

Clockmakers, Milliners and Mistresses: Women Trading in the City of London Companies 1700-1750¹

Amy Louise Erickson

Mary Delany wrote to her sister in 1750 that 'young men have a thousand ways of improving a little fortune, by professions and employments, if they have good friends, but young gentlewomen have no way, the fortune settled on them is all they are to expect – they are incapable of making any addition'.² Her opinion epitomises the historical view that no woman of social standing – traditionally, social standing was designated by the title 'mistress' or 'Mrs' in its abbreviated form – would have worked for her living unless forced to do so by penury.³ The historiography of occupational training appears to reinforce this position. Studies of girls' apprenticeship in England have focused on pauper apprenticeship, where the overwhelming majority of girls, some as young as six, were set to learn the 'art and mystery' of housewifery.⁴ To a modern eye, training in housewifery appears to confirm the supreme importance of marriage for women and their consignment to a life of domestic drudgery at least at lower, or perhaps ordinary, social levels. The pauper apprenticeship system was based on the medieval apprenticeship system operated by urban guilds, from which it differed in key respects: in gild apprenticeships, parents paid a premium; and children were only apprenticed in their teens, for a period of seven years. The literature on these companies agrees that there were a few women members in the middle ages and through the early modern period, but they were a small proportion of the total, and they were excluded from the governance of the companies.⁵

London's guilds were called livery companies, and there were around eighty of them in the early modern period. It is certainly true that women appear to have been unusual in the companies:

-
- 1 This article arises from work on the Occupational Structure of England and Wales c.1379 to c.1729, funded by the Leverhulme Trust. It started life at the 'Letters before the Law' conference held at the Clark Library, UCLA, 3-4 October 2008, and I thank the participants and especially the organisers, Ann Jessie van Sant and Jayne Lewis.
 - 2 Lady Llanover, ed., The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Granville, Mrs Delany, 1st ser., vol. 2, 1861, 574. She was criticizing the 'error which which most fathers run into, and that is in providing too little for daughters'.
 - 3 There are many examples of this assumption, but Peter Earle is most frequently cited on the subject of women and work in London, so examples from him are: 'The Middling Sort in London', in Jonathan Barry and Christopher Brooks, eds, The Middling Sort of People, Basingstoke & London, 1994, 153; 'The Female Labour Market in London in the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries', Economic History Review, 42, 1989, 338.
 - 4 Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, Adolescence and Youth in Early Modern England, New Haven, 1994. Keith Snell, Annals of the Labouring Poor: Social Change and Agrarian England, Cambridge, 1985.
 - 5 C.R.H. Cooper, 'The Archives of the City of London Livery Companies and Related Organisations', Archives 16/72, 1984, 19. Steve Rappaport, Worlds Within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth-Century London, Cambridge, 1989, 36-42. Maryanne Kowaleski and Judith M. Bennett, 'Crafts, Guilds and Women in the Middle Ages: Fifty Years after Marian K. Dale', Signs 14/21 (1989), esp. 474-80.

among apprentices (and apprenticeship is the only form of membership which has been quantified to date) only one percent of the total was female.⁶ But looking more closely at who these girls were, and what they and their masters or mistresses were doing in the companies, brings into focus an entire section of London's luxury trades centering on millinery, and its geography in the City, which has never been recognised. The companies' role in the City and the City's relation to women in business is completely absent in the existing literature. This article will uncover a surprisingly large population of well-to-do tradeswomen. The new evidence undermines the received views on the relationship between wealth, women and paid work.⁷

To introduce these women and explore the issues of apprenticeship, company membership and business ownership and how they relate to family life, I will start with Elinor Mosely, whose elusive appearances in surviving historical records first introduced me to the complexities of women's company membership. Mosely's life spanned the first half of the eighteenth century, which sets the parameters of this study, and she is visible to us through her apprenticeship records in the Worshipful Company of Clockmakers, her tax payments and her family's wills. The second section of this article looks at the structure of the London companies and their significance for businesswomen at this time. The final section examines the nature, extent and significance of the millinery business, an entrepreneurial trade which had no company of its own.

Elinor Mosely

Elinor Mosely was the second child of Rowland Mosely, a prosperous York apothecary, and one who was prominent enough to serve as one of the six city chamberlains in his early twenties before marrying.⁸ Elinor was seventeen years old in April 1718 when she was bound as an apprentice in London to George Tyler and his wife, Lucy, under the auspices of the Worshipful Company of Clockmakers - of which George was a freeman (that is, a full member). George and Lucy were around forty years old at the time they took Elinor Mosely as an apprentice.⁹ When she arrived, there were already two older girls in the Tyler household serving as apprentices: Mary Darby and Rebeckah Fisher (see Table 1). Two more were taken on during Elinor's term of seven years: in

6 This estimate is based on the nearly 60,000 apprentices over this half century in Cliff Webb's database of fifty-six of London companies' apprenticeship records. My thanks to Cliff Webb for generously allowing me to use his material.

7 I use 'tradeswomen' in the sense that merchants, wholesale-men and shop-keepers are 'tradesmen', superior to mechanics or handicrafts-men. Earle, 'Middling Sort', 141.

8 Surtees Society xxx

9 Elinor was christened 25 November 1700. The Parish Register of St Crux, York, vol 1, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Parish Register Section, 1985. George began his own apprenticeship in 1692, and must have been at least 21 when he took the freedom in 1699. London Guildhall Archive (hereafter LG): The Company of Clockmakers' Register of Apprentices 1631-1931, compiled by C.E. Atkins, London, 1931. Married couples at this social level were normally of about the same age.

1720 George and Lucy took on Catherine Jackson, daughter of a Leeds clockworker¹⁰, and in 1722 Hannah Campleshon, daughter of a York grocer. Another apprentice, Elizabeth Newton, joined the household after Elinor had left it. So at any given time over the decade between 1715 and 1725 there were at least three and usually four female apprentices in the Tyler household. George Tyler had earlier taken one male apprentice, and he may have overlapped with the first four female apprentices.¹¹

TABLE 1

In January 1726/7, Elinor earned the freedom of the Clockmakers' Company in her own right, paying the standard fee of £1 at the quarterly meeting of the company's court. Nine months later the same court recorded that she took her own first apprentice: Catherine Mosely. Catherine was her own sister, who was fifteen years old at the time. (The usual age of apprenticeship was around fourteen, so that the seven-year-term concluded at the age of legal majority, twenty-one.) The following month Elinor took on a second apprentice, Mary Bate, the daughter of a Kentish clergyman. (See Table 2.) In 1729 Mosely took premises in the north end of Gracechurch Street, where she lived with her two apprentices and undoubtedly also with female servants to undertake the domestic labour. Three years later she took on a third apprentice, Mary Newton, daughter of a London goldsmith and by his address a neighbour of hers. When her first two apprentices had finished their seven-year terms, she took on a fourth, Elizabeth Aiskell, daughter of a Kentish sea captain, and subsequently Katherine Capon in 1737, Frances Griffith in 1738 and Mary Eyre in 1739. For the next three years she appears to have kept four apprentices in the house, and then three again from 1742. Even if we suppose that, in common with many male London apprentices, some of Elinor Moseley's may have left her before their contract was up,¹² she must have run a thriving business to support that amount of additional labour.

TABLE 2

Gracechurch Street was a prominent location: part of a main thoroughfare, the Roman road connecting the southern counties with the city via London Bridge, and extending north to

10 The record clearly says 'clockworker', although in Leeds it seems likely that he may have been a clothworker.

11 Henry Elliott was taken on by Tyler in March 1704/5 for a seven-year term but did not take his freedom until December 1720, which is very unusual. Whether he lived in the Tyler household throughout is unclear.

12 Ilana Krausman Ben Amos, 'Failure to become Freeman: Urban Apprentices in Early Modern England', *Social History* 16/1, 1991, 155-72.

Cambridge and thence to York (now the A10). Mosely's was one of the dozen or so premises immediately north of the junction with Lombard Street and Fenchurch Street, a main east-west artery through the City. Wealthier tradespeople dominated the streets, while poorer ones lived in the alleys and courts. Mosely was very close to both Leadenhall Market (being redeveloped in her lifetime but still housing a green market, a hide market and the nearby herb market, in mid-century)¹³ and the Royal Exchange in Cornhill, next to the Bank of England and a centre of luxury trading for a century and a half by Mosely's time.

Mosely ran her business in Gracechurch Street for at least fifteen years. She was obviously a single woman, but we know that only because of the continuity of her surname. Neither the records of the Clockmakers' Company nor the tax records ever marked her as unmarried. Her identity was as a business proprietor and taxpayer – we would say an occupational identity – until her final appearance in the Clockmakers' Company records, in the register of members' quarterly dues payments called the Quarterage Book. In the last quarter of 1747, the clerk entered 'Married' in the space which should have recorded the payment of her dues, just as he entered 'Dead' or 'Gone away' against other names.

Mosely was forty-seven years old at the time of her marriage, and under the English custom of coverture all of her moveable property -- including her stock, her employees, her profits and her company membership -- became her husband's upon marriage. As far as the Clockmakers were concerned, Moseley's occupational identity was overridden by her identity as a married woman. But her occupational identity was complicated even before her marriage: the same clerk who wrote 'married' against her name in 1747 also included a column for every member's specific business.¹⁴ From this it appears that Mosely was in fact not a clockmaker: she was a milliner. Not one of the records of apprenticeship in which Mosely was involved gave any hint of her actual occupation. Her seven apprentices, duly enrolled in the Clockmakers' Company, were actually training in millinery but this was never specified. Mosely herself, and the other five girls apprenticed to George and Lucy Tyler in the Clockmakers' Company, must have been training in millinery with Lucy Tyler.

This vignette of two London households is not one normally associated either with a City company or with genteel women in the eighteenth century. A closer look at the companies and their structure will help us understand the situation of both the female apprentices and their mistresses, Lucy Tyler and Elinor Mosely.

13 I can identify her location because she paid land tax in the ward of Bishopsgate Within and poor rates in the parish of All Hallows Lombard Street and these two jurisdictions overlapped in only a small area. [Ogilby's Map of the City of London \(1676\)](#), Harry Margary with Guildhall Library, 1976; John Rocque's map 1746.

14 LG: Ms 2723/2, Clockmakers' Company Quarterage Books, 1745-51. This is the only volume of the quarterage books which includes members' specific occupations.

Clockmakers and other companies

The apprenticeship indenture secured the apprentice's good behaviour and obedience in exchange for bed, board, clothing and training from her master and mistress for the standard term of seven years. The agreement was between the child on the one hand, and the master and mistress on the other, although the parents or guardians had doubtless been involved in arranging the apprenticeship and they supplied the premium paid to the master or mistress. The level of the premium in London company apprenticeships in the early eighteenth century could range from nothing, especially where the apprentice was related to the master or mistress, to hundreds of pounds for the highest levels of the highest status trades. Most premiums amounted only to the cost of maintenance for one or two years. The medieval system of apprenticeship was debated in the eighteenth century: both R. Campbell's London Tradesman (1747) and Joseph Collyer's The Parents and Guardians' Directory (1761), handbooks to the London trades, were sceptical of the value of apprenticeship in many trades. And its use in that period as a means of skill transfer is debated by economic historians today.¹⁵ Certainly few, if any, trades actually required seven years to learn. But the later part of the term may be viewed as the master's compensation in labour for the investment made in training in the early part of the apprenticeship. And parents certainly saw apprenticeship as an investment in the future economic wellbeing of their children.

The paternal background of Lucy Tyler's and Elinor Mosely's apprentices and the value of the premiums paid with them are distinctive in the Clockmakers' Company. Their fathers were three clergymen, a gentleman, a ship's captain, an apothecary, a clockworker/clothworker, and a grocer, all from outside London, and a City goldsmith. In contrast, the fathers of most male apprentices in the Clockmakers' Company were from lower status trade backgrounds within greater London. The premium that Mosely's parents paid for her apprenticeship was not recorded, but her fellow apprentice, Hannah Campleshon, was bound in 1722 for £60. At the same company court session there were four boys bound, apparently to clockmaking: one for £8 and three for £10 10s. Frances Griffith was bound to Elinor in September 1738 with a premium of £42. In the same month, boys were bound for premiums of £15, £25, £40, and 'goodwill' (i.e., nothing). In November 1739, Mary Eyre was bound with £50, while boys apprenticed in November and December came with goodwill (two), £6, £10, and £42. There is as yet no systematic study of apprenticeship premiums, so the relative amounts paid with girls and with boys, and their relative value in different companies,

15 S. R. Epstein and Maarten Praak, eds, Guilds, Innovation and the European Economy 1400-1800, Cambridge, 2008. Ian Anders Gadd and Patrick Wallis, eds, Guilds, Society and Economy in London 1450-1800, London, 2002.

remains unknown. One estimate, based on the apprenticeship tax imposed in 1709, suggests that the average premium was £23 in these years. However, the tax did not apply to premiums worth less than £5 or to those who were made apprentices for 'goodwill' or 'for love and affection', as the Grocers' Company put it, so the real figure was considerably lower.¹⁶ We can at least say that the girls apprenticed to George and Lucy Tyler and to Elinor Mosely in the Clockmakers' Company were substantially more prosperous than most of the boys bound apprentice in the same company.

