

Medieval and Early Modern Artisan Culture

Margaret A. Pappano

Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario

Nicole R. Rice

St. John's University
Queens, New York

In the United States, the artisan is undergoing a vogue that recalls the nostalgic promotion of handicrafts in Victorian England. As in the first age of industrialization, the current artisan movement responds to anxieties about mass production and the alienation of labor.¹ On the one hand, independent makers of food, clothing, and furniture are reviving small-scale production methods and marketing to self-conscious, mostly urban consumers. In a related development, one sees the term *artisan* applied to everything from Dunkin' Donuts "artisan bagels," to a local podiatrist's office ("Artisan Podiatry"), to "Artisan" fragrance for men, whose bottle comes sheathed in brown wicker. These labels capitalize on cultural nostalgia, evoking the individual baker's touch, recalling doctors' association with craft practice, and packaging the artisan's masculine essence in a charming basket. While there is no regulation of the terms *artisan* or *artisanal* in the United States, the designations are codified in France, where all professions except farming are considered to fall into the categories *commerciale*, *artisanal*, or *liberal*. Tradespeople register with the Assemblée permanente des chambres de métiers et de l'artisanat, which divides them into food, construction, textile, and service workers. Thus, although the category has changed significantly from its premodern incarnation, *artisanal* remains a term with a continuous history in Europe.

If the artisan provides an outlet for many cultural impulses today, it should come as no surprise that this category has long been subject to varying constructions. As a specific economic category, premodern artisans are typically bounded by two historical markers: the rise of urban centers in the medieval period and the reorganization of commodity production as a result of industrial capitalization in the early modern period.² Though

artisans were not exclusively an urban group, the increasing importance and density of cities created markets that drew skilled as well as unskilled workers, encouraging craft expansion, specialization, and organization.³ While bound up in the economic structure of towns and cities, artisans can be recognized by specific social practices. For as historian James Farr argues, while artisans were fundamentally identified with a mode of production—“skilled people who fashioned artifacts with their hands and tools but without the aid of machinery, the classic handicraftsmen”—just as important were the social dimensions of their identity. Speaking of a “more or less coherent artisan culture that endured for half a millennium,” Farr proposes that “we might profit from thinking of an artisan’s life (and his or her work) as being in important ways a product of what we might call symbolic exchanges, where labor was a sign of social place as well as a means to survival or material accumulation.”⁴ Some of these “symbolic exchanges” included membership in exclusive religious and occupational associations such as guilds, adherence to patriarchal and patrilineal structures, and the organization of work in association with the urban household.

When we speak of “artisan culture,” we wish to evoke the social practices that characterized the lives of craftswomen and craftsmen and that were closely linked to their places in the social hierarchy. As Lisa H. Cooper observes, the study of late medieval English artisans has recently moved “toward an examination of artisanal *culture* that attends to both craft labor and craft life as forms of practice, bodies of knowledge, and realms of experience that distinguished medieval artisans from other members of the social body.”⁵ The present moment seems right for an examination of artisan culture in its pan-European dimensions over the long period from around 1300 to 1700. During this era, through collective processes, artisans produced, participated in, and shaped distinctive cultural forms. Because of their limited access to literacy, many of these forms were oral and performative: the elaborate cycle drama of late medieval England is a preeminent example, but there are plenteous records of processions, plays, and ceremonies, as well as protests and revolts, by artisans throughout Europe. We also find artisans as producers of literate culture, from guild account books like the fifteenth-century “Masons’ Constitutions” discussed by Cooper to the seventeenth-century artisan diaries, chronicles, and autobiographies examined by James Amelang.⁶ Artisans developed distinctive cultural forms related to their workshop-oriented lifestyle: Geoffrey Chaucer clearly associates particular models of masculinity with his artisan characters, the Miller, Cook, and Reeve (indeed, the Reeve, formerly a carpenter with “a good myster,” suffers

emasculatation because of his movement away from artisan work into estate management).

