

CARTERS IN THE CITY: THE OPERATION AND REGULATION OF COMMERCIAL CARRIAGE IN THE CITY OF LONDON, 1250–1550

Claire Martin

SUMMARY

This article examines wheeled transportation and the operational practices of carters in the medieval City of London, the development of the industry and the way in which this was regulated by the mayor and aldermen. It compares the official costs of carriage set down in city ordinances with the reality of prices paid by institutions such as the Bridge House, and aims to assess any changes in price over the course of the period. It sheds new light on the early history of the Fraternity of St Katherine of Carters, the long and complex relationship that developed with the woodmongers and the problems which prevented the establishment of a strong, independent trade association. It concludes that the 16th century saw the development of a more professional carting industry which employed many more men but that this was not supported by appropriate legislation from the City's authorities, who sought only to deal with immediate issues and problems rather than develop a transport policy.

INTRODUCTION

Although the emergence of any authority equivalent to the Department of Transport lay many centuries in the future, the medieval transport system of the City was far from unregulated. Throughout the later medieval period there was much legislation concerned with the control of prices, the movement of carts in the streets and the ways in which carters operated. The mayor and aldermen,

however, did not see a transport system; they saw a series of problems related to transport which were dealt with individually. This article is based on research undertaken by the author for a PhD thesis.¹

ROAD TRANSPORTATION IN AND AROUND LONDON

The late 15th, early 16th century was a time of dramatic developments in the carriage industry both in terms of numbers and administration. Barron (2004, 66–7) has found that 2.3% of those who enrolled wills in the Commissary Court of London between 1374 and 1486 were involved in the transport industry, but this had risen to 6.4% by 1540–1600, based on burial records. That tendency continued over the following decades and Stow noted that the numbers of ‘cars, drays, carts and coaches’ had increased and that:

the coachman rides behind the horse tails, lasheth them and looketh not behind him; the drayman sitteth and sleepeth on his dray, and letteth his horse lead him home ... for the world runs on wheels with many whose parents were glad to go on foot. (Stow 1908, i, 83–4)

This expansion probably reflects both the economic and population growth of London

in this period as well as a transfer from private to hired carriage that resulted in the professionalisation of carters and carmen. Again, however, although the City passed extensive regulations and set up a governing body, their involvement with this new industry was essentially focused on dealing with particular issues and, as will be seen, was largely unsuccessful.

The freight industry in and around London operated on several different levels. London-based carters would have been employed to carry loads to distant trading locations such as Southampton (Hampshire) or other market towns. Cloth in particular was distributed in large volumes from London to Southampton. In the last quarter of this century, for example, alien merchants sent between 2,500 and 4,500 cloths per annum by cart from London to Southampton for export. In 1480–1 4,000 cloths were carried over this route in about 150 cart loads (Bradley 2015, 73–4). On return journeys they would have brought other goods into the capital such as wool from the Cotswolds or imported wares such as wine, woad or alum from Southampton (*ibid.*, 68–70). The pattern revealed by the brokerage books of Southampton, whereby individual carters tended to specialise in particular routes (Hicks 2015, 47), probably also applied to London, and regional or suburban carters would have regularly travelled the roads from Stratford (Essex), Hertfordshire or Westminster to the capital. Finally, there was the distribution of goods within London. Imported wares were moved from the docks to the many warehouses, markets and merchants' houses spread throughout the City, and goods for export passed in the opposite direction. There was, of course, overlap in these areas of operation. Commodities brought into the City by road would have been taken straight to the docks or warehouse by the carter who brought them to the City and vice versa.

This paper will focus attention on the internal freight industry. This industry worked within the area of the jurisdiction of the mayor and aldermen of the City of London and their legislation resulted in the surviving records which shed the most light on carting within the City. As will be seen, the tension between this part of the

industry and the requirements of the Crown for transportation over greater distances became controversial and important in the history of the carters in the later 15th and early 16th centuries, particularly in relation to the type and size of carts they employed.

Wheeled transport in this period took several forms but was largely horse drawn. As Langdon (1984) has demonstrated, haulage by horses began to increase from the middle of the 12th century and by the later 13th century had largely superseded ox hauling for transportation in the countryside and to market towns. This was certainly also true for transport within London, where the speed and manoeuvrability of horse-drawn carts would have been far more suited to short distance transport within the City, and horses may well have been dominant from an even earlier period. Commercial vehicles were mostly cars or 'carres' and long carts. The former were approximately 12 feet (3.7m) long and 3 feet (0.9m) wide and had only two wheels. They were more useful in the narrow streets of the City and particularly on the lanes leading up from the waterside. Long carts were around 14 feet (4.3m) long and 4 feet (1.2m) wide and were suitable for heavier loads and longer journeys (Bennett 1952, 12). It is probable, however, that even long carts had only two wheels. The wardens of the Bridge House, who presumably used long carts for transporting heavy stone and timber, rarely bought more than one pair of replacement wheels at a time.² Interestingly, the brokerage books of Southampton, which record only carts arriving in and leaving from the town, contain no references to the smaller *bigae* or *carae*, confirming that these were not used for cross-country transportation (Hicks 2015, 44). While a car may have commonly been pulled by only one horse, a fully loaded cart would often have required two or more horses depending on the weight and distance (Willard 1932, 246–7). That the Bridge House had six horses and two carts suggests that their deliveries of heavy building materials were pulled by two or three horses each (*Lon Br Ac*, xiv). Technically, a carman was an operator of the smaller car and a carter of the larger long carts, but in practice these terms seem to have been used interchangeably. When regulations refer to carters, for example, this

should not be taken as implying that carmen were exempt.

THE OPERATIONAL PRACTICES OF CARTERS

The earliest surviving regulations regarding speed, safety and codes of conduct for carts and carters date from the late 14th century. In 1377, it was forbidden for carters to drive their carts when empty at a greater pace than when full, on penalty of a fine and imprisonment (*Cal Lbk H*, 74). As innovative and modern as regulations on speed may appear, they should not, however, be taken as an indication that the city authorities were developing a central policy on vehicles and transport. As with most other legislation in this area, these were separate responses to discrete problems. In the 15th century the operation of the carting industry as a whole was essentially unregulated.

By the late 15th and early 16th centuries, a growing city and population made it necessary to establish a new code of practice aimed at controlling and managing the movement of an increasing volume of traffic, although the inception of these ordinances seems generally to have been reactive rather than proactive. At the heart of the matter was the congestion of the busy, but narrow, waterside streets and lanes. Since much of the work of the carters involved moving goods away from the wharves, a prospective customer would presumably have found numerous carts unloading or awaiting hire in these areas. A petition laid before the mayor and aldermen by the inhabitants of Thames Street and Petty Wales in September 1479 vividly demonstrates the associated problems. They complained about the behaviour of the carters with their empty carts, in particular at Billingsgate, at both ends of St Dunstan's Lane, in Harp Lane and in Petty Wales, where ten or 11 horses and carts at a time were said to gather so that nobody could pass:

some of the carters goon to the ale-house. And many of hem cluster together sittynge upon voide stalles fer from their cartes and so leve theym unkept by longe tyme. And often so that ... all thenhabitauntes in the same stretes

been sore annoyed and hurte by suche cartes and horses by casting downe of wares of their stalles and stopping of their gates and dores of their shoppes, in lettynge of chapmen and other people as wold entre the same gates and dores. Whereby oftentimes fallen grete discensions, affrays, hurtes and debates.³

It was decided that carters with empty carts should stand in Tower Street, East Smithfield, Tower Hill or in other larger and less crowded places until they were 'called from thens by some persons' and should then go direct to pick up their loads without tarrying in any of the streets on the way. Every carter in breach of these rules was to be fined 12d, half of which was to go to the chamberlain and half to 'that persone that fyndeth hym aggrieved and thereof maketh his compleynt'.⁴ A similar system operated in Southampton where the street outside Bargate was known as the Street of Carters and operated as a 'taxi rank' where carters waited for their next hire (Hicks 2015, 43).