In 1761, Collyer opined that 'A milliner, in good business, will not take a girl with less than £40 or £50, but one in a lesser way will take with a girl £20 or £30.' An apprenticeship to a clockmaker, he thought, required a premium of £10 to £40.¹⁷ An earlier guidebook, A General Description of All Trades (1747) called millinery 'a considerable Trade' and suggested that 'the better sort very rarely take less than 20 or 30 guineas with an apprentice'.¹⁸ So in the first half of the eighteenth century premiums of £40 to £60 mark out Tyler and Mosely as milliners in very good business. This is the level of premium with which boys could be set apprentice to merchants, apothecaries or goldsmiths (although those could also go into hundreds at the top end).¹⁹ Elizabeth Aiskill's and Katherine Capon's lower premiums of £31 and £30 respectively in the 1730s may have been accepted by Mosely because she had a kinship or business connection with their families, which is now lost to posterity. Capon's premium is particularly interesting because two thirds of it was paid by the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy. Millinery must have been sufficiently respectable not only for a clergyman to apprentice his daughter in the business, but for the Corporation to finance this endeavour and thereby stretch its interpretation of 'sons'.²⁰

Millinery's respectability is not widely accepted by historians today, and I will deal below with its associations with seduction and prostitution. However, the apprenticeships listed in Tables 1 and 2, involving thirteen girls from gentry and professional families around England bound by a City company in two London households, with premiums several times those of their male peers, certainly suggest that apprenticeship might be a means for a girl to acquire a skilled occupation other than taking care of a household. The apprenticeship of Mary Eyre to Elinor Mosely in 1739

16 Christopher Brooks, 'Apprenticeship, Social Mobility and the Middling Sort, 1550-1800', in Barry and Brooks, Middling Sort, 65-7. Note that the schema offered by Peter Earle in The Making of the English Middle Class: Business, Society and Family Life in London 1660-1730, London, 1989, p.94, is based on a few court cases, not on company apprenticeship records. His estimate of £30-40 for skilled craftsmen in A City Full of People: London 1650-1750, London, 1994, 63-4 and 118 are, like Brooks', based on the 1709 apprenticeship tax and so are certainly too high.

17 Parents and Guardians Directory, London, 1761, 196 and 104.

18 A General Description of All Trades, London, 1747, 149-50.

19 Examples can be seen in company records, or in printed county record series such as Mrs Hilary Jenkinson, 'A List of Bedfordshire Apprentices: 1711-1720', Bedfordshire Historical Record Society 9, 1925, 148, 160, 168, 173.

20 A fictional example of a milliner's apprentice financed by the Sons of the Clergy appears in John Alcock, The Life of Miss Fanny Brown (A Clergyman's Daughter), Birmingham, 1760, 4, English Short Title Catalogue. Eighteenth Century Collections Online.

(see Table II) was distinctive insofar as her father was not mentioned, and a closer examination sheds light on the familial importance of girls' apprenticeship. Mary was described as the daughter of Elizabeth Eyre 'of Christ's Hospital'. The surviving fortnightly governors' minutes of Christ's Hospital School reveal that Elizabeth had been hired in 1733 as one of ten ward nurses (they would now be called matrons), each in charge of fifty children at a salary of £18 per annum. It is not recorded in the Hospital's records whether 'Mrs Eyre' was married or widowed at that point.²¹ So a ward nurse at Christ's Hospital could apprentice her daughter with £50 – more than twice her annual wage – to a milliner 'in good business'. Of course, Elizabeth Eyre may have had other income, or perhaps her husband had left a bequest of £50 for Mary's apprenticeship. But she cannot have been very well off because otherwise she would not have taken a job at £18, near the bottom rate for a journeywoman milliner. Her financial situation improved a couple of months after she placed Mary, when she was elected by the governors to the post of nurse to the sick ward. This must have been a promotion because there were twenty-three candidates for the job, including all of the ward nurses, but I have been unable to locate the pay level. The Hospital's schoolmistress, who may have been the highest paid woman on the staff, earned £40 per annum in 1721.²² It is unlikely that Elizabeth Eyre's new salary exceeded this level, even twenty years later. Clearly the advancement of her daughter was a significant investment for the family, and the route was through apprenticeship in a London company.

The London companies by the eighteenth century had, by and large, lost monopoly control of their trades, although this varied between companies. The most powerful companies (called the 'great twelve', as all were ranked) had only tenuous connections to their nominal trade. So in the Haberdashers' Company, less than ten per cent of the members were in trades related to haberdashery.²³ In the much smaller Clockmakers' Company, ranked 58th, ninety per cent of the members were still in clockmaking trades, and the remaining ten per cent were engaged in quite other trades. There is no more indication that the clerk was surprised at the presence of a female milliner in the ranks than he was at the presence of a male pawnbroker or druggist.

Why did non-clockmakers become members of the Clockmakers' Company? Because in order to trade within the walls of the City of London (an area just over three miles square²⁴) a man

21 'Mrs' was regularly used as a status title for unmarried women (see note xxx), but Elizabeth Eyre could not have been single: possession of an illegitimate daughter would certainly have made her ineligible for the post of nurse.

22 LG: Ms 12806/10, Christ's Hospital Court Minutes 1718-45, 498, 12 Feb 1739/40; 363. I have been unable to locate a birth record for Mary Eyre, so do not know her father's name, status or occupation to find a will or any siblings. There is no Mary born to an Elizabeth in London at the right time. Elizabeth may have been Mary's stepmother, a relationship which would not have been designated in the eighteenth century.

23 Based on a sample of 100 masters' occupations taken from LG: Ms 15864/3, Haberdashers' Company Register of Bindings, 1708-26, October 1708 to May 1709.

24 Malachy Postlethwayt, *The Universal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce*, 4th edn, 1764, vol. 2, under 'Middlesex'

had to be free of the City, which meant he had to be a member of one of the City's companies. Three routes to company membership are normally adduced: apprenticeship, patrimony, and redemption (purchase). Redemption was facilitated in certain circumstance, for example after the Great Fire of London in 1666, when the City wanted to encourage rebuilding. Henry Jevon in 1673 purchased the freedom of the Clockmakers for one pound 'he having taken a house and inhabiting in the new buildings of this Cittie'.²⁵ But there was a very important fourth means of attaining company membership, and that was by marriage. As an attorney at law, Henry Jevon may have participated in company business and feasts. But it was his wife, Christian, who enrolled five girls as apprentices in the Clockmakers' Company between 1675 and 1685, as she was entitled to do as the wife of a freeman. Their daughter, Mary Jevon, took the freedom by patrimony in 1706, and transferred it to her husband when she married in six years later.²⁶ Neither Christian's nor Mary's trade was specified in the company records.

It appears that women as well as men needed membership of a company and freedom of the City of London to trade there. This is not an obvious conclusion, since women were barred from civic freedom in other English cities and towns so far studied. In Oxford and Southampton only widows were allowed to trade, and they were harassed by the companies when perceived as a threat.²⁷ In York, the rules of patrimony applied equally to daughters and sons²⁸ and women did take up freedom in the sixteenth century²⁹ but rarely in the seventeenth or eighteenth.³⁰ In Beverley and Southampton, single women had to purchase a special certificate to trade which was much more expensive than company freedom.³¹ The London system was not like the German ones, where guilds excluded independent unmarried women and required widows continuing the trade to take on journeymen,³² or like French ones, where separate seamstress guilds were established in the later

(no page numbers).

25 LG Ms 2711/2, Clockmakers' Rough Minute Book 1673-84/5, 5 May 1673.

26 LG AHS Pam 51 Female Apprentices in the London Clockmakers' Company and Ms 2711/4, Clockmakers' Rough Minute Book 1698-1709, 30 Sep 1706. Mary and her husband (John Lyon, m. Aug 1712, All Hallows London Wall, International Genealogical Index (hereafter IGI) v5.0) were threatened with a lawsuit in February 1712/3 if they failed to pay quarterage. Ms 2710/ 3 Clockmakers' Court Minute Books 1699-1729.

27 Mary Prior, 'Women and the Urban Economy: Oxford 1500-1800', in her *Women in English Society 1500-1800*, London, 1985, 108. Amy M. Froide, *Never Married: Single Women in Early Modern England*, Oxford, 2005, 25, 94. For further urban conflict between guilds and women outworkers, see Beverley Lemire, *Dress, Culture and Commerce: The English Clothing Trade before the Factory*, Basingstoke, 1997, 44-55.

28 *Register of York Freemen 1680 to 1986*, compiled by John Malden, York, 1989, 6.

29 Diane Willen, 'Guildswomen in the City of York, 1560-1700', *The Historian*, 46:2, 1984, 214, and individual entries in *Freemen of York*, vol 1, Surtees Society 96, 1896.

30 S.D. Smith, 'Women's Admission to Guilds in Early-Modern England: The Case of the York Merchant Tailors' Company, 1693-1776', *Gender & History* 17:1, 2005, 103.

31 In Beverley around 1700 the fee was £6 13s. 4d. *Beverley Borough Records 1575-1821*, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series 84, 1933, 188. Froide, *Never Married*, 94-6.

32 Sheilagh Ogilvie, *A Bitter Living: Women, Markets and Social Capital in Early Modern Germany*, Oxford, 2003, 234, 240, 277.

seventeenth century.³³

There was no Milliners' Company in London.³⁴ But there were two companies whose trade resembled that of millinery. One was the Haberdashers' Company, but whether the haberdashers were in conflict with the milliners remains unknown: the official history offers no discussion of the role of women in the company before the twentieth century.³⁵ The other was the Mercers' Company, the wealthiest of them all and half-owners of the Royal Exchange, whose membership by the time milliners appeared was entirely divorced from the original trade of dealing in fine fabrics.³⁶ By 1700 a man could open up shop as a haberdasher or a mercer or a draper without being a member of the Haberdashers' or Mercers' or Drapers' Company, as could a woman. But they had to be members of some company and free of the City.

The requirement of citizenship for businesswomen was enforced both by the companies and by the City. In the Leathersellers' Company, the apprenticeship of Mary Lepar in 1702 was annulled less than two months later by the company court when it discovered that 'the same was fraudulently contracted to protect the sd Mary Lepar to follow a trade in the City'.³⁷ Lepar clearly needed citizenship, but the Leathersellers were not prepared to countenance misuse of their apprenticeship system to provide her with it. London's Court of Aldermen in the later seventeenth century regularly received petitions from women who had neither served an apprenticeship nor married a freeman, requesting the freedom of the City in order to continue their trades.³⁸ At least in the later seventeenth century, the court never turned down such requests. Hilda Smith estimates from the Court records that 'around forty per cent of those in the freedom and operating shops and other businesses were women in the late 1600s', including widows admitted automatically. By contrast, the Corporation of London freedom lists show only one in ten were female, because they do not include widows or those admitted by petition.

The number of women who gained access to civic freedom by virtue of marriage is entirely

33 Clare Crowston, 'Engendering the Guilds: Seamstresses, Tailors, and the Clash of Corporate Identities in Old Regime France', *French Historical Studies*, 23/2, 2000, 339-71.

34 Other European cities did have all female guilds, but not London. Ogilvie, *Bitter Living*, xxx. However, this is not necessarily an explanation of the absence of a milliners' company because millinery did not become female-dominated until 1700, long after most companies were founded.

35 Ian Archer, *The History of the Haberdashers' Company*, Chichester, 1991.

36 A 'mercier' in London dealt in fine fabrics, whereas in a country town he was simply a tradesman of relatively high status. On the company see Anne F. Sutton, *The Mercery of London: Trade, Goods and People, 1130-1578*, Aldershot and Burlington VT, 2005.

37 Leathersellers' Company Archives: Register of Apprentices 1686-1707. I am grateful to the Worshipful Company of Leathersellers for allowing me access to their records.

38 Hilda Smith, "'Free and willing to remit': women petitioners and the Court of Aldermen", paper presented at Umeå University. Between 1681 and 1700, Smith has identified 231 women admitted to the freedom of the city by service, by patrimony, or by redemption. This was probably only one per cent of the total. In 1690, one per cent of applicants for civic freedom (23 of 1850) were female. D. V. Glass, 'Socio-Economic Status and Occupations in the City of London at the End of the Seventeenth Century', *Studies in London History*, London, 1969, 185-6.

unknown. The only reason for the wife of a freeman to appear in the apprenticeship records of his company, as Christian Jevon and Lucy Tyler did, was that the apprentice was learning her trade, not his. But conversely, she was not necessarily named even if the apprentice was hers: the Haberdashers never and the Leathersellers rarely named a man's wife, even if a female apprentice was clearly not learning the master's trade of, say, customs house officer. There were in the Clockmakers' Company in the first half of the eighteenth century seven other couples besides George and Lucy Tyler who took one or more girls apprentice. These I think can safely be assumed to be learning the trade of the wife. There were also seven men and seven women alone besides Elinor Mosely who took one or more girls apprentice in this period. These may have been learning clockmaking or not: the trade is impossible to tell by the sex of master or mistress. Some of the men were clockmakers taking their own daughters as apprentices, alongside their male apprentices, where we can be reasonably confident they were learning clockmaking. Women who took male apprentices in the company and who can be identified (by a marriage record) as the widow of a clockmaker, were probably teaching clockmaking. Perhaps half of the mistresses who took apprentices in the Clockmakers' Company appear to have been in a clockmaking trade.³⁹

Lucy Tyler was never identified by the Clockmakers as a milliner, but another freeman's wife was so identified. At the same 1722 session of the Clockmakers' court that saw Hannah Campleshon bound to Lucy Tyler, Catherine Cext, a Wandsworth girl whose Huguenot father was dead, was bound to 'James Hubert for seven yeares to learne the trade of Elizabeth his wife who is a milliner'.⁴⁰ Elizabeth took two other girls apprentice in 1725 and 1728, so she had two apprentices in the house over a decade, and for one year, three. James Hubert took no male apprentices. In 1730 Cext was, like Mosely before her, admitted a freewoman of the company. She took no apprentices through the company, but she may have traded nonetheless.⁴¹ She did not marry until nine years later, at the age of thirty.⁴² But while only Catherine Cext and Elinor Mosely were identified as milliners among those women free of the Clockmakers' Company in their own names, it seems fairly certain that other mistresses might also have been milliners.

