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Abstract

Medieval women were a vital part of thirteenth-century society, and women in Canterbury were no exception. Canterbury was important regionally as a seat of royal government and an ecclesiastical province; it was a cosmopolitan centre, with close proximity to trade routes and a pilgrimage location. It is therefore surprising that a study of Canterbury women in this period has not previously been conducted; indeed there has been no study of a town in the South East from this angle. This thesis will look at the questions relating to women’s property holding and the role they played in the local economy before the Black Death. Furthermore, marriage on a local level will be examined to discover the issues which faced couples intent on contracting a marriage, as well as the problems which they could face during their marital life. There are a wealth of records which survive for Christ Church Cathedral Priory, including a series of rentals and charters, allowing us to trace women as landholders and the presence of both maritigium and dower in the city. The occupations which Canterbury women were involved in will be explored, as will their position within society and the impact which their marital status had on their lives. The chapters of this thesis are designed to explore and highlight the position and role of women in thirteenth-century Canterbury, with regard to marriage, property and work, comparing their life experience with those of women in other areas, such as Lincoln and York. The analysis and experiences of Canterbury women will add to the existing historiography on medieval urban women.
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Introduction

It was a line from 'How the Good Wife Taught her Daughter', a poem written in the early to mid-fourteenth century, which inspired this research, as it positioned women within the structure of society - 'Daughter, if you want to be a wife, look wisely that you work; look willingly, and in good life you love God and Holy Church'. ¹ This text indicates that women were expected to work, participating in society and contributing to the lives of their families and households in a wide range of capacities, while insinuating that marriage was a socially accepted institution in which both sexes were encouraged to participate. ² Medieval women still seldom figure prominently in modern scholarship, and instead analysis of political and economic events have overtaken recent historiography of this period. The status and position of women in medieval Canterbury have barely been discussed, which is interesting considering Canterbury's importance in England during the thirteenth century, and its place as a popular destination for pilgrims provided opportunities for employment for its residents, but were these open to women? Through this research I shall attempt to determine the role of women within Canterbury in terms of marriage, access to property and work, while taking into consideration the influence of Christian teaching and the institutional apparatus of the Church over their lives.

Historiography concerning women during the medieval period has grown in recent years, although women in thirteenth-century England have received relatively little attention by comparison with their fourteenth- and fifteenth-century counterparts. Women are often considered in a general context in studies that cover a broad chronological framework, and that often deal with women’s lives after the Black Death of 1348-9. ³ In 1992 Jeremy Goldberg undertook a study on Women, Work, and Life Cycle in a Medieval Economy which looked at similar material for women in Yorkshire, albeit later to the material examined in this thesis. ⁴ His work was important because it illuminated for the first time the roles women played within the medieval urban economy of the north of England, and how they were often marginalised from economic life in the period between 1300 and 1520. ⁵ Some of Goldberg’s arguments concerning York can, however, be called into question. Goldberg proposes a link between

² This text will be discussed in Chapter Three: Women and Work.
³ S. Bardsley, Women’s Roles in the Middle Ages (Westport; Greenwood Press, 2007).
⁴ Goldberg, Women, Work, and Life Cycle.
⁵ Ibid., p.337.
economic prosperity and a low birth rate with regard to marriage, however, as Christopher Dyer argues, this link is not wholly convincing. It is unlikely that women in ‘tedious, repetitive, and ill-paid jobs’ found them satisfying and rewarding enough to delay marriage. Yet, Judith Bennett has noted Goldberg’s work is underpinned by assumptions which are often based on little evidence, with some of his conclusions becoming sweeping and giving no consideration of alternative possibilities. Goldberg’s conclusions that women did not marry unless they were forced to do so by economic hardship, and if they did marry it was later in life and less frequently than previous generations, seem a little farfetched and based upon a narrow body of evidence. In a society where marriage was the pinnacle of women’s lives it is difficult to believe that they simply did not want to marry. This is not to deny that when two people married they were generally in a more economically stable condition as they only had one rent payment between the two of them, and a combined income. As Bennett also comments, women may not have been able to marry due to the sex-ratio in York which favoured women.

Other historians have also researched the place of women in medieval society and the roles that they fulfilled at different stages of their lives. Louise Wilkinson conducted a study entitled *Women in Thirteenth-Century Lincolnshire*, examining female involvement and interaction with society. Wilkinson argues that gender roles might be economically, legally and socially reinforced, but ‘these roles did allow women some scope for action’. Furthermore, she notes how female identity was not fixed and instead evolved with the female life-cycle and changes in circumstance. Her chapter on ‘Townswomen’ is of particular relevance to this thesis, as it provides a point of comparison for the research conducted in Canterbury. Wilkinson’s work recognised that gender ideologies formed societal expectations which women operated within, yet there was ‘sufficient latitude’ which could enable women to circumvent gender norms. In his work *Gendering the Black Death: Women in Later Medieval England*, S.H. Rigby presents an examination of the condition of women bringing

---

12 Ibid., p.197.
13 Ibid., pp.92-115.
14 Ibid., p.199.
together various ideas which surround the debate, while recognising a problem which medieval historians face – the limited information which surviving sources from the period offer with which to answer the range of questions which historians have.\textsuperscript{15} Furthermore, Rigby recognises that the real opportunities which were open to women altered and developed throughout the medieval period, in response to demographic, economic, political and social change.\textsuperscript{16} In Rigby’s work \textit{English Society in the Later Middle Ages – Class, Status and Gender}, it could be argued that it was precisely because women possessed inferior property rights and economic opportunities as a gender, that their claims over resources were determined primarily by the social class of their husbands.\textsuperscript{17} Eileen Power’s work \textit{Medieval Women} argues that the position of women was one socially constructed, and that their place politically, legally and socially.\textsuperscript{18} Power also recognises the variety of positions which were women were expected to occupy under different settings, and that these often contradicted each other; this gave women and inconsistent status, something which Rigby also notes.\textsuperscript{19} Barbara Hanawalt’s work, \textit{The Wealth of Wives: Women, Law, and Economy in Late Medieval London}, draws attention to the way women learnt to operate within the web of patriarchy, while recognising that marriage was understood to be the basis of the household economy.\textsuperscript{20} For medieval society it was the conjugal couple that provided a stable foundation, and brought together the elements which were needed to make a functioning and well-ordered society work.\textsuperscript{21}

The working lives of medieval women have garnered more attention in the last two decades, and as such more literature is being produced. Marjorie McIntosh’s study, \textit{Working Women in English Society 1300-1620}, which focused primarily on five market towns, also examined the lives and experiences of urban women.\textsuperscript{22} McIntosh argued that women’s level of participation in the market economy varied across time and place, reflecting social, economic, cultural and demographic change. McIntosh also argued that women provided services which were mainly in a domestic context, and their freedom to do this was as a result of men finding


\textsuperscript{16} Rigby, ‘Gendering the Black Death’, p.746.

\textsuperscript{17} S.H. Rigby, \textit{English Society in the Later Middle Ages – Class, Status and Gender} (Basingstoke; MacMillan Press Ltd, 1995), p.282-283.


\textsuperscript{22} M. K. McIntosh, \textit{Working Women in English Society 1300-1620} (New York; Cambridge University Press, 2005). The five market centres were: Tamworth (Staffordshire), Ramsey (Huntingdonshire), Northallerton (North Yorkshire), Romford (Essex), and Minehead (Somerset).
such work undesirable.\textsuperscript{23} Overall, McIntosh found that opportunities for women to engage in economic activities that generated income were much more restricted than those available for men, so that ‘women’s work was seen as secondary to the need of male household heads’ in the later Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{24} Maryanne Kowaleski’s work \textit{Local Markets and Regional Trade in Medieval Exeter} includes an exploration of the specific groups of traders who operated in the city and discusses the occupations in which women were employed, and their position within society.\textsuperscript{25} Kowaleski also emphasised how women’s economic occupations were generally low status in a similar way to McIntosh. Yet, she argues that there were a large number of women in Exeter who achieved some independence in the clothing and textile trades, although they were treated differently to men in the industry having to pay a fine to carry out their work as they did not belong to the freedom.\textsuperscript{26} This links in with the theme within the historiography that women were disadvantaged within the workplace, which Bennett’s work on the brewing industry also shows.\textsuperscript{27} Bennett argues that single women who brewed in towns were at a disadvantage as they lacked both capital investment and managerial authority.\textsuperscript{28} Although research has been conducted on women in other parts of England, there has been little study on the south east – something which this research aims to rectify by adding to the existing historiography a town centred approach to medieval women.\textsuperscript{29}

There is a large body of surviving documentation from Canterbury during the thirteenth century that sheds light on women’s lives, and it is from this material that the research will be based. A collection of material relating to the city of Canterbury and to the properties of Christ Church Cathedral Priory is held at Canterbury Cathedral Archives, some of which was published by William Urry in his work \textit{Canterbury under the Angevin Kings}.\textsuperscript{30} Urry transcribed a number of the rentals from the priory, these can be combined with other unpublished rentals from Canterbury Cathedral Archives, supplying evidence of female property holders within Canterbury. These rentals are extremely valuable as they provided names and rental prices, some also note when rents were paid, and give a brief description of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} Ibid., p.250.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Ibid., p.215.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Kowaleski, \textit{Local Markets}, p.154.
\item \textsuperscript{27} J. M. Bennett, \textit{Ale, Beer, and Brewsters in England: Women’s Work in a Changing World, 1300-1600} (New York; Oxford University Press, 1996).
\item \textsuperscript{28} Ibid., p.57.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Hanawalt, \textit{The Wealth of Wives}.
\item \textsuperscript{30} William Urry, \textit{Canterbury under the Angevin Kings} (London; The Athlone Press, 1967).
\end{itemize}
the different properties that Christ Church held in the city. 31 Other documentation including grants, charters, writs and quitclaims are used in conjunction with the rentals, to undertake a detailed analysis of women’s land holding, occupations and marital status, from which an understanding of the role of women will be drawn. 32 Furthermore, these documents will demonstrate how female property holders were using their property, and will allow for some comparisons with men in Canterbury, as well as women in other areas. Grants were generally concerned with the transfer of land from one party to another. Quitclaims could be used in conjunction with grants to secure transactions of land or property, and could also be used alone to convey land from one person to another. A writ is document which grants authority or gives a command, and these could be in the form of a royal writ where the authority or command was issued by the king. Another valuable type of record in which women appear are the freemen’s lists for Canterbury, which include the names of men who secured admission to the freedom of the city through marriage to a freeman’s daughter. 33 All of these documents can provide information on a woman’s marital status and occasionally her occupation. Extant ecclesiastical court records will also be consulted in order to look at the issues surrounding marriage formation in Canterbury, and how successfully these were regulated by local ecclesiastical authorities. Furthermore, ecclesiastical statutes and legislation will be examined, as there was a theological shift towards marriage during the twelfth into the thirteenth centuries.

Other documentation, including government records, can provide further evidence for the activities in which women were involved as landholders. Fine rolls record the offer of money to the king or his justiciar in exchange for charters, writs, pardons and grants, which were generally of land. 34 The pipe rolls are important exchequer documents as they record the sums of money paid to the king by each county sheriff for the income from his rights and land within the county; also, up until 1270 they recorded any outstanding debts to the crown. 35 Also of value are the charter rolls, which note enrolments of royal charters that record grants of

---

31 Rentals from Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin Kings, and the 1230-35 Rental, CCA, CCA-DCc-Rental/33 will be examined in Chapter Two: Women and Property. Much of the evidence is from Christ Church Priory, Canterbury, however some records from St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury will be touched upon.

32 There are no surviving town and court documents from this period.


land, privileges or liberties to religious communities, towns and individuals. Legal treatise such as Tractus de Legibus et Consuetudinibus Regni Angliae, more commonly known as Glanvill, and De Legibus Et Consuetudinibus Angliae (On the Laws and Customs of England), often referred to as Bracton will also inform this research. Glanvill is attributed to Ranulf de Glanvill who was the chief justiciar under Henry II from 1154 to 1189. Bracton is attributed to Henry of Bratton and English judge of the coram rege, the king’s bench and who later served on judicial commissions after his retirement in 1257. Bracton’s work attempted to rationally describe the whole of English law and give guidance on its use, as well as expanding upon its basis by incorporating principles from canon law, and so offers a useful insight into the legal position of women within society. Wills have not been used for this study as none survive for this period which pertain to women. When information from these documents is combined it will provide both context and evidence for the place of women within society, the occupations in which they were active, their position as property holders and the realities of marriage formation in Canterbury.

Thirteenth-century Kent was a county which encompassed a diverse populace, particularly in relation to wealth and social status, and had distinct contrasts in population density and land use in different parts of this region. By 1300 about 10,000 people lived in Canterbury – making it the tenth largest town in England. Canterbury held a prominent position within English politics, as a seat of royal government and the centre of an ecclesiastical province. It was a cosmopolitan centre, with close proximity to trade routes and a pilgrimage location, where visitors flocked to Thomas Becket’s shrine. Classified as a royal borough, the town belonged to the king; therefore it was his officials who organised the law court and collected the taxes. The fine rolls from Henry III’s reign show that in October 1234 the king granted Canterbury to its citizens for £60 a year, £30 of which was to be paid to the Exchequer at Easter and a further £30 at Michaelmas, he also granted them the right to elect their own bailiffs from among the residents. Yet, in 1236 a charter was issued by King Henry III granting the citizens of Canterbury the right and indeed privilege to collect their own taxes.

36 Glanvill. Bracton.
37 Glanvill, p.xi.
38 Bracton.
39 Bracton.
42 CFR, 1233-1234, no.395.
and organise their own law courts.\(^{43}\) The town was self-governing after the 1236 charter was issued, with the wealthy citizens electing six aldermen and two bailiffs to deal with the cities administration. These bailiffs and aldermen also made up part of the council who sat at the law court, Burmote, which met fortnightly.\(^{44}\) Previously a charter from 1155 was issued by Henry III which makes mention of a ‘Burghmoat’, an undifferentiated court and council, which held fortnightly meetings on a Tuesday – although by the late thirteenth century this institution had become bifurcated into individual bodies of both court and council.\(^{45}\)

Canterbury was a city which had embraced its ecclesiastical heritage. It had been instrumental in the conversion of the country to Christianity. Pope Gregory had targeted the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Kent for a missionary venture in c.597, and Canterbury came to occupy a position of power and supremacy within the Church.\(^{46}\) Its position of ecclesiastical importance furthered its relationship with royal government, with the Archbishop of Canterbury overseeing the Catholic Church within England and often called upon to give counsel to the royal family. Kent was the only county in the English kingdom which had two episcopal sees and two cathedrals (Rochester and Canterbury), yet it was Canterbury which became the dominant one – gaining further ecclesiastical power through the mass of pilgrims which flocked to the city, particularly after the murder of Thomas Becket in 1170.\(^{47}\) By the early thirteenth century there were twenty-two parishes in Canterbury, and each of these had its own church and priest who was responsible for providing his parishioners with a religious education, and catering for their spiritual needs.\(^{48}\) Canterbury was a city mainly encased within a Roman wall, featuring six gates which provided access in and out of the city.\(^{49}\)

There were two main ecclesiastical institutions in Canterbury during this period – the monks living within Christ Church Cathedral Priory and the monks of St Augustine’s Abbey. The house of Benedictine monks at the cathedral was established in 598 after the king granted a

---

\(^{44}\) Urry, *Canterbury under the Angevin Kings*, p.91.
\(^{46}\) Lyle, *Canterbury*, p.43.
\(^{47}\) Ibid., p.43.
\(^{48}\) Parishes of Canterbury: All Saints, St Alphege, St Andrew, St Dunstan, St Edmund Ridingate, St George, St Helen, Holy Cross, St John Baptist, St Margaret, St Martin, St Mary Bredman, St Mary Bredin, St Mary de Castro, St Mary Magdalene, St Mary Northgate, St Mary Queningate, St Michael Burgate, St Mildred, St Paul, St Peter, St Sepulchre. Urry, *Canterbury under the Angevin King’s*, pp.210-211.
royal palace to the monks, and it was restored as a church and consecrated to the saviour – Christ Church.\(^{50}\) Christ Church was a formidable presence in thirteenth-century Canterbury, owning vast estates, particularly in the South East of England, as well as land in Canterbury itself. By the end of the thirteenth century the priory had fifty-seven manor estates, with thirty-eight of these in Kent, as well as owning nineteen rectories in the period between 1178 and 1397 on top of their urban properties in Canterbury, Sandwich, London and Southwark.\(^{51}\) Dyer illustrated Christ Church’s dominance with regard to property ownership - in 1199, houses and shops in the city which were worth £25 per annum belonged to the cathedral priory; however, by 1300 a third of the town was owned by the priory, who enjoyed an income of £110 from rents.\(^{52}\) As Barrie Dobson and Elizabeth Edwards comment ‘the prior and the chapter of Christ Church were in many ways the largest business corporations that late medieval Britain had to offer’.\(^{53}\)

However, relations between Christ Church and the king were often fractured, as the archiepiscopal election controversy of King John’s reign indicated - the monks of Christ Church were expelled in July 1207 by King John for their part and they did not return until June 1213.\(^{54}\) This archiepiscopal election controversy, which caused debate between King John and the Pope and led to John’s excommunication, occurred after the death of Archbishop of Canterbury, Hubert Walter, in 1205 and centred on the election of his successor.\(^{55}\) Some of the monks elected the sub-prior of Christ Church, Reginald, while a faction who were under pressure from King John elected the Bishop of Norwich, John de Grey.\(^{56}\) After an appeal to Rome both of these elections were quashed, and Stephen Langton was elected and

\(^{54}\) Urry, *Canterbury under the Angevin Kings*, p.12.
consecrated at Viberto in June 1207. Langton was refused entry to England, and the Pope responded by placing an interdict on the entire country from spring 1208 to summer 1213. The monks at the cathedral priory also often came into conflict with those at St Augustine’s Abbey, whose foundations are believed to have occurred at a similar time to those of Christ Church, with the late medieval chronicler William Thorne giving a date of 598. St Augustine’s Abbey lay just outside the city walls, and was originally designed to be the burial place for Augustine himself and his successors of the episcopacy, as well as the Kings of Kent. Relations between the monks at these two institutions were often frayed, with disputes over land and ports (particularly at Sandwich) continually being negotiated. In 1200 the papal decision that St Augustine’s should not be subjected to Christ Church was disputed by the Archbishop, and this quarrel became on ongoing theme. The abbey also clashed with civic authorities as it had a considerable property portfolio in the city, and occasionally the two bodies disagreed regarding rights and jurisdictions.