This special issue includes a diverse group of essays exploring artisans' distinctive interventions into western European culture from the fourteenth through the seventeenth century. While naturally this long period saw fluctuations in models of gender, devotion, public ceremony, and political organization, there was also much continuity, as artisans sustained their traditional modes of reproducing knowledge and status. The forms of artisan culture were always products of social relations. This observation holds true for all of the contributors included here. For example, Shayne Legassie examines fictional representations of relations among Florentine painters, attending carefully to the vocational language of comradeship; Shannon McSheffrey interrogates the social role of foreign craftsmen in Tudor London; and Luis Corteguera considers artisan social status and claims to experiential knowledge in relation to contemporary political discourses.

Although much commonality existed within the artisan category, the range of crafts and trades encompassed and the statuses of individuals practicing them varied widely. Heather Swanson observes of late medieval York, "The artisan class . . . embraced at one extreme the wealthy and prestigious pewterers and goldsmiths, and at the other indigent and even destitute members of the textile and building crafts."⁷ Status tended to correlate with refinement of skills or rarity of materials, in turn translating into levels of wealth and influence. In Spain, Corteguera notes, the institutionalized hierarchy of "high crafts" (*artistas*), including painters, goldsmiths, surgeons, and notaries, and the lower "mechanics" (*menestrales*), including weavers, shoemakers and carpenters, traditionally entailed differing levels of political participation. Although some early modern theorists considered "mechanics" unsuited for philosophical enterprise or the pursuit of learned *scientia*, Corteguera shows that many others saw affinities between the artisan's hands-on experience and contemporary approaches to the "new science of politics" known as "reason of state."

Social divisions among artisan groups were codified in most cities, such as Florence, where the crafts were divided into "major" and "minor" guilds, as Sabrina Corbellini and Margriet Hoogvliet show. Another key aspect of artisan identity, which existed alongside these status divisions, was the close relationship between production and retailing. Buying raw materials and selling one's products were integral to artisan identity, and most Florentine guilds both manufactured and retailed their wares.⁸ Artisan identity always involved the sale of products in the local marketplace, though some

artisans eventually moved into the ranks of the mercantile class. Artisans are often defined in opposition to merchants because of their ties to local rather than foreign markets and the cultural perception of their rootedness (often more imagined than real) in contrast to the merchants' mobility. Yet precisely because the master craftsman's identity was localized, dependent upon recognition by peers and neighbors, premodern artisans often imaginatively constructed their relations to the nation. In the fourteenth century, the brothers of the London Bowcraft censured the bowstrings of nonguild members, maintaining that "the greatest damage might easily ensue unto our Lord the King and his realm" through faulty products.⁹ The work of craftsmen, like that of knights, was cast as protecting the entire nation; through their collective identity, the bowers articulated a sense of national belonging.

Even during a long period marked by increasing polarization between artisans and merchants, the identities of these two groups continued to overlap in productive ways. Christine Jones demonstrates how, in the later seventeenth century, pressures wrought upon the French artisanal world by contact with distant places—the Levant, Far East, and Mesoamerica—are manifest in the ways that new, exotic beverages (coffee, tea, chocolate) were incorporated into local markets, facilitated by the creation of practitioners whose expertise transcended national and local identities. In how-to guides on hot beverage preparation, the hybrid figure of the French coffee-merchant, a "trader/maker/seller of hot drinks," incorporated both mercantile and artisan identities, exalting foreign travel while calling attention to traditional forms of craft expertise in explaining how customers might make use of these alluring new products.

As already implied, another key element of artisan identity during this long period was the link between craft practice and membership in an occupational guild, or corporation.¹⁰ While not all craftsmen were guild members, the guild represented a primary avenue to economic stability and civic visibility. The major economic functions of guilds are well known: regulating craft quality and establishing local monopolies over the sale of particular items. Farr notes, "The corporate guilds to which masters belonged were public bodies whose purpose was to provide the essential needs of society. In return for this service they were granted corporate privileges, among them the power to police their own members in accord with their own statutes and regulations."¹¹ These groups were bound up in varying ways with the political organization of towns: in Venice, the glassworkers' corporation, which included both guild (*arte*) and religious confraternity

