

As early as 1275, apprenticeship was defined as one of three ways to obtain the freedom of the city of London which conferred various legal and economic privileges.¹ In the early fourteenth century, ~~twenty seven~~²⁷ percent of London's citizens obtained the city's freedom via apprenticeship.² The institution of apprenticeship grew stronger during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries so that by the sixteenth century almost ~~ninety~~⁹⁰ percent of all London freemen entered by apprenticeship.³ What was the nature of the medieval institution which in the early modern period became such a prominent feature of London life?

Despite the obvious importance of the later development of this institution, the formative period of medieval apprenticeship has been little studied. A H Thomas treated the subject in 1929, in the introduction to his edition of the Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls⁴ while both Thrupp and more recently Hanawalt have also made ^{such as?} important contributions.⁵ Other than these studies and a few brief discussions of the subject found in more general works about London, there has been little written about medieval London apprentices. The major purpose of this study is to address this gap in medieval London historiography by focusing on the social, economic, and political roles of apprentices and apprenticeship in

¹ William Stubbs, ed., The Chronicles of Edward I and Edward II (London: Rolls Series, 1882), 85-86. *o all app?*

² R. Sharpe, ed., Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London, Book D (London: 1902), 35-179! 656 entered by redemption. 247 entered by apprenticeship.

³ Steve Rappaport, Worlds within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 292 note 8.

⁴ A H Thomas, ed., Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls, 1364-1381, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929), xxvii, xxx-xlvii, lix-lxi.

⁵ Sylvia Thrupp, The Merchant Class of Medieval London, 1300-1500 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1948), 191-233; Barbara Hanawalt, Growing Up in Medieval London (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993): 129-171.

medieval London.

Although in general little is known about the lives of medieval London apprentices, the sources surviving from early fourteenth-century London offer rare glimpses of the apprentice population. In addition to sources like court cases and guild ordinances, a freedom register compiled between 1309 and 1312 recorded information concerning the lives of 532 apprentices.⁶ Each entry contains details about an apprentice's origin, occupation, master, ward, length of apprenticeship, and fees and fines paid to the Chamberlain. The information provided by this document offers irresistible opportunities to reconstruct a fragment of London's medieval apprentice population.

The surviving documentation lends itself to a prosopographical analysis of apprentices and informs several questions relevant to the history of apprenticeship: What was apprenticeship?; Who were these apprentices?; From where did these apprentices originate?; What economic investment did apprenticeship require?; What time commitment did apprenticeship require?; What emotional stake did masters, families, and individuals place in this arrangement? The assessment of these questions revealed⁵ three themes in the lives of early fourteenth-century apprentices. First, the most powerful people of London were training apprentices or began their careers by serving ~~as~~ apprenticeships themselves. Second, the disparity between the results of the prosopography on the one hand and the prescriptive literature about apprentices on the other hand suggests that

⁶ LBD, 35-179. There are 541 total entries because 9 apprentices were recorded twice.

certain segments of the apprentice population were grossly underrecorded. Third, although London was far from creating a complete or consistent system for handling apprenticeship, the events of the early fourteenth century represented the first links in a long chain leading to the establishment of apprenticeship as the primary gateway to the city's freedom.

What was apprenticeship in early fourteenth-century London?

In the late thirteenth and the early fourteenth centuries, Londoners defined apprenticeship and the administrative offices and procedures regulating it. These reforms established three key precedents: the relationship of apprenticeship to the city freedom, the Chamberlain's role in its regulation, and the nature of apprenticeship lists produced to record administrative procedures. Because the surviving freedom register was one product of these reform developments, the political context of these reforms provides ^{important?} necessary background for a prosopographical analysis of apprentices.

These three specific reforms resulted from a creative political tension between two competing systems of organization in London: the ward and the guild. The ward system, stable and well-established, provided for the election of aldermen since the mid-thirteenth century and tax collection since 1292.⁷ Only seven guilds dominated by merchant interests had had more than one

⁷ Thrupp, The Merchant Class of Medieval London, 68-69. Gwyn Williams, Medieval London from Commune to Capital (London: Athlone Press, 1963): 34. Ewert Ekwall, ed., Two Early London Subsidy Rolls (Lund, 1951):139-204.

think I like listing or categorizing as an aid to analysis, you're over doing it - its p. 3 or you've already given 3 lists of '3'... this over-use makes the effectiveness of the technique

Alderman on the city council by 1275.⁸ This stable ward organization did not, however, respond well to London's tremendous economic and population growth during this period. London's vibrant guild system lent itself much better to this growth. As various craft guilds organized, they demanded a greater share in London's political, social, and economic privileges. The complex interaction of guild and ward produced a creative tension resulting in frequent administrative experiments attempting to resolve issues concerning the election of officials, control of the city's seal, and requirements for the city freedom.

London officials experimented with apprenticeship legislation during this period as well ascribing ever more importance to the connection between apprenticeship and the city freedom. In 1275 apprenticeship was defined as one of three ways to enter the freedom of the city. The same chronicle entry also stated that apprentices should only serve masters who had achieved the city freedom,⁹ and the Chamberlain penalized apprentices disobeying this law.¹⁰ As the course of the fourteenth century continued and guild organizations gained power, the union between apprenticeship and the freedom strengthened so that by 1408 the commons of the city requested that apprenticeship be the only method of entry to the freedom.¹¹

2nd time, you've said this

As apprenticeship legislation developed so too did the office of the Chamberlain. Apprenticeship legislation from 1275

⁸ Williams, Medieval London from Commune to Capital, 319. These were drapers, mercers, vintners, goldsmiths, pepperers, woolmongers, and fishmongers.

⁹ Stubbs, The Chronicles of Edward I and Edward II, 86.

¹⁰ LBD, 140-141.

¹¹ LBI, 63.

to 1300 consistently associated reforms in apprenticeship with reforms of the office of the Chamberlain. In 1300, the Mayor Elias Russell reformed the Chamberlain's duties regarding apprentices and the annual rendering of his accounts to the Mayor and Aldermen.¹² The Mayor gave the Chamberlain the power to hear cases and issue fines for apprentices who had not properly followed the registration procedures. Moreover, the Chamberlain was now required to render his accounts annually before the Mayor or some other elected auditor. This legislation influenced the format of the freedom register of 1309-1312; the register of apprentices survives as a detailed section of the Chamberlain's accounts for those years.

The reforms produced several apprenticeship lists demonstrating how these changes were enforced. Although only the 1309-1312 register survives, ~~evidence proves that~~ there were at least three other lists kept in London between 1270 and 1320.¹³ Earlier lists from the reign of Edward I organized their entries by ward. ^{but} ~~In contrast to these earlier lists,~~ the surviving register from the reign of Edward II recorded occupational and ward associations. This stylistic change in recording reflected a new balance achieved between ward and guild in London between 1309 and 1312.

Historians of London have argued that the period in which

¹² H T Riley, ed., Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis, vol 2, part i (Rolls Series, 1859-1860):93-94. See Appendix I.

¹³ LBD, 35-179. Apprentices often referred to earlier documentation to prove that they had served their full terms. From these references we can reconstruct the following lists: an old list or the first list of apprentices kept from 1270 to 1285, a second list kept from 1300 to 1307, a list from the time of John Dode chamberlain kept from 1313 to 1318. The entries from John Dode's list were often added onto the list of 1309-1312.

the register was produced represented an active period in craft guild activity. Based on high freedom enrollment rates, more craft recognition in the aldermanic council, and the nature of Edward II and his reign, Williams argues that the period between 1309-1313 represented an influential but short-lived craft revolution.¹⁴ Thrupp, not nearly as committed to the idea of a craft revolution, stated that, "The only radical change to be attempted was the experiment of shifting the basis of representation for one of the councils that met in December, 1312, from the wards to the crafts".¹⁵ The degree to which this period was revolutionary is debatable, but clearly the period between 1309 and 1312 represented a new balance between ward and craft organizations in London. ^{*} The register of apprentices reflected the political balance between guilds dominated by merchants, Aldermen, and wards, on the one hand, and artisans and craft guilds on the other.

aren't there more recent entries in the debak? e.g. Pamela Nightingale?

→ this section is useful but a few of the sentences on the inward link context of the register or its context would be even more helpful

Pamela Nightingale here

Whether

Who were these apprentices?

The prosopographical data permits an analysis of the apprentice population along several lines including gender, class, and occupation. There is a discrepancy between prescriptive evidence and the data accumulated from the freedom register suggesting that many apprentices, particularly females and those of some craft guilds, were underrecorded. The reasons for this inconsistency are not entirely clear, but there is no doubt that

¹⁴ Williams, Medieval London from Commune to Capital, 191-195, 270-273.

¹⁵ Thrupp, The Merchant Class of Medieval London, 68.

the list contained in Letter Book D did not record everyone learning a trade in early fourteenth-century London.

Gender was among the most important factors influencing the course of an apprentices' life. So different were the experiences of male and female apprentices that many writers treating the subject choose to discuss male and female apprentices separately. Though significant differences did exist, like the age of entry into an apprenticeship,¹⁶ there were many points of continuity between female and male apprenticeships. The evidence from court cases demonstrates that young women certainly served as apprentices in early fourteenth-century London.¹⁷ Nor was the freedom forbidden to women at this time. Caroline Barron and Kay Lacey have outlined various legal positions permitting widows and married women to partake in the economic advantages of the London freedom.¹⁸ In fact, two women whose names appeared in the 1309-1312 register entered the freedom by redemption.¹⁹ Despite the active role women played in London trade and economic life, not one of the 532 apprentices recorded in the freedom register was female. How can we explain this discrepancy?

Marr
K.
Dale!

The absence of female apprentices in the freedom register does not mean that women were nowhere recorded in this document. Quite to the contrary, women acted as witnesses on apprentices' behalf, and they also trained apprentices either with their

[? does this a universal trend? why?]

¹⁶ Hanawalt, Growing Up, 142. Females began apprenticeships earlier than males.
¹⁷ CPMR, vol 1,274; LBF, 142; Hanawalt, Growing Up, 142-144.
¹⁸ Caroline Barron, "The 'Golden Age' of Women in Medieval London," Reading Medieval Studies 15 (1989): 35-58. Kay E. Lacey, "Women and Work in Fourteenth and Fifteenth Century London," in Women and Work in Pre-Industrial England, ed. Lindsey Charles and Lorna Duffin (London: Croom Helm, 1985), 24-82.
¹⁹ LBD, 51, "Elizabeth de Burnham", 75, "Agnes la Blake, brewster"; CPMR, vol 2,lix-lxi.

husbands or as independent masters. The Chamberlain's register listed no less than sixteen female masters training a total of nineteen apprentices to be braelers, burellers, butchers, corders, cornmongers, curriers, dyers, fishmongers, plumbers, smiths, and surgeons (Table 1).²⁰ There is also evidence that the influence of these female masters was considerably greater than the numbers immediately suggest because the short chronological coverage of the freedom register detracts from our knowledge of their careers. For instance, from court records we know that the butcher, Matilda Fattyng, had at least two apprentices in the early fourteenth century even though only one was recorded in the freemen's roll.²¹ Moreover, Johanna de Chigwell, the fishmonger, trained one of London's most influential apprentices, Hamo de Chigwell, who was both a London member of Parliament and the Mayor of London four times.²² Female masters therefore trained apprentices more often than this register shows, and by even the highest standards they trained their apprentices successfully.