The populace within Canterbury were diverse and their social statuses occupied all ranges of the spectrum. The city featured a small but active Jewish community, merchants, victualling trades, wood and metal industries, moneyers, as well as a cloth industry. Many of the Canterbury Jews lived in the Jewish quarter, with most placed in the parish of St Mary Bredman or the adjoining parish of All Saints. Between 1200 and 1290 there are 144 Jews recorded within Canterbury documentation, of these people seventeen are women. The Jewish quarter encompassed the area around Stour Street, and in particular ‘Jewry Lane’, with a synagogue close by, but they were a group often excluded from many aspects of society. Under the Catholic Church Jews were not allowed to participate in trade nor own land, however one occupation in which they dominated was as ‘moneymakers’. The Catholic Church found moral implications with a Catholic occupying the position of a moneymaker. In 1139 the

61 Ibid., p.129.
63 Ibid., p.96.
64 Jews will be touched upon in this study, however it is not the main focus of this thesis. Economy and trade will be discussed further in Chapter Three: Women and Work.
66 Ibid., pp.122-124.
67 Urry, *Canterbury under the Angevin Kings*, p.32.
Second Lateran Council condemned the practice of usury and anyone practicing it was to be severed from the Church and deprived of a Christian burial. The Church pointed to biblical evidence which condemned usury, however there was a loophole which meant that Jews could not lend to other Jews, but they were permitted to make loans with interest to non-Jews. After Christian prejudices against the Jewish populace and royal taxation changes which specifically targeted Jews, they were eventually expelled from England in 1290 under Edward I. Asset stripping further diminished Jewish inheritance, and this wealth was brought to the crown.

The position of women within the thirteenth century remained one of inferiority and subordination, stemming from the strong patriarchal structure which was in place throughout England. The ecclesiastical authorities had two different and colliding views on women, one as Mary, the immaculate mother of Christ, and the other as Eve. Under the figure of Mary women were supposed to be pure, kind, mothers and women were encouraged to emulate Mary. On the other hand they were seen as temptresses who were heiresses of Eve - condemned for the damnation of mankind by tempting Adam to eat the forbidden fruit. Churchmen regarded married women as more stable than single woman, as they came under the authority of their husbands, unlike single women. The Catholic Church held the position that women should be subservient and were beholden to their husbands. Women were expected to be under the authority of their fathers until they married; at this stage governance over them passed to their husbands, as did all their property. Legal treatises make clear the position of women in relation to men and this is something which will be looked at in more detail in this study, as their position impacted upon their ability to own property, testify in court and caused issues when trying to find employment. Marital status was vital to a woman's standing within society and it was something which we shall discover often shaped her identity, particularly in rental records.

This thesis will focus on three main areas in its examination of women, work and life cycle in thirteenth-century Canterbury. Marriage was an important part of the female life cycle, and could be considered the foundation on which a woman’s life was defined. The marital status of women will be studied to understand how this influenced their position in...
society, and affected their involvement in community life. The issue of women and property will be discussed, with a view to analysing the importance of female landholders. Women often received land as part of their dower, while those in the upper echelons of society had the opportunity to inherit land. Furthermore, employment prospects in Canterbury and their role within the local economy will be investigated. There were opportunities for women to work, although much of their work was focused in a domestic setting; the term “work” covers any task in which physical or mental effort is used to make or do something. These three areas of marriage, property and work were all influenced by one dominant force within medieval life – the ecclesiastical authorities. It is hoped that an understanding of how far female experiences were shaped by the ecclesiastical view on women will be gained, as it underpinned local society’s thinking on the roles of men and women.
Chapter One: Women and Marriage

Women’s lives were marked by the stages in their life cycle, and the most important stage within this cycle was marriage. Marriage was seen as a vital part of society, and the Statutes of Salisbury (1217-1219) noted its importance - ‘it appears that in this life the most desirable, good and privileged thing is marriage.’ It was anticipated by Christian teaching, drawing on the ideas of St Paul, that those who were not entering a religious vocation would venture into matrimony. It was a state which many were ushered into, although there were often single women within medieval society. Throughout their lives women were instructed in the art of being wives and mothers, with the expectation that they would marry and produce children. The importance of marriage within society cannot be underestimated. It meant a change in a woman’s position in the social hierarchy, and altered her sphere of influence. Matrimony was an accepted institution within medieval society, and it was vital from a family perspective for the control and transfer of property. Yet, Charles Donahue argues that there were two competing models for marriage which existed between the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries. There was a secular model which was built on lineage, which sought to tightly control marriage choice, valuing family consent, while having a tendency to practice endogamy. However, there was also an ecclesiastical model which was unconcerned with lineage, while emphasising the freedom of choice given to the marrying couple rather than that of their families or lords, and insisted on exogamy. The ecclesiastical authorities impressed upon the population how vital matrimony was for the functioning of society – it legitimised children, established households, controlled sexual activities and ensured the salvation and moral conduct of the English population. A variety of methods were used by the ecclesiastical authorities to impress the importance of marriage upon the population; from bible readings, to the ecclesiastical legislation on sexual intercourse,

77 Ibid., p.32.
78 C. Donahue Jr., Law, Marriage, and Society in the Later Middle Ages – Arguments about marriage in five courts (New York; Cambridge University Press, 2007), p.3.
79 Ibid., p.3.
80 Beattie, Medieval Single Women, p.32.
marriage and relationships, the Church ensured it got its message across. Overall there was a belief that marriage performed a vital acceptable social function necessary for the procreation of children.

The majority of sources that touch upon marriage which survive for Canterbury from this period are ecclesiastical in nature; indeed this is no surprise due to the fact that marriage had been declared a sacrament by the Catholic Church.\(^\text{81}\) Furthermore, the Church issued legislation regarding the conduct of marriage. The Church attempted to police the sexual activities of both the clergy and the laity, and exalted virginity and chastity above marital sex.\(^\text{82}\) Ecclesiastical sources are problematic, as they were often written by clergymen enjoined to keep celibacy about lay behaviour which they regarded as sinful. Court documents from the consistory court at Canterbury, particularly those from 1292-1294 due to a preponderance of data from this period, will be analysed. Documents from the court do not always survive and this presents problems of interpretation, as we cannot gain a complete understanding of marriage as a whole throughout the thirteenth century. Furthermore, some cases are incomplete and thus we only have partial knowledge of the surrounding circumstances. Additionally, the Church’s attitude towards sexual behaviour could affect what information was transcribed. The negative connotations which often surrounded the sexual behaviour of the laity may explain why the sexual element of many ecclesiastical court cases is often focused on.\(^\text{83}\) Within this chapter the theory and ecclesiastical view of marriage will be explored, and how far ecclesiastical teaching on marriage was upheld and regulated in thirteenth-century Canterbury. After a brief survey of the ecclesiastical view of marriage in the thirteenth century, this chapter will explore the evidence for marriage formation and marital relationships among Canterbury’s population. The various impediments to marriage which existed during this period will be discussed with material from the Canterbury court records used to highlight the importance and realities of marriage in thirteenth-century Canterbury.

Marital theory relied heavily on the ecclesiastical view of marriage, and the lives of medieval people were governed by ecclesiastical thinking on a variety of different issues. Ecclesiastical theology provided a framework within which marriage could be understood and operate, without incurring damage to people’s souls, and their eternal salvation. Biblical

\(^\text{83}\) McCarthy, Love, Sex and Marriage, p.2.
foundations for marriage were laid out in both the Old and the New Testament, providing a scriptural basis for unions. In the Old Testament references to love and marriage can be found in Genesis, Ruth, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea and Ecclesiasticus. The Book of Ecclesiasticus, often referred to as Sirach, 40:18-23 gives praise to marriage in a passage known as ‘The Joys of Life’. Verse 23 states, ‘A friend or companion is always welcome, but a sensible wife is better than either’, proffering the view that marriage was something to aspire to, an institution to be upheld. In Genesis 1:26-28 God created mankind male and female, commanding them to ‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it’; for the Church this backed up their notion that marriage was for the sole purpose of procreating children. Furthermore, Proverbs 31:10-12, often referred to as an ‘Ode to a Capable Wife’, points to the indissolubility of a marital union. Similar sentiments are echoed in the books of the New Testament. In Matthew 19:5-7 the lifelong commitment of marriage is evident, stating that a man and a woman become ‘one flesh’, ‘Therefore what God has joined together let no one separate’. Other biblical passages such as 1 Peter 3:1-7 talk about the roles of wives and husbands, while Ephesians and Colossians give guidance on the Christian household. It was these biblical passages which formed the foundation for marital theology.

The ecclesiastical foundation for marriage was rooted in scripture, yet the work of theologians further shaped this seemingly social institution. St Paul in his letters to the Corinthians dedicates an entire chapter to the issue of marriage and celibacy; in his letters to the Ephesians (5:21-33) St Paul shows the position of subordination the wife held within her marriage, the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church. St

---

85 BSIV, Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 40:18-23.
86 BSIV, Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 40:18-23.
Verse 23: ‘amicus et sodalis in tempore convenientes et super utrosque mulier cum vira’.
87 BSIV, Genesis 1:26-28.
Partial Verse 28: ‘benedixitque illis Deus et ait crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram et subicite eam’.
88 BSIV, Proverbs 31:10-12.
90 BSIV, Matthew 19:5-7.
Verse 6: ‘itaque iam non sunt duo sed una caro quod ergo Deus coniunxit homo non separet’.
92 BSIV, Ephesians 5:21-33 – particularly verse 23 ‘Because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the church. He is the saviour of his body’ or ‘quoniam vir caput est mulieris sicut Christus caput est ecclesiae ipse salvator corporis’.
Augustine provided theological works which pertained to marriage and sexual behaviour. It was these ideologies and scriptural references which developed the ecclesiastical model, and made marriage a sacrament. For Augustine the ‘first natural bond of human society is man and wife’, yet he ordained a hierarchical model which proposed the three grades of chastity - virginity, widowhood and marriage. The three grades of chastity were the basis of the hierarchy of the saved, and this was determined by a person’s state of chastity at the point of their death. The concept was structured around the Parable of the Sower in Matthew 13:3-23, however verse eight really encapsulated Augustine’s model – ‘other seeds fell on good soil and brought forth grain, some a hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty’. The state of virginity was represented by the hundred grains, it was a state to aspire towards, while widowhood was at a lower level of sixty grains because they were no longer virgins yet they were no longer engaging in sexual intercourse. Married people were at the lower end of the spectrum, and were represented by the thirty grains. For Augustine sex within marriage presented difficulties, and he argued that no sexual activity could take place without having a corrupting effect on the participants. Furthermore, he believed that marital intercourse which was motivated by lust or merely to avoid the greater evil of fornication was a venial sin. On the other hand, Augustine praised marriage as a relative good, and formulated three goods that marriage contains (fidelity, offspring and the sacrament). These goods mean that Christian marriage is indissoluble, monogamous and directed towards procreation. Moreover, the virtue of marital state meant that it muted sexual pleasure and prescribed procreation, as Augustine wrote 'wherein husband and wife cleave to one another, they have in mind that they be father and mother’. These ideas influenced the works of twelfth-century writers such as Gratian and Peter Lombard, regarding the theory of consent and consummation within marriage.

Canonical changes during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries meant there was a shift in the theological morals and principles regarding marriage. There had been a shift in
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ecclesiastical theology surrounding marriage during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, particularly with the development of the theories of Lombard and Gratian. The Gregorian reform movement had stimulated an evolution in the ecclesiastical model for marriage, and by the mid-twelfth century marriage had become an entity which was now controlled by the Church.\textsuperscript{103} The First and Second Lateran Councils saw the initiation of marriage as a religious sacrament, and it was now constituted an ecclesiastical issue, one in which the Church could exercise control. It was only during the twelfth century that the Church fixed a definition of what constituted a valid marriage under Pope Alexander III.\textsuperscript{104} Other statutes were introduced under Stephen Langton during his term as the Archbishop of Canterbury (1207-1228).\textsuperscript{105} Langton instigated a series of Canterbury statutes which began with the regulation of the act of betrothal; these statutes moved beyond measures from Hubert Walter’s Westminster Council of 1200, as twenty-three of thirty-three sets of statutes which were issued between 1213 and 1289 set out formalities and requirements for a legal betrothal.\textsuperscript{106} I Canterbury 55 required the engagement to be entered publically before witnesses.\textsuperscript{107} Langton held a provincial council for Canterbury at Oxford in 1222 and from here sixty canons were introduced, covering a wide range of topics; many of these canons were later included by other dioceses in their own legislation.\textsuperscript{108} The Oxford council’s canons included arrangements to excommunicate those who bear false witness in marriage cases, demonstrating the seriousness of marriage.\textsuperscript{109} In canon 27 the Church required marriage to be open to all couples, they should not be declined because they did not have the money to pay for a service; this shows that marriage was a sacrament which was open to all because of its importance to society.\textsuperscript{110}
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Canon 27: ‘We firmly forbid burial, baptism, any ecclesiastical sacrament, or the contracting of matrimony to be denied to any on account of money.’
There were two theories regarding marital consent, consumption and what processes constituted a marriage competing during the twelfth century, and these theories were solidified in the thirteenth century. The Decretum or Concordance of Discordant Canons, is a collection of canon law which was compiled and written in the twelfth century, and it contained an extensive discussion of marriage.\textsuperscript{111} The Decretum is often just known as Gratian, after its author, and presented a view that the creation of a marital bond between a man and a woman occurred in two stages – consent and consummation.\textsuperscript{112} Gratian argued that it was an espousal (desponsatio) combined with a sexual union (commixtio sexum) that solidified a legal marriage.\textsuperscript{113} For Gratian the exchange of verbal consent between the persons to be married initiated a marital union, yet it was only through subsequent sexual intercourse that a couple completed and rendered their union indissoluble.\textsuperscript{114} Furthermore, it was the consent of the individuals entering the marital union which was important, not their families, with Gratian stating ‘no woman should be married to anyone except by her free will’.\textsuperscript{115} A later twelfth-century writer Peter Lombard agreed with Gratian on the importance of individual consent, yet he offered an alternative view of what constituted a marriage.\textsuperscript{116} Lombard’s theological views were summarised in The Four Books of Sentences, in particular the one pertaining to marriage (The theology of marriage) which was written in 1150.\textsuperscript{117} Lombard championed a purely consensual definition of marriage, and rejected the inclusion of Gratian’s sexual requirement.\textsuperscript{118} Lombard drew on the marriage of Joseph and Mary, whose marriage according to scripture was never consummated, and therefore under Gratian’s theory their marriage would not have been considered legal; this theory, using the example of Joseph and Mary, held that present consent alone created a perfect marriage and an indissoluble bond.\textsuperscript{119} Lombard distinguished between two types of desponsatio, one by words of present consent (verba de presenti) and the other by words of future consent (verba de futuro).\textsuperscript{120} According to Lombard, anyone who entered a marriage with words of future consent only created an indissoluble bond if the marital union was followed by sex.\textsuperscript{121} It was the consensual model as described in the Sentences which formed the basis of the marriage doctrine of Pope Alexander

\textsuperscript{111} McCarthy, Marriage in Medieval England, p.22.
\textsuperscript{112} Helmholtz, Marriage Litigation, p.26.
\textsuperscript{113} McCarthy, Marriage in Medieval England, p.22.
\textsuperscript{114} Helmholtz, Marriage Litigation, p.26.
\textsuperscript{115} McCarthy, Marriage in Medieval England, p.22.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., p.22.
\textsuperscript{117} Peter Lombard, Sentences in Love, Sex and Marriage, pp.62-63.
\textsuperscript{118} Leyser, Medieval Women, p.115.
\textsuperscript{119} McCarthy, Marriage in Medieval England, p.25.
\textsuperscript{120} Helmholtz, Marriage Litigation, p.26.
\textsuperscript{121} Donahue, Law, Marriage and Society, p.1.
III (c.1105-81), and thus was included in the ‘decretales’.\textsuperscript{122} Alexander’s mature marriage theory, based on Lombard, allowed for the two modes of contracting a marriage either \textit{verba de presenti} or \textit{verba de futuro}.\textsuperscript{123} Manuscript fragments containing Lombard’s sentences survive within \textit{CCA} and are dated from 1200, indicating that this material was in circulation in the city.\textsuperscript{124} It was these theological views which were used to shape the ecclesiastical legislation surrounding marriage.

The formation of a marriage in reality was not straightforward. The issue of consent was non-negotiable as far as the Church authorities were concerned; however, within families parental consent was often more at the forefront. The consensual model of marriage was set out in canon law from 1140 and had been inherited within England from previous secular rulers - particularly from King Canute (1016-1035), whose second law code stated that ‘no woman should be forced to marry a man that she dislikes or be given in marriage for money’.\textsuperscript{125} Therefore a notion of marriage was promoted within the Church, where both husbands and wives were required to give their consent freely to matrimony for their union to be considered valid.\textsuperscript{126} As we have already seen, Lombard’s theory of what constituted a marriage required words of consent to be exchanged between the couple, therefore there is an implication that it is the couple themselves who are consenting to the marital union. Moreover, the correct way for contracting a marriage was laid out, with both of the couple using the following words to commit themselves to each other in front of the priest – ‘I N. accept you as mine.’\textsuperscript{127} These ecclesiastical statutes demonstrate the Church’s concern to regulate marriage, but it is the formation of marriage which generally caused the most problems.