(*scuola*), was governed by the town magistracy, with oversight by officers who had been elected by guild members.¹² Hence membership in a guild, which in towns usually correlated to “free” or burgess status, was important not only to economic success but also to political representation and power. Some important exceptions did exist, however: in late medieval Douai, a city officially lacking corporate guilds, a strong culture of artisan association still prevailed, and craftworkers “managed to preserve craft culture and assert trade rights.”¹³

As seen in the Venetian glassworkers’ combination of *arte* and *scuola*, collective religious devotion was likewise integral to artisan culture. In late medieval England, some craft guilds probably originated as pious fraternities connected to particular parishes or saints: for example, the York Tailors were associated with the fraternity of John the Baptist.¹⁴ Professional identity was inextricable in many craft ordinances from “the honor of God,” and the announcement of York’s cycle of plays, produced by the city’s artisans, contains language connecting artisanal honor with the “reverence of our lord Jesus Christ.”¹⁵ Across Europe, craft confraternities organized collective worship and feasting as well as providing mutual aid, funerals, and prayers for deceased members. As Corbellini and Hoogvliet show for late medieval Italy, religious confraternities with extensive libraries also gave artisans access to devotional reading, enabling some to deepen their spiritual practice and even to become authors in their own right. While the Reformation forced the reconfiguration of artisan devotional identity in some respects, the above evidence from Italy, as well as McSheffrey’s work on sixteenth-century London, suggests that artisans may have experienced more continuity than rupture in their religious practices and identities.¹⁶

Although the traditional scenario of the master artisan working alongside apprentice and journeyman is just one configuration of artisan work, which in the early modern period increasingly took place in larger workshops employing numerous workers, the home-based workshop in which the guild master, often with his wife, supervised apprentices, journeymen, and other laborers, remained a crucial touchstone for artisan culture.¹⁷ The family workshop exerted a strong influence on sixteenth-century artists such as John Heywood, whose play *The Shoemaker’s Holiday*, Natasha Korda argues, expresses nostalgia for the workshop tradition together with anxiety about the feminization of workers. Craft ordinances from late medieval towns attempt to delimit the social role of each worker in relation to the master craftsman. In particular, masters and their apprentices existed in a state of mutual definition designed to keep artisan knowledge and practice

within the orbit of the craft fellowship and linked to local urban identity. York's master craftsmen, as freemen, were required to reside within city limits, and their apprentices had to be English-born. In his capacity as teacher of apprentices, the master's commitment to his craft's intellectual property and retail monopoly was also legislated, with all masters enjoined not to "enforme or teache anye person which is *of anye other craft in ther cunningge or science*."¹⁸

While apprentices, contractually bound to masters responsible for their welfare and training, were on track to becoming masters (though many never attained this status), journeymen and wage laborers occupied more insecure places in the artisan economy.¹⁹ In late medieval England, "some masters were advised not to teach their journeyman secrets as 'they might do their apprentice,'" for "the master would not risk their setting up as a competitor."²⁰ On the Continent, journeymen tended to be more highly organized, as in early modern Germany, where their fellowships echoed the organization of craft guilds, with provisions for financial and spiritual support of members. Generally forbidden to marry until becoming masters, German journeymen turned the exclusion of women into a constitutive element of their identity as single males, during a period when the wider artisanal body was growing more hostile to female participation.²¹

Some journeymen artisans may have been capable of transforming aspects of subordination into affirmative elements of social identity, but this possibility seems not to have existed for the mass of waged laborers.²² We do not have to wait until Karl Marx to see the artisan workshop as a precarious place, threatened by capitalist forces that fracture the bonds of fellowship, alienating workers from products and customers. "Piece-work," whereby different aspects of manufacturing are performed by different people, usually outside of the workshop, characterized even early urban economies.²³ Medieval artisans themselves often organized piece-work production, sending some work out to laborers while maintaining control over the finished product for sale, thus increasing profits. Craftsmen who performed piece-work usually did not oversee workshops, hold property, or enjoy civic political rights. Such workers could not lay claim to the full title of "artisan" or the social status enjoyed by the master craftsmen who produced and sold their own goods.

