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Abstract
Large numbers of foreign immigrants, also known as aliens, moved to London in the late medieval period in the hope of taking advantage of the city’s economic opportunities. Aliens who stayed in the city for sustained periods had moved away from traditional networks and family and had relocated to a place where they were less well known. This was potentially very problematic considering that bonds of friendship and social connections were crucial for an individual to prosper within a late medieval society and economy. The issues faced by aliens who lacked social connections raise salient questions which form the two driving questions of this thesis: what did aliens do to overcome the difficulties associated with uprooting to a new environment? What options did they have to do so?

The thesis uses a combination of legal and probate records to reconstruct the lives of individual aliens, and stories about individual aliens which were presented within legal contexts, to address these driving questions. It also explores ideas drawn from the sociological concept of belonging using these legal and probate sources. Through studying individual lives to uncover the strategies which undertook to survive and settle and the options they had to do so, the thesis adopts the novel approach of privileging the perspective of the migrants themselves. The thesis argues that resident aliens actively worked to negotiate their inclusion within different groups in London and, in doing so, offers a significantly more comprehensive understanding of alien experiences and sociability than that presented in previous scholarship. The analysis also offers an important challenge to the ways historians have conceptualised the ‘assimilation’ of aliens into London society and explores elements of alien lives which have hitherto been unnoticed.
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Introduction (i)

This thesis concerns the lived experiences of foreign immigrants, also known as aliens, in late medieval London and its suburbs between 1400 and 1540. The most recent estimate of the number of aliens in late medieval England rests at 30,000 individuals, which has been calculated using a poll tax levied sporadically upon first-generation immigrants between 1440 and 1487, called the alien subsidy. Using this figure, aliens may be said to have constituted some 1–1.5 per cent of the whole population of England.\(^1\) Although recent research has made it clear that aliens in England by no means only lived in town and cities, urban centres played a central role in the lives of many of them.\(^2\) London had the largest immigrant population of any English city and a study using the alien subsidy calculated that there were around 3,540 alien men, women and children living in London and its suburbs in 1441.\(^3\) This thesis will contribute new understandings concerning the lived experiences of aliens in late medieval London and its suburbs. It will analyse a range of sources, particularly petitions to the Court of Chancery, copies of wills recorded in the probate registers of London’s Commissary and Archdeaconry Courts, witness depositions provided in London’s Consistory Court, and reports of sexual transgression recorded in the Act Books of London’s Commissary Court. These sources will be used to reconstruct elements of the lives of individual aliens, or at least stories about these aliens which appeared credible within legal contexts, in order to address the two driving questions of the thesis, namely what strategies did these aliens undertake to survive and settle in London and what options did they have to do so? In addressing these questions, this thesis will privilege the perspectives of the migrants themselves.

---


Aliens and Terminology

The term “immigrant” was not used before the modern era. The people a modern commentator would name an immigrant were legally defined as ‘aliens’. An alien was legally someone who owed no direct allegiance to the English Crown due to their place of birth. From 1351, those born of parents who were English subjects yet outside of the dominions of the king were still classified as English subjects. Andrea Ruddick argues that in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries there were two strands of discourse in government documents regarding subjecthood. One strand was that birthplace within the kingdom of England was to be born into the ‘English people’, which in turn was synonymous with loyalty to the king and subjecthood. Another was that people born within the king’s dominions abroad were still his subjects, incorporated into his faith and allegiance, regardless of their birthplace outside of England. Yet, this seems to have changed over time. Ralph Griffiths argues that during the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the definition of subjecthood narrowed considerably, and it essentially became the preserve of only those born in England. In practice, the boundary between alien or denizen status for someone who was born outside of England but within the king’s dominions was not always clear during the fifteenth century. Immigrants who were born in areas under the king’s rule, for example, were still subject to the alien subsidy, which was granted by Parliament in 1440. It was only in 1449, when another subsidy was granted, that those born ‘under the king’s allegiance’ in Normandy, Gascony and Guyenne were specifically made exempt. In addition, the shifting borders of northern England with Scotland and of English territory in France during the period of study meant that those born in ‘border regions’ could easily be identified as alien. Moreover, an individual may have been perceived as an alien regardless of their technical legal status. Indeed, even though an individual may have been an English subject, if they had a strong accent or had atypical traits they could be perceived to be alien by the native populace. This is demonstrated well by the men in the northern parts of England who had to prove their English

---

birth in order to disprove allegations of Scottish allegiance during periods of Anglo-Scottish tension in the last quarter of the fifteenth century.10

Migration from an area outside of England also meant that aliens were, initially at least, strangers to the areas in which they arrived. Indeed, alien merchants were frequently labelled as ‘merchant strangers’ and aliens in general are frequently referred to as ‘strangers’ in the historical record. The Middle English term ‘straunger’ could be used to denote someone born overseas, but it could also be used more generally to refer to someone who was not a member of one’s social group or even of one’s family.11 Moreover, most aliens who arrived in an urban area were also technically ‘foreign’ as well yet not in the modern meaning of the word. London had a royal charter which bestowed upon it rights and liberties, such as the ability of its citizens to rule themselves and have a civic government. Only freemen, those privileged enough to hold the freedom of the town or city, had access to the collective economic and political rights which came with the freedom. Anyone who was not part of the franchise, even if they had lived in London for their whole life, could be labelled as a ‘foreigner’.12 As such, in medieval source material the terms ‘alien’, ‘stranger’, as well as a ‘foreign’, could be applied to those born outside the realm.13 It is important to also note, however, that terms like ‘foreign’ might be used to describe English migrants who had moved to London. This thesis will use the terms ‘alien’ and ‘immigrant’ to denote alien immigrants.

**London’s Aliens and Economy: A Contextual Sketch**

Much of London’s wealth was connected to its role as an inland and overseas port, and its trading connections with many parts of Europe.\(^\text{14}\) London was particularly well connected with the Low Countries, and many small vessels from this region imported small manufactured goods in ships captained by both English and alien captains.\(^\text{15}\) The key export from London in the fourteenth century was wool, transported to the Low Countries or to the Mediterranean, but by the start of the fifteenth century cloth exports had outgrown that of wool. Most of this cloth was shipped to the Low Countries.\(^\text{16}\) London’s trading connections mean that it is most usefully perceived as having been situated within a wider economic region extending to the southern parts of the North Sea and including the cities of the Low Countries.\(^\text{17}\) London’s share of England’s overseas trade grew during the period under study here. It has been argued that in the first half of the fifteenth century, London exported two-fifths of the country’s goods. By the end of the fifteenth century this had risen to four-fifths.\(^\text{18}\) Scholarship has also presented London as the primary centre from which imported goods were distributed elsewhere in England.\(^\text{19}\) Luxury goods, as well as raw materials necessary for some of London’s crafts, were imported into London in great quantities by Italian merchants, particularly Venetians. Many of the liverymen of London’s companies in the mid-fifteenth century acted as wholesalers for these goods and were in large part dependent upon the regular visits of the Venetian galleys.\(^\text{20}\) Alien merchants played a key role in London’s maritime trade, and recent scholarship argues that aliens controlled at least on average 40 per cent of the value London’s imports in the

---


\(^\text{16}\) Barron, *London in the Later Middle Ages*, 337.

\(^\text{17}\) Derek Keene, “Metropolitan Comparisons: London as a City–State,” *Historical Research* 77, no. 198 (2004): 470.


fifteenth century. It has been estimated that around 40–47 per cent of the total value of the city’s overseas trade was controlled by alien merchants throughout the century, and also that they obtained the value of around half of all cloth exports.

London’s wealth and, by extension, its attractiveness as a place to move to were not solely based on mercantile trade, however. Caroline Barron argues that the spending of the aristocracy and gentry, drawn to London for business, the city’s law courts, to attend Parliament and on royal business, was crucial for both London merchants and artisans. There was, however, also a demand for manufactured goods from the lower strata of society. Following the Black Death, with the reduction in population and increase in wages associated with it, there was heightened demand for consumer goods by those of a lower socio-economic status. This demand helped fuel London’s manufacturing base, which was so large it has led Barron to describe the city as a ‘great industrial centre’ where a wide variety of goods were produced. Indeed, it has been estimated that three-fifths of London’s occupations involved some form of production of goods. James Bolton suggests that the likely low rents and high wages after the Black Death combined to create an attractive environment for north-European artisans to settle. Scholars also point to an exceptional concentration of workshops in the capital that produced manufactured goods and to a wide range of premises where goods might be purchased such as inns, warehouses and market stalls. London’s most important commercial street was Cheapside, the centre of London’s business district. Cheapside was renowned as a

21 Oldland, “The Expansion of London’s Overseas Trade from 1475 to 1520,” 83.
25 Barron, London in the Later Middle Ages, 46–76.
centre for luxury goods, with members of the Mercers’ Company often making a large part of their fortunes through the sale of luxury fabrics and adornments.\footnote{Anne Sutton, \textit{The Mercery of London: Trade, Goods and People, 1130–1578} (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 1–4.}

With the help of the civic government, the economy during the period under study was regulated primarily by London’s craft guilds or companies. As will be explored in Chapters II and III, these institutions had important implications for the lives of aliens. Although not their only function, these guilds sought to regulate the manufacture, sale and distribution of certain wares which came under their jurisdiction, control labour within these trades and also manage the system of apprenticeship, which was one of the most common ways through which individuals acquired the freedom of the city.\footnote{Barron, \textit{London in the Later Middle Ages}, 58–76, 199–235; Stephanie R. Hovland, “Apprenticeship in Later Medieval London, c.1300–c.1530” (PhD dissertation, London: Royal Holloway, 2006), 15–16.} On the southern side of London Bridge lay Southwark, a highly populated suburb of London. From 1444 one of its five manors technically came under the jurisdiction of the civic government, yet even this was contested until 1550; the suburb essentially lay outside of the jurisdiction of the city and the majority of its craft guilds during the medieval period. The alien subsidies and other sources demonstrate that Southwark attracted many un-enfranchised artisans, a significant number of whom were aliens.\footnote{Martha Carlin, \textit{Medieval Southwark} (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), in particular 123–125, 143–167 and 254–256.}

To the south-west of the city lay the town of Westminster, a vill holding liberty status and thus immunity from London’s guilds. This vill also attracted large numbers of alien artisans.\footnote{Gervase Rosser, \textit{Medieval Westminster, 1200–1500} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 12, 190–196.}

It has been argued that most of the aliens who came to England hoped to pursue opportunities to better their lives and were what we would now call economic migrants.\footnote{Ormrod, Lambert and Mackman, \textit{Immigrant England, 1300–1550}, 1.} As England’s largest economic centre, London acted as a magnet for such people. Using the assessments of the alien subsidy granted in 1483, Bolton has estimated that there were around 3,400 aliens in total in late fifteenth century London and its suburbs, including men, women and children, and that resident aliens formed around six per cent of the population.\footnote{Bolton, \textit{The Alien Communities}, 3–5.} He also argues that very transient merchants and sailors, who came ashore for short periods of time whilst their ships were in port, should be added to this number.\footnote{Bolton, “La Répartition spatiale de la population étrangère,” 426.} Jessica Lutkin, also using the subsidy returns, calculated a similar figure of c. 3,540 aliens in London and its suburbs in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \footnotemark[29]
\item \footnotemark[30]
\item \footnotemark[31]
\item \footnotemark[32]
\item \footnotemark[33]
\item \footnotemark[34]
\item \footnotemark[35]
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Bolton and Lutkin also identify the main immigrant groups who resided in London. By far the largest group were those labelled with the homogeneous term ‘Teutonic’ in the 1483 assessment, which could refer to any individual from the Low Countries or German states who spoke a middle Dutch or Low German dialect; individuals from this group were also designated as ‘Doche’, Dutchmen or Flemings in earlier assessments of the subsidy and in other sources. The high proportion of aliens from these areas was most probably facilitated by the close links between the Low Countries, London and south-east England, connections influenced by trade, politics and geographical proximity. There were also groups of ‘Italians’, again an umbrella term, denoting individuals from different ‘Italian’ city-states, as well as ‘French’ aliens and those from Scotland. The terminology regarding these alien groups will be explored in more depth below. Along with these more numerous alien groups were smaller numbers of strangers from various parts of modern-day Europe, and even beyond; one can find references to individuals from Catalonia, Iceland and even two who are recorded as being from ‘Indea’, a very broad term used to denote the territories eastwards, which stretched beyond the Holy Land.

Previous analysis of the alien subsidies has revealed the habitation patterns of aliens in the city. Such research notes that there were high concentrations of aliens in London’s central and eastern wards. The Italians clearly were concentrated in the more central wards, particularly Langbourn and Broad Street wards in the north east area of the city. Yet, those from the Low Countries and German states were more heavily concentrated in the peripheral areas of the city, such as the wards adjacent to the riverside, the city walls, and also the extramural areas to the east and west. There were particular concentrations of northern Europeans in the eastern sections of the city, such as Portsoken and Tower wards. Despite this, there was no alien ‘quarter’. As a result, contact between aliens and natives would have been frequent, which raises questions regarding how important these connections were to the lives of aliens and how they were forged. The exception to the general rule of a lack of enclaves are the

---

36 Lutkin, “Settled or Fleeting?,” 141.
Hanseatic merchants, usually comprising of 30-40 semi-permanent merchants, who lived in their Kontore named the Steelyard in Dowgate ward.\(^{40}\)

The alien population in London grew steadily during the first decades of the sixteenth century, which was then followed by a large influx of religious and political refugees from the 1540s onwards, mainly a result of the Counter-Reformation in mainland Europe.\(^{41}\) In contrast to the c. 3,400 aliens living in London in the late fifteenth century, it has been estimated that there was a significant increase in the number of foreign-born residents in the capital after 1540. Indeed, Pettegree has estimated that there were around five or six thousand aliens in the capital by 1547.\(^{42}\) One estimate is that there were over 10,000 ‘strangers’ living in London in 1553. These strangers were granted permission to establish their own stranger churches in the capital in 1550.\(^{43}\) Despite the discrepancies between the estimates of the alien population post 1540, there is general consensus that there was an increase in the number of aliens. The majority of the evidence used here dates prior to the English Reformation, and I have chosen not to analyse any post-1540 evidence. 1540 has been chosen as the later end date of this study because the large influx of religious refugees and the establishment of stranger churches shortly after this date significantly altered the nature of migration. As such, this latter phase of London’s migration history falls outside the scope of this thesis.

**Migration Studies and Internal Migrants: The Broader Context**

The study of immigration to late medieval London, and England, is a sub-set of the much wider topic of migration studies. Much of the scholarship concerning aliens in late medieval England has been produced by historians writing in the period after the Second World War and directly after the so called ‘migration crisis’ of 2015. It is thus within the context of large movements of people in and outside of Europe that scholars have studied immigration to late medieval England, and it seems most likely that it was this context which influenced their interest in the


\(^{42}\) Ibid., 15–17.

topic and helped shape their research agenda. International migration in twentieth and twenty-first century contexts is an important subject in many academic disciplines, particularly within sociology, geography and history. Despite this, with the exception of Bolton, scholars who study immigration into late medieval England rarely ever explicitly draw upon studies of modern immigration to help inform their research.\(^\text{44}\) The lack of engagement with the studies of immigration from the modern era is particularly regrettable because an awareness of the literature on migration studies would furnish medievalists with new ideas and questions to pose to their source material.\(^\text{45}\) As will be explored in Chapter III, historians of immigration into late medieval England have put forward their interpretations of how aliens incorporated themselves into London, and English, society using the terms ‘assimilation’ and ‘integration’. This indicates that they have indirectly been influenced by sociological concepts developed in the latter half of the twentieth century. It is notable, however, that this influence is rarely acknowledged.

One major theme in migration literature is the importance of social networks for immigrants who move to a new region. The importance of social ties, both in the country of origin and in the host society, has been widely discussed in migration studies in various nineteenth-, twentieth- and twenty-first century contexts. A common argument runs through much of this scholarship, namely that membership of social networks, consisting of friends, family members, neighbours or fellow countrymen could act as important channels through which migrants can acquire various forms of support and companionship.\(^\text{46}\) The interest


\(^\text{45}\) For an overview of key research themes in international migration, see Karen O’Reilly, *International Migration and Social Theory* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 2–3.

devoted to the connections between immigrants and acquaintances in their regions of origin is
due in part to the fact that they are viewed by some as a key factor influencing where an
immigrant chooses to settle. Membership of such networks, which requires establishing and
maintaining social ties with others, as well as providing various forms of help to other
members, has been described as generating ‘social capital’ for the migrant. This might also be
generated through an individual’s membership of more formal organisations. Social capital,
although conceptualised in varying ways in sociological literature, might be usefully seen as
the potential resources and benefits linked to the membership of groups, as well as the
obligations shared among individuals of the same group. It also has been usefully
conceptualised as the ability of an individual to convert their connections with others into
value-producing assets.

Research concerning late medieval aliens, including this thesis, should also be seen as
part of a wider body of literature concerning migration in late medieval England. Indeed, we
should view aliens as only one specific group of migrants. Current scholarship concerning
aliens in late medieval London tends to view them primarily as immigrants from overseas, who
possessed a different legal status from the king’s English subjects. Although correct, we should
not let their ‘alien’ status obscure the fact that they were, in important respects, similar to
certain demographics of English denizens. In being newcomers who had moved from their
home regions to London and its suburbs, whether temporarily or permanently, aliens occupied
similar positions with English migrants who had migrated to the capital. With a high death rate,
London relied upon internal migrants to keep its population stable. Both prior to and after the
Black Death, there were large numbers of English, or internal, migrants who were on the move,
usually in search of more favourable economic opportunities. Many of these migrants came

48 Louise Ryan, Umut Erel and Alessio d’Angelo, “Introduction: Understanding ‘Migrant Capital’,” in Migrant
Capital: Networks, Identities and Strategies, ed. Louise Ryan, Erel Umut and Alessio D’Angelo (Basingstoke:
Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 3–13; Celia McMichael and Lenore Manderson, “Somali Women and Well–Being:
Social Networks and Social Capital among Immigrant Women in Australia,” Human Organisation 63, no. 1
(2004): 88–89.
51 Derek Keene, “Metropolitan Values: Migration, Mobility and Cultural Norms, London 1300–1700,” in The
Development of Standard English 1300–1800: Theories, Descriptions, Conflicts, ed. Laura Wright (Cambridge:
Carlin, Medieval Southwark, 144–148 L. R. Poos, A Rural Society after the Black Death: Essex 1350–1525
Growth in Early Fourteenth Century Norwich: Evidence from the Tithing Roll,” Urban History Yearbook 15,
no. 1 (1988): 17–28; for the migrant origins of York’s freemen, see David Palliser, “A Regional Capital as
from rural environments to towns and cities and, in the later fourteenth century, seem to have included higher numbers of women than men. The high degree of movement amongst the English populace even prompted legislation. In 1406, for example, Parliament passed a statute that was designed to slow down the migration of young men from the countryside into towns in order to help allay some of the problems in the rural labour market. Indeed, many of London’s apprentices, some of whom would complete their terms and become freemen of the city and full members of their respective guilds, originated from elsewhere in England and came to London to be trained. Recent research has demonstrated that not all English migrants who moved to the city became part of the guild system via apprenticeship, but rather practiced their trades outside of this system on the margins of the city’s economy.

**Aliens in Later Medieval England and London**

The study of aliens in England has been the subject of a growing corpus of research and the study of aliens in London is a sub-set of this wider scholarly field. In what follows, the salient themes within the scholarship concerning aliens outside of London will be outlined. Following this, the key aspects of the scholarship regarding aliens in London and its hinterland will be explored and compared with the literature concerning the alien presence elsewhere in England.

Many studies provide surveys of aliens within a specific settlement or area in England. These tend to be primarily concerned with a multiplicity of topics concerning these groups, such as the number of immigrants, their occupations, settlement locations and the social structure of their communities. Over half a century ago, Sylvia Thrupp carried out pioneering analysis of the alien subsidy rolls. Compared to all other sources, the subsidy rolls have been the most influential in shaping the historiography of late medieval migration to date. These

---


rolls contain nominal listings, which served as official records of aliens assessed as liable for a tax imposed upon first-generation migrants between 1440 and 1487. With over 50,000 names recorded, the alien subsidy material has provided an opportunity to understand migration to late medieval England in ‘unparalleled detail’ when compared to other medieval states. Thrupp’s first publication stemming from her research of the subsidy rolls was a survey of the immigrant population in mid-fifteenth century England. In this, Thrupp explored *inter alia* the context of the tax, the areas where certain alien groups were present in the greatest numbers and the trades often practiced by different nationality groups. Other scholars have subsequently undertaken similar surveys of aliens in other areas of England. Barrie Dobson uses the alien subsidy rolls and civic records to shed light on the aliens in York. Lutkin provides a detailed overview of aliens in Hampshire and Southampton, and Tom Beaumont James conducts a similar study of aliens in Southampton. Alan Kissane and Jonathan Mackman use local judicial records from fourteenth and early fifteenth-century Lincolnshire, in conjunction with the alien subsidies, to gauge the nature and extent of the county’s alien population, but also their experience of crime and justice.

Other studies focus on specific alien groups and explore multiple topics concerning these groups, such as population numbers, levels of transience and relationships with native society. Bolton explores the presence of the Irish in England and their regulation by the Crown and Parliament. Bart Lambert and Milan Pajic study the presence of banished clothworkers from Flanders in fourteenth century Colchester, and Jane Laughton maps the migration of Irish, Manx and Welsh settlers in Chester. Lambert examines the very fragmentary evidence of

---


residents Scandinavians living in England. Peter Fleming explores the presence of Icelanders in England and notes the likelihood that some were used in forced labour. Alwyn Ruddock’s work illuminates our understanding of Italians in Southampton and their trading practices. Christopher Linsley analyses the alien subsidies to gauge the distribution of French aliens and their status, and he questions whether the alien subsidies can be taken at face value with regards to exploring whether aliens from specific regions of France had distinct settlement patterns in England. Maryanne Kowaleski provides a detailed survey of the French-speaking aliens in Devon in the mid-fifteenth century, noting that there was a very heavy concentration of them there. The presence of Scottish immigrants in England has also received attention. James Galloway and Ian Murray study letters of denization and the alien subsidies to outline the distribution patterns and socio-economic background of Scots in England. A similar survey of Scottish migrants has been conducted by John Thomson. More recently, Sarah Rees Jones and Judith Bennett have both brought to our attention the presence of a Scottish mobile labour force with a high proportion of low-status women in the North of England during the mid-fifteenth century.

One important theme in migration literature is how aliens were regulated by both national and civic governments. Lambert and W. Mark Ormrod argue that although the Crown prompted confiscations of the property of ‘French’ subjects during the conflicts in France in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, these initiatives tended to be aimed at alien

---

clergy. They also highlight that French aliens, usually of high status, could petition for royal protection to guard against confiscations if they could prove that they had deep roots in England, such as by arguing that they were freemen of the town in which they lived and had resided there with their families for long periods. For Lambert and Ormrod, it was the grant of letters of protection to those who were long-term residents that led to the creation of ‘the conceptual category of the ‘resident alien’. Lambert and Ormrod also study the emergence of denization, the process by which an alien swore an oath of loyalty to the English crown, renounced loyalty to their previous lord and acquired the legal status of English subject. They argue that denization developed within specific diplomatic and military contexts in 1377 and shortly after. In this context, the Crown required a more consistent approach to identify French aliens hostile to the realm on one hand, yet on the other the need to protect the property and persons of French aliens whose habitation in England was deemed to be beneficial. Helen Bradley’s introduction to her edition of the Views of the Hosts of alien merchants details how the activities of alien merchants were supposed to be regulated as part of the hosting act of alien merchants passed in 1440. Peter Fleming argues that restrictions put upon Irish migrants in mid-fifteenth century Bristol helped them create a degree of cohesion and ‘self-identity’. Lambert and Christian Liddy highlight how the ‘Doche’ immigrants in Great Yarmouth were fined for undertaking activities technically only permissible for burgesses of the town. Other studies have focused on the rights aliens had within courts of law. Alice Beardwood’s monograph explores the legal and economic position of alien merchants in terms of their ability to trade and seek legal redress. Sussane Jenks highlights that aliens taking part in civil law

suits were able to have juries half comprised of Englishmen and half comprised of people who had originated from the same province as themselves by the mid-fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{77}

The use of the alien subsidy material to illuminate the broad social and economic structures of alien groups, their habitation patterns, and to provide informed estimates of their numbers, as well as studies concerning how national and civic governments reacted to aliens, has laid important groundwork enabling historians to study the lives of aliens and their social ties in context. There is an increasing number of studies focusing on specific aspects of the lived experience of aliens in England, which is a topic that is growing in importance within medieval migration studies. Andrea Ruddick uses the alien and Tudor subsidies to study patterns of intermarriage in late medieval England. She concludes that intermarriage was a widespread occurrence.\textsuperscript{78} Maryanne Kowaleski draws on a wealth of source material from Exeter to study the assimilation of aliens into the city in the mid-fifteenth century using a prosopographical approach.\textsuperscript{79} She also analyses the relationships forged between alien seamen and English people on-board ships and onshore.\textsuperscript{80} Judy Ann Ford explores the level of interaction of aliens within a parish community in late medieval Sandwich and the conditions they had to meet before acquiring parochial office.\textsuperscript{81} Meg Twycross writes a number of personal case-histories about certain aliens in fifteenth century York, emphasising how they might marry and enter into guilds to enhance their economic and political prospects.\textsuperscript{82}

The AHRC-funded project \textit{England’s Immigrants 1330–1550} has generated, and acted as catalyst for, many of the recent migration studies. This three-year project (2012-2015) produced several important articles and created a searchable online database of the alien subsidy returns, oaths of fealty, letters of denization and protection, as well as other pertinent sources produced by the English government to tax and regulate aliens. The project itself also


generated two books. One is the edited collection *Resident Aliens in Later Medieval England*, most of the constituent essays of which have been discussed above, and the other *Immigrant England* co-written by Ormrod, Lambert and Mackman. Immigrant England provides primarily an analysis of the sources found on the database, particularly the alien subsidy rolls. It uses the alien subsidy material to provide a combined qualitative and quantitative analysis to gauge the level of the alien presence and their interaction with societies and economies within England within the period 1300–1550. It has a wide scope concerning the numbers of aliens, the social and economic profiles of different alien groups, their geographical distributions, the rare instances of antagonism towards them, and how far they integrated within English society.

The themes addressed in the scholarship of aliens in late medieval London specifically have considerable overlap with those explored in the historiography regarding aliens elsewhere in England. As with the study of aliens in other settlements, there have been survey studies of aliens within London as a whole, and such research also forms part of broader histories of particular areas of the city and its suburbs. In 1969, Thrupp used testamentary evidence and the alien subsidy rolls to explore the numbers of aliens in London, their places of origin and the nature of their connections with natives and with each other. She used probate material to construct a picture of near harmonious coexistence, arguing that aliens met ‘with Englishmen on terms of mutual respect as individuals’. The next major work concerning the analysis of the subsidies is Bolton’s introduction to his edition of the 1440 and 1483-4 alien subsidy rolls of London and Middlesex in 1998. He uses the alien subsidy returns from London and Middlesex to provide an analysis of the numbers of the alien population, their economic and social structure, their levels of transience, their level of ‘assimilation’, and how they acted as a focus of discontent within tense economic or political contexts. Bolton makes a significant challenge to Thrupp’s claim of harmonious coexistence, using instances of attacks against aliens in the capital to question her conclusion of mutual tolerance between aliens and natives. The spatial distribution of aliens in the city is also analysed by Bolton and he puts forward a

---

86 Bolton, *The Alien Communities*, 3.
87 Ibid., 35–40.
number of hypotheses to explain habitation patterns.\textsuperscript{88} Many of the questions that Bolton explores have been subsequently built upon in Lutkin’s analysis of the alien subsidy returns.\textsuperscript{89} Shannon McSheffrey’s research of St Martin’s le Grand, a liberty and sanctuary within the city of London, attracted large alien populations by at least the mid-fifteenth century. She has also explored, \textit{inter alia}, their occupational patterns and the reaction of the city’s guilds towards them. In doing so, she has shed light on an important concentration of aliens within the city.\textsuperscript{90} Monographs which provide comprehensive histories of specific suburbs of London, such as Southwark and Westminster, also include useful overviews of the alien populations in these locations.\textsuperscript{91}

Studies of Southampton’s Italian population are far outnumbered by a substantial body of work regarding London’s larger Italian population and their trading practices. Most historians of late medieval migration and trade are well aware of the trading activities of London’s Italians and how they could be victims of economically inspired antagonism at times of economic or political tension. Other studies have focused on the social connections, the trading practices of the Italian groups who lived in London and formed communities of others from the same Italian state as themselves, and their degrees of ‘integration’ into civic society.\textsuperscript{92}


\textsuperscript{89} Lutkin, “Settled or Fleeing?,” 137–155.


English crown and Hanseatic League, offer some insights into the Hanseatic merchants trading in the city.  

As with studies which focus on areas outside of the capital, there has also been an interest concerning aspects of the lived experiences, lives and social connections of aliens in London. For example, one of the key conclusions that Lutkin arrives at whilst using alien subsidy material is that around one-fifth of the aliens recorded in the tax stayed in London for ten years or more. She also argues that others would have come to London for a short period of time before moving elsewhere. Suzanne Dempsey argues that it was relatively easy for resident Italian merchants in fourteenth century London to establish links with natives and ‘assimilate’. Interest in the lives of alien individuals has led to recent studies regarding some of the personal ties that these individuals had and the communities of which they were members. Justin Colson studies the corporate religious and social practices of migrants from the Low Countries, German States and France in late medieval London through an analysis of ordinances from alien fraternities. Jens Röhrkasten highlights how aliens, particularly Northern Europeans and Italians, often sought spiritual services from members of London’s mendicant orders who could speak to them in their own tongue. Spindler demonstrates the strong sense of community between Hanseatic and Italian men involved in long-distance trade in the North Sea. He shows that members of these groups could rely upon one another due to the bonds of friendship, sympathy and obligation that existed between them. Bradley, *inter alia*, examines the contacts resident Italian merchants and the sailors of Venetian galleys had with different strata of London society through their trading activities and habitation in the capital.

---

93 See Lloyd, *England and the German Hanse, 1157–1611*; Fudge, *Cargoes, Embargoes, and Emissaries*; to place the Hanseatic Kontores in England within the context of the Hanseatic League and its trading activities, see Phillipe Dollinger, *The German Hansa*, trans. D. Ault and S. Steinberg (London: Western Printing Services, 1970); There is a wider literature concerning the Hanseatic League in German, but I have had to utilise literature in English for this study.

94 Jessica Lutkin, “Settled or Fleeting?,” 137–155.


Like the responses of civic government and guilds in other urban centres in England towards aliens, the response of London’s government and companies towards aliens has attracted significant attention. Indeed, studies have explored how these organisations attempted to restrict, regulate, and in some instances accommodate, alien labour and trade. Matthew Davies demonstrates that these organisations did not simply try to exclude alien craftsmen from practicing certain crafts and restrict their labour in every instance. He explores the ways in which certain companies could accommodate alien labour and concludes that they had to strike a difficult balance between acknowledging the demand for the skills and labour of alien craftsmen on one hand, yet on the other they also had to respond to the concerns of those in their organisations who were concerned with the competition that these aliens posed. Scholars have also drawn attention to how, during the economic downturn of the second half of the fifteenth century when the competition posed by aliens became more problematic, these companies lobbied Parliament and the London’s authorities to place protectionist measures to the detriment of unenfranchised alien merchants and artisans. For example, Bradley has demonstrated how economic grievances, the wish of London’s companies to control overseas trade, combined with the frequent setback of English forces in France, led to the passing of an act in the Parliament of 1439-1440. This compelled alien merchants to be hosted by Englishmen and to have their trading activities recorded by their English hosts partly to ensure

---


that the money they made from selling imported goods was spent on goods for export. Bolton argues that there were several mercantile interest groups, led by influential Londoners and London’s livery companies, which lobbied Parliament for anti-alien legislation in the form of the 1439-40 hosting law and the grant of the first alien subsidy. The influence of alien skills upon certain sectors of London’s economy has also attracted attention. Lien Luu explores the connection between the presence of aliens and the diffusion of skills in the economy of London, their economic impact on London’s industries in the mid-sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, and briefly discusses aliens in the capital in the later medieval period.

One way in which the scholarship on aliens in London differs significantly from that concerning aliens in the rest of England is its focus on violent attacks against migrants perpetrated by specific groups of natives. This is because nearly every recorded attack against aliens in England happened within London. Such violence has attracted much scholarly attention, and evidence of these attacks offers something of a challenge to the evidence that speaks to positive connections between aliens and natives, both before and after these episodic attacks. In particular, the attacks against Flemish communities in London and Southwark during the Peasants’ Revolt are the focus of many of these studies. Spindler provides a detailed overview of chronicle accounts of the murder of Flemings during the Revolt, arguing that the attack helped rebels construct an English community which was based on the victimisation of ‘the other’. Len Scales uses chronicle accounts of the same attacks as evidence of a wider argument that there was an inheritance of knowledge and assumption that the destruction of peoples was inevitable and that occasionally it should happen. Studies on the Peasants’ Revolt as a whole describe the attacks, usually explaining them in terms of economic
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104 Bradley provides an overview of economic complaints levied against alien merchants by their native counterparts in *The Views of the Hosts*, xii–xiv, xlii–xlix.
106 Although predominantly concerned with alien presence in the second half of the sixteenth century, Luu’s analysis does draw upon some evidence from the late medieval period, Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries of London*, in particular 235–236, 259–268.
107 This contradictory evidence is one of the main reasons for the differences of opinion between Thrupp and Bolton concerning the nature of coexistence. This apparent contradiction in evidence is noted by Kowaleski, “The Maritime Trade Networks of Late Medieval London,” 402.
resentment towards Flemish textile workers. Bart Lambert and Milan Pajic, however, argue that it was not economic antagonism which led to the attacks, but the frustration of native weavers that the Crown privileged weavers from the Low Countries in the capital over them and did not enforce the rights they believed they were due. There has been some commentary on the harassment of Doche immigrants in London following Phillip the Good’s repudiation of his English alliance in 1435, and also when his plan to besiege Calais in 1436 became widely known in England.

Ralph Flenley, in an article concerning Italian merchants in London, focuses upon the attack against Italian merchants in 1456 and a failed attack against them in 1457. Bolton argues that these riots can be explained as a group of elite London merchants who were disillusioned by the Lancastrian Crown’s economic policies, particularly its unwillingness to enforce stricter rules upon Italian trade, which led them to instigate the riots. Ian Archer, in analysing the reactions of natives to aliens in the capital from 1400 to 1600, argues that native attitudes were ambiguous and suggests that large-scale attacks against aliens were attempts by particular economic groups to prompt the civic authorities to deal with popular grievances. Attacks against Italians in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are covered in Anne Sutton’s history of the Mercer’s company. These attacks, she argues, only happened in tense economic and political contexts and often the Italians were attacked as political scapegoats. Luu explores possible reasons for what she terms ‘xenophobia’ in sixteenth century London, the most violent manifestation of which were attacks against alien property in the liberty of Saint Martin’s le Grand in 1517 in the Evil May Day riot. Reassessing these attacks, Ormrod,
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Lambert and Mackman reject the idea that they were caused by innate English xenophobia, and also argue that they should be viewed as an infrequent and extreme part of the alien experience.\(^{118}\) Anti-alien sentiments in poetry written during political and economic crises has also attracted the attention of scholars.\(^{119}\)

As such, in terms of the experiences of aliens, their lives and social connections, there is a corpus of scholarship which focuses on specific topics. Studies concerning London’s aliens explore the mobility of the alien population, the importance of alien-only fraternities to certain groups, the reasons for their spatial distribution, and the connections of elite Italian and Hanseatic merchants. The social contacts of aliens are also seen by some as a means to gauge levels of ‘assimilation’ or ‘integration’. The reactions of sections of London society to aliens, which would have had important implications upon their experiences, are much studied. Indeed, the measures taken by London’s government and companies to regulate aliens and the episodic attacks aimed against certain alien groups have proved to be some of the most popular topics of analysis. Literature regarding aliens elsewhere in England has also focused on specific aspects of alien experiences, such as levels of assimilation, the frequency of intermarriage, and how elite male aliens might incorporate themselves into local families and positions of authority within urban centres.

**Agenda of the Thesis**

Despite this research, there are still notable gaps in our understanding of the experiences of aliens in later medieval London. Scholarship demonstrating the problems faced by English migrants in late medieval towns raises important questions which historians who study London’s aliens should address in much greater depth. In his research concerning guilds, Gervase Rosser considers the problems that migrants, in the more general sense of the word, faced and how they needed to establish relationships of trust with townspeople to overcome them. He argues that migrants would have uprooted themselves from networks of kin and friends and would have entered a new environment. This was potentially very disruptive for

---


the newcomer considering that survival in late medieval society revolved in large part around the creation of relationships of trust and friendship through which an individual might obtain help and companionship. These relationships were also crucial for economic success as through them an individual might access credit and because business was often conducted with individuals with whom one had close connections. For Rosser, one of the principles of guilds was to establish ‘a selfless devotion to God through the friendship of the community’. With this emphasis on promoting friendship between members, Rosser argues that membership of a guild was particularly desirable for uprooted migrants. For him, guilds acted as artificial families who could provide support for these people who were less able to draw on the support of family members or other acquaintances and also conferred an element of credit-worthy status upon members.120 He also contends that research about the roles of guilds should focus on the reasons why individuals might participate in various social groups to access security, trustworthy reputation, and support.121

The emphasis which Rosser places upon the importance of social ties of the medieval migrant new to a town has strong resonances with the literature concerning international migrants in other time periods noted above; this highlights the significance of membership of social networks in helping a migrant survive in a host society or new environment. An alien newcomer to medieval London would have moved to an environment where they were less well known than they were in their regions of origin. If they wished stay in the city for sustained periods of time, it follows that they would have to get to know people in their new environment and to orientate themselves within pre-existing webs of solidarities and networks.


The issues that faced migrants who lacked social connections in late medieval cities raise salient questions concerning the alien experience in London and form the two driving questions of this analysis: what did aliens in late medieval London do to overcome the difficulties associated with uprooting to a new environment? What options did they have to do so? I will use legal and probate records to reconstruct aspects of the lives of individual aliens, and narratives about them that appeared credible in legal contexts, to address these questions. In doing so, the thesis privileges the perspective of the migrants themselves to contribute new understandings of the experiences of aliens. I will explore how important membership of social networks and other groups within London’s social fabric was for aliens, how they might become members of such groups, the kinds of support they might obtain through membership and, more generally, the strategies they deployed to survive and settle in the capital. I will also challenge the way that historians have conceptualised how aliens incorporated themselves into London society using the terminology of integration and assimilation. Through addressing these issues, this thesis will contribute to the existing corpus of scholarship concerning aliens by providing a significantly more comprehensive understanding of the experiences of aliens, their lives and social connections. Where pertinent, I will compare primary evidence regarding alien experiences elsewhere in late medieval England, as well as secondary literature regarding immigrant behaviour in other time periods, with the late medieval London evidence. This will help to place the findings of this thesis within a broader contextual framework and will go some way to help us gauge whether the experiences of immigrants uncovered here were unique to late medieval London.

**The Aliens Under Study**

With the exception of Chapter I, which explores the strategies of all alien newcomers to the city, this thesis privileges aliens who were ‘resident’. That is those who stayed in London for sustained periods of time over temporary sojourners. This is because these individuals would have had greater need and greater opportunities to develop strategies to survive and settle than those who only stayed temporarily in the capital. Occasionally, the lives of temporary merchants will be analysed when they reflect something of the wider alien experience. The primary focus, however, is upon those medium- to long-term ‘resident aliens’, who Ormrod
and Mackman argue are likely to have constituted most incomers to late medieval England recorded in the alien subsidies in the mid-fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{122}

The thesis primarily uses probate and legal records, which necessarily has made some alien demographics more visible than others. Indeed, probate and legal sources privilege wealthier members of society, those who were of middle or high social status, had access to legal advice and recourse, or had goods to bequeath.\textsuperscript{123} Although, where possible, the thesis will analyse the experiences of those of lower social strata, such as transient servants in Chapter II and some female slaves in the households of Spanish and Italian merchants in Chapter IV, the alien lives which are discussed here tend to be those of the ‘better off’.

In addition, probate and legal records have a gender bias. The aliens to which they refer tended to be men. This is partly because men were more likely to bequeath goods, pay probate fees to have their wills enrolled within surviving probate registers and wage their law, and partly because the most recent estimates of the gender-ratio of aliens indicate that it was heavily skewed in favour of men. The key determinant, however, was perhaps the predominance of males within the population of aliens. Indeed, based on the research of the alien subsidies, the ratio has been calculated as 85:15 in favour of men.\textsuperscript{124} Between 1440-1487, the alien subsidy returns for London record 16,822 instances of aliens who were assessed to pay the subsidy, 13,952 (83%) of whom were male, 2,804 (17%) female, and 66 (0.39%) whose sex cannot be identified.\textsuperscript{125} In the Southwark assessment of 1440, of the 445 aliens recorded 323 (73%) were male and 121 (27%) were female, with one person whose sex cannot be identified.\textsuperscript{126} In the Westminster assessments between 1440 and 1487, in the 764 instances in which aliens were assessed 715 (94%) were men and 49 (6%) were women.\textsuperscript{127} Even if we take into account that alien wives of English men were exempt from the tax, and it is likely that some female dependants of alien householders may have been overlooked by the assessors as they were considered ‘covered’ by the householder, these figures are still suggestive of a heavily skewed

\textsuperscript{122} Ormrod and Mackman, “Resident Aliens in Later Medieval England: Sources, Contexts and Debates,” 15–16.
\textsuperscript{123} That legal and probate sources privilege this demographic of aliens has been noted by Kowaleski, “The Assimilation of Foreigners,” 164.
\textsuperscript{125} Lutkin, “Settled or Fleeting?,” 143.
\textsuperscript{126} TNA E 179/184/212 (All references from the E 179 series have been accessed via the England’s Immigrants Database (henceforth EIDB) https://www.englandsimmigrants.com/).
\textsuperscript{127} TNA E 179/141/94; E 179/141/69; E 179/235/69, m. 2; E 179/235/57; E 179/141/89; E 179/113/107, m. 2; E 179/113/108, m. 2; E 179/113/130.
sex ratio in favour of men. The lower number of alien women in relation to men, and their poor representation in much of the material used in this thesis, makes exploring the experiences of female aliens in the same depth very difficult. It follows that the experience of female aliens and of those of more modest social rank are necessarily underrepresented in this thesis, although effort has been made to explore aspects of the experiences of female aliens and those of a lower socio-economic status where the sources permit.

The alien population of late medieval London was varied and comprised various groups who differed in occupation, social status and levels of transience. Even within alien groups, there were stark differences between individuals: a transient poor labourer from Bruges who sought temporary work in London should not be viewed in the same light as a wealthy, workshop-owning artisan who had originated from the same city. The focus on London and its hinterland means that the thesis will privilege the study of individuals from more populous immigrant groups from the Low Countries and the German States, to the detriment of other groups, such as the French, who were more populous in rural areas. Moreover, the wealth and status, as well as the survival rate, of sources relating to mercantile trade has resulted in Italians merchants leaving a greater impression upon the historical record. Thus, they are discussed at greater length in this thesis than, for instance, the Irish or Scots in the capital.

In order to demonstrate the diverse nature of London’s alien population, it is useful to provide brief profiles of the alien groups which are of key concern to this thesis, including discussion of the terminology used to describe them, and their salient characteristics. Throughout the thesis, I use convenient labels such as ‘Doche’, ‘Italian’ or ‘French’. These are either linguistic or modern nation terms and should be viewed only as convenient ways to refer to certain groups of aliens. As will be noted below, these umbrella terms encompass a diverse range of persons.

Doche is a linguistic label, and only one of a range of terms, used by English scribes to denote those who came from modern day Belgium, north-eastern France, the Netherlands, or elsewhere in north-western Europe. Indeed, anyone who spoke Low German or a Middle Dutch dialect were liable to have been labelled as ‘Doche’, or a variant spelling of the same. This heterogeneous group of people were also described by English scribes under the

129 The Doche were the most numerous alien group in London, whereas the wealth of the Italians ensured that they were often mentioned in the historical record. See below for more detail concerning this group; for the small numbers of French in the capital, see Bolton, The Alien Communities, 8.
overlapping terms ‘Fleming’ or, in the third quarter of the fifteenth century, ‘Teutonic’. As noted by Colson in his study of alien fraternities in London, there would have been significant internal diversity amongst London’s Doche population. All the above are labels present in most of the source material, often making it difficult to gauge more specifically from where immigrants originated. This thesis will use the term ‘Doche’ to refer to these aliens. Licences to remain, which aliens originating from lands under the dominion of the Duke of Burgundy were compelled to acquire in 1436, give some indication of where these aliens originated from in the early fifteenth century, as often the places of origin are recorded in the Patent Rolls. The licensed aliens living in London and Middlesex are recorded as being predominantly from Holland and Brabant, with a much smaller proportion from Flanders and Zeeland.

The Doche tended to live in greater numbers in urban as opposed to rural areas. In London, Westminster and Southwark they formed the majority of the alien population, as they did in many urban contexts in the south east of England. The list of Doche aliens who had acquired licences to remain in 1436 provide us with a strong indication as to how London acted as a magnet for this group. Indeed, some 600 of these individuals, over a third of all those who acquired the licences, lived in London or its suburbs. Studies of London and its environs, as well as of other urban centres in England, have argued that the Doche tended to live in localities close to one another, which has led to many scholars referring to these aliens as living within communities. Bolton highlights that around 65 per cent of the alien population in London, as assessed in the 1483 alien subsidy, comprised male householding artisans, their wives and their servants, the majority of whom were Doche. This, in turn, indicates that much of this population worked as part of the household unit of production. These artisans practiced an array of trades, which included some practiced by native artisans (such as tailoring, shoemaking and metalworking), and other specialist crafts not practiced by natives (such as spectacle...
Although some used their specialised skills to produce goods for the elite, the majority seem to have fulfilled the demand for basic goods and services in London and, thus, their labour often provided competition for native artisans.

‘Italian’ will be used as a term to refer to individuals who had originated from one of the city-states in the Italian peninsula. These individuals are sometimes labelled in relation to their specific state of origin by English scribes. Less frequently they are described using the homogeneous term ‘Lombard’. Although there was a small number of artisans, many aliens from the Italian states in London were either merchants, mariners or brokers. Italians usually imported either expensive luxury items, such as cloth of gold and silks, or essential raw materials for the cloth trade such as woad or alum. These merchants were mainly concerned with exporting English wool and cloth, and to some extent tin, either to the prosperous markets of the Low Countries or to the markets of the Mediterranean and the Levant. In the fourteenth century, they dealt more in wool exports, which were particularly the concern of the Lucchese and Florentines. With the increase in cloth production from the late fourteenth century onwards, they became increasingly involved in the export of English cloth. In the fifteenth century, the Venetians and Genoese were particularly active in this lucrative export trade. Although probably one of the smallest alien groups in London, numbering around 40–50 or more permanent agents in the fifteenth century and a greater number of more transient, younger merchants, the wealth of the Italians and links to banking made them a distinguishable commercial and financial elite. Members of the city-states of Genoa, Venice and Florence formed the bulk of the Italian population, although there were a small number of Lucchese merchants, who monopolised the sale of silk and were also involved in money-lending. Italian mercantile firms also operated banks in London, offering services ranging from the extension of credit, the exchange of money overseas via bills of exchange, to selling and buying

140 Bradley, The Views of the Hosts, xvii.
goods. The study of ledger books of Florentine companies in London highlight that prominent members of London’s elite mercantile companies set up accounts with these banks.\textsuperscript{144}

Bradley argues that the composition of the Italian population changed considerably from the late fourteenth century onwards, particularly in response to the decision of the Venetian Senate in 1391 to send state galleys directly to London. She argues that prior to this, there was a core of resident Italians who had acquired the freedom of the city, predominantly Lucchese and Florentines, interested in the export of wool, and to a lesser extent cloth, who acted as a link between London contacts and the more transient Italian population. However, from the late 1440’s onwards there was a significant increase in the number of transients and the reduction in the number of resident Italians from the first half of the fifteenth century. This, Bradley argues, led to the slow erosion, although not complete disappearance, of the core of resident Italians who connected their transient counterparts with London society.\textsuperscript{145}

In London, Italians tended to live and work amongst people who had originated from the same city-state as themselves and formed ‘expatriate’ city-state communities. These communities made collective decisions about issues of common concern, tried to resolve disputes between members, and might even exclude members who had disobeyed the community.\textsuperscript{146} They also predominantly resided in the north-east quarter of the city, with the largest concentrations in the Broad Street and Langbourne wards, and smaller concentrations in Walbrook and Bishopsgate.\textsuperscript{147} It is important to note the heterogeneous nature of the Italians beyond the fact that they formed different city-state communities. Indeed, we should note the differences in their careers and patterns of residence.\textsuperscript{148} Resident Italian merchants in London were either commission agents for foreign parties who tended to stay in England for sustained periods of time, part of small family contingents, or agents of much larger Italian mercantile families.\textsuperscript{149} Yet, these resident Italians were certainly a minority: some came to London to trade for short periods before leaving, others came on a galley which only stayed in England for a few months at most. Another important group were the young men of powerful mercantile families sent over to the English branch of the family company in London to learn their trade.


\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., 288–304; Bradley, “‘Saluti da Londra’,” 108; Bart Lambert, “‘Nostri Fratelli da Londra’,” 89–90.

\textsuperscript{147} Bradley, “‘Saluti da Londra’,” 107.


\textsuperscript{149} Bruscoli and Lutkin, “Perception Identity and Culture,” 149.
under the supervision of a more experienced agent. The practice of sending young men to learn from more established merchants leads Bratchell to characterise the Italian community in early sixteenth century London as ‘essentially bachelor uncles, with a constant infusion of younger men’.150 The Italians in London seem to have been predominantly adult males, as references to Italian women in England are limited to the wives and female servants accompanying the more permanent family members in London. Female aliens from the Italian peninsula appear to have been very much in the minority.151

I have used the term ‘French’ to refer to aliens who came from different provinces within the territory of modern-day France, such as Normandy, Gascony, Brittany, Picardy and Aquitaine. The recorded places of origin of the French who took out letters of denization imply that the majority of aliens came from north and north-western France.152 The French were the most numerous group in late medieval England as a whole, with particular concentrations in the south and the south west.153 Despite this, only a small proportion settled in London and its suburbs.154 The extent to which they spread out across rural communities makes them stand out from most other alien groups, as did their broad social range.155

Scots were not prevented from migrating to England by the frequent violence along the Anglo-Scottish border or by any anti-Scottish sentiment.156 They constituted one of the largest groups of aliens recorded in the mid-fifteenth-century alien subsidies, especially in the north of England. They were largely concentrated in the four counties closest to Scotland and to the north of the river Trent.157 A smaller number of Scots settled in the south of England. Scots who were wealthy enough to acquire letters of denization were concentrated particularly in London, Westminster and the south-east, predominantly originating from the burghs of eastern

150 Bratchell, “Regulation and Group Consciousness,” 592.
151 Bruscoli and Lutkin, “Perception Identity and Culture,” 150.
153 Ibid., 95.
155 Linsley, “The French in Fifteenth Century England,” 149; the 1440 alien subsidy highlights that two-thirds of Devon’s French-speaking aliens lived in the county’s more rural areas, see Kowaleski, “French Immigrants and the French Language,” 217.
156 Thomson argues that hostility towards the Scots would have been greater in northern England than in the south, see Thomson, “Scots in England in the Fifteenth Century,” 13; Rees Jones argues that anti-Scottish sentiments in the north, if present, were not strong enough to prevent Scots moving to Northumberland and Yorkshire, nor to prevent the English gentry from employing them, see Rees Jones, “Scots in the North of England,” 65–75, in particular 65 and 75; Griffiths, “Crossing the Frontiers of the English Realm,” 218.
or southern Scotland. Galloway and Murray argue that Scots in the south tended to be of a higher socio-economic status than their counterparts in the north.\textsuperscript{158} The authors of \textit{Immigrant England} argue that there were a greater number of Scots living in the south at the time of the 1483 alien subsidy than at the time of the 1440 subsidy. They suggest that this was a consequence of a relatively long peace between England and Scotland during this period.\textsuperscript{159} The 1483 alien subsidy demonstrates that Scots were dispersed around the capital, being present in twenty-three of the twenty-five wards. Like the Doche, Scots were concentrated in greater numbers in the peripheral wards of the city. Although a small proportion was recorded as artisans, Scots are often shown to be engaged in low-status occupations in the alien subsidies in both London and England generally.\textsuperscript{160} In the 1483 alien subsidy assessment, those recorded as Scots constituted about one in ten of the alien population of the city.\textsuperscript{161}

Even these basic profiles highlight that the term ‘alien’ encompassed a heterogeneous range of individuals. Even within the same alien group, there were discrepancies in the levels of wealth, transience and social status between individuals. Moreover, for some alien groups like the Scots at least, London may have attracted a greater proportion of wealthier, higher status aliens, than would be found living elsewhere in England. Care has been taken to distinguish, as far as possible, the nuanced differences within London’s immigrant population, although the vague terms used to describe aliens in the historical record means that this is not always possible. It is to this source material that we now turn.

\textsuperscript{158} Galloway and Murray, “Scottish Migration to England,” 32–34, 36.
\textsuperscript{161} Ormrod, Mackman and Lambert, \textit{Immigrant England}, 87.
Introduction (ii): Sources and Approaches

The main sources used here are those either written on behalf, or which record the testimony, of aliens themselves. Extensive use is made of petitions to the Court of Chancery, witness depositions and probate evidence. These sources were either written on behalf of an alien or document their testimony which means that they are well suited for the analysis of alien experiences. They are also sources which provide detail rich enough to reconstruct aspects of an individual’s life or credible legal narratives concerning individual lives; it is difficult to obtain a similar depth of detail from other London sources such as tax records, records of fines imposed by London’s guilds or the terse entries concerning aliens in chronicle accounts. Some use will also be made of documents produced as part of the process for the regulation of aliens, however, such as tax records. In particular, the alien subsidies shall be used in certain instances to provide context for aspects of the alien experience, and to pose questions and formulate hypotheses concerning certain aspects of the immigrant experience, which are then explored further with the use of legal and probate material.

