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Abstract This article examines English women who were engaged in wholesale long-distance or international trade in the later Middle Ages. These women made up only a small proportion of English merchants, averaging about 3 to 4 percent of the mercantile population, often working in partnership with their husbands. The article systematically quantifies, for the first time, women’s penetration into this male-dominated trade and adds new perspectives to our understanding of women and trade in the Middle Ages by using both debt and customs records. It poses important questions about women’s economic roles, the nature or distinctiveness of their businesses, and the ways that their actions fitted within mercantile activity more broadly. It examines the extent to which wives acted as equal economic partners with their husbands and also assesses the extent to which women’s economic potential or agency in wholesale trade was shaped, or indeed constrained, by economic and patriarchal forces. It concludes by arguing that patriarchy certainly limited female access to wholesale markets, particularly after 1300, along with other linked features that also shaped women’s economic trading endeavors. These features included status, access to capital, and the advantages to working within dynamic, extensive, and busy markets such as those found in later medieval London.

FEMALE MERCHANTS: OPTIMISTIC CHERRY-PICKING?

In 1916, Annie Abram published a groundbreaking article in the Economic Journal, “Women Traders in Medieval London.” In it she recorded the large number of occupations undertaken by London women in the Middle Ages, both as artisans and as traders. She also identified—and was among the first to do so—that women, beyond being engaged in small-scale, domestic commerce and manufacturing, were also “engaged in some of the most important and remunerative trades,” notably that of “merchant.” She presented a number of intriguing examples, such as Mariota Ferars and Dyonisia la Rower, who supplied the king with a range of merchandise. Other influential scholars followed Abram’s lead. Eileen Power collected a large amount of material on medieval women, published posthumously in 1975. Here again, Power—in very positive terms—highlighted the wide range of economic opportunities available to medieval women, pointing out that the trades “carried on
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by widows ranged from that of merchants on a large scale, trafficking in ships and
dealing with the crown, to that of small craftsmen.\textsuperscript{5} She pointed out, quite rightly,
that a great deal of business acumen was required to manage large commercial ventures
and that examples of widows practicing large-scale, international mercantile trades
"abound in our sources."\textsuperscript{6} Like Abram, she provided tantalizing examples. In the
mid-1980s and early ’90s, the focus shifted to tell the story of English women as the
mistresses of their households, belabored with maternal duties yet simultaneously
capable of producing all manner of industrial goods or selling small items as hucksters
and still able to brew enough ale to satisfy the consumption needs of an entire parish.\textsuperscript{7}
However, most scholars, notably Kay Lacey, Maryanne Kowaleski, and P. J. P. Goldberg,
agree that a small proportion of women, commonly the wealthy widows of merchant
husbands, were engaged in international or wholesale trade.\textsuperscript{8} Earlier historians unex-
pectedly discovered female mercantile agency in medieval records, but might these
examples be interpreted as an overenthusiastic reading of the later medieval evidence?

Much of the historiography suggests that female merchants, those engaged in
wholesale, long-distance, or international trade, were a rare breed. When discussing
women’s employment in the manufacturing or craft sectors of the medieval English
economy, Goldberg argues that wives were expected to work alongside their hus-
bands and sell their merchandise. In the absence of adult male heirs, Yorkshire crafts-
men often bequeathed their tools and stock to their widows in order that the family
business might be administered until a son could take over.\textsuperscript{9} Thus one model that
might explain the paucity of examples of female merchants might be that these
women were not actually engaged in commercial enterprise on their own behalf
but rather were merely assisting or representing their husbands while they were
away, selling their merchandise on their behalf, or fulfilling their outstanding business
obligations after they had died.\textsuperscript{10} These tasks in themselves were significant undertakings requiring considerable energy and deft expertise.

No one disputes that medieval women played a central role in the retail of goods,
especially victuals, from shops and in markets within a local setting.\textsuperscript{11} However, there
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is a considerable gulf between selling inexpensive, home-produced goods from a market stall and managing, and particularly funding, a highly capitalized international trading venture. Yet such ventures were supposedly undertaken by exceptional women like Rose de Burford and Margery Russell within a commercial environment in which women not only suffered from a more limited access to capital to invest in ventures such as these but also were generally considered to be more suited to supportive (and domestic) roles.12 Later medieval female merchants need to be considered within these rather more demanding and onerous economic and social circumstances. It is argued here that due to an interaction of commercial and patriarchal factors, women in the late Middle Ages made up only a minority of English merchants.

There was certainly no injunction against female traders in the Middle Ages. They were regularly described as “mercatrix,” “mulier mercarix,” “woman sole marchaunt,” or “ele soit tenuz pur marchaunt (she be taken as [in the sense of “reputed to be] a merchant)” in borough customs that regulated women traders in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.13 Women like Isabel Torrington of Bristol, Margaret Godmanston of Wiltshire, and Margaret Beauchamp and Agnes Wylmot of Middlesex certainly all described themselves as “merchants” (mercatrix) in staple debt transactions of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.14 These women clearly considered themselves—or were considered to be by the clerks who enrolled their credit agreements—merchants who were engaged in mercantile activities.15

What is required, therefore, is a systematic investigation into records that pertain to wholesale, long-distance, or international trade. This article seeks, for the first time, to quantify more precisely what Abram discovered a century ago about female merchants. It strives in particular to assess systematically the extent to which female merchants penetrated English wholesale markets. Furthermore, it seeks to refine our understanding of the intricate and often indistinct realities of women’s contribution to medieval commerce in order to add new perspectives to our understanding of women and trade in the Middle Ages. In doing so, it poses important questions about medieval women and wholesale trade and the ways that their actions fitted within mercantile activity more broadly. For example, to what extent did wives act as equal economic partners in commonplace joint transactions with their husbands (as theorized by Barbara Hanawalt for later medieval peasant women and by Shennan Hutton for businesswomen in fourteenth-century Ghent)
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rather than acting merely as their deputies or substitutes. In essence, this article asks whether female merchants operated in the same way as the male majority, or whether female mercantile activity was in some way distinctive. It has also been argued that women’s participation in commercial debt transactions declined in the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and that this is explained by economic factors rather than the oppressive burden of what Judith Bennett has described as the “patriarchal equilibrium,” a system by which women have traditionally been both excluded and disadvantaged. To what extent was women’s economic potential or agency in wholesale trade shaped, or indeed constrained, by economic rather than patriarchal forces?

The period under investigation here is a long one, stretching over two and a half centuries between the mid-thirteenth century and the early sixteenth century. Clearly this was not a uniform period of unchanging economic circumstances, but the sources used in this study do exhibit remarkably similar characteristics over time while the commercial world they recorded changed dramatically. This pattern is seen not least in the period bisected by the demographic collapse occasioned by the Black Death of 1348–1350 and its subsequent outbreaks during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. This long time frame is therefore divided into three, more manageable, periods: period one (1250–1349), period two (1350–1449), and period three (1450–1540).

Historians have normally relied upon one preferred type of evidence when studying women and work. The following sections, however, examine these questions over a long chronology using these two complementary forms of evidence that have not previously been used to study women and trade. The evidence studied here comes in two principal forms. The first is records of debt and credit; credit, the deferred part-payment for goods sold or advances for future delivery of goods, was ubiquitous in later medieval society and central to all medieval business. The second category is customs accounts and brokage books; used here as an adjunct to the debt evidence, these records, when studied systematically, provide a huge amount of supplementary information that eloquently contextualizes the debt evidence. Examining women’s participation in commercial ventures using these two connected elements of wholesale trade allows for a far more rounded, and comparative, understanding of women’s involvement in that trade to be achieved.

**FEMALE MERCHANTS AND DEBT**

In the first period, between 1276 and 1312, debts could be enrolled in London in the form of recognisances before the chamberlain at the Guildhall; they were recorded in
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the city’s Letter Books. These recognisances clearly demonstrate the role of Londoners in the marketing of goods that Gascon and Spanish merchants imported into (and occasionally exported from) the Port of London, particularly wine and leather. The 1,851 recognisances recorded during this thirty-six-year period in the Letter Books surveyed here were used to secure the deferred payment of goods bought and sold on credit in London.