By 1527, the problems seem to have escalated, and in August new rules were introduced to manage traffic flow. It was decided, because Thames Street was narrow and became blocked when carts met, that carters and carmen, when they had loaded at the wharves, should go straight up the next lane, rather than going east or west on Thames Street.⁵ This was repeated in 1528 when the carters were also instructed that if two carts or cars should meet in any straight lane then the unloaded vehicle should give way to the loaded one.⁶ This general principle applied throughout the City, but there is only surviving evidence of particular problems in the vicinity of the docks and Thames Street, which was an area of concentrated activity and a continual pinch point. By 1535, changes again needed to be made, possibly because of the increased number of carts in the City. In this year the Court of Aldermen appointed 25 commoners to discuss the locations of standing areas for cars, the price of carriage and how many cars there should be in London.⁷

The management of congestion was not the only new feature of the early 16th century. There was also the introduction of cart licences or car rooms, as they were known,

which were required to operate a horse and cart for profit, and a trade fraternity was founded to help regulate the industry. As will be discussed below, however, the regulations with which the City was concerned had more to do with facilitating royal cart requisitioning than with developing a transport policy.

PRICE REGULATION

It was not only the operational practice of carters which was the focus of increasing legislation. As with other areas of business and retail, the regulation of price was at the heart of the City's activities. These regulations provide valuable information on transport costs, although crucial details such as the distance covered, the origin and destination of the journey, and the type or quantity of goods being moved are often absent. This is demonstrated by the earliest regulations from the mayoralty of Gregory de Rokesle in the 1280s which stipulated that carters bringing sand and gravel should charge 1d per cart, but failed to mention the distance covered (*Lib Cust*, ii, 543).⁸ As will be seen below, by 1350, the cost of transporting sand and gravel was at least three times as much, suggesting that either there was dramatic inflation or that these price regulations were unrealistically low. Following an inquisition by the mayor and aldermen in 1300, it was ordered that the measurement, carriage and portorage of 'one quarter' of corn from Queenhithe as far as West Cheap, St Anthony Budge-Row, Horse-shoe Bridge over the Walbrook or Wolsiesgate in the Ropery should cost $\frac{3}{4}$ d, to Newgate, Cripplegate, Cornhill, East Cheap or Billingsgate 1d and to the bars of the suburbs $1\frac{1}{4}$ d (*Lib Alb*, 212, 605–6). However, in later regulations, different rates were set down for different commodities. In 1350, legislation on this matter was introduced along with other measures against the high wages and charges being demanded by labourers and other manual workers after the Black Death. It was ordered that a cart with sand or clay that came from Aldgate as far as the conduit in Cheap should take 3d for hire. If the carter was to continue past the conduit he could charge $3\frac{1}{2}$ d. The same two-stage price structure was also outlined from Cripplegate to Cheap, although no

other gates were mentioned. If the said cart passed the bars of the suburbs but delivered its load before entering the city walls it should only charge 2d (*Memorials*, 254). This may at first glance appear rather odd as, unlike grain at Queenhithe, sand and clay were not unloaded into carts at Aldgate or Cripplegate and had in fact come much further. This is because the city authorities could only regulate prices within the area under their jurisdiction, that is, the area inside the bars of the suburbs. These charges were in fact only part of what any purchaser would have paid to carters to deliver their goods from source. They are, however, quite literally, the price of carriage within the City of London. Also in 1350, the carters known as 'waterleders' or waterbearers were to take $1\frac{1}{2}$ d for every cart going from Dowgate or Castle Baynard to Cheap and an extra penny on top of this if they went beyond Cheap. If they did not go as far as Cheap the cost would be only $1\frac{1}{4}$ d. Carts bringing any imported merchandise from Woolwharf to Cheap could charge 4d (*Memorials*, 254). This scale of pricing remained in place and was repeated in 1362/3 (*Cal Lbk G*, 148–9). In 1407 the rather complicated schedule of prices was simplified with the ordinance that no carter would charge more than 4d for loading and carrying merchandise to any part of the City, with the exception being made for 'great bales of mercery' (*Cal Lbk I*, 60–1).

Further tables of prices were issued by the City under the auspices of the new trade Fraternity of St Katherine the Virgin and Martyr of Carters in 1517, as outlined below, and greater pressure was placed on the wardens to ensure that the rules were followed.⁹

On 2 January 1520, the carters of the Fraternity of St Katherine were summoned to the Court of Aldermen to discuss the 'outrageous prices taken for carriage against the ordinance'.¹⁰ The issue remained unresolved and, following complaints, the invitation was extended specifically to the wardens of the fraternity in July. The following month, the mayor and aldermen went so far as requesting to see the accounts of all the carters of the Fraternity of St Katherine.¹¹ The problems came to a head in 1527. In August, because the various

Table 1. Rates of carriage set in 1517 and repeated in 1528 (*Lbk N*, fols 38v–40; *Lbk O*, fols 92–3)

Distance of delivery	Price
For the carriage of any load from Tower Wharf or any other wharf between there and the bridge, to the churches of All Hallows in the Wall, St Margaret Lothbury, the Stocks, Walbroke or Dowgate	3d
For the carriage of any load from the same wharves to any other places beyond the said places, westward and within the walls of the City	4d
For the carriage of any load from the same wharves to any other places beyond the said places, westward and without the walls of the same	5d
For the carriage of any load from Castle Baynard or any other wharf between there and Dowgate to the churches of All Hallows in the Wall, St Margaret Lothbury, the Stocks, Walbroke or Dowgate	3d
For the carriage of any load from the same wharves to any other places beyond the said places, eastward and within the walls of the City	4d
For the carriage of any load from the same wharves to any other places beyond the said places, eastward and without the walls of the same	5d
For the carriage of every load carried in a car to or from any place within the City or suburbs	2d
For the carriage of ten draughts of iron from any of the places aforesaid to any of the places above expressed at the rate of ...	1½ loads
For a load of sea coal	As accustomed or as agreed

laws that had been formulated regarding the price of carriage had not been ‘putt in dew execution’, it was ordered that tables of prices be made up and posted around the City, so that customers knew what they were expected to pay and carters knew what they should charge.¹² In October 1527, a Common Council was held to discuss the prices of carters and carmen, and on 30 July 1528 the standard charges were again defined and ordered to be proclaimed (outlined in Table 1).¹³

Given that the last detailed price regulations that we have are from the late 14th and early 15th century, it is impossible to say whether the 1517 prices represented new rates or the reaffirmation of then current prices, but the principle of charging one price for a journey as far as Cheap or the Stocks and a greater price for anything beyond that remained key to the price structure of carting. These pricing zones are shown in Fig 1. Carters were also bound to take the load of the first person who came to them and not to wait for favoured customers or better deals, else they risked imprisonment. Clearly it is not easy to assess changes in price over time using these

regulations, as the way in which charges were set and expressed was not consistent. As noted above, the only potential basis for any comparison is the practice of setting prices for carriage in various zones: from one side of the City up to a central point, such as Cheap or the approximate line of the Walbrook, beyond that point up to the walls, beyond there again and into the suburbs or within the suburbs only. As can be seen from Table 2, the only meaningful comparisons that can be made are based on the price of a journey across half the City or across the whole City, using an average for 1350–62, and known figures from 1517–28 (*Memorials*, 254; *Cal Lbk G*, 148–9; *Cal Lbk I*, 60–1).¹⁴ This limited evidence does suggest that there was no more than a slight increase in the average cost of carriage in the intervening period.

