

Guernon, was by command of the king, and by the hand of the bishop of Evreux, handed over to be burnt' (p. lx).

Now of all this there is not a word in the document as I read it. The bishop of Evreux (Giles) merely says:—

*Privilegia [sic] autem quae ex confessione Gaufridi Catalaunensis episcopi, in praesentia sanctae recordationis Innocentii Papae, adulterina probata sunt, et praedicto Domino nostro Archiepiscopo reddita, de mandato eiusdem Domini nostri igni comburenda propriis manibus tradidimus.*

The king, it will be seen, is not mentioned. The *mandatum* was that either of Becket or of the archbishop of Rouen. I gather from the document that it was the latter, and that he gave his nephew the 'privilegia' to burn. I see no evidence that Giles visited Canterbury, or that he compelled the production of the bull to St. Augustine's, or indeed that it was burnt. And I think this letter of his to the pope was probably written in connexion with the renewed struggle on Roger becoming abbot of St. Augustine's in 1178.

J. H. ROUND.

#### A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY ASSESSMENT OF WAGES.

In an earlier number of this Review,<sup>1</sup> I ventured to suggest that the discovery of assessments among unpublished records might show that the justices of the peace had acted upon their legal powers before the days of Elizabeth. A fortunate accident enables me now to point to one instance, printed indeed over forty years ago, but buried in a local archaeological journal<sup>2</sup> until a short time ago, when in modernised form it reappeared in the 'Notes' of a local weekly newspaper.<sup>3</sup> In 1853 a note relative to labourers' wages, as fixed by the justices of the peace for Norfolk in 9 Hen. VI, was communicated to the Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society by Sir Henry Ellis, who derived his information from a volume in the British Museum.<sup>4</sup> He merely gives the text of the ordinance, and it may therefore be of interest to indicate the connexion in which it is found. Among various treatises bound together is one in a fifteenth-century hand described in the catalogue as a 'registrum chartarum de villis, terris, maneriis, libertatibus, privilegiis, aliisque ad iura episcopi et conventus Eliensis spectantibus.' It deals more particularly with the manors of the hundred and a half of Mitford in Norfolk, held by the bishop of

<sup>1</sup> ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW, ix. 318.

<sup>2</sup> *Norfolk Archaeology*, iv. 362.

<sup>3</sup> *Norfolk and Norwich Chronicle*, 30 Oct. 1897. I am much indebted to J. C. Tingey, F.S.A., Hon. Curator of the Norwich archives recently placed in the Castle Museum, who drew my attention to the 'Note.'

<sup>4</sup> Cott. MSS. Dom. A. xv. f. 187b.

Ely, gives the names of persons owing suit, mentions various payments due from the several manors, and adds some miscellaneous information apparently for the guidance of Henry Sherington, the bishop's bailiff.<sup>a</sup> Among other things, disconnected from anything that precedes or follows, is the following ordinance:—

Ordinac̃ fact' p Justic̃ pacis in Com̃ Norff sup stipendiis Artificiar' seruieñ  
et laboř Anno ix<sup>mo</sup> Regis H. Sexti.

It is ordeyned that a plowman a shephard a carter a maltester the best shall take xiijs. iiij*d.* in the yere and mete and drynk and clothyng and the secondary xs. and mete and drynk.

A woman seruant of husbondrye the best shall take xs. and mete and drynk and clothyng.

A laborer a dycher a waller an hegger a dawber shall take in the wyntersday *j*d.* ob.* and in the somersdaye *i*d.** and a secondary laborer a dycher a waller an begger a dawber shall take in the wynterday *j*d.** and in the somersday *j*d.* ob.* and mete and drynk.

A Baylly of husbondrie shall take in the yere *xx*d.** and mete and drynk and clothyng.

A Thatster shall take in the wynters day *j*d.* ob.* and on the somers day *i*d.** and mete and drynk.

Masons leyers reders tylers sall take on the wynȝesdaye *i*d.** an on the somersday *i*d.* ob.* and mete and drynk.

A Carpenter a sawer shall take on the wyntersday *i*d.** and on the somersday *i*d.** a secondary Carpenter a sawer shall take on the Wynters daye *i*d.** and on the somersday *i*d.* ob.* and mete and drynk.

The thrussyng of a q<sup>r</sup> Whete Rye mestalyon pesson and benes and the syeng of the same *iiij*d.** withoute mete.

The thrussyng and the syeng of a q<sup>r</sup> Barly and ote *i*d.** wyth oute mete.

This, then, is a copy of a very early assessment of wages, being the earliest instance which we as yet know, in which the justices acted upon the powers conferred by 13 Ric. II st. 1. c. 8, a statute which, according to the recital in 6 Hen. VI c. 3, had not been executed owing to the omission of any penalty for non-observance. The latter measure, designed to remedy this defect and passed as a temporary act, was confirmed by 8 Hen. VI c. 8 'until the king hath otherwise declared his will in the full parliament.' In less than two years there appeared this ordinance for the regulation of wages in Norfolk. That the wages thus fixed were actually paid cannot perhaps be proved, but the inclusion of the ordinance among entries of payments and dues is surely not without some significance as indicating that the assessment was held to be binding. Was it not as important for the bishop's bailiff to know the price payable for labour on the episcopal estates as to be acquainted with other payments due from those same estates? Apart from any value as an instance of local regulation, the assessment is of some

<sup>a</sup> Blomefield, *Hist. of Norfolk*, v. 1178.

