

Chapter 1

Regulating Migration in Early Modern Cities: An Introduction

Bert De Munck and Anne Winter

Contrary to earlier views of early modern Europe as an essentially sedentary society, research over the past decades has amply demonstrated that migration was a pervasive characteristic of European society in the early modern period. Many people moved, over various distances, to different destinations, for different reasons and for different periods of time.¹ Only a fraction of all mobility was directed towards towns, but these migrations were of great importance for urban economic and demographic development in the early modern period.² Because early modern cities as a rule recorded more deaths than births, most cities relied on a permanent influx of newcomers in order to maintain their population size, let alone grow.³ In a fast-growing town the majority of the population was likely to have been born outside the city limits, while the proportion of immigrants could easily amount to more than 30 per cent in a relatively stable population.⁴ As most migration was temporary, the total volume of urban immigration and emigration was much higher than the number of urban immigrants at any given

¹ Among others, see: Peter Clark and David Souden (eds), *Migration and Society in Early Modern England* (London, 1987); Steve Hochstadt, 'Migration in Preindustrial Germany', *Central European History*, 16/3 (1983): pp. 195–224; Olwen Hufton, *The Poor of Eighteenth-Century France* (Oxford, 1974) pp. 69–106; Jan Lucassen, *Migrant Labour in Europe 1600–1900: The Drift to the North Sea* (London, 1987); Leslie Page Moch, *Moving Europeans: Migration in Western Europe since 1650* (Bloomington, 2003), pp. 22–101; Daniel Roche, *Humeurs vagabondes. De la circulation des hommes et de l'utilité des voyages* (Paris, 2003); Charles Tilly, 'Migration in Modern European History', in William H. McNeill and Ruth S. Adams, *Human Migration: Patterns and Policies* (Bloomington, 1978), pp. 48–74.

² On recent calculations of the volume of urban immigration in early modern Europe: J. Lucassen and L. Lucassen, 'The Mobility Transition Revisited, 1500–1900: What the Case of Europe Can Offer to Global History', *Journal of Global History*, 4/3 (2009): pp. 347–77.

³ Paul Bairoch, *De Jericho à Mexico. Villes et économie dans l'histoire* (Paris, 1985), pp. 264–71; Jan de Vries, *European Urbanization, 1500–1800* (London, 1984), pp. 175–98; Moch, *Moving Europeans*, pp. 44–6.

⁴ Hochstadt, 'Migration'; Moch, *Moving Europeans*, p. 44.

moment might suggest, and the total proportion of persons engaged in urban migration patterns at some point of their lives was substantial throughout the early modern period.⁵

While the precise demographic contribution of urban migrants remains subject to debate, even critics of the model of urban natural decrease do not question the magnitude of urban migration in the early modern period, or its importance as ‘the linchpin of the urban economy’.⁶ The constant flow back and forth of labourers, domestic servants, tradesmen and artisans played a key role in the development of early modern labour and commodity markets and in the diffusion of technology, and was essential to the working of the urban economy.⁷ Early modern European cities were therefore characterized by permanent flows of migrants in and out of the city, guided by as varied motivations as finding jobs, schooling, patronage, business opportunities, shelter, alms, health care or marriage partners. The existence of a diverse and often temporary group of migrants – both short-distance and long-distance – was an essential element of everyday city life which left an important mark on the demographic, economic, social, political and cultural characteristics of individual cities.

Yet whereas actual patterns of migration to early modern cities have by now received a good deal of attention, the ways in which urban groups and authorities attempted to *influence* and *control* these movements have only recently started to be treated as a subject of historical research, reflection and discussion. Most studies dealing with urban migration policies have so far tended to concentrate either on distinct migrant groups or on specific institutional mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion. Studies of the first type tend to favour migrant communities with distinct ethnic, religious, occupational or wealth characteristics, such as merchant *nations*, Jews, Moriscos, Huguenots and the *compagnonnages*.⁸ While these studies have yielded major insights, urban policies

⁵ de Vries, *European Urbanization*, pp. 200–206, also Moch, *Moving Europeans*, pp. 43–7.

⁶ de Vries, *European Urbanization*, pp. 196–7; Allan Sharlin, ‘Natural Decrease in Early Modern Cities: A Reconsideration’, *Past and Present*, 79/1 (1978): p. 138; Ad van der Woude, ‘Population Developments in the Northern Netherlands (1500–1800) and the Validity of the “Urban Graveyard” Effect’, *Annales de Démographie Historique* (1982): pp. 55–75.

⁷ de Vries, *European Urbanization*, p. 200ff.; Moch, *Moving Europeans*, p. 43ff.

⁸ F.R.P. Ackhurst and Stephanie C. Van D’Elden (eds), *The Stranger in Medieval Society* (Minneapolis, 1997); Jacques Bottin and Donatella Calabi (eds), *Les étrangers dans la ville. Minorités et espace urbain du bas Moyen Âge à l’époque moderne* (Paris, 1999); Donatella Calabi and Stephen Turk Christensen (eds), *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe: Volume 2: Cities and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700* (Cambridge, 2007); Raingard Esser, ‘“They obey all magistrates and all good lawes ... and we thinke our cittie happie to enjoye them”’: Migrants and Urban Stability in Early Modern English Towns’, *Urban History*, 34/1 (2007): pp. 64–75; Jean-Pierre Jessenne (ed.), *L’image de l’autre dans l’Europe du Nord-Ouest à travers l’histoire* (Lille, 1996);

directed towards the large majority of migrants who did *not* belong to any such recognizable (minority) group have received considerably less attention, yielding the unjust impression that regulation was directed mainly at conspicuously ‘different’ newcomers. Studies of the second type have been more attentive to the ways in which the presence of newcomers of *all* types was related to a wide range of local mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion – which were connected, in turn, to a wide range of urban institutions. Collective institutions such as urban citizenship,⁹ guilds,¹⁰ associational life¹¹ and public and private poor relief systems¹² were all characterized by certain legal, social, cultural and/or financial barriers to prospective members, while differential treatment by institutions of control and repression – from policing to tribunals – reinforced distinctions between ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders.’¹³ Yet while many case studies have enhanced our insight into the functioning of these various institutions, they often only

Lien Bich Luu, *Immigrants and the Industries of London, 1500–1700* (Aldershot, 2005); Denis Menjot and Jean-Luc Pinol (eds), *Les immigrants et la ville. Insertion, intégration, discrimination (XIIIe–XXe siècles)* (Paris, 1996); Hugo Soly and Alfons K.L. Thijs (eds), *Minderheden in Westeuropese steden (16de–20ste eeuw)* (Brussels, 1995); Francesca Trivellato, *The Familiarity of Strangers: The Sephardic Diaspora, Livorno, and Cross-Cultural Trade in the Early Modern Period* (New Haven, 2009); Cynthia M. Truant, *The Rites of Labour: Brotherhoods of Compagnonnage in Old and New Regime France* (Ithaca/London, 1994). An early example of a more comprehensive focus: Etienne François (ed.), *Immigration et société urbaine en Europe occidentale, XVIe–XXe siècle* (Paris, 1985).