Nevertheless, as the 16th century progressed, the carters seem to have come under increasing economic pressure to pass the mounting costs of keeping their horses on to their customers. In February 1534 they claimed they could not serve at the rates which had been set and so aldermen Dodmer, Hardy and Symonds and other

Table 2. Price of carriage according to city regulation (*Memorials*, 254; *Cal Lbk G*, 148–9; *Cal Lbk I*, 60–1; *Lbk N*, fols 38v–40; *Lbk O*, fols 92–3)

Year	Commodity	Across half the City	Across the whole City	Across the City and into the suburbs	Within the suburbs only
1350–62	sand and gravel	3d	3½d		2d
1350–62	water	1½d	2½d		
1350–62	imported goods	4d			
1350–62	average	2¾d	3d		
1407	all	4d	4d	4d	4d
1517–28	all except iron and coal	3d	4d	5d	

common councillors were charged with revising the price schedule of carters.¹⁵ In 1550, the under-chamberlain was required to peruse the accounts of Nicholas Pygott and other late wardens of the carters and report, with the result that the following year the Court of Aldermen again adjusted the carters' and carmens' rates for the carriage of things within the City.¹⁶ Frustratingly, in both cases, the records note only that a review took place, not the detailed prices.¹⁷

Masschaele (1993) has found that the cost of land transport cross-country rose by around 40%, allowing for inflation, between the 14th century and the 18th century. He does not, however, examine the intervening centuries and therefore cannot draw any conclusions about when, or why, this apparent increase occurred. It would appear that in London, at least, the average cost of moving one load of goods within the City remained fairly constant up to the middle of the 16th century.¹⁸ Change was imminent, however, as the population of the City was rising. This produced a greater need for carriage to provide the goods required and to facilitate the operation of business within the metropolis. In turn, this resulted in a climate of opportunity for carters, and many more people were employed in the industry. Prices were not reduced by the emergence of more professional carters as supply was matched by demand.

At the same time, the early 1500s saw an increase in the cost of keeping a horse, in terms of the price of hay in the City, possibly fuelled by demand from the increasing

number of horses required to supply the needs of the growing population. In 1483 it was affirmed by ordinance that a *bottel* or bundle of hay should weigh 5 pounds (2.3kg) (*Cal Lbk L*, 209), but by 1532 hay had become so expensive that the Court of Aldermen granted the petition of the inn-holders that a *bottel* should weigh only 4 pounds (1.8kg).¹⁹ Four years later there must have been such a shortage of fodder that a number of brewers were sworn to supply the carters with grain for their horses, to keep the transport system of the City moving.²⁰ Analysis of grain prices suggests that the 1530s was a period of plentiful harvests. If conditions were good for growing grain they were presumably also good for growing grass to make hay, so this shortage of both hay and grain was probably a shortage of supply to the capital (Rappaport 1989, 131). The growing population may have meant that there was more demand in areas of hay and grain production so less was brought to the London market, and supply may also have been adversely affected by suburban carters avoiding the capital because of cart requisitioning (see below).²¹

Individuals may have found it was no longer worthwhile to maintain their own stables, while carters, who operated in a professional manner, discovered that the rewards were worth the increased expenses of feeding and maintaining their horses. While others may only have made irregular use of their horse and cart, the commercial carter, who was able to go from one hire to another all day, gained maximum benefit from his investment in hay

and horseshoes. Many men, it seems, saw and took this opportunity. In the first half of the 16th century, many car rooms or cart licences were given to men who had other trades and were unlikely to give up those professions to become a carter. Owen Mone and John Ball, for example, who were given car rooms in 1540, were merchant tailors.²² It is unlikely that they wanted these licences because they were planning to give up this respected and lucrative profession in order to become carters, but the possession of a car room did enable them to make additional income on the side from the cart they may have used for their own business. In fact, the citizen who wanted to keep his own cart may only have been able to afford to do so, given the increased price of fodder, if he could hire it out when not using it for his own business; hence there was an increase in the number of carters in the 16th century and the subsequent need for more regulation, a trade fraternity and the demand for the new commercial carting licences. As we will see, however, the mayor and aldermen also had other considerations in mind when supporting the carters' efforts to start a fraternity and gain corporate identity.

CARTERS AND CART LICENCES

Before considering the complex changes and developments in licensing and regulation which occurred in the 16th century, it may be useful to define the carting infrastructure as it existed in the later 15th century and earlier. Firstly, for most of this period, all freemen of the City had the right to keep and use a cart within the City and liberties for their personal or business use. Not all of them were professional carters who hired their services to others, but they all had the right to do so if they wished. Secondly, not all those who owned or drove carts in the City were London citizens. Many traders from outside the City drove into London during the day. Foreign bakers from Stratford (Essex), for example, brought bread in carts every day to sell in the marketplaces. In 1493, they were ordered to remove their carts by noon, but consistently failed to adhere to the letter or the spirit of the law (*Cal Lbk L*, 295, 301, 306, 308).

The involvement of the city authorities in

the regulation of the numbers of carts in the City is complicated and not fully explained by the surviving records, but legislation by the mayor and aldermen was limited before the early 16th century. The only evidence of city directives in this area before 1500 dates to 1300, when John de Kirketone, John Bulichromp, called 'le Bindere', Richard de Kirketone and Robert de Stanforde were convicted of forestalling and of brokerage of carts. Accordingly, they were committed for contempt against the king and they abjured the business of brokerage of carts (*Cal Lbk C*, 67). Brokerage of carts presumably means hiring carts for public use, but could also imply the monopolising of supply. While hiring out a cart was not illegal and indeed was a vital part of the City's economy, attempting to control supply was, in the same way that forestalling foodstuffs or other goods was illegal. As well as issues of price, this was presumably motivated by a desire to protect the trade of freemen.

The aldermen began to regulate on and restrict who could and could not be a professional carter in the City from the beginning of the 16th century and a trade fraternity was created.²³ From the second quarter of the century onwards, use of the phrase to 'occupy a car-room' was common. This seems to have meant the right to have a car and, crucially, to hire it commercially. These permits were awarded by the mayor and aldermen and were a significant innovation in the professionalisation of the carting industry.

