67; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 26b, 150a, 192b, 193a, 250b, 283a. For 1*s.* per week, see *Pipe R.* 16 John, 124. For 2*d.* per day, see *Pipe R.* 14 John, 47. For 3½*d.* per day, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 9b. For 4½*d.* per day, see *Pipe R.* 7 John, 39; *Pipe R.* 8 John, 76; *Pipe R.* 9 John, 16; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 3a, 102b.

⁸⁸ For those paid 7½*d.* per day, see *Rot. de Lib.* 6 (one horse); *Pipe R.* 6 John, 41; *Pipe R.* 7 John, 41 (one horse), 133 (one horse); *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 21b (one horse), 28a (one horse), 53a (one horse), 63b (one horse), 192b (one horse), 195b (one horse). For those paid 12*d.* per day, see *Rot. de Lib.* 6 (two horses); *Pipe R.* 7 John, 14 (two horses), 39, 41 (two horses), 133 (two horses), 160 (two horses), 266, 272; *Pipe R.* 8 John, 10 (two horses), 119, 211; *Pipe R.* 9 John, 8 (two horses); *Pipe R.* 11 John, 10; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 21b (two horses), 23b, 28a (two horses), 45a (two horses), 53a (two horses), 60b, 63b (two horses), 107a (with good horses), 113b (two horses), 195b (two horses), 214b. For those paid 15*d.* per day, see *Rot. de Lib.* 6 (three horses); *Pipe R.* 7 John, 14 (three horses), 133 (three horses), 160 (three horses), 266, 272; *Pipe R.* 8 John, 10 (three horses), 211, 214; *Pipe R.* 9 John, 1, 8 (three horses); *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 28a (three horses), 45a (three horses), 53a (three horses), 192b (two horses). Other rates can be found. For 6*d.* per day, see *Rot. de Lib.* 101; *Pipe R.* 8 John, 76; *Pipe R.* 9 John, 116, 130, 209; *Pipe R.* 16 John, 124; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 47a, 102b. For 9*d.* per day, see *Rot. de Lib.* 94, 102; *Pipe R.* 6 John, 187; *Pipe R.* 9 John, 114; *Pipe R.* 12 John, 111; *Pipe R.* 14 John, 146; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 3b, 9b. For 5*s.* per week, see *Pipe R.* 16 John, 124. For 16*d.* per day, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 45a (three horses).

⁸⁹ For crossbowmen on foot paid at 3*d.* per day, see *Pipe R.* 5 Henry III, 12, 13; *Pipe R.* 26 Henry III, 143; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 462b, 470a, 484a, 492b, 493a, 503a, 510b, 524b, 538a, 538b, 541a, 548b, 560b, 576b–577a, 585b, 589a, 592a, 597b, 607b, 617b; ii. 3a, 9a; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 235; ii. 254; iii. 50. Other rates paid to crossbowmen on foot can be found. For 2*d.* per day, see *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 11; vi. 254 (referring to 1234/5). For 3½*d.* per day, see *Pipe R.* 26 Henry III, 9, 122; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 10; ii. 94, 177. For mounted crossbowmen paid at 7½*d.* per day, see *Pipe R.* 5 Henry III, 12, 13; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 462b, 470a, 484a, 493a, 503a, 510b, 524b, 536a, 541a, 547a–b, 548b, 553b, 560b, 576b–577a, 589a, 591b, 607b, 617b; ii. 3a, 8b, 9a, 58b, 153a. For mounted crossbowmen paid at 12*d.* per day, see *Pipe R.* 26 Henry III, 9, 122; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 382b, 389b, 390a, 585a–b, 585b, 587a, 587b, 591b, 592a, 597a; ii. 8b, 44b, 58b, 144b, 153a; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 231, 260, 379, 439; ii. 94; iii. 52. For mounted crossbowmen paid at 15*d.* per day, see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 585a, 591b, 597a.

