

BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Harding, Vanessa (2009) Sons, apprentices and successors in late medieval and early modern London: the transmission of skills and work opportunities. In: Eliassen, F.E. and Szende, K. (eds.) *Generations in Towns: Succession and Success in Pre-Industrial Urban Societies*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press, pp. 153-168. ISBN 9781443813013.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/3129/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>
contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

or alternatively



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Enabling open access to Birkbeck's published research output

Sons, apprentices and successors in late medieval and early modern London: the transmission of skills and work opportunities

Book Chapter

<http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/3129>

Version: Author-produced PDF

Citation:

Harding, V. (2009) **Sons, apprentices and successors in late medieval and early modern London: the transmission of skills and work opportunities** – Eliassen, F.-E.; Szende, K. *Generations in Towns: Succession and Success in Pre-Industrial Urban Societies*, pp.153-168

© 2009 Cambridge Scholars Press

[Publisher version](#)

All articles available through Birkbeck ePrints are protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

[Deposit Guide](#)

Contact: lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk

CHAPTER ELEVEN

SONS, APPRENTICES, AND SUCCESSORS IN LATE MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN LONDON: THE TRANSMISSION OF SKILLS AND WORK OPPORTUNITIES

This paper draws on several strands of research on late medieval/early modern London, including work on the records of London Bridge and its workforce,¹ study of the building trades,² and the research project *People in Place*, focusing on family and household in early modern London.³ The latter project is breaking new ground in reconstituting London families and households and examining their dynamics, and an important aspect of this is how they reproduced themselves over time, both biologically and socially. This paper takes one element of this and considers the family in relation to work opportunities and prospects. Some excellent work has been done on the household or domestic unit of production, including the way men and women worked together or in complementary fields, but can we get at the importance of the family lineage and network as a means for transmitting skills and capital across generations and as a source of work opportunities for its members? The essential context for the study is the enormous demographic growth of early modern London after 1500, largely fed by migration from the English provinces and dominated, at least in the sixteenth century, by apprentice migration, so that intergenerational transmission of resources, skills, and cultural values happened not only within the nuclear biological family but through other collateral networks and connections.

Sons and successors

For a number of reasons, the nuclear family could not be the sole or perhaps even the major agent in the process of transmitting skills and resources in later medieval and early modern London. The part that it played in the literal reproduction of urban society was limited: Londoners had a low rate of success as parents, as Sylvia Thrupp argued in 1948 in relation to the merchant class. Between 30 and 40 per cent of the fifteenth-century merchants she studied lacked male heirs; in some decades, as she noted, more than half of her merchant testators appear to have had no surviving children at all. And as she suggested, the merchant class may have been somewhat more successful than the generality of Londoners.⁴ Of 141 lay testators in the Consistory Court of London in the early to mid-sixteenth century, only 40 per cent mentioned their own children in their testaments.⁵ It is possible that fewer than half of all marriages resulted in surviving offspring, and the reproduction rate probably fell far short of the 2.1 children per woman said to be necessary for a population to replace itself in the long term.⁶ William Caxton lamented that “in this noble city of London a line can scarcely continue to the third heir, or even to the second...”, even though in other cities families could trace their lineage back “for 5 or 600 years, in some cases for 1000”.⁷ Though some marriages undoubtedly produced several children, a great many men and women had no lineal descendants to whom to pass their skills and business capital; either they must expect that the resources they had accumulated during their lifetimes would be dissipated on their death or at best that of the surviving spouse, or they must find other ways of transmitting them to the next generation.

Something that actually limited the parent-child link still further as a mode of skills and wealth transmission was the fact that sons were rarely apprenticed to their fathers. Although this is a commonly-repeated observation, it is hard to test objectively, in the sense that we can rarely estimate the population of London-born youths at any time, let alone know to whom they were all apprenticed. It is certainly easy, however, to show that only a tiny proportion of apprenticeships in mid-sixteenth-century London were of son-to-father bindings. Of the 1,148 entries to the freedom registered in 1551-3, only five (less than half of one per cent of the total, and less than 3 per cent of the 179 London-born apprentices) were young men who had been apprenticed to their own fathers: a merchant tailor, a leatherseller, a woolcomber, a cordwainer, and a woodmonger, a fair spread of mercantile and artisanal occupations.⁸ Son-to-father apprenticeships may have had a higher success rate than others, at least insofar as the option of absconding or returning home was not open to such sons; one hopes also that they received better treatment than some apprentices did. It is not clear, however, whether the citizens' sons who