The earliest grants of car rooms were to John Pye in 1535 and to Michael Spencer, an unspecified 'Officer of the City', the following year.²⁴ Such grants, however, were not particularly common until 1539, when the mayor was given a car room to grant to whomever he pleased, and after this there was an explosion in the number of such grants.²⁵ On 28 October 1540 each alderman was similarly given the right to bestow a car room.²⁶ Some efforts were made to limit the number of cars. So in July 1541, the Court of Aldermen ordered that no new car rooms were to be granted for three years and that no new licences should be issued when a carter died.²⁷ Similarly, gifts of car rooms were restrained for another three years in 1544, and for two years in 1549.²⁸ In 1551,

the Court of Aldermen drew up an ordinance clarifying the rules governing the gift of car rooms. Confusion had arisen as it was unclear in the original act whether such grants were to continue for the life of the grantor or the grantee. It was ruled that they were only valid for the life of the grantor or during his term of office, whichever expired first.²⁹

A close relationship with an alderman was not the only way to get a car room. A decision on quarterage payments taken by the Court of Aldermen in 1548 makes it clear that by this date there were several means by which cart licences could be acquired. Payment of quarterage was said to be due from long carts and cars, 'gift cars' or those bestowed personally by the aldermen, 'ward carts' or those operated by the raker or street cleaner of each ward and 'wharf cars', those operated by wharfingers or wharf-keepers who had the right to occupy a car or short cart because they maintained a long cart needed by the royal cart-takers.³⁰ To this list we also have to add carts 'going under the king's placard'. Since the king presumably was not running his own carting business, they must have been licensed by the Crown in a similar way to 'gift cars' given by the aldermen.³¹

There were also a few other ways in which people could gain a car room. Widows were able to claim use of their deceased husband's car rooms and there are several examples of this occurring. In 1502 a list of all those who occupied a car in the City was compiled for the Court of Aldermen, and Clemence Talborough, widow, was included as the holder of one car.³² In 1517, Agnes Edmond, wife of John Edmond, was given the right to operate a car until the new ordinances and regulations that were being formulated for the carting industry had been drawn up.³³ Agnes had previously been married to Richard Norrys, one of those named in the 1502 list of carters. These women did not have 'car rooms' as such terminology had not yet been introduced, but, in 1547, Elizabeth Allen claimed and was given the car room of her late husband Geoffrey.³⁴ Dependent daughters may even have had some similar right, as John Crathorn left his daughter, Ellen, a car and all things belonging to it in his will.³⁵ In addition, some car rooms were granted as a form of pension for the officers of the City. Lawrence Cornwall,

serjeant to the sheriff, for example, was given a car room in 1539 for 'spending his youth in the service of the city'. Apparently, however, he did not spend that much of his youth, as it seems he did not die for several years. It was not until 1551 that his widow Agnes claimed his car room.³⁶ These grants were not uncommon, and the same reason was also cited for the award of car rooms to Richard Benet in 1546, Thomas Ferroure and John Ball in 1547 and William Plompton in 1548.³⁷ John Jaques, 'one of the attorneys of the sheriff's counsel', similarly received a car room because he had fallen into poverty, demonstrating that car rooms could be seen simply as a way of generating income.³⁸

THE FOUNDATION OF THE FRATERNITY OF ST KATHERINE THE VIRGIN AND MARTYR OF CARTERS

A new era for the carters began in 1502, when a list of all those appointed to have a car in the City was drawn up.³⁹ This initially ran to 26 cars, although two extra names were inserted later. These were presumably commercial carters rather than private cart users, who are likely to have been present in far greater numbers. In January 1508, freemen occupying cars were ordered to report those who occupied cars who were foreigners or not citizens of London, and on 5 February 1512 it was ordered that no foreigner could occupy a car or cart.⁴⁰ This did not of course mean that nobody from outside London could drive a cart in the City. Such a prohibition would have cut off vital supplies for the City. Rather it meant they could not keep their carts in the City and operate them commercially within the walls as freemen did. At the same time, the mayor arranged discussions with freemen cart owners to agree future arrangements for the occupation of cars and carts. The fruit of these conferences was the order a week later that there should be 40 carts of freemen, that each man who had a long cart therefore earned the right to have a car and that nobody would be allowed to have a car who did not also have a long cart.⁴¹ The idea of connecting the ownership of long carts and cars in this way was pursued for many years and was a key part of the development of the industry.

On 26 February 1512, it was ordered that, in deciding who these 40 carters should be, freemen should be preferred to foreigners if enough freemen came forward, but the inclusion of foreigners was not prohibited if they proved necessary to make up the numbers to 40. The organisation of this was placed in the hands of the sheriffs and chamberlain.⁴² In summary, the situation at this stage, as envisaged by the relevant legislation, was that there were 40 men in the City who had a car and a cart each and authority to let them out for hire. The City would ideally have liked all these men to be freemen but some may have been foreigners. Other foreign carters could drive into the City but could not pick up goods or ply for hire without having one of the 40 licences to do so.

By 1514 this system was proving to be ineffective, for in this year the chamberlain was ordered to check how many freemen had carts in the City and aldermen were again appointed to determine which freemen should have these carts and cars.⁴³ Two years later, Packet, a sergeant of the City whose first name was not provided, was found to have been occupying a car contrary to these ordinances. His car was taken to the City's market and storehouse at Leadenhall until a decision was made on whether this should be authorised or not. In the meantime, Packet seized his car and was rude to the mayor, for which he was discharged from his office.⁴⁴ The industry needed some sort of governing body, and in the following year the Fraternity of St Katherine the Virgin and Martyr of Carters was founded.

On 20 January 1517, authority was given to Nicholas Partryche, grocer, John Kyme, mercer, John Wylkynson, draper, Thomas Partryche, fishmonger, Nicholas Warlay, goldsmith, and Paul Wythypoll, merchant tailor, to reform and establish certain statutes for the good ordering of the king's carriage within the City and for the cleansing of the streets and lanes.⁴⁵ Two days later, the founder members of the brotherhood of St Katherine bound themselves to observe the ordinances made for carriage and cleansing the streets.⁴⁶ The full purpose of, and regulations for, the fraternity were enrolled on 19 March 1517 when the leadership of the carters was placed into the hands of Thomas

Newman, an inn-holder.⁴⁷ The ordinances for the new fraternity admit that previous orders regarding the numbers of carts had not been properly observed and therefore the mayor and aldermen had to make changes to control the number of carters. Over the coming years the regulation, organisation and operation of the carting industry would be shared between this fraternity, the mayor and alderman and, as we will see, the woodmongers. In addition to Newman, the carters who founded the fraternity in 1517 were Thomas Bonde, tallow-chandler, John Hatton, skinner, Robert Anderson, salter, John Scott, saddler, Christopher Arundell, inn-holder, John Ranewyke, brewer, Edward Tomlynson, inn-holder, Thomas Cure, brown-baker, James Richardson and Bartholomew Worrell, grey-tawyers, Robert Hamond, woodmonger, John Hilles, cofer-maker, John Wrytsam, fuller, and John Briggs, tailor. These men who 'with ther horses and cartes usen and occupyn comen carryage within this Citie' swore, on reasonable warning given by the king's officers, to provide horses and carts for the use of the Crown in carrying wine, ale and other goods.⁴⁸ They also agreed to clean the streets and remove dung and filth from the City in return for 'such sumes of money and at suche prises as the wardes be now appoynted and assessed to paye'.⁴⁹ Although this was clarified by the stipulation that those who already cleansed the wards, namely the rakers, could continue to use their carts as long as they did not hire them out for common carriage. The carters also swore to comply with the prices for carriage which were set by the City (as outlined above in Table 1) and, in return, they were given the right to operate as a fraternity, to take in new members and to elect four wardens each year. At the heart of these arrangements was the regulation that only freemen, who were also members of the brotherhood, could hire out carts for common carriage within the liberties of the City, although all freemen could operate a cart for carriage of their own goods.