Yet the question remains, why was not a single female apprentice enrolled between 1309 and 1312? Of course under registration is always a concern with sources of this type, but this cannot explain the total absence of female apprentices from this source. I K Ben-Amos, in her study of female apprentices in Bristol, has argued that many young women learned trades through a variety of informal methods including a parent's

²⁰ LBD, 47,102,105-106,109,109-110,112,114,129,142,144,145,149,155, 157-158,159,175

²¹ LBC, 123; EMCR, 246-247.

²² Johanna was married to Alderman, Richard de Chigwell who mentions a Hamo in his Will. Ekwall, Two Early London Subsidy Rolls, 332. Because Richard and Johanna were both mentioned in the training of their apprentice and because Richard was busy with political and economic duties, it is quite probable that Johanna had the primary influence on Hamo's education.

Table 1: Female Masters 1309-1312

Master	Trade	No. of Apprentices
Alice Byfold+	currier	1
Johanna de Chigwell+	fishmonger	1
Isabella Crokesle+	unknown	2
Agnes de Evre	cornmonger	1
Matilda Fattyng	butcher	1
Alice Markeday*	unknown	1
Alice Osbern+	butcher	1
Alice Picard+	smith	1
Isabella Picot	unknown	1
Johanna Presle*	braeler	1
Juliana Rikinhale+	dyer	1
Katherine Surgeon*	surgeon	1
Agnes Wandlesworth+	corder	2
Isabella de Ware	fishmonger	1
Agnes Winchester+	bureller	2
Margaret Winchester*	plumber	1
Total: 16 Masters	11 Trades	19 Apprentices

Source: LBD, 47, 102, 105-106, 109, 109-110, 112, 114, 129, 142, 144, 145, 149, 155, 157-158, 159, 175.

Notes: + = a widow and * = wife/husband tandem.

good

Marian K. Dale!

workshop, domestic service, or learning a husband's trade during marriage.²³ Her explanation applies to London's female masters because twelve of them were either training apprentices in tandem with their husbands or they were widows continuing the family trade. Therefore, because many of London's skilled women were probably trained informally, their training was not documented by the freedom register in question.

well, you still haven't answered your question... what about the political implications of this list as a reason to exclude women?

The male apprentices recorded in the freemen's roll were by no means a homogeneous group. Class differences affected the individual fortunes of apprentices by determining their personal connections and the resources they could expend for their careers. There are many aspects of the London class structure to consider when identifying apprentices by class. Personal lineage, of course, was an issue for some apprentices, particularly those from noble or merchant families. More influential for an apprentice however was his or her master's class. An apprentice of an Alderman or wealthy merchant had considerable advantages over an artisans apprentice.

M. Howell's essay (by way of comparison) in Women and Power in the MA + Kowalewski/Bennett article in Signs on women's girdles...

Although they were a small minority, there were apprentices of noble lineage recorded between 1309 and 1312. Usually noble appointments to the city freedom were recorded as redemptions.²⁴ When nobles did request that apprenticeships be granted, they did so for a family member so that he or she might be trained by a wealthy London merchant. This was precisely the case when Sir John Sandal's nephew served as an apprentice to William

²³ | K Ben-Amos, "Women apprentices in the trades and crafts of early modern Bristol," Continuity and Change 6 (1991), 237-242.

²⁴ Thrupp, Merchant Class of Medieval London, 66. Thrupp notes that twenty of the King's men obtained the city's freedom by redemption between 1309 and 1312.

Combemartin, a wealthy London merchant who had exported more wool than any other Londoner in the early fourteenth century.²⁵

Although this apprenticeship arrangement was an exception far from the rule, this exception demonstrates the appeal apprenticeship had even for those among London's elite population.

The merchant and aldermanic class formed a small but powerful segment of the apprentice population (Table 2). The apprentices of Aldermen and other London officials were often not required to pay the fees and fines demanded of others. Merchant masters enrolled more apprentices than artisans because they could afford the cost of maintaining several apprentices at once. For instance, Nicholas Picot, the mercer, enrolled four apprentices during this three-year period. It was to the advantage of masters to take many apprentices because a greater number of apprentices often improved a master's status in his guild.²⁶ No less than

? as a reflection of his wealth?

twenty-two masters registered a total of thirty-eight apprentices.²⁷ The wealthiest and most powerful members of London society took advantage of the institution of apprenticeship.

hub? which 22 masters? the office holder?

Some of the apprentices trained during this period went on to assume prominent positions in London society (Table 4). Although only eight apprentices recorded on this list became London officials,²⁸ these apprentices achieved the highest ranks in London political and economic life. Thomas Maryns was city Chamberlain

²⁵ LBD, 159. Williams, Medieval London from Commune to Capital, 151.

²⁶ Hanawalt, Growing Up, 136-137.

²⁷ LBD, 101,102,103,105,106,116,117,121,126,130,131,132,134,137,138,146-147,147,149-150,150,152,153,156,159,167, 177.

²⁸ LBD, 97, 119,125,127,131,146-147,165,170.

Table 2: Registered Masters Holding Political Offices

Masters	Trade	Offices	Dates	No. of Apprentices
Simon de Mereworth	bureller	She	1311	2
Richard de Welleford	chaucer	She	1311-1312	3
Nigel Drury	corder	Ald She	1307-1315 1307-1308	1
Luke de Haverynge	corder	Cha	1310-1311	2
John Vyvyen	corder	Ald	1321	1
Simon de Abyndone	draper	Ald She MP	1316-1322 1319-1320 1316	2
Richard de Willehale	draper	Ald	1305-1319	2
Richard de Chigwell	fishmonger	Ald She	1305-1306 1281-1282	1
Adam de Fulham	fishmonger	Ald She MP	1291-1307 1296-1297 1298	2
Hugh Pourte	fishmonger	Ald She	1300-1307 1302-1303	1
John Poyntel	leatherseller	Ald She	1319-1330 1318-1319	1
John Dode	ironmonger	Cha	1313-1318	1
Robert le Callere	mercier	Ald She	1321-1323 1301-1302	2
John de Cherleton	mercier	MP	1318	2
Roger de Paris	mercier	Ald She	1312-1319 1304-1305	3

Table 2: Continued

Masters	Trade	Offices	Dates	No. of Apprentices
Simon de Paris	merc	Ald She Cha	1299-1321 1302-1303 1298-1300	2
Nicholas Picot	merc	Ald She Cha	1298-1312 1307-1308 1300-1304	4
Richer de Refham	merc	Ald May She MP	1298-1312 1310-1311 1298-1299 1314	1
Richard de Wymbisshe	potter	Ald	1316-1325	1
Geoffrey de Conduit	vintner	Ald She	1307-1312 1306-1307	1
William Combemartin	woolmonger	Ald She MP	1304-1318 1303-1304 1305, 1307, 1316	2
Thomas Prentiz	woolmonger	MP Cha	1321 1318-1320	1
Totals: 22 Masters in 11 Trades				38

Source: Beaven, The Aldermen of the City of London, vol.1,261-387.

Notes: Abbreviations are as follows: Ald=Alderman; She=Sheriff;
May=Mayor; Cha=Chamberlain; MP=Member of Parliament

*is Beaven
totally accurate
without gaps for these
early period?*

Table 3: Masters Serving As Guild Wardens In 1328

Masters	Trade	No. of Apprentices
William de Haukedene	cheesemonger	1
Geoffrey de Getlestone	cutler	1
Roger de Ely	fishmonger	2
Richard de Enefeld	fuster	1
John de Dallynge	mercier	1
Robert de Dodeford	skinner	1
Thomas Prentiz	woolmonger	1
Totals: 7 Masters		8
7 Trades		

*good*Source: LBE, 232-234.**Table 4: Apprentices Obtaining Political Or Guild Offices**

Apprentices	Trade	Offices	Dates
Thomas Maryns	apothecary	Cha War	1336-1349 1328
Walter de Blecchyngelleye	cheesemonger	War	1328
John de Nortone	cheesemonger	War	1328
Henry Darcy	draper	Ald She May	1330-1349 1327-1328 1337-1339
John de Denham	fishmonger	War	1328
John de Prestone	girdler	War	1328
John de Aylesham	mercier	Ald She War	1342-1345 1343-1344 1328

Table 4:Continued

Apprentices	Trade	Offices	Dates
John de Aylesham, Jr	mercier	War	1328
John Knopwed	mercier	War	1328
Henry de Denecoumbe	painter	War	1328
William de Porkele	painter	War	1328
John de Grantham	pepperer	Ald May She MP	1323-1344 1328-1329 1322-1323 1328, 1330, 1338
Andrew Godard	pepperer	GB	1312
Reginald Conduit	vintner	Ald May She MP War	1321-1347 1334-1336 1320-1321 1322, 1327, 1330 1332, 1334, 1337 1328
Richard de Rothyng	vintner	Ald She MP War	1333-1346 1326-1327 1335, 1338, 1340 1328
Totals:15 Apprentices 10 Trades			

Source: Beaven, The Aldermen of the City of London, vol 1., 261-387.
LBE, 232-234.

Notes: Abbreviations are as follows: Ald=Alderman; May=Mayor;
She=Sheriff; MP=Member of Parliament; War=Guild Warden;
GB=Weigher of the Great Beam.

from 1336 to 1349.²⁹ John de Grantham, another notable London apprentice, served as an Alderman, Mayor, and Sheriff, and represented London in Parliament three times.³⁰ Perhaps the greatest testament to the future power of this generation of apprentices lies in the fact that between 1334 and 1349, the three senior Aldermen in London were former apprentices listed in the freedom register: John de Grantham, Henry Darcy, and Reginald de Conduit.³¹ The generation of apprentices recorded between 1309 and 1312, for all intents and purposes, controlled the highest positions in London's political life from 1330 to 1350.

Despite these merchant success stories, the overwhelming majority of London apprentices were trained by retailers and artisans representing a wide range of trades. The opportunities available to apprentices of this class were more modest than those open to apprentices of the merchant class. The most successful apprentices of this class would most likely set up a shop and take apprentices of their own. Those who could not meet the financial demands of running their own shops might become permanent journeymen, wage laborers, or even seek to establish themselves as masters in other towns. Unfortunately, we know more about the merchant exceptions than we do about the artisan apprentices who formed the largest segment of London's apprentice population. A list of guild wardens from 1328 however reveals that apprentices and masters from craft guilds did assume positions of power in their trades (Table 3 and Table 4). Only by examining London's

all Rappert's essay on apprentices learning London in 16th c (in Kotschmitt for Ouyue dia)

²⁹ Betty Masters, The Chamberlain of the City of London 1237-1987 (London, 1987), 107.

³⁰ A. Beaven, The Aldermen of the City of London, vol. 1 (London, 1908), 383.