claimed the freedom by patrimony (at least 80 in 1551-3) had also trained with their fathers.⁹ Searching through the printed records of a limited number of city companies also suggests that son-to-father apprenticeships were rare.¹⁰ It might seem likely that such relationships were more common in the alien communities in London, which were often criticised for keeping their trade secrets and work opportunities within the community, but in the alien subsidy rolls of the mid-fifteenth century, which list householders and household members, only one “son and servant of” is noted for Southwark in 1440, and only one such in the city in 1484.¹¹

It was not uncommon, but it was certainly not universal, for citizens to apprentice their sons into the same trade as themselves. There are several well-known cases of this: Thomas Gresham, mercer, son and nephew of mercers; John Stow, tailor, son and grandson of London tailors.¹² But of the 99 citizens’ sons entering the freedom by apprenticeship in 1551-3, only eleven had been apprenticed into the same trade as their father, not counting the five apprenticed to their fathers. The rest exhibited a very wide range of couplings, some of which seem to make economic sense (the son of a butcher apprenticed to a salter, the son of an innholder to a vintner) but many more without obvious rationale (the son of a brickmaker apprenticed to a minstrel, the son of a carpenter to a grocer).¹³ The reasons for this are hard to determine; one might expect that a father could make the most of his patronage, skills, tools, business connections, to benefit a son in the same trade. Neighbourhood and local community may have been significant, and there must have been an element of “trading up” when a father apprenticed his son into a trade and company of higher status than his own.

Wills and testaments obviously document the transmission of wealth from father to son, including the devise of real or leasehold property, which might well be a way of handing on a business—perhaps a brewhouse, an inn, or a wharf, or simply a messuage and shop. But even bequests of this kind might really represent a form of investment, rentier capital, rather than a going concern. And the explicit bequest of tools and trade goods from father to son—implying that they practised the same trade, whether or not they belonged to the same city company—is certainly not common, though we must remember that most wills are brief and inexplicit, and that much may be assumed but unsaid. Among the wills enrolled in the city’s Court of Husting between 1400 and 1550 (not the most promising source, since they dealt mostly in real property) there are only two certain examples: a goldsmith leaving all his instruments or tools appertaining to the art of goldsmithery to his son, and a “brouderer” (embroiderer) leaving his three sons the implements of his craft.¹⁴ A grocer who left a mortar from his shop to his son may have been passing on something of utility for the business, or just an intrinsically valuable piece of equipment.¹⁵ Rather more cases can be found in the unpublished Commissary Court wills, such as the carpenter John Snellinge, who left his son William the lease of a house and timberyard in Houndsditch, with half the timber stored there, suggesting an ongoing business.¹⁶ But even when there were sons, they were not necessarily chosen to inherit a business. Giles Hamound left a carpenter’s house in the parish of St Michael Bassishaw to William Hamound, possibly his nephew; his timber and boards were to be sold equally to William and two other carpenters. His own sons received money and gowns.¹⁷ Another carpenter left his stock of timber, nails, etc in his timberyard to be sold, rather than to his son, who received a money bequest, while a third carpenter left £60 to his son, £30 to each of his two daughters, and £6 13s. 4d. and all his tools to his apprentice.¹⁸ Thomas Martyn, a butcher, left “all such instruments and tools that pertain to my occupation” to be sold to pay for his burial, though he had four surviving sons.¹⁹ As already noted, many men had no sons or descendants to whom to leave their trade goods, and therefore left them for sale: a marbler left his tenement and all his marble for sale; a skinner left “all my furs wrought and unwrought, and all other stuff pertaining to [my] craft of skinner” to be sold to pay his debts; a carpenter left his messuage and timberyard to his executors, with remainder to the Carpenters’ Company.²⁰