One of the main sources used here are petitions by aliens to the Court of Chancery, and around 550 Chancery petitions concerning aliens in London and its hinterland have been analysed for this study. The Court of Chancery grew out of the practice of the King’s council in the fourteenth century of passing bills of complaint to the chancellor. A court developed out of this and it increased in popularity throughout the fifteenth century. Indeed, in 1410-20 an average of 54 cases a year were conducted in the court, but in 1530 this had risen to 786 cases a year. The court did not follow the rules or procedures of common law and was, instead, influenced by the convention of canon law courts. The Chancery was a court of equity which tried to provide remedy for petitioners when common law could not provide justice. Its main concern was that these offences against conscience were remedied. The court decided cases by drawing on notions of conscience, although it is difficult to define what these were. Conscience would have been perceived as an objective notion, one which could be defined

164 Ibid., 214.
against, or was referable to, determinable moral laws and accessible to human reason. As such, the chancellor or his deputies decided on cases depending on their notions of right and wrong using common and canon law as guidelines. People who petitioned the court claimed that an action against them had been unjust and that common law could not provide remedy. Their aim was to get a legal case moved from the jurisdiction of a particular court to the Chancery, to have a case which had already been heard in a court to be reassessed, or to bring their case to the chancellor before it reached other legal forum, and ultimately to convince the chancellor to use his power to force the respondent to do whatever conscience required. The court’s legal process would also normally be quicker and thus less expensive for the petitioner than within other courts, and was not bound by the restrictions of common law, meaning the court could offer help to those who were vulnerable or those who usually could not bring forward legal suits.

The petitioning process was begun by a bill of complaint, there was no jury, and evidence could be given by witnesses and parties themselves. After a bill was accepted and a case moved to the jurisdiction of the Chancery, the respondent had to answer the charges within the bill, usually in person. The petitioner could then submit a written response to their answers, to which the respondent could in turn respond in written form. This would go on until a number of points of contention were agreed. Following this, evidence was collected. Witnesses were examined, either in court or outside of it, and their written depositions given to the chancellor. The petitions along with these documents were presented to the chancellor who would then decide on the case. Chancellors prior to Thomas More were all episcopal appointments, so they would be familiar with canon law and canon law procedures such as the use of depositions and weighing up evidence from written documents.

166 Dennis R. Klinck, Conscience, Equity and the Court of Chancery in Early Modern England (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 30, 39–40.
170 Timothy Haskett, “Conscience, Justice and Authority in the Late–Medieval English Court of Chancery,” in Expectations of the Law in the Middle Ages, ed. Antony Musson (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2001), 156.
The bills were the main vehicle through which petitioners could put forward their narrative of their problem to the court.\textsuperscript{173} The court did not allow significant modification of the narrative after the bill had been submitted.\textsuperscript{174} It was important, then, that they were presented in the correct form, and petitioners employed lawyers who moulded their narratives in the most persuasive and forceful terms and into a format which would be accepted by the court. As such, most petitions would have been the product of a collaborative effort on behalf of both the lawyer and the petitioner, which is discussed further below.\textsuperscript{175} In certain cases, the bill might not have been made at the insistence of the petitioner, but rather at the instance of interested parties in the name of the petitioner.\textsuperscript{176} In nearly all cases it is only these bills which survive in the C 1 series held at the National Archives, and the majority of those which date from the mid-fifteenth century onwards are written in English.\textsuperscript{177} Usually only broad date ranges can be attributed to the bills because in the majority of cases the only evidence for dating is the ecclesiastical see of the chancellor to whom they were addressed. A miscellaneous collection of bills, answers, replications and rejoinders from Chancery cases from the mid-fifteenth century to 1660 can be found within the TNA C 4 series. I have attempted to match the petitions in the C 1 series analysed in this study with their corresponding answers and rejoinders in the C 4 series, yet in the vast majority of instances I have not been able to do so.\textsuperscript{178}

As such, I will focus here on the petitions sent to the court now archived in the C 1 series.

A number of scholars have argued concerning medieval and early modern legal records that men and women had to shape their narratives, usually with the help of legal personnel, to fit the requirements of different courts, provide the most persuasive case within these legal contexts, and achieve a desired outcome.\textsuperscript{179} Similarly, to ensure that their bills were accepted

\begin{footnotes}
\item[175] Timothy Haskett, “Country Lawyers?: The Composers of English Chancery Bills,” in \textit{The Life of the Law: Proceedings of the tenth British Legal History Conference}, ed. Peter Birks (London: Hambledon Press, 1993), 22–23; Beattie, “Servantes, Femmes et Veuves,” 8. Although the bills were written by lawyers, when describing the authors these bills I will describe them as being composed by the petitioner themselves for sake of ease.
\item[177] Haskett, “The Medieval English Court of Chancery,” 293–308.
\item[178] This is most likely because there are far more bills within the C 1 series than there are answers, rejoinders, etc. in the C 4 series. A search of the National Archive’s online database reveals 59,501 result ‘hits’ when one searches the C 1 series using the date range 1400-1540, yet there are only 14,168 result hits for the C 4 series using the same date range.
\item[179] This line of thinking owes much to this ground breaking work Natalie Zemon Davis, \textit{Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in Sixteenth–Century France} (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990). For other examples studies viewing legal records as crafted narratives see Elizabeth S. Cohen, “Court Testimony from the Past: Self and Culture in the Making of the Past,” in \textit{Essays on Life Writing: From Genre to Critical
by Chancery, and their cases moved to its jurisdiction, petitioners needed to include certain elements within their bills. The most important theme that petitioners had to emphasise is how the action taken against them was unjust and against conscience.\(^{180}\) It was also essential that petitioners justified why they were unable to seek redress via common law and thus needed to seek redress through the Chancery.\(^{181}\) Petitioners and their lawyers regularly created narratives that proclaimed their innocence, emphasised the injustices done to them, and which sought to villainise their respondents.\(^{182}\) The petitions, then, are narratives which were crafted to achieve specific objectives, and they included several narrative strategies to do so. Petitioners frequently emphasised certain elements and deliberately omitted information that would prejudice their case. Petitioners might even include honest error, indeed, include certain fabrications. For example, Timothy Haskett identifies a petition concerning a dispute of inheritance in which a woman describes herself as related to a deceased man in a different way to that which she was in reality.\(^{183}\) The petitions are, then, similar to the narratives within sixteenth-century French pardon tales, which were crafted by legal professionals in order to persuade the King to intervene on behalf of the petitioner.\(^{184}\) The petitions were not completely devoid of historicity, however. The people behind the bills must have been in distress in order to seek the support of the chancellor. The petitioner would have to defend anything they alleged in their petition in court, normally through their word and that of their witnesses.\(^{185}\) The respondent also had the chance to challenge the petitioner's narrative when they gave their responses and have witnesses support their narratives. If the court could establish that the

---

\(^{180}\) Haskett, “The Medieval English Court of Chancery,” 311.


\(^{184}\) Davis, Fiction in the Archives, 25–45.

‘facts’ of the petition were wrong, presented in the wrong way, or believed the narrative implausible, the bills would be rejected or the case could fail.186

As such, the historicity of the all the elements within the narrative can be doubted, yet at the same time they should not be regarded as complete fictions. It is often very difficult to determine whether what the petitioner alleged actually happened. Whatever ‘happened’ is frequently intertwined with and distorted by the narrative strategies of the petitioners and the lawyers who composed the bills, and it is difficult to distil historicity from narrative strategy.187

When there are reasonable grounds to surmise that elements of the petition’s narrative took place, I will signal this, however, that is not the focus of the analysis. The aim here is to use the petitions as windows through which to view wider alien experiences, their strategies, and what options were available to them. It is not to establish whether the petitions records something that actually happened. The utility of petitions as historical evidence lies in that they were written to offer credible accounts, and for the court to find the narratives credible they would have had to reflect and be representative of broader social realities and cultural understandings of the time they were written.188 As such, despite our concerns about the historicity of the petitioner’s accounts, they can still be used to understand the immigrant experience. Indeed, a petition that concerns an alien would have offered a credible narrative concerning an alien of that alien group, age, occupation, gender etc., which reflected social realities, even though its specific historicity may be doubted.

Another source used here are depositions presented as part of marriage and defamation litigation, which came under the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts. Depositions made within the London Consistory Court, and one case from the Court of York, will be analysed.


188 Cordelia Beattie has used a similar approach to analyse petitions for cultural understandings about gender. She calls it ‘looking beyond the alleged truths’: Beattie, “Single Women, Work and Family,” 178.
Ecclesiastical courts usually consisted of a judge and a registrar who compiled and kept the court records. There would also have been proctors and advocates in the court who were trained in canon law and would provide counsel, or argue points for, parties. The London Consistory, the bishop’s higher court, was presided over by an appointed Official, who had jurisdiction almost over the entire diocese of London, which comprised of The City of London, Middlesex, Essex and parts of Hertfordshire. Depositions of witnesses brought to the court were written into deposition books. Instance litigation followed a set procedure within these courts which, in turn, has influenced the content and format of these depositions. Initially a plaintiff submitted a libel, which detailed their petition, and to this libel the defendant gave a general answer. The plaintiff’s case was then separated into several parts, named positions. The defendants had to answer every one of these positions. It was only those positions which the defendant denied which had to be proved through the examination of witnesses, who were brought to the court by the parties themselves. Next the plaintiff would put forward questions and statements which would inform the questions, named articles, put to the witnesses. After this, the defendant, having seen the articles, could formulate their own questions, called interrogatories, to be put to the witnesses. The witnesses were examined separately outside the courtroom by an examiner and, following this, the depositions were given to the Official who then decided on the case. The Official would be concerned with two aspects of the depositions. The first was the validity of the case made in relation to canon law. The second was the credibility of deponents, with particular weight being attributed to consistency within their narratives.

Reading depositions should be approached in a similar manner to reading Chancery petitions. Depositions at first appear to provide rich accounts of individuals' lives and perhaps even their ‘voices’, which can be utilised. Such accounts, however, should not be viewed as objective truth or an unproblematic version of events. First, what the historian sees is not a transcript of what litigants and witnesses stated. The witnesses’ testimonies were translated from Middle English to Latin and also likely tacitly edited by the clerk to focus on the key

191 Ibid., 196. Within the deposition books, the articles or interrogatories which influenced the questions asked to witnesses were not recorded and have to be inferred from their answers Ibid., 196.
aspects which answered the articles put to them. Crucially, we must also consider that the records are a product of their legal context. As Jeremy Goldberg argues, witnesses crafted an account, usually prior to their appearance in court with the help of lawyers, to make the court find in favour of the individual they testified for.

The need to analyse legal accounts as narratives used to obtain a desired objectives, and as constructs of the legal process, has been applied by scholars who have used the York Consistory evidence. McSheffrey, referring to medieval records from London’s Consistory Court, aptly states that legal documents recorded ‘what someone thought should happen, hoped would happen, wanted to pretend had happened and yet sometimes had not happened at all’. The lawyers who provided legal advice to deponents must be seen as having influenced their testimonies, but it is unlikely that all deponents merely repeated what a lawyer had prompted them to say. Indeed, Tom Johnson argues that the witnesses themselves could analyse and manipulate discourses on their own behalf and thus self-consciously attempt to determine the narrative of their testimony. Moreover, just because there are plaintiffs and respondents in a legal case it does not necessarily follow that they were the ones who directed or desired the suit. Indeed, in many instances there were likely friends, family members, or employers who helped a party organise their case or, indeed, organised it for them.

Like petitioners to Chancery, it is certain that the litigants would have stated something which appeared credible, and consequently witness depositions will be analysed here in the same way as the Chancery bills described above. For the Official of a court to believe the narrative credible it would have to reflect the wider social realities and cultural understandings.

---

194 Ibid., 34, 37; Swanson, ‘“… et examinatus dicit…”’ 206.
198 Johnson, “The Preconstruction of Witness Testimony,” 139–146; Goldberg, Communal Discord, Child Abduction, and Rape in the Later Middle Ages, in particular 38–61.
199 McSheffrey, Marriage, Sex and Civic Culture, 111–113.
of the time they were made.200 As such, the crafted narratives which include migrants as their protagonists can reflect broader social practices concerning alien experiences in the capital, and it is in this way that the stories are analysed here. For this analysis, the recorded depositions found within the deposition books of 1467-1475/7, 1487-1496 and 1510-1516 have been consulted for cases concerning aliens.201

Another key source utilised here are the testaments of aliens. The testamentary evidence used in this study derives from the copies of wills recorded in the probate registers of the Bishop of London’s Commissary Court, the Archdeaconry Court of London and, a much smaller sample for comparative purposes, the Exchequer Court of York.202 In total I have consulted the wills of 87 testators who can be identified as aliens in the probate registers of the Archdeaconry Court (which range from the dates 1394–1421) and 241 from the registers of the Commissary Court’s registers 001–009 (covering the dates 1374–1521).203 Within London there were over one hundred parishes, and testamentary jurisdiction for the majority of them was roughly split between the bishop’s Commissary Court and the Archdeaconry Court.204 If the deceased held goods and property in more than one archdeaconry, the testament was meant to be proved in the Archdeaconry Court. If a testator held goods and property in more than one archdeaconry in London’s diocese, then the testament was supposed to be proved in the Commissary Court.205

Technically, there was a distinction between a will, which was concerned with the transferal of real estate, and a testament, which was concerned with the bequests of movable goods and chattels.206 Generally, wills in England were not used to hand over inheritable

200 Ibid., 12. A similar approach is used by Cordelia Beattie whilst analysing petitions to the Court of Chancery see a Beattie, “Single Women, Work and Family,” 178.
201 The depositions within the deposition books dating from 1487–1496 were viewed on the Consistory Database website < http://consistory.cohds.ca/obj.php?object=deposition&action=list&f=1&expand=depositions>. I was able to search for depositions within the LMA DL/C/0205 deposition book as Professor Shannon McSheffrey kindly provided me her transcript of this book. I was able to search for depositions concerning aliens in the book dating 1483–1516 (LMA DL/C/0206) using McSheffrey’s personal calendar of the book and McSheffrey’s photos of the same. I would like to thank her for this help.
202 Probate registers for the Archdeaconry Court DL/AL/C/002/MS 09051 (henceforth MS 09051); probate registers for the Commissary Court DL/C/B/004/MS 09171 (henceforth MS 09171).
203 In his study of the probate registers of the Archdeaconry Court, Wood states that there are fifty-four alien wills recorded in the register: Robert A. Wood, “Life and Death: A Study of the Wills and Testaments of Men and Women in London and Bury St. Edmunds in the late Fourteenth and early Fifteenth Centuries” (PhD Dissertation, London: Royal Holloway, 2013), 49. It is unclear as to how he distinguished aliens in these wills and it is clear that the number of alien wills in these wills is higher than his suggestion.
property and usually include chattels and moveable items and even then extant wills might only deal with a proportion of the testator’s moveable goods.\textsuperscript{207} I will use the terms wills and testaments interchangeably here to refer to the documents copied into probate registers.

The role of the probate courts was to ascertain the wishes of the testator and ensure that they were undertaken. In turn, the court asked for a probate fee based roughly on the total value of moveable goods.\textsuperscript{208} As such, the court would scrutinise the inventories of the goods of the deceased produced by the executor, as well as the final account of their distribution, and ensure that the testator’s estate had been valued and distributed according to the provision of the will. When the final account had been accepted by the court, executors received their acquittal.\textsuperscript{209} The actions of the executor were essential to this process.\textsuperscript{210}

Probate evidence privileges particular demographics. Wills were only made by better-off individuals, such as merchants, artisans and some of their widows.\textsuperscript{211} The bias of testamentary evidence toward those of ‘middling’ to higher social rank is reflected in the sample for this analysis which is also skewed towards wealthy alien testators whose crafts were those in which aliens were particularly involved. In addition, women were severely underrepresented in probate records, which is a problem also shown in the will sample analysed in this study. This is partly due to the much higher proportion of male aliens to female aliens in London as suggested by the alien subsidy material, but also to other factors. Although wills made by married women are not unheard of, because canon law insisted that women could make testaments, by the fifteenth century the common law tradition that married women could not make wills, because they had no legal rights concerning chattels, had mainly prevailed in

England.\(^{212}\) As such, most female testators were widows.\(^{213}\) It is also likely that women’s wills were less frequently recorded in probate registers, due to the probate fee, which further reduces the number of wills by female testators available to us. Robert Wood notes that the majority of the testators who had their wills recorded in the Archdeaconry Court’s probate registers were married men, and this is certainly also the case for the majority of alien wills analysed here.\(^{214}\)

A number of factors must be kept in mind when analysing wills, particularly when using them to reconstruct the social contacts of testators. Indeed, the intention behind making a will was primarily to direct the place and manner a testator’s burial, ensure that provisions were made for their eternal soul, ensure that their debts were paid, and, only then, to leave bequests.\(^{215}\) Moreover, testaments do not provide a comprehensive list of the testator’s goods, properties and acquaintances at the end of their lives. Indeed, the testator could have made provision for goods before they had died, there could have been arrangements for goods and property to pass onto someone post mortem, or property could have been expected to be passed onto an heir, and the wife to receive some of a husband’s goods, via the channels of common law.\(^{216}\) By the late fourteenth century the custom of *legitim*, namely the right of children to their parents’, and that of widows to their husbands’, property or goods which had roots in Roman law, had largely ceased throughout most of England. However, in both the London diocese the *legitim* custom was still enforced and thus widows and children had a legal right to their parent’s inheritance. A married male with children, then, had control over one third of their goods and could use them for the benefit of their soul.\(^{217}\) Consequently, testators in these probate jurisdictions often did not include any reference to goods or property which they wanted to go to their heirs or widows. They knew that inheritance would have happened automatically and thus was not needed to be included within the will. Despite these caveats, wills are important documents in migration studies. They contain information concerning how the alien testators wished to be buried, how they wished to have their soul provided for, and

---


\(^{215}\) Ibid., 63–64.

\(^{216}\) Burgess, “Late Medieval Wills and Pious Convention,” 14–33; Maddern, “Friends of the Dead,” 156.

where they lived. They also provide a partial index of some of the people who they wished to remember.218

The last major source used here are the Act Books of the London Commissary Court which intermittently cover the period 1470-1529. The Commissary Court had jurisdiction over moral and spiritual crimes within the city of London and the deaneries of Middlesex and Barking.219 The cases heard in the court were primarily concerned with sexual sins, defamation, tithes, testaments and breaches of faith.220 The court’s Act Books are records which note brief summaries of the cases which were heard in the court. Usually they include the defendant’s name, their parish, the accusation against them, whether they were citied to court and, if so, their plea.221 These entries should be viewed as memoranda, intended as aids to identification or perhaps a starting point for questioning.222 Richard Wunderli found that around 40-50% of court business was formally instigated when an accuser officially accused someone of a moral crime and when the defendant was summoned to court as a result.223 The rest of the court’s business concerned ex officio cases. These were instigated by the court acting in a policing capacity where the court learnt of a rumour concerning individuals through various channels such as public fame or presentments of churchwardens and summoned a defendant to answer for a sin which they had allegedly committed.224 Charges against individuals, or rumour which reached the court’s attention, could have been merely the result of ill-informed gossip, or be the result of jealous neighbours.225 By the early sixteenth century, however, the records of proceedings had changed. The records were far more detailed and formal, and included many more instances of defamation suits than fifteenth–century proceedings.226

The uncertain nature of the reports which the court acted upon, how they may have been generated by jealous, ill-willed, neighbours, makes it problematic to ascertain the veracity

222 Ingram, Carnal Knowledge, 178.
223 Wunderli, London Church Courts and Society, 33.
224 McSheffrey, Marriage, Sex and Civic Culture, 155; Karras, “The Regulation of Sexuality,” 1019.
226 Ingram, Carnal Knowledge, 195.
of many of the accusations which the court made against individuals. However, for an accusation to have a chance of being believed by the court, and for the court to issue a citation, the accusations would have to have had a ring of credibility. Despite our doubts concerning the veracity of the accusations levied against individuals, if there were multiple accusations that particular groups of people committed certain sins then that is strong evidence that those groups often practiced those behaviours. Following this logic, we can use the reports in the Act Books to shed light upon the lives of certain groups of aliens, although, it should be borne in mind that it is possible that prejudice resulted in aliens being targeted specifically for false accusations. For this analysis, Act Books 002-011 were examined for instances of aliens who were cited to the court.

**Identifying Aliens and Source Samples**

Identifying people born outside of the King’s dominions using sources which were not designed to regulate aliens is not always straightforward, and the level of difficulty differs from source to source. Certain records are more explicit about the alien status of individuals than others. Chancery petitioners often, but not always, stressed their alien status and the clerks who recorded testimonies of witnesses in the Consistory Court recorded where the deponent had lived prior to the deposition, which often allows us to identify aliens. Other sources present greater challenges. Alien testators occasionally described their place of origin, or ‘nationality’, yet this is quite rare. When using testamentary evidence there are indicators which might suggest alien status, such as naming evidence, explicit links with regions outside of England and, to a lesser extent, the testator’s array of social contacts. I have tried to match testators who I suspect to be alien with those who were assessed in the alien subsidies, yet this has not always been possible. In some instances, it has been necessary to rely upon naming evidence alone to gauge whether an individual within a testator’s will was likely an alien or a native. I have also used naming evidence and recorded alien epithets to identify aliens in the Act Books of the Commissary Court.


228 LMA DL/C/B/043/MS 09064/ 002–011 (Henceforth LMA MS 09064/xxx).
Names, then, are one of the most important means to identify aliens when a source does not explicitly record an individual’s alien status. Yet, identifying aliens through naming evidence is not without its problems. Some aliens, for example, may have had names which were also found within native nomenclature. This is particularly the case for Scottish aliens. Moreover, second-generation immigrants might have non-English names. As such, findings drawn from such a method must be handled carefully. However, naming evidence is of significant value. Certain names such as Godscalus Trout, Eva van Styburgh and Diego Sanchez strongly suggest that these individuals were not English-born. Scholars of medieval and early modern immigration, rather than shy away from naming evidence, have embraced it to good effect. McSheffrey, in her recent work on alien artificers in the liberty of St Martin’s le Grand, uses naming evidence to identify people who were likely aliens in many of her sources. Bolton, when arguing that alien testators could choose both native and alien beneficiaries, relies upon naming evidence.\textsuperscript{229}

All names which I believe might indicate alien origin have been checked against pertinent reference works of names and name databases. One method used here is the cross-referencing of names with the names of aliens recorded in the alien subsidies, letters of denization and letters of protection, inter alia sources, reproduced in the \textit{England’s Immigrants Database}. Even though names are likely to have been somewhat anglicised as they were either collected and, written down by, English people, the database is still an important resource against which to check alien names. Containing over 55,000 entries of aliens, many of them with first and / or second names, the database provides a good indication of common patterns in alien nomenclature. For example, the name ‘Giles’ or ‘Arnold’ were common forenames amongst Doche men, and ‘Jacomyn’ amongst Doche women. Further patterns concerning Doche nomenclature can be found in McSheffrey’s database of aliens (predominantly Doche male artisans) living in St Martins le Grand in the first half of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{230} I have also cross-referenced names, either those I suspect to be alien or native, with published dictionaries of English first names and of surnames, which provide historical examples.\textsuperscript{231}

\textsuperscript{229} McSheffrey, “Stranger Artisans and the London Sanctuary of St Martin Le Grand,” 545–563; see also her list of residents of St Martin’s online: https://shannonmcsheffrey.files.wordpress.com/2018/10/mcsheffrey-sanctuary-seekers-spreadsheet.xlsx; Bolton, \textit{The Alien Communities}, 37; for a similar methodology for aliens outside of London see Kissane and Mackman, “Aliens and the Law,” 106–107.

\textsuperscript{230} The excel spreadsheet containing these names is available at: https://shannonmcsheffrey.files.wordpress.com/2018/10/mcsheffrey-sanctuary-seekers-spreadsheet.xlsx, accessed 20 Feb, 2018.

Online databases of forenames and second names from the Netherlands, although concerning name data in more recent eras, have also occasionally proved useful.\footnote{Corpus of First Names in the Netherlands, 2017, accessed 2 Dec, 2017; \url{https://www.meertens.knaw.nl/nvb}; Database of Surnames in the Netherlands, 2017, accessed 2 Dec, 2017 \url{http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/nfb/?taal=eng}.} I have identified someone as an alien or native only if there is strong evidence, through their name or otherwise, to support their identification as such. It must be remembered, however, that such a method is imperfect and that aliens with names that coincide with native nomenclature very likely have been missed by this analysis. For the sake of clarity, when it has been possible to identify individuals as first generation immigrants either through labels such as ‘stranger born’ or national epithets, I will refer to them as ‘aliens’ or ‘immigrants’. In some instances, contextual indicators highlight that an individual was an alien, and in these cases I will explain why I have identified them as such. In instances where I suspect an individual to be an alien based on naming evidence, place of habitation, and connections with regions abroad, but it is not possible to say with confidence whether they were an alien or a second or third generation immigrant, I will highlight this ambiguity by using labels such as ‘likely alien’ to describe them.

This problem of identification prevents the full numeration of the aliens recorded in the probate registers, petitions, deposition and act books used here. It is simply not possible to gauge the full number of aliens in these records since there are an unquantifiable number not identifiable as aliens through naming evidence. Moreover, I have not attempted to analyse every individual petition, will, deposition, or report to the Commissary court, which relates to an individual who can be positively identified as an alien. The volume of material has made this impractical, particularly because the methodology deployed here privileges the close-reading of each text to reconstruct aspects of individual lives and does not attempt a quantitative analysis. Moreover, not every source consulted for this thesis has been utilised as evidence in the analysis, as I have had to assess to which documents provide greater insights into the experiences of aliens than others and have privileged documents accordingly. For example, Chancery petitions which depict aliens marrying natives have been used as evidence here, whereas those which tell an unremarkable narrative of debt between two mercantile parties, and nothing else about the relationship, have been omitted from analysis.

That I have not undertaken quantitative analysis of every alien will, petition, or deposition may raise questions regarding the representativeness of this analysis. Yet, to think of representativeness in terms of numbers alone is to overlook an important point. Even if an
aspect of alien lives is mentioned infrequently within the historical record we are not justified in dismissing it as ‘unrepresentative’ of broader patterns of behaviour. As will be shown throughout the thesis, there were mundane aspects of the lives of individual aliens, that are crucial for understanding their experience, which were rarely pertinent in legal, governmental or guild contexts, and thus only infrequently are recorded in the historical record. Despite this, when in the rare instances they were recorded and are visible to us, we can use them as windows into wider alien experiences. This is particularly the case when these aspects of medieval life are recorded within legal narratives which were crafted to appear credible and thus reflect these wider realities.

**Belonging**

The major theme which permeates the analysis is how resident aliens could negotiate their belonging. The thesis makes use of the sociological concept of belonging as an analytical tool to conceptualise an alien’s belonging, and non-belonging, to different groups in later medieval London. Belonging is not a static framework which has similar meaning in different contexts. It is conceptualised, and applied, in sociological literature in various ways, usually because the concept is modified to work in conjunction with the diverse data-sets available to sociologists. It is also a concept that can be applied to the study of many different demographics, although it has particular application to the study of migration.233 I follow Floya Anthias’ argument that belonging should not be perceived as having a fixed definition. Like the concept of identity, the concept of belonging does not hold analytical worth in and of itself, rather, as Anthias puts it, ‘it is in the way we use [the concept] that this worth is given’.234 As belonging has been thought of in different ways, scholars approaching the belonging literature will find that there are various components of belonging they might explore within their research and that these components serve different questions and research agenda.235 Some of the major components of the concept are as follows: belonging can refer to an individual’s belonging or non-belonging in relation to formal and informal forms of membership (such as social networks or citizenship) and how this is negotiated by a number of actors;236 feelings of belonging, or an emotional

---


235 Ibid., 8–9.

attachment, to a locale or grouping due to a set of shared values, relations, and practices;²³⁷ the politics of belonging which refers to specific political initiatives designed to construct emotional attachment to a particular collectivity;²³⁸ belonging in the sense of sharing a similar social location/position with others, such as a gender, class or racial categorization; and the ethical and political value systems with which individual and collective attachments are assessed and valued.²³⁹

Scholars wishing to utilise belonging need not explore all components of the concept in their research, as to do so would likely make their analysis so multi-faceted to the point it would become unwieldy. Rather, they should pragmatically gauge which components of belonging, and analytical ideas connected to these components, might be utilised to enhance their analysis and work in conjunction with their source material, and which components or ideas cannot. In this analysis, I am primarily concerned with one component of the belonging concept, namely individuals’ belonging or non-belonging in relation to formal and informal types of membership, which I will label as ‘groupings’, and how their belonging is a process negotiated by a number of different agents. The analytical ideas concerning this component of belonging have prompted me to pose questions to the medieval source material. Considering that these ideas were developed in relation to studies of people within the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, I have adopted a necessarily select approach. I have chosen certain ideas that can be used fruitfully in conjunction with my chosen sources highlighted above.

The ideas used in this thesis are as follows. An individual’s belonging can be seen as a socially constructed category which revolves around their belonging and non-belonging to certain formal and informal modes of membership or groupings.²⁴⁰ These groups can be located in an individual’s place of residence, as well as elsewhere.²⁴¹ As a socially constructed category, an individual’s belonging can be negotiated by a number of different actors such as members of local communities, governments and the migrant themselves.²⁴² Individuals can

²³⁹ Ibid., 13–18.
²⁴¹ For the need to see belonging not only in terms of citizenship to a state see Harders, “Belonging, Migration, and Profession,” 11–13.
belong on different levels, or to many different groups, concurrently; they could be included by one group yet excluded from (or not belong to) others. There are criteria of belonging to certain groups and individuals can undertake means to achieve these criteria. The criteria for belonging to a group, or community, differs in different times and contexts, and the boundaries of the groups which define belonging can change. A migrant’s belonging can be redefined in periods of conflict or high tensions against members of the ethnic group of which the migrant is perceived to be part. It is, then, useful to view an individual’s belonging as fluid. At times immigrants could have successfully negotiated their belonging into a grouping within native society. However, a specific political event could make natives hostile toward them, which in turn affected their inclusion within certain groups. Nor is belonging a static property that becomes, as noted by H. Cuervo and J. Wyn, ‘firm when it has been obtained’. It is instead a constant process of negotiation that must be consistently managed and worked towards by an individual. Viewing an individual’s belonging to groups as something worked towards and as part of a process of negotiation is one of the major strengths of the concept of belonging and, as argued by Brockmeyer and Harders, it allows scholars to conduct analysis which ‘bears reference to both individual agency and societal structure’.  

This thesis will explore these ideas using medieval source material. It will identify the key groups in London and its suburbs which aliens were included within or did not belong to and what the criteria of belonging to these groups were, and it will ascertain the strategies which aliens carried out to achieve those criteria to negotiate their belonging. It will also gauge whether there is evidence of aliens occupying multiple positions of belonging, explore how the parameters of belonging could change in different contexts and identify the contexts in which aliens were excluded by particular agents. These ideas fit the depiction of urban society in late

243 Anthias, “Identity and Belonging Conceptualisations and Political Framings,” 9; Harders, “Mobility and Belonging,” 99, 108. The idea that an individual might be concurrently included within various networks or groupings has been suggested in the study of Italian cities in the early modern period, although the idea that migrants might carry out strategies to achieve criteria and negotiate inclusion is not discussed, see Fabrizio Nevola, “Introduction: Locating Communities in the Early Modern Italian City,” Urban History 37, no. 3 (2010): 351–352.
244 Anthias, “Identity and Belonging,” 8; for strategies of inclusion in a historical study see Harders, “Mobility and Belonging,” 22.
246 The idea that belonging can be redefined during times of conflict is emphasised in Brockmeyer and Harders, “Questions of Belonging and Biography,” 4.
medieval England as localised and defined by inclusion and exclusion within different groupings.\textsuperscript{249} Within an urban environment there was a multiplicity of groupings to which aliens might belong, such as those revolving around parishes, fraternities or between craftsmen and traders in similar trades who created ‘communities of interest’. It should be stressed that belonging is used here as an analytical tool. I explore the ideas above within the lives of aliens to contribute to our understanding of the alien experience. This does not mean, however, that I have used the concept of belonging in conjunction with every piece of evidence analysed. The concept has only been used when it can add value to the analysis.

This thesis will also make use of an analytical perspective that has been linked to the concept of belonging termed intersectionality. This posits that an individual’s belonging is a process constructed along the axes of intersecting categories of social difference, such as gender, socio-economic status, nationality, stage in the life-cycle, etc. Nira Yuval-Davis notes that these categories technically have no concrete meaning in and of themselves as they always intersect with other categories of difference; no one, for example, is ever just a woman, they are also old or young, poor or rich, an ethnic minority or a hegemonic majority, etc.\textsuperscript{250} One idea which must be kept in mind throughout the analysis is that an individual’s capacity to negotiate inclusion within certain groups depends upon an individual’s need and ability to do so. This, in turn, is dependent upon an individual’s position within the intersection of various different categories of social differentiation, such as gender, wealth, age etc.\textsuperscript{251} For example, we might expect that resident male aliens of a high socio-economic status had far greater opportunities to become a London citizen than their poorer counterparts. The use of probate and legal records, necessary to reconstruct aspects of the lives of aliens, privileges the study of alien men of middling to higher social rank. As an individual’s belonging often works along the axes of these categories of social difference, we should be careful not to apply the findings from these sources to all aliens. As such, what follows are primarily the strategies which resident aliens of a middle to high social-economic status undertook as part of the work of belonging.


\textsuperscript{251} This is most clearly demonstrated in a historical study in Harders, “Belonging, Migration and Profession,” 23, 8–10.
Early in the research process, I considered the possibility that Chancery petitions might be used to explore whether alien petitioners felt an attachment to a locale or group, which is one component of the belonging concept, or how individual aliens self-identified. These, however, proved problematic for two reasons. One important consideration is that petitions do not contain a narrative written by the petitioner themselves, but rather one which was negotiated between a petitioner and a lawyer, and the latter packaged the narrative to fit the form and style of a Chancery petition. The stories we have, then, have been filtered through the lens of an English lawyer and are conveyed through his vocabulary and ideas. Any attempt to use the petitions to gauge whether aliens themselves actually identified as being part of a ‘national’ group, or to look at how aliens themselves might have expressed feelings of belonging, are thus highly problematic. For example, aliens are often described in petitions as ‘dochemen/women’ or ‘italeyn’ and rarely as being from specific regions or cities, such as Brabant, Flanders, Venice or Genoa. The terms used in the petitions, then, are homogenous labels used by the English lawyer to describe their clients and are unlikely those which the alien petitioners would have actually used to define themselves. Moreover, as will be explored below it was very common for aliens (and their lawyers) to stress how they were not part of a group to emphasise how they could not seek redress for their complaint through other legal means, a strategy used by petitioners to encourage the court to accept the petition. As this was a common legal argument in alien petitions, we should not view them as containing personal narratives which explain how individual petitioners felt excluded.

However, the narratives of non-belonging within Chancery petitions made by aliens are useful as they can be used to identify the key criterion of belonging to social networks. Indeed, it was common for petitioners and their lawyers to tell a story of how the petitioners did not belong to webs of people within English society whereas their respondent was well-connected in order to emphasise how they could not obtain justice elsewhere. The explanations which petitioners put forward as to why they were not included within networks can then be used to identify some of the criteria required to belong within them; if a petitioner argued that they did not belong to a group because of a particular reason then that reason constituted one of the key criteria for inclusion. One means by which petitioners argued that they did not belong, and thus stressed to the chancellor that they could not obtain justice via common law, was that they were strangers in the cities in which they lived. For example, a Doche beerbrewer who lived in London named Gerard van Scouneburgh argued in his petition (1493x1500) that the native respondent Robert Helgæy had levelled an action of trespass against him because ‘your seyd
Oratour is but a straunger borne beyond the se hauyng litill acqueyntaunce reason wherof he [Robert] intendyth to cause your seyd Oratour to be condemnyed’. A similar argument is used in the petition of Piers Hawes (1460x1465) a Doche alien who lived in London. It states that the respondent initiated an action of trespass against him because he was a ‘staunger born not having here in thees parties eny friendship or knowledge to helpe hym or to socour him’. Peter van Lubyk, in a petition dated 1475x1485, used this strategy. He argued that an action of trespass was levied against him by a respondent named John Lyvelander ‘by cause your said Oratour is a Straunger not knowyn within the realme of Englond not having any acquaytaunce wherby he might have socour or help’. George Jeneweys argued that his respondent levied a false action against him because ‘your saide oratoure was a straunger and had noo frendis to helpe hym’. The argument that alien petitioners were strangers and not known by people in the city was one used in a number of petitions.

The language of the bills clearly refers to the term ‘stranger’ in the sense of alien status—a ‘straunger borne’. Yet, through emphasising their lack of connections, petitioners were also clearly evoking another sense of the word which would have been obvious the chancellor, namely to refer to someone who was unknown. As such, alien petitioners argued that they were strangers, in this sense of the term, because they were not known by anyone within London. They did so to emphasise to the chancellor that, because they were not known by anyone within the city, they were not part of any of the networks of people within it. These arguments indicate that to be known by and to maintain positive ties with members of networks within London was an essential criterion of inclusion within these groups.

An important concern of this thesis is to use legal and probate evidence to explore how aliens might establish these connections, their motivations in doing so, as well as to identify the types of networks aliens attempted to negotiate their inclusion into. To this end, I view social relationships through the lens of networks—and thus my approach like many other recent approaches to late medieval social history has been influenced by network theory—yet I do

252 TNA C 1/225/44.
253 TNA C 1/28/480.
254 TNA C 1/64/750.
255 TNA C 1/143/11.
256 For only a few examples see John Bole (Bull in other sources) C 1/67/192, Gerard Van Sconeburgh C 1/225/44, John Beawme C 1/611/30, John Spur C 1/24/70, Andrew Tewell C 1/584/17, Jane Defyens C 1/32/277, William Gerard C 1/66/173.
not use the formalities of the Social Network Analysis (SNA) methodology. This methodology is used in recent studies by Justin Colson and Charlotte Berry to explore the degree to which sociability in London and its hinterland was conducted on a local basis and to gauge how a place of residence could influence patterns of sociability. Charlotte Berry succinctly describes SNA as a ‘quantitative methodology for the analysis of interactions between a set of “nodes” (points within the network) which enables both the visualisation of those interactions as a network graph and the statistical expression of a network’s characteristics’. This entails inputting data from historical sources into a computer programme which then can generate a network graph. I do not use the formalities of SNA because it does not fit the approach utilised here. Indeed, much of the source material I use is narratives presented within legal contexts to obtain specific outcomes. In using legal sources, I wish to privilege individual narratives and to explore the different narrative strategies and discourses within them that, in turn, shed invaluable light upon different elements of the lived alien experiences. To extract ‘information’ from these narratives and convert it into statistics, or enter it into a computer programme, is a methodology which would not suit this approach. Moreover, doing this might run the risk of separating the narrative from the legal context in which it was created and the ‘information’ from the reason why it was presented in the source in the first place.

The concepts, and the terminology, of ‘groups’, ‘communities’ and ‘networks’ are used by scholars in different ways. Referring to a medieval and early modern context, Justin Colson and Arie van Steensel have recently shown that there can be no single definition as to what a ‘community’ is as they have no fixed content that can be applied to different studies. Instead, they pragmatically suggest that scholars studying communities should provide a working definition of what they mean by ‘community’. Recent research concerning London has viewed the city as not one single ‘urban community’, but as ‘multiple communities, or rather,
webs of networks and solidarities’. The multitude of groups to which individuals might be included within late medieval London can be split into two broad, often overlapping, categories. In what follows, the terms ‘social networks’ will be used to describe webs of people bound together via interpersonal ties which may, or may not, have revolved around a particular locality. These are what might be termed ‘informal groups’. The term ‘formal group’ will denote groups with defined entry requirements, rules as to how their members should act (e.g. religious fraternities or craft guilds), and / or which conferred certain rights and privileges upon their members. The term ‘groupings’, or ‘communities’, shall refer to informal and formal groups collectively. The distinction between ‘informal’ and ‘formal’ groupings has been made for the sake of clarity, yet it should be remembered that they were not mutually exclusive as membership of a formal group might have facilitated inclusion within an informal group and vice versa. For example, membership of a guild offered socialising opportunities, and formal groups usually emerge out of pre-existing informal groups. A similar, yet not identical, distinction between ‘informal groups’ and ‘formal groups’ is used by Charles Phythian-Adams in his analysis of the social structure of late medieval Coventry.


Charles Phythian-Adams, *Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 81–169; Phythian-Adams classifies formal groups as the household, the craft fellowship, socio-religious guilds, and ruling councils, and argues citizens well-advanced in their ‘career-cycle’ usually simultaneously held positions in all of these. He defines informal groups as social stratification (Journeymen, masters, magisterial elite, etc.), extended family and social topography.
I. Levels of Transience and Alien Newcomers’ Strategies

Levels of Transience

There was clearly no standard model of residence which every alien followed, although common themes among different groups can be observed. As might be expected, certain alien merchants would stay in London long enough to sell their wares and buy goods for the return journey before leaving again. Large galleys and carracks from Italy might stay in London for months, and their sailors would go ashore, spend money and interact with the locals. Bolton notes there would have been a large number of transient merchants and sailors who would only make fleeting appearances in the city. The Views of the Hosts (a record of the commercial transactions of alien merchants who lodged with English hosts from 1440 to 1444), lists many small independent traders who only stayed in the capital for short periods. Many Italian merchants were young men who were sent to London representing their family’s mercantile firm in order to learn the business. As such, few would have sought permanent residence. It would, however, be too simplistic to argue that alien merchants were transient. Suzanne Dempsey demonstrates that in the early fourteenth century, during Edward II’s reign, there was a small group of long-term Italian residents who often established strong ties with native society. Helen Bradley shows that among the Italians in the fifteenth century there was a small number who settled more permanently in London becoming citizens, raising a family and acquiring English friends. Certain merchants of other nationalities stayed in England for sustained periods of time, such that the merchant stranger Mattice Petit described himself in his petition to the Chancery (1475x1480) as ‘of London’, and who lived there with his wife, and Peter De Valiadolet is described as a ‘merchant of spayne resident in the Cite of london’ in his Chancery petition (1486x1493 or 1504x1515).
That the collectors of the alien subsidy were not deemed responsible if the amount collected for the tax was less than the amount due from the assessments led Thrupp to argue that it was assumed that aliens were often mobile, and it was acknowledged that many would move between the time of assessment and the time of payment.²⁷² Sarah Rees Jones and Judith Bennett both show that in the north of England there were large numbers of poor, low-status, Scottish men and women who were highly mobile and often moved to find work.²⁷³ It is possible that low-status aliens might have come to London and its economic periphery, taken service roles for a number of years, and then moved to other areas of the country. In a recent study of aliens recorded in a single alien subsidy or in only a small number of subsidies for London, Jessica Lutkin supports Bolton’s argument that only around a fifth of London’s alien population were long-term residents in the capital.²⁷⁴ Although, Bolton defines ‘long-term’ as someone who had lived in London for two/three years or more, whereas Lutkin defines ‘long-term’ residents as those who had lived in the city for ten years or more.²⁷⁵ Lutkin suggests that we should consider long-term residents as only one category of alien in London, and that those who lived in the city for up to ten years might be usefully described as mid-term aliens, while those who stayed for less than a year as short-term aliens.²⁷⁶

It is easy to assume that alien artisans, that is master craftsmen with workshops, were less transient than alien merchants who often went overseas, or alien journeymen or servants without workshops of their own. Certainly, artisans could stay in London and its suburbs for a number of years. For example, the cordwainer Gerard Wesyll is recorded as living in Southwark in the Patent Rolls of 1436 and in the alien subsidy assessments of 1440, 1442 and 1449.²⁷⁷ The tailor Henry Perwyk from Guelders took an oath of fealty to the Crown in 1436 and is recorded as living in London.²⁷⁸ The same man is recorded in the alien subsidy assessments in 1441, 1449 and 1451 as living in the Langbourn ward of the city.²⁷⁹ Long-term residency, however, was not the norm for all alien artisans. It is likely that some of the Doche

²⁷³ Rees Jones, “Scots in the North of England,” 57–60; Bennett, “Women (and Men) on the Move,” 18–21, Bennett shows that, in Northumberland, Scottish women had to travel further south than Scottish men to find work, 21.
²⁷⁴ Bolton argues based on the 1483 subsidy assessment for London and the 1440 subsidy assessment for Southwark that only around 20 per cent of alien householders were long-term residents, see Bolton, The Alien Communities, 25–27.
²⁷⁶ Lutkin, “Settled or Fleeting?,” 154.
²⁷⁷ CPR, 1429–1436, 544; TNA E 179/182/212, rot.10 (1440); E 179/235/17, rot.3 (1442); E 179/242/126, m. 2 (1449).
²⁷⁸ CPR, 1429–1436, 547.
²⁷⁹ TNA E 179/144/42, m. 23 (1441); E 179/235/23, m. 10 (1449); E 179/144/64, m. 3 (1451).
artisans recorded in the alien subsidy as servants were journeymen who had completed an apprenticeship in their region of origin and had gone on their wandersjahre travel, or ‘tramping’, the act of migrating elsewhere in order to learn new techniques in their craft with the hope of returning home someday. This was a very common practice amongst journeymen in central Europe from the fourteenth century onwards. Moreover, master craftsmen might stay in London or its suburbs for short periods of time before moving and settling permanently to other areas of England. Lutkin, in her analysis of those recorded as ‘moved’ in the alien subsidies suggests that many aliens, particularly skilled craftsmen (masters and journeymen), would have stayed in London for short periods of time before moving elsewhere ‘although definite examples remain elusive’. A case (1492x1547) brought to the Court of Common Requests by Andrew Hore, a yeoman of London, and Ellen his wife, a ‘duchewoman’, supports Lutkin’s argument suggesting that, having stayed in the area for a period of time, master craftsmen might move and conduct their trade elsewhere.

Ellen and Andrew Hore claimed that Ellen had previously been married to Henry Bette of Dedham, Essex, who had left 100 pounds worth of goods when he died. They complained that Thomas Webb, Robert Cradok and John Stephenson had forced Ellen and Henry to live apart for seven years and, upon Henry’s death, they took on the role of executors and embezzled his goods without giving any to Ellen. In their response, Thomas, Robert and John denied the allegation. They instead claimed that Henry’s goods did not cover his debts because during his lifetime Ellen had run off with another man and had stolen Henry’s ‘chefe goodes’. In order to dismiss this accusation and to portray herself as an honest woman, Ellen was compelled to provide a narrative within her replicatio to the court concerning her life before and after her marriage to Henry. She asserted that she was married ‘in the parish of seint olaf in southwerk unto Jenyn Robynson skinner whiche afterward dwelled in Abyndon and there decesseid levyng the seid Elen of good substaunce of goods’.

---

281 Lutkin, “Settled or Fleeting?,” 150.
283 TNA REQ 2/6/86, f. 1.
284 TNA REQ 2/6/86, f. 2
goods’ portrays him as having prospered in Abingdon, an important textile town.\textsuperscript{285} The replication reads that only after Jenyn’s death did Ellen marry Henry Bette in the church of Saint Helen, Abingdon, and goes on more explicitly to deny the respondents’ allegation of adultery.\textsuperscript{286} The name of Ellen’s first husband ‘Jenyn’ strongly suggests that he was a Doche alien, as does his marriage to Ellen, a ‘duchewoman’, in Saint Olave’s in Southwark. This was the parish with the highest concentration of Doche migrants in Southwark, itself a suburb with a large alien population.\textsuperscript{287} As such, Ellen’s replication provides an account of a Doche alien living in Southwark who then subsequently moved to Abingdon. This is a rare example of what probably was a broader practice according to which alien artisans could stay in London and its suburbs for a time before establishing themselves elsewhere in England.

The narrative also demonstrates something of the experience of the alien wives of artisans who moved elsewhere within England. Ellen’s story of migration from Southwark to Abingdon suggests a wider practice of both artisans and their wives in England relocating together as an economic unit. The alien subsidy returns indicate that Doche artisans in London tended to be married to Doche women.\textsuperscript{288} These wives would have been essential partners in their husbands’ businesses. Indeed, studies of the economic role of the wives of artisans in an English and Low Countries context demonstrate that they played a key role in managing the household economy, helping their husbands in the workshop, as well as practising a wide range of other profit-making activities, such as ale brewing and spinning.\textsuperscript{289}

What is clear is that aliens formed a heterogeneous group of people with different levels of transience; some might have intended to settle in London and its suburbs for sustained periods of time, others might have intended to stay there for a few years before relocating, and some were transients in the short term only coming to London for reasons of trade. However, if we accept Lutkin’s argument that around 20 per cent of London’s population lived in the city

\textsuperscript{286} TNA REQ 2/6/86, f. 3.
\textsuperscript{287} Carlin, \textit{Medieval Southwark}, 154.
\textsuperscript{288} Bolton, \textit{The Alien Communities}, 19.
for more than ten years (long-term), there still would have been a sizeable number of aliens who were not necessarily transient, yet at the same did not stay in the city for all their lives.

**The Needs and Strategies of an Alien Newcomer**

It has been demonstrated by scholars of migration in other time periods that migrant newcomers, both from abroad and from elsewhere within a country, have a number of essential requirements which they need to meet. In his study of nineteenth–century Lancashire, Michael Anderson demonstrates that migrant newcomers faced problems in finding a place to live, a job lacked information concerning the town to which they had moved.²⁹⁰ In discussing migration in the mid-twentieth century, Charles Tilly notes a similar set of problems to be overcome by newcomers: assuring a source of income, finding shelter, and acquiring advice and information about their new environment.²⁹¹ A study of Chinese and Somali immigrants and refugees to twenty first–century Canada has also concluded that the basic needs of an immigrant included local knowledge and emotional support in the initial stages of settlement.²⁹²

Studies of migration have indicated that the support of family members and friends, who had migrated at an earlier time, often proved essential in helping newcomers overcome these issues. It is argued that the seventeenth century English newcomers to a town relied upon close or distant kinsfolk who already lived there to provide help with finding a job, accommodation and other forms of aid.²⁹³ The role of already established friends and family members in helping newcomers is also seen as a common pattern within studies of migration in the modern period.²⁹⁴ Louise Ryan argues that in regards to Irish migration to Britain in the 1930s, female kin played an essential role in finding jobs and accommodation for family members who moved to the same towns as they had.²⁹⁵

These studies prompt a question which can be posed to the medieval source material: Did already established friends and family provide similar support for alien newcomers to late medieval London? In his study of the alien subsidies of 1441 and 1483 of 1998, Bolton argues that migration of Doche immigrants to London and its suburbs followed a ‘migration chain’ pattern, namely a movement of adults who would send back information about England to their home towns and villages. Their wives, children, friends and parents would subsequently follow and live with them and be helped by their contacts who were already there. Bolton’s evidence for migration chains in the fifteenth century is slight. He points to one pair of Doche brothers who lived in London and were recorded in the 1483 subsidy, although he acknowledges that it is not possible to determine whether they had moved to London together or one preceded the other. In a chapter written in 1999, Bolton put forward a hypothesis that one of the reasons why Doche aliens tended to congregate in similar areas to one another in London was because of chain migration, because aliens went to areas where they knew friends and family were. He points to the licenses of remain granted in 1436 to aliens from the Low Countries, which record their region of origin, arguing that as many seem to have come from similar areas in Brabant and Holland, it is likely that they followed a migration chain pattern. Drawing upon Bolton’s analysis, Lien Bich Luu argues that aliens followed a migration chain pattern. She also reconstructs the life of a Doche migrant who came to London probably in 1565 and was later employed by his brother who owned an established brewhouse and points to this as being suggestive of chain migration.

Although these examples point to the practice of chain migration, there are still important questions about this form of movement which, if answered, would help us better understand the experience of alien newcomers and strengthen the argument that migration in the late medieval period often followed this chain pattern. Namely, was seeking out friends and
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family members who had already migrated to a particular area one of the first priorities of a newly arrived alien? What was the benefit of doing so? In addition to addressing these questions, this section will examine other strategies that aliens adopted, and the options at their disposal, to obtain the basic requirements that a newcomer would have sought, particularly in relation to finding accommodation. In doing this, the analysis will draw mainly on London will be used predominantly, but also on comparable evidence of alien newcomers to York.

The depositions recorded in Martin c. Paynaminuta, an instance action concerning marriage brought to the London Consistory Court in December 1494, reflect that alien newcomers to London could seek out kinship members who had already established themselves in the city. A summation of the depositions of the witnesses, and John Paynaminuta himself, provides a narrative of an alien who moved to England, leaving a spouse in the process, and who then subsequently married someone else in London. In 1478, John Paynaminuta, otherwise known as Apperys, allegedly married one Conesyn de Ionquelas in Bayonne and lived with her for around four years. At the time of the case, he claimed that he had not heard from Conesyn for eleven years. Sometime after leaving Conesyn, he migrated to England, settled in London and married Katherine Martyn. About half a year before the case, he was told by one John Paynaminuta, a witness in the case who shared his name, that Conesyn was still alive. Upon learning this, John told the witness that ‘he was sad about Conesyn’s being alive’ yet stated that ‘nonetheless it was necessary to be divorced from my wife Katherine’. After this, he allegedly self-divorced himself from Katherine by repudiating her as his wife. The depositions in the case were provided by four men who testified on behalf of Katherine, viz. Oliver Growell of Bordeaux, the other John Paynaminuta, an alien from France who had lived in the Salisbury diocese before moving to London prior to the case, as well as the parish clerk and the curate of the parish church of St Mary Colman. The testimony of John Paynaminuta, the defendant, also survives.300

These depositions depict alien newcomers seeking out family and friends upon arrival in London. Paynaminuta is a name highly suggestive of alien origin, something which is supported by the testimonies that he married a woman in Bayonne before coming to England.

---

It is, thus, very likely that John was indeed an alien who originated from France. I have, however, not been able to identify where in France he may have emigrated from. The witness for the plaintiff John Paynaminuta claimed that he had known his namesake since childhood, that he was married to Conesyn, who was still alive, and that he had told the defendant that he had seen his wife in Bayonne two years previously. That John shared the same name as the defendant, that he portrayed himself as having links with Bayonne as did the defendant, and that he was in contact with the latter’s first wife is notable. It strongly suggests that the witness was related to him and was, consequently, an alien also.

The testimony of John Paynaminuta, the witness, reflects that one of the priorities of a new arrival was to seek contact with family members who also lived there, and that the residence of a family member in London would be an additional incentive for kin members to move to the city also. He argued that two years before his deposition, he had seen Conesyn in Bordeaux and had soon after come to London, relaying the information to his relative that she was still alive. At some point after this, he moved to Salisbury diocese for a year or more, but he had been living in London since the feast of Easter prior to the case. John’s deposition is notable in that it reflects the social practice of a migrant seeking out contact with family members upon arrival in a new environment. Indeed, his arguments that he had moved to London two years previously, had known where to find his relative, went to him to discuss Conseyn, and that after a period of living elsewhere in England he had come back to London (presumably to live near his relative) where he had lived since Easter all indicate this. John Paynaminuta’s (defendant) testimony further indicates that another strategy of an alien who came to a settlement would be initially to seek contact with alien acquaintances who had originated from their region of origin. Indeed, he stated that Oliver Growell, who was from Bordeaux, came to see him in London around two months before the case and told him about Conesyn being alive.