³¹ Beaven, The Aldermen of the City of London, vol. 1, 250

Rappert's article

Table 5: Apprentices Registered In London Between 1309-1312,

By Trade and Trade Groups

Trade	No. entering guild	No. admitted to freedom	Total	% of 541 apprentices
Victuallers	60	57	117	21.6
bakers	0	1	1	-
bladers	2	3	5	0.9
butchers	14	10	24	4.4
buttermen	1	0	1	-
cheesemongers	8	5	13	2.4
cooks	0	1	1	-
fishmongers	27	26	53	9.8
fruiters	0	1	1	-
pepperers	1	6	7	1.3
salters	3	2	5	0.9
spicers	1	0	1	-
taverners	1	1	2	-
vintners	2	1	3	-
Textile Trades	52	38	90	16.6
burellers	7	6	13	2.4
chaloners	3	0	3	-
drapers	7	4	11	2.0
dyers	0	1	1	-
mercers	29	26	55	10.2
shearmen	1	0	1	-
woolmongers	5	1	6	1.1
Leather Trades	46	32	78	14.4
ceynturers	2	1	3	-
cobblers	0	1	1	-
cordwainers	1	1	2	-
curriers	3	3	6	1.1
fusters and joiners	5	2	7	-
girdlers	1	4	5	2.2
girdlers	0	5	5	0.9
glovers	7	4	11	2.0
leathersellers	1	0	1	-
pouchmakers	9	0	9	1.7
saddlers	3	1	4	-
skinners	3	1	4	-
tanners	11	9	20	3.7

21.6

15.7

includes 14.3

14.4

1 - .2
 2 - .4
 3 - .5
 4 - .7

have you checked your numbers? The % column doesn't add up right...

Table 5: Continued

Trade	No. entering guild	No. admitted to freedom	Total	% of 541 apprentices
<i>Other Retailers</i>	30	19	49	9.1
apothecaries	2	1	3	-
chandlers	12	8	20	3.7
cordors	13	5	18	3.3
haymongers	0	2	2	-
potters	3	3	6	1.1
<i>Clothing Trades</i>	17	17	34	6.3
chaucers	6	4	10	1.8
fripperers	1	3	4	-
hatters	5	4	9	1.7
hosiers	2	0	2	-
kissers	2	4	6	1.1
tailors	1	2	3	-
<i>Metal Trades</i>	21	11	32	5.9
braelers	1	0	1	-
buckle-makers	1	1	2	-
cutlers	2	2	4	-
founders	0	1	1	-
goldsmiths	5	1	6	1.1
ironmongers	6	6	12	2.2
lorimers	1	0	1	-
plumbers	4	0	4	-
smiths	1	0	1	-
<i>Wood Trades</i>	12	8	20	3.7
bowyers	3	1	4	-
coopers	1	1	2	-
woodmongers	8	6	14	2.6
<i>Other Crafts</i>	12	6	18	3.3
candlers	8	2	10	1.8
ointers	0	2	2	-
painters	2	1	3	-
paternosterers	1	1	2	-
seal-makers	1	0	1	-

2.4

Table 5: Continued

Trade	No. entering guild	No. admitted to freedom	Total	% of 541 apprentices
<i>Other Services</i>	1	4	5	0.9
barbers	1	2	3	-
boatmen	0	1	1	-
surgeons	0	1	1	-
<i>Unidentified</i>	43	55	98	18.1
<i>Totals</i>	294	247	541	99.9

Source: LBD, 35-179.

guild system which overlapped its class structure, can we gauge the issues of artisan apprentices more closely.

The guild or trade breakdown of the apprentice population reflected the political balance created between merchants and artisans (Table 5). Roughly ~~thirty~~³⁵ five percent of the apprentices enrolled between 1309 and 1312 belonged to the handful of guilds dominated by merchant interests such as the mercers, vintners, fishmongers, and drapers.³² Of this group, the fishmongers and mercers alone accounted for ~~twenty~~²⁰ percent of all the apprentices enrolled. The remaining apprentices represented craft guild organizations attempting to increase their role in civic politics by enrolling more guild members among the city's freemen.

numbers attached to per cent are given in Arabic numerals

is this the right description to use?

The problem with this politically balanced apprenticeship register is that it misrepresented the apprentice population in two ways. First, the registration rates were obviously top heavy because, as previously discussed, merchants and aldermen had more incentive and greater ability to enroll apprentices than did artisans. In fact, two chaloners were fined in the register for not enrolling apprentices.³³ Therefore, underregistration was generally more of a problem for members of craft guilds who were often not well equipped to make the required payments. Second, prescriptive evidence suggests that certain guilds in particular were underrepresented. The cordwainer's provisions against

³² Depending on the criteria used to classify a guild dominated by merchant interest, this figure can be anywhere from 26.0 percent to 47.3 percent. The first figure was derived by calculating the numbers for seven guilds active in the aldermanic council and of unquestioned merchant interest: drapers, mercers, vintners, goldsmiths, pepperers, woolmongers, and fishmongers. The second figure was calculated from the list of 25 guild wardens compiled in 1328, LBE, 232-234.

³³ LBD, 66.

explain!

20

? didn't each guild have a wardens? so, how does this illustrate merchant interest?

authority
you should cite an authority on which guilds were elite merchants which were lowly artisans...

maintaining too many apprentices sound absurd if we believe that only two cordwainer apprentices were enrolled during this period.³⁴ With these problems in mind, the politically well balanced ? apprenticeship list proves to be an off balance representation of London's apprentice population.

From where did these apprentices originate?

Many scholars have treated London's population and its immigration patterns because growth, in every sector of life, was crucial to the evolving capital. Scholars have argued that London's pre-plague population was approximately 40,000-50,000,³⁵ although more recently historians have estimated that London's population in 1300 could have been double that amount.³⁶ With a population approaching 100,000 people, there can be little doubt that immigration ^{played a role in} ~~was~~ crucial for maintaining the population level. ^{An analysis of} The ~~more specific~~ apprenticeship population contained in the 1309-1312 register suggested ^S that at the very least one-third of the apprentices ~~recorded~~ came from outside London.³⁷ Another ⁴¹ ~~forty~~ one percent of the apprentices bore locative surnames which indicated that they came from places other than London. The remaining individuals had occupational surnames with no reference

³⁴ Riley, MGL, vol 2, part i, 84.

³⁵ Williams, Medieval London, 19-20,315-317.

³⁶ Derek Keene, "Medieval London and its Region" London Journal 14, 2 (1989):107; James A Galloway and Margaret Murphy, "Feeding the City: Medieval London and its Agrarian Hinterland" London Journal 16, 1, (1991):3.

³⁷ CPMR, vol 2,xxxi-xxxiv. Of the 536 entries sampled by Thomas, 185 or 35 percent decribed apprentices as originating outside of London.

to place of origin.³⁸ These figures suggest the possibility that as many as ~~seventy~~⁷⁶-six percent of these apprentices immigrated to London from elsewhere. Because many of the locative surnames, however, could have been inherited, a more reliable estimate of ~~fifty~~⁵⁰ to ~~sixty~~⁶⁰ percent is appropriate.

If roughly half or more of these apprentices came from outside London, what counties, towns, or regions contributed most to London's apprenticeship population? Most studies of London immigration have supported the conclusion that the two major regions contributing to London's population were the home counties and the eastern counties, particularly Norfolk. Thrupp's study of 112 apprentices from the 1309-1312 register revealed that ~~sixty~~⁶²-two percent came from the home counties and ~~twenty~~²³-three percent originated from the eastern counties of Lincolnshire, Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk.³⁹ Thrupp's conclusions, though somewhat dated, were consistent with the more recent studies of London immigration conducted by Russell and McClure.⁴⁰ In short, the trends of those apprentices migrating to London mirrored the trends of overall immigration to London.

What economic investment did apprenticeship require?

Individuals, their families, and their masters all made

³⁸ CPMR, vol 2, xxxiii-xxxiv.

³⁹ Thrupp, Merchant Class of Medieval London, 208-210. Apprentices from: Home Counties, 69; Eastern Counties 26. *She doesn't say!*

⁴⁰ J C Russell, "Mediaeval Midland and Northern Migration to London, 1100-1365" Speculum XXXIV (1959):641-645; Peter McClure, "Patterns of Migration in the Late Middle Ages: The Evidence of English Place-Name Surnames" Economic History Review, 2nd ser, XXXII, 2 (May, 1979):167-182. McClure states that roughly 50% of London's immigrants *do* come from places within 40 miles of London. Russell recognizes the importance of eastern counties like Norfolk for immigration trends.

Apprenticeship

OK, so what are the ramifications of this finding (hint - look at Roppoport's essay)

which 112? she doesn't say!

but note the distances they were migrating to London differed from that of other English towns

investments of money, time, and other resources to establish a contract of apprenticeship. Without the necessary funds, a young person could not afford the personal expense of the trip to London, let alone the guild and civic fees required. Although the economic specifics were subject to the parties making the contract-- parents, guardians, masters, and apprentices⁴¹-- would-be apprentices in the early fourteenth century had to pay major fees to the guild and Chamberlain of London.

Guilds charged fees to all who wished to be apprenticed to a master of their trade. The specific requirements for each guild, however, differed from each other, sometimes drastically. A comparison of the economic requirements necessary to enter the cordwainers' guild with those required for the mercers' guild illuminate the common elements and crucial differences found in guild fees. The cordwainers' guild ordinances of 1271 established expensive fees for those apprentices who wished to join their ranks. Each apprentice paid 40s for his or her teaching and 25s for the poor members of the craft.⁴² These payments were fairly large and could, in part, explain why so many cordwainers avoided officially enrolling their apprentices. The mercers' ordinances of 1347 offered a contrast to the steep fees of the cordwainers. When the apprentice entered his or her term, the master paid 2s to the mystery. Upon the completion of the term, the apprentice made another 2s payment to the guild. In addition to these fees,

⁴¹ The personal aspects of these arrangements will be dealt with in section V. The economic aspects of these contracts usually involved clauses requiring the master to provide food, clothing, and shelter for apprentices. In return, the apprentice was to obey the rules set by the master and guild, including restrictions on independent trading. For a sample contract see Hanawalt, Growing Up, 134-135.

⁴² CPMR, vol 2, xxxi.

how do you explain these differences?

three annual installments of 6s 8d were required of each member admitted to the livery.⁴³

Despite the differences in detail between cordwainer and mercer guild fees, the ordinances reveal several similar concerns. *good*

First, each guild required initial payments to begin an apprenticeship term. Second, both ordinances demonstrate a concern for an equitable balance of economic responsibility. On the one hand, the cordwainers had a collection box for poor members, on the other hand, the mercers required equal payments from apprentices and masters. Third, both used payments to define an economic hierarchy reinforcing the emerging social hierarchy of London's guild system. In this way, guilds responded to economic disadvantage or created elite bodies like liveries within their ranks.

In addition to guild fees, apprentices had two major civic fees to pay: an entrance or ingress fee for those beginning their apprenticeships and an exit or egress fee for those finished with the term of their apprenticeship. Despite this simple scheme, apprentices paid a remarkably diverse set of fees and penalties which seemed not to cohere to any consistent set of principles. Before addressing the fees themselves, the civic procedures outlined for the registration of apprentices should be discussed because any deviation from these procedures could (or could not) result in penalties.