In the thirteenth century couples who were marrying were required to do so in a public setting, in the presence of a priest, so that their union was recognised by the Church. The husband was expected to declare the dower publically at the wedding, so ideally a property settlement had to have been agreed before the couple could be married.\textsuperscript{128} Couples were restricted by the liturgical calendar as to when they could marry, and marriages were
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banned during the liturgical seasons of Advent and Lent. Evidence of the public nature of a marriage ceremony can be found in the Sarum Missal from the Diocese of Salisbury. Written in the thirteenth century the text stated ‘The man and the woman are to stand before the door of the church or in the face of the church, in the presence of God, and the priest, and the people’ – this missal was adopted by the whole of England by the fifteenth century. The groom had to make an announcement as to the dower which his bride could receive should he predecease her, before a ring was blessed for the bride and vows in the vernacular were exchanged. After the couple had performed this ceremony they were considered married by both Church and society. The couple then entered the church for prayers to be said and mass followed, it was only after the Sanctus that the couple had their marriage blessed. A wedding feast followed the mass, and then a priest went with the couple in order to bless the bridal bedchamber and the bed. By blessing the bed the Church was blessing the sexual union of the married couple, and therefore praying that their union would produce children. It was expected that couples, unless otherwise agreed, had sexual intercourse as the primary purpose of marriage was to produce children. It was also considered to be conjugal debt. The public setting of marriage served several purposes. It ensured that the community were aware of the marriage, allowing time for people to appeal after the banns had been read. Furthermore, it was a visible display of a couple’s consent to spend the rest of their lives together, certifying that both participants were entering willingly. Finally, the public setting meant that witnesses were present, and should a marital case appear in court there were people who could attest to the marriage. A case from the Canterbury Courts in 1293 shows just how detailed the witness statements could be as a list of questions which the courts wanted to ask those involved in a marriage case survives; this list of questions was to be put to Dulcie Herdman regarding a marriage case from Folkestone in which Alice Peytevyn and William Baudeioun were accused of having illicit intercourse. The questions asked what the witnesses knew about the couple, what they had seen and heard about the alleged intercourse. The presence of a priest also ensured that couples were using the correct terms
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when exchanging words of consent, and that their marriage would be declared legal and valid by the Church.

When planning for marriage a couple had to ensure that it was legal for them to do so, certifying that no impediments were in place. The purpose of publishing the banns was to discover if any impediments were in existence, or if a prior claim of marriage would reveal itself, preventing the couple from marrying. By the beginning of the thirteenth century there were a variety of impediments which could prevent a couple from marrying. These impediments included vows, orders, consanguinity, affinity, disparity of cult and sponsorship, with five categories of people who were excluded from marriage: godfathers, godmothers, godchildren and spiritual brothers and sisters; there was a threat of excommunication for anyone who concealed an impediment to matrimony.¹³⁶ You could not marry if you had previously taken religious vows or were in Holy Orders, as you were technically married to God. Disparity of cult meant that you were not allowed to marry someone who was not a Christian, as you could not fulfil the purpose of a Christian marriage. Evidence for disparity of cult is certainly limited, and Donahue argues that while intermarriage occurred, whether legal or illegal, evidence within the Church courts records simply does not exist.¹³⁷

It was in order to uncover any existing impediments before the marriage took place, the banns were read out three times in the church, as specified at the Council of Westminster in 1200 ‘let not any marriage be contracted without proclamation repeated three times in the church’.¹³⁸ The importance of reading the banns can be demonstrated by a case from Canterbury in 1292.¹³⁹ Eleanor de Roluindeene, upon hearing the banns announcing the impending marriage of Simon Bertelet and Cecilia daughter of John Mot, raised an objection to them. The letter which survives pertaining to this case is from Master Martin de Hampton, commissary of Canterbury, and is dated 15th September 1292. Within the letter Master de Hampton wrote to those who were hearing the case informing them that Eleanor believed she had a prior contract with Simon.¹⁴⁰
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Under the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 the number of degrees were reduced and the rules of consanguinity were modified, which meant that any persons with an ancestor in common in the previous four generations were forbidden to marry – the ruling had previously been seven generations.\textsuperscript{141} Previously the rules of affinity had meant that anyone whose ancestors had married or had intercourse in the previous seven generations could not marry, yet this was also reduced to four generations under the Fourth Lateran Council.\textsuperscript{142} Under the new rules the impediment of affinity meant that a woman could not marry the widower of her sister through to the widower of her sister’s great-granddaughter.\textsuperscript{143} The issue of consanguinity and affinity will be looked at in more detail later in this chapter. Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, presented the rules on marriage from the Fourth Lateran Council in a schematic form, in order to make the reforms comprehensible and therefore aiding priests in their administration of the sacrament.\textsuperscript{144} His manual was entitled \textit{Templum Dei (The Temple of God)}, written between 1220 and 1230, and included illustrations to show the degrees of separation, in relation to consanguinity and affinity, which were allowed under the new Lateran legislation.\textsuperscript{145} The diagrams provided clarity so that priests could ensure there were no impediments which would prevent a couple from entering marriage. It was these diagrams and instructions which aided those in the ecclesiastical courts when they were faced with cases of consanguinity and affinity. As a strong ecclesiastical centre Canterbury regularly had contact with priests around the country, and it is certainly possible that \textit{Templum Dei} and other similar work were in circulation here.

There was a case heard in Canterbury’s consistory court in 1293 alleging affinity between Alice Gyg and William le Thocchere, who lived in Birchington.\textsuperscript{146} Alice was a woman who was to marry William, however it was claimed that William had previously had sexual intercourse with a woman called Margery, a relation of Alice. The two women, Margery and Alice were said to be kinswomen as they were both descended from Gousilda, who married and became the grandmother of Margery, and being a widow married again and became the grandmother of Alice.\textsuperscript{147} Another case which was heard was that of Richard Brunyn and his wife Alice. Richard and his wife were accused of incest; although the documentation is dated
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as 1294 the case alludes to a sentence from a previous court case in 1279. There is note within the documentation from Master John de Raveningeham who presided over the court sixteen years previously in 1279, which had ordered their marriage to be solemnised. The court heard that the couple had been married for sixteen years, and were accused of incest on the grounds that Richard’s mother was Alice’s godmother. The couple were alleged to have been related due to spiritual affinity, although the commission found that the testimony of those against the marriage was defective and would not stand up in court, and they decreed that Richard and Alice should remain husband and wife. Another cases survives from Canterbury concerning John, son of Simon de Twyferde and Alice, widow of William the tanner who had been accused of consanguinity, although the degrees of alleged relationship is not known. Their case was judged by Richard de Clyve, commissary of Canterbury sede vacante, who heard the case 3rd June 1293. This case of consanguinity was held not to be true and so the parties were adjudged to be man and wife by the commissary.

Cases concerning the validity of marital contracts were also dealt with by the Church courts in Canterbury. A case concerning a breach of promise between Cristina de Westgate, daughter of Alexander the farrier and John, son of Ralph ate Cherche occurs in the records for 19th February 1293. Their case concerned a de futuro marriage contract and was heard before the commissary of Canterbury sede vacante. The court decided that the contract was valid and unbreakable, therefore the couple were instructed to join together as the Church recognised them as married. Another case, heard in the same year, touched on a marriage contract from the parish of St Alphege in Canterbury. The suit was between Ralph of Maidstone, clerk, and Mabel the daughter of Gilbert de Roff. The couple were alleged to have contracted a marriage in the house of Beatrice de Cruce. Mabel was trying to assert her marriage to Ralph, however Ralph had married another woman called Margery eleven years prior to the alleged contract with Mabel. In addition to this, both marriages were said to have been contracted ‘de velis pieeutei’ in an ale house. The depositions of two witnesses, Thomas and Albreda de Boffa, survive for this case. The court adjudged that it was Ralph and Margery who were married, and therefore they were told that they should not expect any
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trouble from Mabel. This appears to be a typical example of case concerning a marriage contract; often it was a woman who alleged that she had a prior claim over a man, showing how seriously people took the promise of marriage. The promise of marriage was not, after all, one to be taken lightly; once vows had been exchanged a couple was expected to remain together, no matter the circumstances, until death.\(^{156}\)

Legal treatises such as Bracton and Glanvill described what being married meant for women’s status. Women had a limited public role and their position within society was restricted by the law.\(^{157}\) Glanvill indicates that once a woman married she effectively became a second class citizen; her husband gained control and she lost many of her property and individual rights.\(^{158}\) In the treatise it states ‘legally a woman is completely in the power of her husband, it is not surprising that her dower and all her other property is deemed to be at his disposal.’\(^{159}\) Within Bracton men and women are given classifications with regard to their sex, writing that ‘women differ from men in many respects, for their position is inferior to that of men’.\(^{160}\)

Similar ideas about female inferiority and subordination are evident within ecclesiastical texts from the period. Thomas Aquinas (d.1274) described how a ‘women’s weaker intelligence ... affected her moral behaviour and justified her subjection to men’, and this supported the belief that a wife’s behaviour impacted and reflected upon her husband.\(^{161}\) The balance of power within the relationship was important; there had to be a balance between marital affection, a wife’s submissiveness and a husband controlling his assertiveness. A wife’s behaviour reflected upon her husband and was in turn a reflection upon the couple’s relationship; if a wife stepped out of line it was believed to be down to poor discipline at home, therefore her husband was at fault. As Sara Butler writes ‘Both common and canon law supported a husband’s right to discipline his wife with reasonable and moderate degree of physical force.’\(^{162}\) Biblical texts, such as Ephesians 5:22, supported a
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husband’s right to have authority over his wife, and they also encouraged husbands to physically discipline their wives. The courts, however, ‘were generally reluctant to intervene unless force was excessive.’\textsuperscript{163} Common law supported a husband’s right to discipline his wife, and society seldom saw violence as sufficient grounds for marital separation. While cruelty was a cause for separation and severe beatings of wives were subject to legal punishment, the Church courts upheld the right for a husband to strike a wife if there was found to be ‘just cause’.\textsuperscript{164} Once a woman married she was ‘under the rod and in the power of her husband’.\textsuperscript{165}

The relationship between a medieval husband and wife was different to a modern married couple. Some marriages may have become companionate and mutually affectionate, but the idea of falling in love before marriage was not necessarily realistic. Most couples managed to stay together and evolve a working partnership; it was easier to survive by combining their different skills than for someone on their own. The Church advocated a loving relationship, one in which the couples could grow and nurture each other in order to foster and develop their family.\textsuperscript{166} Marriage brought a new status, ushered in new obligations and privileges, and reconfigured women’s social and sexual roles.\textsuperscript{167} Church court records from Canterbury show that some couples were willing to defend their marriages in court, indicating that they wanted to remain together and perhaps is evidence of marital affection. A court case from 1294 featured a couple, Richard Brunyng and his wife Alice, defending their sixteen year marriage after being accused of being too closely related on grounds of spiritual affinity – Richard’s mother was Alice’s godmother.\textsuperscript{168} The couple were willing to stand up in a court room and discuss their marriage in order to remain together. This demonstrates the expectation that a couple, once married, would remain together until death. Another court case in 1292 which perhaps shows marital affection, or indeed a deep respect for the person they saw as their partner exists.\textsuperscript{169} Within the case Joan de Ottorynden denied being married to Thomas Bolysee and instead defended her marriage to George, who she married after the alleged contract with Thomas.\textsuperscript{170} It could be argued that cases such as these do not necessarily
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depict marital affection, but instead display respect to both the Church and the sacrament of marriage. But there were unions where love and companionship grew in a supportive atmosphere.

The Catholic Church sought strict control over the sexual lives and practices of the laity, and sex outside of marriage was expressly forbidden. The First Statutes of Salisbury 1217-1219 included clauses relevant to marriage and sexual intercourse, with the Church’s attitude towards sex being made clear in section thirty-five. Entitled ‘A warning concerning legitimate marriage’, it states how the ecclesiastical authorities have a position to remind the laity that ‘all intercourse between man and woman, if not excused through marriage, is a mortal sin’. Clause eighty-two stated how marriage should be commended and is a state to aspire towards; this clause also demonstrated the importance of marriage for any children produced – ‘For only children born of a legitimate marriage are not excluded from ecclesiastical and civil honours’. Children born within marriage had more opportunities open to them within society, marriage was designed for the procreation of children, and it was felt they were being raised in a secure and stable environment. In the thirteenth century Alexander Stavensby, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, compiled a list of statutes, and included a tract entitled A Tract on [Hearing Confessions] (Quidam Tractus de Confessionibus), for distribution among parish priests within England. It is possible that this tract was in circulation in Canterbury, visiting priests may have brought it with them. This tract was written between 1224 and 1237, and was designed as a manual of instruction to guide parish priests in their daily duties and stressed the importance of psychological discernment in fitting the penance to the character of the sinner. Bishop Stavensby presented the Church’s stance on the seriousness of the sin of adultery - ‘someone who consents to fornication – whether man or woman – should be punished the same as someone committing [this] mortal sin’. Within the manual Bishop Stavensby gave questions which parish priests should ask single people at confession in order to establish their sexual morality. A visitation of the diocese of Canterbury 1292-1294 indicates the double standard in penance and discrimination regarding social standing.
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adultery. He was also accused of ill-treating his wife. The case states that it is ‘not seemly’ for a knight to perform public penance, and Thomas was instead instructed to pay twenty marks to poor villeins of the district as his penance. On the other hand, Agnes was instructed to be whipped five times through the market place and a further five times around the church. Agnes had admitted to cohabiting with Thomas for nine years, although it had been over a year since he had ‘last known her’, and she had given birth twice with their children. Thomas and his wife were instructed to appear before the commissary on the feast of St Luke the Evangelist so that dissension which occurred between them can be considered. After Thomas’s death in 1305, his wife, Maud, requested custody of her late husband’s tenements in Kent, which had been held in gavelkind, in order to support her three sons. While Thomas and Maud’s marriage may not have been particularly happy children were produced, indicating that they were performing a primary function of society.

Other cases that were dealt with by the ecclesiastical courts in the province of Canterbury, if not necessarily in the city of Canterbury itself, indicate the fragile nature of women’s sexual reputations in the eyes of the Church. There is a case from the Canterbury Courts 1288-1294 in which Muriel de Dunham asked that John Burnoth be adjudged her husband and thus separated from his wife Joan, due to a pre-contract he had made with Muriel – it is not known who presided over the court as the seat of the Archbishop of Canterbury was vacant. Muriel stated that John had married her on 3rd February 1286. Muriel further stated that after contracting the marriage the couple engaged in ‘sexual intercourse’ before he then married Joan; however the issue of adultery is raised when it became clear that the contract of marriage was made as long as Muriel behaved herself in the future (‘si se bene haberet in futurum’), and according to John she had not done this.

Marriage contracts which were made on the condition of behaviour were surrounded with a degree of mistrust and mystery. It could be argued that it was not clear what behaviour John expected of Muriel, and therefore was she beholden to a standard which was unreachable? John makes an oath on 26th October 1288 stating that Muriel had ‘shamefully committed fornication or adultery with Alexander Grete and others after the time when her witnesses say
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the marriage was contracted.\textsuperscript{182} This case took six years to pass through the courts before ‘Martin, commissary of Canterbury’ adjudged that Muriel had proved her pre-contract and pronounced the marriage between John and Joan as ‘null and void’.\textsuperscript{183} In this sense an annulment had taken place – a judicial declaration that since one of the parties was already married then the ecclesiastical ceremony had not produced a marriage. A case from July 1293 further demonstrates the importance of marriage for sexual relations. Sarah Melemeyns was summoned to appear before Richard de Clyve, accused of fornicating with Alan de Helles - Sarah claimed that Alan had contracted marriage with her.\textsuperscript{184} Richard ordered Sarah to cease \textit{caranalis copula} with Alan until a decision had been made about the contract, and Alan was cited to appear before the court.\textsuperscript{185} The Church sought to uphold that sexual intercourse was preserved for married couples only, and thus they had to ascertain whether a couple was legally married.

Clandestine marriages were difficult for the Church to deal with during this period, and were another example of a type of marriage that deviated from ecclesiastical ideals. The term ‘clandestine marriage’ can be used to describe a variety of marriages, including a marriage which cannot be proved to have taken place due to lack of evidence or witnesses, or a marriage which was contracted without an element of ecclesiastical ceremony – from the banns to the ceremony not being conducted at a church.\textsuperscript{186} The English councils and synods seem to mainly deal with four potential types of clandestine contract: 1. The exchange of present consent by two parties outside any ceremonial setting, possibly with few or no witnesses; 2. The contracting of marriages without the threefold announcement of the banns having preceded them; 3. The celebrating of marriage ceremonies in secret circumstances or locations; and 4. The celebrating of marriage ceremonies where the persons to be married are unknown.\textsuperscript{187} While the Church gave instruction on the correct way to get married in legislation from the Fourth Lateran Council, clandestine marriages were not invalid. There were issues with clandestine wedding as they were still technically marriages, although not solemnised by the Church. Within the marriage case of Richard Brunyng and his wife Alice who have been accused of being related by spiritual affinity, it states that in 1279 the presiding judge ordered Richard and his wife to have their marriage solemnised, as it had previously been a spiritual
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union. Additional documentation for the 1279 case does not survive, although it demonstrates the Church trying to exercise control over marriage, and the importance of a union being seen as valid in the eyes of the ecclesiastical authorities.