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that other kinds of relationship—collateral descent, kinship, and apprenticeship—figured largely in the inter-generational transmission of skills and capital. Several men passed their assets to a brother or nephew. Giles Hamound’s bequest to William has been noted; John Baylie left his carpenters’ tools, and his house, to his brother, with the exception of a bow (in this context, probably a bow-saw) which he left to another carpenter.²¹ Some of these collateral relationships may have included apprenticeship; although, as noted, only a very small number of young men were apprenticed to their own fathers, the numbers apprenticed to a member of the same family may have been quite significant. In most cases, we do not have unequivocal evidence of kinship, and have to proceed by making assumptions, of which surname linkage is the first. Thirty-eight (3 per cent) of the 1,148 new freemen in 1551-3 had been bound apprentice to men of the same surname who were not their fathers.²² Sixteen apprentices in the Carpenters’ Company were bound to men of the same surname between 1548 and 1560; in the Drapers’ Company in 1552-3, six youths were bound apprentice to men of the same surname, and six apprentices who had been so bound were made free of the company.²³ It also looks possible that aliens took on apprentices with family connections: in the alien subsidy rolls of 1440 (Southwark) and 1484 (city), eighteen alien masters had alien servants with the same surname and nationality, though here the limited range of surnames has to be borne in mind.²⁴

Clearly such observations cannot be taken too far. Where the surname is Smith, the probability of a blood relationship is pretty low, and in no other case is it more than possible. We also know that apprentices sometimes assumed their masters' surnames, though this is unlikely to have been the case until after the binding. On the other hand, this approach is bound to underestimate the role of the kinship network in providing heirs to skills and businesses, since it fails to detect relationships through female connections. It would not reveal the apprenticing of a boy to his maternal uncle or uncle-in-law, though that could have been quite common. We know, of course, that women practised crafts on their own account, participated in their husbands' businesses, and carried on those businesses (including training apprentices) after their husband's death, but it is hard to assess—and probably easy to overlook—the role played by marriage and connections through female lines in creating substitute heirs for craftsmen's skills and capital. Wills certainly offer some evidence of this, though again it tends to be anecdotal rather than general. One example was the cook who left the reversion of a messuage to his sister's son, on condition that it be kept as a cookshop; similarly, the clothworker who left four pairs of shears, including the best pair, to his wife, and three pairs to his daughter and her husband, may have assumed that both households would effectively inherit his business.²⁵

Apprentices and servants

The most significant nexus, in which the biological family and kin often but not always played a part, was the master-apprentice one, a kind of substitute or surrogate father-son relationship explicitly centred on the transmission of skills and work opportunity.²⁶ In medieval and early modern London, typically, youths in their mid- to late 'teens were bound apprentice to a London citizen and companyman (guildsman) for seven or more years. Both the city's companies (guilds), and the central city government in the person of the Chamberlain, had oversight of apprenticeship, aiming to ensure that apprentices were properly bound and registered, that both master and apprentice observed the terms of the contract, and that at the end of the term the fledgling freeman was enrolled as a citizen with the endorsement of the wardens of his company. The arrangement was hierarchical but paternalistic, protecting the interests of the apprentice as much as the master and giving the former opportunities to seek help if his master failed, for good or bad reasons, to perform his part of the deal; in this sense, the interests of an apprentice were better guaranteed than those of a son. While the balance of costs and benefits of the arrangement to individuals and society varied, it is clear that taking on apprentices was seen as something of a privilege, in that many companies restricted the numbers any master could take, often allowing senior members to take a larger number. Partly no doubt this reflected caution on economic grounds, aiming to prevent an excess of new members for whom there might not be sufficient work, but it also suggests that there was a positive value in being the master of several apprentices.

Apprenticeship functioned to train, socialise and induct young men into citizenship, and it had a particular importance in the assimilation of migrants into London society. In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the migration of young men to London to obtain an apprenticeship was the largest contributor to the capital's demographic growth, probably averaging over 1,000 a year in the middle of the sixteenth century, when 85 per cent of new freemen were provincial-born. Vivien Brodsky Elliott analysed the origins of 8,233 apprentices registered in fifteen city companies between 1573 and 1646 (mostly between 1600 and 1640); only 6.8 per cent of the total were London-born, and less than 20 per cent of the migrants came from the Home Counties.²⁷ The connections and contacts that enabled country boys to find masters in London are not often traceable, but many must have benefited from the mobility of an earlier generation, helping them to find apprentice placements if not taking them on as apprentices themselves. Francis Langley and his brother Thomas were born in rural Lincolnshire, but following their father's death in 1556 they were taken to London by their uncle, an earlier migrant and by now a successful goldsmith. When they reached their mid-'teens, they were apprenticed to well-to-do masters, a draper and a haberdasher respectively.²⁸ Vivien Brodsky Elliott reconstructed connections between eight young men who migrated successively from the Leicestershire village of Shepshed to London in the early seventeenth century, and their masters in London; half were related by kinship or marriage to their eventual masters, while the other boys seem to have been beneficiaries of the existence of the connection.²⁹