The civic statutes of London established four rules for

⁴³ Jean Imray, "Les Bones Gentes de la Mercerye de Londres: A Study of the Membership of the Medieval Mercers' Company" in Studies in London History, edited by A E J Hollaender and William Kellaway (London, 1969), 157.

apprentices relevant to entrance and exit procedures. First, by 1275, chroniclers and legislators insisted that apprentices must serve a master who was a freeman of the city of London.⁴⁴ Second, the same chronicler defined seven years as the minimum duration of an apprenticeship, and in the 1309-1312 register, apprentices were fined for not completing a seven-year term.⁴⁵ Third, as of 1300, all apprentices had to enroll at the Guildhall within a year of the commencement their service.⁴⁶ Fourth, apprentices were fined for practicing their trade before they were enrolled as freemen.⁴⁷ From these rules and the inconsistent enforcement of them, London apprentices could pay fees ranging from nothing to 2 marks to obtain legal recognition as apprentices.

In addition to these fines, there were also many reasons for which an apprentice could be exempted from ^{fines and other} ~~payments of any kind.~~ For instance, the apprentices of Aldermen usually were exempt from any payment, and fees were often reduced or waived at the request of nobles, the Mayor, or other prominent London citizens. It is not clear why these exemptions were allowed, and our understanding of them is complicated by many exceptions.⁴⁸ Several historians have pointed out that guilds with Aldermen on the city council, such as the mercers, corders, and goldsmiths tended to enter the

⁴⁴ Stubbs, The Chronicles of Edward I and Edward II, 85-86. See Thomas' translation in CPMR, vol 2, xxvii. This 1275 entry in the Annales Londoniensis was enforced again in the reign of Edward I. See H T Riley, editor and translator, Liber Albus: The White Book of the City of London (London: Richard Griffin and Company, 1861):237. See appendix I.

⁴⁵ Stubbs, The Chronicles of Edward I and Edward II, 85-86. This statute includes a 7 year minimum clause. See also Riley, Liber Albus, 237.

⁴⁶ Riley, MGL, vol 2, part 1, 93-94. See appendix I.

⁴⁷ Riley, Liber Albus, 237. For a possible oath for freemen see, LBD, 195.

⁴⁸ LBD, 149-150. Richard and Johanna de Chigwell's apprentice, for example, was not excused from payment.

freedom through apprenticeship rather than redemption.⁴⁹

Advantages like fee waiving for Aldermen can, in part, explain these trends. The fees, fines, and exemptions therefore were largely extensions of the complex guild hierarchy developing in London in the early fourteenth century.

The ingress of apprentices more often than not was completed with little complication (Table 6). The standard payment for the ingress of an apprentice was 2s 6d, and ~~ninety~~⁹¹ one percent of the apprentices beginning their terms paid this fee. Just under ~~five~~⁵ percent of the payments were explicitly fines, and less than three percent of those beginning apprenticeships had fees exempted. With only the payments for reference, these fees would seem to be uniform and well enforced.

Nothing, however, could be further from the truth. A H Thomas has noted that many more than thirteen apprentices were enrolled after the one-year grace period, and yet no fine was exacted.⁵⁰ In fact, ~~twelve~~¹² percent of the apprentices made their official ingress two years or more after the commencement of their apprenticeships.⁵¹ Many more apprentices never bothered to register their ~~ingresses~~^{entries} at all; these apprentices often paid fines when they registered for the freedom at the end of their terms (Table 7). Often two consecutive entries appeared with the same set of circumstances, but only one of the apprentices was penalized. For example, Robert de Boreham, purser, had two

⁴⁹ CPMR, vol 2, l-li. Williams, Medieval London from Commune to Capital, 192. Imray, "Les Bones Gentes", 159.

⁵⁰ CPMR, vol 2, xxxii-xxxiii.

⁵¹ LBD, 101, 105, 106, 110, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 131, 133, 135, 137, 138, 139, 144, 166, 171, 172, 174.

apprentices enrolled on May 1, 1312. Both had stood with Robert as apprentices for three years, two years past the grace period, and yet only Payne Godwyne paid a 5s fine because he was not previously enrolled.⁵² William Dawe, on the other hand, paid 2s 6d, the standard ingress fee.

could reflect differences in ability to pay, which was a common guideline in M.A.

The inconsistent enforcement cannot be easily explained.

The majority of the apprentices passed over in this manner served masters from the most powerful guilds: four drapers, three mercers, two fishmongers, two goldsmiths, three ironmongers, two woodmongers, and one corder. The status of these guilds might have been enough to excuse the procedural laxity of their apprentices and masters. These tacit exemptions could be seen as an extension of fee waives[∨] for Aldermen to other members of these powerful guilds. Trade status, however, does not explain the exemption of a painter, chaucer, purser, and ceynturer. Personal status cannot be overlooked as a criterion for these exemption. At the request of Alderman, Nicholas Farndone, William de Westoye paid a standard entrance fee of 2s 6d, despite the five-year hiatus between his entry and his registration.⁵³ In 1328, after taking his master's surname, Porkele, William became a Warden of the painters guild.⁵⁴ Although far from conclusive, William's personal status and connections may have won him favors as an apprentice and as a member of the painters' guild.

yes

⁵² LBD 171-172.

⁵³ LBD, 122.

⁵⁴ LBE, 234. Ekwall, Two Early London Subsidy Rolls, 285. See Table 5.

Table 6: Fees and Fines Paid by Apprentices upon Ingress

Fee or Fine	No. of Apprentices	% of total
Standard Ingress Fee 2s 6d	269	91.5
Fines	17	5.8
<u>Not enrolled within one year:</u>		
3s 4d	1	-
5s	12	4.1
<u>Enrolled before master was a freeman:</u>		
5s	1	-
<u>No reason stated</u>		
5s	3	-
Exemptions	7	2.4
<u>Master was an Alderman</u>		
	3	-
<u>Mayor's request</u>		
	2	-
<u>Master was a Sheriff</u>		
	2	-
Totals:	293	99.7

Source: LBD, 35-179. One entry recorded no fee. LBD, 108.

should be 100.0

why no % figure here?

why no % figures here?

The exit fees for apprentices had more complicated requirements and more inconsistent enforcement than did entrance fees (Table 7). What makes the interpretation of these fees most difficult was the wide range in the payments themselves. Only a little more than one-third of the apprentices paid the standard 2s 6d upon exiting their apprenticeships. Leaving penalties aside, apprentices paid between 2s 8d and 22s 6d for what appear^s to ^{have} been fully legal admissions to the freedom. Why, precisely, some apprentices paid more for the same administrative fee was unclear. Differences in personal wealth might explain, at least in part, the unequal fees. Because exiting apprentices were taking their final steps toward claiming the freedom of the city and in many cases setting up their own shops, the Chamberlain or some other official might have asked the wealthier among them to contribute more money. Unlike entrance fees, occupation, apparently, was not a factor for those who paid higher exit fees. Apprentices from trades as diverse as butchers, bowyers, cutlers, bladers, fishmongers, and fusters paid higher fees with no preference evident in the data. Therefore, for lack of a better explanation, the personal wealth or social status of apprentices might well be an important factor.

any chance they need an installment plan?

With this diversity of fee amounts came a diversity in the kinds of payment the Commonalty required apprentices to make. In addition to exit fees, apprentices might pay for their ingress and egress at the same time, and ⁶ six percent did so. These combined fees ranged from 5s to 1 mark. The 5s payment obviously combines both standard entrance and exit fees (2x 2s 6d), but the higher

Table 7: Fees and Fines Paid by Exiting Apprentices

Fee or Fine	No. of Apprentices	% of Total
Exit Fees	128	51.8
Standard 2s 6d	91	36.8
2s 8d	1	-
4s	1	-
5s	18	7.3
6s 8d	8	3.2
10s	4	-
12s 6d	1	-
13s 4d	1	-
15s 10d	1	-
22s 6d	2	-
Ingress and Exit Fees	16	6.5
Standard 5s	11	4.5
10s	2	-
6s 8d	2	-
13s 4d	1	-
Fines	97	39.3
<i>not previously enrolled</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>23.1</i>
2s 6d	1	-
5s	16	6.5
5s 6d	1	-
6s 8d	10	4.0
7s 6d	1	-
10s	18	7.3
12s 6d	1	-
13s 4d	3	-
15s 10d	3	-
20s	2	-
22s 6d	1	-

*your %s
still don't
add up!
what's going
on
here??*

Table 7: Continued

Fee or Fine	No. of Apprentices	% of Total
<i>not enrolled</i>		
<i>immediately after</i>		
<i>apprenticeship</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>6.5</i>
5s	10	4.0
6s 8d	4	-
10s	1	-
26s 8d	1	-
<i>admitted before</i>		
<i>end of term</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>8.9</i>
5s	6	2.4
6s 8d	4	-
8s 4d	1	-
9s 2d	1	-
10s	3	-
13s 4d	3	-
15s 10d	1	-
20s	1	-
22s 6d	1	-
22s 7d	1	-
<i>practicing trade</i>		
<i>before end of term</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>-</i>
5s	1	-
12s 6d	1	-
Exemptions	6	2.4
Totals	247	100.0

Source: LBD, 35-179.

fees are more difficult to explain. Perhaps again these higher fees reflected a difference in personal wealth. The real question concerning these combined fees is why these apprentices did not pay penalties. By definition of this payment, the apprentices who paid this fee did not enroll when they began their apprenticeships. Why did they not pay a penalty, "because not previously enrolled"?⁵⁵

In some cases, they were indeed paying penalties which were not explicitly stated as such. For instance, John de Benstede enrolled as an apprentice in 1290-1291 and was not officially admitted to the freedom until 24 March 1311, twenty years later.⁵⁶ His 5s payment for ingress and exit was most likely considered a penalty even though not explicitly stated. Why would he have to pay for an ingress which he supposedly made 20 years ago? This document made clear that the guild and civic ordinances describing the proper procedures for apprenticeship, as they now survive, were incomplete guides to these administrative processes. The Chamberlain and other London officials charged with conducting these procedures must have relied not only on these guidelines, but also on either unwritten customs that developed in the Guildhall or written customs that no longer survive.

The explicit penalties further obscure attempts to reconstruct ~~this administrative process~~ because these fines oscillated arbitrarily between leniency and harshness. On the one hand, Geoffrey de Chelchethe worked and traded in London for

⁵⁵ LBD, 35-179. This phrase was used for apprentices who were penalized while exiting for not enrolling their ingress. These apprentices committed the same legal mistake which was mentioned but unpunished.

⁵⁶ LBD, 137-138.

thirty years before being legally admitted to the freedom. Considering the length of his delayed entry, one might expect him to pay a considerable sum. He paid only 5s, "because he had long sustained the burdens of the City".⁵⁷ It is difficult to reconcile Geoffrey's lenient payment with John de Grenewych's 26s 8d fine because he was not enrolled immediately.⁵⁸

maybe they were taking into acct motivation for avoidance?
✓

The blurring of exit fees and redemptions plunges us deeper into the quagmire of inconsistency found in these fees and fine. As the fees for exit and exit penalties became larger they began to appear similar to the redemption format. The most extreme example was the record for the cordwainer, John de Bikleswolde.⁵⁹ Though this entry was written in the register for apprentices, there was no element in the entry itself to distinguish it from a redemption entry. The text reads: "Wednesday before Easter, John de Bikleswolde, cordwaner, admitted to the freedom, before Thomas Romayn, the Mayor, John de Wyndesore and William Trente, Aldermen, and Richard Potrel, the Chamberlain. For obtaining the freedom 22s 6d".⁶⁰ There was no mention of a master, an apprenticeship duration, or any other proof that an apprenticeship had been served. In both linguistic format and in the value of the fee, this entry appeared strikingly close to a redemption entry.⁶¹

There were two major factors contributing to the inconsistencies found in these fees and fines. First, London

⁵⁷ LBD, 140.