As these gradations of artisan identity show, an artisan was not simply someone who possessed a skill but also someone with authority to exercise that skill. As Margaret Somers states, "[T]he property of skill was a *relational practice* rather than an individual attribute. Not the *capacity* to work

a trade but the *right* to do so was endowed by virtue of membership in a skilled community.”²⁴ The specialization that guild membership demanded fostered the development of advanced craft techniques. Those who were not in guilds had a greater tendency to change occupations and transfer their skill sets from one craft to another, often not attaining the level of knowledge associated with the master craftsman. In addition, innovations, “secrets of the craft,” were usually accessible only to guild members.²⁵ However, there are many examples of skilled artisans practicing outside of the guild system that provide counterevidence to this truism. As McSheffrey shows, the civic liberties provided a workplace beyond the reach of guild jurisdiction, allowing alien artisans to flourish in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century London. The products of these alien artisans—largely Dutch—attained a reputation among elite consumers for their superior style. The relation between local and nonnative artisans was often fraught, as locals sought to affirm the rights of their collective, casting the work of outsiders as defective and threatening to the civic or national good. However, infiltration between the local and foreign still occurred: Stephan Epstein maintains that the migration of artisans and journeymen was essential to the transfer of technological innovation in premodern industry.²⁶ Korda’s essay describes how in early modern London, foreign wares entered a domestic market, producing anxiety and stigmatization but also becoming assimilated, and even providing new employment opportunities for those outside of the guild system, like women.

There were some guilds of women artisans—notably, textile workers in Paris, Rouen, and Cologne—and many guilds with women members.²⁷ However, Martha C. Howell has proposed that the late medieval conceptualization of civic citizenship based on the guild system worked to marginalize women’s occupational status by creating a political locus outside the household in which men were, almost exclusively, the craft representatives.²⁸ Most women exercised craft skills outside of guilds, either within the household production unit under the nominal or real direction of husbands or fathers, as piece-workers (spinning and carding were both feminized activities), or as “illicit” independent artisans, liable to harassment and censure by the “official” artisans and local government. That most female artisans contributed substantially to their household incomes is evident from wills, which might note major pieces of equipment belonging to women, civic court records documenting infractions by women workers, and guild records listing payments by wives and widows. Women were also considered repositories of artisan knowledge, as indicated by guild bylaws that per-

mitted widows to carry on businesses independently, including the training of apprentices, and by the common provision allowing a man marrying an artisan's widow to become an official member of the craft.²⁹

Many historians see opportunities for women artisans contracting with the late medieval/early modern movement toward increasing specialization, capitalism, and division between mercantile and artisan work. Others see a more continuous history of secondary work conditions, suggesting that premodern women never enjoyed a "golden age" of work equity. Judith M. Bennett's study of the English brewing industry has shown how ale brewing remained a low-paying, feminized profession until the introduction of beer made possible larger profit margins, at which time men entered the industry, displacing women workers.³⁰ With larger numbers of male brewers, brewing also became organized into guilds in many towns and cities, enabling male brewers access to beneficial civic legislation that made it difficult or impossible for women to continue small-scale brewing. Ale-wives were hence widely stigmatized in early modern representations and, indeed, women's work was frequently represented as defective, imaginatively tied to their defective bodies.³¹ Korda's essay reveals that despite overtly discriminatory rhetoric, one can discern the centrality of women's work to both the male-headed workshop and civic economy, as one female character helps to manage the workshop while another finds employment, thanks to consumer demand, making and selling fine needlework.

In addition to responding to changes in consumption patterns, artisan work and identity were shaped by premodern shifts between categories of knowledge, particularly by the crossing of the traditional Aristotelian conceptual divide between *techné* and *epistémé*.³² While the object of knowledge associated with artisan work was traditionally categorized as the lowest form of know-how, involving the manipulation of materials, in opposition to knowledge associated with fixed principles, certain "crafts" passed from one category to the other over this long period. Medicine is a good example. In fourteenth- and fifteenth-century urban contexts, surgeons might be grouped with barbers (those who cared for the body by shaving, cutting hair, and pulling teeth) and physicians with apothecaries, painters, or chandlers (those using resinous materials). Well into the sixteenth century, many physicians and surgeons still trained within the guild system; however, with the changing conception of the human body and expansion of medical training in the universities, the work of physicians and surgeons was elevated and eventually became associated not with artisan knowledge but almost exclu-

sively with literate knowledge and techniques of scientific investigation, such as dissection.³³

