

The Condition of the Working-Class in England, 1209-2004¹

Gregory Clark

University of California, Davis

¹ The data collection for this paper was made possible by NSF grants SES 91-22191, SES, 02-41376. The author owes an enormous debt to the many transcribers and compilers of English wage and price data, some of whom are listed in the appendix. This paper would have been impossible without these printed sources. Thus of the 45,444 wage observations used only 4,656 were collected directly from manuscripts. A particular debt is owed John Munro for generously sharing his coded data from the Beveridge Archive on the medieval Winchester Estates.

ABSTRACT

The paper uses building workers' wages 1209-2004, and the skill premium, to consider the causes and consequences of the Industrial Revolution. Real wages were trendless before 1800, as would be predicted for the Malthusian era.

Comparing wages with population, however, suggests 1640 actually was the break from the technological stagnation of the Malthusian era, long before the classic Industrial Revolution and even the arrival of modern democracy in 1689.

Building wages also conflict with human capital interpretations of the Industrial Revolution, as modeled by Becker et al. (1990), Galor and Weil (2000) and Lucas (2002). Human capital accumulation began when the rewards for skills were unchanged, and when fertility was increasing.

I. Introduction

The paper estimates the real wages per hour worked for building craftsmen and laborers in England annually from 1209 to 2004, as well as the wage premium received by skilled workers compared to laborers. These series are employed to interpret both the causes and the consequences of the Industrial Revolution. Because the derivation of these series involves a huge amount of data and sources – 46,000 wage observations and 110,000 observations on prices and house rents – the details of the derivation are given in an appendix. The body of the paper concentrates on the series themselves and their implications.

The most important implications are that the break from the Malthusian era of little efficiency advance in England began circa 1640, long before the famous Industrial Revolution, and before even the emergence of the modern political regime in England in 1689. Further while it is possible that the fundamental cause of this break was much greater investment in human capital, those gains in human capital investment cannot have their origin in the incentives provided by labor markets. Both real wages and the premium for skills in the seventeenth century did not change in such a way as to induce a switch to fewer children of higher quality. Finally the new series suggest that the classic Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth century was much more favorable to workers real earnings than other recent studies have implied.

Figure 1 shows the estimated real purchasing power of the hourly wage of building workers from 1209 to 2004 by decade. Before 1870 when wages are mainly quoted by the day work hours are assumed to be 10 per day. Appendix 1 shows that if anything work hours before 1800 were likely to have been higher than 10 per day, so that the gain in real wages in the Industrial Revolution era is probably slightly greater than the figure suggests.

Before 1800, though there were major fluctuations, real wages display no clear trend. Wages in 1200-49, for example, averaged only 9% less than those in 1750-99 at the eve of the Industrial Revolution. Given the large and persistent swings up and down in real wages before 1800 it is impossible to be confident that there was any trend. Thus a major implication of the Malthusian model of the pre-industrial era, that there should be no secular gain in wages all the way from the hunter gatherer era to the Industrial Revolution, is borne out as far back as 1200. From 1800 to 2004, in contrast, hourly real wages grew thirteen fold, gaining 1.3% per year.

Figure 2 shows craftsmen's wages relative to those of unskilled workers by decade from the 1220s on, calculated in two ways. The first is by measuring by decade the relative wage of all craftsmen relative to all laborers. The second is by using only those observations where we have a matched pair for the same place and year of wages for craftsmen and laborers. The broad trends are very similar and suggest that over time the skill premium declined markedly in England. The premium was 100% or more before 1350, but declined to only about 50% by 1400. It maintained this level for 500 years till about 1900. Then in the twentieth century there was another profound decline in the market reward for skills in the building industry, to a level of 12% or less by the 1960s. Since then there has been a modest gain in the skill premium, but in 2004 it was still only 21-24%, less than half the pre-industrial level.

II Wages and the Timing and Causes of the Industrial Revolution

There has been a tendency to regard the classic Industrial Revolution of the 1760s as representing a single sharp break between the Malthusian world of negligible efficiency advance and the modern world of continual efficiency gains. This view was supported by the famous earlier attempt to estimate real builders' wages in England from the 1265 to the 1956 by Sir

Henry Phelps-Brown and Sheila Hopkins (hereafter PBH). Their results suggested that Malthusian stagnation continued in England almost up until 1800. In the Malthusian era we can roughly approximate the total factor productivity of the economy by comparing real wages to the level of population, as is done for the PBH series for carpenters in figure 3.² If there was a constant level of total factor productivity in pre-industrial England, then there would be an inverse relationship between wages and population, other things being equal (including trade possibilities and taxation). At a given level of population, the higher the productivity of the economy the higher would be the level of real wages. Figure 3 suggests almost complete stasis of aggregate productivity between the 1280s and the 1760s and even the 1800s, with some surprising declines in productivity in between. The seventeenth century advances in intellectual understanding of the natural world – Bacon, Newton, Hooke, Boyle and their ilk - apparently had little effect on the efficiency of the economy before 1800.

The series developed here is very different from the PBH, however. Figure 4 shows the two series for comparison for the decades before 1870. In particular real wages before 1600 are much lower, in some decades being almost 50% less than in PBH. The appendices detail why these series differ so much and why the current estimates are preferable.

The revised series also implies a very different image of economic growth in England before the Industrial Revolution. Figure 5 shows real wages by decade with this data from the 1280s to the 1860s versus estimated English population. Now in the decades prior to 1600 there is a remarkably stable inverse relationship between wages and population. The curve in figure 5 shows the fitted relationship from regressing the logarithm of the real wage on the log of

² Loose because the wage only indicates the marginal productivity of labor. So changes in the capital stock could also change wages.

population for the decades of the 1280s to the 1590s. Population alone explains wages very well in the years before 1640.

With the new data on wages the efficiency of the economy shows the first signs of significantly exceeding medieval levels in the 1640s, when real wages are 12% higher than would be implied by the population given the observations before 1600. There was seemingly significant productivity growth in the economy between the 1630s and 1740s. By the 1740s wages were 68% higher than would be predicted from the pre-1600 relationship. This growth was followed by an apparent pause in productivity growth at the eve of the classic Industrial Revolution, before the resumption of productivity growth in the 1790s. However, real wages in the decades of the 1770s to the 1810s were depressed by as much as 10% by the heavy indirect taxes imposed to finance the substantial military expenditures of the government in these years of the American Revolutionary War and the struggle with Napoleon, and by the disruptions of trade caused by the wars. The seeming pause in TFP growth in these years may thus reflect just in part a limitation of trying to infer TFP growth from wage and population information alone.

The beginnings of the escape from the Malthusian stagnation in England in the 1640s and 1650s is a surprise, considering the social and political history of seventeenth century England. From the 1630s to the 1680s there was considerable political and religious conflict, resulting in an open civil war for most of the 1640s between the King and Parliament. After the execution of the King Charles I in 1649 there was 11 years of unsuccessful rule first by Parliament and then by a military dictatorship under Cromwell and his successor. The restoration of the monarchy in the form of Charles II in 1660 left the basic conflict between the King and Parliament unresolved, and the succession of his brother James II in 1685 added religious venom to the issues. Yet as figure 6 shows in detail, this was the first period in recorded English history where

substantial growth of real wages was not explained by population declines. After six turbulent decades real wages in the 1680s were 43% higher than would be expected from past experience.³ This is thus the first sustained period of growth in estimated TFP in recorded English history. The arrival of the new stable regime of rule by Parliament with the replacement James II with William and Mary in 1689 is associated with a decline of the implied TFP growth rates in the early eighteenth century, and the stasis of the late eighteenth century.

For the many economists who see institutions as the explanation for the lack of efficiency growth before 1800 the first appearance of modern growth in the years 1630-1690, and its slowdown for a hundred years thereafter, should be an uncomfortable revelation. The Glorious Revolution of 1688-9 established a highly stable democracy in England, an institutional regime largely unchanged to the present day. Economists such as Douglass North and Barry Weingast have asserted that the reforms of 1688-9 were the pre-condition of modern growth. They allegedly gave security to investors and innovators in a way that previous rule by despotic monarchs, unable to control their predatory urges, could never ensure.⁴ After 1689 increased security should have raised the value of private assets such as land or houses, and reduced the rate of return on capital. Greater investment and capital accumulation should have driven up real wages. Instead it is impossible to trace any effect of the Glorious Revolution on capital markets, land markets, housing markets or now on labor markets either (Clark 1996, 2002a, 2002b). The bad old regime fostering more economic growth than did, at least initially, the new one.

Another class of recent theories of the Industrial Revolution have focused on the acquisition of human capital and the growth externalities this creates (Becker et al. 1990, Galor

³ This wage gain does not seem to be the result just of the redistribution of incomes. Real land rents rose in these years, the tax burden was largely unchanged, and while returns on capital fell, they fell so modestly that they could not explain these wage gains (Clark 1998, 2002b).

and Weil 1996 and 2000, Lucas 2002). The vision has been of a pre-industrial equilibrium where both incomes and the private returns to skills were low. This induced parents to prefer to produce as many as children as possible, but invest little in the human capital of their offspring. Short term gains in income in this pre-industrial equilibrium resulted only in population growth, which pushed income back to the subsistence level. The Industrial Revolution represented a break from the Malthusian Equilibrium associated with families switching their behavior towards fewer births but greater investment in each child. The cause of this break differs with the specific theory, but there are really only two things that can signal families to change their childbearing and child rearing behavior towards modern norms. The first is a higher level of real incomes, for husbands, wives or both, which determines the value of the opportunity cost of the parents' time. The second is a higher implied private return to human capital, which determines the returns to investing in human capital.

