

Crossing The River: Of Whores and Watermen

Clare Atfield, University of Nottingham

Introduction

As a cultural perspective on the movements of local Londoners, this paper seeks to examine the nature of the River Thames as a boundary of propriety, behaviour, and acceptance in late-medieval and Tudor London. The chronological period for this study is the atypical continuum of the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries; whores and watermen are placed together in texts concerning movement and criminal or sinful behaviour. The geography is narrowly confined to the wards of the City of London adjoining London Bridge and the southern suburb of Southwark. London Bridge was the physical link across the river, but it was the work of the watermen to provide access for the multitudes seeking pleasure, commerce, or escape outside the bourns of London. Known for its Stews, and the women who frequented them, Southwark was an area outside the jurisdiction of the Mayor of London. The movements of whores and criminals relied on watermen who provided a more efficient access to the south bank of the Thames than London Bridge. The following discussion does not focus on the widely discoursed movements of the wealthy, but on the movements of the poor, illiterate, undocumented, unwelcome local people, revealing how the watermen were essential to both the transport over and trespass of the River Thames.

Watermen, a term encompassing both ferrymen and boatmen, were local labourers who provided the important links of transportation. They were also damned as the accomplices of whores and villains, and undoubtedly many were. However, a reading of the sixteenth-century documents of rates and docks of the Waterman's Company demonstrates how the illicit became legitimate with the rise and fall of whoredom in medieval and early-modern London. The Waterman's Company rates, transcribed by the author, are included as an appendix.

The *Liber Albus* (the White Book), a fifteenth-century rulebook, compiles the customs and laws of the City of London, and provides a valuable textual reference for the expected behaviours of London's citizens. Amongst the laws against thieves and whores (courtesans in the Victorian edition by Riley), a declaration on boatmen states:

Of Boatmen: And it is provided, that no boatman shall have his boat moored or standing over the water after sunset; but that they shall have all their boats moored on this side of the river, that so thieves and misdoers may not be carried by them under pain of imprisonment; nor may they carry any man nor woman, either denizens or strangers, unto the Stews, except in daytime, under pain of imprisonment (Riley 1861:242).

Laws are not created without precedence, and not without questions. What was happening in the City and across the River that warranted this restrictive access? Were they trying to solve the problem of trafficking women or fugitives? Did they recognize the issue of only one bridge in the busy metropolis as a limitation on transportation? In a city without a recognized police force until the eighteenth century, how did the civic authorities expect to reinforce the above ordinance? Who used the river, and how? In the course of this study, geography, practice, and people will combine with petitions, permissions, decrees, and regulations to answer these questions.

Bridges and Boats

The geography of the English capital lends itself to segregation, which was recognized in the control of prostitution. The River Thames, rising tidal to Staines, was not fordable. Here, geography and history collide as the natural landscape changed with human encroachment into, and onto, the River. A ferry once existed near the site of London Bridge (Harrison 2004:64). As London grew in the twelfth century, it became evident that a permanent bridge was necessary. Sources on the building, endowments, upkeep, and maintenance of the Bridge are in the Bridge House archival records, named for the building constructed for the administration of London Bridge. These include primarily deeds on local property and the

income of endowments for the upkeep of the Bridge. They relate little about the boats and ferries that must have been in extensive use on the River. Instead, they establish the occupations and crafts of those living and working on the Bridge.

London Bridge was a ward and a community unto itself. 'With a stone gate at its south end, a tower to the north, and a drawbridge near the middle', the Bridge was a formidable structure with a considerable traffic density. With gates, houses, shops, a chapel, tower, and drawbridge, the busy twenty foot wide structure had only a twelve foot roadway. It would not have been an easy passage from the north to the south banks of the River Thames via the Bridge (Christianson 1987:3-4). However, illustrations of London Bridge do show considerable water traffic, including many smaller craft use for local transportation. Christianson lists John Norden, C. J. Visscher, Wenceslaus Hollar, and Thomas Wyck as sixteenth- and seventeenth-century artists who captured views of London Bridge (Christianson 1987:3).

Though the Bridge had replaced a ferry, small boats – either tidal or wherry – were the preferred vehicles to avoid the bustle of the Bridge. Subterfuge, illicit movements, and fugitive escapes via the Bridge would not have been as easy as coercing the waterman into crossing the River at night. Boats were the vehicles for whores and their clients and for criminals who sought sanctuary, official or otherwise, on the southern shore of the Thames, away from the laws and jurisdiction of London. Early in the history of suburban whoredom, watermen were firmly associated with the traffic of sin and villainy.