The category of “art” constitutes another domain of knowledge that splintered from artisan work during the premodern period. Legassie’s essay explores how art became divided from craft through a gradual deemphasis on its material basis and elevation of its intellectual aspects and connection with “design.” Even so, he shows, authors such as Boccaccio and Sacchetti chart painting’s continuing association with artisan work by drawing attention to the labor involved in painting as well as the element of guild camaraderie that characterized the social world of Florentine painters. Pamela O. Long contends that the fifteenth-century rise of treatises on the mechanical arts instantiates the art/craft divide: “particular crafts and constructive arts, having been transformed into written, discursive disciplines, came to be treated as forms of ‘knowledge,’ characterized by rational and sometimes mathematical principles.”³⁴ This enunciation of cultural divisions between artist and artisan and between scientist and artisan adumbrates the historical processes by which certain forms of knowledge developed a privileged status separate from artisanal knowledge. Artisan knowledge and identity remained as an “other” against which “advancing” forms of knowledge and their practitioners defined themselves. Technological innovations, written treatises, and new modes of thought did not so much elevate artisan knowledge as make these innovations another form of knowledge altogether. Linked with manual labor, as the term “handicraft” suggests, artisan knowledge remained aligned with lower social status throughout the period.

While artisans were often conceived of as limited, practical-minded people, historian Pamela H. Smith contends that practical or experiential knowledge achieved newly privileged status in the early modern period. She locates an “artisan epistemology” that equates how-to knowledge with the fixity and certainty of deductive knowledge. Arguing that the reevaluation of practical knowledge is reflected in the unprecedented proliferation of artisan treatises and manuals from the fifteenth century onward, Smith uncouples artisanal knowledge from artisanal social status. These manuals, often written for courtly audiences, emphasize technical know-how to elevate the particular artisan in the eyes of a patron.³⁵ However, though artisan knowledge might be elevated, artisans themselves (with a few exceptions) were not. Thus, although there is much evidence for the ever-increasing literacy of artisans over this long period, artisan culture remained strongly linked with local milieux and oral culture, dependent upon transferring craft knowl-

edge through direct, bodily means—literal hands-on teaching—rather than through the written word. Paradoxically, the expansion of formal education and proliferation of books through the printing press from the sixteenth century onward also served to reinforce the lower social status of the artisan, who, with few exceptions continued to train through traditional patterns of apprenticeship. It is precisely such forms of “tacit” knowledge that Adam Smith dismisses in his *Wealth of Nations*: “there is scarce any common mechanic trade . . . of which all the operations may not be as completely and distinctly explained in a pamphlet of a very few pages.”³⁶

While artisans are still found today, whether the remnants of a continuous history of handicraft production or the embodiment of a modern marketing strategy, the guilds that empowered them saw their demise in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Over this period, one finds legislation against corporate association in nearly every European national context.³⁷ While the abolition of guilds is often tied to the popularity of market liberalism promoted by figures like Adam Smith in England and Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot in France, traditional ways in which artisans organized their work and profit had seen challenges well before this. For example, the development of retail shops, in which artisans not only sold their own goods, usually on a bespoke basis, but also displayed goods for general consumption originating outside their own workshops, signifies an earlier fissure between producer and commodity. Korda shows this process at work in sixteenth-century London with the development of ready-to-wear shoes and the earliest shopping malls. By tracing the declining numbers of artisans and increasing numbers of wage-laborers in urban contexts over this period, scholars have identified a proletarianization of the workforce that presages the end of artisan-dominated manufacturing.