Overall, marriage was an institution in which women were expected to participate. From an early age girls were groomed for married life; they were expected to fill the position in society of wives and, in time, mothers. Furthermore, within medieval society it was believed that being a bride was the apex of a woman’s life, and it was something to which all women aspired. Everyone was subject to the same ecclesiastical legislation and the same customary ceremonies were expected. Marriage within the province of Canterbury, and in the city of Canterbury, followed a similar pattern to the rest of the country. We have seen the courts exercising their control over marriage by hearing a variety of different cases concerning aspects of marriage. The importance of the banns was demonstrated through Eleanor de Roluindeene, who objected to an impending marriage as she believed she had a prior contract with the groom. Prior contracts were most common within the ecclesiastical courts, and it is easy to see why. The case of Muriel de Dunham versus John Burnoth and Joan his wife demonstrates that marriages could be contracted with conditions; it further showed the fragility of female reputations as Muriel was accused of committing adultery. The case of Cristina de Westgate, daughter of Alexander the farrier and John, son of Ralph ate Cherche concerning a breach of promise shows the nature of contracts, which could be complicated. The public nature of marriage aimed to ensure the validity of marriage, often meaning issues of consanguinity and affinity were heard within courts. English medieval marriage was a sacrament and a contract, while being a means of producing legitimate children who were essential to the formation of dynasties and the orderly transition of properties through generations, and Canterbury was no exception.
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Chapter Two: Women and Property

Most English towns were subject to both the apparatus of royal government and the rights of tenurial lordship, and Canterbury was no exception in the thirteenth century. The gendered structures which governed the lives of medieval women extended into all aspects of their lives – including their access to landed property. Within this chapter, rentals from Christ Church Cathedral Priory as well as charter evidence will be examined to develop a picture of the relationship which existed between women and property within Canterbury. Furthermore the various forms of tenure will be discussed, particularly in relation to gavelkind – a form of tenure prevalent within Kent during this period. The impact of marital status for female landholders will be looked at; did it have any bearing on a woman’s ability to hold and administer property? This chapter will also explore the ways in which women are described within the records and compare their nomenclature with that employed for male landholders in the city. Their depiction may provide an insight into how those who wrote the documents perceived women. The amount of rent which tenants paid will be analysed on a variety of levels to determine whether there was a difference between men and women. The rentals will also be looked at to establish the ratio of men to women holding property, both within Canterbury and within individual parishes. This evidence will be examined in order to ascertain if there was continuity in rental prices for women throughout the thirteenth century, and if women continued to hold property within the town. Overall this chapter aims to draw a conclusion as to how prominent women were as landholders within Canterbury.

Medieval property rights have been discussed by historians in many different contexts due to the variety of ways in which land could be held during this period. The relationship between lords and their tenants, particularly those who rented from the aristocratic and knightly classes, was one of obligation; tenants were expected to pay rent and perform services in return for their land. Bruce Campbell has looked at the development of landholdings in England and their relationship with the agricultural economy from 1200 to 1500, as well as the impact the developing land tenure and agricultural practices had on the urbanised areas and their reliance on the countryside to provide for their needs. Furthermore, Campbell argues that controlling and owning land conferred power, wealth and prestige onto a person; holding land meant a position within society, yet was this position of...

---

equal standing for both men and women when the patriarchal nature of society was taken into consideration? Female landholders are often thought of as powerful heiresses who inherited great estates, as women whose family connections put them in advantageous positions of wealth and social standing, but female landholding also occurred on a much smaller scale and in the lower echelons of society. There is often both a gender and a status difference between how tenants and their landlords are analysed in modern scholarship, with historians often overlooking women as though they are chattels of men. Yet there was also an element of equality between landholders, as they were often bound by the same forms of tenure. F. W. Maitland described women’s parity with men: ‘The woman can hold land, even by military tenure, can own chattels, make a will, make a contract, can sue and be sued.’ Maitland further argued that a female landholder was just as important as a male one, but we need to ask was this the case for all women, regardless of social standing? Property ownership and female landholders at the lower end of the social spectrum are often overlooked within the secondary literature, especially within urban contexts. Perhaps this oversight is due to the wealth of sources which are available for the higher classes, with records of aristocratic and knightly heiresses being more prevalent than for lowly urban widows. After all female heiresses were more likely to have documentation pertaining to their land, not just because of their status within society, but also their attractiveness as potential brides due to their inherited wealth.

Ideas pertaining to women and their property rights during this period can be traced within contemporary legal treatises, like those known as Glanvill (1188) and Bracton (1210-1268). Women had a limited public role due to their sex, and their position within society was restricted by the law. As noted in the previous chapter, once married a woman effectively became a second class citizen, since her new husband gained control of both his new wife and any assets which she brought with her into the marriage, and she lost many of her property

---

197 Ibid., p.179.
201 Glanvill (Tractatus de legibus et consuetudinibus regni Anglie qui Glanvilla vocatur), is the first textbook pertaining to common law which heavily features the king’s court at the Exchequer and writs.
and individual rights. The treatise states that ‘legally a woman is completely in the power of her husband, it is not surprising that her dower and all her other property is deemed to be at his disposal.’

Glanvill indicates how women were effectively used as vessels by which property could be transferred between families, particularly as discussions pertaining to the transfer of land would often have occurred during marriage negotiations conducted by the couple’s parents. It is possible that the bride herself would not have participated in the property negotiations, as the property under discussion would generally have been held by her father and thus she had little need to be involved. Similar ideas about women and property were expressed in Bracton, which noted how ‘everything that is the wife’s is the husband’s’, and this included any land which they may have inherited. Any land or property which a woman inherited was ultimately subject to one of the varying forms of tenure which existed during the thirteenth century.

There were a variety of different tenures in medieval Canterbury, and the first type to be discussed is gavelkind. Gavelkind, or socage tenure subjected to the custom of gavelkind, was a system of land tenure which was associated mainly with Kent. The custom of gavelkind had some peculiarities in comparison with other tenures. Those tenants who held their land in accordance with the customs of gavelkind were required to pay money rents, rather than holding their lands in return for service. Furthermore, tenants had more freedom and responsibilities with their land then those who held their land by military service; under gavelkind they were allowed to dispose of the land in their will, and they also had the possibility of granting part or all of their land as a fiefdom once they reached fifteen years of age. Under this system, as well, if a tenant was convicted of a felony by the courts the lands were not confiscated by the Crown, unlike other tenures which saw the tenant stripped of their assets. In cases of intestacy, the estate was divided equally amongst the sons or their representatives – usually their children or heirs. Women who were claiming property in their own right were given second preference under the terms of intestacy, although they were still eligible to inherit through representation – a husband could, in theory, represent his wife in
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these circumstances. Gavelkind was primarily concerned with the ownership of the ground rather than any structures which were built upon the plot; a complexity arose when irremovable structures occupied the ground, like the great stone houses that were sometimes erected in the city by the richer inhabitants during the late thirteenth century – as no longer could the tenant dismantle the house and move elsewhere if they disposed of their ground plot.210 Charters often specified that land was held under a particular type of tenure, although as a prevailing custom within the county, land was often presumed to be held in this way and, therefore, it is not always noted upon surviving documentation.

Some properties within Canterbury were held under military tenure. Land which was held under military tenure was usually held in return for knight service to either the king or another lord. However, tenants who held their land by knight service were expected to pay relief and other incidents to either the king or the tenant-in-chief. These payments were intended to be paid when the lord was in need of aid, and circumstances for extracting aid included the knighting of the lord’s eldest son, the ransoming of the lord’s person and the marriage of the lord’s eldest daughter.211 Those who held their property by military tenure could not dictate who the land would be inherited by, and unlike those who held by gavelkind they could not dispose of their lands in their will. The eldest son of the deceased tenant could inherit property under military tenure, but he had to do homage to the lord, as well as pay a relief.212 Lands held by military tenure descended by primogeniture, which meant that the firstborn male child of the deceased inherited the parental property. Under primogeniture, the absence of a direct male line meant that all surviving daughters of the deceased inherited equally, creating co-heiresses. As explained in Bracton, ‘Where one first engenders a daughter she may be called the nearer heir; if a male is born she ceases to be heir. Where a daughter is an only heir and other daughters are born, she will no longer be such by herself but with the others in common.’213 For Bracton a male heir was more preferable to a female and this was also stated in the earlier writings of Glanvill, depicting how primogeniture and the dominance of patriarchy continued throughout the medieval period. For women in Canterbury this meant that their access to property was dependent upon men, and co-heiresses could expect a smaller inheritance than a male heir.
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Women also secured access to additional property in their widowhood, which was intended to provide for their maintenance in old age. Dower was a grant made by the husband from his possessions to provide for his wife should she survive him; it was given to a widow by right and her entitlement was usually declared at the church door during the wedding ceremony.\footnote{C. de Trafford, *The contract of marriage: the maritagium from the eleventh to the thirteenth century* (1999). Accessed via: http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/2325/. Accessed on 24 September 2015. p.1.} A widow could claim dower regardless of whether the marriage had produced any children; it was considered that she had earned her dower by consummating the marriage.\footnote{Leyser, *Medieval Women*, p.168.} Widows whose dower came from land held under gavelkind tenure were entitled to receive half of their deceased husbands’ assets. Gavelkind also enabled a widow who had no children to inherit half the estate as a tenant, so long as she remained unmarried.\footnote{Twiss, *The history of English law*, p.270.} In contrast to this, widows whose dower came from land held by military tenure were entitled to a dower worth ‘one third’ of their late husbands’ holdings for the duration of their lives.\footnote{Britnell, *Commercialisation of English Society*, p.42.} There was a slight shift in the definition of dower in the thirteenth century. Previously a woman took what was promised to her at the church - either a third of her husband’s property or whatever the husband had nominated – however, women now had an option. If a widow did not approve of her nominated dower (provided it was a third or less of his property), she could instead opt to receive the common law third instead.\footnote{P.J.P. Goldberg, *Women in England c.1275-1525: Documentary Sources* (Manchester University Press; Manchester, 1995), p.19.} The 1217 reissue of Magna Carta defined dower as a third of all land held by the husband, not just land which the husband had brought into the marriage.\footnote{D. Carpenter, *Magna Carta* (London; Penguin Group Limited, 2015), p.428.} Although it came to be generally recognised that the dower should be a third of both land brought in to the marriage and land acquired during it, the main legal treatises of *Glanvill* and *Bracton* had restricted dower to a third of land at the time of marriage.\footnote{*Glanvill*, p.60.}

There are examples of dower operating within Canterbury during the thirteenth century. A grant made by Lettice, ‘the late wife of Richard-the-red’, shows a widow in possession of her dower.\footnote{Grant, *CCA, CCA-DCC-ChAnt/C/830*.} In the document she grants away her messuage, in the parish of St George’s, which she received as her dower, to the prior and convent of Canterbury Cathedral.\footnote{Ibid.} This grant dates from the mid-thirteenth century. Another example of dower
within Canterbury is mentioned in a quitclaim from February 1299, whereby Agnes de Bestok resigned her rights to the rector of St Peter’s Church in Canterbury her right and claim by dower to a messuage with houses on it in the parish of St Mary Northgate.\textsuperscript{223} In 1286 Helewise, widow of John Brun, butcher of Burgate, granted her dower to the priory of Canterbury Cathedral.\textsuperscript{224} The priory paid a gersum fine of five shillings for her dower tenement in the parish of St Mary Magdalene. It is interesting that widows granted away their dower rights. It suggests, that while widows could administer their property as individuals, they were not always in a position to maintain it. Under gavelkind tenure women had to relinquish their dower before they could remarry; perhaps these documents indicate women granting away their dower rights from their previous marriage so they could make a new marriage, although the documentation does not state that remarriage was the reason behind their decisions.\textsuperscript{225} There are examples of women granting away their dower throughout Kent in the \textit{Pedes Finium}. Aldeva, widow of Arnulf, quitclaimed her dower land for twenty shillings, indicating that women throughout the county were administering their property rights in their widowhood.\textsuperscript{226}

Widows could often be placed in a less financially stable position than widowers. The courtesy of England meant that a widower could claim the seised lands of his deceased wife, so long as issue was born alive to the couple.\textsuperscript{227} Courtesy of England could also include any property which the woman inherited throughout the duration of the marriage. In some respects the courtesy of England resembled dower in that it gave the surviving spouse the lifetime use of inherited property from their marriage partner. In this respect the husband could continue to control his wife’s property after her death. If the land which the widower was claiming was held under gavelkind he was only entitled to claim half if no issue had been produced from the marriage, and if he remarried the courtesy would cease.\textsuperscript{228} Men therefore had access to more land than their female counterparts, and were thus more financially secure. Widows were reduced to enjoying a third of their husband’s original income and were in a vulnerable position. Hanawalt has argued that the courtesy of England was actually more
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generous to the surviving husband, as he could control a larger proportion of property and, in turn, create a more substantial income than his wife.  

Widows could also face difficulties when trying to access their dower. The dower rights of women were continually protected under Magna Carta and in its subsequent reissues in 1216, 1217 and 1225. In 1236, under the Statute of Merton, widows were to receive compensation for any delay which occurred in the handing over of the dower.  

In the latter part of the thirteenth century the entitlement of widows was once again protected by law, the First and Second Statutes of Westminster, suggesting that widows were continually battling to claim their rights. Henrietta Leyser has addressed this issue in her work on medieval women, highlighting how a widow ‘still needed the co-operation of the heir’ in order to claim her dower, particularly as by claiming their dower the widow was reducing the heir’s inheritance.  

There were a number of tactics used by heirs in order to keep their family estates and rightful inheritances in one piece – principally in cases where there was more than one widow claiming her third of her husband’s estate. Heirs would claim anything to obstruct the claims of widows, from the marriage being invalid to delaying the legal process by demanding to view the property or failing to turn up to court; an heir’s motivation was due to the fact he or she would be denied access to this portion of the property until the widow had died. It could be argued that the relationship a widow had with the heir, and the impact and influence she had on his or her life affected whether or not she received her dower. From c.1250, women also had access to land which had been settled jointly upon both the husband and his wife – this was later termed jointure. This medieval form of tenancy was sometimes seen as an alternative to dower, as the couple had joint tenancy over a parcel of land and they could enjoy the income from the land even after one of them had passed.  

R.M. Smith argues that jointure arose to counteract the possibility that a women would receive nothing in her widowhood; as previously if a wife had not been named in a life tenancy then in theory she
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would have not been allowed anything in terms of the property upon widowhood, and jointure was designed elevate.\textsuperscript{237} It could be argued that jointure gave either a widow or a widower a further sense of financial security, after the death of a spouse, particularly for a widow as she could retain the entirety of the property rather than just a portion.

Women also had access to property through marriage portions, or \textit{maritugia}, which they brought with them as part of the marital settlement. Indeed one could make a strong case for stating that an important function of a marriage was to transfer property, as marriage transactions meant that land could be amassed and heirs born.\textsuperscript{238} In a rental from 1230-1235 William Blampeyn receives land in the parish of St Peter upon marrying the daughter of Robert Pucoc, showing land transfer upon marriage occurring in Canterbury during this period.\textsuperscript{239} Marriage contracts and, indeed, terms of settlement could be agreed at an early age, particularly among the wealthier members of society. In these types of marriages, contracts between children sometimes included nominations which were made for a second or third choice of partner, in case one of the proposed spouses died; this was due to the high rate of infant mortality. It was customary at this time for a father to arrange the marital match.\textsuperscript{240} However, in the twelfth century if a father died before arranging marriages for his children, the moral obligation to perform this task fell to the lord of the land, and by the thirteenth century this moral obligation also became a legal one.\textsuperscript{241} The lords could influence the marriages of those who held land from them, even if the father was alive, as their permission was needed for couples to marry.\textsuperscript{242} The \textit{maritugium}, or marriage portion, was customarily passed from the bride’s family to the couple, and it also served to provide for the widow. In practice, marriage portions of land were generally for the wealthier members of society. Claire de Trafford has highlighted that \textit{maritugia} could be given to more than one daughter if the family had the financial means to do so.\textsuperscript{243} Women in Canterbury brought \textit{maritugia} with them into their marriages, and this specific form of property came under the control of their husbands during
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their lifetime. However, changes in English manorial courts from 1250 led to alterations in the way women functioned within land tribunals, affording women with clarification of their acceptance of land transfers during the course of the marriage.244 In the late thirteenth century some manorial courts had begun to adopt the practice of formal examination of wives to establish that the wife had agreed to either the sales or granting of land in which she and her husband had concurrent rights.245 An example of land being given as a marriage portion which is under the control of the husband can be found in a Christ Church Cathedral Priory rental of 1230-35 touching properties in the parish of St Peter.246 The rental refers to a moiety of land there which one William Blampeyn had acquired in marriage with the ‘daughter of Robert Pucoc’.247 It is interesting to note, however, that the woman is not given a first name in this rental, with a blank space appearing instead - she is simply referred to as the ‘daughter of Robert’.248 In the same document there is another reference to William and the marriage portion, and again the woman is given no name, although this time she is referred to as ‘[blank] his wife’.249 In Canterbury, as elsewhere in England, a widow was able to retain her marriage portion after the death of her husband. There is an example of a widow controlling her marriage portion after her husband’s death within the parish of St Mary de Castro.250 Mary of Lewes had a quitclaim ‘for a tenement in St Mary de Castro [Canterbury] which John of Aidisham, her father, gave to her in free marriage’.251 Overall, marital settlements had an impact upon property and land, and female involvement, as agents or vehicles for the transfer of rights within these transactions was vital.

There has been some debate as to whether or not women were better off under the governance of gavelkind or common law. Gavelkind meant that the tenants had freedom over their land, and therefore they could grant away land to whomever they wished – including women. Generally a system of primogeniture was active in which the eldest son was the sole inheritor, although under gavelkind the estate could be divided equally between the sons or their representatives, who could be female. Under this females could claim a share of the
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inheritance, although they were given second preference to their male counterparts. Tenure by knight service did allow for circumstances in which, when there was no male heir, all daughters inherited equally creating co-heiresses. Evidence of co-heiresses exists in a quitclaim from Canterbury in June 1247. Wimarc, Lettice and Matilda were the daughters of Walter Eilmeri, who resigned their right to the land and rent just outside the walls of Canterbury, which came to them on their father’s death; they had been renting the land from the priory, and the priory paid fifteen shillings as a gersum fine. A widow who had not produced any children from the marriage was entitled to half of her husband’s estate, to hold for the duration of her life as a tenant so long as she remained unmarried. Widows were entitled to hold a larger share of their dead husband’s tenements under gavelkind than they were under other forms of land tenure. Yet, under whichever system, common law or gavelkind, women were always inferior to their male counterparts and their economic circumstances and personal situations were dependent on their marital status as well as the existence of male heirs.