That one of the initial strategies of an alien newcomer was to seek someone else who they knew in London evidenced in a petition to the Chancery made by Clement Morys ‘locket macker of london’ (1538x1544). The petition reads that his wife’s sister ‘cam from by yond the see forthe of fraunce for necessyte and to require frenshepe and succor at you sayd orators hand and his wiffis’. ‘Consydering his sisters indigntye and poverte’, he stated that he was
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very glade and wyllyng to haue prefferryd hyr in to sum service’. Following this, after Clement had implicitly after asked around his acquaintances for a service position, one John Pyllarde, Clement’s neighbour, asked Clement whether his sister-in-law could ‘ayde and helpe’ his sick wife. He specifically asked for Clement’s sister-in-law because his wife was ‘not profytt in speaking Inglyshe’. Clement agreed to let his sister-in-law serve John’s wife, as well as to let her live in his house until John could move into a larger dwelling and accommodate her himself. One Richard Clarke, however, claimed that Clement kept his sister-in-law as an apprentice. Richard commenced a legal action against Clement on the grounds that he had an illegal alien apprentice; consequently, Clement petitioned the chancellor to ask for the case to be heard in the Chancery.\textsuperscript{303}

The statute which Clement was accused of breaking was one enacted in 1523, which prohibited any alien from taking on an alien apprentice.\textsuperscript{304} This identifies Clement as an alien. His forename, and that his wife’s sister was French, indicate that Clement originated from France. Clement used the petition to claim that his sister-in-law was not his apprentice and that Richard’s accusation was false. His argument that his sister-in-law had come from abroad to seek him and his wife, desperately seeking their help, was part of his petitionary strategy. Despite this, that he thought the argument would appear credible in a legal context clearly reflects a reality that newly arrived aliens to London could seek out family members who had already settled there.

An earlier marriage case from outside of the capital further demonstrates that one of the priorities undertaken by an alien after they had arrived in a city was to seek friends or family members who had originated from their home regions. This is revealed in the records of a marriage case brought to the Consistory Court of York. In 1364, a cause of divorce \textit{a vincula} was brought to court by one Edmund de Dronesfeld. Edmund claimed that his wife, who called herself Margaret, was in fact Agnes de Donbar, a member of the Scottish aristocracy. According to Edmund, she had already made a valid marriage contract to one William de Brigham, a Scot, prior to marrying him. The summation of the narrative strands in the depositions of the six witnesses provides a gripping story which has already attracted scholarly attention.\textsuperscript{305} Agnes de Donbar, otherwise known as ‘White Annays’ had married William de

\textsuperscript{303} TNA C 1/1037/39.
\textsuperscript{304} Statutes of the Realm, vol. 3 (London: Dawsons, 1817), 208 (Henceforth \textit{Stats. Realm})
\textsuperscript{305} The depositions used for this analysis have been translated from the transcription provided in Dorothy M. Owen, “White Annays and Others,” in \textit{Medieval Women}, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978), 343–46. The original reference is BI, CP.E.87. The case is also briefly outlined in Donahue, \textit{Law, Marriage and Society},
Brigham, a Scottish squire, in Lothian, Scotland, in 1342. The three witnesses testified that they had had children together as a means to indicate that they had cohabited as man and wife. After a period of cohabitation, Agnes somehow was separated from her husband William. Two deponents, Thomas Scot and Gilbert de Donfermlyn, argued that Agnes had left her husband. Another witness, John de Sadberry, argued that she was abducted and taken from her husband by an English squire named Robert Corbett. Upon moving to England, Agnes allegedly changed her name to Margaret, and she married Edmund de Dronesfeld at Bedale, Yorkshire, in 1352. On Christmas Day 1363, David II, King of the Scots, came to York. William de Brigham, now a knight, was part of his retinue. Two witnesses stated that William approached them and, because they had met both William and Agnes before, asked them concerning the whereabouts of his wife. Although not explicitly stated, it is implied in the depositions that William’s arrival in York alerted Edmund to his wife’s previous marriage. This, then, prompted him to force her from his company and no longer consider her his wife.

Three witnesses, Gilbert de Donfermlyn, son of Henry de Whelpdale, Thomas Scot and John de Sadberry, testified for Edmund. They deposed that Margaret was actually called Agnes and that she had contracted a valid marriage with William prior to her marriage to Edmund. These are exactly the arguments which Edmund needed to sue for an annulment on the grounds of prior contract. The depositions of the other three witnesses, John Tias, Robert de Acastre and Robert Flokton are recorded on the same piece of parchment as the first three witnesses, which is good evidence that they were also Edmund’s witnesses. The main thrust of all their depositions was that Agnes/Margaret had married Edmund only after her alleged first marriage, and consequently that her marriage to Edward was invalid.

The witnesses for Edmund provided narratives of connections with Scotland. Indeed, both Gilbert and Thomas claim to have been born in Scotland. As these witnesses call the defendant Agnes, this is the name which I will use hereafter. They portrayed themselves as people who were particularly well positioned to provide testimony, stressing how closely connected they were to the different parties. Gilbert argued that he was the nephew of John de Bawnes, Agnes’s father, whom he knew well. The emphasis on his family connection to both John and Agnes was a strategy to project himself as a witness who would have known about Agnes’s affairs because he was related to her. He also claimed to have known Edmund for four

years; however, his testimony implies that he had lived in England for a number of years prior to the case. Thomas Scot also stated that he had known Edmund for four years. He deposed that he knew William, Agnes and Thomas in an attempt to portray himself as a useful witness. He also testified that he had been present at the solemnisation of the marriage of Agnes and William, but that he had been captured at the Battle of Neville’s Cross (1346) and, subsequently, brought to England, where he had met Edmund, and where he had been living sporadically ever since. John de Sadberry argued that he became acquainted with William and Agnes when he was taken as a prisoner to Scotland. John was English, and he stated that he had been captured by William of Brigham in battle. Having been taken to Scotland as William’s prisoner, he alleged that he had been present at the solemnisation of William’s marriage to Agnes, that he was released in 1347, and that by the time of the case in 1364 he was living in York. The testimonies of Thomas Scot and John de Sadberry, then, place Agnes’s departure from Scotland within the context of the Anglo-Scottish conflict just after the Battle of Neville’s Cross, when most of Scotland’s southern shires were occupied by English forces. 306

Parts of Thomas and Gilbert’s depositions reflect something of the strategies of a migrant newcomer. Gilbert argued that in 1363 William had entered York in the retinue of the Scottish king and had asked Gilbert, who allegedly happened to be in York, where his wife Agnes was. Gilbert then deposed that when he told William that Agnes had married again in the vicinity, but that he did not know where she was, William ‘swore vehemently’. 307 It is notable that Gilbert argued that William sought him out whilst in York and asked for his advice. Gilbert was Agnes’s cousin, making him related to William through bonds of affinity. In order to appear credible, this would need to have followed a social practice, whereby aliens new to a location in England would seek out and ask for the help of fellow aliens to whom they were somehow related. The deposition of Thomas Scot suggests that aliens new to a location did not only seek the help of kin. He also claimed that he saw William in the retinue of the King of Scots in York the year previously. He stated that he was approached by William, his old acquaintance, and that William gave Thomas forty shillings to search for Agnes. Thomas’ deposition reflects that an alien new to a settlement in England would seek out, and ask for the help of, alien acquaintances originating from an area of similar cultural background as themselves.

307 ‘adiurabatur vehementer’.
The reason why aliens sought contact with acquaintances and family after they arrived in a settlement was to obtain help and advice. As newcomers, they did not belong to other social networks or formal groupings in a city, which is why they turned to the support of friends and family who had already established themselves there. Friends and family who had already negotiated their place within social networks, and who were armed with local knowledge, would be well placed to help newcomers. This is most clearly demonstrated in the petition of Clement Moryce which relates that Clement was able to ask around and find a service position for his wife’s sister with one of his neighbours. This is also indicated by the depositions of Thomas Scot and Gilbert de Donfermlyn in the Dronesfeld c. Donbarr case, which stated that William sought out other Scots in York in order to obtain information and help with a view to finding his wife.

The way in which Clement Moryce stated that he intended to help his wife’s sister also points to one of the needs of a poorer immigrant who was new to London. Considering that she was so poor, Clement argued that he was ‘wyllyng to haue preferryd hyr in to sum service’. The petition goes on to state that, afterwards, John Pyllarde wanted her to be his servant, in the sense of a contracted servant who lived with their master; yet, Clement’s initial statement of ‘sum service’ refers to service in its more general sense, namely employment. As such, the petition indicates one way to help an immigrant new arrival who was in need of ‘succor’ would have been to place them into some form of employment.

The petition of the capper Robert Rowes (1493x1500) also indicates that finding work would have been a priority for newcomers. Robert’s petition presents him as having sought temporary work as a journeyman. He argued that he was ‘borne undyr the kynges obedience in the Countrey of Normandy’. He had stayed there until the previous Easter and ‘immedyatly after the same fest’ came to England, straight away entering into the service of one Thomas Hothwayte, a haberdasher of London. It was agreed that Robert would work for Thomas ‘weke in to weke after as they might agre and for a solary betwixt them agreed’. When Robert was not paid, he left Thomas’ service. Thomas then brought a legal action against him under the statute of labourers, which is why Robert petitioned the Chancery. That he explicitly stated in his petition that he came to London directly after Easter is interesting. Indeed, traditional hiring dates for labour and service in England tended to revolve around key religious dates,
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such as Michaelmas or Easter.\textsuperscript{310} The statement that he came to England directly after Easter, then, positions him as having come at a time when employers would traditionally hire.

\textbf{Accommodation}

Another key concern for most alien newcomers would be the need to obtain a form of accommodation. Out of the 1,595 aliens in London recorded in the 1483 alien subsidy, 457 (29\%) were assessed to pay the householder rate.\textsuperscript{311} It is very likely that many of the aliens recorded as ‘householders’ in the subsidies were those who rented property rather than owning it outright. Indeed, there was a common trend amongst townsmen in the late medieval period to lease their homes, usually from large institutional landowners.\textsuperscript{312} In addition, many of the merchant citizens of medieval London owned real estate, which they rented out.\textsuperscript{313} Derek Keene argues that short tenancies in London were available for small and cheap accommodation.\textsuperscript{314} By the late medieval period, few urban residents owned outright the land their residences were built on but had acquired secure leasehold.\textsuperscript{315} A wealthy newcomer intending to stay in a settlement for a sustained amount of time could not technically buy a tenement, as aliens were barred from purchasing real estate under common law.\textsuperscript{316} The authors of \textit{Immigrant England} demonstrate that it was relatively common for aliens to be recorded as ‘staying with’ English people in the alien subsidy returns, implying that they were renting accommodation and staying with English hosts. They suggest that the impact of aliens upon the English rental market was far greater than has previously been understood.\textsuperscript{317}

Sources other than the alien subsidy rolls confirm the argument that aliens commonly rented property which, in turn, indicates that this was an option for wealthier alien newcomers to secure accommodation. The petition of Gerard van Scouneburgh describes him as owning a long-term ‘leese’ of a tenement and a wharf in London from ‘the wardeyns and parson of the
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The petition of Thomas Bleuer (1475x1485) states that John van Delf, a Doche goldsmith, rented a ‘mees in london’ from a Margaret Croston. Individuals were not the only ones to rent. Large mercantile firms did so as well. In the 1430s, the Borromei Bank, an Italian bank which would have had the means to buy premises if it suited them, rented its premises on St Nicholas’ Lane in London from the tailor Alexander Farnell. Individuals who intended to stay in a settlement on a medium- or long-term basis could acquire long-term lets from other aliens. Henry Garratson, likely an alien, petitioned the Chancery (1529x1532) alleging that he bought ‘of on Kyrrst Gossoms an estraunger a certeyn leese for term of x yeres not yet endyd of a certeyn aley […] with certeyn small tenementes and house wityn the same’ within the liberty of St Martin’s le Grand in London. The bill of complaint of John Cullyn (1492x1547), a shoemaker also of St Martin’s le Grand, to the Court of Requests argued that he had promised to buy a seven-year lease of a tenement within the liberty of one ‘lyonell al lyones arundell along with a number of shoes which were kept within it’. John complained to court that, despite paying for the lease, Lyonell had rented the house to someone else when he was ‘be yond the see’. Rather than being only a necessity, leasehold likely offered wealthier aliens the ability to move to a place without needing large capital investment, which may have been a factor which contributed to the mobility of aliens in the city.

Not all aliens who came to London, however, would have sought to rent a tenement for long periods. One of the priorities of transient merchant strangers who came to England was to obtain a place to stay and store their merchandise just long enough to transact their business. Finding appropriate accommodation and storage facilities was necessary to ensure the preservation of their goods. The Chancery petition of the merchant stranger Gabryell de Durno (1502x1503) states that he had had such trouble to rent a place with the appropriate storage facilities that he had to leave ‘dyvers merchayndyses and wares lying upon the waterside’ while he looked for a place at short notice. At certain times, an alien merchant had limited options as to where they could stay. A charter of 1327 forced merchant strangers to sell their goods in London within 40 days, and to live with a citizen host, and denied them the ability to keep their goods.
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own households. It is not clear how strictly this was enforced, and it almost certainly had fallen into abeyance by the fifteenth century when statutes, lobbied for by members of mercantile livery companies, were produced which tried to enforce very similar hosting regulations. Indeed, in the earlier fifteenth century, during times of antagonism as regards the success of alien merchants, which was prompted partly by national bullion shortages, Parliament enacted a number of statutes in an effort to compel alien merchants to take up residence with native merchants. In 1403–4, a statute was passed dictating that aliens were to board with hosts assigned by local authorities. This law was to work in conjunction with a statute of 1402, which required that all money earned from selling imports had to be spent on goods for export. A similar statute was passed in 1425, which stated that alien merchants should stay with native hosts who should supervise their economic activities, yet nothing was done to enforce the rule.

These laws were ineffective and rarely adhered to: the 1403–4 act was reissued in 1416 because ‘the same statutes have not been put in due execution’. The ineffectiveness of the previous hosting laws were the basis for a 1439-40 statute, which required alien merchants to board with natives, and for all their profits to be spent on goods for export. Native hosts were to send the records of the economic transactions of their lodgers to the Exchequer. It seems very probable that this statute was the result of the lobbying of influential London mercantile factions in Parliament which wished for greater regulation of alien merchants and the reinstatement of hosting laws similar to those stated within the 1327 charter. Although initially observed, this statute seems to have been rarely adhered to after the mid-1440s. Thus, at certain points in the in the late medieval period, often just after the declaration of a hosting law, many merchants would have been compelled to board with a native assigned to them by the mayor. This was not the norm, however, as the rigour of these laws seem to have
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lapsed soon after their conception, and thus in most instances alien merchants would have had to find a place to stay and store their wares themselves.

In London’s dockside neighbourhoods, there were various institutions, such as cellars, cook shops and bathhouses, which catered for seamen, many of which would have been frequented by aliens. It has been noted that ordinary seamen could stay in cheap lodging houses on London’s waterfront.\textsuperscript{332} One option available for wealthier merchants seeking accommodation was to stay in one of the many inns which abounded in trading settlements.\textsuperscript{333} Inns were establishments which catered for a wealthier segment of travellers and traders, providing various services such as food and shelter for people and horses, storage facilities for goods, an environment where trade might be carried out, as well as a place for social interaction.\textsuperscript{334} The large number of visitors that were drawn to London due to its economic, political and legal importance resulted in London, Southwark and Westminster having a greater number of inns than anywhere else in the country.\textsuperscript{335} That alien merchants newly arrived in London had the opportunity to stay in specialist inns run by alien innkeepers is evidenced in the Chancery petition of Francis de Barde (1518\texttimes1529).\textsuperscript{336} Francis was an innkeeper, and very likely also a merchant as he was a member of the Florentine Bardi mercantile family, who petitioned the chancellor for aid as he had been imprisoned on the command of the Mayor and Sheriffs of London. He seems to have been a more permanent resident in England because of his position as an innkeeper and because he took out letters of denization in 1514.\textsuperscript{337} He argued that he was a ‘maistir of a place in botulphe lane where in be diverse marchauntes straungiers inhabited’. One John Capelle, a merchant of Venice, paid him ‘by the yere’ for ‘lodging wit scelers and other houses thereunto’. Capelle had wine in his lodging, which James Rogers, a clerk, came to the inn to buy. Capelle accepted the offer on the condition that if Roger came with a freeman to buy the goods on his behalf then he would make the deal. He did so, and a broker was used to facilitate a deal between a citizen and Capelle. Despite this, it was alleged
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that this was a transaction between two foreigners, or unfranchised, which was illegal according to the city's customs. Consequently, the Mayor and Sheriffs imposed a fine of 40 marks against Francis, and not against Capelle, and he was subsequently imprisoned for non-payment.

The description of the services which Francis offered is telling. He stated that he owned a property where many alien merchants lived and where people like Capelle could rent both lodgings and storage facilities annually. This shows that someone of Italian origin could make money from charging other alien merchants, likely other immigrants from Italy like Capelle, for lodging and storage facilities. It also indicates that alien merchants could stay for protracted periods of time in London by renting facilities from an innkeeper familiar with their culture and trading practices. Barde’s statement that his tenements were in St Botolph’s Lane is also important, as it was connected to Thames Street leading to Botolph’s wharf on the river where merchandise could be loaded and offloaded. Consequently, an inn in this area would have been perfectly situated for merchants. Barde’s description of the services he offered to alien merchants has strong parallels to those provided by immigrant hostellers in Bruges, who specialised in catering to the needs of alien merchants from areas of similar cultural origin to themselves. The benefits of staying with specialist hostellers in Bruges was that they shared similar cultural traits to the merchants, could provide character references for their guests and information as to whom the merchants should trust, and were likely proficient in both the visitor’s and the native language. They also provided warehousing and brokerage services.

In other words, having already established themselves within social networks, and being equipped with local knowledge, they could offer invaluable help to merchant newcomers. Barde’s petition demonstrates that alien hostellers might afford a similar type of service in terms of lodging and warehouse facilities in London, perhaps also bestowing other benefits to their customers as those offered by alien hostellers in Bruges. Moreover, it is also noteworthy that James Rogers is described as having arrived to buy goods from James Capelle whilst he was staying in Barde’s inn, as it is an indication that inns catering for alien merchants acted as a forum where they might do business.
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Further evidence that alien householders could offer specialist lodging services for an alien clientele, and more explicit evidence that aliens who offered lodging services could use their local connections to facilitate the business of their guests, can be found in the rolls of the Mayor’s court of London. One Zanobius Martyn of Langbourn ward was brought to court in 1373 admitting that, although he was not a freeman, he kept a lodging house for aliens and acted as a broker against city ordinances. This is reflective of the strict stance which the city’s government took against alien brokers who connected alien merchants with alien wholesale buyers in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.\(^{342}\) His admittance of being a broker highlights that his services to his clientele of alien merchants included both lodging and brokerage; he used his links with others in London to help connect his transient guests with potential buyers.\(^{343}\)

Alien newcomers to Southwark could also take advantage of the services of lodging establishments catering for an alien clientele, as is demonstrated in a petition made to parliament in 1437. Certain inhabitants of Southwark submitted this bill to parliament only a year after the Burgundian Duke Philip the Good besieged Calais, at a time when England was still at war with Burgundy. The unnamed petitioners complained that inns and public houses located outside of the notorious Southwark stews drew thieves and murderers into the area. In addition to this, they argued that certain Flemings had set up hostels and taverns which harboured ‘alle maner aliens and strangers as wel Frencshmen and picardes as flemmynges and alle other nacions aswel adversaries to oure souerayn lord the kyng’. These aliens did not suffer ‘any englisshman tobe herbered or come among hem’, whilst in these groups they allegedly passed on secrets of the King.\(^{344}\) The petitioners wanted a statute which would confine hostelries and taverns to the stews and would ban aliens from owning hostels. The petition contains two requests, viz. for hostels not to be opened outside of the stews and for aliens not to own hostels.

The justification as to why aliens should not be hostel owners was specifically designed to play upon the fears of the King and the Commons at a time of war. Indeed, the petition was made a year after Philip the Good, the Burgundian Duke and lord of Flanders, besieged Calais and two years after he repudiated England in favour of an alliance with France. The nationality
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of the inn keepers, i.e. Flemings, who harboured King’s enemies was explicitly stated by the petitioners because it was a Flemish militia that had besieged Calais in 1436. This particular alien group, at this specific time, would have been synonymous with ‘enemy’. The petition portrays these Flemings as having harboured enemies, who helped the transfer of secrets at a time when England was at war with both France and Burgundy. The reference that the innkeepers were Flemings, and the emphasis that their activities were detrimental to the kingdom at war, were clearly narrative strategies. They were included so that the necessity of the request resonated with the Commons and the King; in fact, we may doubt the validity of the claims of Flemish espionage especially because this was a fairly regular accusation in a variety of different petitions sent to parliament. However, that the petitioners stated that Flemings owned hostels in an area of high alien concentration, like Southwark, which provided services solely for ‘alle maner’ of aliens further suggests that certain establishments could cater specifically for an alien clientele.

Newcomers might also seek accommodation with aliens of a similar cultural background to themselves who were not professional inn keepers. There are five aliens recorded unambiguously as landlords or, in one instance a landlady, in the alien subsidies in London, Westminster and Southwark. They are all recorded in the 1483 subsidy, with four ‘Teutonic’ aliens recorded as such in Dowgate ward and one Scot in Aldgate ward. Dowgate ward was a ward adjacent to the Thames, and was the ward in which the Hanseatic Steelyard was situated, so is likely to have been a place with high numbers of alien merchants and transients who needed lodging. Three of the four were recorded as being landlords of two aliens maximum, which might suggest that they were people who simply rented out rooms to people to supplement the household income rather than professional inn keepers.

Other evidence further indicates that alien merchants new to London could also lodge at the houses of people of a similar cultural background to themselves, who were not necessarily professional hostellers or innkeepers. This practice is reflected in the Chancery petition of Launcelot and Margaret Wytton (1529x1532), which records that Margaret was an ‘estraunger’ born in Flanders who lived in London and that she had one ‘John Jacope a
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merchaunte of Flaunders’ then ‘layeyng yn’ Margaret and Launcelot’s house. That alien merchants could stay with other aliens from areas of similar cultural backgrounds to themselves is also reflected in the testament of Amanenus de la Port (1413), a merchant of Bordeaux who lived in London. The will stated that Amanenus did not own his property. Indeed, at the time the will was made he described himself as staying with one ‘Arnold arress merchant and burgess of the City of Bordeaux’. Bradley noted that it was common for Italians in London to stay with other Italians who had were resident and householders. Aliens in other urban centres also offered hostelling services to people of a similar cultural background to themselves to supplement their income. The petition of Hubert Bussheman, a merchant of ‘Almayne’ to the Court of Requests (1492x1547) argues that he had been shipwrecked in the English Channel, coming ashore at Portsmouth. Desperate for accommodation, he stated that he lodged with the Doche alien Alerd Martenson, a beerbrewer of the same town. This has parallels with Liddy and Lambert’s findings concerning Doche craftsmen and beerbrewers in Great Yarmouth which highlights that these aliens offered hostelling services to merchants from the Low Countries who came to town in October and November for the Herring fair.

The ability to stay with other aliens in London was not open only to alien merchants. Indeed, alien craft workers could also board with householders of a similar cultural background to themselves, and work independently in their households, which meant that this option was likely open to all newcomers who could afford it. This is evidenced in the Chancery petition of a French hosier named Gabryell Dewvale (1529x1532). Gabryell petitioned the chancellor because one Anton de Conysby had brought a legal action against him on the grounds of his keeping one Pety Pero, a Frenchman, as a servant in contradiction to a statute passed in 1523. The punishment was a fine of ten pounds, which prompted Gabryell to ask the chancellor to move the case to the Chancery and rule in his favour. Anton’s accusation revolved around the clause of the statute which stipulated that no alien artisan was to have more than two servants or journeymen in his employ. Gabryell already had other alien servants and, as such, Anton argued that Gabryell had surpassed his limit through his employment of Pety. Gabryell used his petition to provide an explanation as to why Pety lived with him but that he was not his
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servant. He stressed that Pety was in fact his lodger and, consequently, that Anton’s accusation was false. The petition states that Gabryell and Pety had agreed that the latter could have ‘one chamber with a bedde in the dwelling of your orator and all that therto belongith’. The deal also included the provision of ‘mete and drynke by the wyke’. For this, Pety paid 2s. 4d. He was allowed to work in the house and ‘do his owne busenes att his pleasure’. Derek Keene’s research into commercial premises in late medieval Cheapside has demonstrated that there were often one or two stories above shops, the upper rooms of which were rented out to people who could only afford a single room. Gabryell seems to be referring to a similar letting practice in his petition. Although Pety is not given an occupation, that he is depicted as having worked in his chamber alludes to him being a craft worker. Gabryell stressed how Pety paid for his lodgings, and that he was able to do his own work, in order to emphasise the difference between his position and that of a live-in servant. Although clearly a narrative strategy, the petition points to a social reality that non-mercantile immigrants might lodge in the house others from a similar cultural background to themselves and practice their trade in their landlords’ houses. This most likely was an option open to alien newcomers who arrived without the resources to rent a tenement themselves.

II. Occupations

The occupations practiced by aliens have been well studied. Previous scholarship has demonstrated that the Doche in urban areas practiced an impressive range of skilled crafts and were particularly prominent in metalworking and crafts relating to clothing production, such as tailoring and shoemaking. Bolton argue that while these specialised skills catered for the tastes of the elite, for the most part the alien artisans helped fulfil the demand for goods and services of the native population. He also notes that the bulk of the alien population was made up of householders, who were independent masters of their craft, their wives and their servants. It is clear that he was mainly referring to the Doche, although there were other alien artisans of French, Scottish and Irish descent and some Italian craftsmen who worked in the city as well. He concluded that the alien population was an ‘artisan–craftsman working population based on the family unit of production’. Carlin uses the 1440 subsidy to argue that 66 per cent of Doche householders in Southwark were married to alien women, thus indicating a similar type of domestic production of goods based on the labour of a householder, their wife and servants. Moreover, despite some immigrants practising highly skilled alien crafts, the tendency for London’s alien population to practice similar trades to the natives continued until the mid-sixteenth century. Although Bolton’s research into the alien subsidies highlights that there were high numbers of Doche householders, it is possible that the subsidies privileged more settled artisans, with their own workshops, and under-numerated alien journeymen. Indeed, the local jurors who provided lists of aliens in their wards to the assessors would likely be more aware of established householders than more transient alien journeymen who produced piecework. The authors of the *Immigrant England* volume provide a detailed overview of the types of occupations aliens carried out and which groups predominated in them. They also suggest that higher wages after the Black Death, combined
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with lower rents and food prices, meant greater spending power for consumer goods, which encouraged numerous alien craftsmen to move to England.362

As noted in the introduction, the trading activities of Italians in London are well studied. Italians were predominantly involved in the mercantile trade of luxury goods, such as cloth of gold or silks, or raw materials needed for textile production, such as alum and woad. Merchants usually also acted as brokers and branches of mercantile banks could offer a range of financial services to London’s elite merchants.363 Luu has explored the connection between the presence of aliens and the diffusion of skills into the economy of London, and their economic impact on London’s industries between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, with some reference to alien occupations, particularly beer brewing in the late medieval period.364

The attempts of certain craft guilds, particularly those of the Goldsmiths and Merchant Taylors, to regulate and pragmatically accommodate alien labour have received particular attention, as have the petitions to the King in Parliament and London’s government made by certain London guilds in the second half of the fifteenth century, which complained about the competition of unenfranchised labour and sought to prompt regulatory measures.365 Davies, however, suggests that the stance of London’s companies was not universally hostile. Rather, he points to evidence of guilds undertaking a pragmatic approach characterised by both regulation and accommodation of unenfranchised alien labour to suit the contradictory demands of different groups of their freemen, and he argues that their approach to alien labour would change depending on the economic context.366

364 Although predominantly concerned with alien presence in the second half of the sixteenth century, Luu’s analysis does draw upon some evidence from the late medieval period, Luu, Immigrants and the Industries of London, for medieval discussion see in particular 235–236, 259–268.
The connection between an alien’s place of residence and their occupation has also been an important topic of study. Bolton notes that aliens moved to areas in the city where they could best practice their trade. The subsidy material for London from the 1440 and 1483/84 returns indicates that aliens concentrated in certain wards more than in others, although there were no alien enclaves (apart from the Hanseatic Steelyard), and that aliens lived in high concentrations within peripheral wards. He hypothesises that these areas, adjacent to the wall north and east or in the city’s suburbs, were cheaper and more attractive places to move to. Scholarship also explores how alien artisans were drawn to areas outside of the city’s jurisdiction, like Southwark, Westminster and St Martin’s the Grand, to work outside of the regulation of the city’s guilds.

As such, previous literature concerning alien occupations has focused on a select number of themes, namely the types of occupations in which aliens were predominant and their impact on London’s economy, the estimated numbers of aliens involved in particular occupations, how craft guilds reacted to alien labour, their attempts to regulate it, and the connection between an alien’s place of habitation and their occupation. Beyond the study of aliens working in areas outside of the city’s jurisdiction, what rarely has been studied are the strategies which aliens undertook in order to practice their occupations or obtain work successfully and the options they had at their disposal in this regard. Moreover, it is clear that economic success in the late medieval economy revolved in large part around an individual’s relationship with others who might act as their customers, help them in the fulfilment of certain commissions, and lend them goods and capital on credit. However, there is notable lack of scholarship regarding how non-Italian aliens established these crucial commercial connections and how important they were to their occupational practices. It is these issues that this chapter will begin to address. It will explore further the economic reasons which explain why certain occupational groups moved to particular areas of the city to practice their craft. The chapter will also focus on the types of employment agreements which aliens could make with natives, the reasons which lay behind aliens entering service, how they established occupational support

networks, the impact of anti-alien labour laws in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and explore the occupational opportunities to which alien women had access.

**Location and Occupation**

Certain trades required aliens to acquire property close to the Thames. As demonstrated by Colson, the clustering of individuals of the same craft was declining during the fifteenth-century; however, there were still certain benefits which encouraged those of similar specialisms to congregate in the same areas. He argues that reasons for doing so differed between different guilds and specialisms, but they usually involved the benefits of living near people of a similar occupation to themselves (agglomeration), natural features which made trade easier and/or statuary regulation, which forced people of certain trades to work in particular areas. Agglomeration benefits might include access to specialist knowledge, infrastructure and also the best access to customers. Doche beerbrewers strategically moved to areas in England where there would be the greatest demand for their product, have access to water needed for the brewing process, and where they could most easily have access to hops, which they used to flavour their beer and which had to be imported from the continent. Either ports or settlements connected to trading waterways fulfilled both these criteria. Brewing with hops had been established in the Low Countries by the early fourteenth century. As has been demonstrated by Milan Pajic, Doche aliens, mainly from Holland and Zeeland, were the first to start brewing beer in England by at least the end of the fourteenth century, and there were alien beerbrewers in England by at least 1399. It took a long time for beer to become as popular as ale in the capital. Bennett and Bich Luu, writing of London, argue that it was not until the reign of Elizabeth I that natives were drinking beer in greater quantities than ale and that large numbers of natives brewed beer. Even then, many English brewers employed alien servants. They note that alien beerbrewers still controlled a large proportion of beer
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production in London in the 1560’s onwards, with the Privy Council estimating that half the city’s beerbrewers were alien in 1585, even though by this time there were far more native beerbrewers than there were in the fifteenth century. 375

In addition to allowing easy access to imported hops and being convenient places from which beerbrewers could export beer, ports or settlements connected to trading waterways would also have been attractive places to settle as they would serve a high number of merchants, sailors and travellers in need of refreshment. The majority of their clientele in the fifteenth century would have been merchants, sailors or immigrants from the Low Countries and the ‘German’ states, who would have been accustomed to the taste of hopped beer as opposed to English ale. 376 Although the alien subsidies tend to under-enumerate beerbrewers, the places of residence of those who were assessed fits into a clear pattern. 377 Of 155 aliens recorded as either beerbrewers, beer sellers, beer men or beer makers in the alien subsidy returns (1440–87), 129 had their place of residence recorded as well. The great majority lived in either port towns or settlements connected to trading waterways. 378 For example, four were recorded in Hull, five in Boston, nine in King’s Lynn, twenty in Ipswich and thirty-three in London. The alien beerbrewers whose wills survive in the probate records of the Exchequer court of York confirm this trend, as they also lived in settlements connected to trading waterways. The will of Cornelius Arteson (1493) records him as having lived in Scarborough, that of Cornelius Johnson (1502) states that he lived in Hull and that of Constinus Williamson (1461) records domicile in Grimsby. The Christian names of these individuals are suggestive of origin from the Low Countries, or perhaps that they were sons of immigrants, as Cornelius was a popular name amongst immigrants from the region. 379 Constinus Williamson is likely the ‘Costan Berbrewar/Berbruer’ recorded in Grimsby as a householder in the 1458, 1459 and 1460 alien subsidy assessments. 380 Lambert and Liddy have identified a similar pattern in Great

378 For the number of alien beerbrewers assessed as living in each town and a computer-generated map, see EIDB Search terms: ‘beerbræwer,’ ‘beerbræker,’ ‘beerbræman,’ ‘beerbræseller’.
380 TNA E 179/202/133 (1458), E 179/202/135, m. 1 (1459) and TNA E 179/202/136, m. 2 (1460).
Yarmouth in 1430–40, where around 20 alien beer houses existed in South Leet, near to the quayside.  

Luu notes that in the later sixteenth century alien beerbrewers in London tended to have beer houses near the Thames in order to have easy access to the imported hops needed for their drink, access to water used in the brewing process, and to facilitate the export of their beer. It is clear, however, that beerbrewers followed similar patterns of spatial distribution in the fifteenth century. Carlin notes that in this period, beerbrewers in Southwark were located close to the river. Beerbrewers in London also moved to areas close to the waterside in the city close to their main customer base and to areas which clients associated with their craft. The Chancery petition of Gerard van Scouneburgh (1493x1500) provides an example of a beerbrewer who chose to live in London, in a specific type of tenement well suited for his craft. It states that Gerard leased ‘a tenement and a wharf lyeing and set upon the Themys syde within the parish of all holowes Berkyng in london and also of a lane or a gutte commyng from the Theymys between the same wharf and the wharf of one Robert helgey’. This creek was often used by ‘botys and vessellys into the same lane or creke’. Robert had allegedly tried to stop Gerard using this creek for no other reason than enmity, by bringing a false action of trespass against him. The wharf and creek were economic assets, as owners could charge fees for their use. Wharves would also have been important places of activity drawing people to one area. The creek would have been valuable for Gerard, as from here he could offload shipments of hops necessary for his trade, charge money for wharf use, sell his beer to those who drank it, and perhaps also export it overseas as beerbrewers often did in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

The alien subsidies and probate evidence indicates that many Italian merchants lived in the more central wards of the city, particularly Broadstreet ward. This, as noted by Davies, was likely due to the desire of the elite Italians to live in the centres of power and finance, which allowed them better access to markets and institutions. Probate and petition evidence suggests that Northern European and French merchants could occupy property and

382 Luu, Immigrants and Industries, 281.
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386 Beer spoiled less quickly than ale and, thus, was more suitable for export, see Luu, Immigrants and the Industries, 259–264.
warehousing facilities in parishes adjacent to the Thames. John Gyse, a merchant of Antwerp, whose will was made in 1494, lived in the parish of Saint Boltolph Billingsgate, which was next to the river. Bartholomew de Lavernha (1461), a vintner of Bordeaux, was a parishioner of Saint Martin le Vintry, which was a parish connected both to the Thames and, historically, to the wine trade. John Perus of Zeeland (1444), merchant, asked to be buried in All Hallows, Barking, where he is also likely to have been a parishioner, and which was also next to the river. One of the reasons why alien merchants held tenements close to the Thames was that their goods were stored in areas near potential buyers. The ‘marchaunt straunger’, Andrew Tewell, stated in his petition to the Chancery (1518–1529) that he rented a cellar within the parish of Saint Dunstan in East London, which was adjacent to the Thames. He would go to the cellar ‘in the day tyme for to showe his said wares and marchaundyse to the byers therof’. As cellars acted as a place where traders would show their merchandise to customers, it would be in an alien merchant’s interest to have storage in areas close to watercourses and, thus, close to mercantile customers.

As noted, habitation patterns of alien artisans could be influenced by their desire to live and work in areas outside of the jurisdiction of the civic government and the craft guilds. London’s guilds, or companies, sought to protect their enfranchised members from competition by unenfranchised foreign and alien labour; yet, in some instances they accommodated such labour, which is a topic discussed in more detail in the following chapter. Habitation in areas not under the control of the city government or craft guilds meant that aliens could practice their trades as independent masters, open a shop and sell by retail without regulation without fear of punishment. Southwark was one such area outside of the city’s jurisdiction and the control of the majority of London’s guilds. The jurisdictional boundaries of the city and its guilds were not always clear. Many guilds only had authority within the area up to the bars of the city; however, certain companies, such as the Goldsmiths and Haberdashers, had secured royal charters of incorporation which gave them the right to regulate their crafts in the suburbs, as well as in the city proper. Technically, guilds had no jurisdiction over sanctuaries or areas attached to religious establishments with the right to grant perpetual asylum to any individual accused of a crime. An area’s status as a sanctuary was intrinsically linked to other privileges,
such as its independence from the civic corporation and its companies, meaning that people living within them were exempt from the jurisdiction of civic and episcopal bodies. This liberty status is what drew many Doche artisans to live and work in the Sanctuary of Westminster. During the later years of the fifteenth century and early sixteenth century London’s civil authorities conducted a campaign to bring independent jurisdictions under its control. Recent work by McSheffrey has brought to attention the large population of predominantly Doche, but also some French, artisans who lived within the sanctuary and liberty of St Martin’s le Grand in London in the first half of the sixteenth century. Having identified over 500 individuals who lived there from the first half of the sixteenth century, McSheffrey suggests that around eight or nine out of ten people who lived in St Martin’s were alien. She convincingly argues that its main attraction to alien artisans was that trades practiced in the precinct were not regulated by the craft guilds. McSheffrey argues that the presence, and economic production, of the aliens was so great in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries that the city and its guilds launched attacks against the precinct’s sanctuary status and by extension its right to harbour alien artisans who wished to live outside the city’s jurisdiction. This attack, McSheffrey argues, acquired particular momentum in the 1530s.

The alien subsidy material unfortunately does not record the residences of aliens with enough detail to gauge whether they lived within other liberties and sanctuaries. Although sources used for this study have not been able to shed light upon aliens living in liberties within the city walls other than those within St Martin’s, other sources indicate that there was a significant alien population living within the sanctuary of the hospital of St Katherine’s by the Tower situated a short distance east of the city. Like in St Martin’s, these aliens no doubt benefitted from being close enough to access London’s economy, yet far enough, jurisdictionally speaking, from the reach of the London guilds. In his petition (1486), Mattice Severyn of Brabant records that when John Horner of Brabant left the service of his master within the city he ‘went unto the seinturary of seint kateryne’. Henry Garratson, a Doche cordwainer who lived in the liberty of St Martin’s le Grand, stated in his petition (1529x1532)
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that he had rented a ‘vytelyng’ house for two years before deciding that the rent was too expensive, subsequently moving to St Katherine’s where he stayed for a year and a half. This fits a likely pattern that there was frequent mobility between different liberties in London and social connections between people in liberties also.

Cornelius Johnson, either a Doche alien or a descendant of one who lived in St Katherine’s, was one of two petitioners who sent a bill to the chancellor in the early sixteenth century. John Gother, a beerbrewer, asked to be buried in St Katherine’s church despite living in the parish of St Botolph without Aldgate (1464).

Peter la Maire, ‘doucheman’, explained to the chancellor in his petition (1529 x1532) that he had recently bought wares from one Giles Berbruer, who lived in ‘saynt kateryns yn the suburbs of the citie’. A Chancery petition (1529 x1532) relates that a beer brewer named Garret who lived in the sanctuary had made a deal with the beer brewer Giles Harryson, of the same precinct, to have beer delivered to his house. After the Earl of Warwick invaded England in 1470, his Kentish supporters are recorded in the Great Chronicle of London as having come into ‘the Subarbys of London’ where ‘duchmen dwelled and held berehowsys’; ‘seynt katharynys’, as well as Southwark, were named. This evidence not only points to a high concentration of aliens in St Katherine’s, but it also indicates that a large number of beer brewers were operating there who could cater for demand for beer created by the presence of these aliens.

**Alien Labour Legislation**

McSheffrey suggests that one of the main reasons why there was such a large concentration of alien artisans in the sanctuary of St Martin’s in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries is because of the city and guild supervision over alien labour, the attempt at control that gained particular impetus with the passing of a series of alien labour statutes. As part of a petitioning
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campaign to Parliament in the late fifteenth century, London craft guilds successfully lobbied Richard III to produce legislation designed to hinder the economic activities of aliens. This was a time of economic recession and bullion shortage, and in this context London guilds campaigned for greater powers to control alien labour in order to protect the prospects of their freemen. With a tenuous hold on his position and in need of influential allies, Richard III sought to obtain the support of London’s powerful craft guilds, thus ratifying a set of restrictions against alien artisans in Parliament in 1484. This should be viewed within the context of a long-established tradition of royal engagement with London’s guilds. The restrictions were extensive. Aliens who came to England from the following Easter were not allowed to practice a craft unless they were a denizen or a servant of an English subject, on pain of forfeiture of their goods and banishment. Moreover, no alien was to occupy the house of another stranger, no alien artisan was to sell goods via retail, and no alien was to take an alien servant or apprentice on pain of a £20 penalty. It is widely agreed that the statute had a very limited impact upon the lives of aliens. It was poorly, if barely ever, enforced as is evidenced by the need for Parliament to grant similar laws aimed at limiting the economic activities of aliens in 1523 and 1529. The 1523 labour statute inter alia prohibited alien artisans to take alien apprentices, have more than two alien servants, and also made all aliens within a two-mile radius of London, bar those within St Martin’s le Grand, subject to the ‘search and reformation’ of London’s companies. The 1529 statute reaffirmed the 1523 regulations with important additions, such as that no alien artisan could set up in a house, shop or chamber to exercise a craft after 15 February 1529 and all those who were working prior to this date should pay fines to the companies.

Although the ability of London’s companies to enforce the statutes was limited, they were significant in themselves. They remind us that non-belonging to the body of the King’s
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subjects did not mean the same thing, and have the same limitations, throughout the period of study here. These labour acts meant that alien status acquired a handicap which it did not hold before the passing of the statutes. In addition, petitions of aliens who had been accused of breaking the statute highlight that the legislation could have a real and negative impact on alien craftsmen. Indeed, in certain instances, it could be utilised effectively against aliens by personal rivals, significantly hindering their ability to practice their occupation. It is also likely that certain natives saw the statutes as a means to extort money from aliens legally, as all of them included a financial incentive for suing an alien successfully on the grounds of breaching the statute. This usually took the form of a share in the fine payable by the alien.415

One John Avenhauer (1486x1493) ‘born in the parties of almayn’, a cordwainer living in London, complained to the court that his respondent John Welford, cordwainer, had had him imprisoned on the grounds of violating Richard III’s statute. He argued that Welford had accused him of having employed an alien servant named ‘John Russh born in the seyd parties of almayn’, which was in contravention of the statute. As a result, he was arrested and was likely to be charged the £20 fine. He stressed to the chancellor that the accusation was against conscience, as he ‘never reteyned the seyd John Russh to be his seruaunt by indenture nor other wise’.416 John was not the only alien petitioner to the Chancery who complained that the statute of Richard III had been wrongfully used against them. Francis Capon (1515x1518), a gold wire drawer of Florence who worked in London, stated that his respondents had tried to ensure that he was banished from the realm on the grounds that he had violated the statute. Francis argued that they did so as they were the ‘hedde occupyers of the crafte of goldwyre draers’ and that he had refused to join their group which planned to control gold wire production in the city and raise prices.417 Another gold wire drawer, named George Mannolley of Venice, was accused by the same respondents as Capon’s petition of having violated the statute (1515x1518). Like Francis, George alleged that the respondents had done so because he had refused to join their group and raise prices.418

Many of the petitions that are analysed below to shed light upon service agreements and alien occupation patterns were sent to the Chancery and Star Chamber in response to the petitioner having been accused of breaking the 1523 and 1529 labour statutes. For example, one Martin Lambert, a locksmith who lived in Southwark, complained that a fellow Southwark
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resident had accused him of having more than the two alien servants allowed by the 1523 statute and had levelled an action of debt against him to that effect (1529x1532).\textsuperscript{419} The capper William Covale had to prove to the judges of the Star Chamber that he was a householder prior to the crucial date of 15 February 1529, as he was accused of having set up in trade afterwards.\textsuperscript{420} Gabryell Dewvale also petitioned the Chancery (1529x1532), complaining that a legal action had been brought against him on grounds of the 1523 statute.\textsuperscript{421} Clement Moryce (1538x1544), the French alien mentioned in Chapter I, was accused of having his French daughter-in-law as his apprentice, thus being in breach of the labour laws.\textsuperscript{422}

Clearly, not all instances of aliens being prosecuted in one of London’s courts on the grounds of the anti-alien labour statutes would have been referred to either the Chancery or the Star Chamber court (like the Chancery, the Star Chamber court offered equitable justice).\textsuperscript{423} In those cases that did reach these courts, it would have been in the interest of the litigants to stress that their respondents were unfairly using these laws to victimise them. However, that these litigants chose to present these arguments within this particular legal context is telling. Indeed, they indicate that the alien labour statutes could have significant impact on those alien (master) artisans that were targeted. They could be used by natives to harass their alien rivals or opportunistically to extract money from them through fines imposed upon those ‘proved’ to have acted in contradiction to the statutes. It is within this context that we should view the large numbers of alien artisans which McSheffrey has identified as having lived in the sanctuary and liberty of St Martin’s le Grand in the early sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{424} St Martin’s was exempt from the 1523 statute and only lightly impacted by the 1529 legislation stating that aliens in St Martin’s were not allowed to employ more than ten alien servants, as opposed to the maximum of two for aliens outside of the sanctuary. The evidence of these petitions, demonstrating litigation against aliens based on the statutes, supports McSheffrey’s argument that many among the large alien population of St Martin’s would have chosen to live within its boundaries in order to escape guild regulations and the stipulations of the labour acts.\textsuperscript{425}
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Service

One key concern of these anti-alien labour laws was to limit the number of alien servants an alien craftsman might employ. The reason why this was perceived to be an issue is explained by the high proportion of alien servants recorded in the alien subsidy assessments. Indeed, the most common occupational label placed against the names of individual aliens was that of servant. In the subsidy returns for London between 1440 and 1483, 1,291 servants can be identified in the subsidy returns (a figure which includes some individuals recorded on multiple occasions), 1,117 of which were male. In the 1483 assessment for London, which is the most detailed assessment in terms of alien occupations, 743 out of 1,595 individuals assessed (47%) occupied some form of service position.

Alien householders seem to have preferred to employ people from a similar cultural background to themselves. This is particularly notable amongst the Doche and the Italians. In his analysis of the 1483 assessments for London, Bolton argues that alien householders employed 58 per cent of all alien servants, and he notes that 70 per cent of householders employed alien servants, mostly between one and three at a time. The tendency to employ servants of a similar cultural background can also be observed in the hiring practices of alien artisans in the late sixteenth century. The subsidies, however, also demonstrate that alien servants were not exclusively employed by other aliens, as there was also a sizeable proportion of alien servants working for London citizens.

An issue with the label ‘servant’ in the subsidy is that it is difficult to ascertain what form of service they actually performed. Indeed, the term ‘servant’ was broad and could refer to anyone who served another, such as a journeyman, apprentice or labourer. In order to appreciate what the term means, one needs to understand the context in which it is used. It could also refer to live-in servants, who carried out service as a part of their life cycle. This form of service was an established institution in late medieval England, whereby young people
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between the ages of 12 and 25 left home to join another household in service.\textsuperscript{434} They would remain in service until nearly their mid-twenties, often with year-long contracts under various employers, and many would then marry and set up households themselves. As such, this form of service should be seen as part of one’s life cycle and it is not useful to view these servants as a ‘class’.\textsuperscript{435} Service in the life cycle sense began when a contract was agreed between servant and employer about the terms of service. Common terms included service for a year in return for food, board and clothing.\textsuperscript{436} Servants were not always paid and if they were it was relatively little; most of their reward came in the form of their keep.\textsuperscript{437} Many identified as servants in the alien subsidy could have been servants in the life cycle sense, although it is important to note that not all were necessarily servants with formal year-long contracts living with their employers. Further issues in gauging the nature of service from the subsidy arise due to the stipulations of the tax. Those over the age of twelve were eligible for the subsidy, but it is not possible to distinguish whether those described as ‘servants’ over the age of twelve were contractual servants or children of alien householders. In addition, some of these individuals were likely journeymen, who were employed by the day, and the term seems to have also included apprentices. Indeed, in the 1483 assessment no apprentices are explicitly noted for London, indicating that they were most probably recorded under the umbrella label ‘servant’.

Scholarship concerning service in England has characterised types of servants with different levels of skill and differing positions within their masters’ households. According to these studies, life-cycle servants were young and unskilled. Indeed, one of the benefits of this type of service was that it enabled young people serving in different households to pick up a range of skills that they could not acquire at home, including informal craft training.\textsuperscript{438} Unlike journeymen, life cycle servants lived with their masters. Journeymen were skilled labourers, usually having completed an apprenticeship but lacking the means to set up trade independently. They worked in their master’s workshop on a daily basis and went home after

\textsuperscript{435} Goldberg, \textit{Women, Work and Life Cycle}, 158–159; for marriage as often a prerequisite for setting up in a shop, cottage or house in late medieval Coventry, see Phythian-Adams, \textit{Desolation of a City}, 85–86.
\textsuperscript{436} Goldberg, “What Was a Servant?,” 11–14.
\textsuperscript{438} Goldberg, “Migration, Youth and Gender,” 94–95; Barbara Hanawalt, \textit{Growing Up in Medieval London: The Experience of Childhood in History} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 173; the training was informal in the sense that it was not an official apprenticeship, see P. J. P. Goldberg, “Female Labour, Service and Marriage in the Late Medieval Urban North,” \textit{Northern History} 22, no. 1 (1986): 24.
This was common for journeymen across medieval Europe, not only in England. Journeymen, in turn, differed from apprentices who were indentured to a master of a craft to render labour and service, usually for a term of seven years, in return for lodging, maintenance and training.

Skilled alien artisans did not always fit these neat patterns of servanthood detailed in the scholarship. Indeed, there is evidence that aliens skilled in a craft could take service positions and live with their masters, without necessarily being apprentices. Consequently, they do not fit the profile of unskilled life cycle live-in servants or of skilled journeymen with their own accommodation, working in their master’s household on a daily basis. The petition of Mattice Severyn (1486) depicts a skilled alien servant who lived with his master. Mattice stated in his petition that one ‘john horner of braband was late reteigned in the service of oon john hampton of london pouchemaker by the weke’. John Horner’s ‘by-the-week’ employment reflects that he was not an apprentice. He had ‘departe oute’ of his temporary service with Hampton. Mattice argued that, at the request of Hampton, he:

‘made suche meanes unto the seid john horner that he came ayen into the service of the seid john hampton and then the seid john horner was new retyned in the service of the seid john hampton to serve hym in his occupacion by the space of a yere’.  

The petition depicts Horner as a skilled alien artisan, who could help Hampton ‘in his occupacion’ and who was worth retaining in his employ. It is implicit in the narrative that John Hampton had left his master’s service and household, and that he was subsequently convinced by Mattice to return, or come ‘ayen’, into his master’s service and, thus, his household as part of a year-long contract.

That skilled alien servants who were not apprentices could live with their masters is also reflected by the indenture of service copied into the Court Book of the Consistory Court of York in 1427. This contract bound one Herman Horne ‘ducheman’ to William Bene, a goldsmith of York. There is no reference in the contract to an obligation on William’s part to train Herman, which means that the contract can be identified as one of service and not of

---
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That service was an important step towards an alien setting up in trade in a given area is also indicated by the case of one William Covale, an alien master capper, who petitioned the court of Star Chamber in 1531x1532. He stressed that his English respondents had falsely accused him of having come to England and set up in a craft after 15 February 1529, in contradiction to the 1529 statute concerning alien labour. One of the clauses of this statute stated that if an alien was not a householder prior to 15 February 1529, they were not allowed to set up a shop or practice any craft. The penalty for this was to have their goods confiscated, half of the proceeds going to the King and half to whoever brought them to court, followed by banishment.\textsuperscript{448} William argued that the respondents had brought an action of debt to obtain his goods, even though he had lived in England as a householder prior to 15 February 1529, for which he had been placed in prison. He had, thus, petitioned the court.\textsuperscript{449} William brought witnesses to support his claim that he had been a householder prior to the critical date. One such witness named John Sage deposed that William had been living in London for five years and had been a householder for three. He argued that the way William had become a householder was that ‘oone denyse de heyhouse which was master afor that to Covale went at that tyme from the same house and left yt to Covalle’ and that since then he had been paying rent for the tenement and had practiced his craft.\textsuperscript{450} John portrays William as having entered service sometime between his arrival in London (five years prior to the deposition) and his becoming a householder (three years prior to the deposition). The deposition does not explicitly state what type of servant William was and it is unclear whether he was a skilled journeyman who lived with his master, an apprentice or, indeed, whether he occupied some form of service position which did not fit the neat categories of a life cycle servant, apprentice or journeyman.