⁹ Marc Boone and Maarten Prak (eds), *Individual, Corporate and Judicial Status in European Cities (Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period)* (Leuven/Apeldoorn, 1996); Joost Kloek and Karin Tilmans (eds), *Burger. Geschiedenis van het begrip van de Middeleeuwen tot eenentwintigste eeuw* (Amsterdam, 2002); Rainer C. Schwinges (ed.), *Neubürger im Späten Mittelalter. Migration und Austausch in der Städtelandschaft des alten Reiches (1250–1550)* (Berlin, 2002).

¹⁰ Stephan R. Epstein and Maarten Prak (eds) *Guilds, Innovation, and the European Economy, 1400–1800* (Cambridge, 2008); Heinz-Gerhard Haupt (ed.), *Das Ende der Zünfte. Ein europäischer Vergleich* (Göttingen, 2002); Jan Lucassen, Tine de Moor and Jan Luiten van Zanden (eds), *The Return of the Guilds* (Cambridge, 2008); Maarten Prak, Catharina Lis, Jan Lucassen and Hugo Soly (eds), *Craft Guilds in the Early Modern Low Countries: Work, Power and Representation* (Aldershot, 2006).

¹¹ A state of the art in Nicholas Eckstein and Nicholas Terpstra (eds), *Sociability and its Discontents: Civil Society, Social Capital, and their Alternatives in Late-Medieval and Early-Modern Europe* (Turnhout, 2010).

¹² Andreas Gestrich, Lutz Raphael and Herbert Uerlings (eds), *Strangers and Poor People: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion in Europe and the Mediterranean World from Classical Antiquity to the Present Day* (Frankfurt am Main, 2009); Katherine A. Lynch, *Individuals, Families, and Communities in Europe, 1200–1800: The Urban Foundations of Western Society* (Cambridge, 2003).

¹³ Marie-Claude Blanc-Chaléard, Caroline Douki, Nicole Dyonet and Vincent Milliot (eds), *Police et migrants. France, 1667–1939* (Rennes, 2001); Jason P. Coy, *Strangers and Misfits:*

obliquely address their relation to the constant coming and going of migrants, and seldom address the *interactions* between these different institutional mechanisms at the urban level.

To be sure, the observation that urban authorities often sought to attract 'wanted' and repel 'unwanted' migrants is a familiar *topos* in late medieval and early modern urban historiography.¹⁴ Yet the contentious, malleable and multilayered nature of the distinction between 'wanted' and 'unwanted' migrants has so far been insufficiently explored. While rich merchants and invalid beggars were obviously on opposite sides of the distinction, the boundaries between wanted and unwanted migrants were never clear-cut and remained subject to many different interpretations. Institutions such as burghership, guild membership or relief systems all mobilized different repertoires of inclusion and exclusion whose intentions and effects could vary widely through space and time. On close inspection, there has in fact been very little systematic research into the actors, interests and power relations that determined the shifting boundaries between those considered wanted or unwanted, and a comprehensive view of the wide range of institutional mechanisms that governed inclusion and exclusion in early modern towns remains underdeveloped.

The aim of this book is to move beyond the 'selective' perspectives of studies focusing on specific immigrant groups or particular institutions, and to venture into the multilayered and multidimensional reality of urban migration regulation from different local perspectives in order to lay bare the complex interactions of interests, conflicts, actors and negotiations involved in the regulation of migration in different urban contexts of early modern Europe. Because local categories formed the prime organizing principle of social, political and economic regulation, *all* immigration from across the city boundaries is considered part of the research focus, both regional and long-distance, temporary and permanent. And while we use the terms 'policies' and 'regulation' throughout the book, this does not imply that urban authorities necessarily pursued anything like a *conscious* or *coherent* policy with regard to migration. Rather, regulations impinging on migration were often a by-product of interventions in the labour market, housing, policing or welfare arrangements, shaped by the pressures of different urban interest groups and producing a

Banishment, Social Control, and Authority in Early Modern Germany (Leiden, 2008); Daniel Roche (ed.), *La ville promise. Mobilité et accueil à Paris (fin XVIIe–début XIXe siècle)* (Paris, 2000).

¹⁴ See for instance Marc Boone, 'Les villes de l'espace flamand au bas Moyen Âge. Immigrations et migrations internes', in Stéphane Curveiller and L. Buchar (eds), *Se déplacer du Moyen Âge à nos jours* (Calais, 2009), pp. 99–112; Maria R. Boes, 'Unwanted Travellers: The Tightening of City Borders in Early Modern Germany', in Thomas Betteridge (ed.), *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 87–112.

varied and sometimes incongruous range of institutional mechanisms. The main research focus therefore lies with uncovering the interactions between the variety of institutional mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion, and on the interests, conflicts and power relationships that shaped the shifting boundaries between wanted and unwanted migrants.

* * *

This book brings together a range of case studies on the regulation of early modern urban migration in different spatial and historical contexts in order to flesh out the institutional arenas, conflicts and actors in which repertoires of inclusion and exclusion were moulded. The collection is the result of an international workshop on the theme organized in Brussels on 4–5 September 2009, which was a follow-up to a session organized at the IXth International Conference on Urban History in Lyon, 27–30 August 2008. The different chapters address a wide range of historical contexts, and take us from sixteenth-century Antwerp, Ulm, Lille and Valenciennes, over seventeenth-century Berlin, Milan and Rome, to eighteenth-century Strasbourg, Trieste, Paris, London and Antwerp, with comparisons up to the present day.

With each of the chapters addressing the central theme in different ways in distinct urban contexts, together they sketch a varied and lively image of the many ways in which urban authorities and other institutions intervened in the movements of people entering, leaving and inhabiting their city. They bring to the fore how the intricate mix of coercion and conciliation that shaped the local government structure of early modern cities also made room for a certain degree of permanent negotiation and bargaining over the different interests involved. While local elites were themselves not homogeneous groups, they interacted with guilds, relief administrations, central governments, other local authorities, church communities, workers' coalitions, public protesters and other interest groups when devising and bringing into practice local migration policies. At the same time, the studies highlight how policy concerns over migration tended to be concentrated in a number of specific domains which can loosely be grouped under the headings of markets, communal resources and social stability. In their analysis of the 'how' and 'why' of interventions in these domains, the case studies both confirm some existing insights and add up to a number of important new insights which together provide a coherent and stimulating framework for future research.