A woman’s marital status is often shown in rental records from Christ Church Priory in Canterbury Cathedral. The monks of Christ Church Priory let out a great deal of holdings in Canterbury on what William Urry describes as a ‘house-and-shop’ basis. The ‘house-and-shop’ basis in which tenants rented the property rather than the land, appears to be a less formal custom than a private arrangement between the tenant and the monks. It is possible that private arrangements did exist between the monks and their tenants, however due to the tradition of holding land by gavelkind tenure in Kent it can be assumed that many of the tenures would have followed this custom.

The surviving rentals for Christ Church Cathedral Priory date from the beginning of the thirteenth century. During this period the twenty two parishes which existed within the walls of the city were irregular in both size and wealth, and this can make comparisons between parishes difficult. The parishes were: All Saints, Holy Cross Westgate, St Alphege, St Andrew, St Dunstan, St Edmund Ridingate, St George, St Helen, St John the Baptist, St Margaret, St Martin, St Mary Bredman, St Mary Bredin, St Mary de Castro, St Mary Magdalene, St Mary Northgate.

---

253 Quitclaim, *CCA, CCA-DCC-ChAnt/C/971*.
254 Ibid.
256 *Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin Kings*, p.134.
257 Ibid. Gavelkind tenure was prevalent in Kent and was concerned with the renting of land, rather than property.
258 Ibid., p.134.
St Mary Queningate, St Michael Burgate, St Mildred, St Paul, St Peter, and St Sepulchre. The two most extensive rental surveys for the thirteenth century, the one from 1200 and one from 1206, are transcribed in William Urry’s *Canterbury under the Angevin Kings*. The three main rentals which have been examined are from 1200, 1206 and 1230-1235. The rental which pertains to 1200 features nineteen out of a possible twenty two parishes – All Saints, Holy Cross Westgate, St Alphege, St Andrew, St Edmund Ridingate, St George, St Helen, St John the Baptist, St Margaret, St Mary Bredman, St Mary Bredin, St Mary de Castro, St Mary Magdalene, St Mary Northgate, St Michael Burgate, St Mildred, St Paul, St Peter, and St Sepulchre - quite an extensive survey. It is difficult to ascertain how many parishes were included in the rental of 1206, as a parish designation is not always given. Furthermore, the 1206 rental has a different format which means that the tenants are listed by when they pay their rent rather than by their parish; it is possible that the rental did include other parishes, as particularly in the later entries parish names disappear, or are omitted deliberately, indicating perhaps that they had not been recorded. The number of entries (669) would indicate that it was quite a thorough survey, although only thirteen named parishes are distinguishable: All Saints, St Alphege, St Andrew, St Edmund Ridingate, St George, St Margaret, St Mary Bredman, St Mary Magdalene, St Mary Northgate, St Mary Queningate, St Mildred, St Paul, and St Peter. A further rental held in the Cathedral Archives has been dated as covering the 1230-35 period; it relates to only a small section of the priory holdings within the town and has a total of a hundred entries. The 1230-1235 rental consists of a number of folios stitched together to form a roll at a later date. It only relates to seven parishes in the city; those of All Saints, St Alphege, St Andrew, Holy Cross Westgate, St Mary Bredman, St Mary Magdalene, and St Peter.

There are a variety of problems to overcome when interpreting the rentals. Some of these rentals have names of tenants which have been crossed out. This could, perhaps, indicate the transfer of property due to a death or by mutual agreement. The rental which covers 1230-35 from Christ Church Priory also has lines drawn from one tenant’s property to another, which would suggest that one tenant was taking over another tenant’s property and
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therefore the land was being parcelled up.\textsuperscript{264} Annotations and different handwriting would also indicate that perhaps documents were used for long term reasons, like those in the 1230-35 rental, suggesting that the priory used them not just for rents, but for tracking who was residing in a property before the next rental was drawn up.\textsuperscript{265} When names have been crossed out, it could suggest a tenant had died; in the case of widows, or even women who have not been given a status designation, there is the possibility that they had married and as such were no longer residing in the property. In addition to this, any woman who did remarry may have found her dower property had reverted to her deceased husband’s heirs, as was the custom of the time, or if they had previously been single then the property may have formed part of the \textit{maritagium} and been given to the couple, usually by the bride’s father or her parents. If a woman had brought property into the marriage, then it is highly likely that it would be recorded in the husband’s name in future documents, due to the legal customs and practices of the time.\textsuperscript{266}

There is a surprising prevalence of female property holders within Canterbury throughout the early thirteenth century. In the rental of 1200, covering nineteen parishes, there are only forty entries where the land is held by women or a female monastic institution. Eleven of the forty entries concern female tenants who were renting multiple properties from the priory – three individual women and the nuns of St Sepulchre. Yet, it is quite remarkable that some women held multiple properties, particularly as their status is not always clear. In the parish of St Margaret, four women held five plots of land from the cathedral priory, with a combined total rent of six shillings and eleven pence in the records for 1200.\textsuperscript{267} An absence of women in some parishes is also apparent from the three rentals.\textsuperscript{268} Unlike the 1200 rental the one pertaining to 1206 features 106 entries which pertain to women, a stark comparison to forty in the 1200 rental, and this includes several women who held more than one property – eighteen women and the nuns of St Sepulchre.\textsuperscript{269} The rental which relates to the period 1230-1235 is unfortunately incomplete, and there is a distinct lack of female property holders within it. Out of the one hundred entries only eleven pertain to women (just over ten per cent) and

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{264} 1230-35 Rental, \textit{CCA}, CCA-DCc-Rental/33.
\textsuperscript{265} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{266} \textit{Glanvill} p.60 – ‘legally a woman is completely in the power of her husband’.
\textsuperscript{267} Urry, \textit{Canterbury under the Angevin Kings}, Rental D, pp.249-315.
\textsuperscript{268} There are no women in the following parishes: 1200 Rental - All Saints, Holy Cross Westgate, St Edmund Ridingate, St Helen, St John the Baptist, St Mary Bredin, St Mary de Castro, St Michael Burgate and St Peter. 1206 Rental – All Saints, St Edmund Ridingate and St Mary Magdalene. 1230-35 Rental – All Saints. Urry, \textit{Canterbury under the Angevin Kings}, Rental D, pp.249-315. Ibid., Rental F, pp.315-374. 1230-35 Rental, \textit{CCA}, CCA-DCc-Rental/33.
\textsuperscript{269} Urry, \textit{Canterbury under the Angevin Kings}, Rental F, pp.315-374.
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only one of these women is described as a widow – Camila, the widow of Geoffrey, who held property in the parish of Holy Cross, paying thirty one pence in rent a year.\textsuperscript{270} It is interesting that only one woman is specifically described as a widow; perhaps the scribes were not concerned with recording marital status. Within other urban centres female property holders did exist, although many of these were widows, with some choosing to rent out their properties as a means of income.\textsuperscript{271} Goldberg conducted research on urban female-headed households using the poll tax evidence of 1377, with 145 of the 752 houses in York having a female head – nineteen per cent.\textsuperscript{272} However, in other records for the same tax in Northampton, just twenty-one (or eight per cent) of the 263 households included in the assessment were headed by women in that urban centre.\textsuperscript{273} Female-headed households within urban society were not the norm, and this continued to be the case in other parts of the country throughout the medieval period. While there is an unexpected prevalence of female property holders in Canterbury, women still formed a minority of landholders, thanks, perhaps, to the favourable inheritance customs surrounding gavelkind.

Female property holders in Canterbury were not restricted to those in their widowhood, with women holding property at all stages of the life cycle. There are differences between how different widows were described in the Christ Church Cathedral Priory rentals; some were simply referred to as being the `widow of’ and then their husband’s name was given, while others were given a first name. Also, some widows were given both a first name and reference to their husband, as shown by the example of Milisent, widow of Richard Loremier (\textit{Milisent (relict\ ad Ricardi loremier)}) in the 1206 rental pertaining to the parish of St George.\textsuperscript{274} Perhaps this indicated their position within the social hierarchy, those who were of a higher standing or recognised within the community as they were given the privilege of a first name. The designation of women as `daughters’ or `sisters’ is not necessarily a reflection of their true marital status; we cannot presume this meant that they were not married. The same can also be said for those women who are described as widows, over the three rentals a total of fifty-eight women are given the designation of widow. It is possible that older women could have received this designation under the assumption that they had been married.

\textsuperscript{270} 1230-35 Rental, \textit{CCA, CCA-DCc-Rental/33.}
\textsuperscript{273} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{274} Urry, \textit{Canterbury under the Angevin Kings}, Rental F, entry 179, p.332. The 1206 rental excludes the parishes of: St Dunstan, St Helen, Holy Cross Westgate, St John the Baptist, St Martin, St Mary Bredin, St Mary de Castro, St Michael Burgate and St Sepulchre. Loremier is an occupational surname for someone who is a spurrier and makes horse harnesses.
Women who received a designation which would suggest they were single may have been married, and their title on the rental could indicate from where they had inherited property – if they are described as a daughter perhaps the property was the woman’s fathers. Female property holders whose rent was of a minimal amount, like ‘Cecilia, daughter of Bartholomew’ who paid one pence annually for her property in 1200, could quite possibly be young, single, urban women, who had inherited from their fathers.275

The amount of rent which female property holders paid varied from parish to parish. In the 1230-35 rental the rent payments range from four pence up to seventy-seven pence; the lower of these two figures is from the parish of St Peter for a woman who was unusually identified as a wife, while the higher figure came from the parish of St Mary Bredman. In the earlier rental from 1200 the lowest rental figure noted was for one pence from the parish of St Margaret, but there was a widow from St Mary Magdalene who was charged 164 pence, or thirteen shillings and nine pence, a year for her property.276 The widow mentioned above was the widow of John the alderman, and incidentally Pauline (‘Paulina relict Johannis aldermanni’) was the only female property holder within her parish of St Mary Magdalene for the 1200 rental; John the alderman was one of the most important officials in Canterbury, and therefore he had probably been one of the wealthiest inhabitants.277 The male property holders within this parish paid similar rents to the priory for their property, and this is, perhaps, indicative of a wealthy parish.278 For 1200 the most common total rental payment amount was of twenty-four pence, although payment varied and some women paid in instalments at different religious festivals.279 The common rent amount for the 1230-35 rental would be eighteen pence, although this was only paid by two women with the others paying below or above this amount.280 However, the rental pertaining to 1206 indicates that the most common rental amount was six pence, with sixteen women paying this amount, although twelve pence also appears to be a popular amount with fifteen women contracted to this annual rent.281 Male property holders within Canterbury also paid varying amounts for their property, with men in the 1230-35 rental paying annual amounts ranging from two pence to

275 Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin Kings, Rental D, p. 290.
276 The women are ‘Cecilia, daughter of Bartholomew’ and ‘Pauline, widow of John the alderman’ respectively.
277 Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin Kings, Rental D, p.263.
278 Ibid., Rental D, p.263.
279 1230-35 Rental, CCA, CCA-DCc-Rental/33. ‘Alma the wife of Roger Rossi’ paid four pence, and ‘Susanna’ paid seventy seven pence.
280 Ibid.
281 Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin Kings, Rental F, pp.315-374.
408 and a half pence. In the rental for 1200 the rents range from two pence per annum to 240 pence (20 shillings), while for 1206 the lowest rental amount stays the same at two pence and at the other end of the spectrum the maximum amount decreases to 120 pence. It seems that each property was different and there was no common rent amount which could be applied to either male or female property holders within Canterbury. Female property holders paid varying amounts of rent throughout the thirteenth century, and this was not dependent upon their marital status. Generally women were more likely to pay lower rents than men, this perhaps indicates their limited access to property and resources as women. In other areas, women did have access to property in their own right, although it could be suggested this was more likely when women had the opportunity to provide their own income in order to pay the rent for such properties.

In the Christ Church Priory rental from 1200 we can see how some of the parishes listed do not appear to have had any female tenants. It is possible that those parishes that did not feature female-headed households were perhaps areas where there was more wealth, and therefore some women may not have been able to afford rent in these parishes. The parish of St Mary Northgate has eleven entries for women, with nine women designated as widows and two as ‘sisters of’ and one property rented to the nuns of St Sepulchre. The 1200 rental varies in its terminology for widows, and in St Mary Northgate seven were described as relictæ and two are described as uidua; while the terms can be used interchangeably, there is the possibility that some of the women described as uiduae are indeed separated from their husbands rather than widows. In the parish of St Alphege there were only four entries for women, including the only married woman mentioned in this particular rental – ‘Feramin and wife, daughter of Hugh Flagard’. The other properties within St Alphege were rented by the nuns of St Sepulchre and ‘the heirs of Alice’, suggesting that perhaps Alice had recently died. It is also interesting that the only stated married woman on the 1200 rental was simply referred to as ‘wife’, and it could provide evidence of jointure occurring within Canterbury as both husband and wife were said to hold the property. In the parishes of St Andrew, St George, St Mary Magdalene, St Paul, St Peter and St Sepulchre only one female property

---

282 1230-35 Rental, CCA, CCA-Dcc-Rental/33.
284 Ibid., Rental D, pp.249-315. Parishes which do not feature women in the 1200 Rental are: All Saints, St Dunstan, St Edmund Ridingate, St Helen, Holy Cross Westgate, St John the Baptist, St Martin, St Mary Bredin, St Mary de Castro, St Mary Magdalene, St Mary Queningate, St Michael Burgate.
285 Ibid., Rental D, pp.249-315.
286 Ibid., Rental D, p.259.
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288 Ibid., Canterbury under the Angevin Kings, Rental D, pp.249-315.
holder was present in each parish. A female property holder appears in the parish of St Peter and she is simply referred to as ‘Cristina’ with no indication of a marital status, although her rental price of thirty-six pence annually would suggest that she was in the upper levels of society and had inherited her property. 289 Ten female property holders were present in St Mildred’s, with six of them described as widows, and two single women Liueua, the granddaughter of Gerald, and Cristina. The final property, however, in St Mildred’s was held by William son of Winedel, and Liueua, suggesting that they held the property together and were just possibly married – although no clear designation is given. In St Margaret’s there were five female property holders, three of whom are widows and two who were given links to other family relations – a sister and a daughter. In the final parish which had female property holders, St Mary Bredman, there was a widow who held two properties and two women who appear to hold the same property Drifa and Godiuea; perhaps Drifa and Godiuea were sisters who occupied the same property because they had never married. 290 Of the nineteen parishes documented only eleven had female property holders, and even then they appear to be in the minority. Few of the women within this rental seem to have an occupation attached to them, for example ‘daughter of Henry the goldsmith’, suggesting that women were simply known by the marital status rather than an occupation. 291

From the rental records for the priory, it is apparent that men rented more property from the Cathedral than their female counterparts. There appears to have been an increase in females renting land from the cathedral priory between 1200 and 1206, although they did continue to form a smaller proportion of the property holders. 292 The patriarchal system of society would account for a difference between the genders; women were not expected to hold property in their own names throughout the life cycle. At marriage, property would be passed to a husband and in widowhood women held their dower lands; but this property was never truly theirs to do with as they pleased, widows had to take into account the heir and his or her rights over the land after the widow had died. The price of rents for female property holders varied and appears to have had little relation to their marital status. The naming practices applied to men were also different to that of women; men were often described by their connection with a relative. They were also always given a first name, showing a level of respect for their gender. It was possible for both genders throughout the rentals to hold multiple properties at once and this was not dependent upon marital status – made clear

289 Ibid., Rental D, p.308
290 Ibid, Rental D, p.296.
291 The occupational surnames of women will be looked at further in Chapter Two: Women and work.
292 Urry Canterbury under the Angevin Kings, Rental D (pp.249-315) and Rental F (p.315-374).
through various widows in all three rentals holding more than one property from Christ Church Priory at a time. 293

In the eyes of both the common law and local custom a woman who was married was restricted with regard to what she could do with her own property without her husband’s consent. In the same respect her husband could not sell, pawn, exchange or transfer his wife’s property without her consent. The wife’s property was believed to be any assets which she had brought into the marriage, assets which she had inherited in the duration of her marriage or the dower which had been promised to her by her husband at the church door. 294 There is evidence within Canterbury of a married woman granting permission for her husband to deal in property matters on her behalf. In or around 1200, a grant was made in perpetual alms by Robert, son of Robert, to Canterbury Cathedral ‘with consent of his wife and son’ of four shops in Canterbury next to the house of Terric the goldsmith, one of the city’s leading financiers. 295 It is interesting that although Robert’s charter recorded the consent of his wife, she was not named in the document but was referred to as ‘uxoris’. 296 Research by Kim Philips has shown that some deeds from this period start ‘in my free power and virginity’ (in mea libera potestate et virginitate) or ‘in my pure widowhood’. 297 A quitclaim made by the widow Dionisia in or around 1220 to Alexander of Gloucester, whereby she resigned her rights to freebench in her dead husband’s house and land in Canterbury, described her as Dionisia relictæ Henrici le Wode. 298 Charters from St Augustine’s Abbey also mention women who were given other designations in documents that concerned their control over property. A charter from around 1221 to 1222 was from Muriel, daughter of Wlwini regarding a parcel of land in the parish of St Mary Magdalene. 299 In this charter the language makes clear that it was Muriel who held the land, although she was granting it away to the abbey, and therefore she was conducting business on her own behalf. Further evidence of a woman acting independently can be found in the Curia Regis Rolls. In Michaelmas 1211 there is record of an Emma de Ludesdein versus William Chaplain regarding a messuage in Canterbury, however one of them fails to turn up to

293 Ibid., Rental D (pp.249-315) and Rental F (p.315-374). 1230-35 Rental, CCA, CCA-DCC-Rental/33.
295 Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin Kings, Charter LIX, p.432.
296 Ibid., Charters – LIX, p.432.
298 Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin Kings, Charter LXX, p.441.
court and a day is given for the judgement to be heard during the octave of St Martins.\textsuperscript{300} It is interesting to note that Emma is given no marital status, and it is possible she was a single woman, showing that women were able to deal with issues of property at all stages in their life cycle. Women in thirteenth-century Canterbury were able to and indeed did have control of their property and conducted transactions concerning it.