interest as bearing witness to that rise of wages in employments outside the cloth trade which is indicated by the difference in the maximum rates laid down by 12 Ric. II c. 4 and by 23 Hen. VI c. 12. Thus the bailiff who in 1388 receives 13s. 4d. and clothing once a year can in Norfolk in 1431 command 20s. and meat and drink and clothing. The best ploughmen, shepherds, carters, and maltsters receive 13s. 4d., meat, drink, and clothing; the secondary 10s. with similar allowances, as against 10s. in 1388 for master hines, carters, and shepherds, and 7s. for drivers of ploughs.<sup>6</sup> The value of women's work has risen from 6s. to 10s. and allowances for the best, a price at which it remains in later fifteenth-century legislation. That this rise was not entirely due to local causes may be inferred from 23 Hen. VI. c. 12, which fixing general maximum rates more minutely than 12 Ric. II c. 4 shows in some cases an advance on those actually assessed by the justices in 1431.<sup>7</sup> The following extracts from the later statute may suffice for purposes of comparison:—

*Wages by the Year.*

Bailiff of husbandry . . . .	23s. 4d.	meat, drink, 5/-	for clothes.
Chief hind, chief shepherd, carter	20s.	" "	4/- "
Common servant of husbandry .	15s.	" "	40d. "
Woman Servant . . . .	10s.	" "	4s. "
Infant under 14 . . . .	6s.	" "	8s. "

*Wages by the Day.*

	Summer.		Winter.	
	With food	Without	With food	Without
Free masons or master carpenter .	4d.	5½d.	3d.	4½d.
Master tiler, slater, rough mason, mesne carpenter, and others in building trade	3d.	4½d.	2½d.	4d.
Every other labourer . . . .	2d.	3½d.	1½d.	3d.

Special harvest rates are mentioned.

To attempt any proof of a continuous rise in wages<sup>8</sup> during the fifteenth century is beyond the scope of this note, but such a conclusion seems to be warranted by a perusal of the statute book, apart from the evidence adduced by Thorold Rogers in his great work, and it is therefore an open question whether the legislature of the period deserves the unqualified condemnation he has passed upon it.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> 12 Ric. II. c. 4 seems to exclude food and clothing; it draws no distinction between best and secondary servants, and only deals with day labourers in general terms.

<sup>7</sup> The averages given by Thorold Rogers of daily wages for 1431, *Agric. and Prices*, iv. 514, seem slightly higher than those fixed by the justices for a county in which the rate of payment was high: *ibid.* p. 601.

<sup>8</sup> 11 Henry VII c. 22 shows a further advance in some directions on 23 Henry VI c. 12.

<sup>9</sup> Whatever the motive may have been, the rise was not due to a rise in the prices of food. As Thorold Rogers points out, provisions were extraordinarily cheap, and



So far as Norfolk is concerned, we know as yet of no further assessment for a period of one hundred and eighty years, but after the confirmation of the Elizabethan Act by James I the Norfolk justices were certainly not entirely unmindful of their duties, for in 1610 they issued an assessment, a copy of which has survived to our own day among the county records kept in the shire hall at Norwich.<sup>10</sup>

ELLEN A. McARTHUR.

LADY KATHARINE GREY, AND EDWARD SEYMOUR, EARL OF HERTFORD.

In the fifty-first volume of the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' Mr. A. F. Pollard contributed a life of Katharine, the wife of Edward Seymour, earl of Hertford, known in her maiden days as Lady Katharine Grey. On the death of her sister, 'Queen Jane,' she succeeded to a strong reversionary claim to the throne under the settlements made by Henry VIII and Edward VI; and it will be remembered that there was one other sister, the diminutive Lady Mary, who shared the birthright with Jane and Katharine, and also the misfortune which attended it. Lady Katharine's pathetic story has been told more than once, and the intention here is only to refer to the latter years of her life—those of her imprisonment for clandestine marriage with the earl of Hertford—in order to correct an error partially repeated in the notice above referred to.<sup>1</sup>

Sir Henry Ellis, in 1827, showed what the circumstances really were by printing among his 'Original Letters' several found in the Lansdowne collection referring to Lady Katharine, and three—one of these a petition to the queen—written by her own hand. Sir Henry also printed an extremely interesting and touching narrative of her death in 1568, which, it cannot be doubted, was drawn up at the time;<sup>2</sup> and Camden in all probability had knowledge of it when he thus wrote, the English edition of his 'Annales' being now quoted:

wheat, which from 1260 to 1400 had been 5s. 10½d. a quarter, was 5s. 11½d. from 1401 to 1540. *Econ. Interpr. of Hist.* p. 330.

<sup>10</sup> The reference to an assessment for 1630, mentioned by Miss Leonard in the January number of this Review, points to an assessment for Norwich, a separate county from that of Norfolk. [Mr. J. C. Tingey has kindly communicated the text of the assessment of 1610, which will appear in our next number.—*Ed. E. H. R.*]

<sup>1</sup> Misrepresentation of her imprisonment and the place of her death was made by Camden, who wrote of it in his *Annales*, probably not more than forty years after the event. His error, that she died in the Tower of London, was repeated by all subsequent historians down to Bayley, who published his *History of the Tower* in 1825. It had been detected, however, by a writer in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1823 (vol. 93, pt. 2, p. 11), who had discovered in the *Reyes MS.*, deposited at the Herald's College, that Lady Katharine's death occurred at Yoxford in Suffolk.

<sup>2</sup> Of this document (printed in *Original Letters*, 2nd ser. ii. 288) there are two copies in the British Museum, *Harl. MS.* xxxix. 373, and *Cotton MS. Titus, C. 7*, 125. In the heading of the Harleian copy it is said that Lady Katharine died a prisoner in the Tower; but that this is an erroneous addition to the original is evident from the title of the Cotton copy, which does not state where her death occurred.