In October 1517, the process of sorting out the licensed carters and members of the fraternity from the unlicensed began. Eleven men promised to lay down their cars and carts until a further order from the Court

of Aldermen, and five others, who failed to attend the court, were to have their carts taken to Leadenhall by the chamberlain unless, in the meantime, they were accepted into the fraternity – at which point they would again be allowed to occupy them.⁵⁰

Unfortunately, there were a number of weaknesses inherent in the conception of the fraternity which prevented it from attaining full control of the industry. Initially, the Fraternity of St Katherine was not a guild such as those that existed for other trades and, therefore, did not have the power to draw up regulations or nominate apprentices to the freedom of the City. The new fraternity had no hall in which to meet, until it leased a property on Harp Lane in 1668 (Birch 1999, 59).⁵¹ This problem, however, could have been overcome as other guilds had begun in similar ways.⁵² Of greater concern was the lack of any common identity. This was a mixed group of men from different trades and not all members of the association were even freemen or London citizens. Suburban and country carters also joined and were given a guarantee that they would not be troubled by having their horses, carts or servants seized for the use of the king without their consent; however, the wardens of the fraternity, along with one of the officers of the City, were given the right to requisition shod carts which had metal wheel rims from these suburban carters when they found it necessary to fulfil their obligations. These seemingly contradictory rules presumably meant they could make use of the resources at their disposal, but had to do so with the consent of the carter in question. Again, however, the presence of these members could have been overcome within the internal structure of the fraternity, if its authority had been established. There were far more damaging weaknesses.

As described above, the mayor and aldermen did not stop granting cart licences as personal gifts when the fraternity was established. The diverse groups who could get hold of these licences would have been obliged to join the Fraternity of St Katherine, but ultimately this system meant that the carters did not have any real control over their own membership. In authorising the establishment of the fraternity, the city authorities were also trying to kill too many

birds with one stone. As well as using the fraternity to help enforce price controls and regulate the number of carters within the City, they also wanted to provide for street cleaning and waste disposal, and ensure there were enough long carts to satisfy the royal cart-takers who had the power to requisition them for royal use.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ROYAL REQUISITIONING OF CARTS

The greatest problem faced by the Fraternity of St Katherine was that the City tried to use the fraternity to solve the problem of royal requisitioning. This together with the detrimental relationship which developed with the woodmongers ultimately resulted in the loss of the fraternity's independence and power.

The king's officials or 'cart-takers', assisted and supervised by the sheriffs and sergeants of London, could temporarily seize carts and horses for the purpose of moving royal goods. This system applied throughout the country but fell particularly heavily on London because of the proportion of time spent by the court in Westminster or one of the other nearby palaces.⁵³ It was long carts which were needed by the cart-takers, and one of the City's problems was to ensure that there were sufficient long carts for the royal service. The Crown did pay carters and cart owners for the use of their vehicles: 10d for a cart with two horses and 14d per day for a cart with three (Clark 1995, 9). These sums, however, represented an ever decreasing fraction of what could be earned elsewhere. In 1385/6, for example, the Bridge House hired a carter and his cart for four days at a cost of 2s per day; three years later, a cart with four horses for one day's work cost between 20d and 2s. The Bridge House accounts suggest that in the late 14th century, at least, 2s per day was the standard price.⁵⁴

Requisitioning was not a new problem. Throughout the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries excessive and inappropriate requisitioning, fraudulent cart-taking by men who had no such authority and other forms of corruption had all made the system controversial. In 1291, for example, John Hurel was committed to prison for obstructing and assaulting the sheriff who

was trying to take his cart for the purpose of removing the king's wardrobe (*Cal Lbk A*, 192). The civic authorities introduced their own regulations that prevented sergeants from taking the carts of poor people bringing victuals and other goods to the City for sale, while sparing professional carters. In 1357 the dung carts of the City similarly were made exempt from requisitioning (*Lib Alb*, liv; *Memorials*, 299). Problems, however, persisted. In 1362, the valets of sergeants who arranged carriage were ordered to take no more carts and horses than necessary and were again told that they should only target 'traventers' or those who hired carts commercially (*Cal Lbk G*, 148–9). In 1413, the sheriffs were ordered not to take two carts belonging to Henry Cook, carter, as they were being employed on the new work of the Guildhall (*Cal Lbk I*, 115). Nine years later, John Toterich, baker, was arrested for pretending to be a purveyor of the prince's household and for seizing carts belonging to William Nicholl, Thomas Shepherd, John Edryche of Tottenham and other carters, which he refused to give up except on payment of various sums of money (*ibid*, 270). Although Toterich was not a royal cart-taker, the authorised officials were not strangers to similar practices, requisitioning excessive numbers of carts and then accepting bribes to release the cart owners from royal service (Bennett 1952, 11).

It was the suburban and provincial carters, who commonly used the long carts that the king required, who were frequently the targets of cart-takers. The seizure of carts which brought food and other wares into the City deterred their owners from coming into London at all, if they could find other markets for their goods, and therefore the price of food went up (Bennett 1952, 12). The accounts of the tolls raised on carts crossing London Bridge may demonstrate the decline in suburban carters coming to the City as a result of the risks of purveyance. Since the citizens of London were exempt from the cart toll and freemen of other towns claimed exemption, this charge must also have fallen most heavily on the country carters surrounding London. In the late 14th and early 15th century income from this toll was falling and, as seen above, this was also a period of intense complaint about the

practice of purveyance.⁵⁵ By the foundation of the Fraternity of St Katherine in 1517, the problem of high food prices caused by suburban carriers avoiding the City had not been solved and was cited as one of the issues that the fraternity sought to resolve.⁵⁶ The fraternity does not seem to have been particularly successful, however, as in 1521, resentment was still high and a complaint was made to the Court of Aldermen concerning the damages incurred by those who had their carts taken for the use of the king.⁵⁷

The failure of the legislation in place at this time to provide sufficient carriage was demonstrated in February 1523, with the prosecution of John Scott and Robert Anderson, two of the founder members of the fraternity, along with 30 other carters, for having cars in the City but no long carts. Not only was this contrary to the ordinance of 1512, it would have made it very difficult for the fraternity to carry out its obligation to provide the king with carriage. They were ordered to acquire a long cart if they wished to keep their cars.⁵⁸ This ordinance, although clearly still the law, was always going to be ineffective in providing more long carts for the royal cart-takers, as the carmen of London simply did not want the expense of buying and maintaining a long cart and the extra horses which they did not really need.