At a non-aristocratic level it was the growth and development of the common law during the thirteenth century that pioneered the definition of female property rights in land, and worked alongside local customs.\textsuperscript{301} Female property rights were continually protected by the law as women were seen to be the weaker sex and as such needed to ensure that their legal entitlements were made apparent to the population. Women within Canterbury held land at all stages of their lifecycle; we have seen daughters, wives and widows all holding land in the rentals from 1200-1235. It is rare within the records for a woman to be described as holding land jointly with her husband. In the rental from 1200 the only record concerned ‘Feramin and wife, daughter of Hugh Flagard’; perhaps this was land which Feramin’s wife had brought to her husband upon marriage.\textsuperscript{302} Few women are described as wives, a much greater number were described as widows, with many instead being given other designations – although this does not necessarily mean that the women mentioned were not married.

Women as property holders were vitally important as it was often through them that lands and tenements were transferred. Land could be passed through marriages and through inheritance, but land or property granted in terms of dower was more likely to have an impact on a woman’s life in widowhood; it was through dower land that women were able to forge an income for themselves and had a place to live. Female-headed households did exist in Canterbury, but there were fewer of them than male-headed ones – a pattern which continued throughout medieval England.

\textsuperscript{300} Curia Regis Rolls of the Reigns of Richard I. and John, 11-14 John (London; His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1932), p.147.
\textsuperscript{301} Campbell, ‘The land’, p.198.
\textsuperscript{302} Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin Kings, Rental D – entry 72, p.259.
Chapter Three: Women and Work

Many townspeople derived the majority of their income from trade and manufacturing crafts, and there were a variety of occupations within Canterbury during the thirteenth century. The trades and crafts practiced within the town were generally male dominated, and the balance between these crafts was often dependent upon several factors, including local demand, the supply of raw materials, as well as the potential for distributing and selling the goods to a wider audience.303 Within this chapter the place of women within society will be explored with regard to their interaction with trade and occupations. Evidence from a variety of sources will be drawn upon to depict the work in which women were involved, both in a domestic setting and beyond the home. The rental records of Christ Church Cathedral Priory will be analysed to see if the occupational surnames used to describe individual women can offer insights into the work they might have been conducting. Furthermore, a selection of documents, including grants and quitclaims, will be examined to provide further evidence as to the trades which were operating within Canterbury and the possible nature of female involvement in them. Overall this chapter is designed to offer a picture of the role women played within the economic life of the city.

Canterbury was a town with a significant population and a variety of active trades, which the community relied upon. In the early part of the thirteenth century, Canterbury housed roughly 200 shops, as well as a small, yet wealthy, Jewish community who were active as money lenders throughout Kent.304 The Jewish community are exclusively identified with finance, with even the monks of Christ Church borrowing money from them in 1226-1227.305 Other wealthy citizens were engaged as moneyers in one of the eight royal mints, while others worked as goldsmiths. Other craftsmen operated within the town, with carpenters and painters appearing in the rental records. Furthermore, there were craftsmen who were working within the town’s cloth industry; although not as numerous as those in Winchester or York, Canterbury was still able to secure a monopoly over manufacturing within a four mile radius.306 Weavers and tailors can be identified, while there is also evidence of mercers, who were dealers within the textile industry.307 Additional trades relevant to the manufacturing of goods, such as tanners near the river, glovers, saddlers and those who represented the

303 Dyer, Making a Living, p.203.
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306 Ibid., p.121. In 1237 there is a case where the crown was induced by Canterbury craftsmen to stop rivals who had set up looms and were dyeing at Sturry (two miles away) and Littlebourne (4 miles away).
307 Ibid., p.122.
footwear trade can also be found operating in the city.\textsuperscript{308} Bakers and butchers are featured within the records, and the appearance of markets both within and outside the city walls indicates a variety of victuallers who were trading during this time.\textsuperscript{309} A market at Queningate had been established since 762, a wine market was held in Wincheap and a fish market lying west of St Andrews Church was present during the thirteenth century, providing a thriving environment where victualling business might be conducted.\textsuperscript{310} Victualling trades within the town helped cater to not only the local population, but also to the pilgrims. The monks of Christ Church Priory employed servants and cooks, as well as having its own brew house staff. They also had staff for their stable yard and they had a vineyard – although by 1200 the vineyard was possibly no longer under cultivation, as the winepress was no longer on site.\textsuperscript{311} Canterbury was a place of diverse trades, providing opportunities for employment and a chance to earn money which was vital, in order to support local households.

The establishment of any household primarily began with the joining of two people within marriage.\textsuperscript{312} Marriage was seen as a vital part of society, and the Statutes of Salisbury (1217-1219) noted its importance - ‘it appears that in this life the most desirable, good and privileged thing is marriage.’\textsuperscript{313} It has been suggested by Wilkinson, that endogamy was practiced in urban communities during this period; endogamy is a practice in which people marry within a specific class or social group.\textsuperscript{314} There were certainly advantages to this, as it meant that families developed existing expertise in a specialised craft as typically daughters assisted their fathers. There may have been cases of women marrying those of different trades, yet still maintaining similar class, and this enabled skills to be transferred. However, evidence for this is extremely difficult to find, as within the Canterbury records women were identified generally by their relationship to their husband, for example Godelief, widow of Salomon the merchant, or father, for example Felicia and Hagenild, the daughters of William Textor.\textsuperscript{315} Trying to trace a woman from her life as an unmarried woman through to her
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marriage is difficult, and evidence of endogamy or trades marrying within themselves can be hard to discover. However, in Canterbury there is evidence of intermarriage amongst the elite. A goldsmith called Roger of Sheppey married Alice, the daughter of Marnier the rich; Marnier was bailiff in the city and Urry describes him as being a moneyer as well.\textsuperscript{316} Through this marriage Roger and Alice married a partner of similar social status; they were following the practice of endogamy and for their families this ensured that they were evenly matched in terms of wealth and social standing. In Lincoln endogamy was practiced among the urban elite, with Mary the daughter of Godwin the rich marrying Thomas fitzWilliam of Paris, a bailiff, in 1212.\textsuperscript{317} The influence of parents on their children when considering a marriage partner cannot be discounted, yet as Goldberg notes urban women may have had greater freedom of choice over their marriage partner, as through paid employment they had the ability to make more mature decisions.\textsuperscript{318} Marriage was an important and necessary stage of forming a household, and it was through these formations that a household economy could be established.

Once a household unit had been formed through marriage, medieval society had clear ideas about the roles which men and women should conventionally occupy. Furthermore, these ideas extended to the household economy, and the division of labour by gender. The household economy is one to which both men and women contributed in order to ensure an income to support their family.\textsuperscript{319} Hanawalt has argued that the contributions of both husband and wife were of major importance to the household unit, yet the husband’s role was given a higher economic status.\textsuperscript{320} The husband was seen as the primary earner, and had an established trade with which to support his family. There was a gender specific division of labour, and primarily women were expected to run the household. The female domain was perceived to be placed within a domestic setting.\textsuperscript{321} The contribution of a wife towards her household economy was one of fluctuation; she could not necessarily be expected to go out and earn a steady wage while she was with child, or had young children to look after. However, by performing domestic chores, raising children, and running a household women were working, albeit without a wage. Domestic chores gave women transferable skills, and many would have picked up work which they could do within the home, supplementing their
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family’s income. Yet, women could exploit and transfer their skills from the domestic household economy into a more public sphere.

Within society there were lots of expectations as to the roles which women were expected to occupy in the household. Alongside running their own households, being wives and mothers, wives were often involved in assisting their husbands with their trades. Women usually had other skills which they could use to generate an income, although this was not necessarily steady. They were attracted to spinning as a profitable type of by-work: work that could be taken up and put down in the interstices of such daily chores as minding children, cooking and tending animals. In addition to this women’s lives were influenced by the traditional and biblical ideas of the roles which they should fulfil. Traditional ideas around women as nurturers of the family and carers led to employment as nurses and midwives. Biblical ideas centred on women emulating Mary, being mothers and serving their husbands, concepts which had been incorporated into the patriarchal structure of society. Women were primary care-givers, attending to physical and emotional needs of their relatives. As McIntosh writes ‘they contributed to a positive social environment and enabled men to pursue work outside the home.’ Nurturing roles could extend outside of the family home. Canterbury was a centre of religious pilgrimage and therefore there was the possibility of providing pilgrims with accommodation. A papal indulgence from 1363 indicates that Eastbridge Hospital catered for the poor, pilgrims coming into Canterbury and provided accommodation for lying-in women; there were only twelve permanent beds within the hospital, and these were to be attended by an honest woman over the age of forty. As well as this, women had essential economic duties in the domestic setting of providing their family with food and drink; this meant that they had to interact with the market economy, and effectively intertwined the household economy with the market economy. Women were essential contributors within both the household and the household economy, and the role which they played is also evident within medieval literature.
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In the absence of literary material from Canterbury for women’s work, we can turn to conduct literature produced elsewhere for information about the roles women were expected to occupy in urban settings. Literature pertaining to medieval women’s work is scarce for this period, although medieval conduct literature does provide an insight into the roles which women were expected to occupy. *How the Good Wife Taught Her Daughter* is believed to have been written in the fifteenth century, however there were many versions of this text in circulation with some dating back to the early fourteenth century.\(^{328}\) It is one of the few conduct poems which pertains directly to women.\(^{329}\) The male-authored text gives guidance to women as to how they should behave, morals which they should uphold and proverbial advice; it is useful as it indicates the roles and behaviour which women were expected to occupy throughout their lives. The text describes how a woman should wisely govern her house and her servants, while she herself should also ‘work a housewife’s part’ ‘for many hands and folk make a heavy task light’.\(^{330}\) The patriarchal nature of society often meant that women were supposed to be subservient, and this is also evident through the manual which was written in about 1393 instructing a young wife. *The Goodman of Paris* was written by a Paris merchant for his much younger bride, and it contained his ideals on married life, as well as a few recipes; within the text it is written ‘you shall be humble and obedient towards him that shall be your husband’, an indication of the universal patriarchy which was engrained within society.\(^{331}\) While the text itself is not English, it does show the expectations that a husband placed upon his wife, and impresses the need for a woman to keep a clean and tidy house. Although written after the thirteenth century, these pieces of literature provide an insight into how women were expected to behave within society and the roles which they should occupy.

Women occupied roles in both industry and the household, and showing their ability to accommodate the needs of their family. In their domestic roles, women were consumers of goods, but as workers they could be involved in all stages of production. A merchant woman might have assisted her husband by selling the goods in the shop, but she might also have spun wool as a way of supplementing income. It is possible that female relations assisted their husbands or fathers with trades or occupations, but evidence for this is hard to find in Canterbury. Felicia, daughter of William the weaver, may have assisted her father weaving, or

---
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she may have cleaned the workshop but there is no evidence to support this. Jobs which could be put down and picked up again, such as spinning or carding wool, were ideal for a mother, as they enabled her to contribute to the household economy, while looking after her home and family. Laundry was an extension of a woman’s domestic duties, and is something which she could have fitted around her family life – possibly a reason why Mabel the laundress took up this position in Canterbury. Women’s work was notable for its low status, low pay, its standing as an accessory to male labour and the varied nature of the tasks they performed. A wife had to understand her husband’s job and might be expected to take his place when he was absent, although there was a change of emphasis depending on social level and location. Industries in the home, such as the production of textiles and production or sale of food and drink were all possibilities to supplement their income, and women could follow two or three by-industries of this sort – whereas men usually remained with one craft. Women were multitasking, incorporating domestic duties with providing financial support to their family – through a variety of means, including taking up or assisting in a trade, like Mabel the laundress.

The merchant guild and the craft guild both played an important part in the running of the local economy in Canterbury. Membership was much sought after as it conferred on a person the right to trade within the town and excluded others from doing so. Generally membership of a franchise or guild brought a person a license to retail, while many urban authorities also operated a system of additional regular fines and payments to trade within their jurisdiction. Those who were forced to make payments were usually those who did not have the freedom of the city - generally women – and this signifies a less privileged position than their male trading counterparts. Evidence for guilds within the town for this period are sparse; however, the Domesday Book mentions two guilds, one of burgesses and one of priests, existing at the time of its writing in 1086 and, although not much is known about them,
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the text notes the considerable possessions of each guild.\textsuperscript{340} Trade guilds were designed to protect the economic interests of their members, as well as regulating hours, prices and wages.\textsuperscript{341} Moreover, trade guilds established minimum standards in an attempt to ensure and maintain a level of craftsmanship within their trade; this was achieved by the inspection of goods and through apprenticeships, making sure that those who wished to learn were highly trained before they could be recognised as masters.\textsuperscript{342} A merchant guild appears to have existed in Canterbury, although it is last mentioned in surviving documentation from the 1167 rental as the \textit{gilda mercatorum}.\textsuperscript{343} Within the 1200 rental there is mention of an early craft guild, as a holding is said to be next to ground called \textit{terra smithchilde}.\textsuperscript{344} Guilds did exist within Canterbury, yet evidence for them is rare during this period.

Freemen within a city enjoyed the right to trade and own property in the city, and the lists for Canterbury reveal that a man could gain access to this privilege by marrying the daughter of a freeman. From 1298 to 1312, sixty-nine of the 326 men named on the Freemen’s list had become freemen through marriage to a daughter of an existing freemen.\textsuperscript{345} Those who qualified by marriage or birth paid a fixed fee of eleven-and-a-half pence, and had to find two sponsors to support their application to become a freeman. However, the note section of the roll for the 31\textsuperscript{st} year of Edward I’s reign (1302-1303) shows that one of the men admitted through marriage did so through marrying a freewoman.\textsuperscript{346} William Gobayre, clerk, was admitted through his marriage to Helewissa Woggehope (freewoman), indicating that women were able to become freewomen.\textsuperscript{347} In 1307-1308 Alicia de Tours de Scuderesshe was admitted by favour, while Mathild de Bithwode, Marjery Passou, Margery Garlekes and Carshiera de Herbaldoune were all admitted by redemption for half a mark.\textsuperscript{348} No other entries for women becoming freewomen can be found for the period of 1298-1312; there may have been women admitted before 1298, but the freemen’s lists for this period do not survive.

In Canterbury there is evidence of women who were related to men in the metal and wood crafts; crafts in these area were often masculine domains due to their link to physical
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strength and the need for specialist training. Within Lincoln there were women, like Alice le
Yernmanger, working independently, however the same cannot be said for thirteenth-century
Canterbury. Moreover, women within Canterbury are documented as being the wives or
daughters of people who were operating within these trades. It is reasonable to assume that
these women had some experience of these trades, and perhaps assisted their husbands and
fathers in the family workshops. Within the records for St Augustine Abbey there is evidence of
the surname Le Carpenter, suggesting the family were linked with carpentry – Geoffrey the
Carpenter and Alice his daughter. There are two references to women who are related to
the plumbing trade: Avicia and Isabelle the daughters of Ingelnulph the plumber. Both Avicia
and Isabelle were mentioned in the rental records for 1206, paying rent to the monks of Christ
Church Priory for two properties within Canterbury. Isabelle was also mentioned in a charter
pertaining to property in the parishes of St Margaret and St Mildred. On both of these
occasions the women were identified specifically as daughters of Ingelnulph the plumber, and
it is plausible that they themselves knew some aspects of their father’s trade. Within other
Canterbury records, there was a mention of Alice, wife of Adam le Shypwrite of Sandwich who
held a messuage lying between the priory’s orchard and the king’s highway to Longbridge with
her husband in Canterbury; this indicates further trades in which women perhaps gained
experience through their roles within the family. Milisent, widow of Richard Loremier
(Milisent (relictica Ricardi loremier)) appeared in the 1206 rental, and it is possible that she
assisted her husband who was a loremier or spurrier, who made small iron ware, such as bits
and metal mountings for horses’ harnesses. All these women may have picked up skills in
the trades in which their families were engaged, yet none of them are explicitly linked to these
occupations as independent tradeswomen. However, there is no firm evidence from
Canterbury of married women who were able to trade as femme soles (sole women)
independently from their husbands, unlike women from other English town, like Lincoln and
London.

Canterbury had people who were moneyers, thanks to the fact that it was home to a
royal mint. The moneyers gave loans and financial support to a variety of individuals in the city,
including the monks of Christ Church Priory. Evidence of people borrowing money would lead
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us to establish that this practice was occurring within Canterbury, although the scale is relatively unknown. This occupation was usually the preserve of the Jewish population due to Catholic Church teaching, and the Jewish community in Canterbury was relatively small. There is evidence in the cartulary of St Gregory’s Priory of Milkan the Jewess, widow of David and it is possible that due to his religion David was involved in the financial trade. The Jews were traditionally moneylenders, and traders within Canterbury were often dependent on credit in order to establish their business. Now, Milkan may have learnt about the trade through her husband, and it certainly possible that she may have continued to act in her husband’s interests after his death, ensuring that all his business transactions had been completed. There was a decline in the size of the Jewish population during the 1260s and 1270s due to Christian prejudice and royal taxation; this also affected the wealth of the Jews and impacted upon their trade. The Jews were finally expelled in 1290s and the gap became filled with Englishmen who had spare money.