⁵⁸ LBD, 165.

⁵⁹ LBD, 115.

⁶⁰ LBD, 115.

⁶¹ Compare with redemption entry for LBD, 58: "Wednesday the Feast of Saint Hillary, 4 Edward II, Richard le Lacer admitted, before John de Wengrave, William de Leire, and Simon de Paris, Aldermen, Luke de Haveryng being then Chamberlain. Gives for the freedom 2 marks."

officials wanted to reorganize and standardize the city's procedures. This attempt required the synthesis of earlier administrative procedures like two apprentice lists from the reign of Edward I with newer ones like the Chamberlain's expanded authority over apprentices since 1300.⁶² The merging of old and new administrative procedures could have caused many of the inconsistencies. Second, the unstable political climate between 1309 and 1312 probably frustrated these attempts as well. Williams has argued that the political climate of this four-year period produced much administrative experimentation including the election of officials.⁶³ Because the London Commonalty wanted and achieved annual elections for several London offices, including the Chamberlain's, three separate Chamberlains had to lead the reforms in apprentice enrollment.⁶⁴ Therefore, with a new officeholder for each year of the register and with a long and complex tradition to synthesize, little continuity can be expected from these records.

In early fourteenth-century London, therefore, an apprentice beginning his or her term would expect to pay not only for the privilege of his or her training but also for the economic and political opportunities apprenticeship offered. Depending on the apprentice's master, lineage, personal wealth, trade, and luck,

⁶² The first and second lists of apprentices kept in Edward I's reign were referred to more than 100 times in the register of 1309-1312 to prove an apprentice's claims. These sources and the older procedures they recorded may well have produced problems for those trying to implement a new process.

⁶³ Williams, Medieval London from Commune to Capital, 270-271.

⁶⁴ Masters, The Chamberlain of the City of London, 106. Richard Poterel was acting Chamberlain from record's start on September 30, 1309 until November 23, 1310. Luke de Haveryng served from November 24, 1310 to November 19, 1311. John Mazeliner was elected to the office on November 20, 1311 and served until the last entry recorded on December 8, 1312.

apprentices paid fees at several stages of their career that reflected a combination of these factors. Of course, a few lucky ones might avoid paying civic fees because their masters were Alderman, but even these apprentices were expected to take on economic responsibility in their guilds.

What time commitment did apprenticeship require?

The time between the entrance and exit of an apprentice is referred to as the apprenticeship duration or term. Like many other aspects of an apprenticeship contract, this term depended on the agreement made between a master, an apprentice, and his or her family. In addition to these personal arrangements, both guilds and civic authorities also established guidelines for how long apprentices should remain in training. Historians of medieval and early-modern apprenticeship generally agree that these guidelines served two main purposes. First, they ensured that masters properly trained apprentices in their craft so that the trade could maintain a high standard of quality from one generation of masters to the next.⁶⁵ Second, apprenticeship durations regulated a mystery's labor force.⁶⁶ By lengthening or shortening the minimum apprenticeship duration, a trade could effectively control the number of masters under its authority. Both guilds and individual apprentices had a stake in durations of service, because of its personal, economic, and political consequences.

⁶⁵ Hanawalt, Growing Up, 135. Steven Smith, "The Ideal and Reality: Apprentice-Master Relationships in Seventeenth Century London," History of Education Quarterly (Winter, 1981):449.

⁶⁶ George Unwin, The Gilds and Companies of London, 4th ed. reprint, (London: Frank Cass and Co. LTD, 1966), 90-91. Steven Smith, "The Ideal and Reality", 449.

The city of London consistently supported a seven-year minimum apprenticeship requirement.⁶⁷ Most of the guild ordinances of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries followed suit, endorsing seven-year minimums as well.⁶⁸ Both Thomas and Hanawalt have demonstrated that the majority of apprentices in the early fourteenth century served seven-year terms.⁶⁹ Approximately one-third of the remaining apprentices, however, served from eight to sixteen years. Thomas has suggested that these lengthy terms, "were mainly in the selling trades, where some knowledge of figures and writing was probably necessary".⁷⁰ Can we test Thomas' statement?

Both aspects of Thomas' statement can be tested by compiling the average apprenticeship durations for each trade (Table 8). Thomas' assertion defines who held the longest apprenticeships and why they held them. By his reckoning, the term of apprenticeship was dependent primarily on economic necessity; if an apprentice required more ^{training?} education for economic success, then he would have a more lengthy duration. The data reveals that Thomas' explanation is correct, but incomplete. First, some apprentices required more education because of political as well as economic necessity. As Table 4 reveals many of these apprentices served in civic or guild offices which required a knowledge of reading and writing. Second, there were trades that did not require reading and

⁶⁷ Stubbs, The Chronicles of Edward I and Edward II, 85-86. See appendix I.

⁶⁸ Riley, Memorials of London and London Life (London, 1868); MGL, vol 2, part 1. One notable and quite early exception was the 10 year minimum established by the Lorimers. Of course, this may be only a coincidence but the only lorimer enrolled in the document served a duration of 10 years. See entry for John Strafford, LBD, 123.

⁶⁹ CPMR, vol 2, xxxiii. Hanawalt, Growing Up, 135.

⁷⁰ CPMR, vol, 2, xxxiii.

writing, but nevertheless had high duration averages. In these cases high durations are better explained by the common practice of restricting the number of masters in a trade.

Examining the durations of the apprentices listed on Table 4 challenges the idea that the political or economic need for more education resulted in longer apprenticeships. Not a single Alderman served an apprenticeship longer than seven years. Evidence for the guild wardens demonstrated similar inconsistencies. The guild wardens of the painters and the cheesemongers served lengthy apprenticeships of eight to ten years, but the mercers, fishmongers, and girdlers all served seven year terms. These apprentices may not be a good test case, however, because these elite men may have learned to read and write before becoming apprentices. Despite the details of these exceptional members, the trades they represented did generally have higher duration averages than other trades in their group. For example, the fishmongers and the cheesemongers had higher averages than most victualling trades just as the mercers and drapers had higher averages than most in the textile trades. For the guilds dominated by merchants and Aldermen, therefore, education and trade control probably worked in tandem to push apprenticeship terms higher.

Some craft guilds or lesser misteries also had high duration averages. The fusters, painters, and lorimers had among the highest duration averages. These trades did not require an extensive knowledge of reading, writing, or numeracy in the early

*more since often c. 5 yrs
an apprentice was
most valuable to the
The master, longer
apprenticeships benefit
masters & not
apprentices - so,
would longer terms
be required &
poorer
apprentices as a
way to pay
back master?
★*

yes

Table 8: Average Duration of Apprenticeship Terms For Various Trades and Trade Groups

v good

Trade	No. of apprentices	Total Years served	Average duration	High	Low
Victuallers	92	747	8.1	14	5
bakers	1	9	9.0	-	-
bladers and cornmongers	3	21	7.0	7	7
butchers	20	158	7.9	12	7
buttermen	1	8	8.0	-	-
cheesemongers	9	77	8.5	14	7
cooks	1	7	7.0	-	-
fishmongers	43	359	8.3	14	5 <i>was a big difference</i>
pepperers	6	41	6.8	7	6
salters	4	36	9.0	12	7
spicers	1	7	7.0	-	-
taverners	1	12	12.0	-	-
vintners	2	12	6.0	7	5
Textile Trades	79	610.5	7.7	15	4
burellers	11	78	7.1	8	7
chaloners	3	21	7.0	7	7
drapers	9	78	8.7	15	7
dyers	1	7	7.0	-	-
merciers	49	382.5	7.8	12	4
shearmen	1	7	7.0	-	-
woolmongers	5	37	7.4	9	7
Clothing Trades	26	186	7.2	9	6
chaucers	9	63	7.0	8	6
fripperers	2	15	7.5	8	7
hatters	7	51	7.3	9	7
hosiers	2	14	7.0	7	7
kissers	5	36	7.2	8	7
tailors	1	7	7.0	-	-
Leather Trades	57	438	7.7	14	4
ceynturers	2	17	8.5	10	7
cordwainers	1	7	7.0	-	-
curriers	4	28	7.0	7	7
fusters and joiners	6	52	8.6	14	7
girdlers	3	24	8.0	10	7
girdlers	2	14	7.0	7	7
glovers	7	55	7.9	10	7
leathersellers	1	8	8.0	-	-

Table 8: Continued

Trade	No. of apprentices	Total Years served	Average duration	High	Low
pouchmakers	9	73	8.1	12	4
saddlers	3	22	7.3	8	7
skinners	3	26	8.6	12	7
tanners	16	112	7.0	7	7
Metal Trades	27	225	8.3	13	5
buckle-makers	2	14	7.0	7	7
cutlers	3	24	8.0	10	7
goldsmiths	6	53	8.8	13	7
ironmongers	10	84	8.4	11	5
lorimers	1	10	10.0	-	-
plumbers	4	33	8.3	10	7
smiths	1	7	7.0	-	-
Wood Trades	14	112	8.0	14	7
bowyers	4	32	8.0	9	7
coopers	1	6	6.0	-	-
woodmongers	9	74	8.2	14	7
Other Crafts	15	128	8.5	11	7
candlers	9	70	7.7	9	7
ointers	1	10	10.0	-	-
painters	3	31	10.3	11	10
paternosterers	1	7	7.0	-	-
seal-makers	1	10	10.0	-	-
Other Retailers	38	301	7.9	12	7
apothecaries	2	14	7.0	7	7
chandlers	15	107	7.1	9	7
cordors	14	121	8.6	12	7
haymongers	2	14	7.0	7	7
potters	5	45	9.0	11	7

Table 8: Continued

Trade	No. of apprentices	Total Years served	Average duration	High	Low
Other Services	3	24	8.0	10	7
barbers	2	14	56% 7.0	7	7
surgeons	1	10	100% 10.0	-	-
Unidentified	70	548	7.8	16	4
Totals	421	3295.5	7.8	16	4

Source: LBD, 35-179.

3319.5

7.9

fourteenth century, and therefore their high duration averages were more likely due to restrictive tactics. Anecdotal evidence supports this claim. Because the saddlers put out work to each of these trades, the saddlers often tried to manipulate and control these trades for their economic advantage. In 1308, for example, the articles of the saddlers and fusters attempted to mediate the proper relationship between these trades.⁷¹ The tension among the four trades continued throughout the first half of the fourteenth century culminating in a suit brought by the saddlers against the fusters.⁷² During the 1350 case, the saddlers complained that, "the Fusters had agreed not to take any apprentices, with the intention of restricting the number in their mistery, so that they could control prices".⁷³ Furthermore, they charged that, "A similar confederacy had formerly existed among the lorimers in copper, of whom there were now only two left to serve the whole people".⁷⁴ Therefore, for craft guilds like the lorimers, painters, and fusters, trade restriction is a better explanation for high duration averages than education.

yes

If guilds raised and lowered duration requirements to meet educational and economic needs, what other factors dictated the length of an individual apprentice's term?[?] First, the average age of entry for a male apprentice was fourteen in the early

*Jeanette, File 02
Hard drive Real!*

⁷¹ Riley, MGL, vol. 2, part i, 80-81.