England in the period before the Industrial Revolution certainly witnessed signs of a greatly increased stock of human capital. Figure 7 shows estimates of the proportion of men and women who had at least basic literacy by decade in England. This proportion rose substantially in the years before the Industrial Revolution. Literacy was also associated strongly with occupation and with wealth in the pre-industrial period. Table 1 shows the fraction of will writers in the early seventeenth century the fraction seemingly illiterate (because they signed the will with an "X"), and the average value of the bequests by occupation. Those in skilled occupations were more literate than those in unskilled occupations, and they had more assets at time of death.

⁴ North and Weingast (1989). See also Jones (2001) who argues that the increased appropriability of knowledge was key to the Industrial Revolution.

But why was literacy increasing in England in the years preceding the Industrial Revolution? The real wage series in figure 4 shows that the gains in human capital evident in England in the seventeenth century were occurring in an environment where real wages in the early part of that century were in fact low for the Malthusian era. Real wages in the fifteenth century were about 60% higher than in the seventeenth century, because of the very small population of the earlier years. Nor is there any sign in this era of a rise in women's wages relative to those of men, as would occur in the textile industries in the Industrial Revolution era.

The wage premium for skills shown in figure 2 similarly does not point to the seventeenth century as a period when skill acquisition was being better rewarded in the marketplace.

Skilled building workers typically acquired those skills by apprenticing themselves to a craftsman, with the traditional apprenticeship lasting up to seven years. Parents in at least some cases had to pay to secure apprenticeships for their children. These market wage rates would be misleading about the incentives to invest in training would be if the high skill premiums in the early years was caused by restriction of access to skilled crafts through guild limitations on apprenticeships. In major urban centers such as London from at least medieval times crafts were organized through guilds, which required apprenticeships for access to the skilled trades. If the crafts could successfully limit this access then they could drive up the relative wage of the skilled workers. This would result in the premium existing craftsmen were able to demand for apprenticeships rising, so that higher skill premiums in this case would indicate no greater incentive to pursue training for children.

But all the indications are that guild control of entry to skilled crafts in centers like London was weaker in the years before 1350 when skill premiums were high than in subsequent

years when premiums were low. One way to limit entry to the skilled crafts was to increase the required apprenticeship term. In 1309-12 in London the modal term of registered guild apprenticeships was 7 years: 82% served an apprenticeship of 8 years or less (with the modal age at entry 14). By the early fifteenth century, when the premium for skills in the London building trades had fallen markedly, apprenticeships had lengthened: only 41% of registered apprenticeships were for 8 years or less (Hanawalt (1993), p. 135).

Guild regulation of crafts was much stronger in cities than in the countryside. With the copious data I have I can calculate separately the wage premium in the urban and rural areas throughout these years. Generally the skill premium was, if anything, higher in rural areas and small towns than in the largest cities. And the decline in the premium over time was just as profound in the countryside. Thus the secular decline in skill premiums must reflect underlying trends in the demand for and supply of skills in the building industry.

Another possible explanation for rising literacy in the years 1600 to 1900 would be the increasing urbanization of English society associated with industrialization. Estimates of the urban share of the population before 1800 are tentative, but most imply it was very small before 1700. Between 1600 and 1800 the urban share of the population probably increased from about 15% to 35%.⁵ Since there are different occupational demands for literacy, and urban areas benefit from economies of scale in providing schooling, it is possible that the spread of education in pre-industrial was at least partially driven by urbanization and industrialization. However, evidence from the sample of male will writers presented in table 5 suggests that these effects at best explain little of the increase in male literacy between 1600 and 1800. Male testators in

⁵ For example, of the sample of will makers in Suffolk 1620-36 described in table 5, only about 10% were resident in towns at the time of their death. Adding in London the overall implied urban total for England would be more like 15%. By the time of the 1801 census, if we measure

towns in 1620-36 had a 68% chance of being literate, compared to 45% for those dying in the countryside. But will makers were concentrated among the more literate. If we re-weight the sample to conform to the likely occupational distribution of England as a whole the difference was only about 15%. With one fifth more people in urban areas in 1800 than in 1600 this would then explain a 3% greater male literacy rate. Figure 7 suggests that at least 20% more of the population of males was literate in 1800 compared to 1600 (with an even greater increase for women). Rural literacy rates in 1800 must have been much higher in 1800 than in 1600.

Comparing figures 2 and 7 we see that the skill premium moved in inverse relationship to the average stock of human capital. There was a fundamental shift in the amounts of education parents supplied children, even in rural areas, beginning long before the Industrial Revolution, without any significant improvement in the returns to skill. Further as Clark (2005b) shows this increased investment in skills occurred long before there was any decline in fertility, and indeed in an era where fertility was increasing from 1650 up until about 1820. It is thus probable that explaining rising human capital accumulation in pre-industrial England will require models which posit changes in household preferences, as do Galor and Moav (2002).

III The Consequences of the Industrial Revolution

There has been a long standing controversy about whether and when labor gained from the Industrial Revolution in England.⁶ Friedrich Engels, for example, claimed in 1844 that the pre-industrial worker in England was far better off than his successors of the factories of the 1840s, “So the workers vegetated throughout a passably comfortable existence, leading a

urban areas as parishes or townships with a population density of more than 1 person per acre, 34% of England was urban.

righteous and peaceful life in all piety and probity; and their material position was far better than that of their successors” (Engels, 1892, p. 2).

Figure 8 shows real building workers wages by year from 1760 to 1869 as calculated here, but also in contrast the recent pessimistic real wage series for British workers as a whole of Charles Feinstein (Feinstein 1998). The series here is much more optimistic for the Industrial Revolution era than either Feinstein or PBH (see figure 3 for PBH). Feinstein calculates English workers gained 47% in real wages from the 1770s to the 1860s. The evidence here suggests the gains for building workers were a much more substantial 70%. As before with PBH the reason for my much greater optimism is almost entirely that my estimated cost of living rises much less than Feinstein’s.

The real wage series in figure 8 does suggest, however, that Feinstein is if anything too optimistic about the early Industrial Revolution. It was not till the 1820s that real wages advanced beyond their level in the middle of the eighteenth century at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution era. Before then real wages actually declined somewhat from their level of the 1760s. When Malthus published his famous “Essay on a Principle of Population” in 1798 it was in a setting where real wages had been flat or declining for several generations, ever since the first half of the eighteenth century. At the time Malthus was writing the dramatic technical innovations which transformed cotton spinning - the Spinning Jenny and Water Frame in 1769, and the Mule in 1776 – were almost a generation old. But these gains were expended mainly in allowing significant population growth rather than in raising real wages. Ricardo’s adoption and elaboration of the subsistence wage doctrine in the “Principles of Political Economy and Taxation” published in 1817 was also entirely reasonable at the time of its formulation, given the

⁶ This debate seems endless. Recent arguments for optimism are found in Lindert and Williamson (1985), and Clark (2001). Feinstein (1998) and Allen (2001) are much

path of real wages to that point. There was as yet no sign that the economy could consistently generate enough productivity growth to allow permanent real wage increases. Only in the 1820s did real wages begin showing robust growth. Between then and the 1860s real wages growth averaged 0.8% per year.

The “Communist Manifesto,” published in London in 1848, asserted that the wages of the new industrial proletariat were determined by “the means of subsistence that he requires for maintenance, and for the propagation of his race.” But building wages in the 1840s exceeded the highest level they attained in any earlier decade in recorded history in England. By 1867 when Marx published the first volume of “Capital” his subsistence doctrine of wages was increasingly remote from English reality.

This optimistic view of wage growth in Industrial Revolution England is supported by figure 9, which shows the movement of the real wages of Irish building workers in the Industrial Revolution era in comparison with those in England. Both series were set to 100 in the 1860s. Irish real wages were always considerably below those in England, but they rose as much as those in England between the 1780s and the 1860s, and with very similar timing. In the Industrial Revolution era Ireland de-industrialized in response to the industrialization of Britain, losing much of its domestic textile industry, and specializing increasingly in the production of foodstuffs for a rapidly urbanizing England. Ireland also suffered in the years 1846 to 1850 from the devastating Potato Famine, which resulted in the deaths of perhaps as many as 12% of the population. But, nevertheless, Irish real wages rose because of the declining prices of cloth, candles, fuel, sugar, and tea. It would be bizarre indeed had English workers at the heart of the Industrial Revolution witnessed less real wage improvement than their Irish colleagues.

morpessimistic.

Since Irish workers gained as much as English from the Industrial Revolution it is unwise to assume in general that England gained any more from the Industrial Revolution than other countries did. The competitive nature of Industrial Revolution industries, and the rapid transition of England towards exporting manufactures in return for foodstuffs and raw materials, meant that perhaps half of all the TFP gains of the Industrial Revolution were directly exported as falling prices to consumers in England's trading partners, such as Ireland.

IV Conclusion

The real wage series developed above provide insights into the English economy in both the Malthusian and Industrial Revolution eras. The Malthusian prediction that real wages should be trendless before the Industrial Revolution is confirmed for the years after 1200. I also find extremely long periods where there was apparently no productivity growth in the pre-industrial economy. If we compare real wages with population we see from the 1200s to the 1600s a period of 400 years without any signs of TFP growth. But the Industrial Revolution of the 1760s and later is preceded by a period of more modest economic growth starting in the 1640s. Thus the Industrial Revolution is not clearly an abrupt break around 1800 from a stagnant economy. It may just be the acceleration of a process of modern growth that began about 150 years earlier.

We also see in the premium paid for skills that while increased investment in human capital may lie at the heart of the Industrial Revolution, the causes of this increased investment, evident in England as early as 1600 are mysterious. The market signal to parents, in the form of the level of real wages, the relative wages of men and women, or and the market premium for skills, does not explain the increased investment in human skills evident after 1600.