For skilled aliens who aspired to set themselves up independently in trade, serving a master and living in their household would have offered certain benefits. This explains why the individuals described above do not fit easily with traditional labour patterns referred to in previous scholarship and why they were able to practice their trades independently after a spell of service. Indeed, entering into the service of an established householder acted as a form of entrée for aliens into networks of local people, as well as affording them a position in which they could more readily dispel the distrust surrounding them as strangers. In the deeply hierarchical society of late medieval England, the rootless, the unmarried, and those not subject
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to the authority of a lord, husband or master were seen as potentially dangerous and disruptive.\footnote{Goldberg, “Life and Death: The Ages of Man,” 90.} In his Chancery petition (1433x1443 or 1467x1472), the Doche goldsmith Symond Gerardson alleged that he had been arrested not only because of a false action of debt made against him but also because the respondent had slandered him as a ‘fugetife and not abiding to the grete hurte of your said besecher’.\footnote{TNA C 1/46/370.} The statement that Symond was ‘not abiding’, in other words that he was transitory, unsettled, with no fixed abode, was intended to add credence to the accusation that he was a disruptive individual living outside of regular, ordered society – a ‘fugetife’. In order to gain the trust of a community, a non-householder had to be seen as being attached, placed and governed; vagrants or vagabonds who lived outside of local service were perceived to be ungovernable and were often encouraged to leave a town by its governing body.\footnote{M. J. Hettinger, “Defining the Servant Legal and Extra–Legal Terms of Employment in the Fifteenth–Century,” in The Work of Work: Servitude, Slavery and Labor in Medieval England, ed. Allen J. Frantzen and Douglas Moffat (Glasgow: Cruthie Press, 1994), 223; Sarah Rees Jones, “Work and the Problem of Mobile Labour: The Regulation of Labour in Medieval English Towns,” in The Problem of Labour in Fourteenth Century England, ed. James Bothwell, P. J. P. Goldberg and W. Mark Ormrod (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2000), 146–153.} Distrust even surrounded those who were in temporary employment. Rees Jones highlights that the increased influence of the craft system of administration on civic government from the Black Death onwards essentially conceded that the regulation of labour was an issue for employers, rather than for the ward or borough courts. This change, in turn, entrenched an older distinction between the labour of resident householders and more transient workers and conferred a greater stigma upon mobile wage labourers.\footnote{Rees Jones, “Work and the Problem of Mobile Labour: The Regulation of Labour in Medieval English Towns,” 146–153.}

Aliens who came to London looking for work without the resources to set up as independent craftsmen were initially ‘strangers’ and, thus, ungoverned. A service position in an established household ensured an individual’s inclusion in an acknowledged social unit in a given locality, the household, and placed them under the authority of the householder. This authority is demonstrated in the Chancery petition of one Doche spectacle maker named Peter Camur (1433x1472). Peter noted in his petition that when Rauf Vanesom, the Doche servant of the London Haberdasher William Halmer, had refused to pay him for a service he had provided, he threatened that ‘he wold tell his [Rauf’s] maister’.\footnote{TNA C 1/46/39.} In this light, a service
position that placed an alien under the authority of a householder provided a means through which they could dispel some of the distrust against them as ungoverned newcomers. Thus, for an alien to have attached themselves in the service of a reputable householder would have been an important step towards the development of a trustworthy reputation in their locality. In this position, the alien servant would have had greater opportunities to embark on amicable relations and develop bonds of trust with members of the local community than if they were ungoverned, transient non-householders viewed with suspicion.

Although these benefits would have been useful for many types of aliens, they would have been particularly important for skilled aliens like Reynold and William who aspired to set up in trade independently. Skilled aliens who came to London would likely have little knowledge of the native culture, a limited number of contacts, and would generally be ignorant of the commercial situation of the settlement to which they had moved. As such, securing a position of service with an established householder would have also provided them with a platform in which to learn about the environment to which they had moved and to forge connections, enabling them to negotiate belonging within local networks of people. For an aspiring master craftsmen, this would have been essential to establish credit networks and likely to obtain initial stocks and tools.\textsuperscript{456} That working in an area would enable individuals to negotiate inclusion within local social networks is evidenced in the petition of one Martin Lambert, a Doche locksmith who lived in Southwark (1529x1532). One John Parke had come to Martin’s house in Southwark, where no one knew him, and had asked Martin ‘to sett hym awarke’. In trying to convince Martin to take him as a servant, John told him that he had previously worked as a locksmith ‘besides towre hill’ in London and that Martin could find out about his character from people around Tower Hill because it was there ‘where he was known’.\textsuperscript{457} Social ties with neighbours would also have ensured relationships with future customers. One should not forget that while he was a servant to his master, the brewer Reynold Harmenson ‘brought divers and many vessels of ale’ to his master’s customers; when Reynold left his master’s service and set up a business next door, he would have known already many potential customers.

Chancery petitions demonstrate that aliens in London could also accept casual work from native employers, which was not as formal or binding as a year-long service contract.
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This indicates the presence of a flexible, presumably unenfranchised, labour force of aliens in the capital, working for short periods of time for one employer before looking elsewhere for employment. The petition of Mattice Severyn (1486) states that John Hampton, a pouchemaker, had employed his alien servant from Brabant, named John Horner, ‘by the weke’ before offering him a year-long service contract. A temporary form of service is also evidenced in the Chancery petition of Robert Rowes (1493x1500), a capper who was born ‘undyr the kynges obedience in the country of Normandy’. He stated that immediately after coming to England he went to London and entered into the service of Thomas Hothwayte, a haberdasher, ‘for the terme of a weke and so from weke in to weke after as they myght agre and for a solary betwixt them agreed’. When Thomas stopped paying Robert by the week as agreed, Robert ‘departyd owte of his seruice’.

A similar casual service agreement is portrayed in the petition of the goldsmith George Jeneweyns (1486x1493 or 1504x1515), a ‘straunger’ perhaps of Genoese origin. He states that he went to the sanctuary of St Martin’s le Grand in London and made an agreement with one William Herne, goldsmith, ‘dwelling in Sauntwary to continue and abide with the same William by a moneth upon a say and lenger yf they bothe coulde agree’. William Herne is the ‘William Horne’ whom McSheffrey has identified as mentioned in a deposition heard in the Court of Star Chamber. In this early-sixteenth century deposition, he is referred to as having lived in St Martin’s. The petition reads that George ‘toke his leve’ but then William had him arrested on an unrecorded charge, and he was kept in prison for four days without food or drink. William allegedly then came to him ‘seying in thus wyse yf thou will not swere upon a booke to sarve me by a hole yere thow shall dye here in prison’. George relented and agreed, but as soon as he had left prison William placed an action of trespass against him.

The petitioner and his lawyer used a powerful narrative strategy to portray William’s threat. The narrative suddenly switches from the third to the first person to recount William’s ultimatum of either service or death, which made his unjust demand appear more realistic. This story does not refer to George’s initial agreement with William in terms of work. It only mentions that the agreement was to ‘continue and abide’ together. For the sake of appearing credible, however, there must have been some benefit that would entice William to agree to
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stay. As such, it is telling that both men are recorded as goldsmiths and that William was described as having tried to force George to become a servant for a ‘hole yere’ after dwelling together. The initial agreement depicted, then, which involved cohabitation for a month and longer if they ‘coulde agree’, seems to have been one of temporary service. George implied that William had offered him a place to live in return for his service as a trained goldsmith for a month; this was most likely a casual agreement which could be extended if it pleased both parties.

Italian craftsmen with rare skills in the production of luxury items had the option to be find employment as instructors in their unusual crafts. It has been noted that aliens could be instructed to ply and teach others their rare skills upon royal request. Richard II, for example, encouraged one Balwin of Lucca to come to England to weave cloth of gold.\textsuperscript{462} The Chancery petition of the ‘Italian’ Geoffrey Damico (1474x1480) also indicates this. Geoffrey’s petition states that he was a skilled weaver of ‘velwettys cloth of gold and other clothes of sylk […] [who had a house assigned to him] by the kynges good grace at Westminster for the excercise of the seid myster ther to haue enstructe and enformed other persone in the same konnyng’. He argued that ‘duers merchauntes estraungers’, angry that he was practising this skill in England, paid certain men to make false actions of debt and trespass against him to the sheriffs of London who arrested him. The fine textiles, which Geoffrey stated that he taught others to make, were exactly those which Italian merchants imported to England, particularly London. They were part of the ‘exotic’ goods that they sold for profit to either London’s merchants or visiting aristocrats and, as suggested by this petition, the king.\textsuperscript{463}

Italian artisans with the rare skills to make cloth of gold could also be employed by non-royal masters to teach others. This is evidenced in two instances of Italians, who were involved in the production of gold-gilded thread used to make ‘cloth of gold’. The production of this gold thread was called gold wire drawing or thread cutting. Harris has argued that there were at least two resident Byzantine, or ‘Greek’, gold wire drawers in London in 1441 and 1445.\textsuperscript{464} They very likely used the Byzantine technique to produce gold thread, which consisted of flattened gold wire spun around thread, a method which used less gold, and produced a stronger thread than the method used by English craftsmen in this period.\textsuperscript{465} Considering the
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connections between the Italian states and Byzantium, and the high numbers of Greek gold wire drawers particularly in Venice by the fifteenth century, it is likely that they used a similar gold wire technique. In 1466, a suit was brought with the Court of Common Pleas against a gold wire drawer named John Bole by one James de Feraria. There is also a John Bulle who was recorded as a Milanese merchant in the 1467 alien subsidy assessment. James de Feraria was from Ferrara in northern Italy and was also a grocer and citizen of London. He is recorded in the Patent Rolls as having sworn an oath of fealty to the Crown in 1436, as well as being taxed in London in the 1441 alien subsidy assessment, which implies that he was not a transient merchant.

In this suit, James de Feraria pleaded that John Bole owed him 40 pounds in unpaid debt, which is why he brought legal action against him. In response, John claimed that the indenture between them stated that he was to pay James 40 pounds only if he did not fulfil the specific obligations which he had agreed to carry out for him. These obligations included to serve James in the production of gold thread, or gold of Damask, for ten years and to train one young man in his craft. John stressed that he had served James well and, on his behest, had trained a 16-year-old named Reginald Betty of Ferrara in the same craft. Yet, afterwards, James had exonerated John from his obligations and had taken Reginald into his service. Consequently, John argued that he was not obliged to pay the 40 pounds. James produced a counter argument that he had not exonerated John from the agreement and that John had never trained Reginald. Instead, James argued that he had asked John to train one James Llyth, twelve years of age, but John had refused despite the stipulations of their agreement. He claimed that John owed him the 40 pounds. Both John and James de Feraria agreed that one salient feature of their agreement was that John would teach someone his rare craft. What they disagreed on was whether John had fulfilled his promise. For both royal and non-royal endorsed masters to have aliens teach their skills to other servants would have allowed them to acquire cloth of gold more cheaply, and would have ensured a more secure supply, than reliance upon imported goods would allow.

---
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Commercial Contacts and Occupational Networks

Social contacts were of crucial importance for the economic success of many alien merchants or artisans. These aliens found it beneficial to keep in contact and develop close relationships with natives with whom they carried out business. Indeed, the maintenance of close relationships with native business partners would have facilitated further trade and would have created channels through which credit could be extended. Bradley has noted that many of the long-term Italians in London maintained strong ties with leading members of London’s livery companies, the members of which often made large profits in acting as wholesalers of Italian imports and selling them cloth in return. They could also cultivate ties with their gentrified customers. That native gentry are recorded as sureties for the Chancery petitions of certain Italian claimants is reflective of these relationships. A native ‘Gentilman’ named Peter Pekham acted as surety for the petition of Italian Belizard de Barde and Margaret, his wife (1465x1471 or 1480x1483). John West of London, gentleman, acted as a pledge for the petition of Stolde Altevite, a merchant of Florence (1483x1485). Offering to pledge oneself to a Chancery bill acted as a sign that one supported the validity of what was claimed and that they would also pay any damages to the respondent if the petitioner’s case failed. As such, the pledge itself suggests the presence of a strong relationship between the petitioner and the guarantor. It is noteworthy that these Italian merchants had gentlemen acting as their pledges, which perhaps reflects their status as luxury goods traders. It is likely that Belizard and Stolde had developed relationships with their gentrified customers for commercial ends.

The necessity for aliens to foster close relationships between aliens and native business partners is further evidenced in the petition of Mattice Severyn (1486), who is the merchant of Brabant who we encountered above. He argued that the native John Hampton had come to him asking for help to convince his runaway servant to return into service. The reason the petition gives as to why he had asked Mattice for help was because he was ‘wel acqueynte wit your seid suppliant’. The petition then reads that Mattice was willing to do as Hampton asked ‘for asmoche as your suppliaunt had dyuerse tymes bought and sold wit the seid john Hampton’.
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The cordwainer Hans Boslycan, likely a Doche alien due to his name, made a shoemaker of Westminster named John Malden, likely a native, the supervisor of his will (1476), and John is named as the husband of Hans’ sister. Aliens could establish these occupational relationships with natives in the city. Francesco de Aurea was a Genoese merchant who made his will in 1445. Italian merchants in London were heavily involved with the purchase and export of cloth from the city, mainly from Blackwell Hall. It is notable in this case, then, that the two witnesses of Francesco’s will were London citizens Simon Pridney, fuller, and John Whitfield, shearer; both men were involved in cloth preparation. Fulling and shearing were both key processes in the production of cloth. Consequently, Francesco’s connection to these individuals indicates that he was not only an exporter of cloth, but also involved in its production.

That there were large numbers of Doche aliens who practiced similar trades in the capital meant that occupational networks of alien artisans were created. Some of these artisans ‘clustered’ in the same area and in doing so followed similar behaviour to native artisans who formed communities of similar specialisms when it was deemed beneficial. Indeed, testamentary evidence highlights that wealthy aliens could establish and maintain connections with people in similar occupations and from a similar cultural background as themselves to negotiate their belonging within alien occupational networks. The most effective way to illustrate this point is to explore a case study of a group of Doche goldsmiths who lived in and around London’s Lombard Street in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. In this case, we are able to reconstruct their occupational contacts and places of residence from copies of their wills surviving in the probate registers of London’s Commissary and Archdeaconry Courts.

London was the centre of luxury goods production in England and by the late Middle Ages had an international reputation for the manufacture of gold and silver ware. Many goldsmiths from the Low Countries and German states sought to take advantage of this market and large numbers settled in the city or in Southwark and Westminster. In 1469, the
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Goldsmiths’ Company of the city made a list of 113 aliens who were engaged in the craft. This should be taken as a minimum figure.\textsuperscript{482} In an effort to control the activities of these aliens, the Goldsmiths’ Company required them to swear an oath to the company. In the period between 1479 and 1510, 310 aliens did so.\textsuperscript{483} The regulation of these aliens was a constant issue for the guild, however, which developed a licensing system enabling aliens to practice under the control of the craft’s wardens without being full members of the company, or citizens for that matter. The number and success of Doche goldsmiths is indicative of how their skills were prized by native consumers.\textsuperscript{484} The main concentration of English goldsmiths in London was around Cheapside, particularly the western part closest to St Paul’s Cathedral and the adjoining Foster Lane.\textsuperscript{485} Cheapside was the centre of London’s business district and was well known for the sale of luxury and fashionable goods.\textsuperscript{486} Alien goldsmiths seem to have congregated around Lombard Street and its adjacent areas, which were known for house specialist markets and shops. The area was close to, although not on, the main thoroughfare of Cheapside where the largest concentration London goldsmiths was located.\textsuperscript{487} In the 1483 alien subsidy, ten goldsmiths were recorded as living in Langbourne ward, the ward in which Lombard Street was located, nine of whom were householders, eight of them had Doche ‘servants’ who were likely apprentices.\textsuperscript{488} I have identified the wills of thirteen goldsmiths (11 of whom were certainly aliens and the other two were very likely aliens), proved in London’s Commissary and Archdeaconry Courts, who lived close together in parishes connected or in proximity to Lombard Street, Cornhill Street and Candlewick Street.

William de Colonia (1400) was a parishioner of St Mary Woolchurch, as was the goldsmith Vinand Brule who made his will in 1403.\textsuperscript{489} Wynand van Coloyne (1406) asked to
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be buried in the church of St Nicolas Acon, as did Giles Oxeneye (1409). Everard van do Vyn (1427) requested to be buried in the church of King Edward the Martyr in Lombard Street, likely his parish church. Gilbert van Diste (1431) wanted to be interred in the church of St Nicholas Acon ‘prope Lumbardestrete’ and was a parishioner there. Peter Florenson, likely a Doche alien, (1432) was a parishioner of the same church. James Bokis (1432) favoured the church of St Michael Cornhill, where he was likely a parishioner. Its boundaries adjoined those of St Mary Woolnoth and St Edward the Martyr, both of which intersected with Lombard Street. John van Wessel’s will (1447) identifies him as a parishioner of St Swithin’s on Candlewick Street, the boundaries of which neighboured those of St Mary Woolnoth. Gerlosus Dwyx (1455) was a parishioner of St Michael Cornhill. Arnold Steyvert (1464), a goldsmith, bequeathed money to St Mary Woolnoth. Robert van Nemegyn (1468) was a goldsmith who identified himself as a parishioner of the church of St Mary Woolnoth ‘in lumbardstrete’. Luke Ratenhole left money to the high alter of the same church (1481). The will of the goldsmith Jasper Gebe (1521), whose forename, occupation suggests that he was Doche, names him as a parishioner of St Mary Abchurch, located in Candlewick Street while it shared boundaries with St Nicholas Acon and St Mary Woolnoth.

It is notable that the parishes in which these testators either lived or had ties with were all in close proximity to one another. This tendency to congregate in the same area according to alien status and occupation, farther from the larger concentration of native goldsmiths, but not by a lot (i.e. Cheapside), suggests that there were benefits to be reaped by associating with other aliens of similar trades. Moreover, they were concentrated in an affluent part of the city which had a reputation for luxury goods and high-end commerce. Although not as affluent as Cheapside, it was a place known to house luxury shops. Moreover, Lombardstreet and its surrounding area was a place with high concentrations of Italian merchants and must have
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been an affluent place where many business deals involving high-quality, expensive, goods were conducted. It seems likely, then, that this is the reason why Doche goldsmiths congregated here; this was an area that customers would associate with their high-end products.\textsuperscript{502} I have found no explicit evidence of interaction between the Doche goldsmiths here and Italian merchants they lived close to. However, it is unlikely to be coincidence that Italian merchants and Doche goldsmiths, and jewellers, lived in such proximity considering that Italians controlled the import of precious stones to northern Europe and frequently sold luxury items, including gold jewellery, to members of the gentry and to the royal wardrobe.\textsuperscript{503}

These goldsmiths sought to establish and maintain social ties with other Doche goldsmiths, or those with closely related occupations, to negotiate their belonging within alien occupational networks. In some instances, I have been able to identify the place of habitation of individuals mentioned in these testaments and in other instances this has not been possible. In 1403, Vinand Brule made the alien goldsmith Winand Wermes one of his executors. Similarly, in 1406, Wynand van Cologne made one Arnold van Lyge, goldsmith, one of his executors.\textsuperscript{504} In 1464, Arnold Steyvert bequeathed half of all his goods to Tyse van Solre, a jeweller of London. He had also made Tyse one of his executors.\textsuperscript{505} At this time, Tyse was legally an English denizen having taken out letters of denization in 1457.\textsuperscript{506} John van Wessel also had a strong relationship with Tyse making him his executor.\textsuperscript{507} Everard van do Vyn bequeathed 6s. 8d. to John Skevyn, goldsmith of London.\textsuperscript{508} James Bokis made one Magnus de Berdon, a citizen and goldsmith of London, his executor.\textsuperscript{509} The will of John Vantyke (1495), goldsmith of London, named Jasper Gebe, a goldsmith of Saint Mary Woolnoth named above, as his executor.\textsuperscript{510}

Similarly, Gisbert van Diste also made a Doche goldsmith, Swether van Breme, his executor.\textsuperscript{511} Peter Florenson had Herman Hepyt, goldsmith, as one of the witnesses of his
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testament.\footnote{LMA MS 09171/003, f. 311v.} Robert van Nemegyn bequeathed 6s. 8d. to one ‘Rotulando Benselrode’, a goldsmith of London.\footnote{LMA MS 09171/006, f. 27.} The name Rotuland is suggestive of alien origin and it is probable that he was related to the ‘Arnald Benselrode’, a goldsmith from Cologne who lived in Southwark and who swore an oath of fealty to the King in 1436.\footnote{CPR 1429–1436, 544.} Gerlosus Dwyx had established a strong relationship with Floricius Pole, a Doche stoneslipper of St Nicholas Acon discussed in more detail below, and made one Frederik Swart, a goldsmith, one of his executors.\footnote{LMA MS 09171/005, f. 6.} Frederik was an alien and paid a householder’s fee in the 1441 alien subsidy assessment.\footnote{TNA E 179/144/41, m. 23.} Pole’s bequest to him in 1450 is notable as Frederik Swart was recorded in the will of Gisbert van Diste as ‘servienti meo’, which places him either as Gisbert’s servant or, more likely, apprentice. This means that Frederick had been in service to Gisbert when his will was made in 1431 and that by 1450 at the latest, but probably earlier, he had set up as an independent goldsmith in an area of London where he had once served. That many of these testators made other Doche goldsmiths their executors is particularly notable, as this was an important position of responsibility and is good evidence that a strong relationship existed between the testator and their nominated executor.\footnote{Zell, “Fifteenth and Sixteenth Century Wills as Historical Sources,” 67.} These findings resonate with the research of Berry and Colson concerning the patterns of sociability of late medieval Londoners, which highlights that testators often had strong relationships with others of the same craft who lived within their locality.\footnote{Berry, “Margins and Marginality,” 124–136; Colson, “Local Communities in Fifteenth Century London,” 267-272.}

Inclusion within a particular Doche occupational network would have given alien artisans access to other goldsmiths and jewellery artisans to whom they could turn to for support and from whom they could obtain raw materials and capital via credit.\footnote{The importance of credit for artisans and the argument that many did not own the raw materials they worked with, is outlined in Rosser, The Art of Solidarity in the Middle Ages, 155–161.} In the case of the London goldsmiths, participation in their networks would likely also have enabled them to contract other members for the delivery of complex commissions, which required the skill of more than one artisan. One means by which these testators sought to strengthen connections with Doche goldsmiths was through membership in the fraternity of St Eloi (Eligius) or involvement in the parish church in which it was based. Little is known of this guild. Its meeting place was the church of St Nicholas Acon, adjacent to Lombard Street, and it was a fraternity
specifically for Doche goldsmiths.\textsuperscript{520} We also know that it was operating since at least 1427 when Everard van do Vyn bequeathed to it 3s. 4d., and was still active in 1502, when the goldsmith John van Delf remembered it in his will.\textsuperscript{521} Many of our testators are known to have been members of the fraternity. Arnold Steyvert bequeathed to it 13s. 4d., the same amount he gave to the church of the Austin friars, where he wished to be buried.\textsuperscript{522} Everard van do Vyn bequeathed 3s. 4d. to the ‘fraterintati sancti Eligij de les duche goldesmythes london’.\textsuperscript{523} John van Wessell bequeathed 13s. 4d. to the fraternity.\textsuperscript{524} Luke Ratenhole remembered it, describing it as the fraternity of ‘sancti Eligij Aurifabrorum Teutonicorum’.\textsuperscript{525} Robert van Nemegyn bequeathed 10s.\textsuperscript{526} Others were parishioners of St Nicholas Acon and likely had some connection to the guild. Gisbert van Diste was a parishioner and paid 6s. 8d. for his forgotten tithes to the church and separately bequeathed 13s. 3d. to the fraternity. Saint Eloi was traditionally the patron saint of goldsmiths in mainland Europe, whereas the patron saint of English goldsmiths was St Dunstan.\textsuperscript{527} Thus, the fraternity’s dedication to the continental patron saint of goldsmiths demarcated its membership: it was specifically addressed to Doche goldsmiths. This is similar to the alien-only fraternity of the Holy Blood of Wilsnack based at the Crutched Friars, London, whose Saxon dedication seems to have reflected the demographic of its membership.\textsuperscript{528} The fraternity of Saint Eloi is not the only example of a fraternity whose members comprised Doche artisans of a specific trade. Thrupp noted that by 1442 at the latest, Doche cobblers formed a fraternity dedicated to SS Crispin and Crispinian.\textsuperscript{529} Moreover, alien shoemakers had created the fraternities of The Conception of Our Blessed Lady and of the Holy Trinity.\textsuperscript{530}

There are multiple reasons why the Doche goldsmiths would have wanted to join the fraternity of St Eloi. In general, fraternities gave assistance to their members in their worldly dealings, helped them if they ever fell into poverty or sickness, provided for their burial and could employ a priest to perform masses for their souls after their death.\textsuperscript{531} Although

\textsuperscript{520} Reddaway and Walker, \textit{The Early History of the Goldsmiths’ Company}, 129.

\textsuperscript{521} Ibid., 129.

\textsuperscript{522} LMA MS 09171/005, f. 365.

\textsuperscript{523} LMA MS 09171/003, f. 190.

\textsuperscript{524} LMA MS 09171/005, f. 229v.

\textsuperscript{525} LMA MS 09171/007, f. 38.

\textsuperscript{526} LMA MS 09171/006, f. 27.

\textsuperscript{527} John F. Cherry, \textit{Goldsmiths} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 52.

\textsuperscript{528} Colson, “Alien Communities and Alien Fraternities,” 112–117.

\textsuperscript{529} Thrupp, “Aliens in and around London,” 264.

\textsuperscript{530} Archer, “Responses to Alien Immigrants,” 770.

\textsuperscript{531} Rosser, “Communities of Parish and Guild in the Late Middle Ages,” 37.
membership of the fraternity ensured inclusion within a formal grouping, one of the most salient reasons for joining was to help promote their belonging within informal webs of Doche goldsmiths through the opportunities for networking and socialising it provided. For Doche immigrants, the fraternity would have provided a setting in which members could meet with others of a similar background. Through its communal activities, members could meet and strengthen ties with those most able to help them in their crafts, namely other Doche goldsmiths. Indeed, fraternities with broad memberships actively fostered bonds of trust and mutual aid among their members. Like most fraternities, it is probable that the fraternity of St Eloi provided some directives for the moral behaviour of its members. It is also possible that the fraternity acted as a forum for resolving disputes internally.

Although these testators, and the alien goldsmiths who are mentioned in their wills, were part of occupational networks comprised of Doche goldsmiths, these individuals could occupy different positions of inclusion in terms of the franchise and their position within the structure of the Goldsmiths’ Company. This is evidenced in the occasions where it is possible to trace the goldsmiths mentioned above within the printed edition of the Wardens’ Account and Court Minute Books of the Goldsmiths’ Company 1334-1446, which is edited by Lisa Jefferson. The minute books are a series of ‘annual reports’ which included select details of incomings and outgoings, as well as the most important proceedings of the company’s court. Some paid a licencing fee to the company in order to practice their craft but seem not to have become freemen of the city. James Bokis, whose will (1432) was mentioned above, paid four marks to the company to practice his trade in 1404 yet is not again mentioned in the records of the company, or indeed in his will, as ever having become a citizen. Others, such as Giles Oxeneye mentioned above, bought his way into the company sometime between 1387x1398,
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and he made his will in 1409. As noted by Reddaway and Walker, other Doche goldsmiths might pay a licensing fee for a number of years and later became freemen of the city. This was the case for Wynant van Cologne who purchased a licence between 1403x1404. Then, in 1404, he paid the wardens of the company 40s. ‘because he had been an apprentice in the same mistery with a freeman of the same city’, which makes it likely the 40s. was an enrolment fee. Gisbert van Diste, whose will was made in 1431, was granted permission to work by the wardens of the company between 1420x1421 and later paid £10 to become a freemen of the city in 1423. In his testament, Gisbert made one Swether van Breme his executor, and this is the ‘Swether van Bremen’ who was recorded as being a freeman yeoman, i.e. a freeman of the company but not a member its elite group of liverymen, in 1436 when he paid 20s. towards the company’s contribution towards the defence of Calais. More exceptionally, others could work their way into the elite group of company members that was the livery of the company as well as hold office. These people, then, held a different position within the company than other alien freemen who not part of the elite livery. One such individual was Wynant van Wormes, who paid for his entry into the livery between 1393 and 1395 and was one of the executors of Vinand Brule (who made his will in 1403). Giles Oxeneye was recorded as a liveryman by 1403-1404. One Solomon Oxeneye, presumably a relative of Giles Oxeneye, was elected as a warden of the company between 1397x1398 (notably the same time Giles acquired the freedom), as well as in 1403.

These examples highlight that individuals who were part of networks of goldsmiths mentioned above could occupy different positions of inclusion to one another in terms of membership of the Goldsmiths’ Company and the franchise. More broadly, they also indicate how an alien might belong within certain groupings, such as an occupational network, yet be might not belong to other groups, in this instance demonstrated by those who paid licensing fees, and were not full members of the company, or those who were freemen yet were not part of its livery.
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544 Wardens’ Accounts and Court Minute Books, 79.
545 Ibid., 303.
546 Wardens’ Accounts and Court Minute Books, 253, 275.
547 For the idea of multiple positions of belonging explored further see pages 128–152 below.
The proclivity of wealthy, established aliens in London to keep in contact with people of the same occupation as themselves and consequently promote their belonging to alien occupational networks is also evidenced by the wills of four beerbrewers, namely the testaments of Edward Petirson (1438), Giles de Hare (1442), Cornelius Metten (1458) and John Gother (1464). Giles de Hare bequeathed money to a fraternity ‘Theutonicorum’ and Cornelius Metten names his brother John Metten ‘de Brugges’, which highlights their alien status. The surnames, occupations, and place of residence of both John Gother and Edward Petirson strongly suggests they were also aliens. Their testaments indicate a concentration of Doche brewers in and near the St Botolph without Aldgate parish, which was outside the walls, as they all either described themselves as parishioners or asked to be buried in the church of St Botolph’s.\textsuperscript{548} The concentration of beerbrewers in a particular area has parallels with similar concentrations in Ipswich and Colchester noted by Pajic.\textsuperscript{549} St Botolph without Aldgate was a large extramural parish, which was unevenly developed, with a mixture of urbanised areas and pastureland. It had large open spaces, which encouraged brewers to lease sizeable properties there.\textsuperscript{550} This is interesting, as St Botolph’s parish was within the Portsoken Ward. Bolton, using the alien subsidy returns for 1483, shows that Portsoken was the ward with the largest number of resident aliens and, along with Tower Ward, had one of the largest concentrations of beerbrewers.\textsuperscript{551} In the 1483 subsidy five men in Portsoken ward, who had between five and ten servants each, and were charged the special rate of 20s. for keeping a beer house.\textsuperscript{552} It is also significant that St Botolph’s parish was adjacent to the boundaries of St Katherine’s hospital, which as noted above also had a high concentration of aliens, and these beerbrewers were presumably catering for aliens in St Botolphs, and perhaps St Katherine’s, who had a taste for beer. These beerbrewers had established relations with others who practiced their trade in St Botolph’s parish. Cornelius Metten made one ‘Johannem dewes de predicta parochia sancti Boltolphi Beerbrewer’ one of his executors.\textsuperscript{553} John Gother appointed his wife Cornelia as the executor of his will, but made one Arnold Williamson, beerbrewer of the parish of St

\textsuperscript{548} LMA MS 09171/003, f. 507 (Edward Petirson), LMA MS 09171/004, f. 121v (Giles de Hare), LMA MS 09171/005, f. 130v (Peter Van Inggelyn), LMA MS 09171/005, f. 256 (Cornelius Metten) and LMA MS 09171/005, f. 366v (John Gother).
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Botolph, her supervisor. Much like the goldsmiths highlighted above, belonging to a professional network likely allowed individual beerbrewers access to others who could procure raw materials as well as capital, and could help them complete large orders.

Occupation-based connections did not only provide economic benefits, but also ensured that aliens had others they could turn to for trust and companionship. The records of the marriage suit between Elizabeth Brown and Marion Lauson and Laurence Gilis, brought before the London Consistory court in October 1491, provide a narrative of close friendship and trust between two Doche beerbrewers in London. In the suit, two women, Elizabeth Brown and Marion Lauson, claimed to have made a valid marriage contract with Laurence Gilis in August 1491. McSheffrey has outlined the key aspects of the case presented here. Elizabeth Brown initiated the case in October 1491 by suing Laurence on the grounds that she had made a valid marriage contract with him before his marriage to Marion. Marion countersued in November with five witnesses, who testified to the validity of her marriage to Laurence in October. Most of the testimony in the case concerned attacks and then counter-attacks on the credibility of witnesses for each party. Laurence Gilis himself was a Doche migrant who had taken out letters of denization in 1475 and is recorded in the Patent Rolls as being from Brussels in Brabant. In the 1483 alien subsidy roll for Portsoken Ward he was assessed at the high rate of 20s. for owning a beer house. One of the witnesses procured by Marion to confirm the validity of her marriage to Laurence was Godfrey Speryng, a Doche beerbrewer. He had received letters of denization in 1474 and is recorded as having originated from Holland. In the 1474 alien subsidy, he was noted as living in St Botolph without Aldgate, like the testators discussed above. In the 1483 subsidy, he was living in Portsoken Ward and was assessed at the 20s. rate for being a master of a beer house. As Laurence and Godfrey were recorded in the alien subsidies and were both part of the case brought in the Consistory in 1491, they can be identified as long-term residents of London.
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Godfrey’s role as Marion’s witness was to confirm the validity of her marriage to Laurence. The articles put forward by Marion and her legal counsel seem to have been designed to prompt Godfrey to provide a narrative which confirmed their position, namely that Marion’s marriage to Laurence was valid. He did just this, emphasising that he had been present when Laurence had ‘promised that he would not take another as his wife and she would not take another man’ at his house. He then argued that, four or five days afterwards, he witnessed them making a vow of present consent. In fact, Godfrey portrayed himself as an integral facilitator of the marriage and a confidant to Laurence. He stated how he had known Laurence for nearly twenty years or more and Marion for almost one, in order to clarify how he knew the pair. He then stated that he lived in the parish of St Andrew Undershaft, the same parish in which Marion owned a house. Godfrey also argued that he knew about the promise between Marion and Laurence not to marry anyone else but each other because it happened at his house. As a beerbrewer, Godfrey’s dwelling was also a beer house, which fits a wider pattern of taverns and drinking houses being common venues of courtship and marriage contracts. He then stated that he was a witness to an exchange of present consent in Marion’s house, in the presence of the parish chaplain of St Andrew Undershaft and three other witnesses. Moreover, his portrayal of himself as someone who lived in the same parish as Marion, as having known both parties, as having hosted both parties when they discussed marriage, and his being present at the actual exchange of consent is notable; he described himself as playing the role of a close friend who were often very important in facilitating the courtship and the marriage of two parties. This narrative is reflective of bonds of trust and companionship, which could develop within the occupational networks among Doche aliens in the capital.

Other individuals whose professions were intrinsically linked to goldsmithing and beer brewing also attempted to negotiate their inclusion in one of the alien occupational networks detailed above. Indeed, they deemed it economically necessary to cultivate ties with others whose professions created a demand for their expertise. This is evidenced in the testament of one Floricius Pole (1450). The will describes him as a parishioner of St Nicholas Acon next to Lombard Street, and thus close to our goldsmith testators. He is described as a ‘stoneslipper’,

559 MS DL/C/A/001/MS 09065, 86rv. (Shannon McSheffrey, Consistory Database).
562 MS DL/C/A/001/MS 09065, 86rv; in regard to the vow of present consent, the clerk noted that he witnessed the words ‘which the first witness testified above’, a reference to the deposition of John Asshford, MS DL/C/A/001/MS 09065, 85rv.
which is noteworthy in this context. One ‘Teutonic’ ‘Stoneslipper’ named John Payn was recorded in the 1483 alien subsidy of London. The editors of the *EIDB* recorded the occupation as unknown.\(^5\) 564 Reddaway and Walker, however, have identified stone slipping as the cutting and polishing of precious stones, and subsequently placing them in rings. There was no guild of jewellers in London and the craft was mainly undertaken abroad. The earliest reference that Reddaway and Walker located for a stoneslipper dated to 1501, when three alien stoneslippers were ‘received for [their] knowledge’ into the London Goldsmiths’ Company.\(^6\) Stoneslippers, however, have been practising in London prior to this. One Courte van Duren, stoneslipper in London, is recorded as the respondent of a Chancery petition, which dates from either 1475x1480 or 1483x1485.\(^7\) 565 The craft of ‘stoneslipping’ was an unusual skill, rarely if at all practiced by natives. Floricius was recorded in 1441 and 1443 alien subsidy assessments without an occupation but, subsequently, when his testament is used to supply an occupational label, his assessment in the subsidy is the earliest known instance of a ‘stoneslipper’ in England.\(^8\) His place of settlement highlights that he had chosen to live in close proximity to the goldsmiths who would have made use of his skills, and was clearly an economically motivated move on his part. He had also developed at least one close relationship to a goldsmith, as he made one Frederick Swart, who as noted above lived in Lombard Street, his executor.\(^9\) The common practice of medieval artisans practicing other economic activities than only the one denoted by their craft label, however, might mean that Floricius produced gold ornaments as well as specialising in jewels.

One Peter van Inggelyn, who made his will in 1454 and whose name, location and occupation taken together indicate alien status, also saw the need to live near and associate with individuals who required his services, in order to attach himself to the networks of beerbrewers in the locality.\(^10\) Peter’s testament states that he was a ‘cowper’ living in the parish of St Botolph without Aldgate, the same parish previously identified as having a high proportion of beerbrewers. Similarly, the 1483 alien subsidy records four householding coopers in Portsoken ward, where St Botolph’s was situated, who clearly also sought to live close to beerbrewers who would use their barrels.\(^11\) No doubt Peter and the later coopers recorded in
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this subsidy lived in this area so that he could build or repair the barrels needed by the brewers for the storage and transport of beer and hops. Peter developed close relationships with one of the beerbrewers of St Botolph’s, as he made Herman Stale, the beerbrewer identified above, an executor of his will.\textsuperscript{571}

The testaments analysed thus far belonged to wealthy aliens whose occupations required large sums of capital. A Chancery petition from a less prestigious Doche shopkeeper in Southwark, however, reflects that it was not only those who practiced more exalted crafts who kept in contact with people in similar economic situations to themselves. One John Garard, a ‘hardwareman’ of a poorer suburb of Southwark, petitioned the court between 1480x1483 complaining that one Gervase Baker, a tailor of London, had put forward an action of trespass against him in London on the grounds that he had sold cloth, which was stolen from him [Gervase].\textsuperscript{572} John emphasised his innocence, yet stated that he would never win the case as the jury wanted to send a message to Doche shopkeepers in Southwark by making an example of him. Indeed, he alleged that ‘worshipfull men’ had heard certain jurymen say that they would rule against him in order ‘that all Flemynges in southwerk shuld be ware howgh thei bowght any gode of men of the Cite’.\textsuperscript{573} It may be doubtful whether jurymen openly said this, as depicting the jurymen as having said this was probably a narrative strategy to portray the jury as biased. Regardless, John believed it would appear credible for a jury to punish one Doche shopkeeper of Southwark in the hope of influencing the trading practices of others in the suburb. Implicit in this logic is that many Doche shopkeepers in Southwark knew one another and, because of this connection, their trading practices could be influenced by the experiences of their Doche connections. This fits well into Carlin’s argument that Doche migrants in Southwark tended to live clustered together and were a close-knit group.\textsuperscript{574}

\textsuperscript{571} Bolton, \textit{The Alien Communities}, 26–27.
\textsuperscript{572} The ‘Flemings’ in Southwark tended to be poor artisans. The householding population in Southwark was generally poor, with a scarcity of wealthy householders, see Carlin, \textit{Medieval Southwark}, 53, 182–184.
\textsuperscript{573} TNA C 1/61/516 for the economic resentment of London citizens towards aliens in Southwark that this petition implies see Carlin, \textit{Medieval Southwark}, 162–163.
\textsuperscript{574} Carlin, \textit{Medieval Southwark}, 154.
**Female Alien Occupations**

So far, the discussion has concentrated on the occupations of men. What were the occupational opportunities for alien women? The authors of *Immigrant England* have analysed the alien subsidy returns to explore the occupations and social status of England’s female alien population, and some of the arguments they have presented I wish to comment on here. They demonstrate that on the 5,998 occasions on which women were listed in the subsidies between 1440 and 1484, occupations were attributed in 24 per cent (1,464) of instances. The overwhelming majority (94%) of women were assessed as either common or former servants, yet in 32 instances women were recorded as ‘vagabonds’ and in 31 instances women were assessed as labourers.575 Moreover, it is noted that just over 10 per cent of women were householders, compared to 43 per cent of men.576

The authors view the label ‘servant’ as predominantly referring to domestic workers or unskilled helpers in the agricultural or artisanal sectors, and they thus conclude that in 99 per cent of the instances where female occupations are recorded, women were employed in low-status and presumably low-paying jobs.577 This, combined with the paucity of women in the subsidies recorded as practicing crafts independently, employing servants, and being assessed as householders, leads the authors to conclude that alien women benefitted less than alien men from the greater economic opportunities after the Black Death.578 This argument is framed within the wider historiographical debate concerning whether women had greater economic opportunities in the century after the Black Death, described by Barron in her study of female opportunities in London as a ‘Golden Age’ for women.579 Through the above reading of the alien subsidies, the authors of *Immigrant England* conclude that there was no ‘Golden Age’ for
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579 The idea of greater economic opportunity for women caused by the demographic impact of the Black Death, which ended in the late fifteenth century, was first suggested by Goldberg in “Female Labour, Service and Marriage in the Late Medieval Urban North,” 18–38; this idea was applied by Barron to women in London, and she labelled the period following the Black Death a ‘golden age’ of women, see Caroline M. Barron, “The ‘Golden Age’ of Women in Medieval London,” *Reading Medieval Studies* 15, no. 1 (1989): 38–58; Goldberg laid out his argument in greater depth in Goldberg, *Women, Work and Life Cycle*, particularly 325–52. Bennett has challenged the argument, stating that women only had access to low-status, low-paid jobs throughout the period: see Judith Bennett, “Medieval Women, Modern Women: Across the Great Divide,” in *Culture And History, 1350–1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing*, ed. David Aers (Harvester Wheatsheaf: London, 1992), 147–75. More recently, McIntosh has argued that, although it should not be described as a golden age, there were ‘unusual opportunities and agency enjoyed by some women’ for 100–150 years after the plague, see Marjorie Keniston McIntosh, *Working Women in English Society: 1300–1620* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 252.
alien women in the mid-fifteenth century. This, as the argument goes, was different from the experience of alien men who were, generally, able to benefit from better economic conditions after the Black Death.\footnote{Ormrod, Lambert and Mackman, \textit{Immigrant England}, 171–78.}

‘Golden Age’ notwithstanding, some of the means by which the authors come to this conclusion need qualification. Indeed, the high number of women assessed as holding service positions is not as indicative of poor economic opportunities as they might first appear. It is true that in the instances in which occupations were recorded for alien women (which constituted 24 per cent of the total instances in which women were recorded), 94 per cent were recorded as being in some form of service position. Yet, if we calculate the proportion of instances in which women were recorded as servants in relation to the total number of women recorded in the 1440–1487 subsidies, and compare that figure with the proportion of instances in which men were recorded as servants in relation to the total number of men recorded in the same subsidies, then we find that both sexes are recorded as being in service positions in relatively even proportions. Indeed, women were recorded as servants (servant, common servant or former servant) in only 23 per cent of the 5,994 occasions on which women were assessed with and without occupations. The share of men recorded as servants (servant, common servant, former servant, ‘lately’ servant, or servingman) to the total number of men recorded in the subsidy is remarkably similar; men were assessed in service positions in 9,801 instances, which constitutes 21 per cent of all instances in which men were assessed in the subsidies (46,575).\footnote{Men were recorded on 46,568 occasions in the alien subsidy: \textit{EIDB}} Goldberg’s analysis of the 1379 poll tax returns for two Yorkshire towns similarly found men and women occupying positions of service in relatively even proportions.\footnote{P. J. P. Goldberg, “Desperately Seeking the Single Man in Later Medieval England,” in \textit{Single Life and the City 1200–1900}, ed. J. De Groot, I. Devos and A. S. Schmidt (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 119–121.} Based on the logic of the authors of the \textit{Immigrant England} volume that service was low-status, low-paid employment, the alien subsidies can be read in a way that suggests that both men and women entered these low-status positions in relatively even proportions.

The argument that those labelled as ‘servants’ in the subsidies were in low-status, low-paying jobs might equally be called into question. As demonstrated above, the label ‘servant’ was a vague term, which could denote anyone who served someone else, whether they were life-cycle servants, wealthy apprentices, skilled workers or, even, others of much higher status.\footnote{Goldberg, “What was a Servant?,” 2–6; see also pages 95–96 above.} We should be careful, then, not to assume that the label ‘servant’ when placed next
to the name of a woman in the returns necessarily meant that she was in a low-status, low-paid occupation. Undoubtedly, some of the women recorded as servants were in such positions, perhaps working as unskilled servants in the life-cycle sense, but others likely would have had some degree of training in an occupation and could be paid more than women in these life-cycle positions. Ormrod, Lambert and Mackman recognise that some women recorded as servants in the subsidy would be skilled and could have trained with their employers as apprentices, but they argue that the low numbers of female immigrants recorded in the alien subsidy rolls as independent craftspeople suggest that these were a minority. This does not, however, rule out the possibility that more women were trained as apprentices or had acquired skills in a craft while acting as servants than the subsidy returns would allow. Indeed, this logic is based on the idea that women with training in a craft were expected to one day establish themselves as independent craftswomen. On the contrary, it is far more likely that such women were socialised not to run a business by themselves but rather to marry a man who did and contribute their skills to their husbands’ businesses or the household economy, as was the case in London.

One limitation with the alien subsidies regarding female occupations is that they undervalue the economic role of alien wives considerably. This follows a common trend in the historical records of medieval towns, which often obscures the work practiced by married women. The alien subsidy rolls often under-enumerate alien wives as the alien wives of Englishmen were exempt from the subsidy. Further, as no clear order was given whether to assess the alien wives of alien men, assessors assessed these wills on a haphazard basis, although more seem to have been recorded in the 1440 and 1480 assessments. Alien women in England were recorded as wives in all the assessments between 1440 and 1487 on 2,403 occasions, which constitutes 40 per cent of the total of women assessed. Of these, 2,378 (99%) were not ascribed an occupation by the subsidy assessors. In the returns for London,
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Southwark and Westminster between 1440 and 1487, wives were recorded in 1,630 instances, which constitutes 55 per cent of 2,975 instances in which women were assessed. Only in four instances were these wives recorded with an occupation, all four as servants. As such, we can clearly obtain little from the alien subsidies to understand the economic activities undertaken by these wives.

The lack of information regarding the economic activity of alien wives in the subsidy is problematic considering that they likely have played a crucial role in their husband’s business and in the regulation of the household economy. Goldberg argues that the wives of artisans and merchants undertook a wide array of economic activities, such as working in the family business, extending credit relationships, practising other profit-making activities, such as brewing, as well as playing a vital role in household management and its economy. His overall argument is that to be a wife was a job in itself and included multiple economic and domestic roles. Ward also emphasises the importance of wives in helping out in their husband’s businesses and in contributing to the family income. Although not all alien wives in England would necessarily have been married to artisans or merchants with their own businesses, those that were are likely to have been actively involved in the workshops and businesses of their husbands. In the case of wives, then, and perhaps in the case of other groups of women, the subsidies conceal the economic activities that they performed.

The economic activities of wealthy Doche wives of artisans and merchants in London can be explored further through an analysis of Chancery petitions. Certain petitions highlight how they might act as economic partners of their husbands. That Doche women could be involved in their husband’s trade and played an important role in sustaining their businesses is demonstrated by petitions, which portray wives of alien men involved in their husband’s credit transactions. Silvester van Houte, a Doche widow, petitioned the Chancery in 1475x1485. Her petition reads that her late husband, Frederik van Houte, likely a merchant, asked Silvester to seal an obligation of debt to Robert Thorp, a draper of London, on his behalf. Frederik had died, and the debt had not been paid. Robert levelled an action of debt against Silvester, even
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though, she alleged, the debt was made between her late husband and Robert. She claimed she had no obligation to pay the debt as she was not her husband’s executor.\(^{593}\) The narrative thus depicts a Doche woman who aided her husband by having sealed an obligation of debt on his behalf.

A similar account illuminating the role of relatively well-off Doche wives is indicated in the petition of Peter van Lubyk (1475x1485). Peter narrated that the unnamed wife of the Doche migrant John Lyvelander of London, beerbrewer, came to the house of Poule Gruter, a Doche alien, and delivered ‘certayn goodesz for suerte of suche dutes as that tyme growing betwen the said poule and the said john levelander’. Half a year later, John’s wife paid off the debt in full and asked for the goods that were used as surety.\(^{594}\) In both bills, the wives of Doche aliens are represented as helping in their husband’s credit transactions and facilitating the exchange of credit and resources extended between their husbands and their connections. In acting as important partners in their husband’s business in England, Doche women replicated behaviours that were common among wives in the English economy. They also, however, acted according to precepts prevalent in their regions of origin. Indeed, Martha Howell argues that in medieval Leiden and Cologne, the wives of artisans in high-status artisanal and mercantile trades, especially in small-scale economies revolving around the family-unit of production, helped their husbands in both production and trade. They did this, she argues, until they were increasingly marginalised by guilds displacing family in the organisation of trade.\(^{595}\) The importance of wives in their husbands’ businesses has also been noted by David Nicholas in his study of fourteenth-century Ghent.\(^{596}\)

Chancery petitions also demonstrate that certain Doche women of high socio-economic status might trade independently. Robert Cokker petitioned the chancellor arguing that John Chamberlain, William Tame and a certain Hugh used a plaint of *replegiare* before the Mayor and Sheriffs of London against a ‘douche woman’ named Elizabeth North to recover from her 65 books called ‘new statutez’. Robert complained that after John, William and Hugh had won their action, he had been required by the Mayor and Sheriffs to bring the books to them. After he had brought them, Elizabeth began an action of trespass against him.\(^{597}\) The petition presents

\(^{593}\) TNA C 1/64/276.

\(^{594}\) TNA C 1/64/750; Bennett argued that a man and a wife could share the trade of brewing (ale) within a conjugal household as partners see Bennett, “Women and Men in the Brewers’ Gild of London,” 222–224.


\(^{596}\) Nicholas, *The Domestic Life of a Medieval City*, 80–88.

\(^{597}\) TNA C 1/66/6.
Elizabeth as an independent trader, and not as an agent of a husband, since the plaint of *replegiare* was levelled against her personally in court. If a woman worked on behalf of her husband, then under common law the husband would have acted as party in her place. One Richard Forthey petitioned the chancellor (1475x1480 or 1483x1485) that seventeen years previously he had bought goods on credit ‘of a woman called wayn maylers of Brabant amountyng to xx marc’. ‘Wayn’ asked Richard to write an obligation of debt to both herself and a haberdasher of London named Richard Marshall. Richard Forthey stressed in his petition that despite paying the 20 marks to ‘Wayn’ thirteen years previously, Richard Marshall had brought an action of debt against him for the 20 marks after her death. It is likely that Richard described ‘Wayn’ as having sold the goods independently, rather than as an agent of a husband, since the sale of the goods and the bill of obligation were made with her specifically. Indeed, a wife acting as an agent of her husband would not have the ability to make obligations of debt without her husband’s participation.

The petitions which describe the economic activities of Elizabeth and ‘Wayn’ do not record their status: they may have been widows or, perhaps, married women who traded as *femmes soles*. By the fifteenth century, the legal status of *femmes soles* could be claimed by women in London as well as in certain other cities in England, such as York and Exeter. *Femme sole* status provided a married woman, *inter alia*, with the ability to conduct business dealings by themselves, independently from their husbands, and the opportunity to enter in contracts and obligations without their husband’s participation. *Femme sole* status also meant that any actions which arose from a woman’s trading activities would be pleaded by herself. The petition of Launcelot Wytton and his wife Margaret (1529x1532) demonstrates that wealthy Doche women could trade as *femmes soles* in London. The Wyttons stressed that they lived in London and that Margaret had for three years ‘occupied the feete of merchayndicys and bought and sold certen wares and merchandises as a soule merchaunte’. The reason why they petitioned the chancellor was that, although Margaret had paid off a debt that she had owed to one John Sadoke, John had later brought an action of debt against her, which led to her arrest.

---

599 The name is ‘wayn’ in the petition.
600 TNA C 1/64/922.
601 Ibid., 410–30.
602 TNA C 1/689/20 also cited in McIntosh, “The Benefits and Drawbacks of Femme Sole Status,” 422.
Clearly, single alien women with few social ties did not have the same options as the Doche wives and widows to trade for themselves or to work in partnership with husbands. Such women would have had few economic opportunities, and some would be drawn into the sex trade. Karras argues that low-status female migrants might resort to prostitution due to a lack of other opportunities. She suggests that poor, young alien women without kin or friendship networks were particularly prone to being drawn into the sex trade, usually as a means to support themselves. Although, she also notes that some Doche women acted as bawds and brothelkeepers and were not necessarily sex workers themselves. That Doche women were involved in commercial sex is well attested within the historical record. According to the Anonimalle Chronicle, in 1381, during the Peasants’ Revolt, rioters broke into a brothel managed by Flemish women in Southwark. A royal proclamation in 1393, which banished prostitutes from London to Cock’s lane and Southwark specifically targeted ‘Flemish women, who profess and follow such a shameful and dolorous life’. Comments about Doche women in the sex trade were still being made well into the sixteenth century.

That Doche women were involved in sex work is also reflected in alien subsidy assessments for London in the first half of the 1440s. In her study of medieval Southwark, Carlin notes that women recorded with the byname ‘frowe’, similar to the modern Dutch word for woman ‘vrouw’, next to their names in the 1381 Poll Tax returns were usually involved in sex work. It is notable, then, that there was a group of alien women in London who are recorded in the alien subsidies as having ‘frow’ or ‘frowe’ as a last name. For example, one Obrisela ‘Frowe’ is recorded in the 1441 assessment in the Bishopsgate ward, and one Katherine ‘Frow’ in the 1443 assessment in the Queenshithe ward. It seems likely that many of the thirteen (perhaps eleven if we count women with the same name in subsequent assessments as the same person) recorded were sex workers, and thus the word ‘frowe’ is not their last name but more probably a label ascribed to them, as Doche sex workers, by the jurors.

604 Karras, Common Women, 56–57.
608 TNA E 179/144/52, m. 25; E 179/14/42, m. 15.
who provided the names of aliens in their wards for assessment. Information about four of these women supplied by the subsidy collectors supports Karras’ argument that many of the migrant women who were drawn into the sex trade were poor and of low status. Indeed, Elena ‘Frowe’ (Cheap Ward, 1441), Isabella ‘Frowe’ (Vintry Ward, 1441), Jacobyn ‘Frowe’ (Langbourn Ward, 1441) and Myne ‘Frowe’ (Queenhithe Ward, 1441) were all too poor to pay the tax of 6d. for non-householders and were noted by the collectors to have defaulted in their payment. That these women had low status is also suggested by the fact that the jurors who assessed them only provided their first names, using ‘frowe’ as the second. In addition, out of the certainly eleven, and perhaps thirteen, women in London recorded as ‘frowe’, only two were householders. Perhaps they were bawds, whereas the other eleven were assessed as non-householders. The position of these women as sex workers might be connected to wider economic trends from 1440 onwards. Indeed, from the 1440s to the 1470s there was a severe retraction in the economy, known by historians as the ‘great slump’, which had significant implications until the early sixteenth century. It is possible that in this harsh economic climate, poor alien women were particularly prone to being drawn into the sex trade.