The exact trade carried on by members is explicitly identified in the Leathersellers',

39 This estimate is based on the sex of the apprentice. It is impossible to quantify in the Clockmakers' Company, because occupational specification is only available for one six-year period (LG: Ms 2723/2, Clockmakers' Company Quarterage Books, 1745-51), and not in the apprenticeship records.

40 LG: Ms 2711/5, Clockmakers' Company Rough Minute Book, 4 June 1722.

41 Her name is entered in the quarterage books although there is no record of her having paid. However, this volume of the quarterage books is haphazard.

42 Catherine Cext is an unusual name. A woman of that name married a William James Chambers on 28 April 1739 in Westminster St Paul Covent Garden. He was not a member of the Clockmakers' Company, and indeed was only 24 years old at the time of marriage. IGI 1992 microfiche. There is no record of him having served an apprenticeship in London in the 56 companies so far indexed by Cliff Webb.

Grocers', and Haberdashers' Companies. Of the 114 girls apprenticed in the Haberdashers' Company (ranked eighth of the great twelve) in the first half of the eighteenth century,⁴³ 51 (or forty-five per cent) were apprenticed to milliners, most of them female. Fifteen masters' trades (thirteen per cent) were unidentified. The next most frequent apprenticeship after millinery was to haberdashers (six) and tailors (four); all remaining trades were represented by either two apprentices (haberdashers of small wares, button sellers, joiners, merchants, perukemakers, cheesemongers), or one (cane chair maker, coatseller, coffeewoman, cooper, cork cutter, corn chandler, dyer, fanmaker, gardener, glover, goldsmith, haberdasher of hats, knight [sic], leathercutter, mantuamaker, mariner, mercer, sempstress, snuffboxmaker, stocking trimmer, tallow chandler, toyman, warehousekeeper, and wireworker). Most of these non-millinery apprenticeships were to masters, not mistresses, and as the Haberdashers did not make a practice of recording the master's wife's name when the apprentice was to serve her, as the Clockmakers did, it remains unclear whether the girls were serving in their masters' trades or in a different trade belonging to their masters' wives. The Grocers' Company (ranked second) specified trades only between 1717 and 1743. Of the twenty-seven girls set apprentice in this period, eighteen were to milliners, three to coat makers/sellers, and five were unspecified.⁴⁴

The records of other companies, like the Clothworkers, the Cordwainers, the Painter Stainers, the Salters and the Skinners, do not normally specify the trade of the master or mistress, but do include apprenticeships which bear two or more of the hallmarks of millinery apprenticeships, that is: girls of gentry, clerical, professional or prosperous trade paternity, often from outside London, apprenticed with relatively high premiums to a married master and mistress or to a mistress alone.⁴⁵ The 'great twelve' companies exhibit the same patterns as the less influential ones, although some have smaller numbers of women and there is a greater tendency to acquire freedom by patrimony rather than apprenticeship.

Of the eight women taking the freedom of the Clockmakers' Company, six did so by apprenticeship, one by patrimony and one by redemption. By contrast, in the Leathersellers' Company, as many women took the freedom by patrimony as by apprenticeship, and a few purchased by redemption. Overall, apprenticeship remained the most important means of acquiring freedom through the eighteenth century, although the proportions by patrimony and especially

43 LG: Ms 15860, Haberdashers' Company Register of Apprentice Bindings 1675-1708, and Ms 15864/3, Haberdashers' Company Register of Bindings, 1708-55.

44 LG: Ms 11598/2, Grocers' Company Register of Freemen Admitted and Apprentices Bound 1721-43. [earlier xxx]

45 LG: Ms 30719/3, Skinners' Company Presentments, with apprentice bindings upside down at back of book; Ms 24139/1, Cordwainers' Company Register of Apprentice Bindings; Ms 5669, Painter Stainers' Company Register of Apprentice Bindings; and David Wickham's 'The Clothworkers' Company and Women', in his All of One Company, London, 2004, esp. 247-9. I am grateful to the Salters' Company and their archivist, Katie George, for allowing me to consult the company's apprenticeship registers.

redemption increase,⁴⁶ but this may vary widely by company. For women, the numbers taking the freedom and the numbers apprenticed are only fractions of the total number trading under the auspices of any company. The proportion of women among those taking the freedom is the smallest, followed by those serving an apprenticeship, then those taking apprentices (in most companies mistresses took more male apprentices than female apprentices), and the largest proportion is to be found in the quarterage books, since these include women who traded by virtue of marriage but had never served an apprenticeship and those who never took an apprentice, having family members, journeymen or journeywomen to assist. But record survival is patchy for quarterage books,⁴⁷ whereas lists of freemen survive for almost every company.

In the Clockmakers' Company in the first half of the eighteenth century, only eight women took the freedom, but at least thirty-eight were apprenticed.⁴⁸ In the Leathersellers' Company in the same period, eighteen women took the freedom, thirty-seven girls were apprenticed, fifty-nine mistresses took at least one apprentice, and seventy-one women paid quarterage. A total of 136 women were registered as trading or apprenticed. Some sixty per cent of these women had no trade specified, although the fact of their appearing in this type of record means they were in business. Of the fifty-four female Leathersellers whose trade was specified, just under half were in leather-related trades, like leatherselling or trunkmaking or breechesmaking; one quarter were in high end clothing trades like millinery and lace, and one quarter were in quite other trades (confectioner, printer, painter, goldbeater, woodmonger, and so forth).⁴⁹ We have no gender comparison because no study of the Leathersellers has yet clarified what proportion of male Leathersellers were in leather-related trades. The excellent Leathersellers' records exemplify what can be learned about women's activity in a City company. But no company systematically recorded the activity of women married to company freemen and thereby entitled to trade. So estimates of women's trading activity through company sources will always be minimums.

The benefits of company membership were conferred from wives to husbands as well as from husbands to wives. The complications of company membership and marriage are illustrated by an apprenticeship involving Charles Burney, the musicologist and father of the writer Fanny

46 Glass, 'Status and Occupations', 385.

47 Furthermore, not all companies charged quarterage to all members (the Leathersellers exempted the livery) or at all (the Salters never saw the need to charge members dues).

48 This figure is a minimum because the AHS Pam 51 appears not to be complete. For example, LG: Ms 2710/3 Clockmakers' Company Minute Book 1699-1729 lists Mary Ferrier, free on 6 Dec 1714, having been apprenticed to James Ferrier, but she does not appear in AHS Pam 51.

49 I am very grateful to the Leathersellers' archivist, Jerome Farrell, for sharing his own research on women in the company with me. The number of women in the company in this period is a minimum because men in the company's livery (the upper echelon) did not pay quarterage, and neither did their widows, whereas it appears from the fact that girls were apprenticed to men in the livery that the wives of liverymen were in business.

Burney, thereby making the facts of the case slightly easier to trace. In 1746 one Mary Kenn, a surgeon's daughter, was apprenticed in the Haberdashers' Company to a Cheapside haberdasher, Thomas Chapman. Four years later, probably upon Chapman's or his wife's death (in the Haberdashers' Company only the master is named, even if the apprentice was his wife's), Kenn was transferred to Charles Burney, Citizen and Musician. While Charles did have at least three female musical scholars at this time,⁵⁰ he is very unlikely to have personally taken on a haberdasher's apprentice. The Haberdashers' record of the occasion notes 'Mrs B received this'.⁵¹ It does not say that the apprentice was to serve her, rather than her husband, but this was almost certainly the case.

Esther Sleepe, prior to her marriage to Charles Burney, had taken the freedom of the Musicians' Company by patrimony in 1747, at age twenty-one or twenty-two. Her sister Martha also paid her 18s 4d. for the freedom on the same day.⁵² Esther's and Martha's father was unusual in being a musician in the Musicians' Company.⁵³ Like the Haberdashers, and unlike the Clockmakers, most members of the Musicians' Company were not musicians. At the time that the Sleepe sisters took the freedom there were at least twelve other women who were members of the company in their own names (not counting those who were members by marriage).⁵⁴ The Sleepe sisters' occupation was not specified, but in all probability Esther and Martha worked with their mother, Frances Sleepe. When Burney started courting Esther, whom he met at his brother's dancing school, he noted that her mother kept a fan shop in Cheapside.⁵⁵ Having a fan shop meant that fans were probably produced on the premises, almost certainly by a female labour force. Frances had borne fourteen children, of whom not more than eight survived.⁵⁶ There was a Fanmakers' Company from 1710, but Frances could trade in the City by virtue of her marriage to a member of the Musicians'

50 The Letters of Dr Charles Burney, vol 1: 1751-1784, ed. Alvaro Ribeiro, SJ, Oxford, 1991, 3.

51 LG: Ms 15864/3, Haberdashers' Company Register of Bindings, 550. (This is one of the few company registers with page numbers.)

52 Memoirs of Charles Burney 1726-1769, edited from autograph fragments by Slava Klima, Garry Bowes and Kerry S. Grant, Lincoln, Nebraska & London, 1988, 83, n.3. The Musicians' Company had a high proportion of freemen by patrimony and by redemption. Note that the record of the Sleepe sisters' freedom appears only in the original Musicians' Company Renter Warden Accounts (LG: Ms 3091), which lists fees received. They are not recorded in either of the official lists: Musicians' Company List of Freemen 1743-1831 (LG: Ms 3098) or Musicians' Company List of Freemen 1743-69 (LG: Ms 3097). There is a body of work to be undertaken on the discrepancies between different records in each company. For this reason, it is always worth checking the company or gild originals, and not relying on collated lists of freemen. The same may be true in other cities. So whereas the published lists for Norwich, Newcastle and Exeter list no women (Froide, Never Married, 92), this is worthy of further investigation.

53 He was head of the City Waits, who supplied music for civic affairs.

54 My list of women members of the company is compiled from the Renter Warden's Accounts recording purchases by redemption and patrimony (LG: Ms 3091) and the brief survival of apprenticeship records in LG: Ms 3097. The Musicians' Company appears to have apprenticed more girls and apprenticed more boys to mistresses than most other companies: from a 13-year sample, it appears that 7 % of apprentices were girls and 8 % of apprenticeships were to mistresses (1740-53, from LG: Ms 3097, which lists apprentices at the back of the freemen book), compared with average figures of 2 % and 3 %, respectively.

55 Memoirs, 83 for Frances.

56 IGI, 1992 on microfiche. I take the existence of repeat names (two James, two Joshuas, four Richards, and an Esther as well as a Hester) to mean that the elder children so named had not survived.

Company. Esther's and Martha's only possible reason for taking company membership was to trade in the City, either on their own account or more likely in partnership with their mother. When she married Charles Burney in June 1749, Esther's freedom became his (and hers by marriage). Upon Charles' entry into the Musicians' Company on 3 July 1749 (by right of marriage, although this is not stated in the record), he was listed as from 'Fan Shop, Poultry' (Poultry is the eastern extension of Cheapside). At some later point, when he had become more eminent, this entry was crossed out and overwritten 'Musician, Queen Square'.⁵⁷ At the time of his marriage Charles earned, in addition to his private pupils, £30 per annum as organist of St Dionis Backchurch,⁵⁸ the same annual rate, as we shall see, as a journeywoman milliner. When Mary Kenn joined the household the following year, Charles and Esther were still living with Frances. Esther had a toddler and was expecting another child,⁵⁹ but it appears that she was still trading in the fan shop, since there is no apparent reason why Mary Kenn should not have been apprenticed to Frances or Martha.⁶⁰

We might know more about Esther's (and Martha's and Frances') business if her daughter Fanny's early diaries had survived. Esther died when Fanny was ten, by which time she was already writing. But at the age of fifteen, someone – perhaps her father, perhaps her stepmother, perhaps someone else – persuaded her to burn all her juvenilia. Fanny's grandmother, Frances, survived her daughter, Fanny's mother, by many years, yet we still know nothing of either woman's business life. Fanny only described her much beloved grandmother as a 'perfect lady', likening her in that respect to Mrs Mary Delany, a woman who never needed to work for a living.⁶¹ Was it somehow shameful to Fanny that her mother and grandmother had been in trade? They were certainly not unintellectual, if that was what Fanny worried about. Before Esther was ten, her mother had given her a sampler to stitch with a series of aphorisms, including the memorable 'Let not the flesh seduce thy soul but remember these things well and learn to spell'.⁶² Prior to her marriage, in addition to

57 LG: Ms 3098, Musicians' Company List of Freemen 1743-1831, 3 July 1749. Richard Crewdson, in *Apollo's Swan and Lyre: 500 Years of the Musicians' Company*, Woodbridge, 2000, 152, avers that Burney took up the freedom because of his musical appointments 'and through his father-in-law's persuasion', but this seems extremely unlikely in view of the record. For Sleepe's history with the company from 1711, see Crewdson, 149-52.

58 Evelyn Farr, *The World of Fanny Burney*, London, 1993, 12.

59 John Wagstaff, 'Burney, Charles (1726-1814)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, May 2006.

60 There is a hint, no more, of estrangement between Frances and Richard Sleepe, which may have created problems for her taking apprentices. There is no record in the Musicians' Company of any of the three women taking any other apprentices, although any acquired by turnover from a different company, as Mary Kenn was, would not necessarily have been recorded by the Musicians.

61 Mary Delany (1700-88), friend and correspondent of Dean Swift, was in an easy financial position. But she still left a legacy of work in the form of the popular art of shellwork (some of it architectural, in the grotto she did for her friend the Duchess of Portland at Bulstrode in Buckinghamshire), embroidery for her own clothes and as gifts for friends, and in her extraordinary botanical paper collages, admired for their artistry by Joshua Reynolds and for their botanical accuracy by Joseph Banks. Ruth Hayden, *Mrs Delany. Her Life and Her Flowers*, British Museum, 1980, esp. 158.