By the mid-fourteenth century, high-value debts were commonly enrolled in statute merchant or statute staple courts. The statute staple was the successor to the Statute of Acton Burnel (1283) and the Statue of Merchants (1285). The statute staple was a royally sanctioned debt-registration system primarily for merchants, which provided a kingdom-wide system for the efficient recovery of defaulted debts during the second and third periods, between 1353 and 1532. Unlike the local provisions found in London’s Guildhall court, debts were registered in a number of mercantile courts sited in towns and especially ports of commercial importance, such as Boston, Bristol, Exeter, Hull, Newcastle, Salisbury, and Westminster. The staple certificates that were part of the process of debt recovery survive in large numbers. This study draws upon 9,989 staple debt certificates registered between 1353 and 1532. The certificates were a second stage of the process (once a debtor had defaulted) that followed the enrolling of a recognisance. In this study the certificates used (excluding those from Yorkshire) are copies of defaulted recognisances that were sent to Chancery to allow the sheriff to imprison the defaulting debtors, impound their lands and goods, and deliver these to the creditors in order to repay the outstanding amount of the debt.

Furthermore, a rare survival of the 604 debt recognisances—identical in form to those registered in London’s Guildhall—enrolled at Coventry’s statute merchant court between 1392 and 1456 and 1521 and 1535 allows for a more exhaustive and precise picture to be drawn of male and female lending and borrowing at this time. This is because the debts recorded on the Coventry rolls, like the earlier London recognisances, comprise all of the debt transactions enrolled at that court rather than just those certificates of defaulted debts that were part of the debt-recovery process. All of these are directly comparable not only because the workings of the staple system was largely unchanged throughout all three periods but also because recognisances and certificates were two stages within the same judicial process.
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Litigants enrolling recognisances in London in the late thirteenth century were exactly the same types of business people as those suing for the return of their money using certificates in the late fifteenth century and beyond. This system provided the facilities by which England’s trading community was able to lend and borrow confidently and securely. Sums transacted in the staple courts at this period were large, averaging £85, and this credit was generally used to buy and sell merchandise within the English domestic economy, including imported goods redistributed throughout the kingdom.24

Importantly in the context of female merchants, the statute staple courts operated under a system of law known as Lex Mercatoria, or “Law Merchant.” This was an internationally acknowledged body of customs used by merchants that recognized that those engaged in commerce were often itinerant and required speedy resolution of commercial disputes, particularly those involving broken debt and credit agreements. It recognized that merchandise could be perishable and needed to be delivered, frequently by the merchants themselves, to distant, often overseas, markets.25 Unlike common law, in which the legal rights of married women were subsumed under the doctrine of coverture by those of her husband, this very practical system of dispute resolution seems not to have explicitly impeded or excluded women, married or otherwise, from presenting their debt plaints to staple courts.26 Indeed, under the statute staple, the common law courts were prohibited from hearing disputes arising within the staple franchise.27 The usual impediments encountered by women who might have been subject to the imposition of common law in this period are thus absent from these transactions. The Law Merchant system, then, permits a clearer view—one not encumbered by coverture—of female mercantile action in the medieval past.

The workings of this system of debt registration, and the use to which the credit was put, are best demonstrated by an example. On 2 June 1286, Cecelia, widow of John de Stebenhethe, entered into an agreement with Peter Bertram and William Baras in which she purchased 100s. worth of wine, probably imported from Gascony, from the two merchants on credit.28 This deferred payment for the wine was to be repaid in two installments, 50s. at Michaelmas (29 September 1286) and 50s. at Christmas (25 December 1286), giving Cecelia seven and a quarter months to sell the wine and pay the money back to the merchants, possibly on their next visit to the port. While the transaction may have been informally negotiated at either the merchants’ or the widow’s home or place of work, it was later formally registered and enrolled, complete with the transaction dates and all the relevant installment dates, at the Guildhall before the chamberlain. Cecelia, as the recognisance states, acknowledged that she was “bound” (tenere) to the two merchants in
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the sum of 100s, allowing the court to sequestrate her goods or property should she default on the debt.29

Debt transactions using recognisances like this to register high-value credit agreements were the backbone of wholesale trade. Women lent and borrowed in roughly equal proportions over the whole period studied here. Roughly 47 percent of women using the London court in period one (1250–1349) and the kingdom-wide staple courts, in period two (1350–1449) and period three (1350–1540) were debtors and approximately (in all periods) 52 percent were creditors. However, women made up only a small proportion of lenders and borrowers in these courts when compared to men. In London, in period one, between 1276 and 1312, 11.9 percent of those who enrolled their recognisances in the Guildhall were women (163 transactions). While there were many other places where merchants might register high-value debts—not least, from 1283, at statute merchant courts around the kingdom—this proportion of female participation in high-value debt traffic in the London court is at the very least suggestive of wider trends. However, after the high point of female debt enrollment in London in the closing years of the thirteenth century (at 37.2 percent), the proportion of women registering debts at this court fell to a mean of 8.7 percent during the first decade of the fourteenth century. After 1305, in particular, this percentage—part of a declining trend—rarely rose above 6 percent. When this early proportion of women enrolling debt agreements is compared with women’s access to trade finance in periods two and three, it can be stated that 379 of the 9,989 statute staple certificates (3.8 percent) between 1353 and 1532 show women as active participants in the staple credit process either as lenders or borrowers. A similarly small proportion (2.6 percent) is found in the recognisances enrolled at Coventry’s statute merchant court in period two between 1392 and 1456, and in period three between 1521 and 1535, demonstrating that women played a relatively minor, and declining, role in wholesale trade finance in the later Middle Ages.30 This low proportion of female involvement in staple debt transactions, particularly after the Black Death, reinforces the impression advanced by Kowaleski, Goldberg, and others that female merchants were atypical of the broader, largely male, English merchant community. A very similar proportional decline in female debt pleas between the early fourteenth century and the mid-fifteenth century has been noted by Stevens for both the London sheriff’s court and the king’s court of common pleas.31

It has been argued that the severe mid-fifteenth-century decline in debt transactions involving women was not a product of patriarchal exclusion but rather of trends in female debt enrollment that closely follow the chronology of economic growth and decline in the period as a whole. The greatest number of female debt transactions took place during the post-plague economic “boom” of the 1370s and
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1390s, followed by a significant drop in transactions during the first half of the fifteenth-century economic "crisis," a limited and faltering recovery in women’s staple enrollment in the later fifteenth century, and a sustained rise in credit transactions involving women in the first three decades of the sixteenth century. This pattern seems to have exactly followed the movements in lending and borrowing by both men and women as a whole. According to this evidence, therefore, women seem to have been subject to the same economic pressures that male merchants experienced.

The long chronology studied here allows this hypothesis to be further scrutinized. To what extent were economic forces or patriarchy responsible for constraining women’s commercial potential during this time? If women’s engagement with high-value credit is examined over all three periods, it would appear that the early fourteenth century witnessed something of a strengthening of the patriarchal influence upon women and finance. While sterile commercial conditions in the early fourteenth century (a period associated with acute famine and animal murrain) might have resulted in women being forced out of wholesale trade or excluded somehow from the capital acquisition required to finance it (a decline from above 30 percent to about 6 percent), this ratio of women to men did not change or improve when commercial circumstances recovered in the later fourteenth century. Rather, in the latter two periods, this ratio remained fairly constant at about 3–4 percent. This important change, sometime in the early fourteenth century, might have been the result of a hardening of general attitudes toward coverture and an intensification of patriarchy from the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that, as some historians have argued, was linked to the growing imposition of common law at this time. Despite staple courts not officially using common law, a backdrop of these increasingly pervasive values might well have discouraged female entry into the wholesale market.