V Appendix: Calculating Nominal Wages, Cost of Living and Real Wages

Pre-industrial England has a uniquely well documented wage and price history. The stability of English institutions after 1066, and the early development of monetary exchange, allowed a large number of documents with wages and prices to survive. This paper fashions a large collection of these records of wages and prices – more than 46,000 quotes of day wages, 90,000 quotes of the prices of 49 commodities, and 20,000 quotes of house rents - into an estimate of English building workers' real day wages from 1209 to 2004.⁷ The new national wage series is calculated as an average of five regional series in the years before 1915: London, the south east, the south west, the midlands and the north.⁸

There was a change in how wages were quoted around 1860. Before then most wages were quoted for “a day” or “half a day” where the length of a day was unspecified. Thereafter increasingly hourly wages were quoted. What was the length of the work day before the 1860s? In a transitional period between 1750 and 1869 wages were sometimes quoted both by the day and the hour. I calculate the implied hours per day in these decades by dividing the day wage by the hourly wage. Table 2 gives the implied hours per work day by decade using this method. Either taking just the raw averages, or controlling for craft and location, the results are the same. After the 1810s the implied work day is about 10 hours. But from the 1750s to the 1810s the day seemingly declined from 11 to 10 hours. However, the evidence for the years before 1800 is limited to a few observations from 3 towns – London, Exeter and Bristol. Thus I assume a

⁷ These documents have been the basis of many studies of pre-industrial wages and prices. Most notable are those of James E. Thorold Rogers, Elizabeth Gilboy, William Beveridge, , Henry Phelps-Brown and Sheila Hopkins, Peter Bowden, Bernard Eccleston, David Farmer, Donald Woodward, Steve Rappaport, Jeremy Boulton, and Charles Feinstein (Rogers (1866, 1888a, 1888b, 1902), Gilboy (1934), Beveridge (1936, 1939), Phelps Brown and Hopkins (1981), Bowden (1967, 1985), Eccleston (1976), Farmer (1988, 1991), Rappaport (1989), Woodward (1995), Boulton (1996, 2000), Feinstein (1998)).

⁸ London is defined as any location within 10 miles of the City of London.

standard 10 hour day for all day wage quotes for the years before 1869, without making any adjustment for potentially longer days before 1810. Hourly wages after 1869 were converted into a wage for a notional 10 hour day.

Another discontinuity enters the series around 1860. Later wage quotes were mainly for the amounts actually received by workers in wages. Earlier most quotes were for the amounts paid by institutions to craftsmen or building firms for labor costs. The amounts actually received by the workers would be less than these payments in many cases, judging at least from the evidence in the years where we know of both types of payments. The difference was the payment to the firm or the master craftsman for their role in organizing the work. For the years 1843-1869 we have for the same place and work type a set of observations on both types of wage report. In this sample the average direct wage payment is 0.905 of the payment for labor costs by the customers. Thus the overhead charge averaged a little less than 10% of the charge for labor costs. We apply this number to all wage observations which were not clearly direct payments to workers.

To get from the mass of observations of individual wages to a consistent wage series the annual day wages for craftsmen in the new series before 1915 were calculated by estimating the coefficients of a regression of the following form:

$$\ln(W_{it}) = \alpha_i + \sum_{j=1}^{29} \gamma_j CRAFT_j + \sum_{k=1}^{12} \eta_k JOINT_k + \sum_{l=1}^4 \sum_{m=1}^{13} \theta_{lm} REGION_l PERIOD_m + \sum_t \phi_t D_t + \varepsilon_{ijt}. \quad (1)$$

W_{it} is the average wage in location i of a craftsman in year t . α_i is a fixed wage premium for each location i , such as Chelmsford.

$CRAFT_i$ is a set of 29 indicator variables for different crafts such as bricklayer and mason (the omitted category is carpenter). $JOINT_j$ is an indicator variable for a joint wage of a craftsman and a servant or assistant for the thirteen periods 1200-1299, 1300-49, 1350-99,.....,

1800-49, 1850-69 (there are no joint wage quotes after 1869). REGION is an indicator variable for each of the four “regions” (London being the omitted category). PERIOD is an indicator variable for each of the periods 1200-1299, 1300-49, 1350-99,....., 1800-49, and 1900-14. The relative levels of day wages changed across the other regions over time, but by modest amounts. D_t is an indicator for each of 672 years with a wage observation.

From 1209 to 1914 there are 23,524 observations of craftsmens’ wages, where the average wage of each craft at each location in each time period was treated as one observation. 2,164 of these observations were of the joint wage of a craftsman and a helper.

Wages for laborers and assistants for 1914 and before were calculated in a similar way from fitting the parameters of a regression of the form,

$$\ln(W_{it}) = \alpha_i + \beta JOINT_{<1350} + \sum_{l=1}^4 \sum_{m=1}^{13} \theta_{lm} REGION_l PERIOD_m + \sum_t \phi_t D_t + \varepsilon_{ijt} \quad (2)$$

The variable definitions are as for equation 1. I have assumed that laborers’ wages did not vary across crafts. I also use the joint wages of craftsmen and laborers only for the years before 1350 ($JOINT_{<1350}$) where wage observations on helpers alone are scarcer. There are 11,988 observations available for this estimation, of which 572 were joint observations of the wage of a craftsman and a helper before 1350.

These series for nominal day wages was extended from 1914 to 2004 using a variety of sources. From 1970-2004 on I employed the New Earnings Survey followed by the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings. This reports hourly earnings in April of each year, from a national sample of workers including those in constuction. From 1914 to 1974 various sources report hourly earnings of building workers fixed by collective bargaining agreements in some of the larger towns in England: Bowley (1921), Bowley (1937), United Kingdom, Department of Employment and Productivity (1971), and the Department of Employment Gazette..

The earnings of a craftsman relative to an unskilled worker was calculated in two ways. The first was by calculating by decade the relative wage of craftsmen relative to laborers. This is the result shown in the fourth column of table 3. The second was by using only those observations where there exists a matched pair of wage observations for the same place and year for craftsmen and laborers, and estimating the coefficients of a regression of the form

$$\ln\left(\frac{W_{craft}}{W_{lab}}\right)_{it} = \alpha_i + \sum_k \beta_k IDCRAFT_k + \sum_t \phi_t DEC_t + \varepsilon_{ijt}, \quad (3)$$

where i indexes places, and t the year. IDCRAFT is as before an indicator for the craft of the skilled worker, and DEC an indicator for the decade. The results of this estimation are broadly similar to the simple average, as figure 2 shows.

Figure 10 shows the nominal wage estimated by PBH relative to this paper for craftsmen and for their helpers. Though in individual decades the wage estimates deviate by as much as 23%, there is little pattern to these deviations. They do not explain the much higher real wages systematically found by PBH in the years before 1600.

The cost of living index for 1209 to 1869 was formed as a geometric index of the prices of each component, with expenditure shares used as weights. It thus assumes constant shares of expenditure on each item as relative prices change. That is, if p_{it} is the price index for each commodity i in year t , and a_i is the expenditure share of commodity i , then the overall price level in each year, p_t is calculated as,

$$p_t = \prod_i p_{it}^{a_i}$$

The individual price series were derived as the estimated parameters on year indicators of regressions of the form

$$\ln(P_{it}) = \sum_k \beta_k DTYPE_k + \sum_t \phi_t D_t + \varepsilon_{ikt}$$

where DTYPE was a dummy variable for each type of a product, where a type was defined by location, purchaser, characteristics and measuring unit. In this I try and control for variations in the size of units across sources, and in the quality of the product. This is important because both the quality of the product and the size of the measures varied across sources, even for very homogenous commodities in the same place at the same time. In London in 1827, for example, the Clothworkers Guild paid 20 d. per gallon for milk, Bethlem insane asylum 13 d., and the King's Household 24 d, a range in price for a seemingly standard product of nearly 2:1.

The weights for expenditures are derived mainly from budget studies of manual workers expenditures collected in the years 1786-1854, as summarized by Sarah Horrell (Horrell (1996)). The Horrell average budget shares, together with earlier evidence for London manual workers from Vanderlint (1734), are given in table 4. For the share of housing costs in expenditure I can supplement this evidence from even earlier for cases where I know the renter of a house is a building worker. In 22 cases before 1740 the average rental payment as a share of estimated annual income (assuming a 300 day work year) was 5.9%.

Since, as we shall see real living standards vary by only about 2.5:1 over the years 1200-1869, I use the same set of weights for the major categories of expenditure throughout these years. I also, in the interests of economy of space, use the same cost of living index for craftsmen and laborers. The expenditure of the craftsmen had more meat and dairy products, and more beer and tea, than the laborers, but the different movements in their costs of living are not big enough to justify the extra space that would be required to treat them separately. There are at maximum 49 items included in the cost of living index, including such exotica as stockings and pewter plates.

Up until 1869 bread was the single most important item of consumption for workers. The available bread prices before 1816 are mainly those for London, but these were regulated by statute before 1815, and over time the ratio of the assize price of bread in London to the cost of wheat changed markedly. A breakdown of the costs of bread baked for the Navy in 1767 suggests that the price of bread should be nearly proportional to that of wheat, since wheat constituted 92% of the costs of making bread (Beveridge (1939), p. 542). Yet the ratio of the price of 48 lbs. of bread in London to the price of a bushel of wheat in England falls from an average of 1.36 in 1670-1769 to 1.14 in the years 1770-1799, but then bounces back up to 1.32 in the years 1820-69 after the assize was abolished.⁹ This would not be possible if the bread was of constant quality. So for bread and flour before 1816, I infer bread prices from wheat prices. I do this using the estimated coefficients of the regression

$$\ln\left(\frac{p_b}{p_{\bar{w}}}\right) = a + b \ln\left(\frac{p_w}{p_{\bar{w}}}\right)$$

for the years 1816-1869 when bread prices were free of regulation. p_b is the bread price (in d. per lb), p_w is the wheat price (in d. per lb), and $p_{\bar{w}}$ average wheat prices over a 21 year period centered on the year in question. The estimated coefficients were

$$\ln\left(\frac{p_b}{p_w}\right) = 0.174 - 0.221 \ln\left(\frac{p_w}{p_{\bar{w}}}\right).$$

The standard error on the estimate of b is .051. Thus the coefficient on wheat prices relative to trend is highly significant statistically (the R^2 of the fit is 0.26). This implies bread prices were smoother than wheat prices.