Despite the fact that over the long period covered by this special issue artisans saw an overall loss in political representation, the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries nevertheless represent a high point in artisan culture.³⁸ Howell contends that “the late Middle Ages emerges as a fascinating—albeit difficult—period when artisans displayed amazing ingenuity, when entrepreneurial energies proliferated, when artisanal culture might even be said to have flowered.”³⁹ For the premodern period, as for our present moment, this dynamism may stem from artisans’ association with longstanding traditions and their capacity to adapt to changing cultural demands. Throughout the period, we see artisans linked with traditional forms of practice-based knowledge, functioning as repositories of local customs and memory. Although artisan identity may be a pervasive fictional construction serving

to devalue the craftworker as incapable of reason and new thought or to reinscribe the craftsman or craftswoman as a nostalgic relic, many of the essays in this collection show traditional identifications being deployed to innovative purposes. Corbellini and Hoogvliet show how artisans were deeply involved in the production and dissemination of vernacular devotional texts on the eve of the Reformation, creating new forms of spiritual dialogue and sharing religious material as if extending the collaborative nature of craftwork into other arenas of their lives. Likewise, Corteguera demonstrates how the very link between artisans and practice facilitated novel models of political thought that valued experience as a basis of knowledge. In mid-sixteenth-century England, McSheffrey argues, the concentration of foreign craftworkers in the London sanctuary of St. Martin le Grand created the conditions not only for the refinement of traditional crafts (luxury shoes and goldwork) but also for the development of new collective forms of civic participation, as when immigrant artisans expressed their solidarity through arguments in the London courts. Finally, Jones, closing out the volume, shows how the spread of artisanal knowledge in seventeenth-century hot beverage treatises made the coffee merchant into a boundary-crossing figure of artisan prestige and identification for upper-class readers. Although artisans persisted in the lower ranks of society, their dynamic cultural models pervaded the domains of literate, legal, and devotional culture and may even be seen as precursors to later reformations and revolutions.



Notes

- 1 An article in the online journal *AGBeat* notes, “As more business becomes automated and manufacturing has become the American way, many Americans are pausing to consider where their products come from, who made them, and more importantly, will they last for more than a year? . . . we are seeing more and more consumers focus on the high quality local artisans, not only as a way to keep money in the local economy, but to improve their own lives and surroundings.” Lani Rosales, “Revitalizing the Artisan Movement, Focus on Quality,” *AGBeat*, June 3, 2012, <http://agbeat.com/entrepreneur/revitalizing-the-artisan-movement-focus-on-quality/>.
- 2 Pamela O. Long observes, “The development of urbanism in the eleventh and twelfth centuries brought with it the rise of the merchant class and the great expansion of artisanal crafts and trades.” *Openness, Secrecy, Authorship: Technical Arts and the Culture of Knowledge from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 88.
- 3 Although the essays in this volume focus primarily on urban artisans, rural areas, too,

- relied on the presence of skilled craftsmen. Perhaps the most important early modern development in the rural/urban dynamics of artisan production was the widespread movement in northern Europe and England of cloth manufacture *back* to the countryside from cities.
- 4 James R. Farr, *Artisans in Europe, 1300–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 3, 1, and 5 respectively.
 - 5 Lisa H. Cooper, *Artisans and Narrative Craft in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 5; emphasis in original.
 - 6 Cooper, *Artisans and Narrative Craft*, 56–82; James S. Amelang, *The Flight of Icarus: Artisan Autobiography in Early Modern Europe* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998).
 - 7 Heather Swanson, *Medieval Artisans: An Urban Class in Late Medieval England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 2.
 - 8 The only three Florentine guilds without workshops were the bankers, the cloth importers, and the judges and notaries.
 - 9 “Letter Book H,” reprinted in *Memorials of London and London Life in the XIIIth, XIVth, and XVth Centuries*, ed. and trans. Henry Thomas Riley, vol. 2 (London, 1868), 414.
 - 10 The function of guilds as retarding or encouraging economic efficiency remains a subject of disagreement among economic historians. See the debate conducted in Sheilagh Ogilvie, “Guilds, Efficiency, and Social Capital: Evidence from German Proto-industry,” *Economic History Review* 57, no. 2 (2004): 286–333; and S. R. Epstein, “Craft Guilds in the Pre-modern Economy: A Discussion,” *Economic History Review* 61, no. 1 (2008): 155–74.
 - 11 Farr, *Artisans in Europe*, 21.
 - 12 Long, *Openness, Secrecy, Authorship*, 89.
 - 13 Martha Howell, “Achieving the Guild Effect without Guilds: Crafts and Craftsmen in Late Medieval Douai,” in *Les métiers au moyen âge: Aspects économiques et sociaux; actes du colloque international de Louvain-la-Neuve 7–9 octobre 1993*, ed. Pascale Lambrechts and Jean-Pierre Sosson (Louvain-la-Neuve, Belg.: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1996), 109–28, at 112.
 - 14 See Jeremy Goldberg, “Craft Guilds, the Corpus Christi Play, and Civic Government,” in *The Government of Medieval York: Essays in Commemoration of the 1396 Royal Charter*, ed. Sarah Rees Jones (York: University of York, 1997), 141–63, at 144.
 - 15 *Records of Early English Drama: York*, ed. Alexandra F. Johnston and Margaret Rogerson, vol. 1 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), 11.
 - 16 A major example of the disruption of artisan life during the Reformation was the dissolution of craft confraternities in Protestant countries; see Farr, *Artisans in Europe*, 235.
 - 17 On the shift to larger workshops, see James R. Farr, *The Work of France: Labor and Culture in Early Modern Times, 1350–1800* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2008), 79.
 - 18 York Civic Archive, MS E54, fol. 15v.
 - 19 See Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, “Failure to Become Freemen: Urban Apprentices in Early Modern England,” *Social History* 16, no. 2 (1991): 155–72.