Despite the low proportion of female debts, the recognisances and later certificates tell us much about trading activity by English women. Women were actively involved in domestic trade. For example, Emma, the wife of Bernard de Fylers, bought 100s. worth of wheat, barley, and oats from an English merchant in 1278. In the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, women seem to have been more actively involved in the selling of imported goods, buying directly from foreign, often Gascon and Genoese, merchants in the Port of London. In 1298, John le Murager and his wife, Felicia, were extended 53s. worth of credit by Elyas Scarlet, merchant of Gascony, indicating the deferred payment on credit for Gascon goods, probably wine, to be sold in London by the husband and wife partnership. The couple was again extended credit (40s.) by another Gascon merchant, Bydean de Beaulu, 32 See Goddard, “High Finance.” 33 Daniel Klerman, “Women Prosecutors in Thirteenth-Century England,” Yale Journal of Law and the Humanities 14, no. 2 (January 2002): 271–319, at 317; Judith M. Bennett, Women in the Medieval English Countryside: Gender and Household in Brigstock before the Plague (New York, 1987), 194–95; Briggs, “Empowered or Marginalized,” 16, 19; Erin McGibbon Smith, “The Participation of Women in the Fourteenth-Century Manor Court of Sutton-in-the-Isle,” Marginalia 1 (2005), http://www.marginalia.co.uk/journal/05margins smith.php. 34 Sharpe, Letter-Book A, 23. For other examples, see Sharpe, Letter-Book B, 26, 164, 222. 35 Sharpe, Letter-Book B, 78.
seven years later in 1305, suggesting a thriving family importing business. John le Murager was regularly extended credit in this period, commonly by foreign merchants, both solely and in syndicates of merchants (one of which included another woman, Juliana, the wife of Robert le Skot).

The relatively high proportion of debt transactions involving women in later thirteenth-century London is unlikely to reflect a particularly liberal understanding of women’s roles in general, and female merchants in particular, at that time. As is discussed below, the “London effect” may well have played a role. However, this particular period is also well known as one of commercial growth. A rapid population growth, particularly between 1270 and 1290 when urban populations were at their medieval apex, combined with a period of (relatively) high real wages, resulted in an increase in demand for goods and services of all kinds. It has been estimated that the total output of goods and services grew by about three times in the period 1050–1300 and that the value of English overseas trade tripled in real terms during the thirteenth century. It was a period in which new towns, new markets, and novel commercial institutions such as merchant and staple courts proliferated. In the decades around 1300, the volume of English commerce and the quantity of money in circulation were also at their medieval peaks. One way of interpreting these data—as John Langdon has when discussing women working on royal building sites—is to suggest that when commercial opportunities arose within an expanding and dynamic market, like that of later thirteenth-century London, women with sufficient capital resources seized these opportunities and enthusiastically participated in these commercial ventures. Beyond the normative or “background” patriarchal understanding of appropriate roles for women in medieval society placing them within a minority, there seems to have been little beyond that (albeit important) hindrance that particularly debarred women from participating in and investing in this expanding trade.

In the latter two periods (1350–1449 and 1450–1540) following the Black Death, the certificate evidence demonstrates that domestic trade again predominated among the women who used the staple. Only four certificates can be located in which women bought imported goods on credit directly from aliens from Florence, Sienna, and Genoa. For example, in 1367, two Florentine merchants, Roger Thomas and Thomas Blanchard, came to the staple court at Lincoln and sold £160 worth of goods to a partnership of a merchant, William Palmer of Caistor (Lincolnshire), and Agnes, the widow of William Fitz-Simon, also of Caistor, to be repaid.
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twenty days later. Although the certificates do not reveal such details, what likely happened here is that the goods sold on credit by the Florentines were imports brought in on Italian ships and sold to English merchants for redistribution in Lincolnshire. The business partnership of Palmer and Fitz-Simon bought these imports on credit from the Florentines and then attempted to sell them, presumably in their home market of Caistor and its hinterland. Unfortunately, they failed to repay the Italians on time—perhaps because they were unsuccessful in selling all of the imported merchandise—and were consequently sued in the Lincoln court by the aliens Thomas and Blanchard only four days after the debt had fallen due.

Thus, the debt evidence suggests that women were engaged, in a limited way at least, in wholesale trade between late thirteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Tables 1 to 3 indicate that this engagement was often in partnership with their husbands, sons, or other men.

Following the conventions of the recognisances and the certificates themselves, those women who enrolled high-value debt agreements are analyzed here and in tables 1 to 3 according to their recorded statuses as wives, mothers, or independent operators. Widows, another common designation in these documents, are discussed in more detail below. Women often enrolled debts jointly with their husbands or, less frequently, with other men. Examples such as John and Felicia le Murager’s transaction with Gascon merchants have been discussed above, but other similar joint husband-and-wife transactions can be found within the London recognisances. In 1309, William de la Sale, mason, was extended £4 13s. 4d. worth of credit by William de Wyttorne, skinner, and his wife, Roysia. However, husband-and-wife transactions were less common in the earlier period than in the post–Black Death periods, featuring in under a quarter in the earlier recognisance sample (table 1). Husband-and-wife partnerships were much more common in the later certificates, representing over one-third of the female statute staple debts (tables 2 and 3). For example, in 1360 John de Newborough and his wife, Joan, described in the certificate as “merchants of Dorset,” extended £100 worth of credit “for diverse merchandise” to a fellow Dorset merchant, William de Stupelton.

The fact that large numbers of wives and husbands, particularly in the two latter periods, enrolled debts together, effectively creating a legally binding business partnership, validates the idea that medieval business was a family affair, with all the opportunities for capital acquisition that marriage could bring. London’s inheritance laws in particular allowed wives to contribute the capital crucial to trading ventures. Indeed, as Hanawalt and Anne Sutton argue, these legal advantages helped London women engage in high-value trading activities while also helping them to sidestep
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46 TNA C 241/145/84. For similar examples, see TNA C 241/204/29. From the Coventry recognisances, see Beardwood, Statute Merchant Roll of Coventry, 8, 58.
some of the barriers of patriarchy.\textsuperscript{47} From this evidence alone, it is difficult to be certain whether these were full and equal trading partnerships with husbands, as Hutton has persuasively argued for Ghent.\textsuperscript{48} Being named in contracts along with their husband might well have been a customary identifying rubric for many women actively engaged in trade in what might be perceived, from the fourteenth century, as an increasingly patriarchal trading milieu—albeit transacted in a court that was not subject to the limitations of coverture—and it was one that positioned them appropriately within the medieval world view encapsulated in English common law.\textsuperscript{49} However, it also had the benefit of establishing a solid reputation and at the same time alluding to the capital reserves (belonging to her husband) that lay behind the venture. Furthermore, naming the husband and wife in the agreement might well have added further security to a transaction for an uncertain creditor; if one of the two named debtors died before the money was repaid, the agreement would remain valid with the surviving (named) spouse remaining contractually bound for the debt. These were confidence-building guarantees, particularly in the fifteenth century in times of more challenging commercial conditions. As Kowaleski has argued for Exeter, these women were often wives of leading merchants, trained in

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Period 1: Female recognisances in London, 1286–1312 (N = 110), Sharpe, Letter-Books A and B}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\hline
 & Debtor & Percentage & Creditor & Percentage \\
\hline
Single (but not necessarily unmarried) & 30 & 57.7\% & 39 & 67.2\% \\
Husband and wife & 14 & 26.9\% & 13 & 22.4\% \\
Woman and (nonspousal) partner & 5 & 9.6\% & 4 & 6.9\% \\
Mother and son & 3 & 5.8\% & 2 & 3.5\% \\
Total & 52 & 100.0\% & 58 & 100.0\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Period 2: Female staple certificates in England, 1353–1449 (N = 226), TNA C 241}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\hline
 & Debtor & Percentage & Creditor & Percentage \\
\hline
Single & 41 & 47.1\% & 67 & 48.2\% \\
Husband and wife & 28 & 32.2\% & 41 & 29.5\% \\
Woman and (nonspousal) partner & 9 & 10.3\% & 27 & 19.4\% \\
Mother and son & 9 & 10.3\% & 4 & 2.9\% \\
Total & 87 & 100.0\% & 139 & 100.0\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{47} Barbara A. Hanawalt, \textit{The Wealth of Wives: Women, Law, and Economy in Late Medieval London} (Oxford, 2007), 161, 170, 180–81, 190, 276; Anne E. Sutton, \textit{Wives and Widows of Medieval London} (Donnington, 2016), 27.