Bennett and McSheffrey have used the Act Books of the Commissary Court to gauge the connection between the role of the exotic and alien women within London’s sex trade. The court acted on reports and accusations that Doche women acted as bawds (pronuba), which could refer to anyone who engaged in any sort of matchmaking that did not lead to marriage. It is particularly notable that women with names highly suggestive of Doche origin were accused of acting as bawds for other women with similarly suggestive Doche names. For example, an ex officio case was brought against one ‘tame duchwoman’, who had allegedly acted as a bawd between one Marion Duchwoman and Fernando Spanyarde.

609 I would like to thank Bart Lambert for suggesting looking for women named ‘frowe’ in the database. There are, certainly, at least 11 such women with ‘frow’ recorded next to their first names recorded in London in the alien subsidy rolls. Two names are repeated in multiple assessments and could either be the same individual recorded in different assessments or different women with the same names; TNA E 179/44/52, m.25; E 179/144/53, m. 5; E 179/144/50, m. 19; E 179/235/23, m. 1; E 179/144/42, m. 16; E 179/144/52, m. 9; E 179/144/64, m.7; E 179/144/54, m. 1; E 179/144/54, m. 1; E 179/144/68; E 179/144/42, m. 14; E 179/144/54, m.4; E 179/144/72; E 179/144/69; E 179/236/74; E 179/144/42, m. 23; E 179/144/54, m. 4; E 179/144/52, m. 6; E 179/144/53, m. 14; E 179/144/50, m. 4; E 179/144/52, m. 23; E 179/144/54, m. 13; E 179/144/42, m. 22; E 179/144/42, m. 15.
610 TNA E 179/144/42, m. 16 (Elena Frowe); E 179/144/42, m. 14 (Isabella Frowe); E 179/144/42, m. 23 (Jacobyn Frowe); E 179/144/42, m. 22 (Myne Frowe).
613 Karras, Common Women, 74.
614 MS 09064/001, f. 257.
Paulson and ‘Sewt’, his wife, were summoned to court to respond to the rumour that they were bawds for Gertrude Stale and Derik Drayman. 615 John Fasye and his wife Greta were summoned to court to respond to the accusation that they acted as procurers between Margaret Harryson and Henry Preckynson. 616 The rumour that one ‘Anna Duchewoman’ was a procurer to a woman named ‘Jacomyn’, a name commonly held by Doche women, led to her being cited. 617 As noted by Karras, that someone is recorded as a pronuba does not necessarily imply that they were suspected of having acted as a bawd for money, although it often did. 618 These rumours that Doche migrants acted as bawds for other Doche women often reached the court are suggestive that they offered a specialist service: as Doche aliens themselves, they would have been particularly well positioned to procure women of the same background whom they could then match to customers desiring that type of sex worker.

As has been argued by Karras, McSheffrey and Bennett, the nationality of a sex worker likely contributed significantly to their exotic allure. Certain prostitutes adopted (or were given) alien nicknames either to stress their alien exoticness, or to at least suggest to their customers that they were alien: there were prostitutes cited in the Commissary Court with names such as ‘Spanish Nell’ or ‘Dutch Kate’. 619 The link between aliens, the desire for the exotic and the sex trade was also connected to the presence of Greek migrants in London in the last quarter of the fifteenth century. There were a small number of ‘Greeks’, i.e. persons of Greek birth or those born in areas of modern-day Greece but under the control of Italian states, who moved to London to escape the mid–fifteenth-century Ottoman advance towards and capture of Constantinople. 620 It is in this context we should view the citation of one ‘Thomasina Effomato’ to the Commissary Court in 1490. The report that she had to respond to was that she had fornicated with one Randolph Far and had committed adultery with ‘quodam textore’. The court’s scribe also recorded that she lived in her own house (‘dicta Thomasina habitat in domo sua’), and also recorded that she lived in the parish of St Andrew Undershaft. 621 Thomasina had the same second name as the two Byzantine, or ‘Greek’, brothers Alexius and

615 MS 09064/004, f. 188.
616 MS 09064/011, f. 303v. John Fasy and his wife Greta were also accused of acting as matchmakers between various women and Hanseatic merchants of the Steelyard, MS 09064/011, f. 252v.
617 MS 09064/005, f. 39.
618 Karras, Common Women, 74.
619 Karras, Common Women, 56; McSheffrey and Bennett, “Early, Erotic and Alien,” 15.
621 MS 09064/004, f. 74.
Andronicus Effamato who practiced the craft of gold-wire drawing London in the second half of the fifteenth century.\footnote{Harris, “Two Byzantine Craftsmen in fifteenth-century London,” 387–403.} Both brothers are recorded multiple times in the alien subsidies: the last recorded assessment of Andrew Effamato was in 1469, the last for Alex was in 1483.\footnote{TNA E 179/144/67 (Andrew); E 179/242/25, m. 10 (Alex).} There were also other ‘Greeks’ who may well have been from the same family in London at this time as one John ‘Effemato’ was assessed in the alien subsidies in 1467 and 1468, and one Carant ‘Effemathi’ was assessed in 1457.\footnote{Ormrod, Lambert and Mackman, Immigrant England, 121–122.} Most of the Greek migrants were male, which makes the reference to Thomasina Effomato particularly notable.\footnote{Harris and Porfyriou, “The Greek diaspora,” 79.} Thomasina Effomato seems likely to be the same ‘Thomasina’, of the parish of St Andrew Undershaft, who was noted by McSheffrey and Bennett as having been cited to the court in 1493 to answer to a report that she led a concubine into her room dressed in man’s clothing.\footnote{MS 09064/004, f. 239.}

There were other women who were either Greek or, considering the paucity of Greek women in the capital, perhaps women who presented themselves as such to attract customers, who are recorded within the Act Books. Paul Godfrey, a beerbrewer in the parish of St. Botolph without Aldgate, was accused of having fornicated with one ‘Isabella Greke’ in 1490.\footnote{MS 09064/006, f. 126.} The court heard that ‘Rankyn Shomaker’ had committed adultery with one ‘Elisabeth greke’ in 1494.\footnote{MS 09064/004, f. 275.} In 1490x1491, the same Act Book that records Thomasina’s and Isabella Greke’s citation, the court’s scribe noted that a ‘Dericke wytynback estarling forncavit cum johanna manens cum le Grekes wiff apud le tourewharff’.\footnote{MS 09064/004, f. 12; Wunderli has commented that the admission of guilt is unusual within the act books and also identifies her as a prostitute, see Wunderli, London Church Courts and Society, 100–101.} One ‘Johanna Greke’ was cited before the court in 1490 accused of being a ‘communis meretrix’. Found in bed with a priest, she had been taken by a constable to prison (‘le Cownter’). She had also been caught in the house of one ‘Igrane Fusia’ with two Lombards. Unusually for those summoned to the Commissary, Joan admitted her guilt in the court to both these charges.\footnote{MS 09064/004, f. 239.} It seems very likely that the ‘Johanna Greke’ who was accused of fornication in 1490 was also the Joan who was accused of fornication in 1490x1491, when staying with the ‘Grekes wiff’, and was a sex worker who offered services to a clientele of alien merchants. What is clear is that there was a connection
between ‘Greek’ migrants and the role of exoticism within the sex trade in the last quarter of
the fifteenth century; Thomasina Effamato, Joan’s name ‘Greke’, along with the reports of
sexual transgression concerning Isabella Greke and Elizabeth Greke, contributes to the picture
of the role of female aliens, and the exotic, within London’s sex trade.
III. Contact with Native Society

In February 1512, a defamation suit was brought to the London Consistory Court. One Christopher Wastell, a servant of the keeper of Croydon Park named Baldwyn, brought a suit against Thomas and Salmon Dowff on the grounds that they had defamed him as a ‘skotte’ in parish, along with other slurs. One of Christopher’s witnesses named John Cooke told the court that Thomas Dowff had defamed Christopher publicly in a beer house in Haverstock, within the parish of Buttsbury in the diocese of London, where Christopher lived. According to John, Thomas had gestured towards Christopher and had declared that it was a ‘grete pyte that ony suche horson skott schulde be suffred within the parisshe’.

Although the event John described, and the suit, happened before war was declared between England and Scotland in July 1512, there seems to have been anti-Scottish feeling present. The wording of the alleged slander is notable. It references a specific location, the parish, and stresses that Christopher, as a ‘horson skott’, should not be suffered within it. As such, Cooke’s witness testimony depicts Thomas as having used an accusation (that Christopher was a Scot) to stress that he should not be included, or ‘suffred’, within the parish. This raises a number of questions. If aliens, or at least those perceived to be aliens, could be excluded from a body of people, what was the process by which they could become included within more peaceful contexts? Were there particular ways by which resident aliens could incorporate themselves within networks of natives and more formal institutions which were mainly comprised of English people? If so, in which groups in an urban context could they become incorporated? If, as John Cooke’s deposition highlights, attempts might be made to exclude individuals within certain contexts, what were the implications of exclusion and how could it be enacted?

---

631 LMA DL/C/206, ff. 112v, 115v, 116v, 118v, 119r. John Cooke’s deposition: LMA DL/C/206, f. 116r. I am very grateful to Professor McSheffrey for providing me with a copy of her calendar of the deposition book and photos of the relevant folios.

632 The witness depositions were taken in February 1512 and refer to alleged events prior to this date, which means that the narratives were set at a time before James IV of Scotland went to war with England in July 1512: Trevor Chalmers, “James IV,” in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oct 2012, accessed 8 March, 2018 https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-14590.; Dobson, “Aliens in the City of York during the Fifteenth Century,” 257.

633 Cynthia Neville has noted that in late fifteenth–century York, the accusation that someone was Scottish was a useful way to slander economic or personal rivals yet does not refer to accusations in relation to the processes of inclusion and exclusion, see Neville, “Local Sentiment and the ‘National’ Enemy in Northern England,” 433–434.
This chapter explores the process of interaction between aliens and natives and the incorporation of aliens within the environments in which they lived. Historians have used two terms to refer to this topic: assimilation and integration. In their research of aliens, medieval historians have tended to follow, in sociological terms, an particular means of conceptualising assimilation, seeing it as a process by which an immigrant, or immigrant group, sheds its own culture and becomes indistinguishable from the dominant, host society. Implicit in this logic is that the immigrant group has a set of cultural traits which are different from that of the host society, and that the host society has an essentially homogeneous national culture which they can “assimilate” into. Critics of this way of thinking argue that it has been shown that immigrants can still accommodate themselves within a native culture, yet also preserve distinct cultural elements of their region of origin. “Integration” has been suggested to be a less problematic term to generally denote the process by which an immigrant becomes a full and accepted member of society. Certain scholars of medieval migration have not been consistent in their use of the two terms and are not clear as to what they mean by each. In her pioneering article on aliens in England, Thrupp uses the term assimilation in the sense mentioned above. Indeed, she states that ‘the question of the ease or difficulty with which immigrants of different national origins came to be assimilated, to be regarded, with or without formal denization, as English, can only be answered through the continuous tracing of the lives of individuals’. In a later chapter concerning aliens in London, Thrupp uses testamentary evidence of aliens as one of her main sources, and concludes that there was a high level of tolerance and respect between aliens and Londoners in the city. Although Thrupp does not use the terms of assimilation or integration within this chapter, Bolton interprets her argument as one for assimilation. Bolton uses both terms assimilation and integration as synonyms whilst discussing whether anything ‘divided’ alien communities from their native neighbours.

635 For the dangers of this in historical analysis see Hoerder, Lucassen and Lucassen, “Terminologies and Concepts of Migration Research,” xxxv.
638 Ibid., 273.
640 Bolton, The Alien Communities, 35–37; Dempsey uses the terms assimilation and integration to refer both to a migrant’s interaction with natives and to ‘establishing’ themselves in the local community, see Dempsey, “The Italian Community in London during the Reign of Edward II,” 14–20; for the use of the term assimilation, see 18.
Pointing to instances of violence against Italians and the Doche in the fifteenth century, Bolton argues that Thrupp’s argument for a high level of integration of aliens in London, and that they met each other on grounds of respect, must be treated with caution. He also questions Thrupp’s use of testamentary evidence. He argues that because testators had a mix of social contacts of both aliens and natives their usefulness as evidence of ‘assimilation’ is not so clear as Thrupp supposed, and this is one of the reasons he concludes that ‘it is difficult to draw a convincing picture of an alien community at one with the Londoners from this scrappy evidence’.  

In her recent prosopographical study concerning the ‘assimilation’ of aliens into late medieval Exeter, Kowaleski produces an explanation of what she means by assimilation, which is a hybrid between the ways assimilation and integration were utilised by Thrupp and Bolton. Indeed, she describes it as the process by which aliens ‘were integrated into their new home in Exeter and became more like their English neighbours and accepted by them’. The authors of Immigrant England, when referring to the incorporation of aliens, have distinguished between the process of acculturation, and that of ‘assimilation’. They use the term acculturation to denote a process of change, which occurs when different groups interact with one another, opting against the term assimilation with the loss of culture that it implies. It is argued that ‘Englishness’ was a set of values and practices which aliens could adhere to and that ‘becoming English’ was a process of adjustment undertaken by both aliens and native society. Immigrant England also demonstrates how aliens might have contacts with native people, as well as with people of a similar cultural background to themselves. They also describe aliens as being predominantly integrated within English society.

Although scholars tend to use both the terms integration and assimilation to refer to the processes of an alien’s interaction with natives and incorporation within native society in different ways, they tend to attribute similar characteristics to these processes. They write of incorporation and interaction as if aliens could become “integrated” within native society, as if this society was a homogeneous “whole”. Indeed, they discuss incorporation in London society, the society of other cities, or English populace as if they were unified blocs to which a migrant could become part. Another way in which historians write about incorporation is by implying

---

642 Ibid., 37.
645 Ibid., 226–260.
that integration/assimilation is an essentially binary process: either an individual merged with these whole societies, reaching certain benchmarks of integration/assimilation, or they were not incorporated within them. Nearly every analysis concerning integration fails to explore how someone might be concurrently included within multiple groupings, yet how they might not belong to others. They also fail to describe the position these individuals might be situated in. For example, if a migrant was included within a certain local community or network, yet was not part of the freedom of the city, were they integrated or not? If we conclude that they were not integrated, then does that mean that their acceptance by a local community had no impact on their incorporation in native society because it had not reached some arbitrary, unclear “benchmark of integration”? Writing of an alien’s incorporation as a merger with a homogeneous native society, or London society, does not fit easily with recent research concerning late medieval cities, which views urban centres as composites formed from ‘webs of networks and solidarities’. There are pertinent questions about a migrant’s interaction and incorporation in native society that are not explained by previous studies. Could individuals be included in one group yet be not part of others and, if so, how can we define the positions of these individuals?

The concept of belonging allows for a conceptualisation of the process of interaction with native society which is more nuanced and fluid than the ways in which the terms assimilation and integration have been used to date. Indeed, rather than viewing aliens as “integrating” within a whole, homogeneous society, the concept of belonging prompts us to consider that an individual might concurrently be a member of multiple groupings within a society. Similarly, rather than viewing an immigrant as occupying a position in a binary model, as either integrated/assimilated in society or not, belonging acknowledges the possibility that an individual might at the same time be included in certain groupings and not be part of others.

---


647 The exception to this rule is Bradley, “‘Saluti da Londra’,” 107–111, 126–127. Bradley acknowledges that Italians who acquired the freedom of London still retained their legal nationality (and by extension being legally excluded from the body of the King’s subjects). Yet, she discusses integration as if it were a process of incorporation within an ‘English society’, 126.

648 Colson and Steensel, “Cities and Solidarities. Urban Communities in Medieval and Early Modern Europe,” 2, 10.
In other words, the concept helps us recognise that individuals might occupy various positions of belonging concurrently.

This chapter will explore a number of facets concerning belonging, namely, the identification of certain formal and informal groups in native society in which aliens might or might not be members of, as well as the criteria of belonging to these groups. It will then explore the strategies available to aliens to achieve those criteria and, consequently, negotiate their belonging in these groupings. The second section of the chapter will explore how the parameters of belonging might change in certain contexts and how verbal slander might be used in such contexts to exclude aliens from the communities of which they were part.

**Connections with Natives and Inclusion in Social Networks**

As has been explored above, one informal grouping which aliens might seek to negotiate their inclusion into were social networks. It is clear from probate records that more settled and wealthy resident aliens often forged connections with natives. For example, Nannyng Petirson made Nicholas Hynde one of the executors of his 1474 will. Everard van de Vyn, a Doche goldsmith who made his will in 1427, remembered one John Barbour, whose name is suggestive of native origin and who was a tailor and citizen of London. Everard also made John one of his executors. Whyghtmannus Loof ‘de partibus Almannis’, sailor, whose will was made in 1430 had one Thomas Russel, tailor of London, as a witness to the testament. Peter van Acon (1517), either a first or second generation immigrant, made ‘humfrey monmarth’ as the overseer of his will and asked him to be a ‘good father to my wyff and chylde’. Bradley demonstrates that many resident Italian mercantile agents in London often named their English friends and neighbours as witnesses in their wills.

In addition, wills of widows with names suggestive of Doche origin indicate that they sought companionship with natives. Joan Van Egmond, who made her will in 1457, bequeathed items of clothing to women with names suggestive of English origin: Margaret
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Basil, Margaret Gebon, Christine Welwyk and Joan de Harsordsteke in Essex. Katherine Van Utryght, who made her testament in 1495, willed that one mother Haverbeck should have a violet gown lined with grey fur, and it is possible that she was a native. Sote van Berkyng likewise made one Nicholas Child her executor in 1411. Joan van Egmond made two London citizens and likely natives, Nicholas Hatton and Robert Welwyk, her executors. Katherine van Uryght named the likely native John ‘olde fox’ as her supervisor. Sometimes the men who the widows made executors or supervisors of their testaments were family members of their female connections: Joan van Egmond’s executor Robert Welwyk was presumably a close relative of Christine Welwyk who Joan also mentioned in her testament, and Katherine van Utryght left goods to the wife of her executor, and to his daughter Alice. Katherine French argues that widows were particularly vulnerable to legal and economic exploitation because their lack of protection of a husband or father. Her research concerning widows in late medieval Westminster explores how widows relied upon the help of friends to allay their legal and economic vulnerability and survive the ‘dangers and pitfalls of widowhood’; it is likely that the relationships of the widows presented here reflect a similar strategy.

There were a variety of means through which aliens could forge and sustain these connections with natives and negotiate inclusion within social networks. One way was through socialising with them in their households. Indeed, as part of wider narrative strategies in their bills, certain alien petitioners to Chancery portrayed themselves as good friends of people in their settlement, who often paid calls to their houses. The inclusion of these details suggests that close relationships between aliens and natives in London would appear credible to the chancellor. Peter Fermyngus, an ‘estraunger born’, who brought his petition to the Chancery in 1529x1532, was accused by the native Harry Rolff that he had broken into his house in London and attacked his servant. In order to portray himself as someone who was in fact always a welcome guest to Rolff’s house, and not an intruder, he stated that ‘there was grate famelyarutees by long tyme’ between Rolff and himself. The Italian Gabriel de Poza (1538x1544) was a merchant stranger, who had an action of trespass levied upon him by a
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native pewterer named Thomas Reydon. Thomas argued that Gabriel had broken into his house and defiled his wife Ann. Gabriel denied this, argued that he could not obtain justice via common law, and asked the chancellor for the case to be moved to Chancery and to rule in his favour. Gabriel was keen to provide a narrative to explain how he knew Ann, and why he spent time at the Thomas house, which also portrayed him as being innocent of the accusation. To this end, he argued that both Thomas and Ann ‘dyuers tymes wold call your said Oratour into theyre sayd howse to drynk’. Thomas allegedly felt so comfortable with Gabriel that he would ‘goo fouthe and leue your said Oratour ther behynde hym’ with his wife.

Communal drinking was another means by which an alien could foster and maintain connections with natives. Gabriel stressed in his petition that he frequently drank with Ann and Thomas as a means to emphasise that through this bonding activity he had a close friendship with them both. That communal drinking was a means by which aliens could foster strong bonds with natives in London is evidenced in the above-mentioned 1533x1538 petition of the Frenchman John Malyard. John Hart, a native householder, had brought an action of trespass against Malyard on the grounds of a sexual misdemeanour with one of his dependants; in Malyard’s case it was a servant. Hart and Agnes, his wife, argued that John had broken into their house and had impregnated Elizabeth Jeffrey, their servant. Like Gabriel, Malyard petitioned the chancellor and included a story which explained why he was often at the home of the respondent yet was innocent of sexual transgression. To that end, he argued that he ‘never came to the house of the same hart by wit the good wyl and faver of the said hart ther to drynke and spend hys money and to make mery wit the said hart’.

Intermarriage is viewed by anthropologists as a key indicator of an immigrant’s connection with the host population. Marriage of an alien to an English person indicates a conscious decision on behalf of the former to connect themselves to the network of kinship members and friends of their betrothed. In a study on intermarriage in late medieval England which draws primarily from the alien subsidy returns for Rutland and Herefordshire and later Tudor subsidies, Ruddick concludes that intermarriage was a ‘surprisingly widespread occurrence’.

Evidence of intermarriage in London can also be found in sources other than the alien subsidies. Chancery petitions also highlight that certain aliens chose native spouses. Oliver Bouthin, who described himself as a Dutchman, argued in his petition that his wife
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Alionore was an ‘englisshewoman’. Julian Notary, a London stationer who had originated from Venice, and his wife Anna acted as witnesses for a suit of defamation in the Consistory court of London in 1511. Although Julian stated that he was born in Venice, he said of his wife Anna that she was of ‘angla nacione’. McSheffrey has argued that the friends and family members of potential marriage partners played key roles in matching the parties, in orchestrating the courtship process, witnessing the contract, and acting as advisers to the couple, who sometimes needed the consent of family and friends before marrying. We might view intermarriage, then, not only as the decision of an English person – and the evidence of legal narratives concerning London aliens suggests that this was usually a woman due to the highly skewed gender ratio in favour of men amongst the alien population – to choose an alien partner, but also as an indicator of how far the friends and family of the native partner approved the match.

Marriage was certainly an important means through which an alien could forge relationships with, and become obligated to, the friends and kin of their native spouse. John Rowland, witness for the plaintiff in a marriage case brought to the Consistory court of London in 1474, testified that he had been born in Normandy and around 23 years prior to his deposition he had moved to London. He stated that first he had lived in Lombard Street, in the parish of Saint Edmund for four years, and after that he lived in the parish of Saint Sepulchre beyond Newgate for 19 years. In this parish, he married a woman named Elizabeth, whom we can identify as an Englishwoman as she testified she was born in the parish of Saint Sepulchre. Elizabeth had a daughter from a previous marriage named Joan Salman, and in her own deposition Joan stated that because she was so poor she was compelled to live with John and Elizabeth. Under these circumstances, she was present to witness a marriage bond of future consent in the house, and it was this exchange of words that was central to the marriage dispute in question. Joan clearly believed it appeared plausible that John’s marriage to her mother made him obliged to shelter her in his household.

The bonds forged between an alien and their spouse’s kin are further evidenced in the petition of Matthew Petit (1475x1480). Matthew was a ‘merchaunt stranger’ who lived in
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London. He argued that the cousin of his wife, ‘Johane Gybson’ wife to Robert Gybson, came to him ‘gret with childe and sore betyn and hurt and so sore strykyn’ claiming that her husband’s brutality had left her ‘utturly destroyed’. Matthew stated that Joan’s husband was in prison and had left her with no money to sustain herself, making her ask for money and food. Here, Matthew played upon the expectation that a wife should have her husband to support her or, failing that, another close male kin member would. The narrative then states that he had allowed her to come to his house and ask for food and drink should she be in need. When Robert Gybson was released from gaol, however, he brought an action of trespass against Matthew saying that he had forcibly taken his wife away in his absence. Matthew was at pains to explain that he had only helped her with honourable motives. The petition stresses how Matthew only helped her ‘for concideracion that the same Johan was and ys cosyn to the wyffe of your besecher’ and that if he did not feed her then he feared that ‘she shuld peryssh for defawte of mete and drynk’. Matthew’s case was that his marriage had created expectations of succour in his wife’s kin circle, which he was obliged to honour due to the bonds of kinship between them.

Evidence from outside of London that marriage created bonds of affinity between an alien and a native is reflected in a passage from the second book of the treatise known as The Book of Margery Kempe (1436x1438). Kempe was a merchant’s daughter from Lynn, a port with trading links to the Hanseatic Baltic and north European ports, from the late fourteenth to the mid-fifteenth centuries. Ashley has suggested that The Book was created to substantiate Kempe’s claims to sanctity, provide social validation of her holiness and perhaps obtain canonisation. The relation between the text and Margery Kempe herself is much debated partly because it contains many tropes of sacred biography. The Book, however, is useful for this study, as Margery and her scribe use social realities of late medieval society as context for Margery’s holy acts. Margery had a son who had married a woman in Prussia, ‘Pruce’, and
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both of them had moved to Lynn to live with Margery. Soon after, the son and Margery’s husband died. This meant that ‘sche that was hys [the son’s] wife, a Dewche woman, [was] dwelling wyth hys modyr a yer and a halfe’. After this time, the daughter-in-law received a letter calling her back to Prussia but would only do so after she asked consent from ‘hir eldmodyr’, or mother-in-law. Margery then helped her daughter-in-law find a ship destined for her home region. Implicit in this narrative is that Margery had cared for her alien daughter-in-law after her son’s death for a substantial amount of time and wished to help her because of the bonds of affinity that existed between them.

As well as forging connections with natives, another motive behind intermarriage was that it enabled aliens to acquire wealth and property in England. Ruddock highlights how Italian mercantile agents in Southampton married English women in order to obtain their dowry. Petitions to the Court of Chancery suggest that agents of large Italian mercantile firms married Englishwomen in order to gain access to real property, and this might have been a way for them to bypass the common law restrictions upon them buying or inheriting real property as aliens. This is evidenced in the petition of Belizard de Bardi and his wife Alice (1465x1471 or 1480x1483). The petition reads that Alice was the daughter of John Tuxford and his wife Katheryn, and as such she owned the right to a third of the manor of Little Markham in Nottinghamshire. Thus, implicitly, she was co-heiress along with her two sisters. One John Caxton the younger, however, allegedly held this property without acknowledging Alice’s claim, which prompted Alice and her husband to petition the court. Belizarde de Bardi, a member of the wealthy Florentine Bardi mercantile family, was assessed for the London alien subsidy in 1443, 1444, 1449 and 1469. He is not recorded in the Patent Rolls as having taken out letters of denization, which would have allowed him to buy real property himself. These assessments make it likely that his petition was made in the earlier of the two possible date ranges and that he was one of the Bardi family’s more permanent agents in London. The narrative of the petition portrays an Italian who had very likely married an English heiress partly for her property rights, and who was willing to bring litigation against losing them.
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Another Italian who was partially motivated to marry an English heiress for financial reasons is found in the petition of Lawrence de Platea. Lawrence de Platea and his wife Joan petitioned the court (1443x1450 or 1455x1456) claiming that Joan held the right to land in Essex due to her enfeoffment at the command of her previous husband. They argued, however, that one William Spone, a clerk, refused to fulfil her husband’s wishes. Strategic marriages, with a promise of dowry of land and capital, were not only appealing to more permanent Italians but were also much coveted by native merchants in London as marriage often allowed them access to capital and real estate in the form of their wives’ dowries or dowers.

One way in which aliens could establish relationships with native people in their locality was through active involvement in parochial affairs. Parishes and their churches provided centres of community and it was around the parish church that both devotional and secular activities took place. Strong relationships could form between parish clergy and members of their congregation. Colson has noted that parishes can usefully be seen as geographically defined units, but also ‘containers’ within which other ‘sub-sets’ of parishioners were included. They also acted as fora in which interactions and relations between individuals were fostered due to co-habitation. As such, parishes were one of the formally defined groupings, or units, to which a resident alien might belong, yet also provided a platform for them to establish and maintain connections with English co-parishioners and thus negotiate inclusion networks of local people. Indeed, active participation in parish life would have given resident aliens the ability to interact with their neighbours on Sunday assemblies and take part in the ales, feasts and processions which were usually organised by the parish. Research regarding London parishes has highlighted how parishioners were encouraged to be active in parochial affairs and that many parishioners bequeathed good to parish clergy, or the fabric of the parish church, upon their death.

Wills made by aliens can be used to highlight how far
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they chose to incorporate themselves in parochial life. It could be argued that the wish to be buried in a parish church does not necessarily imply involvement in parochial affairs during one’s lifetime. Indeed, belonging to a parish was compulsory. As such, the ‘will’ of many testators to be buried in their parish church may suggest a customary practice. It is possible, however, to identify alien testators who had developed strong relationships with their parish clergy through personal bequests and, consequently, were very likely to have been actively involved in parochial affairs.

Indeed, like native testators, a number of Doche and French aliens testators gave specific bequests to named parochial clergy, which underlines their familiarity. Peter van Acon (1517), likely an alien, bequeathed 6s. 8d. to John Jones ‘our paryssh prest’. Jasper Gebe (1521), a goldsmith who was likely a Doche alien, clearly had close relations with his parish church of Saint Mary Abchurch, as he asked Hugh Bentley, the curate of the church, to be the overseer of his will. Christian ‘van newe contrey’, of the parish of Saint Mary at Hill next to Billingsgate, made the rector of the same church, Henry Cokam, one of the executors of his will, which was composed in 1400. Gylemod Peverell (1413) made the rector of the parish of St Nicholas Acon, John Crowe, one of the executors of his will. Valuable or out of the ordinary gifts to the parish priest in order to ‘pray for the testator’s soul’ suggest a close relationship between the two. One such relationship is evidenced in the will of one John de Ypres, likely from Ypres, of Saint Andrew’s parish (1400), who rather than bequeath money to the rector of his parish church gave him his horse ‘nomine Principal’. Moreover, Helen Bradley has noted that some Italian testators chose to be buried in the parish churches they worshipped in regularly, particularly those in Broad Street and Langborune Wards. This pattern of alien involvement in parochial life is similar to that identified regarding aliens in later medieval Sandwich.
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A further means through which aliens could network with natives was to join a local devotional fraternity, usually within a parish. Fraternities were formal groups with, usually, some form of entry requirements in terms of social respectability and positive personal reputation. Membership was also subject to the payment of fees. Being a sub-set of the parish, these were groupings in which an alien might belong; yet, they also provided a platform to establish relationships with natives, and thus the opportunity to negotiate inclusion into informal social networks, which could prove useful outside of the context of the fraternity. These guilds afforded a number of benefits to their members, such as provision of burial, intercessory prayers, financial support in times of need, an enhancement of *fama* through communal devotional and charitable actions and, as stressed by Rosser, social events. Activities, such as the annual feast and other collective events, provided opportunities for individuals to forge relationships with others in their settlement, which could be financially and politically beneficial. Fraternities actively fostered bonds of friendship between members, as their objective was to cultivate selfless devotion to God or to a particular saint. These relationships, which guild membership might foster, were crucial for survival in the late medieval economy, and were particularly sought after by newcomers who wished to establish themselves in a new environment.

Wills of Doche and French testators highlight that they had joined local fraternities both in London and elsewhere. John Gyse (1494), a merchant who originated from Antwerp, bequeathed money to the fraternity of Our Lady in his parish church of Saint Boltolph Billingsgate. The citizen and joiner David van Den Hoke (1493) bequeathed money to the fraternity of Saint Christopher in his parish church of Saint Martin Orgar Hoke, as well as the fraternity of Saint Sebastian in the church of the Austin Friars. The likely Doche alien Dedericus van Rien, whose will was proved in the Archdeaconry court of London, gave 20 shillings to the fraternity of Saint Anne in his parish church in 1413.
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century, a Doche alien in London was ‘for sworn’ from the fraternity of Saint Michael for failing to pay 2s. 4d. and half a pound of wax to the fraternity. The beerbrewer Cornelius Metten in London bequeathed money to the fraternity of St Stephen in the Chapel of blessed Marie near Berkyngchurch. People with names highly suggestive of alien origin outside of the capital also saw the benefits of joining local fraternities. Hans Martyn of Hull (1453) bequeathed money to the guild of Saint George in the church of Holy Trinity in Hull. Florencius Williamson of Hull (1476) made a bequest to the guild of Saint James in his parish church of Saint Mary in the same town. Cornelius Johnson (1502), who lived in Hull, bequeathed 6s. 8d. to the guilds of the Holy Saviour and Saint James the Apostle in the same town. Henry Johnson (1500) of Norwich bequeathed 12d. to the guild of Saint Mary situated in his parish church. Maurice Biront (1510), an organ maker who lived in York, asked that when he died all the torches of every guild of which he was a member might ‘be borne afor my bodie’.

The ability of aliens to negotiate their inclusion in social networks through contact with English people would have been dependent upon their ability to speak English. It has been noted that there is very little evidence allowing for an insight into the challenges that confronted aliens who sought to acquire English as a vernacular. Certain petitions to the Court of Chancery highlight that not all immigrants had a good grasp of English and that this could hinder their successful interaction with natives. The petitioners usually only explain that they could not speak, or only had a limited grasp of, English as a means to emphasise how the respondent had targeted them or why they could not seek remedy via common law. This is highlighted in the petition of Erik Vedeke (1475x1480 or 1483x1485), a physician who lived in London. He stated that he had agreed to treat one Richard Russel, who after being cured tried to evade payment. Eryke reported in his petition that Richard had deliberately targeted him with a false accusation of trespass because he would be less able to defend himself, as he ‘can not speke the langage of thys land utterly’. Robert Rowe’s petition (1493x1500) states that he was a capper born under the king’s allegiance in Normandy, who ‘toke his iorney in to
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this realme of Englond not knowing the speche of Englond’. It goes on to state that he had fallen out with one of his employers in England and had been arrested for breach of a service contract.\textsuperscript{715} The reference to him as speaking broken English was a means to emphasise how desperate he was, and how dearly he needed the chancellor’s help to free himself from prison. Andrewe Tewell, merchant stranger, argued in his petition (1518x1529) as part of his attempt to convince the chancellor of his precarious position, that he was a ‘straunger and cannot speke ne understond the langage of this realme’.\textsuperscript{716}

Evidence that aliens might struggle with English is further highlighted in an entry concerning the attack against Flemings in London during the Peasants’ revolt found in BL, MS Julius B.II, a “Chronicle of London”, dated to 1435.\textsuperscript{717} The entry provides a very brief description of the Peasants’ Revolt (1381); yet, the attack against ‘Flemish’ aliens in London receives a comparatively lengthy treatment: ‘And many Flemings lost here heedes at that tyme, and namely that koude not say Breede and Chese, But Case and Brode’.\textsuperscript{718} This is the only reference to a language test for the Flemish, or Doche, victims of the revolt. Scales questions the historicity of this extract. He highlights that the story of strangers being killed after pronouncing words in certain ways was a common literary topos, and that there is also a biblical precedent in \textit{The Book of Judges}. He argues that, here, the chronicler recorded, not necessarily an historical event, but a stereotype for ‘recounting acts of interethnic slaughter’.\textsuperscript{719} It may be no coincidence that the author of the chronicle chose to go into detail about the attacks against Flemings in 1381 when during the time he was writing (1435) there were attacks in the capital against Doche aliens, following the duke of Burgundy’s repudiation of his English alliance in favour of one with France.\textsuperscript{720} Despite the doubtful historicity of the account as a source for the revolt, the entry nevertheless indicates that certain Doche aliens could have struggled with the English language.

Language barriers not only would have hindered an alien’s ability to socialise with natives but would also have caused problems in terms of receiving spiritual services from their parish clergy and being fully involved within the spiritual aspect of the parish community. In 1511, a Spaniard named Fernand de Aza was summoned before the vicar general of the bishop
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of London on behalf of one Robert Portland, the rector of Fernand’s parish church of Saint Nicholas Acon in Lombard Street. We do not have the articles posed to Fernand by the vicar general, but only a record of his deposition. It can be inferred from his responses to the article that he had been summoned to respond to accusations that he had been absent from his parish church during numerous feast days. One article concerned the question of where Fernand had heard confession and received the Eucharist the previous Easter. Fernand stated that prior to the feast he had asked Portland for permission to receive the Eucharist in the church of the Austin Friars, as opposed to the parish church of Saint Nicholas Acon; yet, Portland refused the request. Fernand admitted that, despite Portland’s refusal, he went to the church of the Austin Friars on Easter day to hear confession and receive the rite.\textsuperscript{721} It is clear that one of the reasons why he had been summoned before the vicar general because he had taken the Eucharist at Austin Friars against the wishes of his rector and had flouted the compulsory Easter service which parishioners were obliged to attend at their parish church.\textsuperscript{722} In his deposition, Fernand was keen to stress how he did not ignore the rector’s wishes out of malice, but that he did so out of necessity. Indeed, he argued that he had gone to the Austin Friars, which, as will be discussed below, were part of an international mendicant order with brothers from various countries, so that he might find a friar who could speak his language and hear his confession.\textsuperscript{723} Although the Eucharistic rite was conducted in Latin, confession was heard in the vernacular and was an important form of preparation for communion, as it dignified and readied the devotee for the rite.\textsuperscript{724} Fernand’s defence for his actions was that he could not hear confession at Saint Nicholas Acon as he did not speak English and the clergy of the parish did not speak Spanish, consequently he needed to go elsewhere to receive communion at Easter. He also explained his absence in the church during the Feast of the Purification because of his lack of English and that he could not find a Spanish speaker. His deposition offers a rare insight into the obstacles against inclusion within the spiritual life of a parish that an alien without English might face.

Beyond the parish, fraternities and informal social networks to which an alien could belong, certain wealthy aliens attempted to incorporate themselves into the civic franchise. The freedom of a town or city ensured an individual’s inclusion in a privileged, formal group.
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Certain alien petitioners to the Chancery stressed that there was a clear distinction between those who were included in the citizenry and those who were not. This was part of a narrative strategy to convince the chancellor that, because they were not an enfranchised member of their settlement and their respondent was, they would be less likely to be favoured by other freemen and would, thus, be disadvantaged in their suit. Richard Jurden of London for example, a hatmaker, complained to the chancellor (1533x1538) that when one his acquaintances, James Baker, was sued in the city he ‘had noo faver amonge Citezins’ because he was an ‘alyen borne’.725

How common was it for aliens to become London freemen? According to London civic ordinances, the enfranchised, who since 1319 at the latest had to be members of one of London’s craft guilds or companies, had the right to buy and sell land, practice a craft regulated by one of the craft guilds as an independent master, open a shop and sell by retail.726 They also had the right to trade free of toll, and the ability to buy goods in quantity by wholesale and then sell them by retail.727 Although clearly involved in economic regulation, London’s craft guilds also offered important socialising opportunities for their members through events such as feasts and funerals, and other informal means of interaction, much like parochial, devotional fraternities. Membership of such companies, then, might allow an individual to socialise with other members and thus act as a platform to negotiate inclusion into commercially important social networks.728

Due to the benefits afforded by the freedom, one might assume that aliens in artisan or mercantile trades would attempt to belong amongst the enfranchised and, in turn, join one of London’s craft guilds to practice their trade. Very few people who lived in London, however, were actually members of the city’s craft guilds and held its freedom. Indeed, the best estimates based on poll taxes in the late fourteenth century and other sources indicate that there were around 4,000 citizens in late medieval London, which represented only about a quarter to a third of the adult male population and would have included a small number of women trading as widows or femmes soles.729 It is true that this started to change at end time of the period
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studied in this thesis; Parliamentary acts in 1531 and 1536 mandated London companies to reduce the amount they charged for the enrolment of apprentices and which prohibited surcharges on entrance fees for apprentices for entrance into companies. This, Steve Rappaport argues, was enthusiastically taken up by companies who wished to bring foreigners into their membership and meant that by the middle of the sixteenth century roughly three-quarters of London’s adult men were freemen. 730 For the majority of the period of study here, however, the freedom remained the preserve of a minority of the city’s population.

Membership of the freedom in later medieval London was not as essential for practising a skilled trade as ordinances of the civic government and guilds would have us believe. Indeed, we should not view the ability of civic governments to enforce these rules as absolute, and in the process read the regulations as civic authorities wanted them to be read, that is as strict rules rigidly enforced. In fact, however, economic policies in English urban centres were often ignored and were rarely universally implemented and there was often a gap between guild ordinances and reality. 731 Indeed, much craft activity in medieval cities went unregulated and craft guilds sometimes had trouble ensuring that their own members conformed to their ordinances, let alone the unenfranchised. 732 Nor did guilds refuse to countenance allowing unenfranchised aliens to have any role in the crafts they regulated. Indeed, Davies has demonstrated that unfree labour in London, of both English and alien ‘foreigns’, was essential to many trades and that guilds had to adopt a pragmatic approach to the regulation and accommodation of this labour. Measures differed from guild to guild, and from time to time; yet, these guilds responded to the prevailing economic conditions, striking a balance on the one hand between protecting the interests of their less-established journeymen members from unenfranchised competition, and on the other supplying cheap labour to their more established masters. 733 He argues that the Goldsmiths’ and Taylors’ Guilds, which regulated crafts comprising of large numbers of alien craftsmen, could pragmatically incorporate them into the
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Although in theory it was a necessity for aliens engaged in retail trade to become enfranchised, in reality many practiced trades in urban contexts without joining the local craft guilds or the freedom.\footnote{Ormrod, Lambert and Mackman, Immigrant England, 141–142. For an in-depth study of this phenomenon in a specific town, see Lambert and Liddy, “The Civic Franchise and Regulation of Aliens in Great Yarmouth,” 136–140.} In addition, aliens who worked under the auspices of a master householder for short period would have no need to obtain the freedom and would have been part of a large body of individuals involved in a craft who were unenfranchised. The petitions of Robert Rowes, Mattice Severyn and George Jeneweys discussed above all refer to temporary terms of service with a master artisan and were presumably unenfranchised. As part of their attempt to regulate aliens, certain guilds made pragmatic compromises. As noted above, the Goldsmiths’ Company operated a licensing system for Doche goldsmiths to practice their craft, open shops and take on servants, and the Merchant Taylors similarly sold licences.\footnote{Reddaway and Walker, The Early History of the Goldsmiths’ Company, 121–131, 137–139, 167–174; Davies, “Aliens, Crafts and Guilds in late Medieval London,” 144.} Up until the late fifteenth century, the Merchant Taylors’ Company allowed unenfranchised “bochers” to repair and sell second-hand clothing, many of whom were aliens. This distinguished them from the freemen of the craft who produced new clothes with new materials.\footnote{Davies, “Governors and Governed,” 74.} What is clear is that the licenses sold by the Goldsmiths and the pragmatic approach of the Tailors to allow unenfranchised aliens to repair older clothing did not constitute full membership to the guild. Rather, they bestowed specific rights which were usually only available for freemen in other guild contexts.

Some aliens likely practiced their trades independently within the jurisdiction of the city without the freedom despite it being against the civic ordinances, perhaps working in rented rooms above established shops like the Frenchman Pety Pero discussed in Chapter I. Certainly, there is evidence of this in other towns, such as the Doche hostellers/beerbrewers while practicing their trades who ignored civic ordinances in mid-fifteenth century Great Yarmouth identified by Liddy and Lambert. They continued to practice crafts and run hostels, both of which were privileges reserved for certain burgesses, and did so despite frequent fines.
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\footnote{Davies, “Governors and Governed,” 74.}
Others chose to live outside the jurisdiction of a civic government. As noted, aliens could live and work in areas outside of the jurisdiction of the civic government in London, such as Westminster and Southwark, as well as in religious liberties in the city like Saint Martin’s Le Grand.

Not all of London’s aliens were unenfranchised ‘foreigns’, however. There were clearly benefits which encouraged the wealthier aliens to go one step further than acquiring licenses to trade from the guilds by joining the franchise, although they were only a minority in the alien population. Since the middle of the thirteenth century, English towns and boroughs had admitted strangers, both aliens and foreigners, into the franchise usually upon payment of a fee and an oath of fealty to the town and king. In London, the Brewers’ guild accepted at least four Doche beer brewers to join their ranks between 1418 and 1425. Technically, from 1427 onwards, aliens were banned by the civic government from acquiring the freedom of London and were also theoretically prohibited from becoming a member of a company and from practising any skilled craft as an independent masters. A by-product of Richard III’s statute in 1484, which attempted to prohibit any alien from practicing any handicraft or selling goods via retail and was almost certainly the result of the lobbying of London’s companies, was that aliens were technically prevented from accessing two of the most important rights associated with the freedom. It is unclear how strictly, or for how long, these rules were implemented, and it is clear that both the ordinance and statute were not enforced to the letter. Pamela Nightingale describes how the Grocers’ Company granted the Venetian merchant John Marconovo admission to the company in 1428, which was only a year after aliens were prohibited to become freemen. Moreover, testamentary evidence suggests that wealthy, established aliens were able to acquire the freedom through membership of the companies throughout the period of study in this thesis. For example, Gilbert van Diste (1431), a Doche goldsmith, Hans Bosylycan (1476), a cordwainer who was likely Doche, David van Den Hoke (1493), a joiner possibly of Doche origin or at least a second generation immigrant, and James van Zand (1500), a likely Doche tailor, were all described as citizens in their testaments.

---

741 Ibid., 33–36.
742 Pajic, “ ‘Ale for an Englishman is a Natural Drink,’ ” 11–12.
743 Ibid., 33–36.
744 Nightingale, A Medieval Mercantile Community, 393–394.
745 LMA MS 09051/001/001, f. 26v (Godfrey Van Lent); LMA MS 09171/003, f. 297 (Gilbert Van Diste); LMA MS 09171/008, f. 58 (David Van Den Hoke); LMA MS 09171/008, f. 203v. (James Van Zand).
James even anticipated members of his craft to attend his funeral procession and bequeathed 20 shillings for them to have a feast and remember him in their prayers.\footnote{LMA MS 09171/008, f. 203v.} The Chancery petition of the alien Toger Erlestoles (1483x1500) records that, as a freeman of London, he used his freedom to buy unfinished cloth in quantity, ‘dress’ the materials and then ‘selle theym agayn to his most aduantage’.\footnote{TNA C 1/199/3.} The elite Italian residents in London sought the freedom of the city in order to obtain trading privileges, with around 40 of them taking it up between 1350-1450.\footnote{Bradley, ‘‘Saluti da Londra,’’ 110.}

Despite the 1427 and 1484 prohibitions, it is clear that company officials sometimes were willing to grant certain aliens admission into their organisations, and presumably the full rights of citizenship, throughout the fifteenth century. Aliens, then, were not completely barred from London’s companies and by extension the body of freemen. Rather, an individual’s belonging within a company and the freedom was a process determined by the interests of different agents. Certain wealthier (male) aliens sought entrance into companies and the freedom to acquire the economic rights and status which would ensue. The actions of the civic and national government could hinder their admission within certain contexts, yet guild officials could pragmatically overlook such proscriptions and admit aliens when it suited their companies’ interests.

The three principal ways to acquire the freedom of a town or city was through purchase (redemption), inheritance (patrimony) or apprenticeship.\footnote{Stephen H. Rigby and Elizabeth Ewan, “Government, Power and Authority 1300–1540,” in The Cambridge Urban History of Britain: 600–1540, vol. I, ed. David M. Palliser (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 300.} The historical record does not allow us to gauge which method was used more frequently by aliens. In London, the acquisition of the freedom via redemption was rare, although sometimes it was bought by particularly wealthy aliens. Again, it is not possible to gauge how many aliens acquired freedom in this way. Apprenticeship was an alternative option and was in itself a privileged position. It entailed a contracted training period between a master of a craft and an apprentice, which usually lasted seven years.\footnote{Hanawalt, Growing up in Medieval London, 128–161.} There were certainly aliens who served as apprentices and who likely acquired the freedom of their settlement through it. The statute of Richard III in 1484 prohibited alien masters from taking on alien apprentices.\footnote{Stats. Realm, vol. ii, 492–493.} In 1478, the book of ordinances of the London
Goldsmiths’ Company recorded that prior to aliens becoming company members or opening a shop as goldsmiths they would have to serve four to seven years ‘working only as apprentices’. 752 Given that many alien artisans practiced their trades without having acquired the freedom, that there were large alien populations working outside of the jurisdiction of the city in liberties or suburbs, and that only a small proportion of London’s adult male population was enfranchised, we should acknowledge that the majority of resident aliens in London were not members of this privileged group.

Another formal group of which petitioners to the Court of Chancery often stressed that they were not part of, while their respondents were members, was the legal body of the King’s subjects. 753 The only effective strategy for an alien to become a King’s subject was through the acquisition of letters of denization. In order to obtain these letters, an immigrant would have had to renounce their loyalty to a foreign power and swear an oath to the English crown. In return, the alien was given the full status of denizen in English law, although the specific privileges that they received were dependent upon the discretion of the King. 754 Denization ensured a transfer of political loyalty, not the transfer of what modern audiences call “nationality” and the cultural traits associated with it. 755 Among its main benefits, denization enabled holders to purchase land and property via common law and to bequeath it to their heirs, pay custom duties at denizen rates, and have official protection from property seizure and other forms of official harassment in times of war. 756 The letters, however, were only for the wealthy as they cost up to £50, which resulted in them being taken out by a minority of the alien population. 757 Indeed, across the fifteenth century, the chancery issued 334 letters patent of denization, an average of three per year. 758

Lutkin has noted that aliens with letters of denization constitute only one percent of the c. 18,000 aliens in London recorded in the EIDB. 759 It was only in the 1540s, when aliens were

753 For further examples, see TNA C 1/60/207, C 1/64/995, C 1/64/297, C 1/66/374, C 1/67/104, C 1/64/276, C 1/66/392, C 1/64/299.
756 Kim, Aliens in Medieval Law, 158.
759 Lutkin, “Settled or Fleeting?,” 151.
compelled to take out denization or face severe restrictions, that the acquisition of denization became more common and more accessible to those of a lower social status. Most resident aliens in both England and London, including the majority of those discussed in this thesis, cannot be traced in the Patent Rolls as having taken out these letters, made do without, and remained legally outside of the body of the King’s subjects. In terms of belonging, where denization remained rare, there would have been aliens who were included in social networks in London and who at the same time did not belong, in a legal sense, to the body of the King’s subjects.

This brief survey, necessarily focusing upon a select number of groupings, reflects that individual aliens would have belonged to certain groupings in London, and England, yet would have been not have been part of others. Some, having established positive relations with natives, were included within social networks within the city yet they could also not belong amongst legal body of freemen and English denizens. Some could become members of local parish fraternities. Few had full membership of one of London’s craft guilds and consequently of the city’s freedom, although some bought licences to practice their trade. The small number of aliens who did become citizens and members of one of London’s companies, such as the few alien testators mentioned above, were not necessarily members of the elite and exclusive body of those companies, called the ‘livery’, members of which during the fifteenth-century had their own fraternities from which other non-liveried freemen (the yeomen) were not part. The uses of the terms integration and assimilation to refer to a binary process of a migrant being either ‘integrated’ or ‘not integrated’ within a homogeneous native, or London, society have obscured the evident complexity of the lives of aliens; resident aliens simultaneously occupied positions of inclusion in, and non-belonging to, the webs of networks and solidarities of which London’s social fabric was comprised.

761 All denizations recorded in the patent rolls for this period are reproduced in the EIDB.
**Exclusion and Verbal Slander**

Aliens could also sometimes be vulnerable to harassment and violence. The rare instances of physical attacks against aliens in London are probably one of the best researched aspect of migration to medieval England. Scholars have used chronicles and civic government records to reconstruct the attacks against, among others, the ‘Flemings’ during the Peasants’ Revolt in 1381, the victimisation of the Doche in 1435, 1436, 1468, 1470 and 1517, attacks against Italian merchants and their property in 1456-7, and against the Hanseatic Steelyard in 1493. That aliens might be victimised during the context of political tensions between the English Crown and foreign powers has also been noted in other scholarship. Ruddick argues that the assumed connection between ‘birth, territory and loyalty’ was essentially what defined nationality in late medieval England. This meant that in times of warfare aliens were perceived as ‘anomalies’ who disrupted the expected connection between birthplace and political loyalty, and were consequently particularly prone to harassment.

One aspect of antagonism between aliens and natives which is particularly under-researched is defamation against aliens with the use of nationality-based insults. In an article concerning defamation in church courts more generally, Poos briefly notes that nationality-based insults were common but does not analyse their impact or the contexts in which they were used.

On a related topic, Neville finds that in fifteenth–century York labelling someone a Scot was a useful means of defaming personal and business rivals, even if they were of English birth. Ian Forrest argues that calling someone a Scot in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries was a means to claim that someone was not of the community.

Berry draws our attention to two cases brought before London’s Consistory court in which aliens were the alleged victims of nationality-based verbal assault, arguing that ‘xenophobia was an undeniable constant in the perception of aliens’. It is notable that scholars of immigration to late medieval England have predominantly overlooked verbal attacks and depict hostility

---


against aliens as mostly physical in nature, directed either against their person or their property. I will use legal narratives in Chancery petitions, bills to the Court of Star Chamber, and depositions heard within the Consistory court, to appreciate the forms that these slurs took, how they worked as insults, and how they could be used in an attempt to exclude an alien from a community during times of warfare between the English Crown and a foreign power. In what follows, I will follow the convention in scholarship by using the terms ‘nation’ when referring groups of non-English people, i.e. ‘Fleming’ or ‘Lombard’, and ‘national’ when discussing common stereotypes surrounding groups of people. I use these terms pragmatically and by no means subscribe to more modern connotations of the term nation, which tend to refer to set territorial units populated by people with common ‘ethnic’ traits.