Markets

It is a familiar observation from existing studies that early modern town authorities often sought to attract wealthy merchants, skilled artisans and other newcomers with resources deemed particularly valuable, and tried to prevent the arrival and settlement of less resourceful migrants whose presence was not considered useful – aspirations which we could translate as attempts to intervene in the markets and circulation of labour, capital and goods in order to ensure adequate supplies of all three *in situ*. Privileged access to burghership or guilds, tax exemptions, grants and other privileges functioned as typical instruments of attraction, while financial requirements or other means of exclusion from corporative structures and social provisions, together with expulsions, were mobilized against the settlement of the unwanted poor.¹⁵

Most chapters in this book bear out that the regulation of markets represented an important consideration in urban migration policies. Given that migration played a crucial role in the circulation and allocation of labour, goods and capital in early modern cities, attempts by local (and central) authorities to regulate these markets were directly related to opportunities and restrictions for movement and settlement. The chapters by De Meester, Kalc, Niggemann and Winter testify that migration policies were intimately tied up with questions of labour market regulation: while migration restrictions could lead to labour shortages, measures tolerating or even attracting migrant workers were often part of policies designed to augment the local labour supply and/or to import specific skills and technical knowledge. Likewise, Canepari, Niggemann and Kalc remind us how attempts to enlarge or diversify local production and commercial activity to shore up cities' shares in international markets of goods and capital went hand in hand with active recruitment policies towards resourceful merchants, bankers and specialized manufacturers, be it in sixteenth-century Rome, seventeenth-century Potsdam or eighteenth-century Trieste. The latter case is in itself a powerful example of the crucial role of migration policies in attempts to influence early modern markets: policies aimed at attracting merchants, manufacturers and workers, and at facilitating the flows of goods, capital and people, indeed played a key role in the Habsburgs' voluntarist

¹⁵ Erika Kuijpers and Maarten Prak, 'Burger, ingezetene, vreemdeling. Burgerschap in Amsterdam in de 17e en 18e eeuw', in Kloek and Tilmans (eds), *Burger*, p. 121; Marc Boone and Peter Stabel, 'New Burghers in the Late Medieval Towns of Flanders and Brabant: Conditions of Entry, Rules and Reality', in Schwinges (ed.), *Neubürger*, p. 320; Ulrich Niggemann, *Immigrationspolitik zwischen Konflikt und Konsens. Die Hugenottenansiedlung in Deutschland und England (1681–1697)* (Cologne/Weimar/Vienna, 2008), pp. 290–301; Alfons K.L. Thijs, 'Minderheden te Antwerpen (16de–20ste eeuw)', in Soly and Thijs (eds), *Minderheden*, pp. 26–31.

scheme to transform Trieste from a small town into a maritime emporium in the eighteenth century.

At the same time, the different case studies warn against treating the distinction between wanted and unwanted migrants in this respect as self-evident, by providing insight into the dynamics of conflict and processes of negotiation that were bound up with the distinction. Given the instability of urban labour markets and the vulnerability of wage-dependent existence, periods of unemployment could often transform 'useful' workers into 'burdensome' poor and vice versa, even in relatively specialized branches of sixteenth-century textile production (Junot). Moreover, newcomers could be considered 'wanted' by some and 'unwanted' by others. A most obvious conflict of interest in this respect was that between workers and employers: as labour shortages were likely to strengthen the bargaining position of local workers – at least in the short run – and increases in labour supplies tended to push down wages, workers often opposed the influx of additional manpower which was welcomed or stimulated by employers, as exemplified in the chapters by De Meester, Niggemann and Kalc. In a similar vein, while mercantilist interests sought the attraction of wealthy merchants or craftsmen-entrepreneurs, the latter were often received with considerably less enthusiasm by established commercial or artisan communities.

Several chapters stress how guilds often played a crucial role in the articulation of conflicts and negotiations over local migration policies, both because of their economic role in the regulation of labour and product markets, and of their political role in local government. While guilds in an older historiography have often been portrayed as essentially homogenous and protectionist institutes which strove to exclude immigrants,¹⁶ recent research has yielded a more complex picture. Masters sometimes appear to have closed ranks when socio-economic pressures jeopardized their status and well-being, as was the case in Nantes and Lyon in the eighteenth century. Conversely, stable guild systems and the absence of modernization could result in greater openness and higher social mobility for new entrants – if only because of greater career prospects for masters' sons outside the guilds.¹⁷ Even declining guilds could be relatively open as a result of masters' sons not following in their fathers' footsteps.¹⁸

¹⁶ A state of the art on guild historiography in James R. Farr, *Artisans in Europe, 1300–1914* (Cambridge, 2000). See also footnote 10.

¹⁷ Edward J. Shephard, 'Social and Geographic Mobility of the Eighteenth Century Guild Artisan: An Analysis of Guild Receptions in Dijon, 1700–1790', in Steve L. Kaplan and Cynthia Koepf (eds), *Work in France: Representations, Meaning, Organization, and Practice* (Ithaca, 1986), pp. 97–131.

¹⁸ Maurice Garden, 'The Urban Trades: Social Analysis and Representation', in Kaplan and Koepf (eds), *Work*, pp. 287–97.

In addition, guild entry policies were also influenced by internal divisions and power relations within the guilds. Merchants coordinating guild-based *Verlag* systems, for instance, were in theory likely to favour the influx of masters (who provided them with finished products), while large artisan-entrepreneurs rather stood to gain from the influx of journeymen. Small masters, from their part, could be opposed to both in an attempt to preserve a certain equality among masters.¹⁹ Depending on their numbers and degree of organization, journeymen could at times enforce a right of preference by which masters were prevented from hiring outsiders ('unfree' journeymen) when 'free' journeymen (who had finished an apprenticeship term and sometimes a journeymen's trial as well) were available.²⁰

The case studies developed here confirm that guilds were not *a priori* against or in favour of immigration, but rather constituted arenas of tension between small-scale manufacturers, large-scale entrepreneurs, journeymen, workers and apprentices who had different interests and concerns with regard to the immigration and inclusion or exclusion of new groups. While generalization is difficult because of the limited number of case studies, one tentative suggestion in this respect is that small-scale artisans appear to have been most likely and able to mobilize exclusive measures when local markets were fairly small, internal differences within the guild limited and their influence in guilds large – conditions which were most likely in servicing trades aimed at local markets. In guilds and sectors where the influence of large-scale artisan-entrepreneurs was larger, as in the building industry of sixteenth-century Antwerp, small-scale artisans and journeymen were more likely to call for inclusive measures to prevent 'unfree' workers (non-guild members) from undercutting wages and working conditions (De Meester). Finally, when small-scale artisans and wage workers faced concentration trends and had very little political influence, they were most likely to engage in radical anti-immigrant protests as their main (and last) line of defence, as in the case of the anti-Huguenot protests by London's Weavers' Company in the seventeenth century (Niggemann).

¹⁹ Bert De Munck, *Technologies of Learning: Apprenticeship in Antwerp from the 15th Century to the End of the Ancien Régime* (Turnhout, 2007), chapter 2.3. Also: Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly, 'Export Industries, Craft Guilds and Capitalist Trajectories, 13th to 18th Centuries', in Prak et al. (eds), *Craft Guilds*, pp. 119–26; Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly, 'Subcontracting in Guild-Based Export Trades, 13th–18th Centuries', in Epstein and Prak (eds), *Guilds*, pp. 81–113.