\textsuperscript{48} Hutton, \textit{Women and Economic Activities}, 93–97, 106–10.

\textsuperscript{49} For married women’s debt pleas, see Stevens, “London Women, Courts and the ‘Golden Age,’” 75; Matthew Frank Stevens, “London’s Married Women, Debt Litigation and Coverture in the Court of Common Pleas,” in \textit{Married Women and the Law in Premodern Northwest Europe}, ed. Cordelia Beattie and Matthew Frank Stevens (Woodbridge, 2013), 115–32, at 117.
the mercantile arts in the family business. There would have been little point in adding a wife’s name to a contract unless it served some collateral, surety, or reputational benefit to her husband. More likely, these contracts reflect genuine commercial partnerships between husbands and wives in situations in which wives played an active role the transaction or the business.

Indeed, it is likely that the records underrepresent the proportion of women directly involved in high-value debt transactions at this time, as wives may have been unnamed or silent partners in many of the remaining 9,632 staple agreements that cited only men. Other women, often widows, enrolled debts with men to whom they do not seem to have been related (tables 1 to 3). In 1440, for example, Alice Code, of Milcombe (Oxfordshire), and Thomas Eburton, of the same place, went into business together to extend £26 13s. 6d. in credit to two members of the Oxfordshire gentry. Beyond living in the same village, there seems to have been no familial or spousal connection between them. Might the increasing proportion of these women-and-partner transactions, along with increasing husband-and-wife partnerships, particularly in period three (table 3), suggest a tightening patriarchal grip upon unfettered female trading? Perhaps in this later period of economic dislocation—particularly in the mid-fifteenth century—it was felt that women’s credit transactions required the added security of a male co-signee.

Table 4 demonstrates that widows, both singly and jointly with male business partners, were an important constituent of female credit. For example, Eva, the widow of Eustace de Derteford, was granted 28s. worth of credit from London blade-smith (blader) John de Canterbury in 1285. Widows used trade finance in all periods. Nearly a quarter of all female debts in period one were enrolled by widows. However, widows became increasingly prominent in periods two and three, contributing to three-fifths of female staple certificates after 1450. The reasons for this change may relate to increasing scribal precision following the Statute of Additions (1413), perhaps combined with a hardening of the prevailing patriarchal ethos.

Table 3—Period 3: Female staple certificates in England, 1450–1532 (N = 150), TNA C 241 and C152/65

|                  | Debtor | Percentage | Creditor | Percentage |
|------------------|--------|------------|----------|------------|
| Single           | 23     | 27.7%      | 38       | 56.7%      |
| Husband and wife | 40     | 48.2%      | 9        | 13.4%      |
| Woman and (nonspousal) partner | 16     | 19.3%      | 16       | 23.9%      |
| Mother and son   | 4      | 4.8%       | 4        | 6.0%       |
| Total            | 83     | 100.0%     | 67       | 100.0%     |

50 Kowaleski, “Women’s Work in a Market Town,” 155.
51 For husbands and wives working together, see Heather Swanson, Medieval Artisans: An Urban Class in Late Medieval England (Oxford, 1989), 74, 110, 116.
52 TNA C 241/230/102.
53 For London widows and business, see Caroline M. Barron, “Introduction: The Widow’s World in Later Medieval London,” in Barron and Sutton, Medieval London Widows, xvii–xxii, xxviii.
54 Sharpe, Letter-Book A, 88.
55 F. R. H. Du Boulay, An Age of Ambition: English Society in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1970), 70.
Many women listed in the staple certificates as widows enrolled their debts with other men. For example, in two separate transactions in 1402 and 1407, the London widow Joan Wight extended a total of £36 worth of credit to a London tailor, Thomas Awdele (or Audley). In both transactions, she acted in partnership with a London vintner, Alexander Sprot. Like the debtor, Joan Wright’s late husband had been a tailor, suggesting perhaps a continuation of the family business.\(^{56}\) In terms of the availability of mercantile capital for staple widows, many of these women’s late husbands had been merchants or members of London livery companies that specialized in wholesale trade, such as the Mercers or Grocers.\(^{57}\) Their widows’ use of the staple suggests that these men bequeathed sufficient assets or movable goods to allow their widows to effectively continue their mercantile pursuits in partnership with other men.

Likewise, widows in all three periods commonly enrolled their debt agreements without a male business partner (table 4). A typical example is Alice de Wympler, widow of Henry Wympler, who in 1281 bought 60s. worth of yarn on credit from Andrew de Castro Suris, merchant of Spain, and then bought more goods from a London merchant one month later.\(^{58}\) In periods two and three, widows were the largest group to transact debt agreements individually. In the latter periods, widows acting alone comprised just under 60 percent of female certificates (table 4). For example, in 1375, Agnes, the widow of John de Rodys of Lincoln, lent £10 to a Lincoln saddler.\(^{59}\) In the final period, Elizabeth Yarford, a London widow, gave £32 13s. 4d. worth of credit in 1527 to a mercer and merchant of the Calais staple, John Pais, a transaction that clearly indicates the widow’s mercantile credentials.\(^{60}\) London widows were entitled to a third of their late husband’s goods and chattels. In mercantile households, where assets were often in the form of movable

\(^{56}\) TNA C 241/198/77; TNA C 241/202/58.

\(^{57}\) TNA C 241/182/71; TNA C 241/212/9; TNA C 241/272/15; TNA C 241/186/81; TNA C 241/209/63; TNA C 241/212/13; TNA C 241/266/43.

\(^{58}\) Sharpe, Letter-Book A, 45, 46. For other examples, see Sharpe, Letter-Book A, 57, 67, 73–74, 88, 124; Sharpe, Letter-Book B, 87, 253.

\(^{59}\) TNA C 241/175/99.

\(^{60}\) TNA C 241/282/94; for other examples, see TNA C 241/192/79; TNA C 241/281/133, TNA C 241/192/79; TNA C 241/281/133.

|                  | Debtors | Widows acting alone | Creditors | Widows acting alone | Total | Widows as a percentage of female debts |
|------------------|---------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------|----------------------------------------|
| Period one       |         |                     |           |                     |       |                                        |
| (1286–1349)      | 12      | 40.0%               | 15        | 38.5%               | 27    | 24.6%                                  |
| Period two       |         |                     |           |                     |       |                                        |
| (1353–1449)      | 46      | 58.7%               | 58        | 56.9%               | 104   | 46.0%                                  |
| Period three     |         |                     |           |                     |       |                                        |
| (1450–1532)      | 40      | 57.5%               | 50        | 60.0%               | 90    | 60.0%                                  |
goods, this provision must have helped widows to continue in business.\footnote{Barron, “Widow’s World in Later Medieval London,” xvii–xxii, xxviii.} Mercantile widows’ inheritance of viable assets must have played a decisive role in female independent participation in London’s wholesale trade. The cloth trader Alice Bokerel, discussed below, was the executrix of her husband’s will, placing her in an ideal position to use the capital inherited from him to further her own trading interests, in this case, the purchase of imported French cloth.\footnote{Sharpe, Letter-Book B, 23; for other examples, see TNA C 241/225/4; TNA C 241/147/118; TNA C 241/183/3.} Widows could also use their inheritances to extend credit or lend money on their own account. Mabel, widow and executrix of Roger Retonsoris of Bread Street (Bredstrate) in London, lent seven marks to fellow Londoner John Mareschal of Walbrook (Walebrock), her inheritance of Roger’s estate and goods, allowing her to invest in trade finance and thus become integrated into powerful financial networks.\footnote{Sharpe, Letter-Book B, 65; for other examples, see Sharpe, Letter-Book B, 126–27.} This access to capital goes some way to explain the high proportion of widows enrolling recognisances in London at this time (table 4).\footnote{Goddard, “High Finance.”}