However Englishmen had also been acting as financiers before the expulsion of the Jews. A late twelfth and earlier thirteenth-century goldsmith, Terrice (Terric or Thheoric) was a well-respected man within the town, particularly because he was both a craftsman and a financier. His position was further cemented in society because he handled the income of the see of Canterbury during the election crisis in 1208. Terric was also an employer as records show he maintained staff such as Robert the goldsmith, ‘serviens Terrici’. Terric’s widow is mentioned within the rental records, although not by her name, and it is possible that she may have assisted her husband in his trade – both as a goldsmith and as a financier. Perhaps she sold the items, or oversaw the cleaning of his workshop, which could be seen as an extension of her wifely duties but can also be identified as work. It is possible that his sons also continued his work, with potentially their mother giving assistance and providing links to their father’s previous clients. After Terric’s death in or around 1214, his widow Matilda and her son Roger offered King John £100 so that they might have Terric’s lands, goods and debts. Terric’s widow continued to act on his behalf, as the monks of the cathedral had contracted
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large debts with him, and there is documentation which settles the debts to his widow.\textsuperscript{362} There were also other Canterbury women who were involved in the financial sector, although direct evidence of females participating in this trade does not survive for this period. Susanna de Planaz in the 1230-35 rental held property in the parish of St Mary Bredman which was described as a row of shops; it is possible that Susanna rented out this property to others to provide herself with her own income, but she may have also used her position as a high-street shop owner to conduct her own business.\textsuperscript{363}

Victualling was an integral part of community and trade life, and Canterbury was no exception. Victualling allowed people access to the retail of foodstuffs and the ability to purchase the basic essentials in order to survive. Evidence of bakers can be found within the Cathedral Archives, as a grant from the early thirteenth century survives that concerns Gunnora, daughter of Walter the baker.\textsuperscript{364} While this document is badly damaged, with some areas of text illegible, it shows a grant which includes the payment of nine and half pence rent between two female parties.\textsuperscript{365} Once again a woman was described using her relationship to her father, and it can only be surmised that she might have assisted her father or performed the domestic chores within the bakery. The widow of Simon the baker appeared in the 1206 rental, and perhaps she continued her husband’s trade after his death.\textsuperscript{366} Evidence from both York and Lincoln suggests that female participation in both the commercial production and retail of bread was low, and Canterbury appears to have followed this pattern.\textsuperscript{367} The cathedral priory employed bakers for their own use, although evidence shows that there must have been bakers outside the control of the priory due to the existence of a 1262 byelaw.\textsuperscript{368} The byelaw removed a rate which had been originally imposed on windows which displayed bread. The Assize of Bread and Ale was introduced in 1266-1267, and was the first law in Britain which controlled the sale and production of food and drink. The legislation meant that the price, weight and quality of bread and beer was to be regulated, with fines instituted to catch those who fell foul of the law.\textsuperscript{369} Furthermore, due to the importance of trade within the community these regulations were vital to ensure that the community had access to everyday foodstuffs,
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whilst attempting to ensure that the market was a fair economic environment. Whilst baking was seen as a domestic skill, and therefore in the female realm, professional bakers tended to be male – a trend which saw men dominating many of the trades in a professional capacity.\textsuperscript{370}

Brewing was another victualling trade in which medieval women were able to contribute to their family income. Women often monopolised brewing as it attracted little male participation, was relatively low skilled and it suited the domestic responsibilities of many women.\textsuperscript{371} It was also a trade which could be performed on a part time basis, with many women brewing occasionally and by-industrially.\textsuperscript{372} Brewing was an ideal trade for women, as it offered them proof and prestige which most other occupations could not afford them due to their gender.\textsuperscript{373} Evidence for female brewers within Canterbury is scarce, although Urry does make mention of two female brewers operating in Canterbury during the thirteenth century. According to Urry the wife of Igneulph the plumber had supplied ale to monks of the Cathedral to the value of eight pounds – Urry indicates that this figure was four times that of her husband’s annual salary.\textsuperscript{374} Furthermore, the wife of Hugh the goldsmith also supplied ale to the cathedral.\textsuperscript{375} Records for the cathedral priory indicate that they had their own brew house staff. However, female levels of participation fluctuated around the country due to finances, as access to capital to invest was vital to profit from brewing.\textsuperscript{376} M. Stevens further argues that female participation in ale trade allows the level of female market awareness to be assessed, particularly as the Ruthin women adjusted their involvement in the trade in response to market forces.\textsuperscript{377}

Another victualling trade involved the retail of meat and fish. Helewise the widow of John Brun, butcher of Burgate, appeared in a grant and quitclaim from 1286, indicating that she may have aided her husband earlier in the century and potentially continued her husband’s trade after his death.\textsuperscript{378} There was a fish market situated near the parish of St Andrew in Canterbury, and there is documentation pertaining to the daughter of Alan the fisherman. A grant from Basilia, daughter of Alan the fisherman to Simon son of Andrew exists.
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from 1253/4 concerning land within the parish of St Mary Northgate. Although the document does not mention any other trades in which Basilia may have been participating, it does suggest that she was a single woman and was potentially aiding her father in some aspects of the fish trade. It is plausible that Basilia may have run the fish stall within the market, while her father went and caught the fish. Some people had multiple stalls within the market, so there is the possibility that their wives or daughters ran one of the stalls – although it is the men’s names which generally appear in the records. If a man rented more than one stall in the market place it is possible that his wife managed one of the additional stalls independently. Men had the legal power, wealth and standing within society to monopolise trade, and some of the victualing trades which women were in may not have been on the same scale. Goldberg believes that women had a monopoly over the victualling trades, as they provided freedom and flexibility, however the lack of evidence for women following a victualling trade independently from their families in Canterbury is problematic.

Traditionally women were involved in the textile industry in medieval England. Women were generally involved in the production of the raw material more than the manipulation and selling of textile goods. Within the textile industry there was increasingly a gendered division of labour after 1000, and much of women’s work in the preparation and spinning of fibre went unnoticed in the records because of its categorisation as by-work. In Canterbury there were women with male relations within the industry, and it is possible that they would have had some kind of understanding of the trade. The daughter of William the weaver, Felicia, can be found in documentation from 1234/5, holding land in Canterbury. In the cartulary of St Augustine’s Abbey the daughters of William Textor, Felicia and Hagenild, appear along with a woman named Emma de Mercato. This surname translates as ‘of the market’ suggesting she was connected with the market, and she may have been acting independently as a single woman as no marital status appears to be given. Other women appear to have had links with the merchant community. Evidence for Cecily, daughter of Goldwyn the mercer, exists for the thirteenth century, as do records for Cecily, relict of William Silvestre, daughter of Solomon the mercer. The 1206 rental also has a woman from the merchant class, Godelief, widow of
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Salomon the merchant.\textsuperscript{386} Women in Lincoln were more active independently in the clothing trade, with evidence of a draper and a seamstress during the thirteenth century – occupations which did not appear in the Canterbury records for this period.\textsuperscript{387} The evidence of females whose link to the textile industry was through a male does not mean that they themselves were fully involved with the trade, however it would suggest an association on some level, even if this was limited.

The service industry was traditionally seen as an area in which women were heavily involved in medieval towns, although no female servants could be found for Canterbury during the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{388} Domestic and household skills which women would have learnt as wives and daughters could be utilised within the service sector. Many women performed traditional feminine tasks such as needlework and washing as they experienced informal training from an early age within the home. Whereas a man might follow the same trade all his active life, a woman might have to change hers on leaving service, on marriage, and even after marriage; her domestic skills could be relied upon in a number of different settings, from cleaning a shop or workshop to taking in sewing and washing which could supplement her household’s income.\textsuperscript{389} One of the few females specifically mentioned within the Canterbury records as having her own trade was Mabel the laundress, who operated in the city in Henry III’s reign.\textsuperscript{390} The grant in which Mabel was mentioned was not specifically about her, rather it was a grant of land within Canterbury which her son, John Stronge, son of Mabel the laundress, made to the prior and convent of Canterbury Cathedral Priory in April 1234.\textsuperscript{391} However, the mention of Mabel does show women holding an independent trade, albeit an exclusively female one, and indicates the transfer of a domestic skill into a professional one. In fourteenth-century York three laundresses and a ‘kiercheiflavender’ are documented; while in thirteenth-century Lincoln Felicia la Lavender and Matilda were both employed as laundresses.\textsuperscript{392} Urry uses the evidence of a Jewess who was called upon by Godelieva to administer charms and incantations to her foot, to depict women working in a nursing capacity and therefore in the service industry.\textsuperscript{393} Urry’s evidence, however, actually depicts a miracle related to the martyred St Thomas, it shows the reluctance of Becket as a saint to intercede to
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cure the Jewish woman’s foot. Godelieva, a Christian woman, carried a bucket of water which had been sanctified by St Thomas passed the door of a Jewess; the Jewess, who had a weak foot, invited Godelieva inside to charm the foot, but once Godelieva stepped inside the bucket flew into pieces causing her to lose the water, and Godelieva to understand the wicked intuitions of her mind. Women were often working in an informal capacity, nursing older generations, helping sick neighbours, and this was not always done as a regular thing, but rather on an ad hoc basis. Cooking at a professional level was traditionally a male dominated area, but in the records from St Augustine’s, there is a reference to Matildis filia Coc (Matilda, daughter of the Cook) and she may have picked up the trade. The service industry is one in which we expect to see high levels of female involvement, and indeed this might also have been the case in Canterbury.

Urban migration was commonplace within the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, with people travelling from the countryside in the hope of finding work within the emerging towns. The names within the Canterbury records suggest that this also happened in this city. There are a variety of toponymic surnames which indicate that either the women themselves migrated or their parents did, as their place of origin is alluded to in the documentary evidence. Some names come from the surrounding local area, such as Godeleif, daughter of Salomin of Fordwich in the 1206 rental, with the town of Fordwich being 2.6 miles from Canterbury. A widow, Mary of Lewes, was previously Mary of Aidisham and received property in Canterbury as part of her marriage portion. Although Aidisham is just under nine miles from Canterbury, it is plausible that Mary spent some time in the town, potentially working. She may have moved to Lewes upon her marriage and returned to Canterbury in her widowhood. From the research conducted four women migrated from places within a five mile radius of Canterbury, while one moved within a ten miles radius. Felicia, daughter of William of Birchington could have originated from Birchington-on-sea, so it is possible that Felicia travelled from the coast to carve out a new life for herself within an urban centre. Two women have surnames related to places within a fifteen mile radius of the city, while a further two can be placed within a twenty mile radius. One of these was Emma de Eastesture who is
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not defined by a family relation; this would suggest that she is a single woman who has migrated to Canterbury.\(^{402}\) Her surname can be read as East Stour which suggests she may have come from East Stour near Ashford, approximately fifteen miles away. Four others perhaps came from further afield; Joan, for example, is described as the daughter of Thomas Wingate; this could perhaps be Wingate in County Durham some 311.9 miles from Canterbury.\(^{403}\) Toponymic surnames can be problematic as they do not provide conclusive evidence that the person originally came from that area. Some names could be inherited, with their parents or grandparents having moved to a new area and thus giving the appearance of migration. The occurrence of these women within the records indicates that there were women who were migrating from other parts of the country to Canterbury during the thirteenth century, yet we cannot be certain of the numbers of women who did so.

Women were usually listed by their marital status rather than by a specific occupation within the rentals for Christ Church Cathedral Priory. Women were effectively treated as second class people, and were under the governance of a male relative – usually their father or husband; it is possible that their position within society would have affect their employability, in turn, their marital status would have also had an impact. Evidence of women having an occupation independent of their spouse or family is scarce. Indeed the only woman found within the records who did this was ‘Mabel the Laundress’.\(^{404}\) The occupations of women were often derived from the assumption that they assisted either their husbands or fathers in the trade which they occupied. Male occupations are more prominent within the records. Women may have worked in an informal capacity in family businesses - as wives, daughters and servants - and perhaps this was simply seen as an extension of their domestic duties.\(^{405}\) The competitive labour market which was found throughout England, combined with inheritance practices that favoured male heirs, often prevented townswomen from securing access to the crafts.\(^{406}\) Women did not generally enjoy continuity of work but changed their occupations as the need arose; their life cycle and position as mothers did not always allow them to maintain a job.\(^{407}\) They had to learn to work within the web of patriarchy, in order to make their own way and carve out an economic future for themselves – even if this meant using a variety of skills.\(^{408}\) Overall women’s economic activities were important to both them and their families,
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and although they were not always in a stable job their flexible nature and transferable skills meant they were vital assets to their families.
Conclusion

This thesis has examined the role and position of women in Canterbury during the period c.1200 to 1320. Little research had previously been conducted on women in thirteenth-century South-East England, and this study has aimed to rectify this; by adding to the existing, more general literature, on medieval women by the likes of Mate and the London focused study of Hanawalt. Through analysis of a variety of records the lives of Canterbury women have been examined; while their lives were not documented to the same extent as men from the city, evidence which does survive allows us a glimpse of the legal, economic and social context in which they lived. Marriage in Canterbury was regulated in much the same way as other parts of the country, and women also had the opportunity, albeit limited, to become property holders in the city. Women and work is difficult to define in the city due to lack of evidence, yet there were certainly restrictions within which they had to operate, and more often than not were kept in a primarily domestic role. Both genders were active in marriage, property and work in thirteenth-century Canterbury, yet the extent to which they were involved was different primarily based on their sex.

With regard to marriage, women in thirteenth-century Canterbury faced similar issues to women throughout England. Within the ecclesiastical courts of the diocese of Canterbury, the claims of pre-contract, like those which Muriel de Denham brought against John and Joan, were complicated and the importance of witnesses to testify for your cause was vital. There were various restrictions concerning who a person might marry, including ecclesiastical legislation pertaining to degrees of affinity and consanguinity – and these were expected to be followed by all levels of society. Evidence of couples facing claims of consanguinity and affinity exist in the church court records for thirteenth-century Canterbury, as seen by the case of 1293 between Alice Gyg and William le Thocchere in which affinity was alleged between the couple. Court documentation from the city show the difficulties that surrounded trying to establish if couples were married through words of present or future consent, and shows the changes in theological framework which occurred during the thirteenth century. The importance of the marriage banns was visible in the case concerning Eleanor de Roluiindeene, while Muriel de Dunham’s case demonstrated the complexity of medieval marriage
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contracts. In Canterbury there is evidence of endogamy being practiced, as a goldsmith and moneyer Roger of Sheppey married Alice, the daughter of Marnier the rich; similarly women in Lincoln also experienced endogamy, as Matilda, the elder sister of Adam fitzReginald, an alderman, married James de Holm, bailiff of Lincoln. Canterbury women recognised the seriousness of marriage, fighting in court to uphold marriage contracts.

In Canterbury women did have access to property, however opportunities to do so were restricted. There is evidence of women in Canterbury receiving property in the form of marriage portions and dower, and controlling it independently in their widowhoods. There was a charter from around 1200 which is addressed by Robert, son of Robert, to Canterbury Cathedral, and concerned a grant in perpetual alms of four shops to the cathedral. This charter shows how once married a woman’s land became her husband’s, although Robert was acting ‘with consent of his wife and son’ with regard to the four shops; it is interesting that although he had the consent of his wife, she was not named in the document but simply referred to as ‘uxoris’. A quitclaim for the widow Dionisia shows her dealing with property after her husband’s death. In the document she resigned her rights to freebench in her dead husband’s house and land in Canterbury; this indicates her right to act independently upon widowhood, yet by resigning land she may have been preparing to remarry. Female headed households were not the norm in thirteenth-century Canterbury, and this is also echoed in Goldberg’s findings for York, as only nineteen per cent of households in York were headed by women in 1377. Widows who received their dower under terms of gavelkind in Canterbury could expect to receive half of their husband’s property, much like women in Lincoln whose lands were held under burgage tenure. At all stages of the life cycle we see women holding property in the city, yet female property holders were still in the minority. Women in Canterbury held land not just in their widowhood but at all stages of their life cycle, performing an important society function as property-holders.

The evidence for women and work in the city is sparse. Women were rarely identified in the records with a specific occupation. The only solid evidence for a woman embarking on
her own occupation is that of the laundress; yet in Lincoln more evidence survives for women working independently, some in specialised trades, like goldsmiths.\textsuperscript{421} There were, however, a number of women who were related to men in the city, who followed victualling trades, crafts and other occupations, and who might well have assisted their male relations in an informal capacity, such as Matilda, daughter of the Cook, Felicia, daughter of William the weaver, Basilia, daughter of Alan the fisherman, and Gunnora, daughter of Walter the baker.\textsuperscript{422} Both Lincoln and York have brewing industries in which women were actively involved, but evidence for women engaging in this occupation in Canterbury is scarce.\textsuperscript{423} Generally women were described in rentals and charters in relation to the occupation of their father or husband. The types of work followed by men are more prominent within the records, particularly as men were often referred to by their occupation. Women were expected to fulfil traditional female roles – cleaning, cooking, running the household, raising children. In addition to this, they could also be expected to be helping the family financially, supplementing the income with occasional or seasonal work. Lack of evidence for women working in a specific trade supports Goldberg’s belief that opportunities which were open to townswomen were limited before the Black Death, something which is also apparent in evidence for Lincoln and York.\textsuperscript{424} Overall women’s economic activities were important to both them and their families, and although they were not always in a stable or set occupation their flexibility and transferable domestic skills meant they were vital assets to their families, supporting the conclusions previously made by McIntosh.\textsuperscript{425}

It is clear from the evidence that marital status was of vital importance within society, particularly because it appears to have defined a woman. The designation of women within the records is interesting and can be examined in order to understand attitudes towards women in this period. There is a divide between widows, some were simply described as ‘widow of’ followed by their husband’s name, while others were referred to by their first name; some were given both a first name and reference towards their husband, as depicted by Milisent, widow of Richard loremier (\textit{Milisent (relictica Ricardi loremier)}) in the 1206 rental grants.
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pertaining to the parish of St George. In theory women were expected to be subservient to men, often indicative of their marital status, yet in practice this was not always the case for women in society. There is evidence of women acting by themselves or in conjunction with their husband. However it could be argued that the subservience of women is evident through how women are described within the documentation pertaining to Canterbury.