⁷² CPMR, vol 1, 238-239.

⁷³ CPMR, vol 1, 238.

⁷⁴ CPMR, vol 1, 238. The reference to lorimers is particularly interesting in this context because in 1261 the lorimers issued their ordinances which required a ten year duration for all lorimer apprentices. Riley, MGL, vol. 2, part i, 78-79. In 1320, the saddlers burned the lorimers ordinances in Cheap. Unwin, The Gilds and Companies of London, 86.

fourteenth century.⁷⁵ Variations in the age of an apprentice might also result in a longer or shorter apprenticeship. For instance, it is possible that Simon Maitham, who served a sixteen-year apprenticeship, was much younger than fourteen years of age when he began his apprenticeship.⁷⁶ Money or the lack thereof could also account for variation in the length of an apprenticeship. For instance, an apprentice could purchase his or her freedom before the completing a full term, or a master might release an apprentice from service due to financial trouble.⁷⁷ The age and resources of an individual apprentice, therefore, were also important factors in the variations of the length of service. ✓

The tendency to increase the term of service for apprentices did not continue into the sixteenth century. Rappaport has demonstrated that the average term in sixteenth-century London was a little more than seven years.⁷⁸ His figures are confirmed by trends at Bristol as well.⁷⁹ The major difference then between early-modern and medieval apprenticeship terms is the age at which apprentices began their service. Sixteenth-century apprentices generally began their terms between the ages of 18 and 22 because guilds increasingly demanded that apprentices be literate.⁸⁰ The issue of education and its influence on the enrollment of apprentices, therefore, continued to be an important factor in the

⁷⁵ Hanawalt, Growing Up, 135.

⁷⁶ LBD, 134.

⁷⁷ CPMR, vol 1, 243. Two consecutive entries deal with William Kyng . In the first, the jury commanded that he release his apprentice from service because he could not afford to keep him. In the second, he was thrown in jail because he owed debts.

⁷⁸ Rappaport, Worlds within Worlds, 294.

⁷⁹ A. Yarbrough, "Apprentices as Adolescents in Sixteenth-Century Bristol" Journal of Social History 13/1 (1979), 68.

⁸⁰ Rappaport, Worlds within Worlds, 297-299.

lives of apprentices well into the sixteenth century.

What Emotional Stake Did Apprentices, Families, and Masters Place in the Institution of Apprenticeship?

Apprentices, families, and masters invested money and time to the institution of apprenticeship. Was this, however, only an economic and political institution or did it have an emotional component as well? Medieval and early-modern scholars have identified three important themes in the social lives of apprentices. First, Hanawalt, Yarbrough, Smith, and most other scholars of apprenticeship have stressed that apprentices were vital members of the households in which they served,⁸¹ and some have compared apprenticeship to adoption.⁸² Second, Hanawalt and Yarbrough have also emphasized that apprenticeship formed a distinct social period in a person's life coinciding with the biological changes of puberty.⁸³ Third, Smith has argued that apprentices had their own rebellious subculture which served as a period of learning and waiting before they assumed adult responsibilities.⁸⁴ Although apprentices in the fourteenth century did exhibit rebellious tendencies, Hanawalt has questioned the idea of a youth culture in medieval London. These three themes stress the notion that apprentices, masters, and families had an

good ↓

81 Hanawalt, Growing Up, 170-171. A. Yarbrough, "Apprentices as Adolescents in Sixteenth-Century Bristol," 67-81. Smith, "The Ideal and Reality", 449-451.

82 Hanawalt, Growing Up, 129-153. CPMR, vol 2, xxxiii.

83 Hanawalt, Growing Up, 129-131. Yarbrough, "Apprentices as Adolescents", 67-68.

84 Smith, "The Ideal and Reality", 449-459.

emotional stake in apprenticeship and the relationships it created.

There is much evidence from medieval and early-modern sources that masters and their families formed intimate bonds with the apprentices in their homes. Masters often left bequests to apprentices in wills demonstrating their affection. In his will, Master Reginald Abytone left, "To Roger his son a shop in the parish of S. Mary de Colcherche; and another shop to Simon his apprentice".⁸⁵ By granting a similar bequest to son and apprentice, Reginald demonstrated the value masters often placed in apprentices.

This affection was not expressed by masters alone. Apprentices sometimes left marks of affection upon their wills as well. Hamo de Chigwell left all of his tenements to the church of Saint Paul in return for, "services at the altar of S. Thomas Martyr in the said church for the good of the souls of Thomas his father, Cecilia his mother, Richard, Walter, and William, and all the faithful departed".⁸⁶ The Richard mentioned in the will was most likely Richard de Chigwell, his master, appropriately placed next to Hamo's parents. Because Hamo was granting property given to him by Richard de Chigwell, a separate claim was made for the property. In the description of the legal proceedings, the author wrote that it was, "Richard de Chigwell, who granted them [the tenements] to Hamond de Dene, fishmonger, who now in his aforesaid testament calls himself Hamo de Chigwell, for life".⁸⁷ The

⁸⁵ R. Sharpe, ed., Calendar of Wills Enrolled in the Court of Husting, vol. 1 (London, 1890), 272. LBD, 109.

⁸⁶ Riley, Calendar of Wills Enrolled in the Court of Husting, 382.

⁸⁷ Riley, Calendar of Wills Enrolled in the Court of Husting, 383.

adoption of a master's name was not an uncommon practice among London apprentices. In fact, ¹⁰~~ten~~ percent of the apprentices in the 1309-1312 freedom register bore the same surname as their masters, and others adopted their master's surname later in their lives. This practice of London apprentices probably reflected the many complex layers found in a master/apprentice relationship including the dominance of the master, the economic benefits derived from taking the masters name, and genuine affection.

yes

Hanawalt, Yarbrough, and others argue that this affection was produced during a well-defined social stage for adolescents. Apprentices were expected to act according to the same rules as other members of the house. Contracts generally forbade apprentices to marry, fornicate, waste money, or betray the master's secrets.⁸⁸ Moreover, Yarbrough and Hanawalt argue that the ingress of an apprentice and his or her subsequent admission to the freedom constituted rites of passage from childhood to adolescence and from adolescence to adulthood.⁸⁹ Hanawalt argues that the formality of these ceremonies was designed in part to impress apprentices with the authority of city and guild.⁹⁰ Yarbrough adds that these ceremonies might include tests or other rites of passage.⁹¹ These ceremonies demonstrate another aspect of the emotional effort dedicated to apprentices.

Did apprentices or masters sometimes vent their emotions in negative or destructive ways? Court evidence demonstrates that

⁸⁸ Hanawalt, Growing Up, 135.

⁸⁹ Hanawalt, Growing Up, 139-141. Yarbrough, "Apprentices as Adolescents", 75-76.

⁹⁰ Hanawalt, Growing Up, 141.

⁹¹ Yarbrough, "Apprentices as Adolescents", 75.

masters and apprentices did at times behave irresponsibly or violently. Masters often complained of apprentices stealing or wasting money, and apprentices charged their masters with neglect or physical violence.⁹² Citing the established tradition of Shrove Tuesday violence and literary examples of the heroic apprentice, Smith argues that in seventeenth-century London apprentices formed their own rebellious subculture.⁹³ Medieval London apprentices, however, had little chance to develop such a subculture because as Hanawalt argues, "With only one or two apprentices in a household it was hard for the young men to form a strong youth culture in defiance of their masters".⁹⁴ Indeed, the register of 1309-1312 reveals that the majority of apprentices lived with masters who had taken only one apprentice. The apprentices of the bench were the closest medieval equivalent to the seventeenth-century subculture described by Smith. Because they lived together and not under the direct supervision of a master, they had more time to congregate in the manner Smith describes.⁹⁵ Despite the lack of a youth subculture in medieval London, apprentices ^{how?} did vent their frustrations in a ^{shrove tuesday rituals} variety of ways which shows a less amicable side of the emotional issues of apprentices.

others also argue they - also 16th c evidence for this subculture, also note that the 16th c gilds were much larger & more hierarchical than in 17th c - they had clearly distinguished elite groups of liverymen or also groups of 'backbiters'

in many guilds the latter promoted existence of a youth-oriented sub-culture

92 CPMR, vol 1, 243,268-269,275- 276.
93 Smith, "The Ideal and Reality", 455-457.
94 Hanawalt, Growing Up, 137.
95 Hanawalt, Growing Up, 126.

Conclusion

The register of 1309-1312 provides⁵ a rare glimpse at the inchoate institution of apprenticeship on the verge of becoming a major staple in the London political diet. This document predicted the battles for control taking place in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries concerning apprenticeship. By the early fifteenth century, the Commonalty petitioned that, "the Freedom of the City may thenceforth be obtained by apprenticeship only".⁹⁶ Although this extreme stance was never quite adopted, the spirit of this reform idea had its seeds in the early fourteenth century.

On December 1, 1312, while the Chamberlain recorded the last entries of this register, the first official meeting of city's guilds was held in the Guildhall.⁹⁷ The meeting represented the rising influence of guilds in London; the administrative growth of guilds was a prominent feature of fourteenth-century political life in London. The development of the institution of apprenticeship paralleled the administrative growth of guilds. Unwin observed that, "By the charter of 1319 the crafts had been made the main--almost the exclusive--avenue to citizenship".⁹⁸ Once the guild was established as the main vehicle for the city freedom, apprenticeship did not lag far behind. Almost all guild ordinances approved by the Commonalty contained

⁹⁶ LBI, 63.

⁹⁷ LBE, 12-14.

⁹⁸ Unwin, The Gilds and Companies of London, 76.

clauses concerning apprentices,⁹⁹ and in 1364 the Commonalty petitioned that the cost of redemptions be raised to 60s so that more people would serve the city as apprentices.¹⁰⁰ By the end of the fourteenth century, London guilds and apprenticeship were established and growing institutions.

The apprentice population represented in the 1309-1312 register reflected the ~~the~~ political, social, and economic developments ~~of~~ London. The registered population demonstrated women's contributions as masters, and the lack of any female apprentices attests to the difference between male and female apprenticeships during this period. Moreover, the apprentice population reflected the political balance between merchant guilds and craft guilds. The immigration patterns of apprentices were consistent with the pattern of London immigration in general. The political climate of London during this period resulted in a highly irregular enforcement of apprenticeship legislation, particularly for the issue of fees and fines. The duration in apprenticeship terms varied widely demonstrating the different educational and political needs required for apprentices of different classes and guilds. The emotional aspects of apprenticeship revealed a range of responses among apprentices from respect, admiration, and affection for masters to violent reactions. Despite the incomplete nature of this register and the complex and inconsistent system of apprenticeship it describes, the text reveals much detail of a little known segment of medieval

too many
acutemes
with some
structure
give your
prose a
staccato
rhythm...