While married couples and widows were central features of the wholesale trade throughout the period, the extent of female participation in wholesale markets can be accessed more clearly by examining those recognisances and certificates that were enrolled by women, including widows, acting on their own. As can be seen in table 1, in the first period this group is the largest in the sample, at over 60 percent of women lenders and borrowers. In 1291, William Trente, merchant of Bergerac (Brigerack) in the Dordogne, France, extended Sabina Malemeys 40s. worth of credit for (unnamed) goods, presumably merchandise that Trente imported into London by ship from the Dordogne.\footnote{Sharpe, Letter-Book A, 128.} Sabina was the wife (possibly widow by 1291) of Richard Malemeys (or Malemeins), a wool merchant.\footnote{Sharpe, 36.} Earlier in 1286, they had transacted a 60s. deal together—the scribe noted in the margin that Sabina had registered the recognisance with her husband (nota quod uxor fecit recognicionem cum viro)—with another foreign merchant.\footnote{Sharpe, 100.} It seems as though Sabina, dealing both on her own and with her husband, was often at the helm of this particular enterprise. In another example of 1284, Alice Bokerel (or Bukerel) was granted 26s. 8d. worth of credit by Peter Viger, a Bordeaux wine merchant, indicating her participation in the domestic resale of imported wine.\footnote{Sharpe, 86; Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward I, vol. 2, 1279–1288, ed. H. C. Maxwell Lyte (London, 1902), 127.} Alice’s first husband, William Buckerel, had been a draper who loaned money, employed apprentices, and dealt with merchants from Brabant in Flanders in the late 1270s.\footnote{Sharpe, Letter-Book A, 3, 7, 19.} He died ca.1278, but his widow, Alice, and her daughter (or William’s sister) Dyonisia continued his drapery business by importing large amounts of cloth (worth £20 9s. 4d.) from a partnership of merchants from Cahors (Cauz) in France and selling goods (probably cloth) on credit to customers in London.\footnote{Sharpe, 23, 40.} Six years later, Alice had

---

\footnote{Sharpe, Letter-Book A, 23; for other examples, see TNA C 241/225/4; TNA C 241/147/118; TNA C 241/183/3.}

\footnote{Sharpe, Letter-Book B, 65; for other examples, see Sharpe, Letter-Book B, 126–27.}

\footnote{Goddard, “High Finance.”}

\footnote{Sharpe, Letter-Book B, 128.}

\footnote{Sharpe, 36.}

\footnote{Sharpe, 100.}

\footnote{Sharpe, 86; Calendar of Close Rolls, Edward I, vol. 2, 1279–1288, ed. H. C. Maxwell Lyte (London, 1902), 127.}

\footnote{Sharpe, Letter-Book A, 3, 7, 19.}

\footnote{Sharpe, 23, 40.}
remarried, this time to a taverner called John de Branchesle. This second marriage, to a man who must have sold wine in his tavern, might well explain her later diversification into the wine trade.

However, in periods two and three, women operating on their own make up a lower proportion of the sample, averaging about 45 percent of the certificates enrolled by women (tables 2 and 3). Thus, women operating on their own without husbands, business partners, or their sons—but who are not described as widows in these documents—falls from about 60 percent in the first period to about 40 percent in the latter two periods. This drop might again be the ramifications of a hardening patriarchal standpoint concerning women trading by themselves from the fourteenth century. Equally it might also reflect a reduction in commercial opportunities for everybody, regardless of gender, particularly during the long periods of contracting demand during the Great Slump of the fifteenth century. However, some women continued to trade on their own. For example, Isabel de Claregge, who extended 92 marks to a Suffolk merchant named John Prycke in 1362, represents one of the few women who enrolled certificates on their own in the later period.

Yet those recognisances and certificates enrolled by women alone (the “single” category in tables 1 to 3) do not tell the whole story. In period one, roughly 60 percent of the women who, like Alice Bokerel, enrolled their recognisances individually were in fact married. Many, like Katherine de Lyncoln, who in June 1298, sold £17 10s. worth of cloth on credit to merchant and mayor of London, Henry le Galeys, described themselves as “wife of (uxor)”—in this case, John de Lyncoln—within the recognizance, despite their husbands playing no part in the transaction itself. Katherine’s mercantile credentials are confirmed by the fact that the debt was to be repaid at Saint Botolph’s fair two months later, suggesting that she would be selling her wares at this important commercial gathering for wholesale merchants. Many of the “single” women in the latter two periods (tables 2 and 3) were gentlewomen, such as Lady Juliana de Hastings, Countess of Huntingdon, and Alice Giffard, lady of Twyford (Berkshire). These women had access to the landed resources that allowed them to engage in the credit market on their own. Similarly, in the latter periods, some of these women, like Joan Whaplode mentioned above, were married, but their husbands were not cited in the debt certificates. However, unlike in period one, in the latter periods this was comparatively rare. In 1518, Angela John, a newly remarried widow, entered into a debt agreement without her new husband. It is possible that this decline in “single” women’s debt enrollment was the product of a change in scribal or curial practice, particularly after 1413, possibly in conjunction with a toughening-up of society’s conception of

---

71 Sharpe, 83.
72 TNA C 241/188/17; for further examples, see TNA C 241/143/69; TNA C 241/209/23.
73 These women, despite acting alone, cite the name of their husband in the recognisance. For example, see Sharpe Letter-Book B, 37, 41, 60–61, 81, 87, 113, 114, 134, 137, 166–67.
74 Sharpe, Letter-Book B, 69.
75 TNA C 241/138/133; TNA C 241/142/12; TNA C 241/156/31; TNA C 241/158/106; TNA C 241/165/16; TNA C 241/170/23.
76 TNA C 143/427/12; TNA C 146/435. John Whaplode died in 1400; see Corporation of London Record Office, CLRO CLA/007/EM/02/I/004; CLRO CLA/007/EM/04/002/259/291.
77 TNA C 152/65/2/749.
coverture. This hardening might have been particularly acute when demand contracted in the fifteenth century and the market for credit contracted as well. Despite these impediments, the debt evidence suggests that women, generally in partnership with a man—usually their husband—remained a small but important component of wholesale commerce in the later Middle Ages.

**FEMALE MERCHANTS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

Throughout the period covered by the Exeter accounts, jointly importing with other merchants, generally male, was for most of the women common practice. The edited customs accounts and brokerage books of six ports between the mid-thirteenth century and the mid-sixteenth century are evaluated here: Boston, Bristol, Chester, Exeter, London, and Southampton, along with the customs records and other documents pertaining to a number of smaller ports, such Lynn (now King’s Lynn) in Norfolk and the ports of Cornwall.78 The customs accounts, compiled by royal customs officials, record ships’ arrival and leaving dates (usually the dates at which the goods were loaded or unloaded), the names of the merchants whose goods were on board, the nature and value of these goods that were liable to custom or subsidy, and the amount of custom or duty levied on these. In some cases, the accounts also record the ship’s name, its home port, and its master.79 Some, for example, Chester and Exeter, record palatinate or local customs rather than overseas royal customs. This additional perspective is important because local customs covered coastal trade, which required less capital and international connections than overseas trade—factors that probably gave women easier access to the wholesale market than to overseas trade, which required higher capital investment. For example, listed in the Chester custom’s accounts is Alicia Dymmok, the widow of John Dymmok, who imported, presumably from another English port, eighteen tons of iron with three men on the *Mary Grace of Chester* that anchored at Burton (Cheshire) in June of 1529.80

The Southampton brokerage books recorded the tolls charged on goods—generally imports—leaving the port on carts as they passed through Southampton’s Bargate during the final period, between 1430 and 1540. These goods were transported by road to merchants, generally in southern England, to sell to customers inland. These invaluable records document the quantity of goods carried in each cart, the