The above quotation on boatmen demonstrates the complexities that arise from the lack of permanent ferries on the Thames in the centre of late medieval London. Having only two means to navigate the river, Londoners were limited to using the Old Bridge or water transportation. Significantly, due to the tides, there were no medieval ferries or another bridge on the Thames below Kingston until the eighteenth century when Putney Bridge was built in 1729 when the 'technical progress' of the Industrial Revolution enabled this to happen (Harrison 2004:151).

In comparison to the ferries, boatmen were not fixed by one point. By the mid-sixteenth century, the Watermen's Company had established fixed fares for passengers on different types of watercraft. The records are invaluable not only for the rates listed, but also for the landing sites. For example, Pepper Alley, in Southwark, was adjacent to west of London Bridge. Landing sites were spots along the riverside where piers or wharves were built to accommodate the transfer of persons or goods to the watercraft. From the Watermen's Company records, known landings included: Paul's Wharf, St. Katherine's, Purflete, Kingston, Gravesend, Windsor, Woolwich, Grays Thorock, Raynam, Greenwich, Whitehall, Westminster, Limehouse, the Three Cranes, Pepper Alley, Queenhithe, Paris Garden, Blackfriars, Whitefriars, Temple Bridge, Chelsea, Putney, Fulham, Cheswick, Richmond, Hampton Court, Toddington, and Sheperton.

Watermen

Watermen did not leave a significant mark on history. There is little by way of archaeological or documentary evidence for these occupations. The fabric of boats themselves have been discussed with examinations of transportation, however, the historiography of watermen is very limited. Ferryman and boatmen were different creatures, though they served the same purpose. Boatmen used small water craft for local travel between docks on both banks of the Thames. Ferries were flat barges fixed between two points on either side of a river and used ropes or chains, pulled manually or by horses, to move people and goods across the waterway.

In the seventeenth century, a legend concerning the last London ferryman on the Thames had evolved and was printed in 1637. *The True History of the Life and Sudden Death of old John Overs, the rich Ferry-man of London*, provides a history for the disappearance of Thames ferries, the building of London Bridge, and foundation of St. Mary Overie's Church, Southwark. Unfortunately, the reliability of the narrative is clouded by its overt religious morals on covetousness, greed, and avarice. The story relates that miserly

John Overs died while faking his own death as a means to save a few pennies on food for the day of his mourning. His daughter, Mary, inherited his substantial estate earned from the ferry, but gave property, income, and her name to found the Southwark church of St. Mary Overy and the building of London Bridge. The narrator takes the opportunity to give a history of 'the foundation, the building, the antiquity, and some remarkable accidents that have happened upon the same' (Anon 1637:16). For veracity, the narrator names Bartholomew Linsted, the last Prior of St. Mary Overy, as the source of the true history. According to the Prior, a ferry had been 'kept in place where the Bridge is now builded[sic]' (Anon 1637:17). The church still exists, but no sources confirm the existence of the Prior. Though without historical substance, the legends give insight into London's self-awareness of the loss of the ferries, the development of the Bridge, and the mayorial attempt to regulate the misbehaviours of others through the restriction of the watermen. The Puritanical offences of a spend-thrift miser had replaced aiding and abetting of thieves and whores. The south bank provided a space for activities unwelcome in the City.

The Southbank

The presence of the Bridge from the early thirteenth century (it was completed in 1209 after 33 years of work) probably fostered the growth of Southwark, a suburb on the Southbank that supplied the City of London with employees, goods, and services. It consisted of the Guildable Manor (the vicinity surrounding the bridgehead) with Winchester Palace in the western Manor of the Clink and Paris Garden beyond, and to the east was St. Thomas' Hospital in Great Liberty and Bermondsey to the east of it. In the sixteenth century, what is now Borough High Street was known as Long Southwark (Carlin 1966:22, 39). The south bank, unlike today, did not have an embankment, but was a marshland, suited for the maintenance of ponds, and the plenitude of fresh water was used by the bathhouses. During the fourteenth century two industries arose on the Bishop of Winchester's manor: fishponds and bathhouses, both known as 'stews' (Carlin 1996:49). By the end of the fourteenth

century the word 'stews' has lost its meaning of fishponds and bathhouses and had become synonymous with brothels. It was appropriated in popular literature, as demonstrated by the poetry of William Langland.