For beer, a very significant consumption item before 1800, a major improvement of this index over previous indexes is that I have been able to compile from churchwarden and other

⁹ Webb and Webb (1904).

accounts a series of beer prices by the gallon back to the thirteenth century, as well as cider prices by the gallon from 1209 to 1485. The earlier PBH cost of living index only had beer prices back to 1660, and proxied beer by barley and malt prices before that.

Meat prices by the pound can be found only after 1540. Before this meat was typically quoted by the live animal, the carcass, the quarter carcass, or such cuts as the leg, not by weight. Farm animals by the nineteenth century seem to have been much larger than those of the medieval period (Clark (1991)). So it seems unwise to proxy meat prices using whole animal prices before 1540. For the years before 1540 I approximate meat prices using an average of the one animal product that was sold by the pound, suet, egg prices, and also the price of fish (which being caught in the wild can be assumed to be of uniform size over time).

“Sugar” is calculated based on the price of sugar and currants and raisins in later years, but earlier mainly on the prices of honey. Raisins and currants which included here because they seem to have been valued mainly for their sugar content. As can be seen in table 4 “sugar” is extremely expensive in the early years relative to other goods.

For fuel I use the price of faggots (bundles of sticks), turf, charcoal and coal, increasing the relative weight of coal over time.¹⁰ Light prices are proxied by a mixture of gas light prices, oil prices and candle prices for the years after 1815, and for oil and tallow candles alone before then. Gas light prices are measured by the average cost of a cubic foot of gas. The inclusion of gas light which fell rapidly in price from the 1810s to the 1860s makes light prices relatively much higher in earlier years than on the PBH or Feinstein cost of living series.

A major innovation in the cost of living series in this paper is the inclusion of housing rental costs, which I estimate constituted 8% of the expenditure of workers. Rents controlling

for housing quality are estimated for 1290-1840 using the methods discussed in Clark (2002). For the years before 1540 there are only two major sources of housing rents, detailed studies of medieval Winchester by Derek Keane (Keane (1985)), and of Cheapside in London by Keane and Vanessa Harding (Keane and Harding (1987)). After this the range of sources is greater, including properties leased by the Armorers and Braziers, Carpenters, Clothworkers, and Grocers in London, rents on a substantial set of leases for houses owned by the Almshouse in Saffron Waldon, Essex before 1700, and properties owned by local churches in such towns and villages as Ashburton, Betresden, Cambridge, Tewkesbury and York. To calculate the whole cost of lodging I include as 20% of dwelling costs the cost of pewter plates and vessels, and of wooden plates (1540-1650).

The cost of living series used in this paper also has much improved estimates of clothing and bedding costs. These are estimated to constitute about 12% of total expenditure. Much new data for the years 1560-1869 was collected from the records of clothing charities administered by London guilds or parishes: in particular the Brewers, Carpenters, Clothworkers and Goldsmiths. Services, such as schooling, doctors, and barbers, were assumed to constitute 2.5% of expenditures. Their cost is approximated by the average wage of building workers.

The decadal price levels for the major commodity groups used to form the cost of living index are given in table 4. For the years 1870-1995 I used the cost of living index of Feinstein (1995). Thereafter I employed the retail price index of British National Statistics.

One thing that makes the price index before 1869 much more reliable than previous indices is the greater range of commodities included, and the consequently much smaller weight of any individual commodity. Any one series may contain errors, but with 49 different prices at its maximum the law of large numbers begins to operate in reducing the effects of these errors.

Thus in the new price index, after bread (18.5%) the single commodities with the next largest weights are housing (6.5%) and beer (6%). In contrast PBH use at their maximum only 20 goods, and give a weight of 25% to sheep alone and 22.5% to malt alone in some earlier years. Errors in individual series can then have a huge effect on the cost of living index as a whole.

Table 3 shows the cost of living index, and implied real wage of skilled and unskilled workers by decade from 1200-9 to 2000-4. For real wages and the cost of living 1860-9 is set to 100. One feature lending plausibility to the new real wage series compared to PBH is that the lowest level of real wages in the new series occurs in the 1310s, the decade that witnessed the last major famine in England in the years 1316-7. On the PBH series real wages from 1590-9 to 1660-9 and in 1800-9 fell below the decade of the 1310s, yet without any sign in either of these periods of any hunger-related deaths.

The lowest curve in figure 11 shows the PBH cost of living index relative to the index employed here by decade. Before the 1520s PBH estimated the cost of living as typically only 60-70% of my index, a remarkable deviation. Surprisingly little of this divergence stems from the more extensive set of prices employed here. Instead it has two main sources. The first is that PBH employ a Laspeyres index, with the fixed quantity weights derived from their base period of 1451-75. The Laspeyres index overestimates costs of living compared to the base period when relative prices change because people do not consume goods in fixed proportions. With fixed quantity weights goods whose price increases relative to the index become a larger implied share of expenditures. Between 1451-75 and the 1860s PBH do indeed find dramatic differences in relative prices, as table 6 shows. Drink prices, for example, increased more than 17 times, while textiles prices increased less than 2 times. While in the base period PBH gave an already robust 22.5% weight to drink, by the 1860s they implicitly assume drink is 32% of the cost of

living for workers! And while in the base period textiles are given a very reasonable 12.5% weight in expenditures, by the 1860s they are a mere 3% of expenditures. As table 2 shows the actual expenditure weights in these years were closer to 8% for drink, and 12% for textiles.

Figure 11 also shows the level of the PBH index relative to the index in this paper if instead of the Laspeyres assumption we employ fixed expenditure shares for the sub-series in PBH over time, by employing the geometric index used in this paper. This one change increases the cost of living on the PBH index for the years before 1500, relative to the 1860s, by 11% on average. But this is only a partial correction of the problems created by the Laspeyres nature of their index. For each of the six sub-series that PBH combine into their overall index were themselves created as Laspeyres indices of the individual items. And even within categories such as “drink” relative prices changed significantly over time.

The second source of the divergence is the price series PBH employ for their index. The top curve in figure 11 illustrates the relative level of the cost of living indices if I replace all the PBH price series with the ones used in this paper, using the PBH expenditure shares but with constant expenditure weights throughout. Now there is little difference between the level of the series through most of the decades. The most important difference in the price series occurs in the “drink” series. As noted, even using constant expenditure weights, drink is 22.5% of expenditure in PBH. Drink represents beer exclusively before 1689, and after 1801 beer and tea and sugar. PBH, however, do not observe beer prices directly, but infer them through the prices of malt and hops. Despite the rise of large scale brewing in the late eighteenth century, and the introduction of tea and sugar as an alternative to beer, PBH find that these inferred drink prices rise more rapidly than their index as a whole. I calculate an alternative drink index using actual prices of beer, and using tea prices earlier than PBH introduce them in 1801, since tea is already

important in working class budgets before 1800 as is shown in table 4. This drink price index instead of increasing 17 fold between 1451-75 and the 1860s, increases by 7.4 times. Figure 11 also shows the relative level of the PBH to the Clark index if we both employ fixed weights and use these improved drink prices. This alone removes most of the difference between the series.

The new cost of living series also differs from the more recent one of Charles Feinstein for the years 1770-1869. The reasons for this are explored in detail in Clark (2001). The single most important one is that Feinstein, as with PBH, uses a Laspeyres index with a base period in the 1770s. Others include Feinstein's use of official London bread prices for the years 1770-1815 when these seem to have understated true bread costs, so again inflating apparent price increases. Further Feinstein does not include some products such as salt, pepper, currants and raisins, tobacco and gas lighting which were falling rapidly in price from 1815 on.

Sources

The wage and price quotes were drawn from a wide variety of sources, either directly from the original manuscripts, or when possible from transcripts of manuscripts or summaries of their contents. Sources included manorial account rolls, accounts of monasteries and cathedrals, records of Oxford and Cambridge colleges, charitable foundation records, churchwardens' accounts, town government records, London guild corporation records, payments by county governments for the maintenance of goals, courts and bridges, and private household accounts.

Major Secondary Sources

Three major printed sources which give quotes of prices from the 1260s to the 1860s were Rogers (1866, 1888a, 1888b, 1902), the Board of Trade (1903) and Beveridge (1939).

Rogers also gives extensive wage material. Information for the years 1750 to 1869 is also drawn from Afton and Turner (2000), John (1989), and Gayer, Rostow and Schwartz (1953). For earlier years I got some London food prices from Ainsworth (1939), Marsh (1913), Boulton (1996, 2000), and Rappaport (1989).

Gilboy (1934) gives wages approved by Quarter Sessions for repairs to county facilities in the years 1700 to 1800 in a variety of counties. Eccleston (1976) gives wages paid on estates for building workers for five Midland counties for the years 1750-1835. Rappaport (1989) and Boulton (1996, 2000) summarize building wages paid by the London Livery Companies from 1490 to 1700, as well as prices of food. Woodward (1995) reports annual wage rates for major northern towns for building workers from 1450 to 1750 derived from Town Chamberlains' accounts and vouchers supplemented by Churchwardens' records. These sources I have supplemented with a set of 26 printed transcriptions of churchwarden's and chamberlains' accounts from around the country, detailed below, mainly for the sixteenth century.