---

78 S. H. Rigby, ed., *The Overseas Trade of Boston in the Reign of Richard II* (Woodhead, 2005); E. M. Carus-Wilson, ed., *The Overseas Trade of Bristol in the Later Middle Ages* (Bristol, 1997); K. P. Wilson, ed., *Chester Customs Accounts, 1301–1566* (Chester, 1969); Maryanne Kowaleski, ed., *The Local Customs Accounts of the Port of Exeter, 1266–1321* (Exeter, 1993); Norman Scott Brien Gras, *The Early English Customs System: A Documentary Study of the Institutional and Economic History of the Customs from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1918); Henry S. Cobb, ed., *The Overseas Trade of London: Exchequer Customs Accounts, 1480–1* (London, 1990); John Hare and Winifred A. Harwood, “An Assessment of the Brokage Book,” in Michael Hicks (ed.), *English Overland Trade, 1430–1540* (Oxford, 2015), 169–71, maps 1–32B; *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Henry VII*, vol. 2, 1494–1509, ed. H. C. Maxwell Lyte (London, 1916); Dorothy M. Owen, *The Making of King’s Lynn: A Documentary Survey* (Oxford, 1984); Maryanne Kowaleski, ed., *The Havener’s Accounts of the Earldom and Duchy of Cornwall, 1287–1356* (Exeter, 2001).

79 Cobb, *Overseas Trade of London, xxv–xxvi*; Rigby, *Overseas Trade of Boston, xx–xxii*.

80 Wilson, *Chester Customs Accounts, 50*.
name of the carters who conveyed the goods, the people who owned them, and their destination.\textsuperscript{81}

To reveal the extent of medieval women’s participation in international trade—a direct involvement in importing or exporting goods—an analysis of edited English customs records is required. Immediately, the level of female participation in foreign trade is shown to be negligible. In period one in Exeter, between 1266 and 1321, only fifteen female merchants out of 1,071 importers can be located in the customs accounts of the Port of Exeter, representing just over 1 percent of the active traders working in coastal trade at that time.\textsuperscript{82} These women, generally residents of Exeter or its outport, Topsham, were all importers either of fish or, more commonly, wine. The male importers of Exeter trafficked the same types of goods but in larger quantities. For example, in March 1301, Joan Busse (or Bosse), the wife of Nicholas Busse, of Exeter, imported one tun of wine in partnership with Master John Dyrewyn (probably the ship’s master).\textsuperscript{83} The ship, \textit{La Blythe} of Yarmouth, when it docked at Topsham was carrying eighty-six tuns and ten pipes of wine, divided among twenty-eight importers; Joan’s cargo was one of the smallest on board. Her husband, Nicholas Busse—a major Exeter importer—was also importing wine on the ship. His consignment totaled four tuns, one of which, like his wife’s cargo, was imported in partnership with another merchant. Women generally imported goods in partnership with other merchants throughout the period covered by the Exeter accounts.

Seven of these women were regular importers of wine or fish. For example, Edith Girard of Topsham imported a total of 8½ tuns of wine on four ships between 1316 and 1318, indicating a regular participation in the coastal trade.\textsuperscript{84} Two of these ships, \textit{La Langbord} and \textit{La Margarete}, both of Exmouth (Devon), docked only nine days after each other, suggesting that they were part of the same convoy. Edith Girard seems to have been splitting her cargo between ships within the convoy, perhaps for increased security, a common practice among international traders.\textsuperscript{85} Occasionally a number of women imported wine on the same ship. Edith Girard and Richalda (or Rychabella) de Irelond imported wine twice together on the same ship, once with their goods being listed beneath each other.\textsuperscript{86} On one of these voyages—aboard \textit{La Margarete} in 1316—their cargoes were joined by those of a third female merchant, Joan Smalecomb.\textsuperscript{87} Bearing in mind the infrequency of women participating in trading activities, the fact that three women imported the same product on the same ship at the same time suggests some sort of relationship based around shared interests, but one that fell short (as far as we know) of entering into business partnerships together.

\textsuperscript{81} Michael Hicks, ed., \textit{English Inland Trade, 1430–1540: Southampton and Its Region} (Oxford, 2015), 2–8.
\textsuperscript{82} Kowaleski, \textit{Local Customs Accounts of the Port of Exeter}, 20, 53, 65–66, 72, 74, 82, 88–89, 94, 104, 110, 112, 115, 117, 130–31, 133–34, 143, 152–54, 155–57, 167, 173, 180.
\textsuperscript{83} Kowaleski, \textit{Local Customs Accounts of the Port of Exeter}, 66.
\textsuperscript{84} Kowaleski, 134, 152, 156–57.
\textsuperscript{85} Alison Hanham, \textit{The Celys and Their World: An English Merchant Family of the Fifteenth Century} (Cambridge, 1985), 129–30.
\textsuperscript{86} Kowaleski, \textit{Local Customs Accounts of the Port of Exeter}, 134, 156.
\textsuperscript{87} Kowaleski, 134.
While most of these women might be described as occasional merchants (when compared to most of their male counterparts who regularly imported goods into Exeter), importing small quantities of goods only once or twice, one Exeter woman, Joan de Smalecomb, did so on a more significant scale. Between November 1315 and December 1317, she imported a total of fifty tuns and one pipe of wine, with her cargoes being brought in on between three and four ships each year.88

On some occasions, she brought in the largest cargoes of all the merchants importing goods aboard ship, such as the thirteen tuns she imported with the smaller cargoes of the other twenty-five merchants on Le cog Seynt Gile in 1315.89 Following patterns identified above in the debt evidence, it seems likely that Joan was widow of John de Smalecomb, who had been a major importer and member of the mercantile elite of the town, serving as both receiver and steward in the port in 1312–13.90 John’s brother William and another relation, Adam, also regularly imported goods into Exeter. Another female importer, Ceci de Smalecomb, possibly Joan’s daughter, continued to import wine for several years after Joan quit the business (or died) in late 1317.91 The importance of family enterprise, combined with the available capital of a well-connected and successful (and deceased) merchant husband, allowed Joan de Smalecomb to continue his business at an unusually prominent level.92

The early fourteenth-century evidence from the vibrant ports of London and Southampton also identifies female import and export merchants. Joan, wife rather than widow, and therefore probably business partner of Admar de Lile—likely an alien merchant—imported wine into London in 1303.93 She was just one out of fifty-four merchants paying customs in London that year. Even as the plague tore through London in 1349, Isabella de Preston, a denizen merchant, exported English cloth to the Continent on a ship with two other export merchants, one of whom was an alien.94 Isabella’s export venture represented just under 3 percent of all the merchants exporting from London in that grim plague year. In Southampton two female merchants, Joan de Collier and Joan Chamberlayn, can be seen exporting English wool from the port in 1331, composing, again unusually, 14 percent of the Southampton wool-exporting merchants in that year.95

In the smaller ports of Cornwall in period one, only one woman, Sarra, widow of Roger Ylg, can be found during a sixty-nine-year period (1287–1356) paying customs duties for exporting hides.96 But merchants in Cornwall at this time were not a numerically sizable group. Thus Sarra’s two cargoes leaving Cornwall represent about 4 percent of the merchant cargoes in the two-year period in which she is recorded (1285–87). In Lynn (Norfolk) between the late thirteenth and the mid-fifteenth centuries, evidence can be found of women possibly dealing in imported

88 Kowaleski, 130–31, 133–34, 142–43, 152–53, 154.
89 Kowaleski, 131.
90 Kowaleski, 215.
91 Kowaleski, 167–68, 180.
92 For further examples, see Charles Gross, ed., Select Cases Concerning the Law Merchant, AD 1270–1638, vol. 1, Local Courts (London, 1908), 14–16; G. O. Sayles, ed., Select Cases in the Court of King’s Bench under Edward I, vol. 3 (London, 1939), 69–72; TNA SC 8/69/3405.
93 Gras, Early English Customs, 401.
94 Gras, 416; see also 434 for a similar example from Ipswich (Suffolk).
95 Gras, 409–10.
96 Kowaleski, Haverner’s Accounts, 35–36.
French goods and holding shops in the port. However, there is no evidence of English women being involved in foreign trade—one alien woman is discussed below—from this small port.