Right so Piers the Plowman
Peyneth hym to tilye
As wel for a wastour
And wenches of the stewes
(Wright 1856: Passus xix, l. 430-433)

The date of the poem (c.1360-1390) fits with Carlin's date of the fourteenth century as the naissance of the Stews as a location of human geography rather than the site of fishponds and bathhouses. As a consequence of both the human and physical geography of the Southbank, Southwark was given the epithet of the Stews.

A map drawn of Southwark in c.1542 (London, Public Record Office MS MPC 64), when paired with Carlin's work, pinpoints two features that concern Southwark's whoredom: the local streets and local public houses. Outside the mayoral jurisdiction of London and the town's restrictions on whores and brothels, bathhouses could extend their services without much interference.

Jurisdictional control was in the hands of the bishop of Winchester, who had ecclesiastical authority over the whole area and held particular interest in the Stews: the successive bishops rented properties of brothel owners or individual 'single women' (Karras 1996:41-42), and this interest gave rise to the local term for whores as Winchester's Geese.

The River brought travellers from Europe, and further afield to London, but also from the local area. People were 'drawn by the royal court, the law courts, parliament, the international port and marketplace, and all the miscellaneous enticements of the metropolis' (Carlin 1996:196). One illustration of London Bridge by John Norden (c.1600) depicts the heads of public enemies atop spikes on the gatehouse. The visual presence of the consequence of crime at the entrance to the capital was an attempt to reinforce the position of power that city fathers had over its citizenry. By restricting the movements of people

across the Thames through the control of river and bridge traffic, the secular authorities were able to present a front of competent control over potential threats to the City. The area had a reputation for the filth and stench of misbehaviour and noisome activity. It was the home of dyers, launderers, brewers, boatmen, fishmongers, net and rope makers, sailors; all those who used the water of the Thames occupationally. It was the centre of the smelliest, dirtiest occupations in medieval life such as lyme-burning, salt-petre-making, tanning, and fulling (Carlin 1996:178, 254). And, not unpredictably, Southwark became synonymous with the morally dubious. An examination of several texts demonstrates how easily Londoners undermined the city authorities.

Extensive numbers of wealthy travellers were motivated to journey for political, religious, or social reasons. By far, these were the legitimate, the safe, the innocuous, and the clean reasons to travel. Pilgrimage, court sessions, pleasure/boredom, visiting, and shopping probably brought multitudes of nobility, gentry, and the well-heeled into London. If, however, they missed curfew, they had to remain outside the City until the morning. Coming from the south, Southwark's many inns, taverns, and entertainments, some more, or less, reputable, accommodated and occupied visitors.

Public houses – taverns, inns, and hostels – do not appear to have bourn distinguishing marks; most had rooms, rented by negotiation. There was little to differentiate the honest tavern or alehouse from a brothel. Bawds – pimps – were frequently witnessed 'at the sign' of various taverns, with such names as the Rose, the Fleur de Lyse, the Bull, the Tower, the Bell (Karras 1996:52, 60, 99). The names do not give these public houses away as bawdy houses, but their location does. The Fleur de Lyse and the Bell were found in the triangle of land between Love Lane, Maiden Lane, and the south bank of the Thames (map in Carlin 1996:27). From the thirteenth century, the brothels and taverns drew men and women looking for pleasure or work (Carlin 1996:211). In a self-perpetuating cycle, whores solicited in taverns and men went there to look for them (Martin 2001:66-67).

As the City continued to grow in the sixteenth century, new amusements drew the crowds of London. Prostitution was criminalized in the 1550s and theatres, dog pits, and bear baiting replaced whoredom as prostitutes were forced underground and into a prosecuted position in the new state. The newly emerging theatres, bear gardens, and dog pits provided other pursuits for those who could afford the time and little money necessary. One such example happened within a year or two of the dissolution of the monasteries when 'complaints were made in the manor court of Southwark that Sir Anthony Browne had opened a public bowling green in the close and was allowing gambling there' (Roberts and Godfrey 1950:43).

Laundresses, Prostitutes and Criminals

Sin and putrescence are joint in the Old English word *hore* meaning 'dirt, filth, defilement, foulness' (OED 1989). Though this meaning was in use a few centuries before the recording of 'whore', the two terms appear as cognates from the twelfth century. In London, 1494, Cecily Clerk was accused as 'a strong hor of her tong', a conflation of spelling, 'loose speech and sexual misbehavior [sic]' (McSheffry 1998:271). The two terms inform the connection between malodour and the olfactory description of common occupations and common women.