- 20 R. A. Leeson, *Travelling Brothers: The Six Centuries' Road from Craft Fellowship to Trade Unionism* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1979), 30.
- 21 Merry E. Wiesner, "Wanderfogels and Women: Journeymen's Concepts of Masculinity in Early Modern Germany," *Journal of Social History* 24, no. 4 (1991): 767–82, at 769 and 771.
- 22 D. A. Woodward, *Men at Work: Labourers and Building Craftsmen in the Towns of Northern England, 1450–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 94.
- 23 Steven A. Epstein, *Wage Labor and Guilds in Medieval Europe* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 62–79.
- 24 Margaret R. Somers, "The 'Misteries' of Property: Relationality, Rural Industrialization, and Community in Chartist Narratives of Political Rights," in *Early Modern Conceptions of Property*, ed. John Brewer and Susan Staves (New York: Routledge, 1996), 62–92, at 67; emphasis in original.
- 25 Stephan R. Epstein, "Craft Guilds, Apprenticeships, and Technological Change in Preindustrial Europe," *Journal of Economic History* 53, no. 3 (1998): 684–713, at 699.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 702–3.
- 27 Maryanne Kowaleski and Judith M. Bennett, "Crafts, Gilds, and Women in the Middle Ages: Fifty Years after Marian K. Dale," *Signs* 14, no. 2 (1989): 474–88.
- 28 Martha C. Howell, "Citizenship and Gender: Women's Political Status in Northern Medieval Cities," in *Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988), 37–60.
- 29 Janine M. Lanza, *From Wives to Widows in Early Modern Paris: Gender, Economy, and Law* (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2007), 93–95.
- 30 Judith M. Bennett, *Ale, Beer, and Brewsters in England: Women's Work in a Changing World, 1300–1600* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- 31 Natasha Korda, *Labors Lost: Women's Work and the Early Modern Stage* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011).
- 32 Long, *Openness, Secrecy, Authorship*, 2.
- 33 See Nancy G. Siraisi, *Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), for a discussion of the long-standing place of practical training via the guilds alongside the development of university training in the medical professions. See Jacalyn Duffin's discussion of how Renaissance conceptions of the human body influenced medical training: *History of Medicine: A Scandalously Short Introduction* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).
- 34 Long, *Openness, Secrecy, Authorship*, 104.
- 35 Pamela H. Smith, *The Body of the Artisan: Art and Experience in the Scientific Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 59 and 31–32 respectively.
- 36 Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, ed. Edwin Cannan, 4th ed., vol. 1 (London: Methuen, 1925), 128.
- 37 Farr, *Artisans in Europe*, 280–82.
- 38 On the decline of artisan political representation, see *ibid.*, 164.
- 39 Howell, "Achieving the Guild Effect," 128.