⁹⁹ H T Riley, Memorials of London and London Life , 63-248.

¹⁰⁰ LBG, 179. Unwin, The Gilds and Companies of London, 91.

London society which was strikingly similar to London society at large.

APPENDIX I

Statutes and Ordinances Relevant to Apprenticeship
(Text and Translation)

your translation? if yes, say so

1. 1275 entry concerning apprenticeship. From: Annales Londoniensis. Printed in: Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II. Edited by William Stubbs. (London: Kraus Reprint, 1965), 85-86.

Eodem anno quaedam libertas in Londoniis fuit provisa, ut apprenticiorum nomina abbreviarentur in papirio camerae Gildaulae, et eorum nomina qui libertatem dictae civitatis emere voluerunt, in eodem papirio insererentur; et cujus nomen non fuit in dicto papirio, libertate civitatis privaretur. Et hoc factum est bona ratione, quia multi se jactitabant se esse liberos, qui non fuerunt liberi. Sed sciendum est, quod tribus modis acquiritur homini libertas civitatis:--Primo quod sit homo natus in civitate legitime ex patre; secundo quod homo sit apprenticius cum libero homine per septem annos et non minus; tertio quod homo mutuat suam libertatem coram majore et aliis aldermannis cum camerario civitatis.

In the same year (1275), a ^{certain} ~~special kind of~~ liberty was established in London, so that the names of apprentices might be compiled on a paper at the chamber of the Guildhall, and so that the names of those who wanted to obtain ^{buy} the freedom of the said city might be included on the same paper, and so that he whose name was not on the said paper might be denied the liberty of the city. And this was done for a good reason, because many who were not freemen^{*} were claiming themselves to be so. But it ought to be known that the freedom of the city is obtained in three ways: First, that one may be legitimately born of his father in the city. Second, that one may be an apprentice with a freeman for 7 years and no less. Third, that one may purchase his freedom from the chamberlain in the presence of the mayor and the other alderman. ^{a man by patrimony}

2. Ordinances of 1300 concerning both the chamberlains accounts and apprentices. From: Liber Custumarum f. 54b. Printed in: Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis, Vol 2, part 1. Edited by H T Riley. (Rolls Series, 1859-1860), 93-94.

Ordinatio de Compoto Camerariorum

Memorandum, quod die Sabbati proxima post festum Exaltationis Sanctae Crucis, anno regni Regis Edwardi, filii Regis Henrici, xxviii, concordatum fuit per Elyam Russel, tunc Majorem Londoniarum, Galfridum de Nortone, Willelmum de Leire, et aliorum

Aldermannorum, quod omnes Camerarii Camerae Gilhaldae Londoniarum qui pro tempore erunt, de caetero, quolibet anno, infra festum Sancti Michaelis et festum Apostolorum Symonis et Judae, coram Majore qui pro tempore erit, vel aliquo alio certo per ipsum et Aldermannos electo, reddant computum de toto tempore eorum quo extiterint Camerarii Camerae praedictae.

Ordinatio Apprenticiorum

Memorandum, quod dictis die et anno, coram dictis Majore at Aldermannis, concordatum fuit, quod omnes apprenticii qui de caetero infra primum annum a dominis suis non intrentur in papyro, quod nomina eorum irrotulentur in quadam schedula, et in proximo Hustengo Majori et Aldermannis ostendentur; ita quod, per Majorem duo Aldermanni eligentur, et associentur Camerario Camerae qui pro tempore erit; ita quod praefati duo Aldermanni, una cum Camerario, habeant plenam potestatem ad audiendum et terminandum, et fines recipiendum, de praedictis apprenticiis.

Ordinance concerning the Chamberlain's Accounts

Note, on the day of the Sabbath immediately after the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, ^{in the} year 28th of the ^{reign} of King Edward, son of King Henry, it was agreed by Elyas Russel, then the Mayor of London, Galfridus de Nortone, William de Leyre, and other Aldermen, that each Chamberlain of the Chamber of the Guildhall of London, whoever he may be at the time, will render the accounts from his entire period, that is he who had been Chamberlain of the aforementioned Hall, for all future years, between the Feast of Saint Michael and the Feast of the Apostles Simon and Jude, in the presence of the Mayor, whoever he may be at that time or some other specified person elected for this and in the presence of the Aldermen.

Ordinance of Apprentices

Note, that on the said day and year, in the presence of the said Mayor and Aldermen, it was agreed that all apprentices who are not in the future entered on the paper within the first year by their masters should have their names registered in a certain list, which is to be shown to the Mayor and Aldermen in the next Court of Husting so that through the Mayor, 2 Aldermen may be elected and joined with the Hall's Chamberlain, whoever he may be at the time, so that the 2 ^{aforsaid} predetermined Aldermen, with the Chamberlain, may have full power to hear and to terminate [cases] and to receive fines from the aforementioned apprentices.

Appendix II

This database uses PCFILE7 software to enter all of the apprentices noted in Letter Book D of the Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London, edited by R. R. Sharpe (London, 1902). The record lists the apprentices enrolled from 9/29/1309 to 12/08/1312 in the Chamberlain's register of London. Below are the guidelines employed to enter the data. All entries are entered in lower case unless otherwise specified.

A few comments should be made concerning how the values for tables 1-4 were calculated. First, all occupational attributions refer to the master's occupation which is the most relevant information for interpreting what guild rules applied to apprentices. Second, some of the occupational groupings need to be justified, in particular the association between the fusters and the joiners. Joiners, according to J R Dolan, performed fine woodwork not undertaken by carpenters. In London, however, joiners probably made saddle tree bows as did fusters. Furthermore, bladers and cornmongers were counted together because at this period in London history cornmongers were referred by the latin word, "bladarius" and apparently Sharpe translated it with cornmongers and bladers interchangeably. For more information see: George Unwin, ed. Finance and Trade under Edward III (Manchester, 1918):23.

*footnote
+ there are
better sources
for these than
Dolan...*

Field Name	Type	Length	Description
app_name	c	50	The forname and surname of the apprentice ^{as they} appears in Letter Book D, with the forname written first and the surname following.
stapp_name	c	40	Standardized and abbreviated entry of the apprentice's name, written in surname, forname format. The standard name is simply the spelling most commonly used in the document. Abbreviations and Codes: f=son of n=nephew of b=brother of abbreviated locative particles: a=atte d=de

occ_doc	c	20	Records the apprentices occupation as written
occ_flag	c	4	Records the source from which occupational information is obtained if not contained within the entry itself

occ_flag codes

ass--assumed from master/apprentice's occupation
beav--Beaven's Alderman of the City of London
ekwa--Ekwall's Studies on the Population of London
epmr--Early Mayor's Court Rolls
hust--Wills Enrolled at the Court of Husting
lba-lbk--Letter Books A-K
pmm--Plea and Memoranda Rolls(1323-1381)
thru--Thrupp's Merchant Class of Medieval London
1292--1292 Subsidy
1319--1319 Subsidy

occ_gr	c	2	Organizes the occupations in st_occ into groups to facilitate comparisons
---------------	---	---	---

occ_gr codes

<i>v</i> --victuallers	<i>l</i> --leather/skin trades
<i>o</i> --other crafts	<i>c</i> --clothing trades
<i>m</i> --metal trades	<i>p</i> --professionals
<i>t</i> --textile manufacturer	<i>w</i> --wood trades
<i>b</i> --building trades	<i>s</i> --other services
<i>*</i> --trades with distributive functions	
<i>+</i> --trades with merchant functions	

st_occ	c	6	Six letter code representing occupations in occ_doc (shown below)
---------------	---	---	---

st_occ codes

organized in occupational groups occ_gr

Code**occ doc variants**

v--victuallers

baker
blader
butche
butter

cheese
cook
cornmo
fishmo

fruter
pepper
salter
spicer
tavern
vintne

baker
blader
butcher
butterman, le
smeremongere*
formager*
cook
cornmonger*
fishmonger,
pesshoner,
stokfisshmongere*+
fruter, fruiter*
pepperer, peverer*+
salter, saltere*+
spicer
taverner
vintner, vyneter*+

l--leather/skin trades

ceintu

cobble
cordwa
currie
fuster
girdle
glover
leathe
pouchm
saddle
skinne
tanner

ceinturer, ceynturer
(maker of waist-belts)
cobbler
cordwainer
currier
fuster, joiner
girdler
glover, gaunter
leatherseller
pouchmaker
saddler
skinner
tanner

c--clothing trades

chauce
frippe

hatter

hosier
kisser

tailor

chaucer
fripperer, pheliper,
feliper (dealer in
second hand clothes)*
hattere, chapeler,
capper*+
hosier
kyssere, kissere
(maker of kushes, armour)
tailor

t--textile trades	
<i>burell</i>	bureller
<i>chalon</i>	chaloner (maker of blankets)
<i>draper</i>	draper**
<i>dyer</i>	dyer
<i>mercier</i>	mercier**
<i>shearm</i>	shearman
<i>woolmo</i>	woolmonger**
m--metal trades	
<i>braele</i>	braeler
<i>buckle</i>	buckle-maker
<i>cutler</i>	cutler
<i>founde</i>	founder
<i>goldsm</i>	goldsmith
<i>ironmo</i>	ironmonger
<i>lorime</i>	lorimer
<i>plumbe</i>	plumber
<i>smith</i>	smith
w--wood trades	
<i>bowyer</i>	bowyer
<i>cooper</i>	cooper
<i>woodmo</i>	woodmonger*
o--other crafts	
<i>candle</i>	candeler, cirger, cyrer
<i>ointer</i>	ointer
<i>painte</i>	painter, peyntour
<i>patern</i>	paternostrer (a maker of rosary beads)
<i>seal-m</i>	seal-maker
r- other retailers	
<i>apothe</i>	apothecary
<i>chaund</i>	chaundlers, chandlers
<i>corder</i>	corder+
<i>haymon</i>	haymonger*
<i>potter</i>	potter, pottere, poter*
s--other services	
<i>barber</i>	barber
<i>boatma</i>	boatman
<i>surgeo</i>	surgeon

rec_date	d	8	The date of the record itself. This is not necessarily the date of entry into apprenticeship. Expressed in yyyy/mm/dd format
mas_name	c	40	The forname and surname of the master as it appears in Letter Book D
stmas_name	c	30	Standardized entry of the master's name.
mocc_doc	c	20	Each entry reflects the occupation of the master as written in the document.
st_mocc	c	6	6 letter code representing mocc_doc. Same as st_occ codes above.
mocc_flag	c	4	Same as occ_flag above.
mocc_gr	c	2	Same as occ_gr above.
S_entr	n	4	Shilling component of the entrance fee into apprenticeship.
P_entr	n	4	Pence component of the entrance fee into apprenticeship.
M_entr	n	4	Mark component of the entrance fee into apprenticeship.
entr_tot	n	4	A calculated field which converts the data from the three fields above into shillings. The formula is: ((S_entr)+(M_entr*13.33)+(P_entr/12))
S_exit	n	4	Shilling component of the exit fee
P_exit	n	4	Pence component of the exit fee.