²⁰ Bert De Munck, 'One Counter and Your Own Account: Redefining Illicit Labour in Early Modern Antwerp', *Urban History*, 37/1 (2010): pp. 26–44. Also: Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly, 'An Irresistible Phalanx': Journeymen Associations in Western Europe, 1300–1800', in Catharina Lis, Jan Lucassen and Hugo Soly (eds), *Before the Unions: Wage Earners and Collective Action in Europe, 1300–1850* (Amsterdam, 1994), pp. 11–52.

In addition, several chapters highlight how conflicts within guilds were complicated by interventions by local and central authorities. Local authorities did not always take the same sides in conflicts over migration policies in relation to labour and product market regulation. While the Antwerp city government sided with wealthy entrepreneurs during the city's building boom of the early sixteenth century, for instance, it became more sympathetic to the interests of small-scale artisans and workers when the building market came to rest at the end of the century. Moreover, central authorities could and did intervene in local negotiation processes over guild regulations and market access, for instance when they decided to overrule the masons' guild regulations in sixteenth-century Antwerp because of military interests (De Meester); brushed aside demands for protectionist measures in local retail activities in order to stimulate free enterprise (Kalc); lifted local immigration restrictions for particularly 'useful' industries (Winter); or awarded local privileges in order to attract and support the presence of Huguenots in seventeenth-century Germany (Niggemann). In most of these cases, central governments intervened to reinforce market mechanisms and undercut local regulatory activity, mainly out of a mercantilist striving to develop industry and commerce.

Another important observation that emerges from several chapters is that newcomers were themselves not necessarily willing to be integrated in guilds or other corporative structures, which next to certain privileges also implied local obligations and restricted spatial manoeuvrability. The 'unfreedom' of non-citizen journeymen and apprentices in sixteenth-century Antwerp, for instance, gave them a competitive edge in the labour market (De Meester), much like the seasonal Grizon craftsmen in eighteenth-century Trieste (Kalc). Conversely, exemption from guild membership was in some cases mobilized as a privilege to lure skilled manufacturers or merchants, like the Huguenots in seventeenth-century German states (Niggemann), or was actively sought after by wealthy groups wanting to keep their options open, from sixteenth-century Genoa (Canepari) to eighteenth-century Strasbourg (Sonkajärvi). Much appears to have depended on whether newcomers intended to settle down in their new place of residence, in which case they had a stronger interest in being integrated in existing structures of regulation and protection, or whether they intended only a short (be it repeated) stay, in which case the costs of inclusion could outweigh its benefits.

Conflicts over market access, conditions and regulation, then, were rife in early modern urban migration policies. While the underlying interests were relatively similar in many situations, differences in economic and political contexts and power relationships, in the structure of social institutions such as guilds and city governments, and in the degree and nature of interference by

central authorities led to actual negotiation processes and bargaining strategies differing from town to town. The influence of these factors extended not only to the design of migration policies, but also to their enforcement. Indeed, several authors remind us that norm and practice in market and guild regulations were not necessarily the same thing: rather, actual in-the-field power relationships, and the willingness or unwillingness of local and central authorities to enforce certain regulations, often mattered more than normative prescriptions. What is more, in order to understand conflicts and bargaining processes adequately, we need to probe deeper into the interests and field of tensions which confronted the actors involved. In particular, interests in both the design and enforcement of migration policies with regard to market regulation had to be weighed against those pertaining to two other important policy concerns: communal resources and social stability.

Communal Resources

An important local policy domain in early modern cities was the management and allocation of communal resources. The term is used here to designate communal local provisions like common rights and poor relief to which access was mediated via non-market criteria such as moral entitlement and belonging, and which were disproportionately concentrated in cities. These communal resources acted as a buffer against market forces for urban workers, and offered vital compensations for discrepancies between wages and survival.²¹ Because communal resources were managed on an essentially local basis, migration impacted upon the composition and size of the pool of potential claimants. Existing research has therefore suggested that the endeavour to keep out chargeable newcomers was a major motivation in urban policies against alien beggars and vagrants.²² Yet while relief entitlements are often cited as a reason for

²¹ Marco H.D. van Leeuwen, 'Logic of Charity: Poor Relief in Preindustrial Europe', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 24/4 (1994): pp. 600–606; Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly, *Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-Industrial Europe* (Brighton, 1979), chapters 3–5; Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly, 'Policing the Early Modern Proletariat, 1450–1850', in David Levine (ed.), *Proletarianization and Family History* (Orlando, 1984), pp. 163–228.

²² Dirk van Damme, 'Onderstandswoonst, sedentariseren en stad-platteland-teenstellingen. Evolutie en betekenis van de wetgeving op de onderstandswoonst in België (einde achttiende tot einde negentiende eeuw)', *Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Nieuwste Geschiedenis*, 21/3 (1990): pp. 484–9; Abram de Swaan, *In Care of the State: Health Care, Education, and Welfare in Europe and the USA in the Modern Era* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 30–41; Thijs, 'Minderheden', p. 31; Catharina Lis, Dirk Van Damme and Hugo Soly, *Op vrije voeten. Sociale politiek in West-Europa (1450-1914)* (Leuven, 1985).

the exclusion of newcomers, a number of recent studies have highlighted how the development of urban relief schemes, especially by voluntary and private associations, was also linked to a process of community building.²³ Although they excluded certain groups, they therefore also acted as mechanisms for the inclusion of others.

Several chapters in this volume move beyond these paradoxes by demonstrating that also in this domain inclusion and exclusion were the subject of conflicts of interest. As Junot's chapter on the textile towns of Walloon Flanders shows, it was hard to discriminate between economic and religious migrants or between 'useful' newcomers and potential claimants to poor relief. By highlighting the inherent contradictions between attempts to shield local provisions from newcomers and attempts to enlarge the local labour supply, several chapters provide insights into the complex ways in which concerns over migrants' access to communal resources were tied in with a broader process of negotiation over the costs and benefits of migration which pitted the interests of employers against those of relief administrators. To the extent that immigration benefited local employers by depressing the cost of labour, it increased pressure on communal provisions which made up for the discrepancies between wages and survival. Relief providers and administrators therefore often sought to avoid the additional burden which immigration could entail by restricting the immigration of poor and vulnerable groups – which happened for instance in the Jewish community of eighteenth-century Trieste (Kalc), or was the function of the migration restrictions that accompanied the reorganization of Antwerp's poor relief board in 1779 (Winter). Yet several chapters demonstrate that immigration restrictions were difficult to enforce in practice, especially in large cities with limited policing effectiveness (Kalc, Milliot), while they could also encounter opposition by employers (Junot, Winter). Such measures were therefore almost all seconded and sometimes replaced by more retroactive means to avoid migrants becoming a burden on local relief provisions: making access to relief conditional on a certain length of residence or other criteria of local belonging (Winter) and/or simply expelling migrants if and when they became chargeable (Coy). But when large numbers of poor migrants sought relief, even retroactive forms of exclusion could prove unfeasible – or as the Antwerp authorities emphatically complained in the late eighteenth century: '[T]hey are still humans, and ... we cannot let them perish.'²⁴

²³ Lynch, *Individuals*, chapter 3; Katherine A. Lynch, 'Behavioral Regulation in the City: Families, Religious Associations, and the Role of Poor Relief', in Herman Roodenburg and Pieter Spierenburg (eds), *Social Control in Europe, Volume 1, 1500–1800* (Columbus, 2004), pp. 200–19.