62 Joyce Hemlow, *The History of Fanny Burney*, Oxford, 1958, 5.

training in the fan shop, Esther also translated from the French Maupertuis' 'Letter upon comets addressed to a Lady' of 1742, which Charles published anonymously in 1769, after his wife's death.⁶³ In editing her father's papers, Fanny did successfully obscure for the next two centuries the fact that her eldest sister was born before her parents' marriage. Would she really have wanted to obscure her maternal trade history? Whatever the reason, neither Esther's nor Frances' nor Martha's business appears in any biographies of Charles Burney or Fanny Burney. The Sleepe women's enterprise is expunged to such an extent that Charles Burney's biographers are led to hypothesize his mother-in-law's father's membership of the fanmakers' guild in Paris to explain the family's residence in a fan shop in London.⁶⁴

The complicated relationship between the London companies and their female members has been obscured by the subsequent development of those companies that survive into wealthy gentlemen's clubs and charitable institutions. It is not uncommon for members of London companies today to think that they opened their doors to women for the first time in the late twentieth century. Without doubt, freewomen were excluded from full membership: there is as yet no evidence of them ever serving on a company court (the governing body) or of voting for the membership of the court, or entering City politics or even attending the company feasts.⁶⁵ At the same time, the London companies were central to well-to-do women's ability to trade in the eighteenth century. Widows were not officially freemen, but they enjoyed the right to trade and to take apprentices, which was the most essential if not the most prestigious element of company membership. While perhaps half of the women in a company were probably involved of the trade of that company, a significant minority were milliners. So what was a milliner?

Milliners

The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) defines a milliner in the eighteenth century as 'a haberdasher

63 Memoirs, 179, n.1. Charles Burney, An Essay Towards a History of the Principal Comets that have Appeared Since the Year 1742. ... To which is prefixed, ... A Letter upon Comets. Addressed to a Lady, by the late M. de Maupertuis, London, 1769. The annotated translation is at 8-35. The French edition was a topic of interest in the year of its publication, but we do not know when Esther Sleepe made her translation. Miscellaneous Correspondence ... Sent to the Author of the Gentleman's Magazine, Which Could not be Conveniently Inserted at Length or Properly Abridged, London, 1742, 75-9. The Lady to whom the original letter was addressed, according to Burney (p. 4), was the marquise Du Chatelet, who herself translated Newton's Principia into French with commentary, among other scientific works. Judith P. Zinsser, La Dame d'Esprit: A Biography of the Marquise Du Chatelet, New York, 2006.

64 Memoirs, 83, n.5, where the editors assume that the fan shop belonged to Frances Wood/Dubois Sleepe's father, even though it was she who paid the rates on the property (p.86, n.4), following Percy Scholes, The Great Dr Burney, Oxford, 1948, 52.

65 Elinor Mosely, although free in her own right, does not appear on the list of those present at a Clockmakers' Company feasts. LG: Ms 2734. Nor does she appear on the list of parishioners in All Hallows, Lombard Street, despite paying poor rates in the parish. REF xxx

of small wares; seller of fancy wares, accessories and (female) apparel, either originally from those wares coming from Milan, or from selling a thousand things'. Haberdashers themselves had earlier split into two branches: hatmaking on the one hand; 'small wares' like ribbons and gloves on the other hand. Milliners Mary and Anne Hogarth had a business card engraved in 1730 by their brother William, which illustrated a wider range of products than that envisaged by the OED, including children's as well as women's clothing, men's waistcoats, and fabrics for both clothing and upholstery:

ye best and most fashionable ready made frocks, sutes of fustian, ticken and holland, stript dimmity and flannel wastcoats, blue and canvas frocks, and bluecoat boys dra/rs, likewise fustians, tickens, hollands, white stript dimmitys, white & stript flannels in the piece. By Wholesale or retale at reasonable rates.

[ILLUSTRATION: © Trustees of the British Museum]

The blue frocks and bluecoat boys' drawers refer to the uniform for the nearby Christ's Hospital, the charitable school which accepted around 200 children of City freemen every year. So millinery at this time may have included school uniforms. Milliners sold ready-made clothes but also provided bespoke tailoring services. The narrowing of millinery to its current meaning of hatmaking did not occur until the later nineteenth century. As late as 1839, Charles Dickens in Nicholas Nickleby refers to the character of Mme Mantalini interchangeably as a milliner and a dressmaker.

Mary (1699-1741) and Ann (1701-71) Hogarth were almost exact contemporaries of Elinor Mosely (1700-after 1752). Their 'frockshop' in Long Walk was one of seventeen occupied mainly by seamstresses and milliners which lined the cloisters of St Bartholomew's Hospital, in a row that the hospital built to raise funds following the Great Fire. The Hogarths had been there since 1725⁶⁶ but they and their neighbours had to vacate when the hospital refurbished the row in 1730: hence the need for a business card to advertise the new location in Little Britain Gate at the sign of the Kings Arms. They moved again four years later, but if they printed another card on this occasion, it has not survived. In 1736 their fire insurance policy shows them in the West End, near their brother.⁶⁷ Whereas William had been apprenticed to an engraver (an apprenticeship he never completed), there is no evidence as yet that Mary or Anne served an apprenticeship in a London

66 See the Poor Rate Books for the parish of St Bartholomew the Less, in St Bartholomew's Hospital (hereafter SBH): SBL 29/23-24. The Hogarths do not appear in 1724 (SBL 29/22).

67 Ronald Paulson, Hogarth's Graphic Works, 3d revd edn, London, 1989, 74, 232. Little Britain lay in the parish of St Botolph Aldersgate, and its rate books do not survive before 1734, by which time there are no Hogarths. LG: Ms 10142, St Botolph Aldersgate Parish Register.

company.⁶⁸ Since their father, as an adult immigrant to London, had not served an apprenticeship, the most plausible explanation for the sisters trading in London is that their mother, Anne Hogarth, had taken the freedom of her own father's company by patrimony, which she would in turn have shared with her husband, as Esther (Sleepe) Burney did. Her daughters could then claim theirs by patrimony too.⁶⁹

Anne Gibbons lived with her parents, who are described as 'shopkeepers', in St Bartholomew's when Richard Hogarth came to lodge with them in the 1680s. By the time she married Hogarth, at the age of twenty-nine, it is likely that she had learned her trade from her parents. The younger couple remained in the house with Anne's widowed mother for a decade.⁷⁰ Whether Anne continued in business with her mother during that time, or only took it up again when her husband was imprisoned for debt in 1708 or from his death in 1718, is now impossible to find out.⁷¹ The only reference in biographies of Hogarth to his mother's employment is to her having sold gripe ointment in 1709, 'doing her best to bring in some money' while her husband was in debtors' prison.⁷² But between 1725 and 1730, the tenant of the two Hogarth premises in St Bartholomew's listed merely as 'Anne Hogarth' was almost certainly William's, rather than his sister,⁷³ suggesting that Anne Gibbons Hogarth had some retail experience in the millinery business.

Milliners in the seventeenth century were predominantly male, but after 1700 their numbers

68 They do not appear in the 56 companies' apprenticeship lists that Cliff Webb has indexed. William's apprenticeship does not appear in the tax registers (<http://bookhistory.blogspot.com/2007/01/apprentices-h.html>), so the premium that his parents paid may have been less than £5 and so not liable to the tax.

69 I have not yet discovered which company this might have been. The indexes available are only to apprenticeships, and do not include freedom taken by right of patrimony. The Hogarth sisters and their mother were neighbours to Mary and Sarah Henson and their mother, resident in Well Yard from 1719 (SBH: SBL 30/5 Constable's Rate 1719-20. These survive from 1718 but the first volume is missing from the archive. SBL 30/10 SBL 29/18 Poor Rate for 1720. Widow Hanson paid in 1720 and 1721, then Mary Hanson in 1723, Sarah and Mary in 1725, and the Poor Rate books for 1726-35 are missing from the archive, as are those from 1713 to 1720.) The Hensons' insurance policy of 1726 identifies them as clockmakers and silversmiths (Philippa Glanville and Jennifer Faulds Goldsborough, *Women Silversmiths 1685-1845*, London & Washington DC, 1990, xxx). The Henson sisters are not listed in the Clockmakers' Company List of Freemen 1631-1896 (LG: Ms 11568) and they were not apprenticed, so they like the Hogarth sisters probably acquired freedom by patrimony. The Clockmakers' Company freemen lists reliably record women members who gained the freedom by apprenticeship, but I have not checked their accuracy in including those purchasing freedom by patrimony or redemption, so there is a small possibility that the Henson sisters may appear in the court minutes or accounts of the company but not in the freedom lists (see the considerably more haphazard lists of the Musicians' Company, described in note xxx).

70 Lindsay, *Hogarth*, 2.

71 The rental records for St Bartholomew's Hospital do not survive for the first half of the eighteenth century.

72 Jack Lindsay, *Hogarth. His Art and His World* (London, 1977), 10.

73 Paulson, *Hogarth*, 232, does not think that the mother came to live with her two daughters until 1727 when the tenant is recorded as 'Mrs Hogarth', but that appellation could have been applied to any of the Hogarth women, as businesswomen. Paulson and Hogarth's earlier biographers have identified the Anne Hogarth in the tax records (poor, constable, and scavenger rates) as his sister rather than his mother, although the probable identity as Anne Gibbons Hogarth is detailed in letters in the St Bartholomew's Hospital archive as early as 1956 (St Bartholomew's Archive: letters between W. Le Hardy of the Middlesex County Record Office and the hospital archivist, April 1956).

increased and they became predominantly, although not exclusively, female.⁷⁴ The rise of women in the trade is probably partly one of changing nomenclature, but was also connected with the mantua phenomenon at the end of the seventeenth century. The mantua, originally an unboned gown for women, appeared in the 1670s and by 1700 was 'generally worn' (OED). Supposedly because this dress required less skill than more structured women's clothing, being all cloth and worn over a separate pair of stays, seamstresses, who had hitherto made only undergarments, moved into making mantuas. Their business expansion encountered considerable opposition from male tailors, as documented in Oxford and York.⁷⁵ The mantua very soon became as complicated and fitted as its predecessors, and was overtaken by new dress styles. But women retained the trade of making all aspects of dress for women with the exception of riding habits, and the name mantuamaker outlived the fashion of the mantua and became a synonym for dressmaker.⁷⁶ Female milliners probably arose from the ranks of the mantuamakers. At the top of the clothing hierarchy, they employed mantuamakers and seamstresses as well as many other specialist crafts.

Confusingly, the word 'milliner' could describe a range of conditions: a woman who lived in lodgings and worked by the piece to the slop trade (cheap ready-made clothing and military uniforms) might call herself a milliner, rather than a seamstress, if she needed to inflate her status before a court⁷⁷; those who were better off but with limited capital might become 'chamber-milliners', catering to a genteel acquaintance in their own homes and working up with apprentices, and perhaps journeywomen, in a workshop⁷⁸; but at the top end, a milliner might run her own shop with many employees and a prestigious clientele. Today, millinery in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is widely viewed as a genteel trade for impoverished unmarried gentlewomen, requiring some capital and social connections, and involving the milliner in commerce mostly with other

74 The transition is illustrated by various sources. In the Old Bailey, the four milliners appearing between 1676 and 1692 were all male but from 1694 milliners were overwhelmingly female: www.oldbaileyonline.net. Will indexes which list occupations, while never containing very many milliners, do show a gender shift around 1700 in London and in the mid-eighteenth century in the provinces, e.g., Wills at Hertford 1415-1858, British Record Society 120, 2007 or Wills at Salisbury 1464-1858, British Record Society 122-3, 2009 (bearing in mind that women were only rarely identified by occupation in wills or inventories, and even prominent milliners might only be called 'widow' or 'spinster' in probate records: Prior, 'Urban Economy', 96; and Anne Buck, 'Mantuamakers and Milliners: Women Making and Selling Clothes in Eighteenth-Century Bedfordshire', Bedfordshire Historical Miscellany: Essays in Honour of Patricia Bell, Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, 1993, 145.).

75 Smith, 'Admission to Guilds', 99-126. Lemire, Dress, Culture and Commerce, ch.2, esp. 44-55

76 Buck, 'Mantuamakers and Milliners', 145, 148. Buck, Dress in Eighteenth-Century England, London, 1979, 14-17. This may be a rare example of major occupational gender transfer from men to women, in contrast with the documented shift from women to men in brewing, dairying, and agricultural innovation. On the other hand, the London milliners at the top of the high end fashion trades were very similar to the late medieval silkwomen, generally the wives or daughters of male members of the top-ranked Mercers' Company (Sutton, Mercery). It is possible that an element of continuity is hidden under a name shift from silkwomen perhaps through haberdasher or mercer or even seamstress to milliner.

77 See for example the milliner acquitted of shoplifting in 1746, oldbaileyonline.net : t17461205-5.

78 Joseph Collyer, The Parent's and Guardian's Directory, and the Youth's Guide, in the Choice of a Profession or Trade, 1761, 194-96.

women, thereby limiting her public exposure. The emphasis here is upon impoverishment and financial necessity, as in the case of Dickens' Kate Nickleby. But the apprenticeships examined in the previous section, involving substantial premiums and City companies, clearly did not involve either impoverished families or unmarriageable young women.