Such connections may have helped to ensure that the apprentice was received as a family member and treated well, but the relationship was in principle one of potential equality: whatever his origin, the apprentice could in time achieve the same standing as his present master. As already implied, apprentices (whether related or not) were in a real sense their masters' true successors, far more often than sons. More common than the bequest of tools and goods to any family member is the bequest to a servant or apprentice. The value of such a bequest probably varied from one occupation to another, since some like carpentry required a number of quality tools and others might not, but the practice seems to range across a number of crafts. The Husting wills include a goldsmith, two armourers, a horner (who appears to have

been practising metal-casting); the Consistory Court wills include a barber and a tiler.³⁰ The bequest of workshop or business premises, stock-in-trade, and money could make an important difference to a young man starting up in business, as would early release from his apprenticeship, which is quite a common bequest. The carpenter Edward Penson was making a considerable contribution to his apprentice's future when he left him "a pair of screws and tabling for them" (probably a bench screw or vice), an iron crane, and half the remainder of his craft tools, and forgave him half a year of his term.³¹

Often a widow inherited and continued her late husband's business, and with it charge of the apprentices. John Gray left his carpenters' yard to his wife for life, with remainder to his daughter, but all his tools belonging to the carpenter's craft to his two apprentices, provided "that they be good and honest men to my wife".³² Richard Rogerson left an axe, a hammer, chisels, and a handsaw to his apprentice, but specified that his wife was to have the use of them for four years, perhaps the remainder of the apprentice's term of service.³³ The widow also inherited responsibility for the apprentices' future and sometimes the disposition of the business itself. One widow specified in her will that her apprentice be allowed to choose his own master, and to have the shop, tools, and his chamber for a year; another left the apprentice the use of her house and its furnishings.³⁴ Elizabeth Welles forgave her two apprentices each a year of their terms, and left them 20s. and 10s. respectively, on condition they served her executor "justly and truly" for the residue of their terms.³⁵ The stereotype of the apprentice marrying his master's widow, whether for her charms or her assets, can be found from time to time. John Robottom, a draper, died in 1545, leaving 20s. to each of his six children under age, and 20s. to his apprentice, Robert Roo or Rowe, who had been bound in 1541 and was probably in his early twenties, when he came out of his years. All the residue, including presumably his stock, debts, and other capital, he left to his wife Dorothy. Just a year after his death, however, Dorothy, already by then some three months pregnant, married Robert Rowe the former apprentice, now a freeman.³⁶ Cases of this kind somewhat blur the notion of "generations", though it is possible that Dorothy was a young second wife of John Robottom, and therefore little if any older than Robert Rowe.

The category of "servant" (when applied to males) can be difficult to characterise. Sometimes the word clearly means a domestic or menial employee, not a potential equal or heir like an apprentice, but sometimes it is used of apprentices themselves and especially of journeymen and junior employees. When William Walle willed in 1542 that James "my servant" be made free, and three servants more be enrolled, he must be alluding to apprentices, though he also had a servant Harry Gosse to whom he owed wages.³⁷ Henry Lussher, goldsmith, referred to "John Dane which was my apprentice and now is my servant", specifying that he was to be "conveniently rewarded for his service done to me in the two years since he came out of his apprenticeship", for which he had so far received only 25s. The bond was strengthened by the fact that Dane was about to marry Lussher's stepdaughter.³⁸ "Servant" in this sense of business employee or assistant probably mostly occurs among wealthier and mercantile groups in London society, those who were running a complex business enterprise rather than a craft workshop, in which adult associates were important. As above, the individual may have once been the employer's apprentice, and it suggests an ongoing relationship of patronage and perhaps affection, outliving the formal apprentice bond. In 1557 Thomas Hunt, skinner, left £20 to each of his three "servants", John Turner, Roger Evans, and Michael Crowther, including forgiving Turner the money he had lost in "bad bargains" made on Hunt's behalf; he also left the three servants the use (at interest) of £200 until the designated legatees were of age. Hunt also left £10 to Thomas Fisher, apprentice, to be paid when he had served seven years of his term. Hunt's widow Anne, who was generously provided for, clearly took on the apprentice and maintained some relationship with the servants even when they were no longer in her employ: in her will of 1561 she left £20 to John Turner of London, skinner, "my late servaunte", and £10 to Michael Crowther, "my late servaunte", as well as £10 to Thomas Fisher "my apprentis".³⁹ Like a father-son relationship, the master-apprentice (or master-servant) relationship could be one of lifelong mutual attachment: when the carpenter John Jenne died in 1564, he left his (former) master (Christopher) Riddlesden "my clock and all my planes"; the service of his own apprentice or servant William; and the remainder of his tools if the cousin to whom they had been bequeathed should also die.⁴⁰