²⁴ See the chapter by Anne Winter in this volume.

The policy outcome of the trade-off between encouraging immigration and economizing on relief expenses was therefore shaped by power relationships between employers, relief administrators and recipients, but in this constellation local labour market structures also seem to have mattered a great deal. In general, employer interests and labour supply needs appear to have had more chance of prevailing in urban economies that relied most strongly on a permanent influx of newcomers, like international port towns such as Amsterdam, while relief economizing concerns were more likely to gain priority in cities where employers relied mainly on a skilled but low-paid local workforce, like the textile producing Antwerp or silk producing Lyon in the eighteenth century. Both Winter and Lucassen moreover indicate that reciprocity could be an additional consideration pertaining to the exclusion or inclusion of poor migrants, so that urban policies in this respect were also influenced by those of other local authorities as well as by regional or national legislation.

All the same, while local relief provisions, both public and private, were probably the most important type of communal resource, the concept could be extended to include local employment and business opportunities – especially to the extent that they were viewed as scarce communal goods in the ‘moral economy’ described by Niggemann. In this view, German craftsmen opposed Huguenot immigration primarily because it increased competition for ‘Nahrung’, the concept adopted by Werner Sombart to characterize a premodern economic ideology which disapproved of market ideology and revolved around the possibility to make an honest living.²⁵ In that perspective, also resonating in De Meester’s discussion of the building trades in sixteenth-century Antwerp, local income opportunities were considered a kind of communal resource which some wanted to protect from infringements by newcomers – for instance by linking it to burghership. The extent to which they actually succeeded in doing so was, however, dependent upon local contexts, interests and power relationships.

Social Stability and Incorporation

Immigration could run counter to another major policy concern of early modern town elites, that of public order and social stability. The majority of migrants who belonged to the poor and vulnerable classes were often perceived as a potential threat to public order, especially given their alleged proneness to engage in begging, vagrancy, prostitution, libertinage, thieving, rioting

²⁵ For critical observations on this concept, see various contributions in Josef Ehmer and Catharina Lis (eds), *The Idea of Work in Europe from Antiquity to Modern Times* (Farnham, 2009).

and other dangerous or criminal behaviour in the eyes of early modern elites and middling groups. Recent research on the development of early modern policing, particularly in France, has highlighted how the expansion and professionalization of urban police forces were intimately tied up with a growing ambition to control and monitor the whereabouts and activities of newcomers.²⁶ Next to repressive and control measures, more incorporative instruments such as the granting of burgership could also be mobilized to integrate newcomers within the existing social hierarchy.

The chapters by Coy, Junot and Milliot in particular confirm that controlling, detecting and correcting materially or morally dangerous behaviour by low-status newcomers was often a central concern of urban migration policies. Many of the case studies in this book cite the existence of entry regulations and passport formalities at the city gates, and of requirements for landlords and innkeepers to inform local authorities of the characteristics and antecedents of their lodgers. However, the efficiency of these measures was heavily dependent upon the development of urban policing (Milliot), and often failed to deny entry except to the most destitute or potentially dangerous of newcomers (Kalc). Retroactive policies such as expulsions were therefore also mobilized to exclude not only the burdensome but also the violators of social and moral norms (Coy).

Conversely, several chapters at the same time highlight how attempts to restrict or regulate immigration with an eye to social stability, just like concerns about relief, could conflict with employers' interests in expanding the local labour supply. Coy's study provides an instructive illustration on how efforts to restrict and monitor immigration with an eye to protecting moral standards and social stability had to strike a delicate balance with local needs for migrant labour in sixteenth-century Ulm. Kalc's discussion of how calls for a permit system to regulate the number and conduct of porters in eighteenth-century Trieste were systematically boycotted by merchants who feared labour shortages is in turn a telling example of how concerns about public order could remain subservient to employers' interests in unlimited immigration.

Whether because of inefficient control instruments or predominant employer interests, early modern cities remained confronted with a permanent influx of migrants from all social classes that created challenges in terms of social stability that could not be resolved by selective migration policies alone. After all, migration was not necessarily a destabilizing factor. On the contrary, given the demographic and economic needs of early modern cities, migration was necessary for the reproduction of urban life. Yet to the extent that newcomers were essentially unknown and unconnected individuals in an order based on

²⁶ Roche, *La ville promise*; Blanc-Chaléard et al. (eds), *Police et migrants*.

belonging and reputation, something which is stressed by Canepari, migration was a phenomenon that required close monitoring and suitable integration mechanisms. An important consideration in this respect, and one made in several chapters, is that not only the immigration of the *classes dangereuses* but also that of more resourceful groups created challenges in terms of social stability, and that the monitoring and integration of *all* types of newcomers were key concerns in urban migration policies.

The main challenge should therefore be described as *incorporation*, i.e. the allocation of newcomers to their appropriate status and corporative groups in the existing urban hierarchy, in order to channel their entitlement to communal resources while ensuring their commitment to the communal normative framework and the political status quo. Burghership and guild membership were important instruments for the incorporation of better-off groups. Burghership was in the first instance a legal status that defined one's membership of the urban *communitas* and conferred upon its bearer a range of political rights, legal prerogatives, fiscal and economic privileges and social benefits.²⁷ Existing research has highlighted how burghership was the cornerstone of a corporative rhetoric centred on the urban *communitas*, celebrated by pledges of allegiance, processions and other manifestations of corporative identity and sealed with the stipulation that guild masters must be burghers.²⁸ Yet the great variety in criteria for its acquisition leaves open many questions as to the precise ways in which burghership could function as a means of integration.²⁹

²⁷ Marc Boone, 'Droit de bourgeoisie et particularisme urbain dans la Flandre bourguignonne et habsbourgeoise (1384–1585)', *Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis*, 74 (1996): p. 713; An Kint, 'Becoming Civic Community. Citizenship in Sixteenth-century Antwerp', in Boone and Prak (eds), *Individual*, pp. 157–70; Kuijpers and Prak, 'Burger', pp. 115–19; Anna Maria Pult Quaglia, 'Citizenship in Medieval and Early Modern Italian Cities', in Stephan G. Ellis, Gudmundur Hálfðanarson and Ann Katherine Isaacs (eds), *Citizenship in Historical Perspective* (Pisa, 2006), pp. 107–14; Angelika Schaser, 'Städtische Fremdenpolitik im Deutschland der Frühen Neuzeit', in Alexander Demandt (ed.), *Mit Fremden leben. Eine Kulturgeschichte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich, 1995), p. 144; James S. Amelang, 'Cities and Foreigners', in Calabi and Christensen (eds), *Cultural Exchange*, pp. 42–55.