The lack of research on the impact of verbal slander against aliens leaves important lacunae in our understanding concerning both the ability to aliens to belong in communities and the type of antagonism they could face. This is particularly the case considering medieval and early modern societies viewed vicious words to be as damaging as physical violence. Defamation was an effective means to harm someone’s \textit{fama}, which can be defined as the discourse about an individual, which continually shapes their reputation, assigning rank and standing upon an individual. Reputation was very important for those seeking positive connections with upstanding individuals in their locality so as to obtain employment, credit and loans, and to be trusted enough by others to conduct trade. In Ian Forrest’s words, it underlay the ability of an individual to ‘make a living and function as a member of society’. Canon law defined defamation as the malicious imputation of either a secular or spiritual crime upon an individual which caused harm among respectable people. It was so potent precisely

---

770 See pages 26–28 above.
771 There is not enough space here to discuss English nationalism, yet for nationalism and nationality in England until the later fourteenth century see Ruddick, \textit{Identity and Political Culture}, 2–13 particularly 100–256; For the use of the term nationality in relation to aliens see Ormrod, Lambert and Mackman, \textit{Immigrant England}, 202–250.
775 Forrest, \textit{Trustworthy Men}, 77–78.
because it had the potential to destroy an individual’s reputation.\textsuperscript{776} It could have serious social and economic repercussions, to the extent that, as Barbara Hanawalt argues, it could act as a ritual of exclusion from a community.\textsuperscript{777} This is clearly illustrated in the depositions of witnesses for plaintiffs in defamation cases brought to the London Consistory court. One telling deposition is that of John Preston, a witness for Margaret Jenyn, who brought a case against one James Johnson in 1469. Preston deposed that John had called Margaret a ‘stronge hoor, a gallid hoor, and a stronge bawde’ in the parish of Saint Sepulchre and, since then, he had heard that John Langlet and someone named Norys claim that they ‘shunned association’ (‘evitabant consorcium’) with Margaret since she had been defamed.\textsuperscript{778} The danger that defamation occasionally posed led individuals to prosecute their defamers in legal proceedings throughout the period covered here to restore their reputation.\textsuperscript{779}

Alien petitioners to Chancery and the Star Chamber sometimes alleged that they had been the victims of defamatory words as part of a wider narrative strategy to secure the courts’ intervention. Indeed, they often stated that the respondents had victimised them both verbally and physically in order to paint them as having acted unjustly and in a villainous manner. They stressed combined physical and verbal abuse because contemporary legal opinion regarded hostile words and physical assault as under the same category of harm. It was common, for example, for descriptions of defamation in secular courts to portray slander between men either as, or in conjunction with, a physical act of violence.\textsuperscript{780} Petitioners accused a respondent of

\textsuperscript{776} For the legal theory behind defamation and how it was tried in a range of legal courts in different periods, see R. H. Helmholz, \textit{Select Cases on Defamation to 1600} (London: Seldon Society, 1985), xi–cxi, in particular xi–lxxvi.

\textsuperscript{777} Barbara Hanawalt, \textit{Of Good and Ill Repute: Gender and Social Control in Medieval England} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 28–29. Canon law stated that for insults to count as defamation, the defamer had to have used the words maliciously and they had to have caused some form of damage, such as loss of good reputation, see Helmholz, \textit{Select Cases on Defamation}, xxxviii; R. H. Helmholz, \textit{The Oxford History of the Laws of England: The Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from 597 to the 1640’s} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 575–585.

\textsuperscript{778} LMA DL/C/205, f.50v–51r. I would like to thank Professor Shannon McSheffrey for sharing with me her transcription of this deposition book.

\textsuperscript{779} For a summary of defamation in late medieval England, see Helmholz, \textit{Select Cases on Defamation to 1600}, xix–lxvii; Helmholz, \textit{The Oxford History of the Laws of England}, 565–596, in particular 565–566. There are numerous works which discuss the subject in relation to other topics, such as Neal highlights that defaming a man as ‘fals’ was a means to attack his masculine social self, Derek Neal, \textit{The Masculine Self in Medieval England} (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2008), 24–42; Ian Forrest, “Defamation, Heresy and Late Medieval Social Life,” in \textit{Image, Text and Church, 1380–1600: Essays for Margaret Aston}, ed. Linda Clark, Maureen Jurkowski and Colin Richmond (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2009), 148–150: Forrest makes a distinction between ‘bad defamation’, that is malicious actionable slander, and ‘just defamation’, the legitimate reporting of a crime publicly, was very fine and it is now difficult for us to now distinguish why one case was viewed as positive defamation or another as negative defamation.

carrying out both a physical threat and a nationality-based insult to show that they acted in both a threatening manner and used the petitioner’s alien status as a means to victimise them.

The bill of complaint to the Star Chamber (1509x1547) jointly sent by Leonard Peterson, Jacob Cremer, William Grenekyn, George Laurence, Derik Vanhove and John Joyce, Doche migrants living in the sanctuary and liberty of Saint Martin’s le Grand, highlights this. They argued that the constable of Saint Martin’s, one Hugh Payne, vexed them daily, often imprisoning their servants and forcing them to pay for their release. Hugh allegedly also ‘tyraunously cometh into diuerse of their houses wit his pollax and wepons’. If any Doche migrant were defended by their neighbours, Hugh would ‘puttitth thaim in ieobardie of their lyfes […] calling thaim horeson flemynges and erraunt thves and their wifes strong erraunt hores’. A similar depiction of the respondent is used in the Chancery petition (1473x1475) of Humphrey Gentill, a merchant of Lucca. He argued that his respondents Nicholas Russel and John Oxon ‘by synystre meanes caused hym to be brought in to ahouz ther as the said Nicholas dwelleth’. Whilst forcing him to stay there, they called ‘hym fals Lombard with many grete thretenynges and manassynges’. They then allegedly ‘drewe owte wepyns ayens hym seynyng to hym that they wold slee hym’. The petition of Copyn Pylgryme (1433x1443 or 1467x1472), a ‘ducheman’, to the Chancery reads that one Robert Marston ‘shipman’ came to the house of Pylgryme’s master in a threatening manner at ‘xij of the clok in nyght calling hym ther styynkyng Flemyng and other shamefull language’. Although it is not possible to gauge how far the insults relating to the petitioners’ alien status were actually used by the respondents or were embellished as a means to portray them in a negative light, that the petitioners believed that their accounts were credible reflects that nationality-based insults were a potent means by which aliens could be harassed.

Slander aimed against aliens could take different forms. The petition of Thomas Qwkkesley (1473x1475) highlights that certain national labels by themselves could be used in a derogatory sense by natives. Thomas stated that he was in the employ of the Duke of Burgundy, who at this date was Charles the Bold, and he had come over to London with a

\footnote{For biographical details concerning Hugh Payne, see McSheffrey, \textit{Seeking Sanctuary}, 119–121.}

\footnote{TNA STAC 2/21/121.}

\footnote{TNA C 1/48/518.}

\footnote{TNA C 1/45/124; The petition dates from either 1433x1433 or 1467x1472 and the National Archives Discovery Catalogue states that the slur happened in the context of an anti-Flemish riot. It is not possible to ascertain how the cataloguer came to that conclusion, although the petition is now damaged so this detail might have been subsequently lost. If referring to an anti-Doche riot, the petition could refer to attacks against Doche in either 1435, 1436, 1468 or 1470.}
‘feliship’ who were most probably from the Low Countries. Whilst there, one Ralf Suydyll, a tailor, ‘dispised the feliship that your seid Oratour went with callyng them Flemynge with other cedicious words’. One of the fellowship then allegedly hit Ralf. Ralf, who brought a charge against Thomas to the sheriffs of London, alleging that he had been the one to hit him. In fact, it was actually one of Thomas’s companions. Thomas believed it likely that he would be heavily fined for the alleged assault and petitioned the chancellor for his assistance. The wording of the slander is notable: Ralf allegedly called them ‘Flemynge with other cedicious words’. Thomas’s petition intended only to provide an indication of the insult designed to ensure that the chancellor understood that the slander concerned his ‘alienness’. The bill highlights that the term ‘Fleming’, used in the context of an insult hurled by a native toward aliens from the Low Countries, could itself be a ‘cedicious word’ with derogatory connotations.

The derogatory connotations of ‘Fleming’ when used as a personal insult are also reflected in the way alien petitioners to the Chancery from the Low Countries or German territories were described in their bills. Petitions were the product of negotiation between a petitioner and the lawyer who wrote the bill, and it was the lawyers who chose the terminology used in the document. It is notable, then, that whenever the lawyer used an epithet to provide information about a client petitioner originating from the Low Countries or Germany, they used the term ‘Dutchman’, or a variant spelling of the same, but not the term ‘Fleming’. For example, John Fish (petition dated 1475x1480 or 1483x1485), Leonard Towres (1475x1480 or 1483x1485) and Piers Hawes (1460x1465) are all described individually as ‘doucheman’ or ‘ducheman’. That ‘Fleming’ was a term with negative connotations, whereas ‘Docheman’ was a politer term which lawyers used to describe their clients, is further evidenced in petitions in which the petitioner complained of being the victim of slander. Indeed, in these bills Doche petitioners are described as a Dutchman yet complain of having been slandered with defamatory language which included the term ‘Fleming’. Copyn Pylgryme’s petition (1433x1443 or 1467x1472) describes him as a ‘ducheman’ yet states that the respondent had slandered him by ‘callyng hym ther stynkyng Flemyng and other shamefull language’.

785 TNA C 1/48/207.
787 John Fish TNA C 1/66/219, Leonard Towres C 1/64/285, Piers Hawes C 1/28/480. For other instances of the term ‘Dutchman’ being used to describe the petitioner, see Godfrey Hose C 1/64/1039, James Burmestre C 1/67/165, James Lobbe C 1/67/194, John Spur C 1/24/70, Reynold Harmanson C 1/46/278. For instances of someone being described as a ‘Dutchman’ in a petition, with whom the petitioner had no quarrel, see James Ravenell C 1/221/70, Thomas Bluer C 1/60/192, John Gerard C 1/46/448.
788 TNA C 1/45/124.
Oliver Bowthin’s petition describes him as a ‘ducheman’ but depicts his respondent’s as having labelled him as a ‘Flemynge’ when they hurled an insult at him.\footnote{TNA C 1/45/55.} Unlike Thomas’ Qwkkesley’s petition, which provides an indication of verbal abuse related to an alien’s nationality, in other instances alleged insults were recorded verbatim. These examples highlight that verbal abuse against aliens could consist of a derogatory epithet(s) and an alien label. Humphrey Gentill stated in his bill that his respondents ‘called hym fals Lombard with many grete thretenynges and manassyynges seyng to hym that he was a thef and wold robbe the house of the said Nicholas’.\footnote{TNA C 1/48/518.} The petition of the Dutchman Oliver Bouthin, a taverner who lived in Southwark and his English wife Eleanor, stressed in their petition that their respondents ‘sodenily affray and assaulte […] in thawe hose callyng hym [Oliver] bawde traitour Flemynge thef and other orrible names’.\footnote{TNA C 1/45/55.}

Gowing has argued that perpetrators of sexual slander in early modern London drew upon ideas from popular, elite and ecclesiastical culture to form their insults.\footnote{Gowing, Domestic Dangers, 114.} Similarly, certain instances of verbal slander against aliens mentioned above played upon wider cultural ideas and should be seen within the context of popular stereotypes concerning specific national groups. Ruddick has argued that certain poets and chroniclers in late medieval England divided the world into ‘nations, depicting the people of these nations as possessing stock, negative qualities’.\footnote{Ruddick, English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century, 139–151; For these stereotypes concerning certain groups: Ormrod, Lambert and Mackman, Immigrant England, 204–206; Christopher Linsley, “Nation, England and the French in Thomas Walshingham’s Chronica Maiora 1376–1420” (PhD Dissertation, York: University of York, 2015), 143–157.} In the fourteenth and fifteenth, there was a stereotype surrounding Flemings that they were treacherous and untrustworthy.\footnote{Linsley, “Nation, England and the French,” 163–64.} This is most clearly indicated in the rhymes which were produced after Philip the Good’s failed siege of Calais in 1436, which depicted both Flemings and Philip as untrustworthy and cowardly.\footnote{Doig, “Propaganda, Public Opinion and the Siege of Calais,” 98; the trope that Flemings were treacherous, banished men runs throughout a number of these rhymes, see Historical Poems of the XIVth and XVth Centuries,” ed. Rossell Hope Robins (New York: Columbia Press, 1959), 78–89.} This stereotype was presumably why calling a Doche migrant a ‘Fleming’ could prove so insulting. There was also a negative stereotype regarding the Italians in London. Bolton argues that the Italians were widely mocked as ‘fals’, a perception propagated by their perceived love of money, links with banking and the import of luxury goods to the capital.\footnote{Bolton, “London Merchants and the Borromei,” 59.}

\footnote{789 TNA C 1/45/55.} \footnote{790 TNA C 1/48/518.} \footnote{791 TNA C 1/45/55.} \footnote{792 Gowing, Domestic Dangers, 114.} \footnote{793 Ruddick, English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century, 139–151; For these stereotypes concerning certain groups: Ormrod, Lambert and Mackman, Immigrant England, 204–206; Christopher Linsley, “Nation, England and the French in Thomas Walshingham’s Chronica Maiora 1376–1420” (PhD Dissertation, York: University of York, 2015), 143–157.} \footnote{794 Linsley, “Nation, England and the French,” 163–64.} \footnote{795 Doig, “Propaganda, Public Opinion and the Siege of Calais,” 98; the trope that Flemings were treacherous, banished men runs throughout a number of these rhymes, see Historical Poems of the XIVth and XVth Centuries,” ed. Rossell Hope Robins (New York: Columbia Press, 1959), 78–89.} \footnote{796 The Libelle of Englyshe Policye (1436), a poem written...
by one of the London merchant elite for a London mercantile audience, describes Lombards as ‘feyned frendes’.\textsuperscript{797} It argues that they pretended to be friends of the realm, but in reality cared only for their own profit.\textsuperscript{798} A similar sentiment was expressed after the 1457 riot against the Lombards in London. When the Mayor held an inquiry, one rioter named John Bailly stated that he joined the attack because Lombards were ‘fals extoricioners’.\textsuperscript{799} Extortioner in this sense implied rapacious greed.\textsuperscript{800} The attack against the financial probity and honesty of Italian men, and the attack against the trustworthiness of Flemings, fitted with a common pattern of men being defamed as being dishonest, because reputations for men were largely constructed according to ideas honesty and trustworthiness.\textsuperscript{801}

Derogatory terms could act as key elements in insults against aliens. They were often chosen to match negative stereotypes concerning the national group to which the victim was perceived to be a member. Oliver Bouthin’s petition, written just after 1439, would still resonate of Philip the Good’s desertion of his English alliance in favour of France and England’s subsequent conflict with Burgundy.\textsuperscript{802} This explains why, as Doche alien, he stressed that his respondent had called him a ‘traitour’, as he must have been seen as loyal to a lord who had sided with an enemy. The label ‘Fleming’ may have become even more charged after the siege of Calais (1436), where Philip the Good used a militia mustered from Flemish towns in his besieging force.\textsuperscript{803} Humphrey Gentill alleged that he was called ‘fals’, which as noted, was a trait that was popularly ascribed to Italians.

Another instance in which a derogatory adjective was chosen to match negative stereotypes concerning the national group to which the victim was part is recorded within an Act Book of the Commissary Court. Between 1511 and 1512, one Elizabeth Tysher, alias Parysse, wife of John Parysse, allegedly defamed one of her fellow parishioners in All Saints’, Staining in London. Elizabeth seems to have had some form of personal rivalry with one Cornelia Johnson, a Doche woman of the same parish. Indeed, the court heard that Elizabeth had defamed Cornelia as a common whore. Elizabeth admitted that she had defamed Cornelia

\textsuperscript{798} The Libelle of Englyshe Policye, 32; Bolton, “London and the Anti-Alien Legislation of 1439–1440,” 35.
\textsuperscript{799} “Letter Book K,” in \textit{Memorials of London and London Life in the 13\textsuperscript{th}, 14\textsuperscript{th} and 15\textsuperscript{th} centuries}, ed. Henry T. Riley (London: Longmans, Green 1868), 390.
\textsuperscript{801} Neal, \textit{The Masculine Self}, 59–64; Forrest, \textit{Trustworthy Men}, 78–79.
as a ‘dronken hore Flemmyng’.

Here, the derogatory adjectives in the insult matched negative stereotypes concerning people from the Low Countries in England, as the trope that ‘Flemings’ were drunkards was well established.

Moreover, although it was common for women to be victims of defamation which attacked their sexual honour, and ‘whore’ was one of the most common insults used as part of sexual defamation against women, it seems likely that Elizabeth’s insult would have had particular resonance because the victim was a Doche woman. Indeed, the term ‘hore’ likely worked in tandem with a stereotype of licentious Doche women perpetuated by the presence of Doche aliens in the sex trade, noted in Chapter II. A marriage case discussed by Berry, which was brought to the Consistory court in the early sixteenth century further reflects the use of this sexual slander against Doche women. The depositions depict William Hilton, an English journeyman, as having impregnated a Doche woman named Alice Fantell after promising to marry her. William had subsequently become engaged with his master’s daughter. When Alice confronted him about it he replied ‘what wenyst thow that I will for sake this inglisse maide that I am sewer too […] and mary the a doche hore[,] nay’.

William here tapped into the wider idea that Doche women were licentious, using the epithet ‘hore’ as part of his insult against Alice. What’s more, the comparison with the ‘Inglisse maide’ makes the insult even more stinging, as it contrasted Alice, as a morally loose Doche woman, with the chaste English ‘maide’.

In the instances of defamatory insults drawn from stereotypes, derogatory terms could work in tandem with national labels; it was not enough to be called ‘traitour’, ‘dronken’, ‘fals’ or ‘hore’. The nationality of the alien was a key part of the insult. As these terms work in conjunction with the label, the insults do not imply that the individuals were traitorous, ‘dronken’, ‘fals’ or licentious due to their personal merits, but rather their membership of a particular national grouping which made them so. Thus, the implication of the slander was that Bouthin was a ‘traitour’ because he was Doche at a time when Anglo-Burgundian relations were still tense, Cornelia was a drunken whore because she was Doche, and Humphrey was

---

804 MS 09064/011, f. 47. This slur is discussed in more detail below.
807 LMA DL/C/206, 457v–59. The summary of the depositions and the direct quote of the slander is from Berry, “Margins and Marginality,” 200, sewer refers to marriage.
808 *MED*, s.v. ‘maide’.
‘fals’ because he was an Italian. The purpose of making a slur with a carefully chosen derogatory term was that an adjective or label acquired a special resonance when used in conjunction with a national description. When these terms were used, and combined with the label, they tapped into popular stereotypes surrounding a particular national group, which meant that the defamatory words acquired a form of insulting power the terms alone could not possess.

The application of negative labels to an individual would have made their ability to continue amicable relations with their social contacts very difficult. Poos notes that it was the transmission, reception and acceptance of defamatory words by respected and honourable persons, which made defamation so potentially damaging. In times of tension between the English crown and a foreign ruler, slander could be utilised against aliens perceived to have originated from the territories of these lords in an attempt to exclude them from the local networks of people in which they lived. This was exclusion in the sense that victims would find it difficult to maintain positive relations with their local contacts and, by extension, to continue the maintenance of positive connections which was crucial to their belonging within local social networks. Oliver Bouthin and his wife argued that one of their respondents, William Hough a bailiff of Southwark, had slandered Oliver twice: once, informally in Oliver’s house when he had called him ‘a bawde traitour Flemynge thef’, and in another instance when William used his capacity as bailiff to indict Oliver of ‘bawderie and recover of thefes to thentent for to make hem avoide the saide burgh’. As a consequence, Oliver and his wife portrayed the slander and accusation, together with the physical attacks, as aimed at making them leave Southwark.

The accusation that Oliver was a bawd and a receiver of thieves was intrinsically connected to his being a Doche migrant. The idea that alien tavern owners in Southwark harboured unsavoury characters and sold sex was an accusation made in a Parliamentary petition made by Southwark residents in 1437, shortly before Oliver’s petition. The Southwark petitioners complained that many ‘strainge’ persons had set up stew houses, a euphemism for brothels, which harboured ‘theefs robbers […] and other myslyvers’. They also complained that Flemings had set up ‘tavernes’ and harboured aliens who were enemies to the

810 TNA C 1/45/55.
811 As a tavern owner, Oliver was a relative rarity in Southwark, where taverns selling expensive imported wine were outnumbered greatly by beer houses and ‘tippling’ houses, see Carlin, Medieval Southwark, 205.
King, having meetings and not ‘suffering any englisshman to be herbered’. Thus, the accusation recorded in Oliver’s petition that he, as a Doche alien, was a bawd and a receiver of thieves resonated with current perceptions concerning Doche, or ‘strainge’, hostellers in Southwark. Oliver’s petition demonstrates how nationally-charged verbal slander could be used in an attempt to exclude aliens at times of political tension. Labels such as ‘Flemynge’ emphasised that those so labelled were not among the King’s subjects or were viewed as part of an alien group with negative stereotypes. Thus, Flemings were treacherous traitors, or more specifically, Flemish tavern owners harboured thieves and the King’s enemies. Second, through the attribution of derogatory term, abusers could assert that the alien was of bad reputation and did not belong among the respectable body of local people.

The depositions of certain witnesses in the defamation suit brought to the London Consistory court in February 1512, recounted at the beginning of this chapter, further highlights that verbal abuse could be used to try and exclude aliens from local networks of people during times of tension between the Crown and a foreign power. One Christopher Wastell, a servant of the keeper of Croydon Park named Baldwyn, brought a suit against Thomas and Salman Dowff on the grounds that they had defamed him as a ‘skotte’ along with other verbal abuse. He most probably did so in order that the court restored him to ‘good fame’ and make Thomas and Salman ask for public pardon. Accusing someone of being a Scot in the early sixteenth century was valid grounds for a defamation suit. Although the incident described by the witnesses and the suit took place just before war was declared between England and Scotland in July 1512, there was still antagonism towards the Scots in England at the time. This antipathy is evidenced in Salman’s response when questioned concerning an element of Christopher’s accusation. Salman alleged that Christopher had intended to strike him with a ‘woode knyf’ and give him ‘a Scottisshe towche’; fear towards the Scots in this context was such that the touch of one could be compared to a stab wound.
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812 TNA SC8/27/1309.
813 Petitioners to Parliament used a vague term, ‘strainge’, which could denote aliens as well as people who were unknown to a community: MED, s.v. ‘straunge’.
814 LMA DL/C/206, ff. 112v, 115v, 116v, 118v, 119r. I am very grateful to Professor McSheffrey for providing me with a copy of her calendar of the deposition book and photos of the relevant folios. Balwdyn is mentioned in the deposition of Adrian Palles (f. 116v) with no other names.
817 For antagonism against the Scots in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, see Neville, “Local Sentiment and the National Enemy,” 419–437.
818 MED, s.v. ‘touche’, which can refer to a physical sense of touch or a blow or wound.
Christopher had six witnesses to substantiate his suit of defamation. The first three testified as to how Thomas had defamed him, and the remaining three as to how Salman had done the same on another occasion. The depositions of the first three witnesses contain similar themes. They all relate that Thomas Dowff called Christopher a Scot and that the slander had taken place in a beer house in Haverstock, in the parish of Buttsbury (near London, but not in its suburbs). Richard Dawdry stated that Thomas defamed Christopher to his face and in the presence of others, 15 days before the Easter prior to the suit, in a tavern or beer house called The Swan. John Cooke, a servant of a master who owned a tenement named ‘the berehowse of stoke’, stated that the defamation happened in the same tenement the Tuesday before Christmas last in front of Christopher and others. He deposed that Thomas, while gesturing to Christopher, declared that it was a ‘grete pyte that ony suche horson skott schulde be suffred within the parisshe’.

For our purposes, whether Christopher was a Scot or an Englishman is immaterial; what is notable is that the witness testimonies claim that Thomas used nationality-based slander to exclude him from the parish community. Cooke testified that Thomas’s alleged insult took place in public in front of witnesses, with a gesture towards Christopher. As such, Thomas used this slander at a time when there was distrust towards the Scots in an attempt to exclude Thomas from the local community. He proclaimed it a shame that people had to bear Christopher living in their parish, as he was a ‘horson Skotte’. Cooke emphasised how Thomas had gestured towards Christopher whilst saying these words, an example of what Forrest describes as the symbolic ‘corporeal language’ which used in tandem with spoken words held real meaning.

As in Oliver Bouthin’s case, defamatory words comprised of a national label and a derogatory term which, working in conjunction with one another, implied that the recipient did not belong within the community. The label Scot indicated Christopher’s membership of a feared group and stressed he should not belong amongst the respectable of the parish. This fits with Forrest’s argument that Scottish insults in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries were used to claim that someone was not of the community. The derogatory term ‘horson’ similarly emphasised Christopher’s non-belonging from the respectable (male) group of parisioners as it implies illegitimacy.
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A key question remains which is significant to our understanding of these insults, viz. were the victims of these slurs targeted purely because they were aliens? There has been scholarly disagreement concerning the nature of interaction between natives and aliens in the capital, which is, in turn, intimately connected to debates concerning the causes of violence against aliens in later medieval London. Thrupp describes aliens and natives living in terms of ‘mutual respect as individuals’. Using the evidence concerning attacks against the Doche referred to above, Bolton offers a significant challenge to Thrupp’s argument of mutual tolerance.824 He describes the fifteenth century as characterised by ‘fierce anti-alien feeling and direct action’.825 Both Eric Spindler, referring to the Peasants’ Revolt, and Ralph Griffiths, referring to harassment of Doche aliens during the 1430’s, describe instances of attacks against aliens as a consequence of a developing English national feeling.826 The authors of Immigrant England provide a reassessment of these attacks. They argue that they were only enacted by a small number of individuals, predominantly those connected to certain London companies or political agents, who had something to gain from the harassment of alien competitors or subjects of a foreign lord, or did so through frustration that the Crown privileged certain alien groups at the expense of their own economic interests. The authors also note that the attacks were not against all aliens, but rather distinct alien groups who dominated certain crafts, or the trade of exports, and as such they constituted stiff competition for members of the livery companies. The authors conclude, then, that the attacks are not indicative of some latent xenophobia on behalf of all English people.827

A close reading of the instances of slander mentioned above suggests that negative sentiment could surround certain national groups in particular contexts, although aliens were not targeted with slander by natives solely because of their alien status. Martin Ingram argues that cases of alleged sexual defamation between two parties were often part of much larger disputes over land, cash transactions and other issues far removed from sexual matters. As such, sexual defamation should not necessarily be viewed as a product of disputes concerning sex.828 Similarly, just because an alien might be the victim of a nationality-based insult by an English person, we should consider that there were likely complex reasons behind disputes between defamers and their personal rivals which led to the defamation, and that English

828 Ingram, Carnal Knowledge, 69, 74.
defamers did not slander alien rivals solely because of their non-denizen status. This is given credence by the cases in which aliens themselves are said to have used such verbal abuse. Thomas and Salman Dowff were accused of defaming Christopher Wastell as a Scot, yet they were aliens themselves. The second name ‘dowff’, the forename ‘Salman’, and that Thomas’s defamation allegedly took place in a beer house owned by a man named ‘levyng dale’, and was overheard by a person who originated from Antwerp, all indicate that they were Doche aliens. 829 That aliens could utilise nationality-based insults is also reflected in the alleged retort of Cornelia Johnson in her dispute with her English co-parishioner Elizabeth Tysher. Soon after Elizabeth’s citation, and her admission that she had called Cornelia a ‘dronken hore Flemmyng’, the court received a report that Cornelia had defamed Elizabeth in turn. This can be deduced from the fact that the report is noted in the Act Book directly after the record of Elizabeth’s citation, on the same folio. The report was that Cornelia had allegedly slandered Elizabeth as a common whore, adding ‘thou woldest nott have taken a Frenchman to thy husband if thou haddest beyn goode’. 830 Cornelia’s alleged comment is particularly striking as it can be placed in the context of the Anglo-French war of 1512–1514, or at least shortly before it was declared. 831 The implication of the comment was to add emphasis to Elizabeth’s dubious character: not only was she a common whore and thus not virtuous or righteous (‘goode’), but her choice of a French husband (loyal to a hostile lord) confirmed her dubious character. 832 The accusations against Cornelia, Thomas and Salman were not that they hurled nationality-based insults against others simply because of the alien status of their victims or their connections. Rather, these cases indicate that during moments of particular friction caused by hostility between the English crown and a foreign lord people, including aliens, could use national labels to defame adversaries.

The petitions to Chancery and Star Chamber in which petitioners complained that they were victims of verbal insults by natives indicate that nationality-based insults might be used as part of a process of victimisation designed to extort money from aliens. The petition of Leonard Peterson, Jacob Cremer, William Grenekyn, George Laurence, Derik Vanhove and John Joyce, Doche migrants living in Saint Martin’s le Grande (1509x1547), claims that the verbal slander they were subject to was a means to extortion. They stressed that the constable of Saint Martin’s le Grand illegally came into their homes, took their servants and then asked

829 LMA/C/206, ff. 112v, 115v, 116v, 118v, 119r.
830 MS 09064/011, f. 47.
831 This folio is situated after a folio dated 1511 (f.35v) and before a folio dated 1512 (f. 54).
832 MED, s.v. ‘gode’.
13d. for their return. If they were to refuse, Hugh would vandalise their houses and if any of their alien neighbours came to their aid Hugh would label them as ‘Horson Flemynges’. When Humphrey Gentill complained to the chancellor that his respondents had called him a ‘fals Lombard’, he claimed that this slander was used in conjunction with ‘many grete thretenynges and manassynges’. The respondents allegedly then drew out weapons and threatened to kill him unless he gave them 100 pounds. Oliver Bouthin and his wife related that after the verbal abuse aimed at Oliver, which drew upon the fact that as a Fleming he might be thought to be an enemy of England, his respondents tried to make him pay a fine to them ‘atte thaire luste’.

That the respondents in these petitions were depicted as intimidating aliens to extort money was clearly intended by the petitioners to convince the courts that the defendants had acted maliciously. It is notable, however, that the petitioners presented their slanderers as being motivated by greed and using nationality-based slander as a means of harassment. Combined with the evidence that aliens could use nationality-based defamation themselves, the evidence suggests verbal slander against aliens was a means of harassment, made potent by its ability to insult and exclude, but that victims of such slurs were not targeted with slander solely because they were not English. The people who used these slurs certainly drew upon stock national stereotypes, and also antagonism held towards certain alien groups, but the motivation(s) behind this slander was likely more complex than solely a personal hatred of aliens. Indeed, various factors could create enmity between two individuals, and the perpetrators (native or alien) seem to have utilised defamatory words opportunistically to harass personal rivals or for the purpose of extortion. During times of tension between the English crown and a foreign power, the perceived loyalty of an alien to these powers meant distrust surrounded them, which in turn meant they were particularly vulnerable to such attacks. In these contexts, slurs could become especially potent and be used in an attempt to exclude aliens from local communities, as is indicated in the cases of Oliver Bouthin and Christopher Wastell.

The sources utilised in this analysis make little reference to the episodic violent attacks against aliens which have drawn the attention of scholars to date, which means that I have not
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been able to comment on them extensively. However, an idea drawn from the belonging concept might be used in future scholarship to reconcile the seemingly contradictory picture presented by the historical record, which on one hand describes these sporadic physical attacks against certain alien groups, yet on the other that aliens had generally positive relations with natives before and after such attacks.\textsuperscript{838} The violent attacks against aliens have skewed our understanding of the nature of coexistence between natives and aliens, particularly as they have been used as evidence to argue that aliens were not fully assimilated, and that they were a ‘community apart’, within London society.\textsuperscript{839} If we accept the argument of the \textit{Immigrant England} authors that these attacks were specifically instigated by members of some of London’s livery companies, or political agents, against specific alien groups, then we need not see these attacks as evidence that aliens were excluded from some unified London society.\textsuperscript{840}

The argument here is that aliens were neither integrated in, nor excluded from, a homogenous London society, but they instead they occupied multiple positions of belonging. When thinking about how to place the evidence of these attacks into the wider picture of the nature of alien-native coexistence, then, we could consider that even though specific types of aliens were victimised in rare instances of violence instigated by agitators connected to the companies or political agents, they still maintained positions of inclusion within groupings in the city; these could be informal social networks comprised of natives who were not part of the attacks, or more formal groups. In other words, just because certain alien groups were attacked by particular native parties, it does not follow that they were excluded from all the social networks and formal groups to which they had previously belonged. This hypothesis goes some way to reconcile the contradictory evidence concerning the nature of coexistence and might be fruitfully explored within future research, particularly through studying the lives and social contacts of aliens who were victimised immediately before and after the attacks.

\textsuperscript{838} The contradictory evidence explains the difference in interpretation between Thrupp and Bolton see Thrupp, “Aliens in and around London,” 266–270; Bolton, \textit{The Alien Communities}, 39–40; the contradictory evidence is noted in Kowaleski, “The Maritime Trade Networks of Late Medieval London,” 402.

\textsuperscript{839} Bolton, \textit{The Alien Communities}, 39–40.

IV. Contacts with Aliens and Cultural Practice

It has been noted by scholars who study migration in historical eras after the medieval period that immigrants preserve strong relationships with people of a similar cultural background to themselves after uprooting to a new country. Many studies have argued that connections of this nature are very important for migrants and that membership of networks comprising of others from the same country, or region, allow them to draw from pools of support and other forms of resources. Indeed, the practice of immigrants keeping in contact and helping those of a similar cultural background to themselves has frequently been noted by sociologists studying twentieth–century migration. In this research, immigrant contacts with other immigrants are treated as a distinct form of homophily, that is the social process of establishing ties with people, and helping those, who are similar to oneself more often than with those who are not similar. These studies argue that the homophily practiced by immigrants is often based around ‘ethnic’ ties. Historians studying migration in various time periods and locations have identified similar behaviour. Through her analysis of the alien subsidy returns for 1440-1443 regarding the north of England, Rees Jones identifies Scottish women who shared households with, or close to, Scottish friends and family. Sortor, in her study of migrants to St Omer in the southern Netherlands in the fifteenth century, argues that those from other countries and from areas far away from St Omer drew upon the support of networks of people from their regions of origin whilst in the city. In his study in nineteenth–century Lancashire, Michael Anderson notes how Irish immigrants provided help and information to one another. Similar patterns were observed amongst Bangladeshi male migrants win 1960’s London, who would often lend money to unemployed Bengalis in the capital until they could find a job.

845 Kershen, Strangers, Aliens and Asians, 66.
Did aliens in late medieval London establish and maintain connections with people of a similar cultural background to themselves to access support in a similar manner? There has been much discussion on how Italian merchants who had originated from the same city state associated with one another, as well as with other members of their family-based mercantile firms, and formed distinct self-supporting communities or ‘nations’. The close association between London’s Italian populations to the Austin Friars, mainly due to the ability to provide brothers who could provide spiritual services to these Italians in their native tongue, has also been studied. The habitation patterns of Doche aliens within London and its suburbs, as well as in other urban areas in England, strongly indicates that these aliens maintained close connections to one another. Bolton argued that it is very likely that the Doche tended to live and congregate together in fifteenth century London. His analysis of the 1483 subsidy assessment indicates that, despite being dispersed throughout the city, aliens (of which the Doche constituted a significant majority) clustered particularly in the outer wards of the city around the riverside and eastern wall as well as its suburbs. It is important to remember the that alien subsidy returns demonstrate that the alien population in London was spread throughout the city’s wards, suggesting that many aliens also lived alongside native Londoners and that these alien communities were not exclusive immigrant ‘ghettos’. Using the alien subsidy assessments and administrative records for other areas, similar habitation patterns are attributed to the Doche communities in Southwark, Westminster and also in Great Yarmouth. The scholars who have identified that groups of Doche migrants congregated in the same areas have described them as living in communities. That Doche aliens tended to live in areas with other Doche aliens implies a desire on behalf of these aliens to keep in contact with people of a similar cultural background to themselves. Colson’s research explores the religious and social practices of migrants from the Low Countries, German States and France in late medieval London through an analysis of ordinances from four alien fraternities.
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The propensity for aliens to foster relations with those of a similar cultural background to themselves, then, has attracted the attention of historians, yet there are some notable lacunae in our understanding. Indeed, there has been a lack of discussion concerning why Doche aliens fostered connections with other Doche aliens outside of institutional contexts and what form of aid they might obtain through membership of informal alien networks. As was argued above, Doche artisans could embed themselves in alien occupational networks to help facilitate their trade, but could sociability between Doche aliens serve other ends as well? Moreover, although the strong ties between Italian family members has been explored, the importance of kinship bonds between other groups of aliens in the capital has received very little attention. There is also a need to better understand the connections of aliens outside of the city. Was it common for aliens sustain ties with those who they had left behind in their regions of origin? Could they maintain ties with alien acquaintances who lived in England yet outside of London? The agenda of this chapter is to address these issues as well as provide greater depth to the current understanding of alien to alien sociability in and outside the city. Indeed, it will explore further the attempts of aliens, predominantly the Doche and Italians, to negotiate belonging within networks of people from a similar cultural background to themselves, the forms of support that membership of alien networks might provide, and the importance of family members and alien clergymen within these networks. Having analysed alien sociability within London, and their connections with their regions of origin, the second half of the chapter explores whether aliens interacted with each other in ways akin to the cultural practices in their regions of origin and, if so, how far this cultural practice is visible to the historian through legal and probate records.

**Alien Networks and Mutual Support**

The pattern that Doche aliens kept in contact with people of a similar cultural background to themselves can be traced within the testaments of wealthy Doche aliens. Indeed, these testators often bequeathed items to other Doche aliens within the capital and also either made them executors or supervisors of these documents. David van Den Hoke, a joiner of London who made his will in 1493, made his wife Matilda the principle executor, but also named one Gerard Roust, a hatmaker, a co-executor. The will of Otto Henrykson (1448), whose name suggests that he was a Doche alien, shows that he made two men with names suggestive of origin in the Low Countries or the Rhineland, Albryght Tylmauser and Gerard Hermanson, as his
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executors. Peter van Inggelyn, of the parish of St Boltolph without Aldgate, requested in his will (1454) for Gosewine Johnson and Herman Stale to be his executors. Having noted specific goods to certain beneficiaries, the likely Doche alien Henry van Bergh of London bequeathed the residue of all his goods to Gerard Van Laken, Frank van Resen and Peter van Bek, all of whom he made the executors of his will (1413). A similar example of solidarity between Doche aliens can be identified in the will of one John Tyle of Brabant (1400) of St Margaret Pattens parish. After bequeathing sums of money to people with distinctive Doche names, he asked for 6s. 8d. worth of food and drink to be distributed ‘inter meos patriotas’ on the day of his death. James Henrici (1517) of Rotterdam made one Cornelius Johnson, who had been born in Zeeland, and Michael Everard, born in Flanders, as the supervisors of his wife who he named as his executor.

The testaments of wealthy and settled widows with names highly suggestive of Doche origin also demonstrate that they established and maintained contacts with other aliens, particularly women, in order to ensure they were part of networks of people that could help them through their widowhood. Margaret van de Goos, who made her will in 1430, remembered a group of female, likely Doche friends in her testament. She bequeathed a white kirtle to one May van Claster, a hood to May van Beche and another kirtle to a woman named ‘Alsekyn’. Some of these friends were related to the testatrix. Katherine van Utryght, wife of John van Utryght (senior) bequeathed a black gown ‘fuured wyth blacke’ to the wife of John Utryght ‘the yongar’ in 1495. Margaret van de Goos willed that her sister Margaret Seland was to have 26s. 8d. The bequests of these widows follows a broader practice in which widows frequently bequeathed goods to other women. These widows also mention alien men in their wills, however. Katherine van Utryght made one James Asaud her executor. Eva van Stybergh, a widow of a Hanseatic merchant, who made her will in 1445, appointed the
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Hanseatic merchants Henry Ten Hobe and John Swynesbargh’ as executors of her will.\textsuperscript{865} Margaret van de Goos made the alien Gameline Galbeny, a man of sufficient status to have become a citizen of London, her executor.\textsuperscript{866} That the widows asked men of standing to be their executors reflects a wider pattern, identified by French, that widows often made prominent men their executors to reduce the risk of their will being contested by greedy individuals.\textsuperscript{867}

The desire of aliens to keep in contact with others of a similar cultural background was one of the reasons for the foundation of Doche fraternities of St Katherine’s and the Holy Blood of Wilsnack in fifteenth–century London. As Colson argues, these were ‘newcomers’ fraternities, designed to support and regulate Doche migrants in London.\textsuperscript{868} That Doche aliens often lived in close proximity to others of a similar cultural background to each other and sought to seek to foster relations with one another demonstrates that many of them attempted to affirm their belonging within groupings of Doche aliens within the capital. Some of these groupings would have been formal communities with admission criteria, such as the Doche fraternities of St Katherine and the Holy Blood of Wilsnack, which no doubt also provided their alien members with opportunities to network with other Doche aliens in London.\textsuperscript{869} Other aliens such as the testators above, socialised with others of a similar cultural background and consequently embedded themselves within less formal Doche social networks.

Legal narratives can shed light on why Doche migrants sought to ensure their inclusion within networks of people of a similar cultural background to themselves. Indeed, they indicate that to belong amongst these networks ensured that they could obtain help and companionship from other Doche aliens. In the liberty and sanctuary of St Martin’s le Grand, as discussed earlier, the population was predominantly populated by alien, particularly Doche, artisans.\textsuperscript{870} The petition of Leonard Peterson, Jacob Cremer, William Grenekyn, George Laurence and Derik Vanhove, Doche aliens from St Martin’s Le Grand, stressed the unjust actions of the constable there, a man named Hugh Payne.\textsuperscript{871} Payne would allegedly come into their ‘their house with his pollax and wepons all to breketh their pottes pannes and candilstikes’. If any of the petitioners came ‘unto hym to entreat for any of thair neighbours’ to ask him to stop his
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harassment he would then ‘puttith thaim in ieobardie of thair lyfes’, and said that ‘he woll fynde the meanes to hang thaim’.\(^{872}\) This portrayal of Payne was clearly a means to stress to the equity court how he had abused his powers as constable and had thus acted against conscience, however, the depiction of the petitioners as having tried to protect their neighbours from Payne suggests support amongst alien neighbours in the sanctuary.

The petition of Reynold Harmanson (1433x1443 or 1467x1472) highlights that there were networks of ‘Flemings’ in London and underlines the importance of these networks to individual aliens in the city. Reynold had been a servant to the brewer Elys Mumbryne. After leaving Elys’ service, Reynold carried out the untactful move of opening up a brewery right next to his ex-master’s house, which allegedly prompted Elys to bring false actions of debt and trespass against Reynold. Having Reynold imprisoned on the basis of these accusations was apparently not enough for Elys. The petition goes on to describe how he promised his new competitor that he ‘woll chastise your said Oratour that all the Flemynges in london shull be ware by hym to the utter most undoyng of youre said Oratoure’.\(^{873}\) ‘Be-ware’ can be viewed in this context as meaning be wary of, or to watch out for, Reynold; Elys allegedly promised to make other Doche immigrants suspicious of Reynold.\(^{874}\) The idea that Elys would inform ‘all’ the ‘Flemynges’ in London is no doubt an exaggeration. Despite this, that Elys reported this as a major problem is suggestive. Reynold argued that Elys had threatened to cut him off from the ties with people of similar cultural background to himself by making them become ‘wary’ of him, which would allegedly his ‘undoynge’. The petition’s depiction of the threat highlights that to be shunned by Doche aliens in London would have serious implications.

Doche master artisans in London and its suburbs were often married to people of a similar cultural background to themselves, and they either had married prior to migration to London or married Doche women after having moved to England.\(^{875}\) Marriage between Doche aliens ensured obligations between an alien and the family members of their spouse, and Doche aliens saw the benefits of maintaining ties with their affines living in the city. The connections between an alien and their spouses’ kin are evidenced in the petition of one Somon (Simon) Hode, a cordwainer who lived in London (1486x1493 or 1504x1515). The petition records that Simon had married a woman named Gertrude, which is a name suggestive of a connection with
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Low Countries, who was the daughter a man named Giles Johnson.876 The petition describes Giles as being the husband of a woman named Alice. This makes it possible to identify him as the Giles Johnson, a ‘Teutonic’ ‘botcher’, husband to one ‘Alicia Johnson’ who was assessed in the 1483 alien subsidy assessment as living in either Cripplegate ward within or without in London.877 Simon’s petition states that Giles was owed money by one ‘Peter Quytyng of Colyeyn (Cologne) in Almayne’. When Giles died, his widow Alice came to Simon and asked him to arrange the collection of the debt and Simon ‘atte instance and praier of alis’ went to Cologne at his own ‘costes and charges’ to ensure that Alice received her deceased husband’s money.878 Simon depicted himself as having helped his mother-in-law when she came to him for aid, which reflects the obligations which bonds of affinity demanded between them.

The bonds which marriage formed between Doche aliens and their spouse’s kin can also be seen in evidence outside of London, as is reflected in the Chancery petition of Peter Clyff who was a Doche alien who had opened up a beer house in Southampton. His petition (1475x1480 or 1483x1485) states that he had opened his house in close proximity to Tilman Schuter’s beer house. In order to rid himself of Peter’s rivalry, Tilman allegedly brought a false action for debt against him. Peter emphasised that he feared that he could never acquire justice via Southampton’s courts. He argued that the jury of the court was comprised of aliens, due to a custom of the town that aliens should be tried by aliens.879 Peter complained, however, that the jury had been packed by Tilman with his friends and his two sons-in-law. The alien subsidy assessments record Tilman as a householder living in Southampton in 1460, 1463 and 1466.880 The dates where he is recorded suggest that the petition dates from (1475x1480). Tilman’s daughters are not recorded in the subsidy and the petition does not record the name of their husbands so they also cannot be traced in the subsidy rolls. This likely reflects an under-enumeration of female aliens within the subsidy assessments from Southampton from 1460 to 1484 and the fact that, with the notable exceptions of the 1483 assessments of London and Southwark, usually alien wives of alien men were not recorded.881 The argument that Tilman’s daughters also married strangers like himself, and Tilman’s long-term residency in

---


877 TNA E 179/242/25, m. 15.

878 TNA C 1/139/42.

879 Peter’s assertion that Southampton had a custom that would allow a jury of aliens to decide upon a case between two other aliens is notable. This differed from most other courts which would have had an all English jury if both parties were aliens, see Jenks, “Justice for Strangers,” 178.

880 TNA E 179/173/137, m. 1, E 179/173/133, m. 27 and E 179/173/134, m. 1.

Southampton, makes it possible that Tilman’s daughters had also married other Doche immigrants in England. Notably, the petition stresses that Tilman’s sons in law would favour their relative within court which demonstrates that bonds of affinity would lead aliens to help one another.

Bonds of affinity could make aliens obliged to help one another, but marriage between aliens also had financial benefits. Doche men could also marry widows of other migrants to obtain the financial assets of their deceased husbands through their dower, as is implied in the petition of Reynold van Bokem and his wife Elizabeth (1486x1493 or 1504x1515), Doche aliens who both lived in London. Their bill reads that John Pynde and William Daniel were executors of the late John Stevynson who was owed goods by the also deceased Antony van Impe, a merchant. The executors are depicted as having harassed both Reynold and Elizabeth for the goods because they alleged that Elizabeth had previously been Antony’s wife and executrix. Elizabeth and Reynold stressed to the court, however, that Elizabeth had not been legally married to Antony because prior to her marriage to him she had married Herry Petirson, a Dutchman, but he had departed overseas and left her without having any contact for fifteen years. She had thought him dead and then married Antony. However, the petitioners then alleged that after this Herry came back and claimed Elizabeth as his wife. The petition then reads that when both Herry and Antony had died Elizabeth married Reynold. The petitioners’ argument rested on the assertion that although Elizabeth was ‘reputed as his [Antony’s] wife wher she was not in dede’. It is notable that all Elizabeth’s apparent spouses, whether reputed or actual, were Doche aliens. Both Reymond and Antony had ‘van’ in their names and Herry Petirson was described as a Dutchman. That Elizabeth had married Antony van Impe a merchant, and had been the executor of his will, provides a reason why Reynold wished to marry her. In late medieval London, marriage was perceived to be one of the best means for a merchant to obtain capital for their business. As noted in Chapter II, the wives of artisans and merchants could help in their husband’s businesses and be actively engaged in managing their husband’s credit transactions. This indicates another motive as to why Reynold would wish to marry Elizabeth; she was a valuable marriage partner, controlling some of the goods and capital of her late husband, and probably had knowledge of her ex-husband’s business.

A similar instance of a Doche alien who married the widow of another Doche migrant for financial gain and the knowledge of her husband’s trade is evidenced in the case of one
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882 TNA C 1/117/39.
Gerard van Scouneburgh, a beerbrewer of London, who married Jacomyn, a widow of another Doche beerbrewer named John Evingar. The will of John Evingar (1496) names Jacomyn as his wife and gives to her ownership of certain tenements in Antwerp for five years, after which they were to go to his son Andrawe Evynger who can be identified as having later become a citizen and salter of London.\textsuperscript{884} Jacomyn was also bequeathed all the residue of the goods and the debts owed to John after his death. John named Jacomyn and Andrew as his executors and the document records that he had a beer house and tenements which he leased from the priory of the Knights Hospitaller St John of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{885} John was clearly a very wealthy individual with a significant brewing operation.\textsuperscript{886} Indeed, in the 1483 alien subsidy assessment he was recorded as a beerbrewer in Tower Ward of London and the master of ten alien servants, and by 1483 he was also an associate with another beerbrewer named Peter Hounselow.\textsuperscript{887} Jacomyn was also assessed, which highlights that she was an alien.\textsuperscript{888} The Chancery petition of one James Mathewe (1504x1515) highlights that Jacomyn remarried after John’s death. James stated that he had an obligation of debt with ‘John Evyngare’, which he had paid in full before John’s death, and that since John’s death ‘Jaconyne late the wyf of the same John hath take to husband oon Gerard van Sconburgh’. He complained that Gerard had found James’s written obligation to John and had used this document to make him pay the debt again, even though he had paid John in full during his lifetime.\textsuperscript{889} Another petition to the Chancery (1515x1518) supports James’s claim that Jacomyn had married Gerard after John’s death, as it names her as Gerard’s wife.\textsuperscript{890} Gerard is recorded in two petitions to the Court of Chancery as a beerbrewer and seems to have been in London since 1467 at the earliest when he was assessed there in the alien subsidies.\textsuperscript{891} It is notable that after John’s death Gerard married his widow. One of the main reasons why Gerard married Jacomyn was because it allowed him to acquire the assets which John had bequeathed to her in his testament, the long-term lease of John’s beer house with its associated customer base, and likely to acquire Jacomyn as an economic partner with her knowledge of the brewing trade and the ability to manage a brewhouse.

\textsuperscript{884} Bolton provides many biographical details concerning John Evingar, but not his widow’s subsequent marriage: Bolton, \textit{The Alien Communities}, 51.
\textsuperscript{885} PROB 11/11/67, National Archive’s online index ‘Discovery’ names him as ‘John Ebingar’ yet this is a transcription error, the name given in the testament in John Evingar.
\textsuperscript{886} Bolton, \textit{The Alien Communities}, 21.
\textsuperscript{887} Ibid., 78–78, n. 132.
\textsuperscript{888} TNA E 179/242/25, m. 7
\textsuperscript{889} TNA C 1/337/58.
\textsuperscript{890} TNA C 1/411/52.
\textsuperscript{891} TNA C 1/225/44; C 1/411/52. Gerard Van Sconeburgh E 179/236/107, m. 2 (1467); E 179/144/70 (1468); he may also be ‘Gerard Scownbryght’ E 179/236/96, m. 2 (1465).
That aliens sought to foster ties with individuals of a similar cultural background to themselves to affirm their membership within alien networks, and consequently obtain the help and support of its members, was also behaviour which can be clearly observed amongst the Italian communities in London. Italians often congregated and associated with others who had originated from the same city state as themselves.\(^{892}\) These communities are what are referred to as ‘nations’.\(^{893}\) These nations provided a support structure for commerce abroad, helped merchants to deal with a foreign environment, and in London more resident members of the city-state communities had official meetings to take commercial and financial decisions which impacted them as a whole.\(^{894}\) Recent research into the Lucchese community demonstrates that it was a formal organisation, headed by of a consul who was able to judge disputes between its members, and had its own meeting house. This consul might order the exclusion of a member from the community, resulting in the shunning by other members of it. Venetians in London also had a consul from the early fifteenth century onwards, who might exclude members of community in London if they refused to attend the formal meetings held to discuss common matters of concern amongst fellow Venetian merchants.\(^{895}\)

These groupings have parallels with what Spindler describes as ‘portable communities’, namely groups of merchants involved in long-distance trade with who offered each other mutual support.\(^{896}\) Previous scholarship portrays many Italians, particularly those who were only in London for short periods of time, as having operated as a closed community who did not try to establish connections with different elements of native society. There were a significant number of young men who went to London to learn about business under the auspices of more experienced merchants, who were usually their family members.\(^{897}\) Even the small number of Italians who were long-term residents, obtained the freedom of the city and had connections with natives kept strong links with more transitory merchants from their city states.\(^{898}\) So strong were these bonds with others of the same background that the Florentine merchant Julian de Ecclesia used it to the advantage in his Chancery petition (1475x1480 or 1483x85). Julian portrayed his respondent as a calculating villain through arguing that he had taken advantage of Julian’s limited number of contacts within the city in order to place a false

\(^{894}\) Bradley, “‘Saluti da Londra’,” 108.
\(^{895}\) Lambert, “‘Nostri Fratelli da Londra’: The Lucchese Community,” 92; Bradley, “‘Saluti da Londra,” 108.
\(^{897}\) Bratchell, “Regulation and Group-Consciousness,” 585, 592, 595, 607.
action of trespass against him, thinking that Julian would not have the friends to contest the action. Julian stressed that his respondent had done so in the knowledge that Julian was a merchant stranger ‘havyng no aqueyntaunce within the seid citie but off mercyuant straungers’.

The act of maintaining connections with those from a similar city state was a means by which Italian merchants affirmed their inclusion within their communities whilst trading within England.

It was not only elite, mercantile, aliens from the Italian peninsula who practiced this form of homophily, however. The scrivener of a Venetian carrack named Modeste Justynyan complained to the chancellor (1433x1443 or 1467x1472) that he had agreed with Pascall de Raguse in Venice that Pascal would serve, presumably as a mariner, on the carrack during its journey to England and also on its homeward trip. Venetian ships were crewed by people from many regions outside of Venice and Pascal’s name ‘de Raguse’ highlights that he originated from Ragusa in Sicily. Pascall had allegedly come to London found some of his ‘countray men’ living near the Tower of London and, because of the influence of these men, Pascall had refused to return back to the carrack and had put forward a feigned action of debt against Modeste.