Bequests or postmortem arrangements with servants might be businesslike but in an increasingly competitive commercial milieu they conferred worthwhile benefits on the recipient. Robert Cage, a linen-seller, proprietor of the tenement known as the Swan in Cheapside, divided it on his death in 1574 between his wife and his servants; she was to have the upper part of the dwelling house, and the use of the yard and four cellars, but the warehouse, counting-house, a gallery for storage, and the two cellars used by Cage for linen cloth, were to be let to his servants Robert Heron and Robert Archer. Although the ground-floor shop was to be let separately, it was not to be let to a linen-seller while Heron and Archer were trading from the rest of the premises.⁴¹ Similarly, James Huishe, a mercer, divided his Cheapside property on his death in 1590, leaving the residential premises to his wife, as long as she remained unmarried. The shop, two adjacent warehouses, and counting-houses were to be let for seven years to William Bennett, Huishe's friend, "servant" and executor, and Huishe's younger son William, trading in partnership and paying £10 a year to the widow.⁴² Although it is much rarer to find female servants as

business heirs, it did occur. Margery Symcot, a mercer's widow, was clearly in charge of the business herself up to her death in 1599, when she instructed her executors to let the eastern half of her shop premises, together with her wares in the shop, preferably to her maidservant, who was obviously also capable of running the business; her son's inheritance did not include control of these commercial assets.⁴³

Of course, it is not possible to draw a clear distinction between family and apprentices/servants as the medium for the transmission of resources from generation to generation, since some apprentices were kin to start with, and some acquired kin status through marriage, to the widow or daughter of their master, as these cases make clear. And in practice, relationships could be even more complex, interweaving marital, parental, and apprenticeship ties. The wills of two barbers, Thomas and Nicholas Grove, father and son, who died within two months of each other in 1543, reveal such a network: the father left some trade tools (grinding-stones and wrenches) to his servant, the rest to his son, while the son left grinding-stones to his uncle Robert Groves, probably his father's brother. The son also had an apprentice with the same surname as another uncle, perhaps his mother's brother.⁴⁴

Family relationships and employment opportunities

Though attempts at record linkage can be enlightening, it is difficult to get beyond anecdotal observation, and certainly to make valid generalisation. This part of the paper takes an alternative approach, that of examining the family and patronage relationships within an important sector of London's working community. As so often, we must turn to the possibly atypical but well-recorded activities of building craftsmen and labourers, one of the largest wage-earning groups in the medieval and early modern urban population.

London has many archive series that record the employment of building workers, but none so voluminous or continuous as those regarding London Bridge. The principal charge of the institution known as the Bridge House was to keep the bridge itself in good repair, but they also had to keep the landed estate from which it drew its income in tenable condition so that the revenue was sustained. The accounts and rentals which document this activity form one of the largest institutional archives for medieval London, as well as one of the most accessible and interesting. These accounts are a valuable source for wage-rates and earnings, but they also yield much interesting information about work and employment practices, pointing to a contrast between retained and casual labour, and also suggesting that employment opportunities may have been controlled by family and apprenticeship links.⁴⁵

Tracing employment patterns over decades allows us to see the Bridge wardens, as employers, successfully negotiating the work practices of their employees, but we can also see that the workmen could influence employment practice and perhaps monopolise opportunities. From the early fifteenth century we have the names of the craftsmen and labourers, and can look at how individuals worked. As the labour market shifted from relative scarcity in the early fifteenth century to relative plenty, but with a greater demand for skilled workmen by the early sixteenth, it appears that certain individuals were getting a regular share of the Bridge work, staying in employment for a long time, and passing opportunities on to sons or apprentices.