Campbell's London Tradesman, which is the most frequently quoted of the eighteenth-century guides advising London parents on trade apprenticeships, is critical of women in most trades, but he does acknowledge millinery: 'the Fair Sex, who are generally bound to this Business, may have as much Curiosity to know the Nature of their Employment before they engage in it, and stand in as much need of sound Advice in the Choice of an Occupation, as the Youth of our own Sex'.⁷⁹ Joseph Collyer's 1761 Parents and Guardians Directory suggested that to set up a millinery shop required £400 or £500 of capital outlay. (Campbell's earlier guide doesn't give start-up costs for a milliner, as he does for other trades, being too engrossed in warning readers of the sexual predations to which she would be subjected, of which more later.) Both men estimated start-up costs for the comparable trade of haberdasher very broadly between £100 and £2000.⁸⁰ By contrast, a fellow clockmaker of Elinor Mosely's required only £100 to £200 to set up in business.⁸¹

So both the premiums commanded by milliners and their business start up costs were comparable to prestigious male trades. I have been able to identify fifty-one City milliners trading in the first half of the eighteenth century in four of the eighty London Companies and in wills probated in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury (see Appendix). The geographical concentration of the forty-five with known addresses is striking, and suggests that the business could also be very lucrative. From a scattering in the east in Old Bailey, Newgate Street and Little Britain, they concentrated along Paternoster Row, continuing down Cheapside and Poultry (the same east-west thoroughfare which changes names), splitting at the Lord Mayor's Mansion House north into Cornhill, past the Royal Exchange, and south into Lombard Street. At their eastern ends, Cornhill and Lombard Street abut Gracechurch Street, where Mosely had her shop. This is completely different from the areas where the also female-dominated secondhand clothing trade operated.⁸² The milliners were located in the principal market streets of the capital, the ones populated by wealthy merchants. Poultry had Grocers' Hall, as well as Frances Sleepes' and Esther Burney's fan shop. Cheapside was home to the Mercers' Hall, apothecaries, and large houses with multiple

79 Campbell, Tradesman, 206-7.

80 Campbell, London Tradesman, xx. Collyer, Parent's and Guardian's Directory, suggested £500 to £1000, xx

81 Collyer, Parent's and Guardian's Directory, 104.

82 Beverly Lemire, xxxx, John Styles, The Dress of the People: Everyday Fashion in Eighteenth-Century England, New Haven & London, 2007, ch.10 'Clothing the Metropolis', 167-78.

servants.⁸³ Lombard Street housed goldsmiths, bankers and silversmiths.⁸⁴

[MAP]

These City milliners were of course only a proportion of the capital's total millinery offerings. It is to be presumed that other companies will reveal more within the walls. If the proportion in the remaining companies is consistent with those so far examined, we might expect to find 336 women positively identified as milliners in the City in the first half of the eighteenth century, and at least as many again not identified as milliners but apparently engaged in high end commerce.⁸⁵ Outside the City, in Westminster or the rapidly expanding West End and suburbs, milliners are less traceable because they had no incentive to take membership of a City company. The only surviving records of their existence are likely to be court cases and probate records.

Because we know Elinor Mosely was in Gracechurch Street, we can trace her in land tax and poor rate records. Moseley was in the parish of All Hallows Lombard Street as a tenant from at least 1729. In 1736, she moved premises within the parish and purchased a new property in Gracechurch Street.⁸⁶ After a decade in this location, in 1745-6, it was 'Mrs Kempleshaw & Co' who paid the rates on the same property. Kempleshaw bears a striking resemblance to the name of Elinor Mosely's fellow apprentice from York, Hannah Campleshon, who served in the Tyler household with her more than twenty years previously, and whom she may have known even earlier in childhood.⁸⁷ Two years later, the poor rates were again paid by a 'Mrs Mosely', but this Mrs Mosely appeared – from 1749, with a new clerk and a new style -- as 'Dorothy Mosely Spinster'. Dorothy was almost certainly another of Elinor's sisters, eleven years younger than she.⁸⁸ Dorothy, like

83 Patrick Wallis, 'Consumption, retailing and medicine in early modern London', *Economic History Review* 61/1, 2008, 26-53. Vanessa Harding et al, 'People in Place: Families, Households and Housing in Early Modern London', Institute of Historical Research, 2008, 8-9.

84 John Northouck, *A New History of London*, 1773, Book 1, Ch. 11: Charles I', pp. 154-174. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46728> and 'Book 2, Ch. 23: Langbourn Ward', pp. 656-661. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46766>.

85 I extrapolate from the 42 identified milliners in the Clockmakers, Grocers, Haberdashers, Leathersellers, Musicians and Salters, taking account of the absence of identification in the Clothworkers, Cordwainers, Painter Stainers, and Skinners.

86 The poor rate was paid by the tenant, the land tax by the property owner. LG: Ms 10771 All Hallows Lombard Street Book for the Entry of the Poor's Roll 1729[-1755]. There is no earlier record of poor rates in this parish. LG: Ms 11316 Land Tax, Ward of Bishopsgate Within, All Hallows Precinct. The levels of tax that Mosely paid put her in the wealthier half, although by no means at the top, of local residents.

87 Hannah was four years younger than Elinor, and her father, Henry Campleshon, took the freedom of York the year after Elinor's father. Hannah had not taken the freedom of the Clockmakers' Company, nor could she have acquired freedom by patrimony, and nor had she married, to judge by her name. Her right to trade in the City must have been established by purchase of another company's freedom, or perhaps she had married but retained her natal family name for business purposes (see below xxx).

88 Dorothy was born in Feb 1712/3 in St Crux Parish, York.

Hannah Campleshon/Kempleshaw, was called 'Mrs' because in the first half of the eighteenth century this title was invariably a social or occupational designation of status, and not the marital designation that it later became.⁸⁹ She was in her late thirties when she rented the shop, and like Hannah Campleshon and Elinor, Dorothy was probably also a milliner (see below p. xxx).

Elinor Mosely owned the property until 1752, when it passed to Dorothy either by sale or by inheritance.⁹⁰ Elinor continued to be recorded in her maiden name as the owner of the property for a full seven years after the Clockmakers recorded her marriage in 1747. The fact that she moved away from Gracechurch Street as early as 1744 (as evidenced by the fact that she stopped paying the poor rates due from residents) suggests that she may have married then without the Clockmakers being aware of the situation. The last time that she appeared in person before the company court to pay her quarterage was in October 1743. Thereafter, one of the company stewards called on her on his round collecting the quarterly fees.⁹¹ If her address had remained a millinery shop, the steward may have simply presumed that he was dealing with one of her employees if she were not physically present. The fact that the ward clerk who collected the land tax also continued to record Mosely in her maiden name until 1752 suggests either that he too did not know she had married, or that she continued to use her birth name professionally. This possibility is not as anachronistic as it sounds. The young Charlotte Ramsay did exactly that in her writing and acting for several years after her marriage, although she later adopted her husband's name professionally and is better known to posterity as Charlotte Lennox, crowned by Dr Johnson the queen of literature in 1751.⁹²

Unless Mosely's fortune was dramatically larger than her new husband's, it is almost certain that she took his name eventually. It is this custom of name change that makes tracing women so difficult in England: it is impossible to follow Mosely after marriage, as it is to trace Lucy before her marriage to George Tyler.⁹³ England was the only country in Europe at this time in which women at all social levels adopted their husbands' names as a matter of course.⁹⁴ This loss of birth name was directly related to the distinctive English marital property regime under which a man took

89 See further, A.L. Erickson, 'Mistresses and Marriage' (forthcoming).

90 The property changed hands again three years later. There is no will for a Dorothy Mosely in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, and I cannot trace Elinor's will in the absence of her last name at the time of death.

91 LG: Ms 2715/5, Clockmakers' Company Renter Wardens Accts 1742-75, 3 October 1743.

92 Clarke, *Johnson's Women*, 15-16, 69.

93 The Clockmakers' clerk did not record Elinor's husband's name. She did not marry in her home parish (LG: Ms 17615, All Hallows Lombard Street Parish Register) or in the Quaker Meeting House around the corner (Quaker Library: Digest Register), or in any Anglican parish in London (IGI microfiche, 1992). But half of all London marriages in the first half of the eighteenth century took place in the Liberty of the Fleet Prison, and Mosely's may have been one of these. The Fleet marriage registers remain unindexed and complex to use.

94 A.L. Erickson, 'The Marital Economy in Comparative Perspective', in *The Marital Economy in Scandinavia and England, 1500-1800*, Aldershot & Burlington VT, 2005, 11-13.

ownership of nearly all his wife's property, a connection illustrated by the practice of requiring an impoverished groom to take his wealthy bride's surname. Virtually all aristocratic and gentry genealogies display at least one husband who took his heiress wife's name instead of vice versa.⁹⁵ The economic vulnerability which coverture imposed on women could be circumvented by a marriage settlement, but there is no way of knowing whether Mosely made a marriage settlement to protect the profits of her millinery business from any possible predation by her husband because in England marriage settlements were private documents, so they do not normally survive.

If Elinor married a man who was a member of one of London's Companies, she might have taken more apprentices through his company. If she left the City, she may have made apprenticeship contracts privately and as a result they have not survived. Perhaps she used the occasion of marriage to retire after twenty years in the trade. (Business in the mid-1740s was depressed by the costs of maintaining the army in Flanders, Britain's contribution to the War of the Austrian Succession, and then bringing it home again very quickly in 1745 with the Jacobite Rebellion.) But it is clear from the evidence of Mosely's own mistress, Lucy Tyler, and other mistresses like Christian Jevon, Frances Sleepe and Esther Burney, that marriage was no bar to continuing in the business. This must lead to a consideration of the social and business networks which gave rise to the apprenticeships listed in Tables 1 and 2, and which lay behind the milliners listed in the Appendix.

When Elinor moved from York to London, she moved from a city of 12,000 people,⁹⁶ where Grace White was just printing the first newspaper,⁹⁷ to a city of more than half a million people, which had some fifty-five weekly newspapers.⁹⁸ How did she know where to go, who to contact? It is possible that she had relatives in London. The Intelligencer: or Merchants Assistant of 1738, a sort of trade directory for greater London, included entries for 'Mosely & Foster, silkmen, Avemary Lane', and Richard Mosely, ironmonger, in Thames Street, although none for Elinor in Gracechurch Street. Two male Moseleys had earlier been apprenticed in the Haberdashers' Company, and a handful of Moselys married in the London Quaker meeting house in White Hart Court, around the corner from Elinor.⁹⁹ However, only one fifth of any individual's relations shared her or his name,

95 Amanda Capern, Women's Land Ownership xxxx, forthcoming.

96 'The Eighteenth Century: Topography and Population', A History of the County of York: the City of York (1961), 207-15. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=36349>.

97 Register of York Freemen 1680 to 1986, compiled by John Malden, York, 1989, 6.

98 Deborah Hale, The London Coffee House: A Social Institution, <http://www.rakehell.com/article.php?id=206>

99 In 1711, a Charles Moseley was apprenticed to his father, a hosier in Cannon Street; in 1717 the son of a John Mosely of Ratcliff, tallow chandler, was apprenticed to a cabinetmaker. Cliff Webb's database of Apprentices 1700-1750. The Ratcliff Moseleys were Quakers, worshipping at the meeting house around the corner from Elinor. For the location, David M. Butler, The Quaker Meeting Houses of Britain, London, 1999, 396-8. For the marriages, Quaker Library: Digest Register.

so family connections are extremely difficult to identify.¹⁰⁰ The connections of apprenticeship may have been based on trade as well as family.

At least two of the six girls apprenticed to Lucy Tyler, and at least four of the seven apprenticed to Elinor Mosely, were orphaned by the fathers whose names and occupations are listed on all but one apprenticeship indenture.¹⁰¹ Assuming that their mothers were not also dead, it must have been they who negotiated the apprenticeship contracts. Of course they may have used their husbands' business contacts, but they may equally have been in the millinery business in Leeds and York, arranging to apprentice their daughters to their London suppliers or wholesalers. Tyler certainly appears to have had a northern connection: at least three of her apprentices were from York and one from Leeds. There was a millinery connection within the Mosely family: at least some of Elinor's sisters also went into millinery.

Elinor's mother was Jane Wheatley, who married Rowland Mosely at the age of seventeen. She bore sixteen children, of whom fourteen survived. We already know that Elinor took her sister Catherine apprentice in September 1727. The following month, their mother Jane wrote her will in York at the age of 47, providing clues to the fortunes of her other seven daughters.¹⁰² Jane's household included her eldest daughter, also Jane (29), her third daughter, Anne (26), and the youngest five children. Her will did not name any of her four adult sons.¹⁰³ As executrix of her husband's will the previous year, Jane had already distributed his bequests of £100 to each of them. Rowland Mosely's will left £100 to each of his children. The only child singled out was Elinor, who received an additional £100 on condition that she relinquish her right in lands at Great Heck, near Snaith, in Yorkshire.¹⁰⁴ There were many ways to transfer property, and no way now to find out what other property her siblings might have received during their parents' lifetime.

Of the five adult Mosely daughters, only one had married by the time of their mother's death, to a gentleman 'in or near the City of London'. Jane's will notes that Catherine (at sixteen) had recently received £50 of the £100 legacy left her by her father: that was probably the premium for her apprenticeship to Elinor. The youngest daughter, Elizabeth, was later apprenticed to a York milliner in 1734 when she was nineteen.¹⁰⁵ So at least three daughters were apprenticed to

100 This estimate is based on a very simple model of two surviving children per couple, one male, one female, over three generations, i.e., back to grandparents, with universal marriage.

101 See below, xxx, for the one mother listed in the indenture.

102 Her birth to William Wheatley is recorded in Eston, Yorkshire on 6 March 1679/80. She married on 6 July 1697 in St Martin & St Gregory, York. Her will is dated 12 October 1727. Borthwick Archive: PROB Reg 79 fol 561(m/f 999) York Exchequer Court.