Archival Sources

Beveridge Papers, Robbins Library, LSE

The Beveridge Wage and Price History project, which was never completed, extracted copious wage and price materials from archival sources beyond those published in Beveridge (1939). These include prices and wages in the medieval period from eight Winchester manors, from Hinderclay and Redgrave in Suffolk, and from selected Westminster Abbey and Battle Abbey manors. There were also the records of religious and charitable institutions: Battle Abbey, Canterbury Cathedral Priory, Croyland Abbey, Durham Priory, Eton College, Norwich Cathedral Priory, St Bartholomew's Hospital in Sandwich, Kent, Westminster Abbey and

Winchester College. Finally there were records of the town corporations such as Bath, Canterbury, Dover, Exeter, and Nottingham.

Borthwick Institute, York. Churchwardens' Vouchers, St Michael Spurriergate, 1838-1869. PR Y/MS 58-60.

Bedford Record Office: Ampthill, Churchwardens' Vouchers, 1824-1852. P30/5/4. Billington, Town Lands Charity Account Book. P111/25/4.

Bristol Record Office: Bristol Town Chamberlain's Vouchers, 1750-1855.

Cheshire Record Office: Town Chamberlain's Vouchers, 1766-1836. TAV/3/51-83.

Clothworkers' Hall, London: Warden's Accounts 1580-1869. Vouchers 1798-1869. Court Minutes, 1580-1690. Lease Books 1770-1800. Records of purchases of clothing, shoes, and of the rental of company owned housing.

Cumbria Record Office: Carlisle Town Chamberlain's Vouchers, 1748-1834. CA/4/11, Cumberland Quarter Session Vouchers, 1851-4. CQF/5/117. Penrith Magistrates' Vouchers, 1861-69. QPL/20-21. Penrith Churchwardens' Vouchers, 1816-1849. PR/110/1/85.

Devon Record Office: Exeter Chamberlain's Vouchers. 1760-1855. Prices and wages.

Dorset Record Office: Lardner MSS. 1702-1749. PE/WCH/MI/7. Sherborne Almshouse Vouchers, 1850-1869. D/SHA/A981-1139.

Essex Record Office: Quarter Session Vouchers, 1759-1869. Q/FAc/5/1, Q/FAc/6/2/1-59. Saffron Walden almshouse leases. Bassom MSS, 1805-1860. D/DU 84/14 (wages).

Guildhall Library, London: Brewers' Company. Pratt's Almshouse, Aldenham, Hertfordshire. Dame Alice Owen's Almshouse, Islington. 1600-1869. 5491-2. 5473/1-5, 5478/1-3. Clothing, firewood, coals. Carpenters' Company, Warden's Accounts, 1680-1869. Clothing prices.

Hull City Record Office: Chamberlain's Vouchers, 1750-1798, 1828, 1833. BFR/6/--. Charterhouse Charity, 1850-1, 1860-1. WT/6/--. Wages.

Leicester Record Office: Quarter Session Vouchers, 1778-1869. QS/112/1-426. Wages.

London Metropolitan Archive. Foundling Hospital Vouchers. 1830-1856. A/FH/B3/31/42-68. Prices and wages.

Staffordshire Record Office: Shrewsbury MSS, 1808-1867. D 240/E/F/4/1-27. Wages.

Surrey Record Office: Quarter Session Vouchers, 1750-1851, QS2/6. Guildford Borough Vouchers. BR/OC/6/9/1-60. Wages.

UK Data Archive: Southall, H. R. and Gilbert, D. R., Great Britain Historical Database: Economic Distress and Labour Markets Data: Wages Statistics, 1845-13 [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], August 2004. SN: 4564.

Printed Primary Sources of Wage and Price Quotes

Ainsworth, John. Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters. v. 5, Warden's Account Book, 1571-1591. v. 6, Court Book 1573-1594. London, Phillimore, 1939.

Bailey, Francis A. The churchwarden's accounts of Prescott, Lancashire, 1523-1607. Preston: Record Society for the Publication of Original Documents Relating to Lancashire and Cheshire. Publications v. 104, 1953.

Barmby, James. Churchwardens' Accounts of Pittington and other Parishes in the Diocese of Durham, 1580-1700. Publications of the Surtees Society, v. 84. Durham: Andrews and Company, 1888.

Barmby, James. Memorials of St Gile's, Durham. Publications of the Surtees Society, v. 95. Durham: Andrews and Company, 1896.

Botelho, Lynn A. Churchwardens' accounts of Cratfield, 1640-1660. Woodbridge : Boydell & Brewer, Suffolk Records Society, v. 42, 1999.

Bower Marsh. Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters. v. 2, Warden's Account Book, 1438-1516. v. 3, Court Book 1533-1573. v. 4, Warden's Account Book, 1546-1571. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1913, 1939.

Brinkworth, Edwin R. C. South Newington churchwardens' accounts, 1553-1684. Banbury, Oxford: Banbury Historical Society. Records publications v. 6, 1964.

Brownbill, John. The Ledger Book of Vale Royal Abbey. Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, v. 68. Edinburgh, 1914.

Burgess, Clive. The Pre-Reformation Records of All Saints', Bristol. vs. 1-3. Stroud: Bristol Record Society, Publications, v. 46, 1995, v. 53, 1999, v. 56. 2004.

Burgess, Clive. The church records of St Andrew Hubbard, Eastcheap, c1450-c1570. London: London Record Society, 1999.

Carter, William F. The Records of King Edward's School, Birmingham. Vol II. London, Dugdale Society. Publications, v. 7, 1928.

Chatwin, Philip B. The Records of King Edward's School, Birmingham. Vols. IV-V. London, Dugdale Society. Publications, v. 20, 1948, v. 25, 1963.

Colvin, H. M. Building Accounts of King Henry III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Dobson, R. B. York City Chamberlain's Account Rolls, 1396-1500. Surtees Society, v. 192. Northumberland Press, 1980.

Doree, Stephen G. The early churchwardens' accounts of Bishops Stortford, 1431-1558. Hertfordshire record publications; v. 10. Hitchin, Hertfordshire: Hertfordshire Record Society, 1994.

Drew, Charles. Lambeth churchwardens' accounts, 1504-1645 and vestry book, 1610. Surrey Record Society. Publications, vs. 18, --. Frome, Printed by Butler & Tanner for the Surrey Record Society and the Lambeth Borough Council, 1940-1941.

Erskine, Audrey M. The Accounts of the Fabric of Exeter Cathedral, 1279-1353. Devon and Cornwall Record Society, vs. 24, 26. Torquay, Devonshire Press, 1981, 1983.

Foster, J. Churchwardens' accounts of St. Mary the Great, Cambridge, from 1504 to 1635. Cambridge, Printed for the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, Octavo series, no. 35, 1905.

Gillam, Stanley G. The Building Accounts of the Radcliffe Camera. Oxford Historical Society, New Series, v.. 13. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1958.

Greatrex, Joan. Account Rolls of the Obedientiaries of Peterborough. Northampton Record Society, v. 33. Northampton, Northampton Record Society, 1984.

Hanham, Alison. Churchwardens' accounts of Ashburton, 1479-1580. Devon & Cornwall Record Society. Publications, v. 15. Exeter: Devon and Cornwall Record Society, 1970.

Izon, John. The Records of King Edward's School, Birmingham. A Supplementary Miscellany. Vol VI. Oxford, Dugdale Society. Publications, v. 30, 1974.

Littlehales, Henry. The Medieval Records of a London City Church (St. Mary at Hill), A.D. 1420-1559. Early English Text Society, Original Series, vs. 125, 128. London: K. Paul, Trench and Trubner, 1904-5.

Litzenberger, C. J. Tewkesbury churchwardens' accounts, 1563-1624. Gloucester: Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, Gloucestershire record series, v. 7, 1994.

Maslen, Marjorie M. Woodstock Chamberlain's Accounts, 1609-1650. Oxfordshire Record Society, v. 58. Oxford: Oxfordshire Record Society, 1993.

Mellows, William T. Peterborough local administration; parochial government before the reformation. Churchwardens' accounts, 1467-1573. Northamptonshire Record Society, Publications v. 9. Kettering, 1939.

Mercer, Francis Robert. Churchwardens' accounts at Bettrysden, 1515-1573. Kent Archaeological Society. Records Branch. Kent records v. V, pt.3. Ashford, 1928.

North, Thomas. The accounts of the churchwardens of St. Martin's, Leicester, 1489-1844. Leicester: S. Clarke, 1884.

Northeast, Peter. Boxford churchwardens' accounts, 1530-1561. Suffolk Records Society, v. 23. Woodbridge, Suffolk : Boydell Press, 1982.

Plomer, Henry R. The churchwardens' accounts of St. Nicholas, Strood. (B.M. add. ms. 36,937.). Kent Archaeological Society. Records Branch. Kent records, v. V, 1915.

Postles, David. 2003. Stubbington Manorial Accounts (manuscript).

Salter, Herbert E. The churchwardens' accounts of St. Michael's Church, Oxford. Transaction of the Oxfordshire Archaeological Society, no. 78. Long Compton, Shipston-on-Stour : The "King's Stone" Press, 1933.

Somers, Frank. Halesowen churchwardens' accounts. London, Mitchell, Hughes and Clarke, 1957.

Stallard, Arthur D. The transcript of the churchwardens' accounts of the parish of Tilney All Saints, Norfolk, 1443 to 1589. London, Mitchell Hughes and Clarke, 1922.

Swayne, Henry J. F. Churchwardens' accounts of S. Edmund & S. Thomas, Sarum, 1443-1702. Wilts Record Society. Publications. Salisbury, Bennett Brothers, 1896.