Hanseatic merchants living in the Steelyard were members of their London based kontore but also of different groupings both in and beyond the city itself. Hanseatic merchants were the merchant burghers, or citizens, of the confederation of towns and cities located around the Baltic and the North Sea who were bound together primarily through shared commercial interest. It was this burghership of a Hanseatic town which enabled them to access the trading privileges in England. These merchants in London were also members of the Steelyard kontore and, like other kontores elsewhere, there were rules which members swore to follow regarding their conduct towards each other. Kontores have been described as ‘alien guilds abroad’ and can be conceptualised as a formal grouping. Living in this compound, these merchants had platform with which to foster relations with other Hansards. Spindler has argued that Hansards

---

899 TNA C 1/64/302. Julian was assessed as a Florentine in the alien subsidy assessments for London in 1467 and 1468: TNA E 179/236/107, m. 2; E 179/236/111.
900 Bradley, The Views of the Hosts, xxv.
901 TNA C 1/46/254; Near the tower perhaps might refer to St Katherine’s Hospital where, as noted above, there seems to have been high concentrations of aliens.
in both Bruges and London sustained strong ties with one another, offering each other mutual support in a foreign environment. This is indicated in the wills of Hanseatic merchants who bequeathed goods to other Hansards or made them their executors of their testaments. In his Chancery petition, Nicholas Sear stated that his fellow ‘merchauntes of the Styllerd’ offered surety for him when he had been arrested (1475x1480 or 1483x1485).

Despite socialising with others within their own compound, however, not all Hanseatic merchants were clannish and kept amongst themselves. Some could try to forge ties with people who were not Hanseatic merchants outside of the kontore. Nicholas Sear’s petition complained that a native leather seller of the city had refused to let him marry the ‘yong woman’ who was living in his house. Hanseatic testators sometimes also bequeathed goods to Doche aliens in the city who were not members of the Steelyard, and the examples found here indicate that these contacts could be alien citizens of London. John Sampyon (1420) made one ‘Cliverchij Snalke’, a citizen and tailor, one of his executors. Godfrey van Kessel (1403) named both his wife and a citizen goldbeater, Bartholomew Seman, as his executors. Godscalus Trout (1405), a citizen and armourer of the city who was also a parishioner of All Hallows the Great, the church of which acted as the Hansard’s parish church, named the merchant Gerard Dewart as one of his executors. The Hanseatic merchant Henry Esselfoot (1413) made a citizen and armourer as his executor. These testators were most probably the more resident Hanseatic merchants, acting either independently or as an agent for larger firms, for whom connections with London citizens would be economically advantageous. These resident merchants would be more likely to make wills than the young men who were in the city to undertake a mercantile apprenticeship.

Although aliens would often provide help and companionship to others of a similar cultural background to themselves within informal settings, this solidarity could also translate into legal contexts. Indeed, certain alien petitioners argued that if they had had a jury half comprised of men from the same cultural region as themselves, and not Englishmen, then they would have won their case. Although clearly included within the petition to convince the

905 Spindler, “Between City and Sea,” 181–197.
906 LMA 09051/001/002, f. 153; LMA 09171/004, f. 68; LMA 09171/001, f. 408; LMA 09051/001/002, f. 268.
907 TNA C 1/67/199.
908 LMA 09171/003, f. 51v.
909 LMA 09171/002, f. 30.
910 LMA 09171/005, f. 187.
911 LMA 09171/002, f. 292.
chancellor that they could not obtain justice in other courts, and thus needed the chancellor’s intervention, these arguments are indicative of the help that aliens might extend to others of a similar cultural background within legal contexts. Following a statute in 1354, any alien in legal proceedings against a native had the right to request a jury half comprised of aliens. Originally the statute allowed the jury to be comprised of aliens of all nationalities, yet by the fifteenth century the statute was interpreted as entitling aliens to have jurors from either the same kingdom, country, or province as themselves.\(^1\)Certain petitioners stressed that they had not been able to acquire a jury of half aliens of their nationality. The petition of Peter Fermyngus (1529x1532), argued that there was a jury comprised of all natives, which ‘was the onely cause that they passyd agynst your said Oratour for yff the sayd Jury had been of half engyssshmen and half estraungers your said Oratour [would] have been acquyted and discharged’.\(^2\) One petitioner even claimed that the respondent had taken pains to ensure that there were no alien jurymen of the same nationality who would be willing to find in the petitioner’s favour. Anthony de Salas (1475x80 or 1483x1485), a merchant from Piedmont, claimed that the respondent had ensured that the six aliens on his jury were actually Flemings. He complained that as ‘noon of themy of the nacion of your said beseecher’, and as the other English half were also picked by the respondent, the whole jury proved against Antony.\(^3\) Moreover, in his Chancery petition (1529x1532), the French hosier Gabriel Dewvale argued that the six Frenchmen on his jury would have proved in his favour if it had not been for the fact some of the English jurors had beaten them ‘wyth their fystes’. As a result, he stated that they were intimidated by the some of the English jurymen to prove against him and ‘contrary to their concyens’.\(^4\) In both Dewvale’s and De Salas’s petitions, it is assumed that if the alien contingent were of the same nationality as the petitioner, and were not coerced, they would have proved in their favour.

In her analysis of witness depositions heard by the Consistory court in the later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Berry notes that aliens were more frequently asked for their places of birth than native people. She even notes a case in which the alien status of a witness was raised as an issue by a defendant to be put to witnesses in the interrogatories used for cross examination.\(^5\) The depositions of another case brought to the court helps explain why the

\(^1\) Jenks, “Justice for Strangers,” 176–182.
\(^2\) TNA C 1/634/19.
\(^3\) TNA C 1/66/408.
\(^4\) TNA C 1/627/32.
\(^5\) Berry, “Margins and marginality,” 170, 214.
alien status of parties could become salient within a legal context. Indeed, it indicates that parties might usefully raise suspicions concerning the validity of the other parties’ witnesses if a witness was an alien testifying on behalf of another alien. Between 1510 and 1511 the court heard a defamation case brought by Richard Faques, a stationer from Normandy living in London, against one Alice White. Three witnesses deposed on behalf of Faques stating that Alice had accused him of having stolen money from her. One of these witnesses was a Venetian printer and bookbinder named Julian Notary who had lived in London for 16 years. The other two witnesses were Julian’s English wife Anna and an Englishman named John Wendon. The ninth interrogatory which Alice put to the Faques’ witnesses, which can be reconstructed from the answers given in response to it, was designed to discredit the reliability of the depositions through asking the witnesses which territory they had been born in and whether that influenced who they wished to win the case. This interrogatory seems to have been formed for Julian especially as he was an alien deposing on behalf of another alien. Julian replied to the interrogatory that he was born in Venice and that Richard Faques was born in Normandy, and that, consequently, they were of a different ‘nation’ (‘sic diverse nacionis’) and that he did not care about Facques’ nationality in the case but only justice. Because a defendant’s interrogatories were posed to all a plaintiff’s witnesses, the questions were also directed to Faques’ English witnesses. John Weldon replied that he was English born and was impartial (‘anglius ortu est et indifferentes non considerate diversitatis nacionis’). Julian’s English wife similarly stated that she did not care about nations but only justice. The logic behind Alice’s interrogatory seems to have been to raise suspicions in the mind of the court’s Official that because one of the witnesses was deposing on behalf of another alien, he would have given false testimony to help his case.

918 LMA DL/C/0206, ff. 19v, 21v. –22. I thank Professor Shannon McSheffrey for sending me her calendar of the 206 deposition book and for sending me her photographs of these folios. 919 ‘non curat de natione sue tantum de iusticia’ LMA DL/C/0206, f. 22r. 920 LMA DL/C/0206, f. 40rv 921 LMA DL/C/0206, f. 42rv. 922 Interrogatories were used by defendants to undermine the case of the plaintiff see Helmholz, Marriage Litigation in Medieval England, 18–19; Menuge, “An Orphaned Medieval Heiress and the Legal Case as Literature,” 121.
Alien Clergy

The connections which resident aliens forged with clergymen of the same cultural background to themselves are a notable facet of the alien homophily explored so far. Indeed, many aliens sought the spiritual services of clergymen who knew their language and had originated from areas of similar cultural backgrounds to themselves. Mendicant orders in London often had brothers who were not English as individual friars belonged to an order rather than a house, so movement of brothers to different houses, even those across the sea, was common.923 The houses, then, were popular amongst aliens as they had friars who could preach to them, hear confession, and provide spiritual support in their own language.924 Alien testators also often asked alien friars to provide intercessory post mortem masses for their souls.925 All of London’s five male mendicant houses contained alien brothers, as well as English-born brothers, although there were differences between houses in terms of their alien composition. The Austin Friars, for example, had Italian and Doche brothers, although the former outnumbered the latter.926 This helps explain why the Austin Friars was so popular amongst London’s Italians, regardless of the city-state they had originated from.927 Francis Hoth argues that the Austin Friars seem to have especially encouraged aliens, particularly Italians, to become involved with their convent. He points out that alien members of the order who studied at Oxford or Cambridge were frequently required to spend their vacations at the London house so they could preach to and hear confessions of those who shared their language.928 At the Austin Friars, there was even an upstairs room known as the Lombard’s hall where Italians might gather.929 Doche brothers were more prominent amongst the Dominicans, Franciscans, Crutched Friars and Carmelites, and the proportion of Doche friars in the houses of the Crutched Friars and Carmelites was particularly high.930 Using evidence from wills proved in the Commissary Court in the late fifteenth century, Röhrkasten notes that alien testators who remembered the

927 This was first noted by Thrupp, “Aliens in and around London in the Fifteenth Century,” 263–264; Bradley, “Italian Merchants in London,” 17–20.
929 Bradley, “‘Saluti da Londra’,” 106.
alien friars. He also argues that in the late fifteenth century the Observants, in their friary in Greenwich, was often remembered in the wills of Doche testators and that between 1491 and 1506 at least 30 alien friars from the Low Countries, Rhineland and Southern Germany ‘followed their vocation’ there. He also points to the connections of alien testators to the houses of the Dominican, Franciscan, and Crutched Friars.

Röhrkasten argues that out of all aliens, Hanseatic merchants were those who were involved with parish life, whereas other aliens had to ‘look elsewhere for spiritual comfort’ and that they had to turn to the mendicant orders. More recently, this view has been challenged. Colson, in his analysis of ordinances of four alien fraternities hosted by different mendicant orders in London, argues that the choice to join these fraternities did not preclude an alien’s involvement in other fraternities or religious institutions, including their parish churches. He notes that aliens had an array of choices to express themselves spiritually within the city.

The analysis of wills from both the Archdeaconry Court and Commissary Court undertaken for this thesis firmly supports Colson’s argument. As noted in Chapter III, alien testators could bequeath goods to named parish clergy, to parish fraternities, or made other forms of bequests which indicate that they had close relationships with their parish churches. The deposition of the Spaniard Fernand de Aza who argued he needed to go to the Austin friars to hear confession because he knew no English, analysed in the previous chapter, highlights that aliens with no English would have been particularly dependent upon the spiritual support of mendicant brothers. This should not, however, be assumed to be the case for all aliens. Indeed, the bequests of alien testators to their local parishes and parish clergy demonstrate that they knew some English and could seek religious support within a parochial context.

Nor was it only in London where wealthy resident aliens had a range of options concerning how they could express themselves spiritually. In towns with mendicant orders, there is also evidence which suggests more established aliens had the option to participate both in parish life and rely upon the services of mendicants. Indeed, the men with names highly suggestive of Doche origin Costinus Williamson (1461), Florencius Williamson (1476) and
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932 Ibid., 166 n. 102, 180–183.
933 Röhrkasten "Londoners and London Mendicants," 460; In a later publication he maintains that aliens were members of the laity who ‘formed no part of the parochial structure’, Röhrkasten, "Local Ties and International Connections,” 180.
Hans Martyn of Hull (1453), as well as Frenchman John de Parys of York (1390), all bequeathed money to the fabric of their parish churches and a mendicant house within the settlement in which they lived.\textsuperscript{935} One Hertyke Crewlyng of Ipswich (1525) gave money to one James Coleyn of the Friar Minors of Ipswich, who possibly originated from Cologne, yet also made the chantry priest of his parish church the supervisor of his will.\textsuperscript{936} Connections between aliens and friars sometimes went beyond that of only spiritual provision, as is reflected in the Chancery petition of the Doche migrant Peter Petirson (1480x1483) of Ipswich. It reads that a friar of the town by the name of Boswell ‘desired him’ to take an ounce and a half of silver to London for it to be converted into ornamental beads named ‘gaudies’, a task which Peter did.\textsuperscript{937}

Alien clergymen in London would have been important members of Doche networks in the capital. Indeed, through their provision of spiritual services to aliens in their native tongue, a clergymen could establish connections with a multitude of aliens. That the same clergyman could be remembered in the testaments of various aliens reflects this. A Doche confessor who seems to have known multiple aliens is mentioned in several Doche testaments proved within London’s Commissary Court. One John Deus’ Obrant of Flanders in 1380 made a bequest to his confessor ‘domino lambert’.\textsuperscript{938} The testament of John Moyiard (1382), a native of Holland, records a bequest to ‘domino lamberto meo confessori iijs’. John also made this Lambert one of his executors.\textsuperscript{939} The will of Peter deus Smyth of Flanders (1382) also records a bequest to ‘domino lamberto mea confessori’ of 8d. He asked for Lambert to celebrate masses for him.\textsuperscript{940} None of the wills suggest that the testators had a link to a mendicant order, nor did they live in the same parishes. However, the recurrence of the name Lambert, the proximity of the dates of these three documents and the pattern that all the testators had originated from the Low Countries suggest that the Lambert recorded in the testaments was the same person.

The example of a chaplain named Godfrey Saude provides more explicit evidence that Doche clergymen would have had ties, and have provided spiritual support, for a wide range

\textsuperscript{935} Costinus Williamson BI, reg.2, f.411; Florencius Williamson BI, reg.5, f.9; Hans Martyn, reg. 2, f.271; John de Parys YMA DC/L2/4/001, f. 106.
\textsuperscript{936} NRO NCC, register Groundesburgh, f. 196.
\textsuperscript{937} TNA C 1/61/423; MED, search term ‘Gaudies’; Peter Petirson is the hardwareman householder labelled as Flemish who was recorded in the 1483 alien subsidy for Ipswich TNA E 179/180/111, rot.6, m. 1, there is another Peter Petirson recorded in Ipswich in the same year as a non-householder servant of a beerbrewer (TNA E 179/180/111, rot.6, m. 1). That the petition refers to silver, a high value metal, makes it reasonable to identify the Petirson in the petition as the higher status house-holding hardwareman in the subsidies whose craft involved the sale of metal goods.
\textsuperscript{938} LMA MS 09171/001, f. 73.
\textsuperscript{939} LMA MS 09171/001, f. 89.
\textsuperscript{940} LMA MS 09171/001, f. 89.
of aliens. It also highlights that Doche aliens might have connections with alien clergy who were not part of mendicant orders. Godfrey is named as a chaplain in his testament (1413) and requested to be buried in the church of All Saints the Great and bequeathed money to the rector and chaplains of the same church.\footnote{LMA MS 09051/001/002, f. 291v.} All Saints the Great was the parish church used by the Hanseatic merchants of the Steelyard, and Godfrey had relations with Hanseatic merchants as is indicated by his witnessing of Baldwin Blanchard’s will (1412). He was also named as the confessor of Frowin Stebbing in his will (1395).\footnote{(Baldwin Blanchard) LMA MS 09051/001/002, f. 256; (Frowin Stebbing) LMA MS 09051/001/001, 23v-Lloyd identifies Frowin as a leading member of the Steelyard see Lloyd, England and the German Hanse, 78.} It seems, likely then, that he was a chaplain in the church of All Saints the Great for at least part of his residence in London (which was at least between 1395-1413).\footnote{The first document that I have found in which he is mentioned was made in 1395 (LMA MS 09051/001/001, f. 23) and the last reference is his will made in 1413 (LMA MS 09051/001/002, f. 291v.)} Despite this, he did not only provide spiritual services for, and have connections with, Hanseatic merchants, as he also was named in the wills of people who were non-Hanseatic aliens, or had names highly indicative of Doche origin, who lived in other parishes. The Doche alien Lodekyn Manykyn, a parishioner of Saint Nicholas Acon, named ‘Galdrid Saude’ as his confessor (1395).\footnote{LMA MS 09051/001/001, f. 23; The Archdeaconry Court’s probate registers contain the wills of many chaplains see Wood, “Life and Death,” 45.} Derik Clink, a beerbrewer of All Saints Berking parish next to the Tower, made Godfrey the supervisor of his testament (1404).\footnote{LMA MS 09051/001/001, f. 46v.} Godfrey was named as the confessor of one Lambert Cour’, son of Henry Cour’ of Zeeland and parishioner of Saint Boltolph beyond Aldgate, who bequeathed money to Godfrey in his will (1405).\footnote{LMA MS 09051/001/001, f. 56.} Ruddekyn Bare, of All Hallows Barking parish, made him one of his executors (1407).\footnote{LMA MS 09051/001/001, f. 289.} John Tyle of Brabant, parishioner of St Margaret Pattens, bequeathed 20s. to him (1400).\footnote{LMA MS 09051/001, f. 83.} Godfrey also witnessed the will of the painter Godfrey de Ducheborgh, which was, made in 1408.\footnote{LMA MS 09051/001/002, f. 200.} Godfrey’s own will demonstrates that he had relations with Doche aliens in the city, as he named Herman Stokfish, a citizen tailor, Tydman Hughson, a mariner, and one Gobell Goldsmith as his executors. He also bequeathed the bed he was lying in when dictating the testament to Gobell’s daughter ‘Derice’.\footnote{LMA MS 09051/001/002, f. 291v. Tydman Hughson made his will a year later in 1414 in which he is described as a mariner and Herman Stokfish is named as a supervisor LMA 09051/001/002, f. 296v.}
The Chancery petition of John van Lyre (1480x1483) similarly demonstrates that Doche chaplains might have connections with various aliens who originated from similar cultural backgrounds to themselves. It also indicates that Doche aliens could have ties with alien clergy who were not mendicants. John’s petition states that he was a chaplain in the parish of St Olave’s in Southwark and he had acted as surety for a debt taken out by one Cornelius Cost of London from William Brockhurst of London. William had caused them both to be arrested because of the debt and that John wanted the chancellor’s intervention to free him from prison. John’s name and his position as a chaplain in the parish is notable. The name ‘van Lyre’ indicates that John was from the Low Countries, and by the sixteenth century and likely earlier St Olave’s parish held the largest Doche community in Southwark.\textsuperscript{951} Cornelius Cost, moreover, is the individual who was recorded as a ‘Teutonic’ householder of London’s Queenhithe Ward in the 1483 alien subsidy assessment.\textsuperscript{952} As a means to present himself to the chancellor as a respectable clergyman, John emphasised that the people who could act as surety for him were ‘many right honest and thrift persones of the said parish of Southwerk… [who] your said Chapellayn hath served this x yere’.\textsuperscript{953} In his petition, John portrayed himself as a chaplain who had connections with the alien Cornelius Cost and who had strong ties with other Doche aliens, namely the ‘thrift persones’, within St Olave’s parish. It is also significant that in this petition John is described as a chaplain in this petition and so is Godfrey Saude in the testaments of Gobull de Ducheberght and Derik Clynk mentioned above. Chaplains did not have their own livings, which indicates that John and Godfrey were supported financially by the Doche communities they served.\textsuperscript{954}

It is clear that Doche aliens in late medieval London often kept in contact with clergymen, whether they were brothers of mendicant orders or not, who had originated from similar cultural backgrounds to themselves. As clergymen were important members of Doche networks, for aliens to have maintained ties with them not only ensured spiritual support in their own language but also likely helped affirm their inclusion within these networks. Colson notes that friars were often instrumental figures in the Doche fraternities which offered help to alien newcomers and orientated them within new environments.\textsuperscript{955} Beyond the context of alien fraternities, we might suspect that alien clergy like those mentioned above played an important

\textsuperscript{951} Carlin, \textit{Medieval Southwark}, 154.
\textsuperscript{952} TNA E 179/242/25, m. 15v.
\textsuperscript{953} TNA C 1/63/164.
\textsuperscript{954} Colson’s analysis of testamentary evidence indicates that chaplains were willing to socialise with local parishioners, see Colson, “Local Communities in Fifteenth Century London,” 195.
\textsuperscript{955} Colson, “Alien Communities and Alien Fraternities,” 113–114, 116, 117.
role in helping incorporate less established aliens into networks of Doche people. Indeed, Thrupp notes that Doche aliens were far more likely to mention confessors in their testaments than English testators and suggests that this was because the Doche practiced stricter pious practices.\textsuperscript{956} The high proportion of confessors named in alien wills, however, might more usefully be seen as evidence of the position of alien clergymen as important individuals within networks of Doche people, rather than evidence of greater piety amongst these aliens.

\textbf{Kinship Bonds}

Studies of migration in various time periods have demonstrated the importance of kin in helping their migrant family members. In her study of both foreign born and native born migrants who moved to St Omer in the fifteenth century, Sortor demonstrates that many wealthier migrants were part of kinship networks which were key to their success in their new environment.\textsuperscript{957} In a study of Boroughside, a suburb of London in the seventeenth century, Jeremy Boulton suggests that for migrants to the area the lack of traditional kinship networks meant that the connections with the few kinship members they did have in their new environments became even more important.\textsuperscript{958} Michael Anderson noted that Irish migrants to Lancashire in the mid-nineteenth century were often offered aid by kin members who lived nearby.\textsuperscript{959} Irish migrants to Britain in the twentieth century also often relied upon family networks for accommodation, employment and financial support.\textsuperscript{960} This scholarship raises a question which should be posed to the medieval source material: how important was the support of kinship members for aliens in late medieval London? What benefits could they obtain through these contacts?

It was argued above that alien newcomers to a settlement could seek out family members who had already established themselves within the city and had ensured their belonging within networks of people within it. In doing so, newcomers might obtain help and advice. Family members in the city were not only important for new arrivals to the city, however. Testamentary evidence of London aliens demonstrates that wealthy and settled

\textsuperscript{957} Sortor, “The Measure of Success,” 165–183, in particular 174–176. Sortor argues that although the more established migrants tended to be part of location-based and family networks, kinship networks were the most prominent.  
\textsuperscript{958} Boulton, \textit{Neighbourhood and Society}, 259.  
\textsuperscript{960} Ryan, “Family Matters: (e)migration, familial networks and Irish women in Britain,” 355–365.
Doche migrants frequently kept in contact with kinship members in England. The items which were bequeathed were often of a personal, or expensive, nature which suggests intimacy between the testator and their family member.\textsuperscript{961} Lodekyn Mankyn of St Nicholas Acon parish, London, willed that his kinsman Harry received 50 marks which he would be paid in London, and another 50 marks that would be paid from Lodekyn’s goods in Munster, Westphalia.\textsuperscript{962} Floricius Pole, who lived near Lombard Street, bequeathed to his kinswoman named Isabella one feather bed, two pairs of linen sheets and one pillow. Isabella is the only individual he names as a beneficiary, his wife and payment to his executors for their labour excepted.\textsuperscript{963} The Doche goldsmith Arnold Steyvert, whose will was made in 1464, gave to his relative Johanne van Baldeson 10 marks with all his cloaks and robes.\textsuperscript{964} The will of the merchant of Dordrecht, Nicholas van Oyen (1456) gave his relative, Leonard, who was also in England at the time of his death a gold ring.\textsuperscript{965} Gold rings were a precious gift for precious relationships, and further evidence of the close bond between these two men is that Nicholas trusted Leonard enough to make him his executor.\textsuperscript{966} The goldsmith John van Wessel of the parish of St Swithun, Candlewick Street, London released his brother, who was also named John van Wessel, from the debt which he owed to him.\textsuperscript{967}

It has been noted in scholarship of kinship groups in the modern era that kinship networks do not passively exist and require members to undertake ‘kinship work’ to preserve family ties.\textsuperscript{968} Similarly, aliens sought to maintain connections with kin to actively affirm their belonging within these networks which allowed them to access the help which kinship members might offer. This is reflected in the petition of Peter Camur (1433x1443), a Doche spectacle maker, which states that after being arrested because of an action for trespass his ‘kynneswoman’ Katherine Adryan came to give him food in prison. It states that this was necessary because the sheriff fed him so little that ‘he had like to haue perisshed’.\textsuperscript{969} We do not know whether Peter had any male relatives in London. There is, however, likely a gender

\textsuperscript{961} For discussion of how the type of object bequeathed can highlight the nature of the bond between testator and legatee see Lynne Bowdon, “Redefining Kinship: Exploring Boundaries of Relatedness in Late Medieval New Romney,” \textit{Journal of Family History} 29, no. 4 (2004): 409.
\textsuperscript{962} LMA MS 09051/001, f. 23.
\textsuperscript{963} LMA MS 09171/005, f. 6.
\textsuperscript{964} LMA MS 09171/005, f. 365.
\textsuperscript{965} LMA MS 09171/005, f. 179v.
\textsuperscript{966} For the symbolic importance of gold rings see Bowden, “Redefining Kinship,” 413. For the trust implied in making someone an executor see Maddern, “Friends of the Dead,” 164.
\textsuperscript{967} LMA MS 09171/005, f. 229v.
\textsuperscript{969} TNA C 1/46/39.
dimension to this as Peter stated that he had specifically looked to Katherine, a female relative, to provide him with food; there was a tendency to see women as carers and nurturers within society. Katherine Adryan was clearly an alien as she is recorded in London in the alien subsidies on seven occasions between 1441 and 1451. That Peter stated that he kept contact with Katherine as a family member, and that she came to help him, is notable. It reflects that Doche aliens could maintain connections with family members who had also immigrated and could rely on them for help in times of need.

The petition of Laurence Teymonson (1443x1443 or 1467x1472) provides further evidence of how Doche immigrants sought keep in contact with, and ask for help from, family members who had immigrated to England. It states that Cornelius Clayson, Laurence’s cousin, asked him to help take a man named John Sot, whom he wished to sue for debt, to the bailiffs of the court of Marshalsea. Laurence did just this. Laurence petitioned the court because John had laid an action of trespass against him after he had done so. The petition states that Cornelius had seen John in the parish of St Clements in the suburbs of London, presumably St Clements Danes, where Laurence also lived. After this, he asked Laurence to help him haul John before the court. Notably, Cornelius is depicted as having known where to locate Laurence and had known that he could ask for his assistance. Cornelius Clayson has a forename which was very common amongst immigrants from the Low Countries and was taxed as a householder in the 1464, the 1467, 1468 alien subsidy assessments. It is thus likely that, as Cornelius’ cousin, Lawrence was also a Doche alien. The narrative, then, speaks to the support which maintaining belonging within kinship networks in London could offer.

The petition of Arnold Andreus (1452x54 or 1493x1500) explicitly stresses the importance of the bonds of kinship between two alien cousins. Arnold stated that he lived in Crawley in Sussex. His petition reads that his cousin Herry Creyton from the town of Deest, in Brabant, lived in Southwark and had on one occasion travelled to Crawley and had asked him

971 (1441) ‘Katherine Adryan’ TNA E 179/144/42, m. 20; ‘Katherine Adryan’ (January 1443) E 179/144/52, m. 9; ‘Katherine Adryan’ (May 1443) E 179/144/53, m. 15; ‘Katherine Adryan’ (1449) E 179/235/23 m. 2; ‘Katherine Adrian’ (1451) E 179/144/64, m. 8.
972 TNA C 1/46/241.
973 TNA E 179/144/69 (1464); TNA E 179/236/107, m. 2 (1467); TNA E 179/144/77. Rosser has highlighted that the forename ‘Cornelius’ was particularly common amongst Doche immigrants: Rosser, Medieval Westminster, 194–5.
for money. Arnold said that he would give Herry the rent of a property he owned in Deest, after which they went to a scrivener to draw up a document which would legally entail the money over to Herry. The petition then states that the scrivener was busy, so Arnold gave Herry his signet ring to make the document in his absence. This was done and a document was drawn up for Herry to have six years rent in a house in Deest. Herry went over the sea to get the rent but could not obtain it. Arnold then went over to collect the money on his behalf. When he came back, however, Herry took actions of trespass against him and accused him of assault. The petition ends by asking the chancellor to cancel the rent document and to call Herry to the court.\footnote{974}{TNA C 1/22/150.}

Arnold wished to portray himself as a caring cousin who had only ever tried to help his relative and that he had been unjustly treated by his kinsman in a manner which was unfair considering how kind he had been to him in the past. Thus, for this strategy to work, it was important that Arnold emphasised that the kinship bond between himself and Herry meant that needed to help his cousin. The petition, then, portraits him as ‘fayne’, or happy, to lend Herry money because he was his cousin.\footnote{975}{MED, s. v. ‘fain’.} As part of this strategy, Arnold also stated that ‘by wey of loue’ he went with him to London to make the document which would entail the rent to him and lent him his signet ring to do so. It is notable that stated that he handed over the ring ‘trusting [him]… by cause he was his kynnesman’. This, and Arnold’s other statements that he had helped Herry because he was kin, indicates the support which aliens who maintained their inclusion within kinship networks might be able to access.

Arnold’s petition also indicates that Doche aliens could foster and maintain links with their kin and seek help from them even these family members were situated elsewhere in England. In other words, an alien did not need to live in the same settlement as their family members in order to be a member of a functioning kinship network. This is also evidenced in the petition of Sir John Koole of Antwerp to the Court of Requests (1492x1547). He argued that when he was in England he wished to return to his ‘own contre’ so he went to London to find a ship. Whilst in London he met one ‘Bowyn of weghelyn’ goldsmith of Salisbury and his brother one ‘Antonys of weghelyn dwelling in Cambrigge’. The petition reads that Bowyn and Antony took the same ship as John which was headed from Zeel and. On the way, however, bad weather meant that the ship was forced to make port in Dunkirk. Whilst there, John alleged that Bowyn and Antony had attacked him to the extent that they had ‘thought to haue slayne hym
out of hand’ and on his return to England petitioned the court.\textsuperscript{976} Beyond providing interesting details concerning how aliens may have met others on ships going out of England, John’s narrative further reflects that aliens could keep in contact with family members even if they lived at a distance from their own settlement; Bowyn and Antony, despite living in Salisbury and Cambridge respectively, are depicted as having had communication with one another as they were able to arrange a trip to Zeeland together.\textsuperscript{977}

It has been noted by previous scholarship that Italian merchants saw it necessary to maintain strong relationships with their family members who were trading in London as kinship bonds were often essential to their economic activities. Bratchell argues that most Italian merchants worked as part of family mercantile units and often trusted and worked alongside their kin.\textsuperscript{978} As well as there being many familial groups in England, consisting of brothers, sons, uncles and nephews, most Italians were part of either small or large mercantile families who traded across Europe.\textsuperscript{979} Research into merchants in late medieval Florence highlights that they often trusted business matters to their close kin.\textsuperscript{980} Such was the cultural link between family members and business within the Italian states, relationships between long-standing Italian business partners was perceived by both parties to be that of brotherly love.\textsuperscript{981} The strong bonds between kin explains why the Florentine John de Barde ‘london marchaunt’ acted as a surety to the Chancery petition of his relative Belizarde de Barde.\textsuperscript{982} The bonds between kin are reflected in the petition of Stolde Altevite of Florence, who argued in his petition that he entrusted a chest ‘conteyneng his bokes of rekoueryng of his dettes’ as well as other papers and papal bulls in the safe keeping of Carolus de Altebrite, a cousin of his living London.\textsuperscript{983} Due to the nature of their way of doing business with family members, and the culture which they originated from which placed great emphasis upon kinship ties, to have preserved contact with family members in London would have been a matter of second nature as well as a commercial necessity.

\textsuperscript{976} TNA REQ 2/12/199.  
\textsuperscript{977} For the opportunity for socialisation between people of diverse backgrounds on ships generally see Kowaleski, “‘Alien’ Encounters in the Maritime World of Medieval England,” 99–108.  
\textsuperscript{978} Bratchell, “Regulation and Group-Consciousness,” 585.  
\textsuperscript{979} Guidi-Bruscoli and Lutkin, “Perception, Identity and Culture,” 98.  
\textsuperscript{981} Bradley, “Italian Merchants in London,” 289.  
\textsuperscript{982} TNA C 1/31/321.  
\textsuperscript{983} TNA C 1/65/160.
Connections Overseas

Wealthier, resident aliens did not only seek to maintain connections with people within England, however, and habitation in London did not necessarily mean that aliens lost all ties with their home regions. Aliens could still be members of active kin and social networks even if they lived in England and other members of these networks lived overseas, and they could actively seek to foster contacts with members of these networks. Many alien merchants and sailors were not long-term settlers in England, and thus they often maintained connections with their homeland.984 This is evidenced in the wills of the Italian testators whose wills were proved in the London Commissary Court, such as those discussed above produced by Giorgio Spinulla (1470), Andrea di Labato (1493), and Leonardo Lambertyn (1492), who bequeathed goods to their family members abroad.985

That wealthier aliens had connections with their countries of origin is evidenced in legal narratives and probate material which indicate individuals as being members of a friendship or kinship network of people in their region of origin and keeping in contact with members of these groups even after their migration to London. Nicholas van Oyen, who had originated from Dordrecht in Holland, requested in his will (1456) for his relative called Leonard to ensure that all his goods and debts owed to him after the completion of the will went to his relative, Henry Williamson, who lived in Dordrecht.986 A story of an alien who lived in London yet returned to his region of origin to visit his relations was told as part of an early sixteenth century case heard in the Star Chamber (1528x1529). As part of his deposition on behalf of a litigant, the French alien Denis de Hewes stated that he was a householder in St Andrews parish London and that on the 15th of January 1528x1529 prior to his deposition he ‘went into Fraunce to see his frendes’ and returned to London soon afterwards.987 ‘Frend’ could refer to either friends in the modern-day usage but also kinship members.988 Chancery petitions analysed above also reflect a similar theme. The narratives concerning Arnold Andreus, Simon Hode and John Cullyn, for example, depict these individuals travelling back to their regions of origin for a temporary period before returning to England again.

984 The exception to this rule were the small number of Italian merchants in London who took out the citizenship, became settled and held property as noted in Bradley, “Italian Merchants in London,” 305, 344.
985 LMA MS 09171/006, f. 68v (Giorgio Spinulla), MS 09171/008, f. 50v (Andrea di Labato), MS 09171/008, f. 46 (Leonardo Lambertyn).
986 LMA MS 09171/005, f. 179v.
987 TNA STAC 2/10, f. 297. Denys stated that he went to France two days after the Feast of Saint Hilary in the 20th regnal year of Henry VIII. This was the 15th of January 1529.
988 MED, search term ‘frend’.
The Chancery petition of Matthew Beversthorpp (1486x1493 or 1504x1515), a goldsmith who lived in Southwark who had connections with Danzig, provides a narrative of a wealthy alien artisan who kept in contact with a family member abroad and who travelled to their natal town occasionally. The petition states that Matthew’s uncle George Stuche, the abbot of the Olive abbey in Prussia (Oliva abbey in modern day Gdansk/ Danzig), wrote to one George Prowite, a merchant, and asked him to deliver 20 pounds to Matthew on his behalf. Stuche had made a bill of debt to Prowite, in which it was agreed that 15 pounds should be given to Matthew in England and 5 pounds overseas. Three years later the abbot died without stating whether the money had been paid to Prowite. Since his death one Hanz Craco of the Hanse, servant or factor of George Prowite, had brought an action of debt against Matthew for the money. Matthew stated that he had petitioned the chancellor to cancel the legal action.989 Notably, Matthew stated that he had also collected part of the money in Prussia, even though he lived in England, which further highlights that aliens who lived in England might occasionally travel to their regions of origin. That wealthier alien artisans were able to maintain links with people in their areas of origin was not a phenomenon exclusive to the late medieval period. Lien Bich Luu noted that Dutch and French protestant refugees who lived in London in the late sixteenth century frequently kept in contact with their home regions.990 It also has parallels with patterns identified by scholars of twentieth–century migration in which migrants, particularly women, often maintain connections with family members abroad. Such work portrays immigrants as remaining part of their ‘households’ through linkages that cross beyond countries.991

Wealthier aliens in or near port settlements were able to keep in contact with family and friends abroad through letter correspondence, as is evidenced in the second book of The Book of Margery Kempe (1436x1438). Kempe was a merchant’s daughter of Lynn, a port with trading links with the Hanseatic Baltic and north European ports, from the late fourteenth to the mid-fifteenth century. The Book records that Margery had a son who had married a woman in Danzig and had lived with her there. He had travelled with his wife to Lynn in order to see Margery yet had died soon after. Margery’s daughter-in-law then lived with Margery for a year, but her ‘frendys which wer in Duchelond desyryn to have hir hom wretyn leetylrs to hir and

989 TNA C 1/115/40.
991 For this being demonstrated by female Irish migrants to Britain in the mid-nineteenth century see Ryan, “Family Matters: (e)migration, familial networks and Irish women in Britain,” 361–367; for the practice more generally see B. Jorden and F. Duvell, Migration: The Boundaries of Equality and Justice (Cambridge: Polity, 2003), 73; Boyd and J Nowak, “Social Networks and International Migration,” 81.
steryd hir to resortyn to hir owyn cuntre’. Italian merchant firms had bespoke courier services which carried letters to its agents abroad, and in London a network of couriers was in operation for the use of Italian agents who were trading there. Letters were essential instruments for medieval merchants and allowed merchants to keep in contact with their agents and business partners abroad. However, the Book suggests that aliens outside of mercantile companies could use letters to keep in contact with people from the areas which they had migrated from.

That letters could be used as a means of correspondence between aliens in England and their contacts abroad helps explain some aspects of Matthew Beversthorpe’s petition to the Chancery. Implicit within Matthew’s narrative is that there was some means through which he and his uncle could acquire information about each other’s whereabouts and the nature of each other’s affairs. Indeed, George Stuche, Matthew’s uncle, is recorded as having known where his nephew lived in England, and where to send a merchant to send him money, even though Matthew lived in Southwark and his uncle in Danzig. Matthew also allegedly knew about his uncle’s death three years after he went to ‘the parts of the Archduke’ (possibly Maximillian I Holy Roman Empire and Archduke of Austria) to collect part of the money bestowed to him by the same. Clues as to how Matthew kept in contact with his uncle are revealed when Matthew described his uncle’s relationship with the merchant who arranged his money to be sent to Matthew: his uncle ‘wrote to one George Prowas marchaunt desiryng hym by the same to delyuer’ it. The narratives of both and Matthew are set in Lynn and Southwark respectively. Both were settlements close to waterways connected to trade and more specifically, considering Southwark’s close proximity to the Steelyard in London, Hanseatic trade. In such places connected to trade routes letters would be most likely be sent by aliens to foreign ports in the hands of merchants or sailors. There was also surely scope for news and local gossip from an alien’s region of origin to reach them through the reports of others from their regions of origin, including sailors and merchants.

992 The Book of Margery Kempe, 390–391 (1.7560–7575).
Cultural Practice

That it was common for aliens in late medieval London to keep in contact with those of a similar cultural background to themselves, and that wealthier individuals could maintain contact with their regions of origin, raises the possibility that aliens practiced elements of their culture whilst in London. Such issues are particularly important to explore as it is possible that interacting with each other in culturally distinct ways was a means by which aliens could work towards their inclusion within alien networks in London. It is the intention of this section to explore whether there is evidence which demonstrates that aliens practiced behaviours, and interacted in ways, which were common in their regions of origin whilst in London. And also, if so, how far these cultural traits can be identified through the analysis of probate and legal records.

The historical record, however, is rarely informative on this matter. Scholars attempting to uncover cultural practices of foreign protestant communities in London and Norwich in later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries note the lack of information concerning immigrant culture. A similar issue is faced by historians of the later medieval period. Tax or civic governmental records only can hint at the cultural elements of aliens’ lives. Although more suggestive in this regard, probate and legal records rarely offer extensive evidence of specific cultural practices. The elements of culture which historians can now reconstruct using these sources are only those aspects which were at risk of being recorded in legal, probate and to some extent tax records. As such, we can only offer a faint outline of specific elements of alien culture and often know precious little about much cultural practice.

There is also an issue with the use of Chancery petitions to gauge the types of alien culture practiced in England. Even if an element of alien culture was at risk of being recorded within a petition we should remember that we do not have an unaltered, objective, description of that cultural trait told by the alien themselves. Instead, these aliens told a story to an English lawyer who then packaged the narrative in order that it fitted the requirements of a Chancery bill. In these petitions, then, we have narratives which have been filtered through the cultural lens of English lawyers. It is very likely that in certain petitions an English lawyer might describe alien cultural elements in language, and in a form, that was familiar to him as a native. Consequently, the element of alien culture is obscured, at least partially, from the historian’s

---

view. Take for example the petition of Reynold Harmanson discussed earlier in this chapter (1433x1443 or 1467x1472). His petition describes two Doche aliens who were involved in what is described as the ‘craffe of bruynyng’. Reynold is portrayed as being in service to his brewer master and that like a loyal servant he ‘brought divers and many vessels of ale’ to his customers, and as having angered his master by leaving his service and setting up a brew house in close proximity to his own.996 This allegedly led to Elys putting forward fake actions of debt and trespass against Elys. These individuals are clearly connected to other Doche aliens as Elys allegedly threatened Reynold that he would ensure the ‘all the Flemynges in London’ would beware him.997 As noted in Chapter II, Doche aliens in fifteenth–century London dominated the production of hopped beer and that beer at this point in time was a distinctive Doche drink consumed primarily by aliens. In late medieval England beer was perceived by the native populace as an alien drink as English people only started to consume more beer than ale from around the reign of Elizabeth I onwards.998

That Reynold’s petition depicts him as serving ‘ale’ to his master’s customers as opposed to beer seems strange and does not fit the clear pattern that Doche brewers with brew houses in the fifteenth century brewed beer and not ale. Our suspicions that Reynold actually was involved in beer, rather than ale, are confirmed by another petition of his to the Chancery (1475x1480 or 1483x1485) in which he is described as a ‘Berebruer’.999 Why, then, did the petition telling the story of Reynold’s dispute with his ex-master describe him as serving ‘ale’? The most satisfactory explanation is that English lawyer who wrote the petition used the word ale when describing Reynold’s work because ale was an element of food culture, and a term, that was more familiar to himself as an Englishman; in reality it is probable that Reynold helped his master brew beer. When moulding Reynold’s story into the form of a petition, the lawyer would not have been concerned to correctly distinguish the nuances between ale and beer, what was important is that he shaped Reynold’s story concerning the dispute with his master in such a way that it would convince the chancellor to provide aid. In his other petition, however, the label ‘Berebruer’ was provided just after Reynold’s name after the address to the chancellor, and the lawyer took care in being specific, by stating ‘Berebruer’ rather than ‘bruer’ generally, because it was an important piece of information which helped identify Reynold to the chancellor. This is not to argue that all lawyers described aspects of alien culture using English

996 Ale is my own emphasis.
997 TNA C 1/46/278.
999 TNA C 1/67/127.
terms when drafting petitions, and that the bills are of no use to reconstruct elements of alien culture in England. It should, however, serve as a reminder that in certain instances it is likely that elements of alien culture within petitions are hidden from us because they are described in the language, and through the cultural lens, of English lawyers.

Despite these issues, it is still possible to provide an outline of the cultural elements that certain alien groups maintained whilst in England using legal and probate material. The study of alien names is one avenue of research. The names of these aliens are very notable markers of alien culture. The use of the names recorded in the alien subsidy rolls to understand alien nomenclature has been limited, as these names are not those provided by the aliens themselves, but rather those which were provided by native jurors.\(^{1000}\) As a result, a large number of low-status aliens, or those without skilled occupations, are merely recorded with a second name which comprised of a national label ending with -man or -woman, e.g. John Frenshman or Joan Dutchwoman, which tells us how they were known to the English jurors and little about the names which aliens used themselves. Sources which record information provided by the individuals, in contrast, highlight some important patterns. Indeed, certain resident aliens could go by two names when living in England. Presumably one which they took up in England and one which was their original name. Perhaps the most notable example of this can be found in a will of a Doche migrant made in 1400 in which a Doche migrant named John stated that he was also called ‘Cristian van newe contrey’.\(^{1001}\)

There is evidence that suggests that aliens with two names in England often had one which aligned with either English nomenclature alongside their more obvious alien name. In 1480, a Milanese alien applied for letters of protection from the English Crown. He is recorded in the patent rolls as having two names John Bull and ‘John de Salareo’.\(^{1002}\) Salaro is now a commune of the city of Milan. John Bull is also recorded as a Milanese merchant in the 1468 alien subsidy assessment.\(^{1003}\) This highlights that the John Bulle in the petition was the Milanese alien John de Salareo.\(^{1004}\) For the official purpose of the acquisition of letters of protection, John clearly deemed it necessary to provide the two names he went by.

There are a number of instances in which men are recorded with two names, one which fitted native nomenclature and another that was distinctly alien. The painter Godfrey ‘\textit{alisus}


\(^{1001}\) LMA 09051/001/001, f. 84.

\(^{1002}\) CPR 1476–1485, 229 reproduced in the \textit{EIDB}.

\(^{1003}\) TNA E 179/236/111.

\(^{1004}\) CP 40/819, rot. 102.
Gobull’ de Duchberght, who made his will in 1408, likewise had two forenames, one which fitted with English nomenclature and another which did not.\textsuperscript{1005} The testament of John Bosylycan, citizen and cordwainer, which was proved in the Commissary Court of London in 1476 also highlights that he went by two names. He is referred to ‘\textit{Johannes Bosylycan alias dicte hans Bosylycan}’.\textsuperscript{1006} Similarly, one John Monke ‘\textit{alias dicte hans monke}’ was remembered in the will of a testator named Conrad Austyn (1458).\textsuperscript{1007} A clerk recording the testimony of a Doche witness in a case of marriage litigation brought to London’s Commissary Court in 1474 initially wrote the witnesses’ name as ‘Johannes’ Langerman, but afterwards deemed it necessary to include his other name ‘Hans’, which is interlined after ‘Johannes’.\textsuperscript{1008} In this case Langerman had provided the court with the two names which he went by. That these men were simultaneously called John and Hans is notable considering that ‘Hans’ is the Germanic form of the English ‘John’ which is \textit{Johannes} in Latin. Some individuals seem to have kept their original name but also had a name which linked them to their occupation. Thus, one Doche testator who was a goldsmith named John van Wessel also stated that he was known as John Goldsmith.\textsuperscript{1009}

Out of the two names which these individuals were recorded as having, one was clearly part of alien nomenclature and the other was more in line with native nomenclature or masked their alien name with an occupational equivalent. John de Salareo, John van Wessel, Gobull de Duchberght, Hans Bosylycan and Hans Langerman also went by the names John Bulle, John Goldsmith, Godfrey de Duchberght, John Bosylycan, and John Langerman respectively. That they referred to both their names in wills and other legal documents highlights that these individuals acknowledged that they went by more than one name in England. It can be said with certainty that John de Salareo, John van Wessel, and Hans Langerman were aliens, whereas the others have names suggestive of alien origin, although might have been second generation aliens. For those who we can certainly identify as aliens, and perhaps for the others, it is likely that they used their two names to fit different contexts. They may have had one name which appeared more English, or at least referred to an occupation, which they used when interacting with natives. They, then, could have used their original name when dealing with those of similar cultural origin to themselves. It is only in legal documents when it was
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important for these individuals to state the multiple names they went by that we see evidence of this naming practice. This raises an interesting question as to how far the large number of Doche aliens recorded in the alien subsidies as having forenames which match native nomenclature, such as John, were actually their anglicised names which the English assessors knew them by.1010

Food culture is a key part in the experience of many migrants.1011 This element of the alien experience is unfortunately rarely ever recorded in English legal and probate material. It is unlikely that this reflects that food culture was not important to aliens, rather that it was an element of culture which, in its nature, would seldom be referred to in civic, legal and probate records. Indeed, sometimes the odd reference hints that food played a greater role in the lives of migrants than the impression left by much of the London source material would have us believe. In 1311 a baker of London named John de Bledelow was called before the civic authorities for having made bread which weighed less than the standard halfpenny loaf of wastrel bread. In his defence, John claimed that he had not made the loaf for sale, but rather for the merchants of ‘Lombardy’ who had asked him to make bread of their own wheat. After this one ‘Chuccone’, a Lombard, acted as surety for John.1012 The most satisfactory explanation for this is that John was baking a form of bread for his wealthy Italian clients with wheat that could be not found in England to produce bread that suited their tastes.

Perhaps the clearest evidence that aliens sought to maintain elements of their food culture whilst in England are the presence of Doche beerbrewers in England. As noted in Chapter II, hopped beer production, in contrast to un-hopped ale, was introduced to England by aliens from the Low Countries, predominantly from Holland. Doche aliens dominated beer-manufacture and were the predominant drinkers of beer for the majority of the period under consideration here.1013 Doche aliens could make agreements with beerbrewers to ensure they had a supply of beer delivered to them. This is evidenced by the petition of William Reynold who lived in precinct of St Katherine’s Hospital to the east of city and petitioned Chancery between 1518 and 1529. William stated that he had married a widow named Ely who had lived

in St Katherines with her late husband named Garret. Garret had an arrangement with one Giles Harryson, a beerbrewer living in the same precinct, that Giles would deliver as much beer to Garret as he would drink ‘yn hys house’. Giles approached William and asked whether he would want to maintain the same arrangement as he had with Elys’ previous husband, and William agreed. Despite this, William alleged that Giles had demanded more money for this beer than he was due and kept on sending him beer even though William had terminated the agreement and had arranged for his beer to be delivered to his house by another brewer of St Katherines. Giles is portrayed as having brought an action of malicious debt against William purely because William ‘hath left hym and byth ber’ from the other beerbrewer. Particularly notable is the portrayal of the agreement between Garret and Giles for the latter to supply the former with beer considering both had names suggestive of Doche origin. Also, of interest is William’s argument that Giles levelled a malicious action of debt against him because he had left him for a rival beerbrewer, suggesting competition between brewers to serve the population St Katherines, which, as argued above, was an area with a high concentration of Doche aliens.

A similar agreement is depicted within the Chancery petition of one Andrew Woolson, a ‘brikemaker’ (1460x1465). Andrew stated that he lived in ‘lambith’ and had an agreement with a beerbrewer of Lambeth named Herry Johnson. Andrew stressed that the terms of the agreement were that if Andrew ‘wolde be serued of bere of the seid herry youre seid besecher shuld paye noe redy money therfore by brike and so euerich of hem shuld haue of other ware for ware’. Despite this, Andrew argued that Herry broke their agreement and had since demanded money. According to Andrew, this was particularly reprehensible because the agreement was not an unusual one as he had traded beer for his bricks before and also because Herry’s actions had stopped him acquiring beer from elsewhere:

‘youre seid besecher myght hauye ben seued of an other berebruer like as he was before of hym ware for ware had nought the seid herry […] endtendith to recover the seid money’.

That Doche aliens introduced new types of building design to England and dominated the production of bricks, brick laying, and designing from the early fifteenth century until around the 1480’s, and that Andrew is depicted as a consumer of beer in a mid–fifteenth–century context, makes it safe to view him as a Doche alien. Again, we can see an agreement between a Doche alien and a beerbrewer to supply beer to him. The agreed payment of bricks, moreover,
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is notable as construction with bricks had been a technique which had originated in the Low Countries, and alien brickmakers were known to be present in the construction of some of England’s first brick structures.\textsuperscript{1016} We should, then, read the narrative as an exchange between two aliens of products symbolic of northern continental culture in the mid-fifteenth century—brick for beer.

Out of all alien groups, the cultural traits of wealthy Mediterranean merchants, particularly those from Italy, are the clearest. Certain Italian cultural practices concerning dowry, other marriage negotiations and service were very distinctive from English practices. This, in turn, make them easier for the historian to identify within the historical record. Moreover, marriage negotiations as they concern the exchange of valuable goods, and service master relationships characteristic of Mediterranean culture, as labour owned by a master, were elements of culture which were at risk of being recorded in legal and probate documents as they were deemed important enough to mention in their wills and make legal suits to protect. Combined, these two elements mean that certain Italian cultural practices can be gleaned from probate and legal records. Previous scholarship has identified that many Italians chose not to attempt to take on English cultural practices as few sought permanent residence. Despite this, there has been little discussion concerning which cultural traits Italians chose to maintain beyond brief references to language and perhaps their dress.\textsuperscript{1017}

Evidence that Italians interacted with one another in ways reminiscent of behaviour in Italy can be found in the petition of a merchant of Piedmont within the context of a marriage negotiation. Antony de Sala petitioned the chancellor about the actions of one John Bulle, broker (1475x1480 or 1483x1485). Elements within Antony’s bill make it likely that he was a long-term inhabitant of London, one of the small number of Italians who stayed as long-term agents for wider family mercantile groups, or acted as commission agents.\textsuperscript{1018} He stated in his bill that he had agreed with John Bulle to marry John’s servant Jane Witmiefferd. This is the same John Bulle (Bole) discussed above who was also named ‘John de Salareo’. Considering Jane’s name, and that the Italian community in London was predominantly male with the


\textsuperscript{1017} Bruscoli and Lutkin, “Perception, Identity and Culture,” 142, 162; Bratchell, “Regulation and Group-Consciousness,” 595.

\textsuperscript{1018} Guidi-Bruscoli and Lutkin, “Perception, Identity and Culture,” 149; see also Ruddock, \textit{Italian Merchants and Shipping in Southampton}, 99–101.
exceptions of the wives some of the more senior members of the Italian community, it is possible that she was English.\textsuperscript{1019} Antony stated that he agreed to the marriage because John had promised to pay for the furs, or ‘pellures’, which she was to wear on her wedding.\textsuperscript{1020} The petition then notes that John had asked William Danyell, a skinner of London, to deliver the furs to Jane. William did so, and Antony and Jane were married. John and William then allegedly had levelled an accusation of debt against Antony for the furs, but for some reason William and John did not follow the prosecution through and promised that they would resolve amongst themselves. After this, they brought Antony to court again so that they did not have ‘to pay for the seid pellures’. The jury found that he should pay the debt, which is why Antony petitioned the Chancery.\textsuperscript{1021}

Antony described the marriage negotiations between himself and John in his bill because the narrative that John had allegedly broken the promise to pay for the furs was essential to his argument that John had acted against conscience. The description of the agreement simultaneously portrays the payment for the furs as part payment to Jane and a gift to Antony:

‘by force of which agreement your seid Besecher thereupon married the same jane for the which maryage and also for servuce berfortyme doon to the seid john bulle by the seid jane the same john graunted to your seid besecher to pay for the Appariall of the persone of the seid jane the day of the seid maryage’\textsuperscript{1022}

John’s agreement with Antony concerning the furs reflects that Italians in London held Italian attitudes concerning the responsibilities of a groom toward his bride as part of the marriage agreement. The furs which John promised to give Jane on her wedding day are depicted as payment in recompense for her service to him. They are, however, also described as a gift, or favour, to Antony as he did not have to pay for Jane’s wedding clothes. As such, it would have been Antony’s obligation, as the groom, to pay if it were not for John’s offer. This has striking parallels with the responsibility which Italian grooms had to provide clothing for their wives.