⁹⁰ *Pipe R.* 6 Henry II, 2; *Pipe R.* 8 Henry II, 53; *Pipe R.* 9 Henry II, 69; *Pipe R.* 10 Henry II, 46; *Pipe R.* 11 Henry II, 2; *Pipe R.* 12 Henry II, 59; *Pipe R.* 13 Henry II, 72, 208; *Pipe R.* 14 Henry II, 124, 221–2; *Pipe R.* 15 Henry II, 107; *Pipe R.* 16 Henry II, 134; *Pipe R.* 17 Henry II, 33; *Pipe R.* 18 Henry II, 112

was one exception to this rate, isolated perhaps, but nevertheless perhaps a significant exception. In 1165, as part of Henry II's extensive campaign of that year against the Welsh, 60 knights were paid at 12*d.* per day, more knights than occur in all the other records of payment to knights before 1172/3.⁹¹ It is surely no accident that the next time the rate of 12*d.* per day occurs is in connection with the 1173–4 revolt against Henry II, the next significant military effort in Britain, though 8*d.* per day also continues to be found.⁹²

After 1174/5 there is a long gap in the evidence for knights' wage rates until the end of Henry II's reign, but in Richard I's reign and at the very beginning of King John's reign 12*d.* per day is by far the most common rate.⁹³

There are relatively few clear references to the pay of knights for most of King John's reign, but those that there are would suggest that 24*d.* per day soon became the most usual rate.⁹⁴ Given that soldiers (and crossbowmen) with two or three horses were receiving 12*d.* per day and 15*d.* per day respectively soon after the beginning of John's reign, it would seem natural for paid knights to receive substantially more from then as well. The 24*d.* per day wage rate for knights is much better documented during Henry III's reign before 1250.⁹⁵

While these daily rates of pay provide our best and fullest indication of changes in wage rates, it would be a mistake to regard them as representing at all precisely the true changes in the rate of recompense received by the various classes of soldier. It was not unusual for all types of soldier to receive a *donum* (plural *dona*), literally a gift, in addition to their wage or *liberatio*. *Dona* were not just represented by such things as the gift of robes at Christmas or on other

⁹¹ *Pipe R.* 11 Henry II, 2.

⁹² For knights paid at 8*d.* per day, see *Pipe R.* 19 Henry II, 32, 58, 109; *Pipe R.* 20 Henry II, 26, 55, 111, 139, 142; *Pipe R.* 21 Henry II, 39, 91, 127–8. For knights paid at 12*d.* per day, see *Pipe R.* 19 Henry II, 30–1, 33, 97, 101, 102, 134; *Pipe R.* 20 Henry II, 34, 54, 55, 57, 63, 67, 94, 96, 125, 138, 139, 140, 142–3.

⁹³ *Pipe R.* 1 Richard I, 130; *Pipe R.* 2 Richard I, 75; *Pipe R.* 3 Richard I, 112; *Pipe R.* 4 Richard I, 207; *Pipe R.* 5 Richard I, 2, 13, 57, 83, 86, 99, 110, 132, 133, 148, 165; *Pipe R.* 6 Richard I, 13, 211, 226, 251; *Pipe R.* 7 Richard I, 159; *Pipe R.* 8 Richard I, 42, 76, 88; *Pipe R.* 1 John, 22, 27, 133, 242, 243, 247; *Pipe R.* 2 John, 250. Eight pence per day is still occasionally seen: *Pipe R.* 5 Richard I, 13; *Pipe R.* 1 John, 133. There are also a couple of early examples of a higher rate which would later become more common, 24*d.* per day: *Pipe R.* 10 Richard I, 172; *Pipe R.* 1 John, 129. For the interesting entry where thirty knights received 24*d.* per day in *donis et liberationibus* (*Pipe R.* 3 Richard I, 1), see below, p. 204.