Wardle, F. D. The Accounts of the Chamberlains of the City of Bath, 1568-1602. Somerset Record Society, v. 38. London: Butler and Tanner, 1923.

Weatherill, Lorna. The account book of Richard Latham, 1724-1767. Oxford: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1990.

Webb, C. C. The Churchwardens' Accounts of St Michael, Spurriergate, York, 1518-1548.

Borthwick Texts and Calendars, v. 20. York: University of York, 1997.

Welch, Edwin. Plymouth Building Accounts of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

Devon and Cornwall Record Society, New Series, v. 12. Exeter, Devon and Cornwall Record Society, 1967.

References

Afton, Bethanie and Michael Turner. "The Statistical Base of Agricultural Performance in England and Wales, 1850-1914." In The Agrarian History of England and Wales, Volume VII 1850-1914 (Part II), edited by E. J. T. Collins. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Allen, Marion E. Wills of the Archdeaconry of Suffolk, 1620-24. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press for the Suffolk Records Society, Volume XXXI, 1989.

Allen, Robert C. "The Great Divergence in European Wages and Prices from the Middle Ages to the First World War." Explorations Econ. Hist. 38 (October 2001): 411-447.

Board of Trade. Report on Wholesale and Retail Prices in the United Kingdom in 1902 with Comparative Statistical Tables for a Series of Years. Parliamentary Papers, Vol. LXVIII, 1903.

Becker, Gary, Kevin Murphy, and Robert Tamura. "Human Capital, Fertility and Economic Growth." J. P. E. 98 (October 1990): S12-37.

Beveridge, William. "Wages in the Winchester Manors." Econ. Hist. Rev. 7 (November 1936): 22-43.

_____. Prices and Wages in England, Vol 1: The Mercantilist Era. London, 1939.

Boulton, Jeremy. "Wage labour in seventeenth-century London." Econ. Hist. Rev. 49 (May 1996): 268-90.

_____. "Food prices and the standard of living in London in the 'century of revolution', 1580-1700." Econ. Hist. Rev. 53 (August 2000): 455-492.

Bowden, Peter J. "Statistical Appendix," in Joan Thirsk, editor, The Agrarian History of England and Wales, Vol. IV, edited by Joan Thirsk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

_____. "Statistical Appendix," in The Agrarian History of England and Wales, Vol. V.II, edited by Joan Thirsk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Bowley, A. L. "The Statistics of Wages in the United Kingdom during the last Hundred Years. Part VII. Wages in the Building Trades." J. Royal Statistical Society 63 (June 1900): 297-315.

_____. "The Statistics of Wages in the United Kingdom during the last Hundred Years. Part VIII. Wages in the Building Trades, Concluded." J. Royal Statistical Society, 64 (March 1901).

_____. Prices and Wages in the United Kingdom, 1914-1920. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.

_____. Wages and Income in the United Kingdom since 1860. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937.

Clark, Gregory. "The Political Foundations of Modern Economic Growth: England, 1540-1800." J. Interdisciplinary Hist. 26 (Spring, 1996): 563-588.

_____. "Land Hunger: Land as a Commodity and as a Status Good in England, 1500-1910." Explorations Econ. Hist. 35 (January, 1998): 59-82.

_____. "Farm Wages and Living Standards in the Industrial Revolution: England, 1670-1870" Econ. Hist. Rev. 54 (August, 2001): 477-505.

- _____. “Shelter from the Storm: Housing and the Industrial Revolution, 1550-1912” J. Econ. Hist. 62 (June 2002):---. (a).
- _____. “Farmland Rental Values and Agrarian History: England, 1500-1912” European Rev. Econ. Hist. 6 (December, 2002): 281-309. (b)
- _____. “The Price History of English Agriculture, 1209-1914.” Research Econ. Hist. 22 (2004): 41-124.
- _____. “The Long March of History: Farm Wages in England, 1209-1869.” Manuscript, University of California, Davis, 2005. (a)
- _____. “Human Capital, Fertility, and the Industrial Revolution” Journal of the European Economic Association (2005). (b)
- Cressy, David. “Levels of Illiteracy in England, 1530-1730,” The Historical Journal, 20 (March 1977): 1-23.
- Eccleston, Bernard. A Survey of Wage Rates in Five Midland Counties, 1750-1834. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Leicester, 1976.
- Engels, Friedrich. The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844. London: Swann Sonnenschien and Co, 1892.
- Evans, Nesta. The Wills of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury, 1630-35. Suffolk Records Society, Vol. 29. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1987.
- Farmer, D. L. “Prices and wages.” In The Agrarian History of England and Wales, Vol. II, 1042-1350, edited by H. E. Hallam. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- _____. “Prices and Wages, 1350-1500.” In The Agrarian History of England and Wales, Vol. III, 1348-1500, edited by Edward Miller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Feinstein, Charles. "Changes in Nominal Wages, the Cost of Living and Real Wages in the United Kingdom over Two Centuries." In Labour's Reward: Real Wages and Economic Change in 19th- and 20th-Century Europe, edited by P. Scholliers and V. Zamagni. Aldershot, 1995.

_____. "Pessimism Perpetuated: Real Wages and the Standard of Living in Britain During and After the Industrial Revolution." J. Econ. Hist., 58 (September 1998): 625-658.

Galor, Oded and Omer Moav. "Natural Selection and the Origin of Economic Growth." Q. J. E. 117 (2002): 1133-1192.

Galor, Oded and David N. Weil. "The Gender Gap, Fertility and Growth." A.E.R. 86 (1996): 374-387.

_____. "Population, Technology and Growth: From Malthusian Stagnation to the Demographic Transition and Beyond." A.E.R. 90 (2000): 806-828.

Gayer, A. D., Walt Rostow and Anna J. Schwartz. The Growth and Fluctuations of the British Economy, 1790-1850. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1953.

Geary, Frank and Tom Stark. "Trends in Real Wages during the Industrial Revolution: a View from Across the Irish Sea." Econ. Hist. Rev. 57 (May 2004): 362-395.

Gilboy, Elizabeth. Wages in Eighteenth Century England. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934.

Hanawalt, Barbara A. Growing Up in Medieval London. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Horrell, Sara, "Home Demand and British Industrialization." J. Econ. Hist., 56 (September 1996): 561-604.

Houston, R. A. "The Development of Literacy: Northern England, 1640-1750." Econ. Hist. Rev. 35 (May, 1982): 199-216.

John, A. H. "Statistical Appendix." In The Agrarian History of England and Wales, Vol. VI, 1750-1850, edited by in G. E. Mingay. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Jones, Charles I. "Was the Industrial Revolution Inevitable? Economic Growth over the Very Long Run." Advances in Macroeconomics, 1 (2001). <http://www.bepress.com/bejm/advances/>

Keene, Derek. Survey of Medieval Winchester. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Keene, Derek and Vanessa Harding. Historical Gazetteer of London before the Great Fire, Part I, Cheapside. London: Chadwyck-Healey, 1987.

Lindert, Peter H. and Jeffrey G. Williamson. "English Workers' Real Wages: Reply to Crafts," J. Econ. Hist. 45 (1985): 145-153.

Lucas, Robert E. "The Industrial Revolution: Past and Future." In Robert E. Lucas, Lectures on Economic Growth. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Malthus, Thomas Robert. An Essay on a Principle of Population. London: J. Johnson, 1798.

Marx, Karl. Das Capital, Volume I. Hamburg: O. Meissner, 1867.

North, Douglass C. and Barry Weingast. "Constitutions and Commitment: the Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth Century England." J. Econ. Hist., 49 (December 1989): 803-832.

Phelps Brown, Henry and Sheila V. Hopkins. A Perspective of Wage and Prices. London: Methuen, 1981.

Rappaport, Steve. Worlds Within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Ricardo, David. The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. London: J. Murray, 1817.

Schofield, Roger. "Dimensions of Illiteracy, 1750-1850." Explorations Econ. Hist. 10 (1973): 437-454.

Thorold Rogers, J. E. A History of Agriculture and Prices in England. Volume 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1866.

_____. A History of Agriculture and Prices in England. Volume 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1882.

_____. A History of Agriculture and Prices in England. Volume 6. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

_____. A History of Agriculture and Prices in England. Volume 7, Part 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.


Vanderlint, Jacob. Money Answers All Things. London: T. Cox, 1734.

Woodward, Donald. Men at Work: Labourers and building craftsmen in the towns of northern England, 1450-1750. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Wrigley, E.A., R.S. Davies, J.E. Oeppen, and R.S. Schofield. English Population History From Family Reconstitution, 1580-1837. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.


United Kingdom, Department of Employment and Productivity. British Labour Statistics. Historical Abstract 1886-1968. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1971.

Figure 1: Builders' Real Day Wages, 1209 to 2004




Sources: Table 3.

Figure 2: The Wage of Carpenters Relative to Laborers, 1220s-2000s




Sources: Table 3 and Appendix 1.

Figure 3: Real Craftsmen's Day Wages from PBH Versus Estimated Population, 1280-1869



Sources: Real wages. Phelps-Brown and Hopkins (1981), pp. 28-31. Population, 1540-1850. Wrigley, Davies, Oeppen, and Schofield (1997), pp. 614-5. Population, 1280s-1530s. Clark (2005a)


Figure 4: Real Wages, 1200-1869, PBH versus new series.



Note: 1860-9 on both series set to 100.

Sources: Phelps-Brown and Hopkins (1981), pp. 28-31, Table 3.

Figure 5: Real Wages Versus Population on the new series, 1280s-1860s




Notes: The line summarizing the tradeoff between population and real wages for the pre-industrial era is fitted using the data from 1260-9 to 1590-9.

Sources: Population, 1540s-1860s. Wrigley, Davies, Oeppen, and Schofield (1997), pp. 614-5.