\textsuperscript{1019} Guidi-Bruscoli and Lutkin, “Perception, Identity and Culture,” 96–97; Bratchell, “Regulation and Group-Consciousness,” 593.

\textsuperscript{1020} Pellures refers to a high-quality fur. MED, under pelūr(e) (n.).

\textsuperscript{1021} TNA C 1/66/408; Antony put forward a Chancery petition which, again, alleged that the same John Bulle and William Danyell had maliciously alleged that Antony owed them debt, yet there is no mention of Jane or any furs C 1/64/300. It is not possible to establish which petition was sent to the Chancery first due to the ambiguity of the dates (both date from 1475x1480 or 1483x1485), but that there are two separate bills makes it very likely that Antony’s first bill was rejected from the court and he had to send another.
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in the period directly before, during and after the nuptial period. The expense of these marital gifts of clothing would take up a very large part of the dowry payment a husband received.\textsuperscript{1023} This was common practice within many Italian states, as gifts given by a husband to a bride are frequently recorded in marriage contracts from the southern region of Apulia, and Venetian occupied Crete, as well as Florence.\textsuperscript{1024} John is depicted as having encouraged Antony to marry Jane by having promised to pay for the furs which, according to ‘Italian’ culture, Antony would have had to purchase himself. Antony argued in his petition that it was ‘in trust of which promyssse the same your besecher agreed to the seid maryage’. The agreement between Antony and John was one based on the cultural assumptions about the responsibilities of a groom in Italian culture, and it is rare evidence of men from the Italian peninsula interacting with each other in ways akin to their culture of origin.

Testamentary evidence from London highlights that Italians attempted to fulfil obligations that pertained to husbands and fathers in their regions of origin, which further underlines that they maintained cultural attitudes prevalent within Italian culture. Indeed, certain wills created by Italian testators who knew they would die in England demonstrate a desire to give instructions to their executors to ensure that the matters concerning the dowries for their female relatives or widows were settled after their death. In doing so they ensured that they fulfilled their role as either a husband or father in Italian culture. The will of Georgio Spinulla (1470), a Genoese merchant, stipulates that if his wife Mariola wished to remarry after his death she ‘\textit{habeat de bonis meis saltim dotem suam}’.\textsuperscript{1025} In the Italian states, when husbands acquired the dowry they could use it in whatever way they wished, but were expected that to ensure that their estate had enough money to pay the dowry back to the wife when she became a widow.\textsuperscript{1026} Georgio had clearly invested the dowry into some of his ‘goods’ and he instructed Mariola to reclaim the dowry from amongst them. When Leonardo Lambertyn made his testament in 1492, he was concerned that his young daughter should have a dowry when she came of age. Within Mediterranean culture it was the father’s duty to provide a dowry for his daughters. Dowries were deemed so important to marriage that certain Italian cities had
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communal dowry funds to help poor women marry.\textsuperscript{1027} Leonardo, then, wished for his daughter Margarete to have 20s. sterling, all his goods and chattels within his house in Bruges in addition to a chest and the chattels of his in another house in Bruges when she was to come of marriageable age.\textsuperscript{1028} The chattels in his house were not only part of a dowry, but also likely supposed to form part of the trousseau which wives were expected to bring to her husband’s household soon after their marriage. These often consisted of items such as bed linen which Margarete could have acquired from her father’s house in Bruges.\textsuperscript{1029}

Elite alien merchants from Italy and Spain who stayed in England long enough to warrant them to bring their wives and households to London could also bring over their female domestic slaves. This is notable because domestic slavery as a sign of status was a feature of the Mediterranean world. It was distinct from serfdom in England, which was waning as an institution in the fifteenth century, and domestic slavery was not part of late medieval English culture.\textsuperscript{1030} Indeed, although recent research suggests that some Icelandic aliens were trafficked from their homeland and used as slaves for craft labour in fifteenth century Bristol, this is a distinctly different form of slavery than the practice of keeping female domestic slaves, who were often bought as exotic luxuries, in Italy and Spain.\textsuperscript{1031} The Chancery petition of one Mary Moriana (1486x1493) and the testament of a Spanish merchant in London named Diego Sanchez (1537) indicate that the elite Mediterranean merchants in London kept slaves in their households, and that in doing so they maintained a distinct element of their culture whilst in England.

Mary Moriana’s petition states that Mary had served her master Philip Syne ‘of Venyce’ for around twenty years, with her only remuneration being ‘meyte drynke and cloth’ but he had fallen upon financial difficulties and had tried to sell her to ‘Domynyk merchant of Jeyne (Genoa)’. Mary refused this sale, but Philip subsequently devised a means to force her to agree to the transaction. The petition reads that he feigned fondness for Mary and tricked her into sealing a document that he led her to believe he would pass all the debts that he was owed onto her; what she actually sealed was an obligation which made her indebted to Philip. When a
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notary had drawn up the document and Philip had made Mary seal it, Philip then ‘commenced an accion of dette’ against her in the Sheriffs’ Court of London which resulted in her imprisonment. Philip would only drop the charge of debt if she agreed to be sold to Dominic. Philip was a Venetian merchant with links with both Southampton and London. There is no indication within the petition as to how long Philip and Mary had stayed in London, yet Mary states that she had served Philip for twenty years. A man with the same name as Philip was recorded in the 1463 and 1464 alien subsidy assessments as a householder in Southampton. Considering that it was common for Italian merchants in Southampton to have trading connections with London, as many goods brought to Southampton on Italian ships were moved overland to London, the man recorded in Southampton was the same Philip. As noted by Beattie, on the basis that the petition was addressed to archbishop of Canterbury, the petition either dates from 1486x1496 or 1504x1515, yet the references to Philip in the alien subsidies makes it likely that it was sent to Chancery in the earlier time period. There is not explicit reference that Phillip was living in London at the time when Mary petitioned the court, however. That Phillip had put forward an action of debt against her in the Sheriffs’ Court means that she was with him in London at the time of the action.

The petition is not clear as to what the relationship between Mary and Philip was and she is only described as having served Philip. One way of reading the petition would be that Mary was Philip’s servant. One may point out that Philip’s promise to give her some of the debts owed to him, and that she was only paid with food and clothes, resembles the agreements between masters and young female servants in fifteenth–century Florence. There masters provided their servants with food, clothing and lodging, and the only payment that they received was that of a dowry at the end of their term of service which was normally at the time of their marriage. This interpretation is problematic. The petition states that Philip had tried to sell her, and although their masters in Italy might rent the services of female servants to third-parties, this was not the same as selling them. Servants were contracted workers but were not property of the master. It makes more sense to view Mary as Philip’s slave. This can explain why the petition states that Philip had attempted ‘to sell your seid oratrice’. Slavery
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was practiced in Italian culture and female slaves were more frequently sold than males.\textsuperscript{1037} It may also be significant that Philip, a Venetian, had attempted to sell Mary to Domini, who was a Genoese merchant, as Venice and Genoa were the Italian states in which the slave trade was most prevalent.\textsuperscript{1038}

Theoretically it was only acceptable in Italy to own a slave if they had come from outside of Christian Europe, so slave traders were forced to go outside of Europe to find slaves.\textsuperscript{1039} Many slaves in Italy after the fall of Constantinople (1453) came from North Africa.\textsuperscript{1040} This context combined with the label ‘Moriana’ provided after Mary’s name further supports the argument that she was a slave and makes it likely that she had originated from northern Africa.\textsuperscript{1041} In the analysis of Chancery petitions undertaken for this thesis, all Chancery petitions are described with their first and second name, and I have found no other instance in which aliens have an ‘ethnic’, linguistic, or national label as their second name such as ‘Dutchman’ or ‘Frenchman’. If a petition does include such a label, it is provided after the petitioner’s full first and second name. Considering the convention of a petition was to include the first and second name, the term ‘Moriana’ next to her first name should be seen as something that was included by the lawyer who wrote the petition to fit the form of a Chancery bill, not as a second name. It seems, then, that Mary did not actually have a second name, and that one had to be substituted with an ‘ethnic’ label to work within the Chancery petition form.

Alwyn Ruddock and Judith Bennett have described Mary as a servant.\textsuperscript{1042} Cordelia Beattie has suggested the possibility of her being a slave.\textsuperscript{1043} The petition does not describe Mary as a slave explicitly. The bill although not explicitly referring to Mary as a servant, uses language highly suggestive of the service of a domestic servant. Thus, it states that she had ‘dwelled in the service’ of Philip and that Philip had promised to repay her ‘for hir seid seruice’. It also states that the only remuneration she had received was with ‘meyte drynke and cloth’, which in an English context would be understood as situating her as a live-in servant.\textsuperscript{1044} We should recall, however, that petitions were written by English lawyers who structured and reworted the petitioner’s story to fit the requirements of a Chancery petition. As such, we do
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not have access to the story that Mary told the English lawyer, rather we have a narrative that has been filtered through an English lawyer’s legal and cultural lens and perhaps also the person who translated her story into English because, as she argued in her petition, she spoke no English or Latin. As such, one of the reasons that the petition’s terms have strong connotations of service, and not slavery, is likely that Mary’s lawyer attempted to phrase the concept of slavery in terms that would be more familiar to himself and the chancellor. The ownership of female domestic slaves in households, as exotic luxuries, was part of elite Italian culture and would have been alien to a native such as her lawyer. Therefore, Mary’s lawyer likely couched slavery in the more familiar language of ‘service’ which, as noted in Chapter II, could refer to any form of service to another and not only that of a domestic servant.

A remarkable will of a Spanish merchant named Diego Sanchez (1537) who lived in London offers more explicit evidence that elite Mediterranean householders could retain a distinctive cultural element through the ownership of female slaves in England. Like in Italy, domestic slavery was an accepted institution in medieval and early modern Iberia and most of slaves from the mid-fifteenth century onwards originated from northern Africa. Diego’s will is remarkable as it records his provisions for the slave concubine under his control, his two daughters whom he had fathered with her, and his wife Eleanor de la Palma. Eleanor was made an executor of the will and is described as a ‘straunger’ in London, highlighting that she was in the city when the will was made. A woman named Joan is named as Diego’s ‘slave’ and Diego willed that Joan should serve his wife for two years after his death which highlights that she also lived within his household in London. We know that Joan was also Diego’s concubine as he remembers two ‘wynches which I have had by the said Johan my slave, named oon Agnes and tother Mary’, these daughters were described by Diego as being ‘in my hous’. Diego was a Spanish merchant, who lived in London ‘in the parisshe of St Bennett’ and, considering the presence of his wife, slave and daughters, it is likely that so was he was not on a fleeting business trip to the capital. It is explicitly recorded that the will was first written in Spanish and then translated by a Portuguese man named John Deez and written down by a notary, and the copy of the will which survive is this English version.
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That Diego kept his slave in England, a realm in which domestic slavery did not exist as an institution, provides evidence of elite Spanish merchants maintaining an element of their culture whilst in England. The will also reflects that Spanish slave masters in England could practice similar behaviours toward their slave women as they did in their homeland. Although inserting the stipulation that she had to continue as a slave for two years, Diego promised Joan’s freedom after this service as well as four ducats of ‘gold or the value therof’. In doing so he followed a common practice in Spain whereby masters freed their slaves in their wills and ensured that they had enough money to maintain an honourable life thereafter.\textsuperscript{1048} Diego also proposed a gift of clothing to Joan. He identified this as being connected to her freedom: ‘I wool she shall be free and than I wool shalbe gevyn her raiment to her body, which shalbe at the direcion of my wyf’.\textsuperscript{1049} The clothing acted as a symbolic gift, the gifting of which represented freedom being handed over from owner to slave. Since Eleanor would be Joan’s owner after his death, only she could give Joan her freedom, and thus the clothing, after two years if she had served ‘truly and honestly’.

One telling element of the lives of Mary and Joan which reflects their subjugation is that they lived in England not under their actual first names, but rather those which had been imposed upon them. As noted above, it is very likely that these women had originated from northern Africa. The names ‘Mary’ and ‘Joan’ suggest that these women lived with the names which had been insisted upon them after enslavement and their baptism. Joan’s first name is significant. From the mid-fifteenth century, the majority of slaves who came into Spain were Muslims who had been taken from Northern Africa, had been baptised, and were given Christian names. Generally, there was a narrow pool of names given to these female slaves and Joan, or Johana, was one of the most popular, making it likely that it was one which was imposed upon her.\textsuperscript{1050} As noted by Beattie, Mary Moriana also likely lived in England with a name that had been imposed upon her. That Mary’s name was one which was forced upon her is likely as Mary was a common name given by Italian slave owners to non-Christian female slaves due to its clear Christian connotations.\textsuperscript{1051}

Overall, it is clear that aliens could practice elements of their own culture in England, and the evidence points to particular alien groups interacting with each other in ways akin to
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the cultural mores of their regions of origin. However, it is not possible to reconstruct anything like a full image of the cultural elements that aliens chose to maintain whilst living in England, and how these cultural elements influenced how aliens interacted with one another, utilising legal and probate material alone. The picture presented here is incomplete and provides something of an optical illusion. We can only see fragments of the cultural traits of aliens. Testaments and the legal records used here only allow us to see specific aspects of the cultural life of aliens as it privileges certain cultural elements of particular groups and is silent concerning the cultural traits of other groups entirely. There are two main reasons for this. The first is that usually we can only view the culture of a very wealthy, and elite, group of aliens because their wealth means that they appear more prominently in probate and legal records. As such, we can sketch a faint outline of some of cultural traits held by elite Mediterranean, usually Italian, merchants, yet know very little about that of poorer migrants from other regions. The second issue is that we only see the cultural aspects of immigrant lives which were at risk of being recorded in the historical record.

For more research on Italian cultural practice in London see forthcoming work by Stefania Merlo Perring.
Conclusion

This thesis has utilised legal and probate records to reconstruct aspects of the lives of individual aliens to explore the strategies aliens undertook to survive and settle whilst in London and its suburbs and the options they had to achieve this. In doing this, it has contributed significantly to the existing scholarship concerning the alien experience, the lives of aliens and their personal connections within the capital. The thesis helps fill lacunae within scholarship concerning the alien experience through exploring the importance for aliens of membership of social networks and formal groups within London’s social fabric, how they might become members of such groups, the kinds of support they might obtain through membership and, more generally, the strategies they deployed to survive and settle within the capital.

That the sources drawn upon for this study were largely made in London and privilege the better off has the consequence that the thesis focusses more on the Doche, or very wealthy Italian aliens, over other groups. The frequency with which Italians are represented within the historical record can be partially explained by their wealth and trading practices in the capital, which ensured that elements of their lives were recorded more frequently in legal and probate sources. The strong presence of the Italians within the material used for this thesis can be misleading in the sense that it skews our understanding of the migrant experience: we know a disproportionate amount concerning this small group of elite men. That legal and probate sources tend to privilege Doche aliens, on the other hand, is less of an optical illusion presented by the source base. Indeed, it should be remembered that the alien subsidies indicate that migrants from the Low Countries and German states were by far the most numerous alien groups in London and its suburbs.

Throughout the thesis I have used aspects of alien lives, and elements of narratives about aliens presented within legal contexts, to address two driving questions: what strategies did aliens undertake to survive and settle in London? What could they do to overcome the issues associated with uprooting to a new environment? Posing these questions of the source material, and using individual lives as the unit of analysis, has allowed me to write a history which privileges the migrant perspective. My concern to reconstruct aspects of alien lives to assess the actions they undertook to survive and settle, and the options they had to do so, is a methodology which lends itself to the use of the sociological concept of belonging. I have used ideas regarding the belonging concept as a means to conceptualise an individual’s belonging
within, and their non-belonging to, formal and informal groups, and have explored a number of these ideas using medieval source material. Thus, I explore the groups which people might belong or not belong to and the criteria for belonging to these groups; the means by which they could achieve these criteria; how the parameters of belonging might have changed in certain contexts; and the mechanisms through which aliens might be excluded from these groupings.

A common aspect of the alien experience runs throughout the thesis and stands out as being of fundamental importance for resident aliens. Resident aliens of a mid-high socio-economic status actively worked to establish and maintain connections with others to affirm their belonging within social networks. For example, Doche goldsmiths in and around Lombard Street, as well as the beerbrewers in St Boltolph parish, Aldgate, fostered ties with other aliens in similar occupations to themselves to participate in Doche occupational networks. Certain aliens also sought to establish ties with natives. This is reflected in the Chancery petitions of aliens such as Matthew Peti who told the chancellor that he had married an Englishwoman and felt obliged to help one of her kin, or Peter Fermyngeus and Gabriel de Poza who portrayed themselves as frequent visitors of native households. The wills of both Doche and Italian aliens also clearly highlight that it was common for aliens to maintain ties with people of a similar cultural background to themselves in London, which affirmed their inclusion within alien networks. This is also reflected in legal narratives: Leonard Peterson, Jacob Cremer, William Grenekyn, George Laurence and Derik Vanhove, from St Martin’s Le Grand, collectively petitioned Star Chamber to complain of the actions of an official who allegedly harassed their Doche neighbours. Moreover, aliens would often keep in close contact with family members who had also migrated to the city and elsewhere in England to affirm their position within webs of kin. This is indicated in the deposition of Frenchman John Paynaminuta who told the Consistory court that he had come to London, then lived in Salisbury diocese for a short period before moving back to London where his brother lived, indicating that he had known previously where his brother had settled, or Peter Camur who related to the chancellor that he had connections with his kinswoman living in London which meant that she came to visit him when he was imprisoned.

It was the potential benefits of membership within these social networks which encouraged aliens to actively foster connections with their members; participation within these
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1055 LMA MS DL/C/A/001/MS 09065, 222v-223r; TNA C 1/46/39.
groupings gave aliens access to help and to companionship. The access to support which membership of different networks offered aliens is what petitioners to Chancery, such as, inter alia, Gerard van Scouneburgh, Piers Hawes and Andrew Tewell, alluded to when they stressed that they were strangers and not known by anyone in the city. Indeed, they portrayed themselves as outside any networks of people within London to emphasise that they lacked the support that participation in such networks might offer and consequently needed the chancellor’s help to obtain justice. For certain aliens, such as the cooper Peter van Inggelyn connected to Doche beerbrewers of the same parish, such as Herman Stale, ensuring inclusion within these networks would have been very important for occupational success. The support that membership of alien networks might offer an individual was such that, in an attempt to show that his old employer had acted against conscience, Reynold Harmenson claimed he had threatened to alienate Reynold from his Doche contacts by making Flemings ‘beware’ of him. Aliens were also able to access help and support by maintaining their positions within kinship networks in England. This can be seen in the petitions of Laurence Teymonson and Arnold Andreus who told the chancellor that family members had approached them for aid. This mutual help and trust between kin has been previously noted by scholars studying the Italian ‘nations’ in London as a key element of trading success. It is reflected in the petition of the Florentine merchant Stolde Altevite which relates how Stolde’s cousin, Carolus, had kept a chest full of trading documents on his behalf. Although not all aliens in London and its suburbs would have stayed in the London region for all their lives, the necessity of personal connections in a late medieval environment would mean that even those who stayed in the city for only a few years would still have had to undertake the work of belonging to some degree.

A comparison of the findings presented throughout the chapters highlights that members of networks were often willing to provide support and companionship to others within the group. For example, the Doche widow Silvester van Houte was depicted as having ‘endured’ the dangers of widowhood by her ‘freindes help and socour’ (‘friendes’ could refer to kin or to un-related acquaintances here). The beerbrewer Godfrey Speryng, in his deposition in the Consistory Court, portrays himself as a facilitator of the marriage between
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Marion Lauson and Laurence Gilis, another Doche beerbrewer. He also depicts himself as a confidant to Laurence, which is highly indicative of the companionship offered by Doche aliens who were members of occupational networks. That members of a network could offer help to one another was another dimension of the belonging process. The act of helping members of a network was one of the means by which an individual might achieve the key criterion of inclusion within it; the very act of providing support to people within an informal social group was a way for an alien to reinforce connections with people within the group and thus to undertake the constant work that their inclusion required. Moreover, as McIntosh argues, providing support to people within an informal web of people could build up an individual’s social ‘credit’ upon which they could draw when they themselves were in need, as the people who they had helped previously would feel a sense of obligation towards them.

This thesis focuses on how aliens negotiated belonging and what they sought to achieve. This not to say, however, that all connections which aliens had were unambiguously positive and could be converted into value-producing assets. Like all human relationships, these relations had the potential to turn sour. McSheffrey observes that aliens in the sanctuary of St Martin’s Le Grand could take advantage of one another. Colson notes that the ordinances of the Doche fraternity of the Holy Blood of Wilsnack included provisions for any disputes amongst their membership to be resolved within a fraternity setting. Moreover, the legal narratives from which we can glimpse patterns concerning the alien experience often reached legal fora because a dispute had arisen between and alien and someone else, whether a native or an alien of a similar cultural background to themselves. Such narratives have been of particular use in this study because as well as recording a disagreement they also indirectly shed light upon the forms of support that they offered to one another prior to the dispute.

Berry suggests that alien sociability was less centred around their neighbourhood than that of natives and that aliens were more likely to have connections outside of their immediate vicinity. The evidence analysed throughout the analysis gives an impression regarding the spatial dimension of Doche and French social connections. Chancery petitions, and wills made by testators from a range of London parishes and proved in the Archdeaconry and Commissary Courts, are not comprehensive lists of the social contacts of aliens. Both sources moreover only

---

1062 MS DL/C/A/001/MS 09065, 86rv.
1066 Berry, “Margins and Marginality,” 153–155
sporadically record the place of residence of individuals connected to aliens. The image they present, however, suggest no clear patterns concerning the spatial aspect of alien sociability: Doche and French migrants show contacts with native individuals from their own parish, from other areas of London or England at large, or a combination of the above. Some clearly had ties with individuals living in their parish. One Christian ‘van newe contrey’ (1400), a parishioner of St Mary at Hill, made Henry Cokam, the rector of the church, one of his executors.\textsuperscript{1067} Isabel van de Brake (1412), of the parish of St Anne and Agnes, made Henry Feld, the rector of her church, her executor.\textsuperscript{1068} Nannyenge Petirson, a cordwainer who lived in the parish of St Sepulchre beyond Newgate in West Smithfield, an eastern suburb of London, described himself as living on the street of Saint John in his will (1474). He made both Nicholas Hynde and William Flete, who he named as living on the same street, his executors.\textsuperscript{1069} John Rowland of Normandy, a witness for the plaintiff in a marriage case brought before the London Consistory, had married an English woman who also lived in his parish of St Sepulchre beyond Newgate.\textsuperscript{1070} A similar theme of local social ties is reflected in the Chancery petition (1533x1538) of the Frenchman John Malyard, of the parish of Saint John Zachary, who was in a dispute with his co-parishioner John Hart. Malyard explained in his petition (1533x1538) that he used always to go to Hart’s house with ‘the good wyl and faver of the said hart ther to drynke […] and to make mery wit the said hart’.\textsuperscript{1071}

Other aliens had strong ties with individuals who lived outside of their immediate vicinity. In his Chancery petition (1433x1443 or 1467x1472), John De Sawd ‘born in zeland now dwelling in London’ explained that he ‘hath been aqueynted and diverse tyme in fellowship’ with Thomas Scot, a servant of the tailor John Sklton who lived in Southwark. De Sawd alleged that when Thomas left the service of his master, the tailor levied a legal action against him accusing him of encouraging Thomas to leave his position, supposedly because De Sawd and Thomas had ‘so gret knowlyche and diverse tymes of company’ with each other.\textsuperscript{1072} Derik van Riswik of ‘the Dukedom of Burgoign’, who rented a house in the London parish of Saint Swithins, had Walter Metyngham of Westminster act as a pledge in his Chancery suit (1433x1443 or 1467x1472).\textsuperscript{1073} Testators of middle to high socio-economic status might
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concurrently have both local and wider ties. David van de Hoke (1493), citizen and parishioner of St Martin Orgar, who was very likely Doche bequeathed 12d. to the parish fraternity of St Sebastian. This suggests connections within the parish, but he also had ties with the Dominican friars of London Blackfriars in the south-west of the city as he made one brother John his executor.\textsuperscript{1074} The Doche chaplain of Saint Olave’s parish, John van Lyre, acted as a surety for the debt of Cornelius Cost who lived in Queenhithe ward in the city.\textsuperscript{1075} As evidenced in the petition of Matthew Beversthorpe, and the deposition of Denis De Hewes, aliens were able to maintain social ties with friends and family members in their regions of origin.\textsuperscript{1076} As such, I have not found any clear pattern regarding the spatial dimension of alien sociability in the city, at least amongst Doche and French aliens; the impression given by the sources analysed here is that aliens of these groups might have connections with people in their immediate locality, but also with people elsewhere in the city and beyond its boundaries. This has parallels with Rosser’s analysis of Doche aliens in Westminster, which indicated that they tended to congregate in similar areas in the vill – which points to localised sociability – yet aliens testators also mentioned other Doche aliens in London and its suburbs in their wills.\textsuperscript{1077} Future research might test this impression by deploying a social network analysis of alien testaments.

I have used the term ‘formal group’ to denote groups with defined entry requirements and rules as to how their members should act, such as religious fraternities or craft guilds, or which conferred certain legal rights and privileges upon their members.\textsuperscript{1078} I have used the term ‘informal group’ to refer to networks of people bound together by interpersonal ties but without formal entry requirements. Numbers of aliens clearly sought inclusion within more formal groups in order to access certain benefits. Thus, Toger Erlestoles petitioned the chancellor that he had acquired London citizenship which then allowed him the right to buy unfinished cloth in quantity, dress it, and ‘selle theym again to his most aduantage’.\textsuperscript{1079} Resident aliens of a middling-high status like Toger could become members of formal groupings such as one of London’s craft guilds, and thus be a member of the city franchise, or of religious fraternities. For example, Dedericus van Rien and John Gyse of Antwerp both bequeathed money to
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fraternities in their parish churches. The particularly wealthy, resident aliens, like the Doche beer brewer Laurence Gilis, might even take out letters of denization and become a member of the body of English subjects.

The distinction between informal and formal groups has been made for the sake of clarity, but they both belong to a continuum which ranges from the very informal to the highly formal and are by no means mutually exclusive. Dedericus van Rien and John Gyse, as previously noted, were members of fraternities situated in their parish church and were thus members of more formal groups. Membership of such groups however gave them a platform to socialise with other members of the group and thus the opportunity to access informal social networks that might prove useful outside of the fraternity context. Similarly, some of the Doche goldsmiths discussed above were members of the goldsmiths’ fraternity of Saint Eloi within the church of St Nicholas Acon. Although this was technically membership of a formal group, the opportunities for socialising and communal activities it presented almost certainly helped members reinforce their inclusion within the network of Doche goldsmiths in the Lombard Street area.

The experience of middling to high status resident aliens, then, revolved in large part upon their belonging in various social networks and more formal groups within London society and indeed beyond it. Resident aliens were those who had moved to a new locality where they were less well known than they had been in their regions of origin. They lived in London for sustained periods of time. Some even moved there permanently. This was potentially very problematic for them as the importance of kin and community ties as means of support, as well as for economic and political advancement, has been frequently noted by scholars of late medieval England. The findings presented in this thesis highlight that many of the wealthier, aliens sought to maintain connections with members of different social networks, either new acquaintances in London or friends and kin who had previously migrated there, to affirm inclusion within informal webs of support to survive and orientate themselves in the city. They
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also participated in formal groupings to the same end, as well as to acquire the legal benefits that membership of these groups might offer. By privileging belonging, my approach offers a more comprehensive understanding of alien sociability in London than previous scholarship that focuses narrowly on the role of alien-only fraternities, the connections of Italian merchants, or have focused on whether aliens had ties natives or other aliens to measure levels of ‘assimilation’ or ‘integration’.

Exploring the facets of belonging in relation to the lives of alien individuals offers a significant challenge to the way in which historians have conceptualised contact between aliens and natives and the incorporation of aliens into native society. Previous scholarship uses the terms integration or assimilation to describe how aliens were absorbed or were not absorbed into native society whether that be London society, the native populace or English society, as if these were homogenous blocs of which an individual might become part. This scholarship also presents integration or assimilation as an essentially binary process: either an individual had fused within these ‘whole societies’, had reached certain benchmarks of integration, or had failed to be incorporated within them.\(^{1085}\) This thesis has stressed how thinking about aliens in terms of assimilation or integration hides the evident complexity of their lives. We should not consider aliens in London as being either integrated or not integrated within ‘London society’. Rather, individual aliens were included within, and did not belong to, various groups simultaneously whether that be the networks and solidarities within London, or indeed beyond it. For example, as noted throughout the thesis, an alien might be part of informal social networks within the city as well as a member of a devotional fraternity in their parish church yet might not be a London citizen or a subject of the English crown. Clear examples of this are most of Doche testators studied in this thesis, such as David van Den Hoke, who had a range of social contacts in the city, and were part parish fraternities, yet were never recorded in the Patent Rolls as having acquired letters of denization.\(^{1086}\) Resident aliens were also often members within social networks which extended beyond the boundaries of the city itself, either elsewhere in England or overseas. This is indicated in the wills of Andrea di Labato, Leonardo Lambertyn and Giorgio Spinulla, who bequeathed goods to family members back in the Italian states, or in the Star Chamber deposition of Denys de Hewes, a householder and artisan of
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London, who visited his ‘frendes’ in France before soon returning to London afterwards.\textsuperscript{1087} Such aliens should not be seen as ‘integrated’ or ‘not integrated’ within London or English society. Rather they should be viewed as occupying multiple positions of belonging. We might usefully conceptualise an individual alien as occupying a position in the centre of overlapping circles within a Venn diagram, with each circle representing a formal or informal group.\textsuperscript{1088} The diagram for each individual would usually differ from that of others in important ways and there would be various circles which individuals were not part of at all.

I have discussed the strategies aliens followed to get to know natives in chapter III, and in Chapter IV I explored how aliens sought to foster connections with individuals of a similar cultural background to themselves. This is an artificial division which I have made for the sake of clarity. The preceding chapters have argued that individual aliens might be included within various social networks and formal groups, and that wealthy, resident aliens had connections with both natives and other aliens. It is with this perspective in mind that we should view the wills of alien testators who made bequests to both aliens and natives. A few examples demonstrate this point. Everard van do Vyn, a goldsmith who made his will in 1427, remembered one ‘dererico van water’. He also remembered one John Barbour, a tailor and citizen of London, whose name is suggestive of native origin.\textsuperscript{1089} In 1407 Bertram Ducheman made one William ‘ducheman’ an executor of his will, yet Thomas Lytleworth and John Hattefeld acted as the witnesses to the same document.\textsuperscript{1090} Lambert Cour’ (1405) bequeathed money to his Doche confessor Godfrey de Saude, but the citizens Thomas Sutton and John Iford acted as witnesses to his will.\textsuperscript{1091} Thrupp uses the fact that aliens remembered natives in their wills to paint an image of harmony between aliens and natives.\textsuperscript{1092} Bolton challenges this view and points out that both aliens and natives are remembered and named as executors in alien wills. He argues, then, that because testators had a mix of social contacts from both groups their usefulness as evidence of ‘assimilation’ is not so clear as Thrupp supposed and is one of the reasons he concludes that ‘it is difficult to draw a convincing picture of an alien community at one with the Londoners from this scrappy evidence’.\textsuperscript{1093}
Rather than thinking about this evidence in terms of the binary notions of assimilation and integration, it is more useful to view the presence of both natives and aliens within these wills as evidence that resident aliens could be concurrently part of networks of aliens and of native people in London. That resident aliens could have connections with both natives and other aliens is also highlighted in the instances where aliens were known by two names, one which fitted English naming patterns and another which conformed to alien nomenclature. This can be seen in the cases of John de Salareo alias John Bulle, or Hans Langerman alias John Langerman; these individuals might be known by different versions of their name depending on whether they were interacting with natives or other aliens.\textsuperscript{1094}

Very little of the source material I have used here has allowed me to gauge the impact of the rare instances of violent attacks against aliens in the city upon those who were victimised. Despite this, the findings of the thesis adds something to our understanding of antagonism towards aliens. I have argued that verbal slander might be used as an attempt to exclude people perceived to be aliens from networks of local people during times of tension between the English crown and foreign powers. The recognition that aliens were subject to verbal slander, and to understand ability to marginalise and harm, is particularly important as anti-alien slander as a form of hostility is an understudied aspect of the alien experience. Cases of exclusion and harassment, such as that of Oliver Bouthin who claimed to have been called a ‘bawde traitour Flemynge thef’, when placed alongside the work which aliens undertook to ensure social inclusion, serves to highlight the fluid nature of their belonging.\textsuperscript{1095} Indeed, it indicates how a person’s inclusion within groupings was not a constant but rather was a flexible, variable property which was negotiated by different actors, and that the parameters of belonging could change according to circumstance. During times of tension between the Crown and foreign powers others, motivated by enmity or greed, might show hostility toward them and use verbal attacks to exclude them from the social networks.

We should bear in mind, however, that the findings of this thesis have been made through the analysis of source material which privileges better off alien males. Legal and probate records do not allow the historian to see all levels of society. Although this thesis has attempted to analyse a wider range of people where possible, it is necessarily reflective of the underlying sources. Those that we see within the qualitative evidence are predominantly resident male householders engaged in artisanal or mercantile occupations. In some Chancery
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petitions we can see servants, usually male. These, however, tend to be aliens who had year-long contracts with their masters rather than those who had temporary work and we often know little about their social connections. Chancery petitions can also shed light upon more transitory aliens, yet these were nearly always wealthy merchants who had a dispute with someone else concerning money and who tried to use the Chancery court to obtain a favourable outcome more swiftly than was available via other courts.

We can gauge how representative the types of aliens discussed in thesis are in relation to the wider alien population by comparing them with the profile of the alien population who were assessed in London and its suburbs in the alien subsidy returns. These alien subsidies confirm that the aliens seen through probate and legal sources are not representative of the whole alien population. The qualitative material greatly overstates the proportions of alien householders. The returns indicate that non-householders significantly outnumbered householders, with many of the former occupying service positions with the latter. Lutkin notes that of the 16,822 instances in which aliens were assessed in London between 1440 and 1487, 5,673 (34%) were male householders and 8,276 (49%) were male non-householders. 1096 In the 1483 assessment for London aliens were assessed in 1,595 instances. In 1,138 (71%) of these instances, people were assessed as non-householders and 457 (29%) as householders. 1097 It is also very likely that the proportion of non-householders is actually greater than the subsidy suggests considering the under-numeration of wives in some of the returns. It is these more numerous non-householders, whether that be servants, lodgers, or wives, who are underrepresented in the legal and probate records.

Some of these non-householders may not have stayed in London for sustained periods. As Lutkin and Bolton have argued, there were many aliens who were recorded within one or two subsequent subsidy assessments and who then disappear from the record prior to the next assessment. 1098 Such transitory individuals are rarely found within probate and legal sources. The exception are wealthy merchants able to pursue disputes, usually concerning debt, through legal channels. Another group of aliens underrepresented in the qualitative evidence are apparently low-status aliens recorded in the subsidies with national surnames, such as ‘Giles Dutchman’ or ‘Robynet Franchwoman’, and taxed a non-householder rate. 1099 Moreover, as discussed in the introduction, the subsidies suggest that although there seem to have been fewer
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female than male aliens in the capital, females still constituted nearly one fifth of the instances aliens were assessed in the subsidy.\textsuperscript{1100} Despite this, the only women we can see with clarity within the probate and legal records, besides those called to purge themselves in the Commissary Court, tend to be wives. The exception to this general rule of female underrepresentation is the evidence concerning the widows of the Doche artisans and merchants.

The sources used in this thesis, then, privilege a particular demographic, viz. male householders with artisanal and or mercantile occupations, of a middling-high social status, who stayed within the capital for sustained periods of time and held similar positions to one another in relation to the intersection of different categories of social difference. This is significant as the ability of an alien to undertake the work of belonging was dependent upon their opportunities and their need to do so. Artisans and merchants were exactly those best suited to negotiate their inclusion within different social networks in London since they had both the need and opportunities to undertake the work of belonging. Their status as male householders of relative wealth, and their associated ability to command contractual authority and position to be regarded as credit-worthy would have helped facilitate their inclusion, but the reason why they strove towards it was due to the nature of their occupation.\textsuperscript{1101} The personal face of trade, which was dependent upon reputation and who one knew, made it necessary for these individuals to negotiate belonging within social networks. Indeed, it was necessary for artisans and merchants foster relationships with those in similar occupations to themselves who might help them in their trade, people who were their potential customers, and those who might lend one another goods via credit. Similarly, they would have taken the most interest in, and would benefit most from, membership of fraternities within parish churches or mendicant houses. They sought participation to these partly as a forum with which to forge useful bonds with others and to acquire the added level of respectability which membership of fraternities would grant them.\textsuperscript{1102}

Alien householders in artisanal and mercantile occupations did not seek inclusion within all groupings, however. Only very few of the householders discussed above appear to have taken out letters of denization, demonstrating how the majority of aliens remained legally
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outside of the body of the king’s denizens. Moreover, many master artisans did not take out the freedom of the city and become included within the freedom, but instead they set up their workshops in the suburbs or liberties where the city’s companies had little or no jurisdiction. As McSheffrey argues, areas outside of the city’s regulation appear to have been heavily populated by aliens, particularly after London’s companies became more stringent in regulating alien labour from the last quarter of the fifteenth century onwards.\textsuperscript{1103} It is important not to take this general pattern too far and see all alien artisans as unenfranchised workers who were pushed into specific zones to practice their trades, however. Some wealthier artisans and merchants found it more useful to interact with the guild system and lived in the city. There were those, such as the goldsmith James Bokis, who paid licensing fees to Companies and could practice their trades within the city’s jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{1104} Small numbers of wealthier male aliens became members of the freedom. As Bradley argues, a small number of the more resident Italian agents in the city could become freemen to facilitate their trading activities.\textsuperscript{1105}

Householders who had already negotiated social inclusion in the city were well positioned to help non-householders who lacked connections. Friends and family members who had previously migrated to London, had successfully acquired householder status, and had forged connections with others in the city, were very useful to newcomers who arrived as part of migration chains; having already undertaken the work of belonging, established householders were well placed to help. This is clearly evidenced by the petition of the French locket maker Clement Morys which relates that when his sister-in-law arrived from France asking for the help of him and his wife, Clement was able to ask one of his French neighbours to provide employment as a servant for her.\textsuperscript{1106} Analysis of the help that newcomers could obtain from friends and kin who were already settled in the city helps confirm the argument suggested in in previous scholarship that many aliens followed a migration chain pattern. Similarly, skilled alien artisans who wished to one day set up in trade independently, such as William Covale and Reynold Harmanson, could obtain benefits through entering into service with an established alien householder.\textsuperscript{1107} This, in turn, allowed them to tap into their master’s
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connections which would have been very important for when they eventually would set up in business independently.

Although male householders are most visible in legal and probate material, wills and other legal narratives indicate that both the wives and widows of alien householders were able to undertake the work of belonging themselves and support that of their husbands. The testaments of widows such as Sote van Berkyng, Margaret van de Goos and Katherine van Utryght highlight that they could be members of fraternities or have strong ties with other Doche women and influential men. It is very likely that some of this work was undertaken during the lives of their husbands and that some of their own social ties were useful for their husbands’ trade. They continued the work of belonging after the death of their spouses because, being legally, economically and socially vulnerable without their husbands, they needed friendship and kinship networks to overcome trials of widowhood. When their husbands were alive, however, these wives would use their connections for different ends, that is to fulfil their role of helping their husbands in their trades, a behaviour thought to pertain to wives in both England and the Low Countries. Wives of Doche householders who are depicted in legal narratives as helping their husbands in credit transactions, such as Silvester van Houte or the (unnamed) wife of the beerbrewer John Lyvelander, show that these wives might act as agents in aiding interactions between their husbands and their trading contacts. The petitions also show that they played an important role in facilitating the exchange of support and resources that were channelled through such connections. As such, we can see that the wives of Doche artisans and merchants were able to negotiate belonging themselves and their inclusion within social networks likely aided their husband’s trade. However, they also played an important role in maintaining their husband’s position in networks through sustaining connections between them and their trading contacts.

Not all female aliens had the same opportunities, or agency, to negotiate belonging. Here we should consider the slaves Mary Moriana, who spoke no English and was retained in
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the household of the Venetian, Philip Syne, and Joan in the household of the Spaniard, Diego Sanchez. Both women, living as slaves with names which had been given to them, would have had less agency than the wives of Doche householders. They had neither the opportunities nor the occasion to become members of social networks in London beyond the household that they were part of or indeed of more formal groupings. Similarly, we might view the Doche women who were drawn into the sex trade in London and Southwark as similarly disadvantaged. They were not entirely without connections, as we know for example that some of them had bawds who were also Doche women, but they would effectively have been excluded from parish fraternities or other respectable network by reason of their want of resources, their position as single women, and their identification as sex-workers. We do not know what level of independent agency they possessed, but that some were reported to the Commissary Court as having been prostituted makes it likely that their position as poor, single women, likely with little or no English, meant many were under the coercion of their bawds or pimps.\textsuperscript{1113}

Moreover, aliens who were transitory and did remain in the capital for the long-term had little need to undertake the work of belonging. Modeste Justynyan, the scrivener of a Venetian carrack, clearly did not intend to stay in London for long. He complained to the chancellor (1433x1443 or 1467x1472) that one of the mariners whom he had contracted to serve on the journey to England refused to re-join the ship after stopping off at London for the return journey back to Venice.\textsuperscript{1114} The comparison of the different levels of inclusion enjoyed by individuals within Italian communities illustrates the different degrees to which they engaged in the work of belonging. The positions of long-term Italian agents in London with strong connections with London merchants, some of whom became freemen, were clearly different from transient merchants who arrived in London and then left again on galleys, or the young men of mercantile families who stayed in London only for short periods of time. As previous scholarship highlights, these long-term agents oversaw a mercantile firm’s interest and, for reasons of trade, engineered their inclusion within the city franchise and negotiated their position within social networks of those from the same city-state of themselves as well as of natives, particularly merchants.\textsuperscript{1115} The opportunities and desire of long-term Italian agents to negotiate belonging differed from merchants who appeared on galleys or the young men of

\textsuperscript{1113} Karras suggests that newcomers to a city who were not known by anyone were particularly vulnerable to be forced or tricked into prostitution Karras, \textit{Common Women}, 59–60.

\textsuperscript{1114} TNA C 1/46/254.

\textsuperscript{1115} Bradley, “Italian Merchants in London,” 344–356; Dempsey demonstrates that there were a core group of 20 Italian citizens in the reign of Edward II who developed strong relationships with natives see Dempsey, “The Italian Community in London during the Reign of Edward II,” 14–20.
family firms who stayed in London for short periods of time as part of a mercantile apprenticeship, or indeed the increasing number of more transient Genoese and Venetian merchants in the city from the late 1440s onwards. These groups had an expectation that they would shortly move away from London. As such, they had less need of friendships with natives or inclusion within more formal groupings in the city. That said, they still benefitted from inclusion within communities of other merchants from their city state and they drew upon the support of family members.¹¹¹⁶

The ability of an alien to undertake the work of belonging within various groups, then, depended upon both their opportunities and need to participate within different groups within London’s social fabric. This was contingent upon an individual’s position within the intersection of different categories of social difference such as household status, stage in life-cycle, occupation, gender (with the connected issue of agency) and length of domicile, which of course varied between individuals.¹¹¹⁷ There were common patterns of experience for resident, male householders with mercantile and artisanal occupations, who held similar positions to one another within the intersection of the categories of social difference. However, the patterns noted above concerning which types of people were best, or least, suited to negotiate belonging indicate that we should not talk of a singular, general alien experience. Moreover, the examples of the variant positions of belonging held by Italian resident agents, more transient merchants and slaves in Italian households, as well between Doche artisans, their wives, and sex workers, warn us against talking of a singular experience within a particular alien or linguistic group. We should instead acknowledge that there was a wide array of alien experiences, which in turn reflects the heterogeneous nature of the alien population itself.

Here we might explore patterns of difference and similarity between the experience of Doche and Italian aliens beyond those discussed in previous scholarship, outlined in the introduction. Studies of Italian merchants in London demonstrate the strength of kinship ties between Italian merchants and that family members frequently trusted each other with business matters.¹¹¹⁸ The importance of kin for other alien groups in the capital has received far less

¹¹¹⁷ For the importance of intersectionality in the construction of belonging, see Yuval–Davis, The Politics of Belonging, 6–7; Harders, “Belonging, Migration and Profession,” 8–11.
attention, yet petitions such as those made by Peter Camur, Laurence Teymonson and Arnold Andreus also highlight that kin could play important roles in providing support and companionship to Doche aliens living in the city. The deposition of John Paynaminuta- and the Chancery petition of Clement Morys- similarly show that this was also the case for French migrants in the capital.

As has been noted in previous literature, the Italians in London frequented the Austin Friars and often received spiritual services from brothers who spoke their own tongue. Resident Doche aliens likewise had connections with the Austin Friars, and as argued by Röhrkasten with other mendicant houses besides. They also had access to spiritual guidance from alien clergymen who were not connected to mendicant houses.1119 Peter van Lyre, for example, was a chaplain of the parish of St Olave, Southwark, and provided spiritual aid to the other Doche aliens in the parish.1120 Godfrey Saude, who is remembered by a large number of aliens and is explicitly referred to as a chaplain in his will, was also a secular chaplain who provided spiritual services for aliens from northern Europe.1121 In addition, the experiences of resident Italians and Doche aliens differed in the forms of culture they practiced, and this thesis has gone some way in contributing to our understanding of this. Although the evidence of cultural practice is fragmentary, there are clear distinctions between the Doche and Italians. Beer brewing and the consumption of beer within a fifteenth century context, that is, before natives started drinking beer in large numbers, can be seen as Doche aliens maintaining an element of their food culture. Moreover, Italian merchants practiced forms of behaviour common in their regions of origin. This can be seen in the wills of Italians such as Leonardo Lambertyn, who was concerned about the dowry of his daughter which would have been so important for her marriage prospects in Italian culture. Elite resident Italians such as Phillip Syne could keep female slaves in their households and they could interact ways in akin to the cultural mores of the regions of origin, which is indicated in the marriage negotiation between the John Bolle and Antony de Sala.

The findings of the thesis point to avenues of research which might be fruitfully explored in the future. I have argued that well off aliens often kept in contact with people back in their places of origin and also that alien newcomers sought out friends and family members who had already settled in London to access help and support. That aliens could arrive in London seeking their acquaintances strongly suggests that they had contact with these people

1120 TNA C 1/63/164.
1121 LMA MS 09051/001/001, f. 46v.; MS 09051/001/001, f. 56; MS 09051/001/002, f. 289; MS 09051/001, f. 83; MS 09051/001/002, f. 200; MS 09051/001/002, f. 291v.; 09051/001/002, f. 296v.
even before they migrated or, at least, that were well informed of their whereabouts. This raises important questions regarding the relationship between the shared connections of aliens and their friends and family members in their region of origin and their motivations to migrate to England. Scholars of contemporary migration have noted that immigrants in a host country maintain connections with their home communities and establish flows of communication and resources which facilitate the subsequent migration of family members.\footnote{1122} More research is required to explore the factors which encouraged aliens to migrate to England, and by extension to London. It is possible that tracing the links between established aliens in England and potential migrants back in their places of origin would be a way to explore an important motivation behind migration. Moreover, there is a need for further research regarding how communication between aliens and those abroad was undertaken. Wealthier aliens might travel back to their regions of origins temporarily, or write letters to friends or family. The \textit{Book of Margery Kempe} records that Margery’s Doche daughter-in-law was in contact with relations in Prussia via letter correspondence.\footnote{1123} There is room for further analysis regarding how aliens relied upon letters to keep in contact, as well as how the flows of information and rumour consequent upon the regular movement of sailors and merchants from an alien’s region of origin might keep aliens in London abreast of news from back home.

Where possible, I have compared the strategies adopted by aliens to survive and settle in late medieval London and its suburbs with evidence from outside the capital to place the findings here within a wider contextual framework. Such an exercise indicates that some of the ways by which aliens forged ties with others, both aliens and natives, were not specific to late medieval London. Comparable behaviour can be seen within other urban areas in England. Indeed, examples from elsewhere in England indicate that resident aliens there, like those in London, might marry into families to reinforce ties with both natives and aliens. For example, Peter Clyff, a beerbrewer in Southampton, complained to the chancellor that he could not obtain justice because two of the sons-in-law of his Doche respondent, who were also aliens, were empanelled on the jury and would find in favour of their father-in-law.\footnote{1124} Much like Doche and Italian aliens in London, wealthy and established men in Hull with names suggestive of Doche origin often bequeathed money to mendicant houses in their testaments, indicating that they often worshipped within them. In addition, mirroring the pattern found within London

\footnote{1122} Boyd and Nowak, “Social Networks and International Migration,” 81.  
\footnote{1123} The \textit{Book of Margery Kempe}, 390–391 (L.7560-7575).  
\footnote{1124} TNA C 1/67/131.
probate records, testamentary evidence concerning men from Hull, Ipswich, and York who were likely aliens all indicate that immigrants could seek to become members of parish fraternities.1125 They might also establish personal connections with mendicants in their towns. Indeed, this is reflected in the Chancery petition of one Peter Petirson of Ipswich who described in his petition how he was asked by a friar of the town to go to London with some silver which he wanted to be converted into ornamental prayer beads.1126 That Doche aliens cultivated strong connections with one another has been observed in Winchester.1127 Moreover, the practice of newcomers to a community seeking the help and advice of settled friends and family member can be found within evidence in York and London. However, the size of the alien population in the capital, and its dominant position in the English economy, begs the question as to whether elements of the findings presented here were unique to a London context. Further research might take the comparison of the London-focused findings here with evidence from other English urban centres further and might also be able to identify which elements of these findings were distinctive to a London context. For example, it is doubtful that Italian craftsmen, such as John Bulle who practiced gold wire drawing, had the same opportunities that they had in the capital to be employed to teach others their rare skills.

Broadening our perspective from aliens alone, we should ask whether the findings of this thesis speak to a distinctive ‘alien’ experience. How far did the experiences of aliens analysed here form part of a wider ‘migrant’ experience also shared by English migrants who moved to London? A study which uses similar sources utilised in this thesis to reconstruct aspects of the lives of, and legal narratives concerning, native migrants to London would be a welcome addition to scholarship of both aliens and internal migration. The experiences of English migrants in the capital, which to date have predominantly focused on who moved to London and from where, might usefully be compared with that of alien migrants to gauge which elements of alien lives were part of a wider migrant experience.1128 English migrant experience might also be compared with specific alien groups, such as the Doche or Italians, to gauge whether they had more in common with some alien groups over others. Such a study could also gauge how far alien status was a key factor impinging upon their capacity to engage in the work

1125 Costinus Williamson BI, reg. 2, f. 411; Florencius Williamson BI, reg. 5, f. 9; Hans Martyn, reg. 2, f. 271; John de Parys YMA DC/L2/4/001, f. 106
1126 C 1/61/423.
1127 Keene, Survey of Medieval Winchester, 381–383.
of belonging, or how far it was simply their status as migrants. It could also assess whether alien status was sometimes a less important factor in determining an individual’s experience and ability to negotiate their belonging than other intersecting categories of social distinction, such as social status, occupation or gender.

The way the concept of belonging has been used here, namely as a tool to conceptualise that individuals simultaneously occupy various positions of belonging and not belonging in relation to formal and informal groups, has potential to be applied to other social groups than aliens in later medieval England. Medieval cities were environments with many formal and informal groups to which people could belong, such as neighbourhoods, parishes, guilds and the franchise. Aliens were certainly not the only ones who might be concurrently included within some groups and networks yet not belong to others and actively seek to negotiate belonging within different groupings. The key facets of the concept of belonging would certainly be worth exploring in relation to evidence regarding demographics in the late medieval historiography, such as the unenfranchised workforce working in London and its peripheries which is part of a growing corpus of literature.1129

A final question which would prove useful to address is how far are our findings specific to a late medieval context? Are some of the findings presented here part of a wider immigrant experience that might be traced beyond the medieval era? Where possible, I have compared my findings with necessarily select number of studies concerning immigrants in other time periods. This comparison indicates that there are parallels between the strategies undertaken by aliens in late medieval London to negotiate belonging in different groups and those undertaken by immigrants in more recent time periods. This is not to say that the experience of immigrants in late medieval London and in subsequent eras were identical, rather that there seem to be common aspects to immigrant lives which would repay further analysis. As I noted at the beginning of this thesis, the potential help and companionship that migrants might obtain through social inclusion is an important theme within migration literature focusing upon the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.1130 The findings presented here similarly indicate that late medieval aliens to London would often obtain help and

companionship through their connections. For example, the practice of alien newcomers seeking out friends and family members for help in late medieval London has strong parallels with the practices of immigrants identified in Anderson’s classic study of nineteenth century migrants to Preston and Tilly’s scholarship regarding twentieth–century immigration to England.\footnote{Anderson, \textit{Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire}, 154–155; Tilly, “On Uprooting, Kinship, and the Auspices of Migration,” 144.} The practice of alien artisans in the fifteenth century to maintain contact with other aliens in the same or related occupations to themselves is comparable with the practice of refugee Walloon silk weavers congregating together and practicing their trade in London during the late sixteenth century.\footnote{Kershen, \textit{Strangers, Aliens and Asians}, 58.} Marriage of aliens into native families which allowed them to establish useful connections is a process which has been observed in other historical time periods. For example, in the nineteenth century European fur traders might marry women of the Native American Ojibwa nation to foster ties of kinship which facilitated trade.\footnote{Jennifer Brown, “‘There Is no End to Relationship among the Indians’: Ojibwa Families and Kinship in Historical Perspective,” \textit{The History of the Family} 3, no. 4 (1999), 539.} There is another parallel in that the work of belonging undertaken by the aliens studied here is also a common theme of studies of twentieth and twenty first–century migration. For example, a study regarding recent Chinese immigrants to Canada highlights that they seek emotional and informational support from other Chinese immigrants who had previously settled there, as well as from relatives and friends who had moved there before them, a practice with strong parallels to the findings of this thesis.\footnote{Stewart, Anderson and Beiser, “Multicultural meaning of Social Support among Immigrants and Refugees,” 132–139.} Boyd and Nowack note that through ‘transnational linkages’ immigrants are able to communicate with family members, a behaviour similarly observed here in narratives of aliens in fifteenth–century London.\footnote{Boyd and Nowak, “Social Networks and International Migration,” 81.}
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