⁹⁴ *Rot. Norm.* i. 53; *Pipe R.* 16 John, 123, 124; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 192b, 196b, 214b. Two examples from Henry III's reign refer back to knights paid at 2*s.* per day in King John's reign: *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 67b–68a, 87a. Other rates can be found. In 1215, Warin, son of the count of Eu, presumably a knight, received only 12*d.* per day in expenses: *ibid.* 195b. For an example that suggests 16*d.* per day, see *ibid.* i. 188b. There are examples which suggest pay of 36*d.* per day and 42*d.* per day, though these are for individual knights: *Pipe R.* 16 John, 123.

⁹⁵ *Pipe R.* 3 Henry III, 78; *Pipe R.* 4 Henry III, 14; *Pipe R.* 5 Henry III, 186; *Pipe R.* 26 Henry III, 8–9, 122; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 419a–b, 439b, 457a, 562a, 626b; ii. 12a; *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 11, 190, 231, 235; ii. 94, 157, 158, 213, 245, 269; iii. 151, 254, 279, 284. Again, though, there are other rates. For 12*d.* per day see *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 10: vi. 254 (relating to 1234/5). For 18*d.* per day see *Cal. Lib. R.* i. 304.

occasions—though such gifts in kind of course had value—but *dona* could also be what appear to have been cash payments that were not in any way tied to special, individual service. A full survey of *dona* is out of place here, but a few examples should demonstrate their importance. In 1162/3 a group of knights and soldiers received both wages and *dona*. The value of the *dona* equalled more than 60 per cent of the wages. In 1190/1 thirty knights received a total of £120 for 40 days' service in *dona* and wages. This averaged 24*d.* per day each, double the usual wage rate of knights at this time. Even lowly Welsh foot soldiers could receive *dona*. In 1195/6 five hundred Welsh infantry received an average of 2*s.* 8*d.* each, while their constable received 3 marks as a *donum*.⁹⁶

It would be difficult to deny that military wage rates as a whole rose between the 1160s and the 1250s, though much uncertainty remains. Even though we are better informed about military wages than any other category, the construction of an index of military wages would be fraught with problems. Yet the timing of some of the changes in wage rates has some interesting things to tell us. The first increases in the wage rates of knights, of foot soldiers and mounted soldiers occur early in the period, all by the end of the 1180s. Secondly, changes in wage rates are, on the whole, over before the end of the first decade of the thirteenth century. These points need to be taken into account when the relationship of wages to commodity prices in the period is considered.

The problems are daunting when we consider the question of what happened to wage rates as a whole in the period from 1150 to 1250. Any conclusion must inevitably be qualified by the silences and difficulties of the evidence. Nevertheless, almost all the evidence that we have of wage rates points to a simple but important conclusion: that wage rates generally rose in money terms during this period and that much of the increase that can be detected had been completed fairly early in the thirteenth century.

It has been strongly suggested that food and livestock prices around 1250 were considerably higher than they had been in the mid-twelfth century, perhaps between two and three times higher.⁹⁷ This provokes two questions: firstly, did real wage rates in general fall or rise over the period, and secondly, did real wage incomes fall or rise? The latter is a particularly complex question in a society where wage income might depend on the opportunities for waged labour and where it might commonly supplement other income.⁹⁸

Unfortunately, the quantity and quality of the evidence for wage rates are not sufficient to provide a satisfactory answer to either of these questions. What it is perhaps possible to say—negative though it might sound—is that the available evidence does not point clearly to a change in real wage rates or real wage incomes and that it would be wrong to use these elements as the major bases for

⁹⁶ *Pipe R.* 9 Henry II, 3; *Pipe R.* 3 Richard I, 1; *Pipe R.* 8 Richard I, 19.

⁹⁷ See, for example, tables A and D in Farmer, 'Prices and wages', 787–9, 799–802.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.* 760–79; C. Dyer, *Standards of Living in the Later Middle Ages: Social Change in England, c. 1200–1520* (Cambridge, 1989), 211–33.

interpreting the economy of the period before 1250. The evidence for wage rates before 1250 cannot justifiably be used to help construct a model of price changes where the principal cause is demographic pressure on food supply and where this is demonstrated by a marked fall in real wages or real wage incomes.