Population, 1280s-1530s. Clark (2005a).


Figure 6: Economic Growth in the Seventeenth Century



Notes: The dashed line shows the annual real day wage of building workers, the solid line the 11 year moving average of real day wages.


Source: See appendix 1.

Figure 7: Average Literacy in England, 1580-1920




Sources: 1750s-1920s, Schofield (1973), men and women who sign marriage registers. The north, 1630s-1740s, Houston (1982), witnesses who sign court depositions. Norwich Diocese, 1580s-1690s, Cressy (1977), witnesses who sign ecclesiastical court declarations.

Figure 8: Real Wages in the Industrial Revolution




Sources: Feinstein (1998). Appendix 1.

Figure 9: Real Wages in England and Ireland




Sources: England, Table 3. Ireland, Geary and Stark (2004).

Figure 10: Nominal Wages in PBH relative to this paper



Sources: Table 3. Phelps-Brown and Hopkins (1981), pp. 11-12.

Figure 11: The Cost of Living in PBH Relative to this Paper



Note: The ratio is the relative cost of living by 10 year periods, compared to 1860-9.

Sources: Tables 4 and 5. Phelps-Brown and Hopkins (1981), pp. 44-58.

Table 1: Occupations, Literacy and Assets – Will Writers, 1620-1636

Social Group	Wills in sample	Fraction of all wills signed with an X	Fraction town wills signed with an X	Average value of assets bequeathed (£)
Gentry	50	0.11	0.12	706
Merchants, Professionals	60	0.11	0.13	284
Yeomen, Farmers	439	0.51	0.36	271
Traders	60	0.37	0.40	87
Craftsmen	193	0.56	0.66	87
Husbandmen, Shepherds	212	0.65	0.75	63
Laborers	34	0.76	-	52
ALL	1,048	0.53	0.32	-

Sources: Allen (1989), Evans (1987).

Table 2: Estimated Hours of Work 1750-1869

Decade	Towns	Observations	Simple average length of day	Towns with multiple observations	Average length of day (controlling for craft and town)
1720	1	1	10.0	1	10.4
1730	-	-	-	-	-
1740	1	1	8.0	1	8.3
1750	1	2	12.0	-	-
1760	1	3	12.0	1	11.9
1770	1	2	9.8	1	10.1
1780	2	6	11.2	2	11.3
1790	2	14	11.2	2	10.9
1800	4	22	10.6	4	10.5
1810	5	41	10.0	5	10.3
1820	7	51	10.1	6	10.3
1830	9	44	9.8	8	9.9
1840	10	48	9.8	9	9.9
1850	9	75	10.0	8	10.0
1860	8	67	9.9	5	10.0

Notes: Observations for this table are from Ampthill, Barking, Billericay, Bristol, Canewdon, Chelmsford, Colchester, Croydon, Exeter, Guildford, Halstead, Hull, Leicester, London, Penrith, Sherborne, Sutton Valence, Wigton and York.

Table 3: Building Wages, the Cost of Living and Real Wages by Decade, 1209-2004

Decade	Craftsmen Day Wage (d.)	Helpers Day Wage (d.)	Relative Wage	Cost of Living	Craftsmen Real Wage	Helper Real Wage
1200-9	2.78			7.40	71.3	
1210-9	2.08			8.44	46.5	
1220-9	2.60	1.63	1.56	10.03	50.7	45.6
1230-9				9.15		
1240-9	2.89	1.88	1.92	9.10	58.0	56.7
1250-9	3.17	1.71	1.93	9.85	60.2	48.2
1260-9	3.10	1.77	1.86	10.78	54.9	46.9
1270-9	2.70	1.45	1.89	12.69	40.8	32.4
1280-9	2.84	1.43	2.00	11.83	45.7	35.3
1290-9	2.83	1.42	2.01	12.63	42.6	32.7
1300-9	3.01	1.57	1.93	12.75	44.9	35.8
1310-9	3.27	1.73	1.90	15.46	40.5	32.7
1320-9	3.23	1.67	1.95	15.00	41.3	32.5
1330-9	3.26	1.70	1.92	13.23	47.1	37.6
1340-9	2.89	1.61	1.80	12.64	43.6	37.2
1350-9	4.06	2.28	1.79	15.34	50.4	43.1
1360-9	4.45	2.75	1.63	15.35	55.1	52.0
1370-9	4.72	2.94	1.61	16.02	56.6	53.9
1380-9	4.62	2.95	1.57	13.76	63.9	62.4
1390-9	4.56	2.88	1.59	14.11	61.6	59.5
1400-9	4.72	3.15	1.50	14.45	62.3	63.6
1410-9	4.89	3.17	1.55	14.71	63.2	62.6
1420-9	4.96	3.31	1.50	14.12	66.7	68.2
1430-9	5.06	3.43	1.48	14.39	67.0	69.4
1440-9	5.29	3.54	1.50	13.11	76.7	78.6
1450-9	5.19	3.62	1.44	13.14	74.9	79.9
1460-9	5.03	3.59	1.40	13.33	71.7	78.3
1470-9	5.13	3.45	1.49	13.47	72.4	74.4
1480-9	4.99	3.45	1.45	14.05	67.5	71.5
1490-9	5.09	3.43	1.49	13.42	72.1	74.1
1500-9	4.93	3.36	1.47	13.41	70.0	72.9
1510-9	5.12	3.47	1.48	13.91	70.0	72.5
1520-9	5.29	3.48	1.52	15.85	63.7	64.1
1530-9	5.45	3.64	1.50	16.80	61.6	63.0
1540-9	5.78	4.04	1.43	19.23	57.5	61.4
1550-9	7.62	5.23	1.46	28.44	51.2	53.7
1560-9	8.63	6.10	1.42	31.44	52.2	56.4
1570-9	9.06	6.42	1.42	34.97	49.3	53.5
1580-9	9.76	6.67	1.47	39.57	46.9	49.0
1590-9	10.01	6.76	1.48	47.85	40.1	41.4

Table 3: Building Wages, the Cost of Living and Real Wages by Decade, 1200-2003 (cont.)

Decade	Craftsmen Day Wage (d.)	Helpers Day Wage (d.)	Relative Wage	Cost of Living	Craftsmen Real Wage	Helper Real Wage
1600-9	10.9	7.6	1.44	50.7	41.0	43.6
1610-9	12.0	8.0	1.49	55.7	40.7	41.8
1620-9	12.5	8.2	1.51	55.0	43.1	43.5
1630-9	13.3	9.1	1.47	64.7	39.0	40.7
1640-9	15.0	10.0	1.50	66.4	43.0	43.8
1650-9	16.6	11.1	1.50	66.2	47.8	48.8
1660-9	17.6	11.5	1.53	66.4	50.5	50.5
1670-9	17.7	12.0	1.48	65.0	51.6	53.4
1680-9	17.8	12.2	1.46	63.2	53.6	56.1
1690-9	18.5	12.3	1.50	70.4	50.2	51.1
1700-9	19.0	11.9	1.60	66.7	54.2	51.8
1710-9	19.7	12.1	1.63	69.2	54.1	50.8
1720-9	20.0	12.4	1.62	68.0	55.8	52.8
1730-9	20.3	12.6	1.62	63.1	61.1	57.7
1740-9	20.6	12.6	1.63	63.9	61.4	57.4
1750-9	20.5	13.1	1.57	67.5	57.8	56.4
1760-9	21.3	13.9	1.53	71.1	56.8	56.8
1770-9	22.3	15.1	1.48	78.0	54.1	56.1
1780-9	23.4	15.3	1.53	80.5	55.2	55.2
1790-9	26.8	17.9	1.50	92.7	55.0	56.0
1800-9	35.9	23.9	1.51	125.5	54.3	55.2
1810-9	43.8	29.8	1.47	138.6	60.1	62.5
1820-9	42.1	27.0	1.56	115.8	68.9	67.7
1830-9	42.7	28.0	1.53	103.8	78.4	78.5
1840-9	43.3	29.0	1.50	99.6	82.7	84.9
1850-9	45.6	30.1	1.52	95.0	91.4	92.4
1860-9	52.7	34.5	1.53	100.0	100	100
1870-9	65.2	45.8	1.42	99.3	119	131
1880-9	67.8	46.4	1.46	88.5	145	152
1890-9	73.2	51.7	1.42	83.2	167	180
1900-9	80.8	57.3	1.41	87.2	176	190
1910-9	103	79	1.36	128	152	178
1920-9	172	142	1.22	173	189	238
1930-9	160	128	1.25	139	217	265
1940-9	238	200	1.20	218	207	265
1950-9	406	371	1.10	349	221	308
1960-9	660	603	1.09	478	262	365
1970-9	2,612	2,249	1.16	1,099	451	592
1980-9	7,734	6,594	1.17	2,974	493	642
1990-9	14,127	12,022	1.18	4,787	559	727
2000-4	20,756	17,089	1.22	5,705	690	867

Note: Wages throughout are measured in old English pence (d.), where £1 = 240 d.

Source: See appendices 1 and 2.