A personification of the above combination, the laundress was a figure of movement, cleanliness, and sexual misbehaviour, making her an obvious target for legislation and degradation. While the inclusion of laundresses may seem incongruous in this context, washerwomen were regularly affiliated with prostitution. The laundress is a figure who represents how movements – in particular those of women, and more so of poor women – were controlled and restricted. By necessity, her occupation brought her in contact with water, and having access to the Thames made her conspicuous. It was not only for alliteration that the words 'lecherie' and 'lauendere' so often deemed to be synonymous (Rawcliffe 2009:157-158). 'Both the prostitute and the laundress had some connection with

filth, but laundresses most likely acquired a reputation for prostitution because they were among the few women who frequently came and went from all-male households' (Karras 1996:54).

The language of whoredom entered respectable literature. Geoffrey Chaucer replaced *meretrix* (whore) with *lavendere* (washerwoman) when re quoting Dante in his poem *The Legend of Good Women*: 'Envie ys lavendere of the court alway' (Higgins 1995:119). The nexus of soiled linen, washing, and whoredom transfers from the prostitute to the laundress with ease. Medieval towns frequently 'set aside particular places where clothes might be washed, and, in some cases, erected shelters for the storage of tubs and other basic equipment ... at 'le levenderebrigge' on the Thames in London [or] on marginal or contested land' (Rawcliffe 2009:154). One fifteenth-century ordinance demonstrates the customary rights of access, the restrictions of movement, and the use of the Thames by working-classes people like laundresses:

[...] many persons dwelling in the City and the suburbs of London, more consulting and attending to their private profit and advantage than to the common good and convenience, do hold certain wharves and stairs on the bank of the Thames, [...] without having any licence, or paying any thing to the community for the same; [...] these persons do make new customs and imposts upon the poor common people, who time out of mind have there fetched and taken up their water, and washed their clothes, [...] and demanding and taking from such as resort thereto, from some one halfpenny, and from others one penny, two, or more, by the quarter, to the great injury of all the commonalty, [...] no person who dwells on the bank of the Thames, or other person whatsoever, having or holding any wharf or stair, situate or encroaching upon the common soil, to which there has been, or been accustomed to be, common resort of the people heretofore for such needs as aforesaid, shall from henceforth disturb, hinder, or molest, any one in fetching, drawing, and taking water, or in beating and washing their clothes, or in doing and executing other reasonable things and needs there; or shall demand or take, privily or openly, from any person any manner of sum or piece of money, [...] on pain of imprisonment,

and of making fine, at the discretion of the Mayor and Aldermen, every time that he who has or holds any such wharf or stair shall be lawfully convicted of having done to the contrary hereof (Riley 1868: Letter-Book I. fol. cxciij).

Written in 1417, this legislation affirmed the traditional rights of the poor, but also those who needed the river water for their occupations, like the laundresses. Such written documentation on access informs how movement to and around the Thames was closely guarded. Ironically, the ordinance on forbidding the exclusive rights to the River is included between one on the abolition of the stews and one preventing tenants of 'evil and vicious life', a euphemism for whoredom. While the regulations were put in place for the benefit of 'the poor common people', it was a supplement to the authorities' attempt of 1321 to restrict movements and access to the River by less salubrious types:

And that no ship or boat shall moor or lie to at night, elsewhere than in the hythes of Billyngesgate and Queen Hythe, from sunset, namely, to sunrise. And that two good and strong boats shall be provided on the Thames at night, with armed men, on the one side of London Bridge, towards the West, and two boats on the other side, towards the East; so as to guard the water by night, and watch that no one may enter this part of the City to do mischief; and, if they see peril, to warn the people of those Wards which are keeping guard upon the water (Riley 1868: Letter-Book E. fol. cxix).

Despite the reputation of the Stews, Southwark provided accommodation for countless travellers journeying south of London, or to the ports of the coast. *The Paston Letters* provide a comparison of further details of accommodation sought by the gentle family or their associates when travelling to London. One J. Payn specified 'The Whyte Harte' in 'Suthewerk' when he wrote to John Paston in 1465 informing Paston of his new 'raiments' (Davis 1976:314). Henry Windsor recommended the Boar's Head in Bankside to John Paston (Davis 1976:175) and evidently, there was nothing to detract from the Boar's Head at the time of writing in the summer of 1458. By nature, not all inns could have been dishonest, however, one could perhaps surmise that additional services provided at the Southwark inns were not worth the paper and ink to mention them. As with the public houses mentioned

above, the location of the White Hart and The Boar's Head were amongst the low houses on Long Southwark.