In 1420-1, the only two craftsmen with the same surname are John Catelyn senior and John Catelyn junior, masons; none of the other workmen have any obvious connection, though at this time the servants or apprentices of the craftsmen are not usually named.⁴⁶ In 1461-2, both the chief masons and the chief carpenter were being paid their own wages year-round, and a wage for their apprentices, equivalent to a labourer's wage. There are no obvious relationships between the other workmen.⁴⁷ However, in 1501-2, there are several cases of craftsmen and labourers with the same surname: John Burdon, mason, and Robert Burdon, labourer, Peter Burton and Thomas Wright, bricklayers, and Peter Burton and William Wright, labourers. The clerk of the works was Walter Smyth, and the Bridge employed a mason called James Smyth and a labourer called William Smith, though perhaps one should discount all Smiths on principle.⁴⁸ The most noteworthy connection, however, is the Maunsey family. Thomas Maunsey was master carpenter of the Bridge works, receiving an annual salary of £8 13s. 4d. for "overseeing and putting-to his helping hand at all times needful and requisite". Robert Maunsey was warden of the carpentry, receiving a fee and wages for the period from January to Michaelmas, at 4s. a week. James Maunsey, carpenter, was employed for 82 days, Roger Maunsey for 18 days, and another Thomas Maunsey for 4 days, all at 8d. a day. Thomas Maunsey had been one of the wardens of the Carpenters' Company in 1492-3 and 1499; Robert and James also appear frequently in the Carpenters' accounts, enrolling several apprentices in the early 1500s. Only James Maunsey was still in the Bridge's employ in 1513-14, but by then he was the first-named carpenter in the list, suggesting some seniority.⁴⁹

In 1537-8, the groupings of names is even more striking. William Cokes the younger, warden carpenter of the land works of the Bridge, was paid for 47 weeks at 4s. a week; he employed William Cokes the elder, carpenter, and Simon Cokes, carpenter, both for 277 days and 14 tides, and another

Cockes, carpenter, for ten tides. There were three carpenters called Browne: Thomas Browne, Browne senior, and Browne junior, all working for nearly the full total of working days; another Browne, John, was paid for a gang of six men making scaffolds for the gin, over the period of four tides. Two carpenters called Pasmer worked almost the full year. William Wynter, carpenter, worked for 224 days and 12 tides; Wynter, labourer, worked for at least 34 days. Nor was this phenomenon confined to the carpenters: John Orgar, chief mason of the bridge works, was paid £10 as his annual fee, and in addition bought and sold materials to his own profit; Jeffrey Orgar, mason, was fully employed by the Bridge for 277 days and 10 tides. Thomas Allen, boatkeeper, managed much of the labour force working at the Bridge House yard and on the bridge itself, and may therefore have been responsible for hiring Thomas Allen, labourer, for 177 days; perhaps also for Walter Allen, carpenter, for 134 days. Thomas Monkest, dauber, who worked for 229 days, was surely connected with William Monkest, labourer with the plasterers, though the latter only got five days work.⁵⁰

Many of these proposed connections cannot of course be proved; coincidence of surname could be just that. Nor are they all intergenerational links, though when there is an elder and younger of the same name this seems likely. However, where company or other records survive, they help to extend the picture of support and patronage, especially in the context of apprenticeship. John and Jeffrey Orgar were father and son.⁵¹ James Maunsy took on three apprentices with the same surnames as fellow-carpenters employed by the Bridge, suggesting perhaps an agreement to share future work opportunities. Thomas Maunsy, master carpenter of the Bridge works, presented Richard Ambrose as his apprentice in 1504: the latter had himself become chief carpenter of the Bridge by 1537.⁵² As before, it proves impossible to clearly separate family links from apprenticeship ties.

Conclusion

The Bridge House was an exceptional employer, and the Bridge House workmen may have had exceptional opportunities to form close networks of kinship and apprenticeship. It seems likely, too, that patterns of patronage and the transmission of opportunity in different economic sectors such as workshop production, retailing, and mercantile occupations would have differed from those in the building trades more generally. A handful of well-documented merchant families such as the Johnsons and the Ishams, for example, illustrate the importance of family and extended kin connections in overseas trading activity in the mid-sixteenth century; for the seventeenth century, the writings of the turner Nehemiah Wallington document an unusually strong father-son relationship as well as the difficulties of managing workshop employees.⁵³ What can be asserted with more confidence is that in towns, and certainly in large cities with high immigration and high mortality rates, skills and work opportunities were transmitted from generation to generation through several channels: father to son, through lineal kinship networks, by means of collateral kin, and through formal apprenticeship, any or all of which might interconnect.