Table 4: The Percentage of Expenditure by Category for Manual Workers before 1869

Category of Expenditure	1734 (Vanderlint)	1787-96 (Horrell)	1840-54 (Horrell)	Assumed Here
Food and Drink:	54.4	75.4	61.7	67.0
Bread and flour	12.5	17.5	23.5	18.5
Barley	0	3.6	0.0	1.0
Oats and oatmeal	0	9.9	1.5	2.0
Peas	0	-	-	1.0
Potato	0	6.3	4.0	4.0
Rice	0	0.0	0.2	0.5
Farinaceous	12.5	37.8	29.7	27.0
Meat (beef, mutton, pork)	16.7	11.8	9.8	10.0
Fish	0	0.1	0.2	0.5
Bacon	0	0.2	1.8	1.0
Eggs	0	0.0	0.3	0.5
Meat	16.7	12.1	12.1	12.0
Milk	2.1	5.9	2.7	4.0
Cheese	2.1	2.7	1.9	2.5
Butter	4.2	6.2	4.1	5.0
Dairy	8.4	14.8	8.7	11.5
Sugar/Honey/Raisins	-	4.2	4.5	4.5
Beer/cider	12.5	2.8	1.7	6.5
Tea	0	3.4	2.2	2.5
Coffee	0	0.0	1.0	1.0
Drink	12.5	6.2	4.9	10.0
Salt	-	-	-	1.0
Spices (Pepper/Vinegar)	-	-	-	1.0
Other Food	4.2	0.6	2.1	0.0
Housing/Housewares	7.2	5.3	10.9	8.0
Fuel	5.6	4.4	4.8	5.0
Light	2.1	-	-	4.0
Soap	2.1	-	-	0.5
Light and Soap	4.2	3.8	5.2	4.5
Services	8.2	0.1	2.5	2.5
Tobacco	0	0.0	0.7	1.0
Other (Clothing, Bed linen)	20.5	11.0	14.2	12.0

Sources: Horrell (1996), pp. 568-9, 577. Vanderlint (1734), pp. 76-77.

Table 5: Living Costs, 1200s-1860s, By Commodity Groups

Decade	Grain and potato	Meat	Dairy	Sugar and honey	Drink	Salt	Spices	Shelter	Fuel	Light	Soap	Clothing
1200-9	4.5	6.3	4.2		7.0					19.0		17.7
1210-9	6.0	6.4	5.2		7.3	12.8	15.4			16.8		18.0
1220-9	6.8	6.7	8.6		8.1	12.7	23.6			35.5		17.5
1230-9	6.5	8.0	7.0		6.2	11.8				28.9		15.7
1240-9	6.9	7.8	6.1		7.8	14.9	37.2			25.2		18.0
1250-9	7.7	7.7	6.6		9.2	16.1	17.3		12.5	25.2		16.3
1260-9	7.6	8.5	5.8	43.7	9.8	16.5	23.6	8.8	19.5	24.7		20.2
1270-9	10.7	9.5	6.5	58.3	12.5	18.4	25.2	11.5	24.8	27.5	12.0	18.4
1280-9	9.3	9.2	6.9	46.1	11.5	16.7	25.1	11.8	17.4	24.1	16.5	18.9
1290-9	11.4	9.6	6.6	55.1	11.5	21.5	33.3	12.4	20.5	28.0	22.6	16.6
1300-9	9.6	9.9	7.7	48.8	13.5	17.8	30.6	11.3	21.1	32.4	25.7	19.3
1310-9	13.8	12.3	9.8	61.0	14.5	41.0	30.1	10.6	24.1	35.5	16.9	22.4
1320-9	11.9	12.5	9.3	55.4	23.0	27.9	32.0	8.6	21.6	36.1	19.8	20.6
1330-9	9.4	11.0	8.3	48.2	20.7	23.4	30.4	8.3	21.7	32.1	21.4	20.3
1340-9	9.1	10.8	8.1	62.4	17.0	21.2	34.9	7.5	19.7	31.2	21.8	18.2
1350-9	12.1	10.7	10.0	83.5	18.4	50.3	58.3	4.8	32.7	38.2	22.2	27.7
1360-9	12.4	11.3	9.8	83.1	18.9	43.5	37.5	4.5	27.6	39.0	22.4	28.2
1370-9	12.7	11.7	10.4	89.6	22.1	49.5	43.7	4.6	28.6	38.8	26.2	29.4
1380-9	9.1	11.4	9.3	75.1	17.4	41.7	28.6	4.4	26.1	36.8	26.5	27.8
1390-9	9.6	10.7	9.5	69.6	20.3	36.1	36.0	5.5	30.8	33.4	26.5	24.8
1400-9	10.2	10.0	9.9	93.1	15.0	48.9	28.1	6.3	31.0	34.1	26.5	25.9
1410-9	10.5	11.1	11.1	73.9	14.6	37.5	57.3	6.2	31.2	32.3	26.5	25.9
1420-9	9.0	12.0	10.7	76.6	15.2	37.2	43.2	6.0	33.7	30.5	26.7	24.8
1430-9	11.2	10.9	10.0	79.6	17.8	41.3	34.0	5.0	31.5	30.1	27.3	23.3
1440-9	8.8	10.6	8.9	72.9	16.9	37.2	22.9	4.9	29.9	30.2	37.3	21.8
1450-9	9.3	10.9	9.2	63.4	14.5	36.0	26.6	4.8	29.2	25.8	36.9	23.1
1460-9	9.6	11.3	9.1	68.4	14.9	30.9	33.3	5.1	29.9	26.2	35.4	21.8
1470-9	10.0	11.5	8.7	77.7	13.5	30.5	34.6	5.2	27.8	26.0	26.6	23.1
1480-9	11.2	11.9	9.2	70.9	14.9	40.7	38.9	5.4	21.8	25.4	29.2	23.4
1490-9	9.8	12.7	8.7	60.3	14.9	36.8	34.6	5.3	22.5	24.0	29.8	23.4
1500-9	10.8	10.9	7.9	68.0	13.9	36.0	42.0	5.4	25.4	23.6	26.9	23.1
1510-9	10.9	12.0	8.4	66.6	14.6	41.5	34.9	5.9	25.8	25.3	31.0	23.1
1520-9	14.6	13.1	9.4	80.9	15.0	48.1	51.5	5.9	27.1	25.7	35.0	24.7
1530-9	15.9	12.9	10.8	86.7	14.0	48.8	54.3	6.5	27.3	27.5	44.7	26.0
1540-9	17.9	17.8	13.4	113.3	14.9	56.7	57.4	7.2	29.7	31.0	41.7	27.6
1550-9	29.0	31.2	19.8	158.5	19.9	75.3	76.5	9.2	41.8	49.2	72.1	34.4
1560-9	27.2	32.6	23.6	146.9	21.7	77.1	98.5	13.1	46.7	72.2	88.6	42.6
1570-9	29.9	31.6	26.6	181.9	28.8	109.9	81.9	14.2	52.9	70.5	76.3	49.5
1580-9	35.8	34.1	28.1	178.8	36.4	101.0	117.6	17.7	58.3	78.6	73.7	52.6
1590-9	52.1	38.2	35.2	185.0	40.9	126.6	119.9	20.8	64.7	91.5	81.8	54.8

Table 5: Living Costs, 1200-1869, By Commodity Groups (cont.)

Decade	Grain and potato	Meat	Dairy	Sugar and honey	Drink	Salt	Spices	Shelter	Fuel	Light	Soap	Clothing
1600-9	52	41	42	214	36	110	122	23	77	100	85	60
1610-9	61	44	45	205	38	106	110	27	85	105	88	65
1620-9	60	43	43	179	36	128	112	26	89	103	88	70
1630-9	73	47	41	212	60	173	132	31	97	107	109	81
1640-9	72	53	43	213	58	193	163	25	118	117	108	90
1650-9	71	50	43	239	63	181	121	26	109	124	97	88
1660-9	68	53	46	153	68	165	72	30	116	121	93	88
1670-9	64	53	44	142	66	174	98	34	121	111	82	81
1680-9	58	49	47	133	68	169	103	36	121	106	84	79
1690-9	70	51	57	146	76	247	122	33	130	125	116	83
1700-9	57	45	57	143	80	455	106	39	132	115	95	82
1710-9	65	43	54	130	85	433	128	35	129	137	130	85
1720-9	62	45	51	123	87	414	106	38	124	124	132	85
1730-9	52	44	47	115	83	349	94	37	124	118	125	84
1740-9	53	47	50	122	85	377	92	34	135	140	140	86
1750-9	62	48	52	120	82	374	93	36	134	136	133	91
1760-9	68	49	56	118	83	376	91	39	137	142	144	94
1770-9	77	57	64	121	91	374	97	43	150	144	144	92
1780-9	80	57	66	131	94	462	106	42	146	156	159	92
1790-9	96	67	80	166	95	599	111	53	167	172	180	94
1800-9	137	98	113	197	129	1310	145	74	203	226	224	107
1810-9	144	117	124	198	138	1589	170	89	223	247	250	118
1820-9	107	102	98	156	139	668	165	88	192	162	179	112
1830-9	104	97	86	149	101	144	140	86	134	141	161	107
1840-9	103	97	85	144	95	124	126	78	113	127	118	104
1850-9	98	88	89	111	101	82	118	87	98	105	101	93
1860-9	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes: The index for each commodity and overall is set to 100 for 1860-9.

Sources: See appendix 2.

Table 6: Price Movements 1451-75 to 1860s

Expenditure Category	Weight PBH 1450s	Price PBH 1860s/ 1451-75	Weight PBH 1860s	Weight Clark	Price Clark 1860s/ 1451-75
Grains	0.200	11.7	0.180	0.275	10.9
Meat	0.250	14.9	0.305	0.120	10.7
Dairy	0.125	13.2	0.130	0.120	8.9
Drink	0.225	18.2	0.319	0.100	7.4
Honey/Sugar/Raisins	-	-	-	0.045	1.5
Salt	-	-	-	0.010	3.1
Pepper	-	-	-	0.010	2.9
Fuel and Light	0.075	5.9	0.035	0.090	3.4
Soap	-	-	-	0.005	2.9
Clothing	0.125	2.9	0.030	0.120	4.4
Housing and housewares	-	-	-	0.080	20.0
Services	-	-	-	0.025	9.5
ALL	1.00	12.6	1.00	1.00	7.6

Sources: Table 5. Phelps-Brown and Hopkins (1981), pp. 44-58.