103 The eldest son was apprenticed locally as an apothecary the year after Elinor's apprenticeship in London, and was free of the City of York. He was out of the country when his father's will was proved. York City Archives: D13 York City Apprentice Indentures.

104 Borthwick Archive: PROY June 1726 v79 f132, mf998.

105 York City Archives: D13 York City Apprentice Indentures.

millinery.

The eleventh child, Dorothy, may have been the most headstrong of the Mosely children. Their mother's will unusually required her executrix to pay Dorothy £100 within three months – this to a girl not yet sixteen years old. She also stipulated 'in case my said daughter Dorothy shall depart from them my said other two daughters [Jane and Anne] and live separate from them then ... she shall take and receive out of the same household goods and furniture so much thereof as shall be able and sufficient to furnish one room for herself'.¹⁰⁶ We don't know whether Dorothy took this offer of a room of her own, made in 1727, but we do know that she became a business proprietor because the next time we see her is when she took over Elinor's shop in Gracechurch Street in the 1740s.

It seems unlikely that the advantages of apprenticeship would have been offered to some daughters and not others. Jane's principal beneficiaries were the two adult daughters living with her, Jane and Anne. Were they also milliners or other traders in the high end fashion market in York?¹⁰⁷ Although they could have served an apprenticeship in another northern town and then returned home, it is not impossible that they had learned the business from their mother with a view to carrying it on after her death.¹⁰⁸ Admittedly, it seems unlikely that a woman married to a prosperous man at seventeen, who bore fourteen surviving children, was also a business proprietor. But it would also have seemed unlikely that prosperous parents would apprentice their daughters to trade, even if they did have fourteen children. In the case of the Mosely family, the two daughters in their late twenties who kept house with their widowed mother (and perhaps their brothers too) and inherited her estate were probably not waiting around in anticipation of marriage. Even if their mother was not involved in trade, the daughters almost certainly were.

Married women with children did take apprentices and ran businesses in the same way that men did: with the help of domestic servants in the household and apprentices, journeywomen (or men) and forewomen (or men) in the business. According to the OED, the word 'journeywoman' was rare, and denoted merely a woman working at a trade for daily wages. By contrast, a 'journeyman' was 'One who, having served his apprenticeship to a handicraft or trade, is qualified to work at it for days' wages; ... a qualified mechanic or artisan who works for another'. 'Journeyman' is distinguished on one side from 'apprentice' and on the other from 'master'. The difference in skill between journeymen and journeywomen suggested by the OED is implausible. Probably a

106 Borthwick Archive: PROB Reg 79 fol 561 (m/f 999) York Exchequer Court.

107 Jane and Anne were not listed as being free of the the City of York, but York did not enforce civic freedom on women in the way that London did. Smith, 'Admission to Guilds', 103.

108 There was no mention in Jane's will of a business, but that was not uncommon. Half of the fourteen self-described milliners whose wills were probated in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury in the first half of the eighteenth century (three women and four men) did not mention any stock or trade goods.

journeywoman, like a journeyman, had to have completed an apprenticeship in her trade.

Journeywomen testifying before the Old Bailey in the first half of the eighteenth century worked for a wide variety of employers: two milliners; two mantuamakers; two lace merchants; a turner/dollmaker; a silkwinder; a man who made 'gold beater's skin'; a feather merchant; a chairmaker; a silk bobbin seller; and a hoop petticoat shop keeper. Journeywomen continued to appear in the Old Bailey in the later eighteenth century, and the word was also used regularly in eighteenth-century Edinburgh,¹⁰⁹ so it is unclear when the word became 'rare'. Mme Mantalini in the 1830s kept 'twenty young women constantly employed', although Dickens did not call them journeywomen and we have yet to learn what happened to the apprenticeship of girls in the nineteenth century.

By 1843 the length of dressmakers' and milliners' working hours was 'unparalleled in the history of the manufacturing processes' according to the Children's Employment Commission.¹¹⁰ However, in the first half of the eighteenth century, journeywomen milliners earned anything from £15 to £30 per annum, plus their board, according to the trade guides.¹¹¹ This rate of pay was between three and seven times a maidservant's wages in London in the first half of the eighteenth century.¹¹² (For comparison: as a historian, I earn only twice the hourly wage of my cleaner.) The mid-eighteenth-century trade guides may have been conservative in their estimates. Even in the early 1690s, a London lace dealer and member of the Haberdashers' Company gave all her 'journeypeople' 12 shillings per week, which amounted to more than £30 per annum.¹¹³ This pales in comparison with the income of the big entrepreneurs like Hester Pinney, but it was certainly decent, when compared with the wages of Charles Burney as organist (above) or the nurses at Christ's Hospital (below).

The ready availability of household and trade labour meant that a woman's marital status had no necessary effect on her entrepreneurial activity. Nor does there appear to have been any social stigma attached to single women trading. The wills from the Prerogative Court of Canterbury in the

109 Sanderson, Eighteenth-Century Edinburgh.

110 Dickens, Nicholas Nickleby, 1839, chapter 10 (Penguin 1986 edn 191). Ivy Pinchbeck, Women Workers and the Industrial Revolution 1750-1850, London, 1930, 308-9. The insecurity of millinery in the mid-nineteenth century is underlined by Mary Ashford's choice in the early 1840s to take employment in service rather than millinery. Alison Kay, The Foundations of Female Entrepreneurship, London, 2009, 11-12.

111 A General Description, 149-50. I am grateful for these references to Nicola Phillips, whose "'A Heavy Debt to Settle with Humanity'? The Representation and Invisibility of London's Principal Milliners", appears in Beth Harris (ed.) Famine and Fashion, Ashgate, 2005, 215-28.

112 Maidservants' wages were £4 to £5 10s. per annum. D.A. Kent, 'Ubiquitous but Invisible: Female Domestic Servants in Mid-Eighteenth-Century London', History Workshop Journal 28, 1989, 118. Servants' income was probably significantly augmented by veils, the gifts or tips given by visitors to the house, but this has never been studied.

113 Pamela Sharpe, 'Lace and Place: Women's Business in Occupational Communities in England 1550-1950,' Women's History Review, forthcoming. Earle identified 12s per week as the top rate of pay for skilled needlewomen, based on the mid-century career guides. 'Female Labour Market', 342.

first half of the eighteenth century made by people identifying themselves as milliners show the full range of marital conditions among women. Hannah Wilkinson, in the parish of St Olave Hart Street to the east of Gracechurch Street, was a widow who left her millinery business in 1740 to her two daughters in partnership, one of whom was unmarried and one married. Hannah Giles bequeathed her entire establishment in Fleet Street in 1728 to Mrs Mary Dunn 'now living in the house with me'. Mary Dunn, spinster, proved the will in 1741. Presumably the two women continued living and trading in the same location throughout the intervening thirteen years. Mary Hawkins, of 'London', in 1710 appears to have been unmarried, since she left her Bank of England stock to her mother, all the silver plate and wearing linen to her niece and to a 'good friend' her choice of the diamond rings, but the residue, which must have included her stock in trade, went to 'my much beloved friend and partner Mrs Rebecca Weaver of London, milliner'. Like Hawkins, Elizabeth Caldwell in 1748 bequeathed many gorgeous gowns, and silver, gold and diamond rings. She did not specify her stock in trade (see note xxx), but gave her niece Ann Wood £100 'with which her present husband shall no ways intermeddle' on condition that Ann assist her executors in the disposal of the stock, which may suggest that Ann was involved in the business.¹¹⁴

Male milliners' wills are occasionally straightforward: Rhodes Steele, in 1704, left everything to his mother, Phoebe.¹¹⁵ But the rules of coverture mean that they are often more complex to interpret. So John Lambert, 'milliner and fishmonger', made his will in 1713, leaving everything unconditionally to his loving wife Anne and asking her to 'take care educate and bring up my children and to set them out to callings in the world'. There are two possibilities here: either John was the fishmonger and Anne was the milliner (or, in theory, vice versa) since under coverture he was the legal owner of her business; or John was a milliner who was a member of the Fishmonger's Company. He took three male apprentices through the Fishmongers' Company,¹¹⁶ two of whom, her own sons, Anne 'inherited' when she proved the will fourteen years later. From the unconditional bequest, the obvious inference is that Ann was a partner in the business, if not a sole milliner.¹¹⁷

Only one married male milliner, in partnership with his three sons and another man in Cheapside, was married to a woman who clearly was not involved in the business: he left his wife an annuity of £65 per annum, 'in order that my said wife may have a sufficient income to maintain

114 TNA: Wilkinson PROB 11/703; Giles PROB 11/712; Hawkins PROB 11/522; Caldwell PROB 11/768. For two other widows, see Hood, PROB 11/681 and Elizabeth Kello PROB 11/701.

115 TNA: PROB 11/477.

116 The son of a gentleman in 1716, and his own two sons in 1723 and 1726. Webb, Index of Apprentices 1700-1750.

117 TNA: PROB 11/615.

her in a handsome manner', although she was also her husband's executrix.¹¹⁸ Robert Pickeard, another Cheapside milliner, also left his wife a lump sum and an annuity in 1734, while the business went to his sons George and John and a male executor was brought in. But two years later, George's wife Mary proved both her husband's will (which left her everything) and her father-in-law's, after some conflict with the other two beneficiaries of Robert's will.¹¹⁹ Whether Mary had been a milliner up to that point is unclear, but she acquired her husband's and her father-in-law's stock in trade, amounting to a substantial house of at least ten rooms, goods in the shop (fabrics, caps, ribbons, gloves, fans, handkerchiefs, hatbands, purses, necklaces, fringes) worth £417, as well as high levels of both credit and debt.¹²⁰

In principle, all of these City milliners must have acquired citizenship, but that could have been by patrimony, by redemption or by marriage, as well as by apprenticeship. None of Tyler's apprentices except Moseley, and none of Moseley's, took the freedom of the Clockmakers' Company, but they may have married and traded under their husbands' company membership if they remained in the City. Or they may have returned to York or Leeds or Deal or Gloucester, to set up their own high class millinery shops, supplementing local supply chains with fancy goods from London suppliers.¹²¹ The contacts that a girl acquired during her apprenticeship served not only to supply her own business, but in later life helped to send her own daughters to London in their turn.

Milliners from around Britain, some of whom visited the capital annually in search of new fashions, patronised London milliners who, like the Hogarth sisters, dealt wholesale as well as retail. London was the centre of the British fashion world, and by the first half of the eighteenth century, most cities and many market towns appear to have had at least one milliner or mantua-maker or linen-draper.¹²² Finding out about provincial milliners is even more difficult than it is in London. The Bedford sempstress turned milliner Ann Okely (1691-1766) regularly visited London for stock -- which we know only because she was so commercially successful after her husband died bankrupt that she could afford to send her son to Cambridge, where he came under the

118 TNA: Samuel Sedgwick 1741 PROB 11/711.

119 TNA: Robert Pickeard 1734 PROB 11/681; George Pickeard 1736 PROB 11/679.

120 TNA: PROB 31-176-675 and 31-161-62.

121 Pinchbeck, *Women Workers*, 288.

122 Jane Martin in Southampton in the 1730s and 40s, Miss Darnton and Elizabeth Parker in Leeds, Froide, *Never Married*, 97-8. Mary Hirons in Banbury, Prior, 'Urban Economy', 113. Sanderson, *Eighteenth-Century Edinburgh*, 33-4, Helen Dingwall, 'The Power Behind the Merchant? Women in the Economy in Late-Seventeenth-Century Edinburgh', in Elizabeth Ewan and Maureen Meikle, eds, *Women in Scotland c.1100 to c.1750*, East Linton, 1993, 155-6. Later eighteenth-century examples are found in Nicola Phillips, *Women in Business, 1700-1850*, Woodbridge, 2006, 97-119; Shani D'Cruze, 'To Acquaint the Ladies: Women Traders in Colchester c.1750-1850', *The Local Historian* 17:3, 1986, 158-9; Deborah Simonton, 'Claiming their Place in the Corporate Community: Women's Identity in Eighteenth-Century Towns', in Isabelle Baudino, Jacques Carre and Cecile Revauger, eds, *The Invisible Woman: Aspects of Women's Work in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Aldershot & Burlington, VT, 2005, 113.

influence of evangelicals, returned home to Bedford, founded the Moravian congregation in a barn behind his mother's house and shop, and the Moravians wrote a memoir of the family.¹²³

The Bath milliner Mary Chandler (1687-1745) opened her shop opposite the Pump Room in 1705, when still in her teens. We know of it through her own publications, which included A Description of Bath (1733) -- a 322-line survey in heroic couplets of the town, its environs and its morals. Six years later, Chandler opened a fashionable lodging house to cater for growing numbers of visitors. The booming popularity of the spa both contributed to and partly resulted from the success of her Description.¹²⁴ After her death, Chandler's nieces continued the millinery trade.

In addition to supplying country milliners, London milliners were supplied by a multitude of other trades, both in the country and in London: lacemakers and dealers; clothiers, drapers and stuff shop keepers¹²⁵ (to whom carders, spinners, dyers and weavers worked); silk throwers, designers and merchants; cappers, hatters, and head dressers; ribbon weavers; fanmakers; sempstresses, tailors and mantuamakers; quilters (who made petticoats as well as soft furnishings), staymakers, breechesmakers, glovers, and so forth.¹²⁶ These tradespeople were both female and male. So how exceptional were Elinor Mosely and her fellow high-end milliners in the clothing world of early eighteenth-century London?