¹ Vanessa Harding and Laura Wright, eds., *London Bridge: selected accounts and rentals, 1381-1547* (London: London Record Society vol. 31, 1995); Vanessa Harding, "Supplying London Bridge, 1380-1540", *Franco-British Studies* 20 (Autumn 1995): 111-24; Vanessa Harding, "Maintaining London Bridge, c. 1380-1550: costs and resources", in *I Ponti: forma e costruzione dall'antico all'architettura del ferro*, ed. Donatella Calabi e Claudia Conforti (Milan: Documenti di architettura, 2002), 1-12.

² Vanessa Harding, "Employment and opportunity: the building trades in London, 1450-1600", in *L'edilizia prima della Rivoluzione Industriale secc. XIII-XVIII: atti della trentaseiesima Settimana di Studi, 2603- Aprile 2004*, ed. Simonetta Cavaicchi (Prato: Istituto Internazionale di Storia Economica "F. Datini", serie II.36, Le Monnier 2005), 991-1011.

³ See <http://www.history.ac.uk/cmh/pip/index.html>.

⁴ Sylvia L. Thrupp, *The Merchant Class of Medieval London* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1948; reprinted Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1962).

⁵ Ida Darlington, ed., *London Consistory Court Wills, 1492-1547* (London: London Record Society vol. 3, 1967).

⁶ The *Guardian*, 17 May 2002, quoting the Journal of Human Reproduction, April 2002, and figures from the Office for National Statistics.

⁷ W.J.B. Crotch, ed., *The prologues and epilogues of William Caxton* (Oxford: Early English Text Society, original series 176, 1928), 77-8, quoted by Thrupp, *Merchant Class*, 191.

⁸ Charles Welch, ed., *Register of Freemen of the city of London in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI* (London: London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, 1908), 34, 49, 66, 103, 107. Steve Rappaport, *Worlds within worlds: structures of life in sixteenth-century London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), analyses the freedom register in some detail.

⁹ Welch, *Register of Freemen, passim*.

¹⁰ e.g. Bower Marsh, ed., *Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters* (London: privately printed, 6 vols., 1913-68), Vol 2: *Wardens' Accounts, 1438-1516*, Vol 3: *Court Book, 1533-1573*, Vol 4: *Wardens' Accounts, 1546-1571*; Matthew Davies, ed., *The Merchant Taylors' Company of London: Court Minutes, 1486-1493* (Stamford: Richard III and Yorkist History Trust in association with Paul Watkins, 2000); Francis W. Steer, ed., *Scriveners' Company Common Paper, 1357-1628, with a continuation to 1678* (London: London Record Society vol. 4, 1968), 19; cf. John Wareing, "Changes in the geographical distribution of apprentices to the London Companies", *Journal of Historical Geography* 6 (1980), 241-9.

¹¹ James L. Bolton, *The alien communities of Londo in the fifteenth century. The subsidy rolls of 1440 and 1483-4* (Stamford: Richard III and Yorkist History Trust in association with Paul Watkins, 1998).

¹² See *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* sub Gresham, Thomas; Stow, John.

¹³ Welch, *Register of Freemen*, 20, 36, 113.

¹⁴ Reginald R. Sharpe, ed., *Calendar of Wills proved and enrolled in the Court of Husting, London*, vol. II, 1358-1688 (London: The Corporation of London, 1890), 421-2, 472-3.

¹⁵ Sharpe, ed., *Calendar of Wills*, vol. II, 555-6.

¹⁶ Guildhall Library, London (hereafter GL) MS 9171/13, f. 109.

¹⁷ GL MS 9171/10, f. 305.

¹⁸ Sharpe, *Calendar of Wills*, vol. II, 385; GL MS 9171/15, f. 328.

¹⁹ Sharpe, *Calendar of Wills*, vol. II, 132.

²⁰ Sharpe, *Calendar of Wills*, vol. II, 375, 546, 583-4.