A local clientele alone could not sustain Southwark's Stews. There were just too many whores. The clients for the brothels could not all have come primarily from Southwark, or even Surrey, but would have come from London and abroad via boat or bridge. Male travellers who came to London for the legitimate reasons of the courts and markets could combine business with an illicit side trip to Southwark for the pleasures it afforded. The Stews developed in response to the demands made by so many travellers to London, particularly the 'alien' merchants and sailors who went through the medieval port (Goldberg 1999:184). The River Thames, initially providing a boundary to prostitution, had become a conduit for clients and whores.

A petition to the Bishop of Winchester, William Waynflete, demonstrates how permeable the boundary of the Thames was to the trafficking of naïve women, a source of new whores to the Stews. In 1473-4, Elyn Boteler wrote a letter petitioning for her release from Winchester's prison. She describes that her current circumstances, in the Bishop's prison, were not of her own fault. Through the kind reference of a woman, Elyn was encouraged into domestic service for Thomas Bowde. He brought her to the riverside and by boat they arrived at his house in the Stews. Bowde's name is not dissimilar to 'bawd' and in his home, 'there he wold have compelled her to do such service as his other servauntez done there, but this she utterly refused to do, and had lever dye then to be of that disposicion' (Carlin 1996:223). Bowde took out an action of trespass when she protested, putting poor Elyn into debt, and into prison. There are no records of the subsequent events. The boat that brought the abused Elyn Boteler to the Stews of Southwark would have been identical to the wherries bringing clients south across the river and whores north. One Thomas Togood was also indicted for recruiting women by offering them domestic positions 'to become his servants, and to have been common within his house at the Stews' (Carlin 1996:223).

This trafficking was just one reason that Stew holders were banned from owning boats. Ruth Mazo Karras suggests that it was also to protect the customer from inflated prices (Karras 1996:40). Whatever the reason, the same boatmen would have brought felons and criminals, and anyone else seeking sanctuary, to Southwark.

In 1339, 'two boatmen stood before the court of aldermen for allegedly rowing *diversos malefactors et pacis domini regis perturbatores* across the Thames at night – probably to Southwark, where the most notorious brothels in England beckoned' (Rexroth 2007:47). These 'diverse evildoers and disturbers of the king's peace' were frequently associated with the stews of the south bank, where women would harbour their men and their goods. 'Women are, then as now, in a particularly vulnerable position to become receivers, for they most often welcome into their homes felonious husbands, lovers, and children along with their stolen goods' (Hanawalt 1974:261). Receiving and harbouring were demonstrably female felonies associated with criminal movements, as the invitation into the home was an attempt to protect the criminal from persecution.

More effective legal sanctuary could be found in churches. Westminster and the City were both known to have places of sanctuary (Carlin 1996:116), but the sanctuary of the Paris Garden liberty of Southwark provided an additional bonus: it was outside of the limits, and therefore the jurisdiction, of the Mayor of London. By crossing the River, any person wishing to escape persecution in the City could be free after a year and a day. The law that was initially for runaway serfs became the loophole of thieves and murders.

The association between criminality and prostitution is found reiterated in the records detailing of the freedoms of sanctuary offered by the Hospitallers in Paris Garden churches. The regulations of the Hospitallers for any misbehaviour are particularly interesting as they reinforce the affiliation of whoredom with criminality and the movements of fugitives. These regulations, drawn up in 1420, laid down that individuals seeking sanctuary should register their name and reason, and pay the 6d fee. Penalties were laid on anyone found entertaining whores within the liberty, consisting of a fine of 6s 8d and the loss of the privilege of

sanctuary (Carlin 1996:114-115). There are no accounts of how often this happened.

Sanctuary, like many of ecclesiastical institutions, collapsed with the dissolution of the monasteries. 'Permanent sanctuary survived for four more years, though the legislation of 1536 pruned its privileges, required fugitives to wear badges for identification, and imposed curfews' (Kaufman 1984:468).