²⁸ Cf. Boone and Prak (eds), *Individual*; Pult Quaglia, 'Citizenship'; Eberhard Isenmann, 'Bürgerrecht und Bürgeraufnahme in der spätmittelalterlichen und frühneuzeitlichen Stadt', in Schwinges (ed.), *Neubürger*, p. 205ff. According to An Kint, 'Becoming Civic Community', p. 160 burghership did *not* function as the cornerstone of the urban community in sixteenth-century Antwerp.

²⁹ Via birth, residence, purchase and/or marriage. See for instance Kint, 'Becoming Civic Community', p. 161; Kuijpers and Prak, 'Burger', pp. 119–24; Isenmann, 'Bürgerrecht und Bürgeraufnahme'; Amelang, 'Cities and Foreigners', pp. 45, 47; Christopher R. Friedrichs, *The Early Modern City* (London/New York, 1995), pp. 143–4; Jonathan Barry, 'Civility and Civic

What is clear is that burghership and guild membership can be seen as instrumental in *incorporation* policies as well. While established groups sometimes sought to exclude newcomers from accessing these corporative institutions, De Meester and Niggemann demonstrate how membership of the citizenry and guilds could be actively promoted as a way to integrate newcomers' interests with those of established groups. Conversely, Sonkajärvi's study illuminates how the failure to incorporate privileged newcomers into local repertoires of allegiance – in this case through noblemen's adherence to national rather than local citizenship – undermined the existing political and judicial order of eighteenth-century Strasbourg. Further down the social ladder, intermediate statuses of accepted but non-citizen resident – *Beywoner* in sixteenth-century Ulm (Coy), *simple manant* in sixteenth-century Tournai (Junot), *Temporal-Schirm* in eighteenth-century Strasbourg (Sonkajärvi) or residence permit holders in eighteenth-century Trieste (Kalc) – were devised to monitor processes of conditional incorporation of less resourceful groups.

An important observation here is again that neither upmarket nor downmarket newcomers were necessarily willing to take on these statuses of incorporation, especially if they also entailed local obligations and limited manoeuvrability, as the cases of Italian merchants (Canepari) and Strasbourg noblemen (Sonkajärvi) indicate. Burghership should therefore not necessarily be taken as a measure of successful integration, or as the outcome of a personal negotiation process between an 'outsider' on the one hand and an established community on the other. Rather, the inclusion or exclusion of immigrants from corporative structures was part of a wider collective negotiation process over the positions, rights and privileges of different migrant groups in which many different concerns and interest groups played a role.

Identities and Communities

Possibly partly as a reaction against too strong a focus on these matters in earlier minority studies, the chapters rarely consider culture and religion as relevant policy concerns in themselves. Rather, they play down the role of religious differences as a cause of conflict between immigrant Huguenots and local craftsmen in seventeenth-century German cities (Niggemann), stress the malleability of religious distinctions as compared to other concerns in eighteenth-century Strasbourg (Sonkajärvi); illustrate how local policies of

Culture in Early Modern England: The Meanings of Urban Freedom', in P. Burke et al. (eds), *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 181–96, pp. 186, 191.

reconciliation enabled a flexible accommodation of dissenting migrants in cities of Walloon Flanders even at the height of religious conflict in the late sixteenth century (Junot); and provide examples of peaceful religious coexistence, as in seventeenth-century Amsterdam (Lucassen) or eighteenth-century Trieste (Kalc). At the same time, these references show that religious identities were nevertheless considered relevant – be it actively construed and malleable – distinctions by different actors in most urban contexts discussed here. To a certain extent religion, like culture, can be considered part of the corporative identity structure that underlay conceptions of urban citizenship and belonging. Hence policy makers' concerns for a certain degree of homogeneity or categorization in this respect could be considered part of a more general concern for public order and social stability.³⁰

More generally, several of the case studies indicate that the choices made by the actors involved need to be understood in relation to their ideas about community formation and belonging. The defence and distribution of communal resources inevitably depended on how the community was conceived in moral and political terms. The connection between the status of burgher and the exclusive right to own real estate – as existed in Strasbourg – suggests that the idea of political and social standing and privileges being conditional upon settledness was deep-rooted. According to Canepari, being a 'foreigner' in early modern Italian cities was largely synonymous with lacking a permanent residence. In Strasbourg, abandoning burgher status required swearing an oath which committed the ex-burgher to leaving the city.

Processes of state formation and loss of city autonomy were sources of important tensions in this domain.³¹ A former autonomous imperial city (*Reichsstadt*) which came under the sovereignty of the French king at the end of the seventeenth century, the case of Strasbourg illustrates the frictions and conflicts that arose between local and national repertoires of belonging. The conflicts which surfaced after the annexation therefore appear to have been less the result of increased immigration *per se* than of a confrontation between two different modes of classifying inhabitants – related to two different repertoires of political allegiance (Sonkajärvi). As discussions of tax exemptions and the possession of real estate by non-burghers illustrate, the definitions of legal status, social position and privilege were fundamentally related to political claims

³⁰ Additional concerns like the evasion of conscription (Kalc), or the spread of contagious disease (Milliot), can likewise be considered part of efforts to protect the military and sanitary assets of a local community, and hence to maintain its social stability.

³¹ See for instance Maarten Prak, 'Burghers into Citizens: Urban and National Citizenship in the Netherlands during the Revolutionary Era (c. 1800)', *Theory and Society*, 26 (1997): pp. 403–20.

on the urban territory. Both ownership of real estate by non-burghers and tax exemptions ran counter to traditional ideas on 'communal resources' – or else were at least based on another definition of *communitas*. The interference of the central government in sixteenth-century Antwerp (De Meester) might serve as an early example of the same field of tension.

Shifting political claims on local territories entailed shifting definitions of 'foreignness' and different modes of migration control. Canepari's discussion of foreigners' legislation in the state of Milan shows how it became increasingly difficult to be classified as 'local' in the course of the seventeenth century. Milliot's chapter demonstrates more directly how both increasing mobility and state formation impacted upon the identification and classification of individuals in eighteenth-century France. These processes brought about growing concerns with social disaffiliation and disintegration, and, hence, led to the professionalization and specialization of police and administrative forces. The latter were in turn felt to interfere with corporative and neighbourhood-like models of belonging, participation and governance. What Milliot refers to as 'enlightened opinion' appears to have been at odds with 'old community regulation' in this respect – among other things because from the perspective of local communities it entailed a certain 'de-territorialization'.