²¹ GL MS 9171/15, f. 309v. For bow-saw see *Oxford English Dictionary* under "bow", 19.

²² Welch, *Register of Freemen*.

²³ Marsh, *Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters*, Vol 3: *Court Book, 1533-1573*; Percival Boyd, *Roll of the Drapers' Company of London, collected from the company's records* (London: J.A. Gordon, 1934).

²⁴ Bolton, *Alien subsidy rolls*.

²⁵ Sharpe, *Calendar of Wills*, vol. II, 656-7; Darlington, *Consistory Court Wills*, no. 222.

²⁶ For a general discussion of apprenticeship in medieval London, see Arthur H. Thomas, ed., *Calendar of Plea and memoranda Rolls preserved among the archives of the Corporation of the City of London at Guildhall, a.d. 1364-1381* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929), "Introduction", xxvii-lviii. Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos qualifies the understanding of the apprentice relationship as "familial": *Adolescence and youth in early modern England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), 84-5

²⁷ Vivien Brodsky Elliott, "Mobility and marriage in pre-Industrial England", unpublished Cambridge University Ph.D. thesis 1978.

²⁸ Francis later abandoned drapery for the more chancy role of theatrical entrepreneur: William Ingram, *A London life in the brazen age. Francis Langley, 1548-1602* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978), 7-19.

²⁹ Elliott, "Mobility and marriage", 211-13.

³⁰ Sharpe, *Calendar of Wills*, vol. II, 314, 339-40, 512-13, 515; Darlington, *Consistory Court Wills*, nos. 183, 229.

³¹ GL MS 9171/10, f. 226.

³² GL MS 9171/11, f. 84.

³³ GL MS 9171/11, f. 94v.

³⁴ Darlington, *Consistory Court Wills*, nos. 135, 164.

³⁵ The National Archive, Kew (hereafter TNA), PROB 11/42A, ff. 296v-297r.

³⁶ Darlington, *Consistory Court Wills*, no. 327; Joseph L. Chester, ed., *The parish registers of St Michael Cornhill, 1546-1754* (London: Harleian Society, Register Section, vol. 7, 1882); Boyd, *Roll of the Drapers' Company*.

³⁷ Darlington, *Consistory Court Wills*, no. 168.

³⁸ GL MS 9171/8, f. 200v

³⁹ TNA, PROB 11/42B, ff. 107- 111; PROB 11/ 44, ff. 201r-203r.

⁴⁰ GL MS 9171/15, f. 208. Jenne made his will in 1564, and expressed uncertainty about whether his man William and his cousin would survive him; perhaps the devastating plague of 1563 was a factor in this.

⁴¹ Derek Keene & Vanessa Harding, *Historical Gazetteer of London before the Great Fire*, vol. i, *Cheapside* (Chadwyck-Healey microfiche, 1987; full text now available online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.asp?pubid=8>) [hereafter *Gazetteer*], section 145/39.

⁴² *Gazetteer*, 145/38.

⁴³ *Gazetteer*, 11/8A4.

⁴⁴ Darlington, *Consistory Court Wills*, nos. 183, 184.

⁴⁵ City of London Records Office, London (hereafter CLRO), Bridge House accounts; a selection are transcribed and edited in Harding and Wright, eds., *London Bridge Accounts*.

⁴⁶ Harding and Wright, eds., *London Bridge accounts*, nos. 243-95.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, nos. 340-1.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, nos. 386-92.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, nos. 387, 390; CLRO, Bridge House accounts, *passim*; Marsh, *Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters*, Vol 2: *Wardens' Accounts, 1438-1516*.

⁵⁰ Harding and Wright, eds., *London Bridge accounts*, nos. 478-83.

⁵¹ TNA, PROB 11/31, f. 188r-v.

⁵² Marsh, *Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters*, Vol 2: *Wardens' Accounts, 1438-1516*; Harding and Wright, eds., *London Bridge accounts*, no. 479.

⁵³ Barbara Winchester, *Tudor family portrait* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1955); George D. Ramsay (ed.). *John Isham, Mercer and Merchant Adventurer: two account books of a London merchant in the reign of Elizabeth I* (Gateshead: Northamptonshire Record Society 21, 1962); Paul S. Seaver, *Wallington's world : a Puritan artisan in 17th century London* (London: Methuen, 1985).