The most fully analysed, and so far the best-documented, woman in a merchant role in the early modern period is Hester Pinney (1658-1737). Apprenticed informally to her elder sisters, Pinney dealt in Devon lace at the Royal Exchange from the 1680s. By the time Mosely opened her shop in Gracechurch Street, a few minutes' walk from the Royal Exchange, Pinney had an annual income of over £1000.¹²⁷ She was far from the only woman trading in the Royal Exchange. The widowed Gertrude Rolles was a milliner there in the last two decades of the seventeenth century, paying an exceptionally high £50 rent annually for an eight-foot stall frontage. Rolles passed the business on to her two daughters, who had trained with her.¹²⁸ The Rolles sisters' contemporaries in

123 Buck, 'Mantuamakers and Milliners', 148-50.

124 The second to seventh editions were printed by Samuel Richardson (his brother in law in Bath, who was Chandler's neighbour, published her poetry), and by 1767 it had reached its eighth edition. Janine Barchas, 'Chandler, Mary (1687-1745)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004. Linda V. Troost, 'Chandler, Mary' in Janet Todd (ed.), Dictionary of British Women Writers, London, 1989. 'Chandler, Mary' in Virginia Blain, Patricia Clements and Isobel Grundy, The Feminist Companion to Literature in English, London, 1990. Froide, Never Married, 204-7.

125 OED: 1735 Stuff, in Weaving, is any Sort of Commodity made of Woollen Thread, &c. but in a particular Manner those thin light ones that Women make or line their Gowns of or with.

126 Buck, 'Mantuamakers and Milliners', 142, 146.

127 Pamela Sharpe, 'Dealing with Love: The Ambiguous Independence of the Single Woman in Early Modern England', Gender & History 11/2 (1999), 211, 219, 223.

128 Margaret R. Hunt, The Middling Sort: Commerce, Gender and the Family in England, 1680-1730, Berkeley, 1996, 143-4. Shops normally rented at £20 to £30 in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, according to Ray Bert Westerfield, Middlemen in English Business, Particularly Between 1660 and 1760, Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 19, 1915, 348.

the Exchange in the first half of the eighteenth century included Ann Fleetwood, a perukemaker and member of the Haberdashers' Company, and milliners Bethiah Pardice, Mary Hawkes, Margaret Horne and John Martin, who all took female apprentices in the Haberdashers' Company.¹²⁹

Elizabeth Callow was a 'lacewoman' like Hester Pinney.¹³⁰ Lace merchants were dramatically more exclusive than top milliners, requiring, according to Collyer in 1761, between £1000 and £10,000 to set up shop, compared with £500 for milliners.¹³¹ Callow took the freedom of the Leathersellers' Company in 1701 and was still trading in 1722, having taken six female apprentices (the daughters of gentlemen, clerics and attorneys from London, Buckinghamshire, Wiltshire, and Gloucestershire) and one male apprentice (the son of a London grocer).¹³² Fortuitously, one of her clients can be identified as Lady Arabella Furnese, daughter of the Earl and Countess of Rockingham, who paid the substantial bill of £8 9s. to Mrs Callow on a week before her marriage in July 1714.¹³³ All of these traders are only individual encounters in the archives, but John Northouck in his *History of London* (1773) described the Royal Exchange, 'where all the merchants assemble every day to negociate their affairs', as having a gallery extending 'round the four sides of the building, and in which were ... about two hundred shops, occupied by milliners, haberdashers, &c.'¹³⁴

Hester Pinney appears to have been unusual in living for fifty-eight years in a series of London lodgings, including taverns and coffee houses.¹³⁵ But shorter stays in taverns cannot have been unusual for women traders. The sight of a country milliner in London to acquire merchandise was sufficiently familiar for one Mary Wycherley in 1748 – who kept a linen draper's shop in St James Street, Covent Garden – to pretend to be a country milliner in town for a fortnight to buy supplies in order to recover goods stolen from her shop from another (female) 'clothes dealer'. She also helped another (male) linen draper to recover his stolen handkerchiefs.¹³⁶

129 LG: Ms 15860 (1675-1708) and Ms 15864/3 (1708-55) Haberdashers' Company Register of Apprentice Bindings.

130 A lacewoman, like a laceman, was a merchant, not an artisan. The OED reveals another sex distinction on this point (as with journeywo/man): a lace-woman 'works or deals', whereas a lace-man 'manufactures or deals' in lace. It is the merchants who appear in London records, since no lace was made in London at this time.

131 Collyer, *Parents and Guardians Directory*, 180-1, and above, note xxx.

132 Leathersellers' Company Archives: Apprenticeship Registers 1686-1706 and 1707-36; Quarterage Book 1705-48.

133 East Kent Archives: Account Book of Lady Arabella Furnese, EK/U471/A50, 1714-27. The parish church of Waldershare contains a monument to Lady Arabella, born 15 March 1693/4, married 8 July 1714, deceased 6 Sept. 1727. <http://www.kentarchaeology.org.uk/Research/Libr/MIs/MIsWaldershare/01.htm>

134 The number of shops in the new Exchange built after the fire of 1666 was 160 (Westerfield, *Middlemen*, 348), although some of these may have been subdivided. Interestingly, by 1773 those shops 'have been long deserted; and the galleries are now let out to the Royal Exchange Assurance office; the Merchants Seamen's office; the Marine Society; and to auctioneers, &c.' John Northouck, Book 2, Ch. 18: 'Cornhill Ward', *A New History of London* (1773), pp. 601-606. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46761&strquery=cornhill>.

135 Sharpe, 'Dealing with Love', 211.

136 Old Bailey Online, Reference Number: t17480526-25

Manufacturers, female as well as male, came from the country to sell their merchandise.¹³⁷ West country clothiers Hester Wansey and Elizabeth Harvey regularly journeyed to London to trade. Hester Wansey, who according to her grandson had been 'bred up under [her father] to the clothing trade', ran the business from the death of her husband in 1707 until 1739, 'having been conversant in trade above sixty years'. As girl, wife and widow, she bought wool in the local market, and in Salisbury and London, and soap and oil for dying in Bristol or London; the spinning, weaving, burling, fulling, milling and drawing of the cloth was put out to local Wiltshire contractors.¹³⁸ Elizabeth Harvey was married to an attorney and the clerk of Taunton Castle, travelling like Wansey by stage coach to London to buy and sell cloth. Like Wansey, she was involved in both manufacturing and trading cloth in the last decade of the seventeenth century and the first decade of the eighteenth, and at different times also dealt in malt and in wine. Unlike Wansey, Elizabeth Harvey's husband was in a totally different business. In her forties, with at least three children, Harvey's eldest daughter helped her mother after finishing her schooling.¹³⁹

Closely related to milliners and lace merchants were the gown makers. The firm which became Ede & Ravenscroft, gown makers to the crown, was trading in the first half of the eighteenth century as William and Martha Shudall in Holywell Street near the Strand. After William's death in 1757 Martha ran the company by herself, providing all of the gowns for the coronation of George III in 1761, as well as robes for the legal profession and the clergy. Unfortunately, only her customer order book survives, and that is mis-ascribed to a later male proprietor. Neither her employee wage book nor her supplier book, both of which would have included large numbers of women, survives. Even when Martha took a male business partner in the later 1760s, the business was still known as Messrs Shudall and Stone.¹⁴⁰

At this peak of the clothing trade, the Shudalls, and Elinor Mosely, and Lucy Tyler, may well have used the brocaded silks designed by Anna Maria Garthwaite. Garthwaite lived with her sister in Princes Street (now Princelet Street), less than a mile to the northeast of Moseley in Gracechurch Street -- and outside the City so she had no need of company membership. From 1726 to 1756, Garthwaite sold more than 1000 designs to the silk weavers of the East End, for both the domestic and the export market.¹⁴¹ There have been excellent studies of the preponderance of women in the

137 Pinchbeck, Women Workers, 288.

138 Julia de Lacey Mann, 'A Wiltshire Family of Clothiers: George and Hester Wansey, 1683-1714', Economic History Review 2nd ser., 9, 1956-7, 241-53, esp . 241-6.

139 Patricia Crawford, 'One Wife's Place: A Decade in the Life of Elizabeth Harvey of Taunton, 1696-1706', in Anne Laurence (ed.), Special Issue in honour of Mary Prior of Women's History Review 19/2 (forthcoming 2010).

140 'William Webb' (LG: Ms 21,681).

141 Malachy Postlethwayt in The Universal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce (1751) listed Garthwaite as one of three designers who had 'introduced the Principles of Painting into the loom'. Garthwaite probably authored the

mass market clothing trades. What is new here is their fairly widespread presence at the top end of that market.

One curious fact about the literature on millinery is the way that it concentrates on the perceived sexual connotations of the trade, often to the exclusion of its commercial aspects. At least two salacious publications of the eighteenth century cast aspersions upon the morals of milliners.¹⁴² Campbell, the author of the most often quoted of the eighteenth-century trade guides, was obsessed with the economic and social effect of women in all trades, but reserved particular elaboration for his warnings about millinery:

The Resort of young Beaus and Rakes to Milliners' Shops, exposes young Creatures to many Temptations, and insensibly debauches their Morals before they are capable of Vice. A young Coxcomb no sooner is Master of an Estate, and a small Share of Brains, but he affects to deal with the most noted Milliner: ... The Mistress, tho' honest, is obliged to bear the Wretch's Ribaldry, out of Regard for his Custom ... I am far from charging all Milliners with the crime of Connivance at the Ruin of their Apprentices; but fatal Experience must convince the Public, that nine out of ten of the young creatures that are obliged to serve in these Shops, are ruined and undone ...¹⁴³

Neither the General Description of all Trades (1747) nor Joseph Collyer's Directory (1761) made the same association, but the reputation of milliners has suffered considerably, some historians going so far as to equate millinery with prostitution.¹⁴⁴ Without doubt, some milliners' apprentices were seduced, and the market for paid sex in eighteenth-century London was large. Laetitia Pilkington, forced by a vengeful husband in Dublin to turn her hand to paid work as a writer in London in 1739, lived next door to and with milliners at various points, one of whom she suspected of running a brothel. One of the men she approached as a potential patron was the MP Edward Walpole, who had seduced a milliner's apprentice named Dorothy Clement and lived with her and their four illegitimate children in Pall Mall. And in 1745 Laetitia's own daughter, who had been apprenticed by her father to a Dublin milliner, sought her mother in London upon becoming

section called 'Of designing and drawing of ornaments, ... for the use of the flowered silk manufactory, embroidery and printing (of the various kinds of flower'd silks)' in the 1759 edition of G. Smith's The Laboratory or School of Arts. M. Ginsburg, 'Garthwaite, Anna Maria (1688–1763?)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008.

142 The Life and Intrigues of the Late Celebrated Mrs. Mary Parrimore, the Tall Milliner of 'Change-Alley ... and a further illustration of love upon tick (1729) and Francis Coventry, The History of Pompey the Little. Or, the Life and Adventures of a Lap-dog (1751) London & Dublin. English Short Title Catalogue. Eighteenth Century Collections Online. Gale Group.

143 Campbell, Tradesmen, 208-9.

144 Norma Clarke, The Literary Review, October 2009. William Hogarth's biographers cast aspersions on the morals of the street in which Anne and Mary Hogarth had their millinery shop. Paulson, Hogarth, vol 1, 24, 232, 329, following E. A. Webb, Records of St Bartholomew Smithfield, London, 1921, 286ff.

pregnant.¹⁴⁵

However, it is unlikely that the risk of seduction and betrayal to a young woman was any greater among millinery apprentices than in any other group, and arguably it would be substantially lower. Milliners' apprentices were in a business culture, surrounded generally by adult women who had a commercial interest in maintaining their apprentices' reputation as well as their own. They were not isolated in domestic situations as governesses or servants, and nor were they selling food or drink on the streets.

The association between commercial exchange and sexual promiscuity when it is women involved in the commerce is of extremely long standing. The majority of London's population was female precisely because the city offered economic opportunities.¹⁴⁶ The conditions of millinery apprenticeship – involving high status families, the payment of high premiums, and high start-up costs, as well as the location of milliner's premises in the better-off parts of the city – all militate against any casual association between millinery and sexual impropriety. The parents of millinery apprentices took a risk in sending their daughters to the capital for seven years in their teens, but it was a calculated risk, and one that many parents thought worth the gain for their daughters and themselves.

Elinor Mosely, and her mistress and her apprentices, were not abnormal for their social class – the class of prosperous apothecaries and sea captains, merchants and clerics, and the gentry with whom they mixed. These girls were apprenticed by their parents with every intention of making a 'career' for themselves, not in the professional structure, from which they were barred, but in the entrepreneurial structure. This was not a strategy chosen by all families (witness the relatively small numbers of girls apprenticed), but there is no obvious pattern to identify those who followed it.

The traditional assumption is that a woman in trade was somehow unable to marry, either by physical or financial deficiencies. It is of course possible that some of these high status fathers may have been relatively impoverished for their social background and therefore seeking to provide their daughters with a reasonable living in the absence of being able to provide them a marriage portion of a size appropriate to their station. But once established, there is no evidence that these women lacked marriage proposals. Elinor Mosely married in her mid-forties. Hester Pinney received more than one marriage proposal around the age of forty, all of which she declined until moving in with her long-term lover at the age of sixty-six.¹⁴⁷ One milliner, Mary Chandler in Bath, did attribute her

145 Norma Clarke, *Queen of the Wits: A Life of Laetitia Pilkington*, London, 2008, 149, 161, 170, 187-8, 203, 213, 223, 227. Fortunately, the daughter later found work as a lady's maid.

146 Karen Newman, 'City Talk: Women and Commodification' in Ben Johnson's *Epicoene* (1609), in *Staging the Renaissance*, David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (eds), NY & London, 1991.