The extent to which the growing influence of central authorities appears to have undermined local repertoires of belonging and allegiance is a question that is explored further in Lucassen's chapter. By highlighting similarities in the migration regimes of early modern cities and modern states he provides new and stimulating perspectives for further systematic comparisons of intentions, effects and limitations of migration policies in a long-term perspective. Hitchcock's chapter, finally, is an important counterpoint to many of the insights from the other chapters in laying bare the limits of migration regulation. It argues that even in eighteenth-century England, with its highly formalized relief and settlement system and arguably the most centralized state of the time, migration in practice remained largely unregulated and many poor migrants could travel around unmolested. Furthermore, it demonstrates that unsettledness was a daily experience and accepted reality for many migrants and local authorities respectively, and at times provided an alternative, non-territorial sense of identity. Hence, while urban authorities and other institutions engaged in complex discussions on the positions and entitlements of migrants, the precise effects and implications of these policies on the actual manoeuvrability and agency of even the most destitute migrants remains a focal point for further research.

Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research

The different case studies addressed in the chapters of this book demonstrate that merchants, entrepreneurs, small-scale artisans, workers, relief payers, relief recipients and local and central administrations could all have different and often opposing interests with regard to the influx and incorporation of urban migrants in early modern Europe. On the whole, these different interests and conflicts crystallized around three main areas of concern: the regulation of (labour) markets, social stability and communal resources. The degree of overlap between the social groups embodying these different concerns, as well as the power relationships between them, interacted with social and economic contexts and institutions to shape urban migration policies in practice. Several chapters bring to light not only dynamics of conflict, but also arenas of negotiation – of which riots and public protests were only the most visible, and exceptional, manifestation. In one way or another, the outcomes tended to be compromises in that they attempted to accommodate different concerns and interests. In practice this meant that migration policies often combined elements of attraction, restriction and exclusion. The very poor, criminal, uprooted and riotous ranked as the most unwanted type of newcomers, while docile and useful workers, together with skilled and wealthy newcomers, were higher on the wanted list. Yet the chapters show that the boundary between wanted and unwanted migrant was not fixed, but fluctuated according to power relationships between different interest groups involved in the trade-off between attempts to augment the local labour supply, economize on relief expenses and maintain social stability.

Policies made use of both proactive and retroactive instruments of selection and restriction, but both ran up against limits of enforcement. As a result, the integration even of groups deemed less useful or welcome was often a *conditio sine qua non* for urban authorities to deal with the permanent flux of migrants. It is important to stress in this respect that the opposition between inclusion and exclusion is a too linear pair of concepts to describe the multilayered reality that newcomers to early modern cities faced. Local policy makers seem to have been more concerned about the status of the immigrants residing in the city – and hence their obligations and the nature of their entitlements to communal resources – than about their presence as such. So the approach centred on inclusion and exclusion should perhaps be substituted by a more malleable one centred on models, mechanisms and levels of *incorporation*. There were in any case various levels and notions of ‘integration’ in play, on the part of both established urban communities and newcomers alike. Not all newcomers were necessarily willing to follow the incorporative trajectories outlined for them, while expectations

and entry conditions vis-à-vis migrants could vary considerably. Inevitably, these issues were linked to fundamental notions of sociability and community and identity formation, which materialized in distinct ways of defining 'foreigners'.

In the end, it is at the level of the different mechanisms of incorporation and status ascription that long-term transformations materialized. As a result of the choice made to present a range of case studies, long-term trends and transformations remain underexposed in this volume. Yet, we feel that the insights yielded by the different chapters provide important starting points for further research in this direction. One main question in this respect centres on the influence of the growing intrusion of market forces on considerations related to labour market regulation and access to communal resources. To the extent that work for wages became increasingly important as a labour allocation mechanism in the course of the early modern period,³² employers' interests against immigration restrictions are likely to have gained in force. But workers' growing wage dependency at the same time increased the importance of residual welfare provisions as a buffer against the potentially disruptive effects of proletarianization for social and political stability.³³ Growing reliance on relief provisions is in turn likely to have heightened anti-immigration considerations from the perspective of taxpayers and relief recipients who sought to restrict newcomers' potential encroachments on local relief provisions. In other words, the growth of wage dependency is likely to have amplified conflicts of interest over the costs and benefits of immigration between employers and relief providers respectively. If this was indeed the case, this may in turn have been related to the growing role of police control as an alternative way to organize and monitor society: as conceptions of 'Nahrung', charity and neighbourly help came under increasing pressure by market forces, police control may have taken their place as a prime means to maintain social stability *and* to deal with the ongoing rising tensions over immigration. In this context, further research is needed along the lines set out by Lucassen on the role of state formation in shifting definitions of foreignness and remoulding policies of migration. Exploring these questions in a long-term perspective will require taking into consideration the many different manifestations of conflicts and compromises over the costs and benefits of regulating migration through time and space.

³² On the relative and absolute rise of wage labour in the course of the early modern period: Charles Tilly, 'Demographic Origins of the European Proletariat', in Levine (ed.), *Proletarianization*, pp. 30–36.

³³ Leeuwen, 'Logic of Charity'; Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly, 'Policing'; Larry Patriquin, *Agrarian Capitalism and Poor Relief in England, 1500–1860: Rethinking the Origins of the Welfare State* (Basingstoke, 2007), pp. 45–78.

One general conclusion of this book is that labour market regulation cannot be separated from the management of local resources and moral and ideological sensitivities regarding local communities – an observation which can help to articulate new questions for further research too. Urban burghership is for instance an institution that could benefit from further research from a comparative long-term perspective with regard to the field of tension between labour market regulation, communal resources and community building. The fact that citizenship could often be purchased, while in some cases it was free of charge and in other situations it was granted on an ad-hoc basis, made it into an instrument by which foreigners could be excluded or taxed.³⁴ However, burghership was a very diverse and multilayered institution as well. Both power struggles within the city and the need to include or exclude specific social groups according to economic circumstances have led to a wide range of different citizenship types. Burghership was often passed on via ‘*ius sanguinis*’ (having one or two citizen-parents), but sometimes conferred on everyone born within the urban territory (‘*ius soli*’) or awarded after a certain length of residence (from one to 15 years or more).³⁵ Moreover, although early modern urban citizenship was often linked to guild membership, and urban ‘freedom’ in England was even to be acquired through apprenticeship (next to inheritance and marriage), in France or Rome one could become a guild master without being a burgher.³⁶

On the whole, burghership was related to the claims of urban elites to local communal resources. As such, the privileged position of the urban ‘patriciate’ and corporative middling groups was justified by the assumption that their material interests guaranteed loyalty to the ‘common good’.³⁷ But in order to understand differences and long-term transformations comparative research is needed. For this, burghership should be linked to both lower and higher levels of identification and belonging. On the one hand, more research is needed on the alternative patterns of incorporation and identification of non-burghers,

³⁴ E.g. Boone, ‘Droit de bourgeoisie’; Kuijpers and Prak, ‘Burger’, pp. 119–23.

³⁵ Thijs, ‘Minderheden’, pp. 17–20; Kint, ‘Becoming Civic Community’, p. 161; Amelang, ‘Cities and Foreigners’, p. 47.