THE LATER HISTORY OF THE FRATERNITY OF ST KATHERINE AND THE DOMINATION OF THE WOODMONGERS

The next phase in the history of the Fraternity of St Katherine began in March 1528, when John Scott and other woodmongers promised to provide the king with carriage.⁵⁹ This is the first reference to the involvement of the woodmongers with the carters, which was to become so important later. Two weeks later, Hugh Church, who was given the right to operate a car in the City for the carriage of the Duke of Norfolk, agreed to become a member of the woodmongers but was not also compelled to join the Fraternity of St Katherine.⁶⁰ In the same month, all cars used within the liberties of the City were ordered to be taken to Leadenhall.⁶¹ This was presumably pending the new regulations

which were being formulated. These were put forward by three of the founder members of the fraternity, John Scott, Robert Anderson and Thomas Cure, together with Robert Donnyng and other 'colliers, vitellers and fuellars dwellyng and resortynge to the same citie'.⁶²

The new ordinances drawn up on 30 July 1528 represented an ambitious attempt to organise the transport industry of the City into a single company and finally solve the problems of royal cart requisitioning, but it was an attempt that would ultimately fail. The years of prosperity and population growth in the early 16th century produced a rapid increase in the demand for transport. This demand together with the prolific granting of gift car rooms by the aldermen resulted in a rate of expansion which outpaced the ability of the Fraternity of St Katherine to govern it. The demise of the fraternity was also inherent in these new regulations, specifically in the order that all cart users, including woodmongers and rakers, became members. The woodmongers not only already had their own guild, they were also more numerous and powerful and would come to dominate the carmen. The woodmongers held the monopoly of the carrying of wood from wharves, and therefore many owned and operated carts. This together with the fact that the process of moving goods away from the wharves was at the heart of the transport industry, meant carting, wharves and woodmongers were all inextricably linked.⁶³

The sharing of responsibility for the provision of the king's carriage between the carters or later the woodmongers, the City and the cart-takers seems to have been fairly standard by the middle of the 16th century, and there is also evidence that it resulted in some sort of financial arrangement between them. This would appear to have worked to the advantage of all parties so that at times the carters or woodmongers apparently paid off the cart-takers to protect their vehicles from purveyance and at other times were subcontracted by the cart-takers to organise carriage on their behalf. In September 1541, for example, the chamberlain was ordered to pay to the wardens of the carters £5 to 'satisfy', or presumably 'pay-off' the cart-takers John Dymmok and Edward (or Edward)

Rollesley, and this money was to come from 'suche money of the carters as nowe restyth in the handes of the seyd chamberleyn'.⁶⁴ Conversely, in 1549, John Lyon, grocer, the alderman for Queenhithe, was requested to give Nicholas Pygott, woodmonger, and probably at this date warden of the carters, the £9 that he had received from the wardens of the cart-takers to be used by Pygott to prepare the king's carriage.⁶⁵ In July 1551, the woodmongers were commanded not to pay wages to a certain Nicholas, who had been 'meddling' as one of the cart-takers.⁶⁶

While the carters may not have wanted to maintain the long carts that the cart-takers needed, it was to their advantage to manage the system, to receive money from them in order to help fund the provision of carts and, possibly, to direct money to them, either as bribes or to help them pay for carriage in a way that would have less of a negative impact on their own businesses.

By the middle of the 16th century, it also seems to have been common practice for the woodmongers to nominate the cart-takers. The appointment of cart-takers for the king in the City was in the hands of the civic authorities, by 1548 at least, as cart-takers were ordered by the aldermen to:

use suche dyligence and indyfferencye from hensforth in executyng of thir Romes for ye quyetnes of the cytezens of this cytie and other the kinges subiectes reparyng to the same ... this court shall putt other in their places yf they doo the contrarye.⁶⁷

In September 1551 the court requested that the woodmongers present four apt persons to be cart-takers for the king, of whom the court would elect one.⁶⁸ This practice of nominations by the woodmongers may actually have been in operation for some time.

Increasingly it was to the woodmongers that the mayor and aldermen turned to deal with the persistent problems of purveyance. In July 1542, Edward Rollesley, warden of the carmen, made a report to the Court of Aldermen regarding the insufficient number of long carts in the City.⁶⁹ As an immediate remedy for this, the mayor and aldermen chose to target the wharf-keepers or those who owned private wharves or

quays, as they had the space to keep larger carts. They were all ordered to provide a long cart. Meanwhile, Rollesley was charged with devising alternative means by which the number of long carts could be increased.⁷⁰ This was the first time that wharf-keepers were formally involved in the City's efforts to provide enough long carts for the royal cart-takers. When Rollesley's new regulations were agreed and entered in the records of the court, they were described as being made on behalf of the Company of Woodmongers and Wharfingers, not the carters and carmen.⁷¹ Four months after the introduction of this new legislation, however, it became clear that the woodmongers and wharf-keepers generally had no intention of fulfilling their obligations. In January 1543, all the wharfingers were ordered to appear before the Court of Aldermen to declare why they had not provided long carts and were commanded to do so.⁷²

In February 1546 new regulations about the keeping of long carts were issued by the mayor and aldermen. The principle was the same one the City had been pursuing for years, that ownership of a long cart entitled the user to operate a car, and again the focus was on the wharf-keepers. It was ordered that every person who held a 'great wharf' should have a long cart,

and that every suche person by reason therof shall and may lawfully kepe and occupye ij carres one of theym to be occupied onely in the carying of wode from the same wharfe and thother to cary eny kynde of wares or merchandyse in all places of the seyd cytie att the ffre wyll and pleasure of the owner therof.⁷³

This increased the incentive to the wharf-keepers, by doubling the number of cars they were allowed as reward for having a long cart. This privilege was also extended to any freemen living in the suburbs of the City, probably because, in the suburbs, there was more space for long carts, rather than out of a desire to exclude the citizens within the walls. At the same time, unauthorised carting was targeted. All carts which operated in the City with the proper licences were ordered to be marked with the sign of the crown and all others were to be given up. There is no evidence, however, that this inspired the

wharfingers or the carters to acquire long carts and the problems with supplying carts for the king continued.

The mayor and aldermen had long been trying to link ownership of long carts and cars in order to motivate men to keep long carts and had had little success in doing so. They were reluctant, however, to abandon the policy. This meant that of the two groups of transport operators, the woodmongers, and among them the wharf-keepers, were continually favoured over the carmen and by the middle of the century the woodmongers had acquired full control of the fraternity. The regulations drawn up for the fraternity in 1528 required that the carmen keep a book of the licensed carts in the City, but by 1548 this had been taken over by the woodmongers.⁷⁴ In the same year, when a chest was made for the Guildhall to house the irons used for marking cars, one of the sets of keys was entrusted to the wardens of the woodmongers not to the Fraternity of St Katherine.⁷⁵ A year later, the carters and carmen successfully petitioned against Nicholas Pygott and the woodmongers for a reduction in the charge levied for entering a cart in the book, from 4d to 2d, but they were admonished:

to be obedient and to kepe and obey the lawes and ordeynaunces afore made for the servyng of the kynges majestie and to comen redely at all tymes at the lawfull somons of the wardens of the seid woodmongers.⁷⁶