In period two, the comprehensive accounts from the port of Boston in the later fourteenth century during the reign of Richard II (1377–1399) provide an exhaustive picture of the region’s import-export trade. As at Exeter, the hundreds of merchants and their cargoes that entered and left the harbor are listed in the customs accounts. However, none of these merchants was a woman. There is little evidence of declining commercial activity at the port at this time, so the explanation must lie elsewhere. Perhaps the level of female participation was partly the result of a more vigorous blanket implementation of patriarchy but was also dependent upon the size of the market. The number and distribution of customers is of importance here, because the more active or vibrant the commercial environment, the greater ability it had to absorb female participation in trade, as is seen above in Cornwall and Norfolk. If we (somewhat unfairly) compare London and Boston in the period following the Black Death, then the capital’s many thousands of often wealthy customers galvanized a dynamic economy with very large numbers of merchants attempting to satisfy that demand. Where there were more merchants, as in London between 1480 and 1481 (described below), we also find higher female participation in trade. This was not the case in Boston. Therefore, the lack of female merchants in Boston is unlikely to be solely the result of a particularly rigid local embargo on female operators—but rather a function of the generally limited commercial opportunities available in the post–Black Death provincial port.

In period three, in London in the early fifteenth century, 1.2 percent of the cargoes arriving or leaving this busy port contained merchandise carried by female merchants. In 1420–21, most of these were alien female merchants. Very few of these merchant women were English. One, Matilda Tekyll, was a denizen merchant who on 29 April 1421 exported medium quantities of ungrained cloth on a ship also carrying the cargoes of three men; but she appears to have been something of an exception. Of the aliens, Christina Combemaker was the most active, exporting cloth from London on three separate ships in that one year. She, as did many merchants exporting from London at this time, specialized in a product known as thrums.
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97 Owen, *The Making of King’s Lynn*, 274, 455.
98 Rigby, *Overseas Trade or Boston*, xx–xxii.
99 Goddard, *Credit and Trade*, 163–65.
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(thrommes). These were the unwoven woolen threads that remained on the loom once the web had been removed. These waste products of the weaving process were collected together and then exported and made into fine cloth in Flanders in an attempt to avoid paying the English customs duties.105 All of Christina’s cargoes were, as was usual, loaded onto the ships with those of male merchants (aliens and denizens exporting cloth and metals), but on two of the voyages the ships’ manifests included the cargoes of other female merchants.106 One of these was Elisa Heyden, who was exporting a parrot (papaga) worth 20s. On another ship, Christina Combemaker imported household goods into London, including comb-heads, perhaps merchandise from a family comb-making business.107 This import of household goods and subsequent export of cloth from London clearly demonstrates the normal patterns of trade pursued by all merchants, male and female, at this time.

The evidence of the brokage books from the port of Southampton between 1430 and 1540 reveals English women marketing foreign imports from that port to markets inland. Carts filled with goods were sent to the markets where the merchants had purchased them then redistributed them. Two of the principal destinations for these goods, Salisbury (Wiltshire) and Winchester (Hampshire), are surveyed here. Out of the 1,502 Salisbury merchants who received carts from Southampton, eleven were women (0.7 percent). These women’s goods included wine and fish, but others, such as Margery Hill, imported oil and woad (raw materials for the local cloth industry), and Madeline Ravenell imported canvas.108 These women are not described in terms of their marital status, but it is known that some, such as Isobel Ailward and Margaret Bele, were related or married to merchants. Isobel Ailward’s father, Robert, imported wine, dyes, cloth, and metalware, and Margaret Bele’s husband, Richard, imported fish, hides, soap, and tar (used in the dyeing process)—instances that reinforce the importance of family capital in mercantile ventures.

In Winchester, 1,173 merchants were in receipt of carts from Southampton; twenty-one of these (1.8 percent) were women. Here again the demand from the local cloth-manufacturing industries meant that many merchants redistributed imported dyestuffs. Nine of the twenty-one female merchants from Winchester, such as Johanna Reson and Alice Dyer, dealt in imported woad, madder, dyes, and oils for the cloth industry.109 Another of these was Isobel Ailward, who, as seen above, sold wine in Salisbury but sold woad in Winchester in 1461. Clearly this woman was acting as a merchant—albeit on a small scale, with very few carts leaving Southampton—but nonetheless she seems to have reacted to the assorted demands of different customers or markets. Four of these women sold imported wine, and three, including Isobel Grante (or Graunte) and Mabel Yonge, sold imported miscellaneous or household goods.110 Compared to their male peers, however, these women played a relatively minor role in the long-distance (from Southampton to Salisbury and Winchester) wholesale import distribution trade.
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In Bristol in the later fifteenth century, women likewise had a share, again a small one, of the import-export market. Of the cargoes paying customs duties at this major port, 1.6 percent belonged to women. Between March and September 1461, one woman (in fact the only woman in that period), Margaret Holbroke imported wine, woad, and resin (*rosin*, used in the dyeing process) into the city. Like other merchants, she divided these cargoes among four ships, three arriving on 20 May 1461 and the fourth arriving six days later, presumably as part of the same convoy. Margaret may well have been a widow, as a Richard Holbroke of Bristol is known to have died in 1457. She may have worked with her husband in his business or was continuing it after his death. Eighteen years later in the same port, fourteen (1.2 percent) of the 1,197 import/export cargoes were recorded as belonging to women. Many of them are listed several times in the customs records, suggesting ongoing business ventures. Three were particularly active between 29 September 1479 and 3 July 1480: Alice Hutton, Margaret Rowley, and Agnes Vale. Agnes Vale imported fish from Ireland and oil and vinegar on two separate ships; Margaret Rowley imported wine, often very large consignments, from Bordeaux and madder (*a dye*) from Flanders in three ships, again in larger quantities than those of the men on board the same ship (one consignment being valued at £82). Margaret Rowley had a merchant daughter or sister named Joan who imported sugar, oil, wax, and Spanish wine from Hondarribia in Northern Spain on three separate ships, again suggesting the possibility of a family-run trading business. Alice Hutton imported wax and sugar from Spain and woad from Bordeaux on three separate ships. On two of the ships from Spain her cargoes were joined by those of other female merchants, on one ship by Joan Rowley and on another by what amounts to a (virtual) sorority of Bristol businesswomen, Agnes Vale, Joan Rowley (whose goods were listed directly beneath Vale’s), Agnes Harding, and Alice Brown. Alice Hutton’s trading activities in this year reveal much about husband-and-wife trading partnerships. Aboard the *Trinite* of Bristol, landing in March 1480, Alice Hutton imported two hundredweight of sugar from Lisbon along with ninety-four other shippers. Her cargo is listed below that of her husband, John, whose cargo included large quantities of wine, oil, and wax. Clearly the couple was working separately, or at least paying the customs individually, while carrying their goods together on the same ship. The fact that their cargoes are listed beneath each other might suggest that their goods were positioned adjacent to one another on the deck and were thus disembarked and assessed by the harborside customs official one after the other. This suggests perhaps a marital partnership whereby each specialized in different commodities within the family trading business.
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From among the 439 ships listed in the customs accounts of the port of London for 1480–81, only the cargoes from thirteen of those ships included goods belonging to seven women, representing just under 3 percent of those ships that berthed and unloaded goods at the port in that year. None of these women were English. These alien women merchants generally imported goods, including cloth, household goods, and fish, into London. Of these, Margaret Claysson was the most active. She imported flax, yarn, and cloth (twenty-two pieces of Brabant cloth of three hundred ells in size) on two different ships that arrived in London on the same day (7 March 1481), presumably part of the same convoy. She also exported nine days later two barrels containing 276 candles on a ship bound for Bergen-op-Zoom in Flanders. Like most import-export merchants, Margaret imported goods to sell in London and then bought English goods to export on outgoing ships to Flanders. This example fits well with our understanding of the female merchants of later medieval Ghent and Cologne. Many of the female merchants of Ghent were considerably less active than their male counterparts; those of Cologne often specialized in discrete sectors of the import trade, particularly spices, while being entirely absent from other sectors. The female merchants generally dealt in smaller quantities than the mercantile elite of both cities. Continental women traders also seem to have concentrated upon the redistribution of these imports in their home markets.