³⁶ Friedrichs, *The Early Modern City*, pp. 143–4; Barry, ‘Civility and Civic Culture’, p. 191; Amelang, ‘Cities and Foreigners’, p. 45. Why, moreover, could burghership sometimes be conditional upon membership of a guild, as was the case in London and Zurich, rather than the other way around? Marc Boone et al. ‘Introduction. Citizenship between Individual and Community’, in Boone and Prak (eds), *Individual*, p. 5. See also the chapter by Canepari in this volume.

³⁷ Marc Boone, “‘Cette frivole, dampnable et desraisonnable bourgeoisie’”. De vele gezichten van het laatmiddeleeuwse burgerbegrip in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden, in Kloek and Tilmans (eds), *Burger*, p. 45; Ulrich Meier, ‘Gemeinnutz und Vaterlandsliebe. Kontroversen über die normativen Grundlagen des Bürgerbegriffs im späten Mittelalter’, in Schwinges (ed.), *Neubürger*, pp. 53–82.

and on the social and cultural significance of intermediate categories such as *ingesetene*, *manant*, *Beywoner*, *Schirmbürger* and so on.³⁸ On the other hand, interactions between urban citizenship and non-local, especially national, categories of belonging are in need of further research.³⁹ When Venice and Florence turned into ‘territorial states’ in the sixteenth century, for instance, citizenship changed from an identificational to a juridical concept. While urban burghership had been intimately tied in with the social and political body of the ‘commune’, belonging to the state was less and less connected to *participation* in governmental (and perhaps economic) affairs.⁴⁰ How can this be tallied with the recent idea that there was at the same time a return to the territorial idea of early ‘communes’, whereby the *ius sanguinis* of the late medieval cities (which enabled extending urban citizenship to the *contado*) was replaced with citizenship being reserved for actual residents and perhaps to those who owned real estate and paid taxes?⁴¹

In order to link questions of burghership and belonging to economic factors, additional research on the political economy of guilds may prove helpful. While the old image of guilds as exclusive cartels of masters who jealously guarded their production monopoly and their labour market monopsony have fallen into disrepute, the factors determining the relative openness or closedness of guilds are in need of further qualification. Important differentiations need to be made, for instance, between entry policies towards apprentices, journeymen and masters, while also the nature of the industrial activities, production relations and political power of and within different guilds needs to be taken into account. Hence, it is of major importance to examine guilds’ regulations and their

³⁸ For studies from a legal perspective, see for instance J. Gilissen, ‘Le statut des étrangers en Belgique du XIIIe au XXe siècle’, in *Recueils de la société Jean Bodin, vol. X* (Paris, 1984), pp. 233–308; Pelus-Kaplan, Marie-Louise, ‘Travail, immigration et citoyenneté dans les villes hanséatiques, XVIe–XVIIe siècles, d’après les exemples de Lübeck, Hambourg et Danzig’, in Pilar Gonzalez-Bernaldo, Manuela Martini and Marie-Louise Pelus-Kaplan (eds), *Etrangers et sociétés. Représentations, coexistences, interactions dans la longue durée* (Rennes, 2008), pp. 337–50. Also: Schaser, ‘Städtische Fremdenpolitik’, 147–9. In Amsterdam, the juridical status of ‘ingesetene’ in 1668 appears to have been created in order to include a welcome category of artisans as it gave access to the local guilds (while at the same time excluding them from communal office) – but research is still very much in its infancy here: Kuijpers and Prak, ‘Burger’, p. 122.

³⁹ Interesting perspectives: Prak, ‘Burghers into Citizens’; Tamara Herzog, *Defining Nations: Immigrants and Citizens in Early Modern Spain and Spanish America* (New Haven, 2003); Renaud Morieux, *Une mer pour deux royaumes. La Manche, frontière franco-anglaise (XVIIe–XVIIIe siècles)* (Rennes, 2008).

⁴⁰ Pult Quaglia, ‘Citizenship’.

⁴¹ Pierre Racine, ‘La citoyenneté en Italie au moyen âge’, *Le moyen âge*, 115/1 (2009): pp. 87–108.

implications for labour market regulation from a micro-perspective in order to understand when, why and how guilds encouraged or restricted immigration of skilled (and at times unskilled) masters, journeymen and apprentices.

Analogous observations can be made with regard to poor relief arrangements. Although long-term trends in poor relief are typically described as shifts from private and religious forms of charity to public poor relief and businesslike insurance schemes, different perspectives abound. While some have studied the development of public poor relief in the context of proletarianization and state formation,⁴² others have focused on private and bottom-up initiatives such as poor boxes.⁴³ Recently, poor relief has been approached from the perspective of community building, as a result of which incorporative strategies towards the shamefaced poor are stressed.⁴⁴ Further research should, in our opinion, not only address different types of mutual aid and charity providers from the perspective of exclusion and incorporation, but should also consider the interconnections and fields of tension between different levels and types of poor relief.⁴⁵ In order to understand long-term transformations related to the incorporative and exclusionary mechanisms at the urban level we need to examine poor relief as a whole – including confraternities, guilds and parishes on the one hand, and public and private poor relief schemes on the other.

⁴² E.g. Lis and Soly, *Poverty and Capitalism*; Hugo Soly, 'Continuity and Change. Attitudes Towards Poor Relief and Health Care in Early Modern Antwerp', in Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham (eds), *Health Care and Poor Relief in Protestant Europe, 1500–1700* (London, 1997): pp. 85–107; de Swaan, *In Care of the State*.

⁴³ E.g. Sandra Bos, 'Uyt liefde tot malcander'. *Onderlinge hulpverlening binnen de Noord-Nederlandse gilden in internationaal perspectief (1570–1820)* (Amsterdam, 1998); Sandra Bos, 'A Tradition of Giving and Receiving: Mutual Aid within the Guild System', in Prak et al. (eds), *Craft Guilds*, pp. 174–93; Sigrid Fröhlich, *Die Soziale Sicherung bei Zünften und Gesellenverbänden: Darstellung, Analyse, Vergleich* (Berlin, 1976); Marco van Leeuwen, *The Logic of Charity: Amsterdam, 1800–1850* (London/New York, 2000); Marcel van der Linden (ed.), *Social Security Mutualism: The Comparative History of Mutual Benefit Societies* (Bern, 1996).

⁴⁴ Lynch, *Individuals*; Lynch, 'Behavioral Regulation'.

⁴⁵ Manon van der Heijden, 'New Perspectives on Public Services in Early Modern Europe', *Journal of Urban History*, 36/3 (2010): pp 269–284. A case study in which the differences between guilds and trade-related poor boxes are examined: Bert De Munck, 'Fiscalizing Solidarity (from Below): Poor Relief in Antwerp Guilds between Community Building and Public Service', in Manon van der Heijden, Elise van Nederveen Meerkerk, Griet Vermeesch and Martijn van der Burg (eds), *Serving the Urban Community: The Rise of Public Facilities in the Low Countries* (Amsterdam, 2009), pp. 168–93.