The carters also believed that they were carrying an excessive financial burden regarding quarterage, and they petitioned that they should not pay any more than they had previously been accustomed to paying, although the result of their petition is unclear.⁷⁷

Resistance, however, proved futile. The woodmongers continued to control the carters until 1582, but they did not destroy their corporate identity or swallow them up. In this year three carmen devised a scheme to escape the woodmongers by replacing their control with that of Christ's Hospital, a plan to which the mayor and aldermen assented in order to help provide funding for the hospital. The hospital retained dominance until 1605, when, after

a period of considerable dispute, authority over the carters was handed back to the woodmongers, and the carmen were granted a royal charter to form one corporate body with the woodmongers. Endless infighting ensued and it was another hundred years before the carmen finally managed to rid themselves of the woodmongers.⁷⁸

CONCLUSION

It is clear that the city authorities did make a concerted effort to impose some sort of regulation and control on the carting industry. Their focus, however, was not on developing the emerging industry to meet the needs of the population and there was not a directional transport policy. Instead, there were several distinct features based principally on preventing price inflation and dealing with requisitioning. It is clear that by the 1520s the carters, placed under increasing economic pressure caused at least in part by rising fodder costs, wanted to charge more for their services. The mayor and aldermen saw this and introduced direct legislation to try to prevent it. At the same time, the increasing demands made on the City by the royal cart-takers for a king based more at Westminster meant that suburban carters avoided the City, if possible, and the price of food also increased. Much of the City's legislation regarding the carting industry was actually an attempt to prevent this by making more long carts available, but with little success. While the number of men involved in the transport industry may have increased, these were carmen meeting the demands of the London population and they did not provide the new long carts the City wanted.

By ending the freedom of any citizen to be a commercial carter and introducing licensing, the mayor and alderman took a significant step in the development of the industry, effectively creating the professional carter. However, they failed to make full use of the system they had created and, in their desire to solve the problems of royal requisitioning, ultimately gave effective control of the industry to the woodmongers. Although a disaster for the independent development of the carters as a trade community and guild, this does not seem to

have had a particularly negative effect on the transport service offered to the public. The populace of the City did not care how many long carts there were, since it was the smaller cars they needed to move their goods. The price regulations that were introduced seem to have been reasonably effective, and although there were some complaints about excessive prices and blocking of the streets, generally the population of the City seems to have been satisfied with the services provided or, at least, not dissatisfied enough to voice their grievances through official channels.

Wrigley has found that the number of tertiary service providers such as carters, inn-holders and corn-chandlers tends to increase as more and more agricultural production was consumed away from where it was produced (1978, 229), leading to the development of a national marketplace. He has found this model in action in the century after 1650, but it seems possible that the process was already under way in the early 16th century. The emergence of professional carters in this period may actually be just one aspect of the evolution and expansion of the service sector, in an economy dominated by mercantile trade and manufacture. It was within this economic structure that the fraternity and guild model had worked effectively for centuries, but attempting to apply the same system of regulation to a service industry with no craft skills to learn or goods to produce may have been behind the problems experienced by the Fraternity of St Katherine.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to record my thanks to Professor Caroline Barron, my thesis supervisor, for many helpful suggestions during the course of this research and to the reviewer for advice given in the preparation of this article. This article has been published with the help of a grant from the late Miss Isobel Thornley's Bequest to the University of London.

clairemartin101@gmail.com

NOTES

¹ Martin, C, 2008 'Transport for London 1250–1550' unpub PhD thesis, Royal Holloway University of London.

² The Bridge House organisation owned many properties throughout the city. The income raised from these properties together with tolls charged for passage over the bridge and for raising the drawbridge were used to maintain and repair the structure of London Bridge. *Bridge House Account Roll 1390–1405: translation*, fols 133, 139, 229, London Metropolitan Archives (LMA) CLA/007/FN/01/019.

³ *Letter Book L*, fols 146v–7, LMA COL/AD/01/011.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Letter Book O*, fols 48, 92v, LMA COL/AD/01/014.

⁶ *Lbk O*, fols 92v–3; *Journal 13*, fol 35v, LMA COL/CC/01/01/013.

⁷ *Repertory 9*, fol 93v, LMA COL/CA/01/01/009.

⁸ *Letter Book A*, fol 88, LMA COL/AD/01/001.

⁹ *Letter Book N*, fols 38v–40, LMA COL/AD/01/013.

¹⁰ *Repertory 5*, fol 13v, LMA COL/CA/01/01/005.

¹¹ *Rep 5*, fols 60v, 63v.

¹² *Lbk O*, fol 48; *Jnl 13*, fol 35v.

¹³ *Repertory 7*, fol 225v, LMA COL/CA/01/01/007; *Lbk O*, fols 92–3.

¹⁴ *Lbk N*, fols 38v–40; *Lbk O*, fols 92–3.

¹⁵ *Rep 9*, fol 47; *Jnl 13*, fol 397.

¹⁶ *Repertory 12*, fols 279v, 414–v, LMA COL/CA/01/01/012.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Useful evidence comes from the accounts of London Bridge as oak and elm were regularly carted from Croydon (Surrey) for the maintenance of the bridge from the late 14th century to the 16th century. Between 1390 and 1513 the price per load remained between 18d and 2s. There follows a short period where supplies were sourced from elsewhere, and when cart loads of lumber were again brought from Croydon in 1536/7 the price per load had increased to 2s 2d – the first time it had exceeded 2s in over a century. *BHAcR 1390–1405*, fols 66–7, 71, 90–2, 178, 215, 231; *Bridge House Rental 1460–84: translation and transcript*, fols 230, 273–4, 316, 458, 548, 653, 741, 825, 1068, 1144, 1228, LMA CLA/007/FN/02/060; *Bridgemasters' Annual Account and Rental 1484–1509*, fols 51v, 117v, 128v, 139, 159v, 214, 271v, 283v, 313, LMA CLA/007/FN/02/004; *Bridgemasters' Annual Account and Rental 1509–25*, fols 11, 66v, LMA CLA/007/FN/02/005; *Bridgemasters' Annual Account and Rental 1525–41*, fol 130, LMA CLA/007/FN/02/006.

¹⁹ *Repertory 8*, fol 265v, LMA COL/CA/01/01/008. In contrast, the cost of keeping the horses owned by the Bridge House between 1381/2 and 1461/2 varied between 20d and 2s 1d, depending on

how many horses were in the stables, but the cost per horse remained consistent at 5d each (*Lon Br Ac*, 10–29). *Bridgemasters' Account Rolls 1381–9: translation*, fols 61, 82–102, 116–37, LMA CLA/007/FN/01/018; *BHAcR 1390–1405*, fols 241–2; *Bridge House Weekly Payments Book 1404–12*, fol 65, LMA CLA/007/FN/03/001.

²⁰ *Rep 9*, fol 184.

²¹ See below, 'The Significance of Royal Requisitioning of Carts'.

²² *Repertory 10*, fol 169, LMA COL/CA/01/01/010.

²³ See below, 'The Foundation of the Fraternity of St Katherine the Virgin and Martyr of Carters'.

²⁴ *Rep 9*, fols 133, 205v.

²⁵ *Rep 10*, fol 100v.

²⁶ *Rep 10*, fol 178v.

²⁷ *Rep 10*, fol 212v.