The life of one *diverso malefactor* has been reconstructed from several Southwark documents (Carlin 1996:250). The career of Robert Allen 'illustrates how Southwark's inns, drinking-houses, prisons, and brothels formed a fertile matrix for criminal activity'. He began as a stable-boy in 1529, when theft led to imprisonment in the Marshalsea, before keeping a 'bawdy house for thieves and masterless men'. Eight years later he assaulted the wife of a man called Harrison, who was walking alone down Maiden Lane in Bankside. Bankside was known from as late as the fourteenth century for its brothels (Carlin 1996:220). An analysis of street names of medieval English towns within a context of prostitution, has shown street names 'arose in the first place because for contemporaries they conveyed accurately these streets' perceived, predominant character' (Holt and Baker 2001:202). The streets of Southwark have a resonance with the services offered by its inhabitants. It is unlikely that a man or woman would have lost themselves down Gropecunt Lane and been surprised with what they found. Mrs. Harrison knew where she was walking and any woman alone was vulnerable to such attacks.

Such career criminals as Robert Allen were not an anomaly. Many worked in conjunction with whores, and contemporaries affiliated the low, disreputable locals with one another.

Of thieves and courtesans – And whereas thieves and other persons of light and bad repute are often, and more commonly, received and harboured in the houses of women of evil life within the City than elsewhere, through whom evil deeds and murders, by reason of such harbouring, do often happen, and great evils and scandals to the people of the City (Riley 1868:268).

Another example from the *Liber Albus*, the above ordinance then states that if any such person should be found within the City, they were to be expelled or imprisoned for forty days.

By its very legislation, the City of London encouraged Southwark to develop as the melting pot of undesirables from the City. The movements of *disverso malefactor*s were directed across the River in an attempt to cleanse London of the *hore* with whom they were unwilling to interact. Whores were included with the *pacis domini regis perturbatores* because prostitution was legally classified as a breach of public order (a secular misdemeanour) rather than sexual deviance (a religious offence). The jurisdiction of prostitution was changed with location, and therefore crossing the River would determine the persecuting court.

Locals were not all bad, and some protested the corruption of the Bishop of Winchester's court. In the early sixteenth century, Alice Skelling 'complained that [Winchester's] jurors were 'only bawds and watermen, who regard neither God nor their conscience but their own appetite and the pleasure of the great officers of the court' (Karras 1996:39-40). Local honest citizens of Southwark were obviously frustrated by the hypocrisy of men of the courts who profited from their posts. Local respectable people witnessed corruption and ill life of watermen, whores, and thieves.

Conclusion

The legislation controlling the movements of men and women in London was based on a reaction to the disruptive behaviours of laundresses, prostitutes, and criminals. Watermen were, therefore, considered to be of a less reputable character because their occupation facilitated the movements of such people from the City to the suburbs by transporting them across the Thames. It is evident from the fare records that travelling across the River by boat would have cost a traveller at least a penny. Wages for women agricultural workers averaged at thirty-five to forty-five shillings (700-900 pence) per annum compared to the

meagre fourteen to eighteen shillings (280-360 pence) for laundresses (Karras 1996:79). In comparison, a whore could earn four pence per trick. This leads to the conclusion that it was not the whores that were using or abusing the watermen's services, but the clients of whores and the criminal elements.

Ordinances and regulations dictated the wishes of the elders of London, who attempted to exclude whores from the City itself whilst still benefiting from the rents and fines on the stews, whores, and bawds in Southwark, that place of dirty work and dubious morals.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Anonymous, *The True History of Life and Sudden Death of Old John Overs, the rich Ferryman of London* (London, 1637)

Davis, N. (ed.), *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century*, Part II (Oxford Clarendon, 1976)

Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd Edition (1989) <http://dictionary.oed.com/>

Riley, H. T. (ed.), *Liber Albus: the White Book of the City of London* (London, 1861)

Riley, H. T. (ed.), *Memorials of London and London Life, 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries: being a series of extracts, local, social, and political, from the early archives of the City of London, A.D. 1276-1419* (London, 1868)

Roberts, H. and Godfrey, W. (eds.), *Survey of London: Volume 22: Bankside: (The Parishes of St Saviour and Christchurch Southwark)* (London, 1950)

Wright, T. (ed.), W. Langland, *The Vision and Creed of Piers Plowman, B Text*, 2nd edition (London, 1856)

Secondary sources

Carlin, M., *Medieval Southwark* (London, 1996)

Christianson, C. P., *Memorials of the Book Trade in Medieval London: The Archives of Old London Bridge* (Woodbridge, 1987)

Goldberg, P. J. P., 'Pigs and Prostitutes: Streetwalking in Comparative Perspective', in K. Lewis (ed.), *Young Medieval Women* (Stroud, 1999), 172-193

Hanawalt, B., 'The Female Felon in Fourteenth-Century England', *Viator*, 5 (1974), 253-268