147 Sharpe, 'Dealing with Love', 216, 219, 223.

entry into business to her lack of marriage prospects as a result of a childhood accident which left her with a crooked spine, but even she received an offer of marriage at the age of fifty-four, which she turned down because she did not want to endure 'loss of liberty'.¹⁴⁸

The 'unable to marry' explanation of women at this social level in the labour market is further undermined by the evidence of married women like Lucy Tyler, Christian Jevon, Frances Sleepe and Esther Burney maintaining their businesses separate from their husbands' business. Clearly they were able to marry and nor did they give up the business upon marriage. The fact that most of the girls apprenticed did not take company freedom and are lost to the record raises the possibility that they were marrying in their early twenties and changing their names (and their companies) – further undermining the 'unable to marry' theory.

The evidence suggests a parental dual strategy for daughters: occupational training followed by marriage. Employment was likely to be a more continuous part of their life than marriage, sustaining them whenever marriage failed, for whatever reason. The apprentices examined here, and their mothers and their mistresses, drew on their kinship and their training networks to establish and maintain businesses, and they used the London companies to further what can only be called their career ambitions.

We now know that women as well as men needed membership of a company and freedom of the City of London to trade there, and that many more than we previously thought used the companies for this purpose. Because of the impact of coverture, neither the number apprenticed, nor the number taking the freedom, reflects the actual level of women in any given company. Widows of company members were entitled to trade without formally entering the freedom books. And marriage as a means of acquiring company membership worked both ways: from wife to husband (Esther Sleepe to Charles Burney) and from husband to wife (George Tyler to Lucy). Despite companies' exclusion of women from their governance (and therefore from City governance), despite their records being far from complete and only irregularly recording information, without companies our knowledge of the extent of women in business in London would be negligible, restricted to the occasional trade card, or insurance policies, which record only the larger establishments and obscure married women, or court records, which are another unrepresentative sample, those likely to be in dispute or financial trouble. Without the female entrepreneurs' need for citizenship, it would not be possible to recover their existence at all.

The loss of the language of training -- of (girl) apprentices and journeywomen, forewomen and mistresses – has been reinforced by the script of the romantic novel which culminates in

marriage for the young heroine, and not a career in millinery. It appears that eighteenth-century upper gentry assumption that respectable women did not work for remuneration has been extended to a much wider section of English society than it actually applied to. Mrs Mary Delany, who came from a family of 'successful traders and country squires',¹⁴⁹ was nevertheless, like Jane Austen in the later eighteenth century, of that level of the gentry with titled relations. At this social level, employment for women, apart from service in an aristocratic household, may have been beyond the pale.¹⁵⁰ It was precisely these gentlewomen unaccustomed to labour who married into trade that Daniel Defoe castigated in his Complete English Tradesman (1726) for their preference for being 'gay and delicate' ladies in lieu of undertaking labour in the counting house or at the counter.¹⁵¹ But for the larger category of 'gentlewomen' more broadly construed, entering business was certainly not unusual. Not only were female entrepreneurs networked among themselves, but there is no evidence that their male trading partners or fellow company members viewed them on the whole with suspicion or derision.

Which of course is not to say that their sex was never used against them. Any culture which can use the same word, 'mistress', as a term of honour and a term of degradation will find a way to undermine a female entrepreneur on account of her sex. Nor is it to disavow the misery which social restrictions and opprobrium could inflict upon unmarried women.¹⁵² And generally, women's marital status was prioritised over their occupational status – but the fact remains that many women were identified by neither: Elinor Mosely appeared in the historical record more than forty times, but on only one of those occasions was her occupation mentioned, and the same record is the only one to specify her as married. The only record to identify her as unmarried (a 'spinster') was her mother's will. Without in any way denying the legal restrictions, the potential for social disapproval, or the exposure to sexual exploitation faced by women in public commerce, the fact that there were a lot of them in this sphere must alter the way we think of the eighteenth-century London economy.

Arguments about change over time in women's participation in the paid labour market as a whole are underpinned by the assumption that the daughters and the wives of men who earned a good living did not run their own businesses and were in fact excluded from doing so, if not legally then at least culturally. That is why the businesswomen enumerated here are important: they illustrate that for the much larger body of the gentry related to tradespeople and the lower clergy,

149 Hayden, Mrs Delany, 51.

150 The unusually well-documented Gertrude Savile (1697-1758) was another such woman. Froide, Never Married, 197-200.

151 The Complete English Tradesman (1726), chapter 21 in this and the 1727 editions, but chapter 23 in later editions. This source is often quoted as evidence that middle class women were rejecting employment, but it does not say this.

152 For an excellent discussion of such, see Froide, Never Married, esp 197ff.

apprenticeship and business for daughters were both quite possible. Of course this kind of entrepreneurial activity pursued by mistresses was only possible, in a situation where what we think of as 'unpaid' domestic labour was almost entirely a female responsibility, with the employment of other women to undertake that labour: domestic servants, nurses, charwomen, laundresses, shop assistants, journeywomen, forewomen, cooks. These wage earners and day labourers were much larger groups than the entrepreneurs.

I have concentrated here on millinery and other high end clothing trades which women may have dominated. At least in London, there was an established method of training and manufacturing and retail opportunities in a sector of the economy that was growing all over the country. But women were not confined to this sector. Half of the women in the Clockmakers' Company were making clocks, and half of those in the Leathersellers' Company were in leather-related trades. A future article will explore the extent of entrepreneurial activity generally among London women in the eighteenth century. And since I have been unable to address chronological change in this article, the situation in the seventeenth and the later eighteenth centuries remains to be investigated. But at least now it can be undertaken within a new framework.

Appendix: Milliners in London 1700-1750, listed by location from west to east

Sources: PCC wills, records of the Clockmakers', Haberdashers', Leathersellers' and Salters' Companies.

Name	Address	Company	Means of freedom	Father's/husband's occupation	Fluorit ¹
Hannah Giles & Mary Dunn	Fleet Street	NA	PCC will		before 1728-41
Margaret Bainton ²	Saddlers' Hall Gate [??]	Leathersellers	A	merchant	1715-after 1720
Rachel Sellary		Leathersellers	P		1713-c27
Elizabeth Callow	Downing St nr Hyde Park Corner	Leathersellers	A (to E. Callow, lacewoman)	attorney	1727-44
Jane Backhouse	Ludgate Hill	Haberdashers	A (Elizabeth White)	Gent [attorney]	1739-48
Anne, Ann & Mary Hogarth	Little Britain	Unknown	[P]		1724?-37?
Elizabeth White	Old Bailey	Haberdashers	[P/R/M]		1723-40
Henrietta Vaughan	Newgate Street	Haberdashers	A (goldsmith)	Doctor of physic	1708-9
Randall Mowse	Paternoster Row	Haberdashers			1700-04
Bazil Foster	Paternoster Row	Haberdashers			1713-15
Ann Page	Paternoster Row	Haberdashers			1708-13
Ann Mattock	Paternoster Row	Haberdashers			1704
Martha Aylett	Paternoster Row	Haberdashers	[P/R/M]		1722
Elizabeth Hood	Paternoster Row	NA	PCC will		1726-36
Joyce Fisher ³	Paternoster Row	Leathersellers			1695-1742

¹ These are minimum timespans, covering only the periods in which apprentices were taken (Haberdashers, Grocers) or quarterage paid (Leathersellers), in the surviving records.

² Listed in first four years as having a stuff shop.

Sarah Sharpe	Paternoster Row	Leathersellers	A	Clerk	1725-44
Giles & Mary Mills	Paternoster Row: The Fan	Grocers			1717-43
Ann Foxall	Paternoster Row: The Rising Sun	Grocers	A (Giles Mills)		1731-41
Mary Bedell	Cheapside: Lawrence Lane	Haberdashers			1704
Susannah Alexander	Cheapside: King Street	Haberdashers			1702-9
Mary Haddock	Cheapside: King Street	Haberdashers	[P/R/M]		1747-53
Samuel Sedgewick	Cheapside	NA	PCC will		1741
Robert & George Pickeard	Cheapside	NA	PCC will		1734-6
Joyce Leeds	Cheapside	Leathersellers	A (Joyce Fisher)	Gent	1730-1 (mar)
Sarah Richards	Cheapside	Leathersellers	A (Joyce Leeds)	Hatter	1737-9 (mar)
Anne Welles	Cheapside	Leathersellers	P		1744-56 (mar)
Hannah Martin	Poultry	Haberdashers	[P/R/M]		1732
Ann Withers	Poultry	Haberdashers			1704
Elizabeth Stockdale	Poultry	Haberdashers			1714
Susannah Caswall	Lombard Street	Haberdashers	A (knight)		1737
William Year	Lombard Street	Haberdashers			1728-38
Sarah Langdon	Lombard Street	Haberdashers			1708-9
Margaret Horne	Royal Exchange	Haberdashers	A (John Martin)	Sussex rector	1709-16
Mary Hawkes	Royal Exchange / Gracechurch St	Haberdashers	A (cheesemonger)	Gardener	1712-29
John Martin	Royal Exchange	Haberdashers			1700-16
Bethiah Pardice	Royal Exchange	Haberdashers			1707
Catherine Sarrazin ⁴	Cornhill: The Fox	Grocers	A	merchant	1730-39

³ Listed from 1705-24 as a head dresser, from 1727-42 as a milliner.

⁴ Born 27 October 1706 to David and Mary, French Huguenots in St Benet's Threadneedle St. She took her ?sister Jane Sarrazin apprentice in 1730, and Jane traded from the same address as a Grocer from 1742 as a coatmaker, but no birth record has been found.

Jane Sarrazin	Cornhill: The Fox	Grocers	A		1737-44
Susannah Cole	Cornhill	Leathersellers	A	Cit & Cooper	1718-c27
Rachel Yerbury	Cornhill	Musicians	R		1750-64
Ann Gort	Cornhill	Haberdashers			1715
Giles Savage	Bishopsgate	Haberdashers			1710
Ruth Price	Bishopsgate	NA ⁵			1720
Elinor Mosely	Gracechurch Street	Clockmakers			1727-47
Hannah Campleshon	Gracechurch Street	Clockmakers			1745-48
Elizabeth Kello	St Botolph Bishopsgate	NA (outside City)	PCC Will		1740
Hannah Wilkinson & daus	St Olave Hart Street	NA	PCC will		1740
Elizabeth Hubert	NA	Clockmakers			1722-28
Mary Archer	NA	Salters			1749
Julia Dowell	NA	Grocers			1722-30
Mary Hawkins & Rebecca Weaver	NA	NA	PCC will		Until 1710
Anne Lambert & John?	NA	NA	PCC will		c.1713
Elizabeth Caldwell	London Bridge	NA	PCC will		1749/50

Means of freedom: A = apprenticeship; M = marriage; P = patrimony..

Listing only those positively identified as milliners, who either earned the freedom or paid quarterage or took an apprentice. Those for whom the only record is of serving an apprenticeship to a milliner, like Catherine Mosely (p xxx), or administering a milliner's estate, like Mary Pickeard (p xxx) are not included here. Nor does it include the coat shops or the stuff shops or the fan shops. The active periods are minima: where only a will survives it is only that year that appears. And male milliners have longer active periods because they are not cut off (nominally, rather than economically speaking) by marriage.

5 Jenkinson, 'Bedford Apprentices', 163.

Sources: London Guildhall

Ms 11598/2, Grocers' Company Register of Freemen Admitted and Apprentices Bound 1721-43

Ms xxx, Clockmakers' Company

Ms xxx, Haberdashers' company

Salter's Company Archives

Leathersellers' Company Archives

Table 1: Apprentices bound in the Worshipful Company of Clockmakers to George Tyler, Citizen and Clockmaker, and Lucy his wife

Date	Apprentice	Parent	Premium
5 Jan 1714/15	Mary Darby	n.a.	n.a.
28 April 1716	Rebeckah Fisher	n.a.	n.a.
3 April 1718	Eleanor Mosely	[Rowland Mosely of York, apoth] ¹	n.a.
5 Jan 1719/20	Catherine Jackson	Joseph Jackson of Leeds, clockworker, deceased	n.a.
5 June 1722	Hannah Campleshon	Henry Campleshon of York, grocer, deceased	£60
4 June 1725	Elizabeth Newton	Thomas Newton of Bishopthorpe, Yorks	£40

Sources: London Guildhall (hereafter LG): The Company of Clockmakers' Register of Apprentices 1631-1931, compiled by C.E. Atkins, London, 1931, and LG: AHS Pam 51, Female Apprentices in the London Clockmakers' Company; LG: Ms 2711/5, Clockmakers' Company Rough Minute Book, 1719-31. The previous volume of the minute book only runs to 1709, so there are no surviving parental details between 1709 and 1719. The value of the premium was not always recorded.

¹ Her father's name and occupation is not in the Clockmakers' records, but in the parish registers of St Crux, York.

Table 2: Apprentices bound in the Worshipful Company of Clockmakers to Elinor Moseley

Date	Apprentice	Parent	Premium
4 Sept 1727	Catherine Mosely	Rowland Moseley of York, Apothecary, deceased	[£50] ¹
19 Oct 1727	Mary Bate	Richard Bate of Chelham, Kent, Clerk	n.a.
7 Aug 1732	Mary Newton	John Newton of All Hallows Lombard St, Goldsmith	£50
5 Feb 1734/5	Elizabeth Aiskell	Francis Aiskill of Deal, Kent, Captain & Mariner, deceased	£31
4 Mar 1737/8	Katherine Capon	David Capon of Leyton, Essex	£30 of which £20 from Corporation of Sons of the Clergy
14 Sept 1738	Frances Griffith	Robert Griffith of Wiliston, Glocs, ² Clerk, deceased	£42
8 Nov 1739	Mary Eyre	Elizabeth Eyre of Christ's Hospital	£50

Sources: As for Table 1, plus LG: Ms 2711/6, Rough Minute Book, 1731-40.

¹ See below, p xxxx.

² I cannot identify this parish.