This study has confirmed Goldberg’s theory that opportunities which were open to townswomen were limited in this period, and further supports his argument that while female headed households were not the norm they were in existence during this period. Furthermore, evidence from Canterbury supports Wilkinson’s argument that gender roles were socially reinforced in society, as women in Canterbury are largely described in reference to their marital status. A woman’s marital status dictated her position within the community and made clear that her place was in a domestic setting. McIntosh argued that women provided services which were primarily in a domestic context, and this appears to have been the case in Canterbury, as suggested by the evidence of Muriel the laundress. However, Goldberg’s argument that women had a monopoly over the victualling trades cannot be supported by this study as there is no evidence of Canterbury women taking on roles within victualling occupations. Moreover, while Kowaleski found that women in Exeter could achieve some independence in the clothing and textile trades there is no evidence for this occurring for women in Canterbury; in fact evidence for Canterbury women taking on any occupation is scarce.

Women in Canterbury were in an interesting position during the thirteenth century. The ecclesiastical image of women infiltrated all aspects of their lives, governing their place in society and the roles in which they could operate. The patriarchal structure combined with their marital status placed limitations on their spheres of influence. Yet they were vital in order for society to function, taking up an occupation, like Mabel the laundress, to sustain their families, while contributing to the economic life in Canterbury and the wealth of their own households. Canterbury women faced similar issues to other parts of England when it came to marriage, with evidence of cases concerning marital contracts and accusations of

426 Urry, *Canterbury under the Angevin Kings*, Rental F, entry 179, p.332. This is prevalent in the 1206 rental.
430 Goldberg, ‘For Better, For Worse’, p.111.
432 Grant, CCA, CCA-DCc-ChAnt/C/782.
consanguinity and affinity appearing within the records. Women could be property holders in the city, yet the majority of those held property as widows, something which is reflected in other parts of the country. Overall, women in thirteenth-century Canterbury were part of society, active as far as their gender and marital status would allow, and yet their presence and contributions to both the medieval economy and society is often underappreciated. They took on many roles, some were taken on out of social pressure and expectation, but their flexibility and ability to adapt to their situation is something to admire.


Appendix One: Map of the Parish Churches located within Canterbury in the Thirteenth Century.

Key

1. St. Dunstan
2. Holy Cross
3. St. Peter
4. St. Mary Northgate
5. St. Alphege
6. All Saints
7. St. Helen
8. St. Mary Bredman
9. St. Andrew
10. St. Mary Queningate
11. St. Margaret
12. St. Mary Magdalene
13. St. Michael Burgate
14. St. Paul
15. St. Martin
16. St. Mildred’s
17. St. Mary De Castro
18. St. John
19. St. Edmund Ridingate
20. St. Mary Bredin
21. St. George
22. St. Sepulchre
Appendix Two: Rental Records.
2a) All female entries from the 1200 Rental - Urry, *Canterbury under the Angevin Kings*, Rental D, pp.249-315.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Total Rent</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alicia, sister of Nigel</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>8 and ¼ pence</td>
<td>8 and ¼ pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Widow</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>9 pence (x2)</td>
<td>18 pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godelief, Widow of Eadwin</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>10 pence (x2)</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Sepulchre Nunnery</td>
<td>Nuns - unmarried</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieueua, Widow of Conrad</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister of Roger, Son of Hamel'</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Ace Sache</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>10 pence (x2)</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Ailward</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>7 and ¼ pence</td>
<td>7 and ¼ pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Hugo le Frode</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>12 pence (x2)</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Wlnoth</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>24 pence (x2)</td>
<td>48 pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wlueua Widow</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>10 pence (x2)</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Godwin</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feramin and wife, daughter of Hugh Flagard</td>
<td>Married - rents with husband</td>
<td>9 pence (x2)</td>
<td>18 pence</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of Alice, daughter of Henry the goldsmith</td>
<td>Inherited</td>
<td>12 pence (x2)</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns of the Holy Sepulchre</td>
<td>Nuns - unmarried</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns of the Holy Sepulchre</td>
<td>Nuns - unmarried</td>
<td>36 pence (x2)</td>
<td>72 pence</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahaut, widow of Gilbert</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliiuua, widow of Padriz</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>25 pence and 7 pence</td>
<td>32 pence</td>
<td>St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agatha, sister of Nigel the monk</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>2 shillings</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>St Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecila, daughter of Bartholomew</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>1 pence</td>
<td>1 pence</td>
<td>St Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godieua, widow of Lawerance</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>36 pence</td>
<td>36 pence</td>
<td>St Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same Godieua</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>St Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Eilredi se Prude</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>5 pence (x2)</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>St Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drifa and Godieua</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godieua, widow of Lawerance</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>36 pence</td>
<td>36 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Steward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same Godieua</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline, widow of John the alderman</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>41 pence (x4)</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brithtiua, widow of Pic</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>St Mildred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>40 pence</td>
<td>St Mildred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goda, widow</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>18 pence</td>
<td>St Mildred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godith, widow</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>20 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Mildred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuette, widow of Elfwin</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>St Mildred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liueua, granddaughter of Gerald</td>
<td>Granddaughter</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>St Mildred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liuiua, granddaughter of Gerald</td>
<td>Granddaughter</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>St Mildred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Warren</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>8 pence and 10 pence</td>
<td>St Mildred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Wlfeach, namely Kila</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>8 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Mildred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter of Mark</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>St Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Alfred Pete</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>3 pence</td>
<td>St Sepulchre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Two

2b) All female entries from the 1206 Rental - Urry, *Canterbury under the Angevin Kings*, Rental F, pp.315-374. Unlike the other rentals studied, this one was generally arranged by the date of the rental payment rather than by parish, thus some of the payments may be for the same property as they are paying in instalments. It is not always clear from the layout of the rental when the date of payment was, and parish name was not always given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Rents</th>
<th>Date of Payment</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunnild</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>Feast of all saints</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina, mother of Thomas</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>Feast of all saints</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia, daughter of Malger</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of Emma the widow</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>16 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godelef, widow of Eadwin</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>16 pence</td>
<td>Birth of Christ</td>
<td>St Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina daughter of Brichtieue</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>Birth of Mary</td>
<td>St Mildred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of John son of Viuani</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>42 pence</td>
<td>Birth of Mary</td>
<td>St Mary Bredmane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Roger Desie</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td>St Mary M(agdelane)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Dunstan</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>26 pence</td>
<td>Middle of Lent</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Hugo Frode</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>Middle of Lent</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns of St Sepulchre</td>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>Middle of Lent</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liueua, widow of Conrad</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>Middle of Lent</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria, Daughter of Elueue</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>Middle of Lent</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns of St Sepulchre</td>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>37 pence</td>
<td>Middle of Lent</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Robert (<em>sacur</em>)</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Middle of Lent</td>
<td>St Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Robert Godiuere</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>24 and 1/2 pence</td>
<td>Middle of Lent</td>
<td>Northgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Arnold (<em>coci</em>)</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>Middle of Lent</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Terric Goldsmith</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>16 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godelief, wife of Stephen the gate</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Queningate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia, daughter of Goduini Bradhefed</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith, daughter of John Swin</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna, daughter of John son of Viuiani</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>63 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore (Susanna)</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia, wife of Roger the marshal</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina daughter of Robert</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liueuea, daughter of Walter the presbyter</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Elrici Oker</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>Feast of All Saints</td>
<td>St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milesent, widow of Richard ioremier</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>Feast of All Saints</td>
<td>St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenia, daughter of Peter</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>Feast of All Saints</td>
<td>St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edilda, daughter of Eadmei</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of All Saints</td>
<td>St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuia and Goditha</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of All Saints</td>
<td>St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of Cecila, wife of Robert Diue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns of St Sepulchre</td>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>36 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecila, daughter of Geroldi (Gerald)</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>60 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Eilmeri the Wald</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Eilwordi Pich</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionisia, daughter of Richard</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>14 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same (Dionisa)</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>1/2 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns of St Sepulchre</td>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina, wife of Roger de Hoiland</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Roger Desie</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>14 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agatha, daughter of Gilbert de Saneis</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>St Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of John son of Viuani</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>36 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Alurendi Gosse</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilia, widow of Hugh son of Edward</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>19 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godelief, daughter of Salomonis de Forduc</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>15 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Simon the baker</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wluitha widow</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Feast of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice widow of Salmon</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Henry (sacriste)</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godelief widow of Edwin parmentarii</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>16 pence</td>
<td>Feast of John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Nigel son of Alberici the goldsmith</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>Feast of John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Galfredi the marshal</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td>Feast of John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionisia, daughter of Richard</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>14 pence</td>
<td>Feast of John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of John son of Viuani</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>60 pence</td>
<td>Feast of John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecila daughter of Edieue</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Roger Desie</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of Emma the widow of Bartholomew</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenia, daughter of Peter the cleric</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>3/4 of a pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eluiua widow of Randolph Pardicj</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avaitia daughter if William son of Odonis</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>16 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina daughter of Brictieue</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma of Horsfolde</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alitia daughter of Wilbert Kide</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>30 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns of St Sepulchre</td>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>37 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Gauldi the marshal</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Nigel son of Alberi</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same (Widow of Nigel, son of Alberi)</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>4 and 1/4 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Robert Godiuere</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wluiua widow of Goduinet</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith, daughter of Suin (John Swin?)</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of John son of Viuani</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>42 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Eilwardi Smalpon</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agatha de Sarnais</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Roger Desie</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avaitia, daughter of William, son of Odonis</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>18 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Feast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Osberti Preth</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>7 and 1/4 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Wlnothi</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionisia, daughter of Richard</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>7 and 1/4 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Godardi upholder'</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia daughter of Melgeri</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auicia, daughter of Igenulf the plumber</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>18 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabele, daughter of the same Igenulf</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>18 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of Cecilia, wife of Robert Diue</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of William Palmere</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns of St Sepulchre</td>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>36 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina, daughter of Radulfi</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileseent, widow of Richard loremier</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina, daughter of Britief (Brichtieue)</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>21 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godiva, land from Richard Corbaille</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Eilmeri Waldeis</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>3 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnild, widow of Chuut</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>21 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elueua, daughter of Wlfech</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>9 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godelief, widow of Salomon the merchant</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>7 and 1/4 pence</td>
<td>At Easter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanild, widow of Eilmeri</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma, daughter of Roger attenhelle</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of the wife of Morin</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of John the Baptist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanild, widow of Eilmeri</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma, daughter of Roger attenhelle</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of the wife of Morin</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria, daughter of Godelief attehelle</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godelief, widow of Salomon the merchant</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow of Alredi uppeheldere</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td>Feast of St Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Two

2c) Rental 1230-35, CCA, CCA-Dc-Rental/33.

This rental shows the name, gender, parish, amount of rent and total rent which was paid to the Cathedral Priory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Total Rent</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew de la hwenham</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3 ½ and 2 pence</td>
<td>5 ½ pence</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman of Westgate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilia, widow of Geoffrey</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15 ½ pence (x2)</td>
<td>31 pence</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry of Ospringe</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2 pence</td>
<td>2 pence</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William de Valeneines</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence (x2)</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our almoner</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28 and 50 pence</td>
<td>78 pence</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William de Valeneines</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 ½ pence</td>
<td>12 ½ pence</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Peper</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master William Curacy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence (x4)</td>
<td>48 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, son of Robert</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3 ½ pence (x2)</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman of Westgate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence (x2)</td>
<td>24 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same (Alderman of Westgate)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4 (x2), 7 , 6 and 5 ½ pence</td>
<td>26 ½ pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The heirs of Serun de Boetune</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stupe</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16 pence</td>
<td>16 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Tollun</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32 pence</td>
<td>32 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip son of Godesman</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master William Airteil</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13 pence</td>
<td>13 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance, daughter of Humphrey</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9 pence (x2)</td>
<td>18 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes, daughter of Humphrey</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9 pence (x2)</td>
<td>18 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, son of William</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9 ½ pence (x2)</td>
<td>19 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger, son of ...</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 ½ pence (x2)</td>
<td>37 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William de Valeneines</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8 pence (x2)</td>
<td>16 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara, daughter of Dunstan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma, wife of Roger Rossa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William blampeyn</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same (William blampeyn)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen, son of Lefwin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 pence</td>
<td>18 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of ... goldsmith</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmund Polre</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, son of Robert</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V...merchant</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>10 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke the moneyer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 pence (x2)</td>
<td>36 pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital of St Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 ½ pence</td>
<td>3 ½ pence</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital of St Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 ½ pence</td>
<td>24 ½ pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, son of Robert</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>4 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict Judeus</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Berebread</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16 (x2) and 2 pence</td>
<td>34 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital of St Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 pence (x2)</td>
<td>32 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William de Elmereston</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10 pence (x2)</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of Walter Boet</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boniface, son of Henry</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2 pence</td>
<td>2 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, son of Robert</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deubeneve Judeus</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15 and ¾ pence</td>
<td>15 ¾ pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bucke</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7 pence (x2)</td>
<td>14 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin ...</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2 pence</td>
<td>2 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam, son of Richard the minister</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16 pence</td>
<td>16 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, son of Henry the sacristan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11, 6 and 12 pence</td>
<td>29 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of Samuel de Rumenal</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (x3) and 13 pence</td>
<td>49 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Almoner</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>7 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph the goldsmith</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 pence (x4)</td>
<td>72 pence</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert de Berham</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2 ½ pence (x2)</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph de pozra</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5 ½ (x3), 3 ½ and 8 ½ pence</td>
<td>28 ½ pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William de Wayn</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2 pence</td>
<td>2 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name crossed out)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50 pence</td>
<td>50 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Amounts</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Silvestre</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13, 6 ½ and 126 ½ pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas de Valeneines</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>102 (x3) and 102 ½ pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of ... goldsmith</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 ½ pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cokin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas de Valeneines</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Silvestre</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Silvestre</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4 ½ and 2 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina de Stabulo</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of Henry ampollar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Treed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50 pence</td>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphege ...</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66 ½ pence (x4)</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence (x4)</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence (x4)</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel daughter of Ingelnulph</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same (Isabel daughter of Ingelnulph)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora daughter of Ingelnulph</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24 ½ pence (x4)</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of ... goldsmith</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same (Heirs of the goldsmith)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same (Heirs of the goldsmith)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin of Burgate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen of Aldi...</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2 ½ pence</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William ...</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 and 2 pence</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns of St Sepulchres</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3 ½ pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William ...</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of ...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 ½ pence</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same William</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8 pence</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Terru</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John son of Robert</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22 and 11 pence</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Almoner</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13 (x2 and 19 ½ pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perruis couef</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 pence (x4)</td>
<td>St Alphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of Simon de Tuna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same (Heirs of Simon de Tuna)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (x2) and 6 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Roger de Boueon</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman of Westgate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswald, monk</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Puerech</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16 and 1 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna de Planaz</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30 ½ (x2) and 16 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maud de ...</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12 (x2) and 17 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17 and 5 ½ pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Terri</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20 pence</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirs of</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 pence (x2)</td>
<td>St Mary Bredman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Three: Women and Migration to Canterbury

3a) A map showing where women have migrated from.
Appendix Three: Women and Migration in Canterbury

3b) Table of women and the towns which they are associated with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felicia, daughter of William Birchington</td>
<td>Birchington-on-Sea</td>
<td>12.2 miles</td>
<td>CCA-DCc-ChAnt/C/1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan, daughter of Thomas Wingate</td>
<td>Wingate (Durham)</td>
<td>311.9 miles</td>
<td>CCA-DCc-ChAnt/M/278B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma of Eastesture</td>
<td>East Stour (Ashford)</td>
<td>15 miles</td>
<td>CCA-DCc-Register/E/292-295/295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary of Lewes</td>
<td>Aidisham</td>
<td>8.8 miles</td>
<td>CCA-DCc-ChAnt/C/778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel de Dunham</td>
<td>Dunham, Greater Manchester</td>
<td>256 miles</td>
<td>Select Cases From the Ecclesiastical Courts of the Province of Canterbury, c.1200-1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice de Lyttleburne</td>
<td>Littlebourne</td>
<td>4.9 miles</td>
<td>CCA-DCc-SVSB/3/51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan de Otterynden’</td>
<td>Otterden</td>
<td>16.5 miles</td>
<td>CCA-DCc-SVSB/3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice, wife of Adam le Shywerte of Sandwich</td>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>13.7 miles</td>
<td>CCA-DCc-ChAnt/C/988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elveva, daughter of William del Blen</td>
<td>Blean</td>
<td>2.9 miles</td>
<td>CCA-DCc-Register/E/592-620/593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan, widow of Thomas Hakynton</td>
<td>Hackington</td>
<td>2.9 miles</td>
<td>CCA-DCc-Register/E/225-237/237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes, widow of Nicholas Kenecurt</td>
<td>Kentchurch</td>
<td>239 miles</td>
<td>CCA-DCc-ChAnt/C/907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godeleif, daughter of Salomonis de Froudic</td>
<td>Fordwich</td>
<td>2.6 miles</td>
<td>1206 Rental (Urry – Rental F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecila, daughter of Goduini Bradhefed</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>257 miles</td>
<td>1206 Rental (Urry – Rental F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c) Table of distances which the women have migrated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from Canterbury</th>
<th>Number of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 miles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 miles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 miles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 20 miles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 miles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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