Harrison, D., *The Bridges of Medieval England: Transport and Society 400-1800* (Oxford, 2004)

Higgins, A., 'Alceste the Washerwoman', in M. T. Tavormina and R. F. Yeager (eds.), *The Endless Knot: Essays on Old and Middle English in Honor of Marie Borroff* (Cambridge, 1995), 113-127

Karras, R. M., *Common Women: Prostitution and Sexuality in Medieval England* (Oxford, 1996)

Kaufman, P. I., 'Henry VII and Sanctuary', *Church History*, 53:4 (1984), 465-476

McSheffrey, S., 'Jurors, Respectable Masculinity, and Christian Morality: A Comment on Marjorie McIntosh's *Controlling Misbehavior*', *The Journal of British Studies*, 37 (1998), 269-278

Martin, L., *Alcohol, Sex, and Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Basingstoke, 2001)

Rawcliffe, C., 'A Marginal Occupation? The Medieval Laundress and her Work', *Gender & History*, 21 (2009), 147-169

Rexroth, F., *Deviance and Power in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge, 2007)

Appendix: The Watermen's Company

The Society of Antiquities hold five pages of fares for the Watermen's Company, printed in 1555. Now held by the Early English Books Online, of the five pages, two are the same printing, and three are variations. The three variations are named for simplicity: A, T, and I, after their initial letters. The three documents are reproduced below, following as closely as possible the spelling and syntax of the original.

A –

The Prices and Rates that
euerye perticuler perfon ovveth to pay for his fayre or paffage,
unto Watermen, or Whyrrymen from Londō to Grauef-
ende, and likewise from Grauefende to London, and to
euery comen landing place, between the fayd two places and the
rates and prices alfo of an hole fare in a whyrye, Tylte
Bote, or tyde Bote, to and from any of the faid
places hereafter breyfelye
appeareth.

from London to Grauefend	A Passenger in the common Barge In a Tytle Boate with foure ores Item for the hole fare of a Whyrre to or fro cither of the fayde places.	ii d. .iiii.d. ii.s.
Grenethyth and grayes Thoroke	A passinger in a tyde boate so that there be twcine in number. The hole fare of a Tylte boate with iiii ores and a steersman. And of a whyrrye with two ores.	i.d. vi.s. xx.d.
Purflete	A passinger in a tyde bote so there be ten in number. The hole fare of a tylt boate with foure ores and a fteerfman. A whyrrey with two ores.	i.d v.s xvii.d.
Raynam Erythe	A passynger in the tyde boate. The hole fare of a tylte boate with foure ores & a fterefman. And of a whyrrey with two ores.	i.d. v.s. xvi.d
Wolwich	A passinger in the tyde boate. The hole fare of a whyrrey with two ores.	i.d. xii.d
Grenewiche	The whole fare of a whyrrey with ii.ores with the tyde. And agaynft the tyde.	viii.d xii.d.
from Rat life to gren wiche.	The hole fare of a whyrrey with ii.ores with the tyde. And against the tyde.	iiii.d. vi.d.
from London to Rat life or lyme houe	The hole fare of a whyrrey with ii.ores with the tyde. And against the tyde.	iiii.d. vi.d.
from Lid key or. S. Diaues	The hole fare of a whyrrey with two ores to S. Katerins or Radryff or other places of lyke dyftaunce.	ii.d.
A commer into ani boate by the way.	No perfon that shal com aborde of any of the faid boates by the way betwene London and Grauefend, shal paye for hys fare aboue the pryce afore lymytte.	

T -

The Rates and Pryces that euery pertyculer perfon
oweth to paye for his fare or passage unto Watermen or Whir
reymen from London Brydge to Wyndefoure, and likewyfe from
Wyndefoure to London Brydge, and to euerye common
landing place betwene the fame two places
hereafter is breifely declared.

frō thoid fwā Peper ally f. ma ry oueries, or y three Cranes. fro poules wha rfe quenehith pa	The hole fare of whyrrey with ii.ores. to Westminster, Lam beth, Whitehall, or other place of like distaunce to or fro. The hole fare of a whyrrey with two ores to Westminster, or Whytehall or other place of lyke distaunce.	iiii.d iii.d.
---	--	----------------------