The women who imported goods into London in the late fifteenth century also seem to have been specialists, concentrating in household items. Antonia Jamys (or James) was an alien importer whose goods were landed in London from two Flemish ships in July 1481. Her cargoes included old feather beds, pillows, bolster, distaffs and spindles, flax, red laces, cushion covers, old sheets, table cloths, diaper towels, chafing dishes, candlesticks, pots, and kettles. Alice Johnson, another alien merchant, imported a similar cargo on a different ship from the same port on the same day as Antonia Jamys. The other female merchants, Isabella Bronell and Dorothea Selk, likewise imported household goods, including two thousand pins, three dozen hats, pillows, and pieces of a rich striped silk, originally from Alexandria (bord Alexander). Only one woman, Elizabeth Wolf, imported barrels of Pimpernel eels (a broad-nosed variety of common eel), and even these might have been destined for household consumption.

Might this pattern, similar to that of the female merchants of Cologne and London in the 1420s (above), be interpreted as a specialization in products for female customers, such as distaffs and spindles, or merchandise for women managing their
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households, such as beds, sheets, cloths, pillows, and chafing dishes? The only female merchant from the records of Lynn, the alien Margaret Durdregh', likewise imported explicitly household-related goods, including in 1396 a barrel of spectacles and haberdashery worth £7. This certainly represents a potentially stimulating area for future research into English female trade, one that makes perfect sense in a patriarchal environment where women might be expected to cater to the various and specific demands of those who managed households.

Among the hundreds of men recorded as importing or exporting goods through the Port of Chester between 1301 and 1566, only three women, Anna Beeke, Alicia Dymmok, and Katheryn Fleming (of Drogheda, Ireland), can be located (that is, three female merchants in 265 years), all operating in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries. They imported wine, iron, and cloth in small quantities, and their cargoes were carried aboard ships among the cargoes of other (male) merchants. For example, in the early sixteenth century, Katheryn Fleming imported one pack and one fardel of yarn (a measure of canvas or cloth, sometimes known as a “bundle”) on the Bartholomew of Liverpool. On the same ship were the cargoes of nineteen male importers. Women seem to have rarely broken into Chester’s coastal trade; Chester, like Boston and other smaller ports, may have lacked sufficient demand or commercial dynamism to encourage widespread female participation in the wholesale distributive trades.

CONCLUSIONS

A century ago, Annie Abram argued that women were engaged in mercantile buying and selling in medieval London. While the picture of English female merchants is more convoluted than Abram suggested, she was in effect correct. This article has sought to quantify the extent to which female merchants penetrated English wholesale markets in the Middle Ages. It is true that women represented only a small minority of the English mercantile community in this period—rarely rising above 4 percent of this community. This low participation rate, which proportionally decreased after 1300, combined with the fact that a significant number of women’s transactions were undertaken in partnership with men, most commonly their husbands, must be considered a product of an overarching medieval patriarchal ethos that maintained that ideally women should not work without male supervision. Women raised within a cultural milieu that consistently promoted patriarchal stereotypes—reinforced by the increasing imposition of the common law of coverture, even if it was not directly applicable in staple courts—may well have opted not to enter this particular male-dominated commercial domain. One could argue therefore that patriarchal forces did indeed constrain women’s economic potential or agency within medieval wholesale trade, contributing to the normalization of women’s low participation rate.
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But this view does not tell the whole story. The above evidence suggests that female merchants did indeed operate in the same way as the male majority and that their mercantile activity was not particularly distinctive. It is true that women dealt in smaller quantities of goods than men and in some cases may have specialized in importing household merchandise, an area in which male merchants may have had less expertise. If some women did specialize in trading in household goods, then paradoxically they exploited the roles that a patriarchal society imposed upon them—domestic roles, care of the household, and so on—thereby exploiting a niche market. Furthermore, women’s very common trading partnerships with their husbands and other men seem by and large to have been based upon genuine commercial collaborations. The Law Merchant used in staple courts did not employ the precept of coverture, meaning that there was no requirement to include a husband’s name in a transaction unless he played some role in it. Access to capital was a key component of entry into this market, and women with access to their husband’s assets were therefore placed in a stronger position. Likewise, these husband-and-wife partnerships, underpinned by joint household reserves and solid reputations that allowed access to both party’s assets, encouraged a greater feeling of security among traders, particularly during uncertain times. As a result, women commonly sought trade finance in partnership with men, usually their husbands.

With patriarchy acting as “background radiation” limiting female access to wholesale markets, the above evidence suggests that four other linked features shaped women’s economic trading endeavors: status, capital, geography, and the vagaries of the English economy. Having these factors in the right place at the right time greatly benefited women merchants. As can be seen from so many of the examples cited above, many of these merchants were of high status, sometimes with gentry family associations but more commonly, as historians have noted before, as wives and widows of wealthy merchants who were at the apex of the mercantile system in which they operated. Being brought up and trained in a mercantile household, cultivating effective business contacts and networks, having the capital to invest in the business, possessing business acumen, and being able to manage agents and factors (who would have been men), would have all been necessary qualities. This elevated status brought with it commercial opportunities and opened doors that might have been closed to other women. Access to capital to invest in business ventures also played a crucial role in women’s decisions to enter the wholesale market. The capital requirements of investing in trading ventures, either foreign or domestic, meant that female merchants required considerable resources in order to operate effectively within this competitive field. This capital came from a number of sources: landed estates, dowries, movable goods, inheritances, and husband’s assets, to name but a few. Widows with access to and full control over their late husbands’ resources similarly were able to engage in trading activities. The absence of sufficient investment capital, and the creditworthiness associated with it, would have excluded many who wished to trade.

Beyond accidents of birth or choices in marriage and the availability of capital, the geographical factor of where women located their enterprise played an important role. It is clear from both the debt and the customs evidence that women merchants were much more common in major commercial centers like London and Bristol than
in smaller provincial centers like Boston, Chester, or Lynn. Between 1353 and 1532, 49 percent (debtors) and 62 percent (creditors) of the debt certificates involving women whose residence was recorded plied their trade in the capital. Populous and wealthy cities like London, with its major port supplying luxury imported goods, possessed more buyers and sellers, more professional services, more specialized and diversified producers, more goods and more merchants than anywhere else in the kingdom. Like Ghent, this dynamic commercial environment presented far more opportunities to investors than did the provincial centers, especially from the fifteenth century on. Women traders seem to have taken advantage of these highly commercialized conditions. In addition to the greater opportunities for female traders afforded by large cities, women’s entry into this market was also affected by economic conditions. A greater female participation rate is seen during periods of economic growth, such as in the later thirteenth century, the 1390s, or the 1520s. Here again women seem to have enthusiastically entered the market when they believed the commercial opportunities warranted it. Declining female debt registration in the early fifteenth century also mirrored the declining trend of male debts at that time. This trend might partly be explained by men and women making rational business decisions to move in and out of the wholesale market depending upon their reading of the economic realities of the period. However, while short-term parallel movements can be seen in men’s and women’s debt enrollments, over the two-and-a-half centuries of this study, we see a fracture (rather than a steady, long-term contraction) in the proportion of female participation in wholesale trade in about 1300. It was a complex interplay of factors, both commercial and patriarchal, that impacted upon the propensity of women to participate in England’s wholesale markets.
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