M_exit	n	4	Mark component of the exit fee.
exit_tot	n	4	A calculated field which converts the data from the three fields into shillings. The formula is: ((S_exit)+(M_exit*13.33)+(P_exit/12))

The majority of the transactions recorded in the list of apprentices fall into one of the two categories above (either *entr_tot* or *exit_tot*). Because the document only covers a period of 3 1/2 years, half the length of an average term of apprenticeship, most apprentices were only recorded as having paid one of the two fees. Some apprentices recorded, however, did pay both fees.

In addition to these two major fees, there were also many other fees and penalties paid by apprentices for various reasons. Almost all of these fees could be counted as exit fees, but for the purpose of precision have been recorded in a separate field. A survey of these various fees follows a description of the their fields.

S_fee	n	4	Shilling component of various fees
P_fee	n	4	Pence component of various fees.
M_fee	n	4	Mark component of various fees
fee_tot	n	4	A calculated field which converts the three previous fields into shillings. The formula is: ((S_fee)+(M_fee*13.33)+(P_fee/12))
fee_f1	c	4	Differentiates the types of fees and penalties paid.

fee_f1 codes

Other fees

i+e--ingress and egress or entrance and exit. Some apprentices paid both the entrance and the exit fees at the same time. When paid together the fee is usually 5 shillings, but can be 10 shillings or higher.

red--redemption. Several apprentices, despite their service, enter the freedom by redemption. The reason for this remains unclear. There is no doubt, however, that

certain guild/craft organizations enter almost entirely by redemption. The cordwainers are just such a guild. Despite the fact that they had many apprentices, only 1 cordwainer entered via apprenticeship compared to 26 who entered via redemption. Redemption fees tend to be higher than apprenticeship fees and are usually introduced by different linguistic formulae.

Penalties

Apprentices (not their masters) were penalized for not following the proper procedures for entering apprenticeships and the freedom of the city. These rules were enforced sporadically and inconsistently. Nevertheless, many apprentices had to pay fines for not following the procedures.

abet--admitted before the end of term. Many apprentices were admitted to the freedom of the city before they formally finished their apprenticeships. A fine was imposed on those who did so.

abmf--apprenticed before master had the freedom. This fine was meant to deter apprentices from practicing with masters who were not freemen. On the other hand, such practice was probably quite common. In fact, the document recognizes many people who were not officially admitted to the freedom but were excused because they had long borne the burdens of the city.

bnef--because not enrolled in the first year of apprenticeship. Those entering an apprenticeship had to be enrolled within a year and a day. If not, an apprentice might pay a fine.

rnei--because not enrolled immediately after apprenticeship. Many apprentices practiced their trade before formally becoming freemen of London. This fee was imposed to deter such activities. Many of those recorded in LBD could have been charged with this fee but were not.

bnpe--because not previously enrolled. This is a penalty enforced against those who did not enroll when entering their apprenticeships. For example, if an apprentice completed his term and wished to be admitted to the freedom of the city, he could be charged this

penalty if his entrance to apprenticeship was not recorded.

pbt--practiced trade before the end of term. Many apprentices also practiced their trade for personal profit before they finished their formal apprenticeship. This fee was imposed on those who had done so.

Reduced Fees

Some apprentices paid reduced fees or were excused from fees altogether. Usually this was a sign of some privilege but it was not necessarily so.

aiom, aioM, aioS--at the instance of master, Mayor, Other. Some apprentices paid lower fees "at the instance of" some superior be it a master, Mayor, or other.

pnba--pays nothing because apprenticed to an alderman. Apprentices of aldermen were excused from many civic fees and yet many apprentices of aldermen pay these fines anyway.

quit--quitclaimed. Some fees were just quitclaimed without any further explanation.

Despite all of this classification, these miscellaneous fees are problematic because often a person cited as paying a penalty pays precisely what one would pay if unpenalized. Moreover, there is quite a bit of overlap between these categories. Often the intention of a specific penalty is quite unclear or contradictory.

durat	n	4	The length of the term of the apprenticeship in years.
dur_f1	c	4	This flag differentiates between two different ways of expressing the length of apprenticeship. It also designates two exceptional cases that occur frequently.

dur_f1 codes

app-- this is a term of apprenticeship. This represents a prescriptive term length in years. It does not represent how long the person actually served as an

apprentice but rather how long the person was supposed to have served. For apprentices entering the freedom, the term length constitutes that agreed upon between the master and the apprentice. For those exiting apprenticeship and entering the freedom, this figure represents either written or oral proof of the completion of the term. Both provide only a prescriptive length of the term.

fita--from ingress to admission. Often for those exiting the apprenticeship and entering the freedom, the entry includes the date of ingress as opposed to the length of the term. For example, the entry will state that an apprentice was enrolled in 28 Edward I. By subtracting the current year from the year of ingress, we obtain an approximate length of time from ingress to admission to the freedom.

The reason for calculating these two values is as follows: By subtracting the average of *app* from the average *fita*, we can determine the average period of time between the end of an apprenticeship and when one takes up the freedom of the city. Despite the imprecision of the numbers, this value may be telling nevertheless.

rel--if the *fita* value is less than the prescribed *app* value or the entry explains that the apprentice was released early from his his term than the *rel*-released flag is marked.

Of course these figures and the scheme for their classification are not perfect but hopefully they will allow for the utmost precision in discussing the length of apprenticeship terms. To preserve this aim some figures have been specially classified as contradictory because of the special problems they pose.

cont--If the figures are blatantly contradictory, then the figure is classified as *cont*--contradictory. For example, in 4 Edward II good men of the mercery testified that one of their apprentices served for 9 years. In the next sentence, the apprentices ingress is cited as I Edward II. Obviously, this apprentice was enrolled very late or released quite early in either case the figure will certainly throw off any attempt to discuss accurately the duration of apprentices in general.

ward n 4 The ward association listed for the

apprentice.

ward codes

<i>aleg</i> --Alegate	<i>aldg</i> --Aldersgate
<i>bayn</i> --Castle Baynard	<i>bass</i> --Bassieshawe
<i>bill</i> --Billingsgate	<i>bish</i> --Bishopsgate
<i>brad</i> --Broadstreet	<i>bred</i> --Breadstreet
<i>brid</i> --Bridge (Pontis)	<i>cand</i> --Candlewickstreet
<i>chep</i> --Cheap (For')	<i>colm</i> --Colmanstreet
<i>cord</i> --Cordwainerstreet	<i>corn</i> --Cornhille
<i>crep</i> --Creplegate	<i>dowe</i> --Dowegate
<i>farn</i> --Farndone	<i>lang</i> --Langbourne
<i>l+ng</i> --Ludegate and Newgate	<i>vine</i> --Vinetry
<i>quee</i> --Queenhithe	<i>towe</i> --Tower (Turris)
<i>wale</i> --Walbrook	<i>lyme</i> --Lymestreet

ward_fl c 2 This field describes the nature of the ward identification.

ward_fl codes

Apparently, lists of apprentices were organized by ward both before and after the list contained in the LBD. From the information given in LBD, partial ward lists of apprentices can be reconstructed.

b--both ingress and exit in ward

e--exit enrolled in said ward

i--ingress enrolled in said ward

u--unspecified designation. This refers to cases where a marginal note or internal reference identifies an apprentice as of a particular ward.

***--secondary ward association

?i--ingress of unspecified ward or other civic list of apprentices

mas_gen c 2 Records the gender of the master or masters. All of the apprentices enrolled are male. There are, however, 16 female masters recorded in the list.

List of Abbreviations

<u>CPMR</u>	<u>Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls</u>
<u>EMCR</u>	<u>Calendar of Early Mayor's Court Rolls</u>
<u>LBA-LBL</u>	<u>Calendar of Letter Books, vols. A-L</u>
<u>MGL</u>	<u>Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis</u>

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources

- Ekwall, Eilert, ed. Two Early London Subsidy Rolls. Lund, 1951.
- Riley, H T, ed. Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis, vols 1-3.
London: Rolls Series, 1859-1860.
- Riley, H T, ed. Liber Albus: The White Book of the City of London.
London: Richard Griffin and Company, 1861.
- Riley, H T, ed. Memorials of London and London Life. London:
Longmans, Green, and Co., 1868.
- Sharpe, R., ed. Calendar of Wills Enrolled in the Court of
Husting, vols. 1-2. London, 1890.
- Sharpe, R., ed. Calendar of Letter Books of The City of London,
vols. A-L. London, 1899-1912.
- Stubbs, William, ed. The Chronicles of Edward I and Edward II.
Rolls Series, no. 76, vol 1. London: Rolls Series, 1882.
- Thomas, A H, ed. Calendar of Early Mayor's Court Rolls.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924.
- Thomas, A H, ed. Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls, vols. 1-2.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926-1929.

Secondary Sources

- Barron, Caroline. "The 'Golden Age' of Women in Medieval London." Reading Medieval Studies 15 (1989): 35-58.
- Beaven, A. The Aldermen of the City of London, vols 1-2. London: The Corporation of the City of London, 1908-1913.
- Ben-Amos, I K. "Women Apprentices in the Trades and Crafts of Early Modern Bristol." Continuity and Change 6 (1991): 227-252.
- Galloway, James and Margaret Murphy. "Feeding the City: Medieval London and its Agrarian Hinterland." London Journal 16, 1 (1991): 3-14.
- Hanawalt, Barbara. Growing Up in Medieval London. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Imray, Jean. "'Les Bones Gentes de la Mercerye de Londres': A Study of the Membership of the Medieval Mercers' Company." In Studies in London History, ed. A E J Hollaender and William Kellaway, 155-180. London, 1969.
- Keene, Derek. "Medieval London and its Region." London Journal 14, 2 (1989): 99-111.
- Lacey, Kay E. "Women and Work in Fourteenth and Fifteenth Century London." In Women and Work in Pre-Industrial England, ed., Lindsey Charles and Lorna Duffin, 24-82. London: Croom Helm, 1985.
- Masters, Betty. The Chamberlain of the City of London 1237-1987. London: The Corporation of the City of London, 1988.
- McClure, Peter. "Patterns of Migration in the Late Middle Ages: The Evidence of English Place-Name Surnames." Economic History Review, 2nd ser, 32, 2 (May, 1979): 167-182.
- Rappaport, Steve. Worlds within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Russell, J C. "Mediaeval Midland and Northern Migration to London, 1100-1365." Speculum 34 (1959): 641-645.

now has a book out on this

- Smith, Steven. "The Ideal and Reality: Apprentice-Master Relationships in Seventeenth-Century London." History of Education Quarterly (Winter, 1981): 449-459.
- Thomas, A H. "Introduction." In Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls, vol. 2, ed. A H Thomas, vii-lxiv. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929.
- Thrupp, Sylvia. The Merchant Class of Medieval London, 1300-1500. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1948.
- Unwin, George. The Gilds and Companies of London. 4th ed. London: Frank and Cass and Co. LTD, 1963; reprint, London: Frank and Cass, 1966.
- Williams, Gwyn. Medieval London: From Commune to Capital. London: Althone Press, 1963.
- Yarbrough, A. "Apprentices as Adolescents in Sixteenth-Century Bristol." Journal of Social History 13/1 (1979): 68.