<p>rifh garden or y Blacke frieres. From y white fryers or Tem- ple Bridge. From y white fryers or Tem- ple Brydge. Frō paules whar fe, parifh gardē the blacke friiers or whitefryers. Crossing the Ryuer.</p> <p>From London Brydge to chel- fey to and fro. From London to Putney, ful- ham or barnel- nies to and fro. From Londō to chelfey or a like diftaūce to & fro From chelfwike or Mortlake or lyke dyftaunce to or fro. From londō to brayneford thi- fteiworth rych- mond banke, or twyckenham, to and fro. From londō to kingfton or tud- dington to & fro From londō to hamton Courte to and fro. From londō to otelāds to & fro. from londō to Sonbery Wiltō ſheapertō, Way bridge, Otelāds chartfeye or ftanes to or fro. From londō to Windefoure to and fro.</p>	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey with two ores to Whythall or Weft minfter, to or fro.</p>	.ii.d.
	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey twi two ores to Saint Mary Oue reys, Pepper Alley, or the iii.cranes to or fro.</p>	.ii.d.
	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey with two ores to or fro Lambeth.</p>	iii.d
	<p>A whyrrey with two ores for croffynge ouer the Ryver betwene London Brydge and Weftmifter.</p>	i.d
	<p>A Sculler for lyke labour.</p>	ob.
	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey with ores.</p>	vi.d
	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey with ores.</p>	x.d
	<p>The hole fare of a Tylte boate with .iiii. ores and a Sterefman for one Daye.</p>	v.s
	<p>The hole fare of a tittle boate with foure ores and a ſterefman for one daye.</p>	vi.s
	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey with ores.</p>	xvi.d
	<p>Of a tytle boate with .iiii. ores and a ſterefman for one day.</p>	vi.s.
	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey with ores.</p>	xviii.d.
	<p>And of a tytle boate with .iiii.ores and a ſterfman to or fro the fayde places also to and fro Todingtō & Kingfton for one day.</p>	vi.s.viii .d
	<p>The fare of one perfonne in the common tylte boate of the fayde town.</p>	iiii.d

	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey with ores.</p>	xx.d,
	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey with ores.</p>	ii.s.
	<p>And of the tylte boate with .iiii.ores and a ſterefman.</p>	viii.s
	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey with ores.</p>	iii.s
	<p>The hole fare of a tylte boate with .iiii.ores and a ſterefman.</p>	ix.s

	<p>The hole fare of a whyrrey to or for with ores.</p>	iiii.s
	<p>And of a tylte boate with .iiii.ores and a ſterefman.</p>	x.

I -

The prices of Fares and
paſſages to be payde unto Watermen from London to Grauefende, and
LikeWife from Grauefende to London, and to euerye com-
mon place betwene. And alſo betwene London Brydge
and Wyndefoure, and ſo to euery common place of

landyng betwene London Brydge and
Wyndefoure.

- In Primis that noo owner or occupier of the
common fare of Grauefende barge, fhall take of anye
perfon from London to Grauefende, or contrarye a-
boue two pence for every perfon so as the fame fūme
of two pence for euerye perfon amount to the fūme of iiiij
- Item, that no owner or occupier of any tylte boate with .iiii.ores
and a fterefman, take for his fare from London to Grauefende, to or
fro above foure pence the perfon, so as the fame foure pence a man do
amount to vi.s.viii.d & for euery ore above foure ores to haue xii.d. vj.s.
- Item, that euery owner of occupier of a whirrey from London to
Grauefende to or fro, fhall not take anye more for hys whole fare,
yf he be required then. ij.s.
- Item, that the owner or occupyer of a tyde boate from London to
Grenehue or grayes Thorock, or to any place of like Dyftaunce, fhall
not take of anye one perfonne to or fro aboue a penye, so as the whole
fare mounte to. xij.d.
- Item, for a tilte boate with foure ores and a fterefman to and fro
not aboue.vi.s. and for euery ore above foure ores xii.d. an ore vj.s
- Item, that no whyrrey with two ores take from Londo to Grene
hyue, Grayes Thorock, or lyke Difftaunce to or fro aboue xx.d.
- Item, that no owner or occupyer of any tide boate from London,
to Purflete or lyke difftaunce, to or fro, fhall take of any one perfonne
aboue a penye, so as the whole fare maye amount unto x.d
- Item, for a tylte boate with foure ores and a fterefsman from lon-
don to Erith or Purflete, or like Difftaunce, to or fro, not aboue fyue
fhyllynge for his whole fare. v.s.
- Item, that no wherryman with two ores take from London to
Purflete or lyke difftaunce to or fro aboue. xviiij.d.