²⁸ *Repertory 11*, fol 99, LMA COL/CA/01/01/011; *Rep 12*, fol 84.

²⁹ *Rep 12*, fol 295.

³⁰ *Rep 11*, fols 505v–6.

³¹ *Lbk O*, fol 90v.

³² *Repertory 1*, fol 94, LMA COL/CA/01/01/001.

³³ *Repertory 3*, fol 133, LMA COL/CA/01/01/003.

³⁴ *Rep 1*, fol 94; *Rep 11*, fol 354v.

³⁵ *Register of Commissary Court Wills 1939–48*, fol 63, LMA DL/C/B/004/MS09171/011. Whether Ellen was married is unspecified.

³⁶ *Rep 10*, fol 142v; *Rep 12*, fol 360.

³⁷ *Rep 11*, fols 268v, 328v; *Rep 12*, fol 13.

³⁸ *Rep 12*, fol 25.

³⁹ *Rep 1*, fol 94.

⁴⁰ *Repertory 2*, fols 39v, 129, LMA COL/CA/01/01/002.

⁴¹ *Rep 2*, fol 129v.

⁴² *Rep 2*, fol 130.

⁴³ *Rep 2*, fols 129v, 194v, 199.

⁴⁴ *Rep 3*, fol 100v.

⁴⁵ *Rep 3*, fol 123v. None of these men were alderman at this date. Nicholas Partryche and John Wylkynson would be admitted later in the year and Kyme in 1519 (Beaven 1913, ii, 23–6).

⁴⁶ *Rep 3*, fol 124v. Although termed a fraternity, none of the ordinances formulated in 1517 or 1528 had a religious aspect.

⁴⁷ *Lbk N*, fols 38v–40.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ *Rep 3*, fol 169.

⁵¹ Other than the ordinances of 1517 and 1528 there are no surviving records for the carters until the 17th century.

⁵² *Lbk N*, fols 38v–40.

⁵³ These royal cart-takers, for there were generally more than one, were not the only authorised purveyors at work in the City, although they

were responsible for most of the demands made upon cart owners. There were also others, given authority by the king. In 1515, for example, Richard Werntyssh, servant to the Duke of Norfolk, who had authority of the king's grace to take certain carts for the carriage of the Duke to Halyngbery, York, was granted the assistance of one of the sheriffs (*Rep* 3, fol 24).

⁵⁴ *BACR* 1381–9; *BHACR* 1390–1405.

⁵⁵ This can only be applied up to 1424/5 when the decline in income was at least partly caused by the ban on shod carts crossing the bridge.

⁵⁶ *Lbk N*, fol 38v.

⁵⁷ *Rep* 5, fol 207v.

⁵⁸ This order had to be repeated again in February 1523, *Repertory* 4, fols 142–v, LMA COL/CA/01/01/004; *Repertory* 6, fol 16, LMA COL/CA/01/01/006.

⁵⁹ *Rep* 7, fol 244v. This is presumably the same John Scott involved in founding the fraternity in 1517, although then he was described as a saddler.

⁶⁰ In 1525, the king issued a letter to the City of London requesting that Hugh Church of Broken Wharf be exempted from the demands of his cart-takers as long as he continued to earn his living while serving the Duke of Norfolk with his cart (*Rep* 7, fol 248v; *Journal* 12, fol 371, LMA COL/CC/01/01/012).

⁶¹ *Rep* 7, fol 247v.

⁶² *Lbk O*, fols 90–1v.

⁶³ For more on this struggle from the perspective of the woodmongers see Braithwaite 2010, 44–53.

⁶⁴ In January, Thomas Ellys, warden of the carters had brought in £22 2d received of the fellowship and delivered it to the chamberlain (*Rep* 10, fols 191v, 221).

⁶⁵ *Rep* 12, fol 120v.

⁶⁶ *Rep* 12, fol 360.

⁶⁷ In 1541 and 1542, two of the cart-takers were John Dymmok and Edward Rollesley, the latter also being one of the wardens of the carters (*Rep* 10, fols 212, 221, 267; *Rep* 12, fol 10).

⁶⁸ *Rep* 12, fol 378.

⁶⁹ *Rep* 10, fol 266v.

⁷⁰ *Rep* 10, fol 267.

⁷¹ *Rep* 10, fols 276–v.

⁷² *Rep* 10, fol 306.

⁷³ *Rep* 11, fols 262v, 264v. Any other freeman who maintained a long cart, available for the use of the king, would also enjoy the right to have two cars.

⁷⁴ In this year it was the woodmongers who were ordered to make up their book of the number of cars (*Rep* 11, fol 429).

⁷⁵ *Rep* 11, fol 414v.

⁷⁶ *Rep* 12, fol 169v.

⁷⁷ *Rep* 11, fols 465v–6, 469, 502v, 505v–6.

⁷⁸ For further details of this period in the history of the company see Bennett 1952, 20–31 or Birch 1999, 27–64.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barron, C M, 2004 *London in the Later Middle Ages: Government and People 1200–1500*, Oxford
- Beaven, A B, 1913 *The Aldermen of the City of London* 2 vols, London
- Bennett, E, 1952 *The Worshipful Company of Carmen of London: A Short History*, London
- Birch, C, 1999 *Carr and Carman: The Fellowship of St Katherine the Virgin and Martyr of Carters*, London
- Bradley, H, 2015 'Southampton's trading partners: London' in M Hicks (ed) *English Inland Trade 1430–1540: Southampton and its Region*, Oxford, 65–80
- Braithwaite, R, 2010 *The History of the Worshipful Company of Fuellers: The Fueller's Tale*, Chichester
- Cal Lbk A–L: *Calendar of Letter Books Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall: Letter-Books A–L* (ed) R R Sharpe (11 vols) 1899–1912
- Clark, J, 1995 *The Medieval Horse and its Equipment, Medieval Finds from Excavations in London* 5, London
- Hicks, M, 2015 'The freight transport of Southampton' in M Hicks (ed) *English Inland Trade 1430–1540: Southampton and its Region*, Oxford, 43–51
- Langdon, J, 1984 'Horse hauling: a revolution in vehicle transport in twelfth and thirteenth century England?' *Past Present* 103, 37–66
- Lib Alb: Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis: Liber Albus* (ed) H T Riley 1859, London
- Lib Cust: Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis: Liber Custumarum* (ed) H T Riley (2 vols) 1860, London
- Lon Br Ac: London Bridge Selected Accounts and Rentals 1381–1538* (eds) V Harding & L Wright 1995, London
- Masschaele, J, 1993 'Transport costs in medieval England' *Econ Hist Rev* 46, 266–79
- Memorials: Memorials of London and London Life in the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (ed) H T Riley 1868, London
- Rappaport, S, 1989 *Worlds within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London*, Cambridge
- Stow, J, 1908 (1603) *A Survey of London* 2 vols (reprinted 1971) C L Kingsford (ed), Oxford
- Willard, J F, 1932 'The use of carts in the fourteenth century' *History* 17, 246–50
- Wrigley, E A, 1978 'A simple model of London's importance in changing English society and economy 1650–1750' in P Abrams & E A Wrigley (eds) *Towns in Societies: Essays in Economic History and Historical Sociology*, Cambridge, 215–43

