Part I

The setting
1 Introduction: questions and sources

More research has been devoted to the English Peasants’ Revolt of 1381 than to any uprising of the Middle Ages; more than to the Tumult of the Ciompi, the Jacquerie, and the widespread rebellions in Flanders of 1297–1305 and 1323–8 combined. Research on the English Peasants’ Revolt has been interdisciplinary, principally the work of historians and literary scholars.


2 For a guide to these numbers in articles published since 1964, see the Brepols Online International Medieval Bibliography.
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and international. Paradoxically, beyond this revolt and, secondarily, Cade’s Rebellion in 1450, scholars have paid much less attention to a wide range of medieval uprisings in England than to ones on the Continent, and especially in comparison with the outpouring of publications on popular revolt in early modern England. Furthermore, the work on medieval English revolts has concentrated on the countryside, making excellent use of England’s exceptionally rich manorial rolls and court records. By contrast, little attention has been directed towards popular protest in English towns and cities, and with few exceptions this work has been restricted to individual uprisings or experiences within individual towns, most prominently, London. Moreover, much of the work on late medieval insurrection in towns outside the capital and not during the Peasants’ Revolt has appeared in local historical and


5 Before Ralph A. Griffiths, The Reign of King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422–1461 (London, 1981), with its extensive research on Cade’s revolt (pp. 610–65), only one major study of this revolt had appeared, and that by a German, a century earlier: George Kriehn, The English Rising in 1450 (Strasbourg, 1892).


8 Most importantly, see Gwyn A. Williams, Medieval London: From Commune to Capital (London, 1963). Also, the attention given to insurrection in Bury St Edmunds stands out, especially M. D. Lobel, The Borough of Bury St Edmund’s: A Study in the Government and Development of a Monastic Town (Oxford, 1935), pp. 118–70.
Introduction: questions and sources

archaeological journals and, as with Bristol’s remarkable and long resistance to the Crown during Edward II’s reign, was written over a century ago. Excellent descriptions and effective use of archival sources can be found in these early works, but they mostly studied individual uprisings within the contexts of single towns, or only at specific moments in their town’s histories. Few have attempted to find patterns in urban protest over time or space, or between types of towns that tended to revolt, such as royal boroughs or monastic ones, or to compare English revolts with ones on the Continent. Comparisons and overviews, few in number, have been confined to brief sections in books and at best have reflected a dozen or fewer cases of factional or class conflict over the long-term of the Middle Ages. As a result, untested assumptions have passed from one publication to the next, such as the notion that insurrections in towns were less frequent and less significant than in the countryside, and that the aims and ideology of urban rebels were less developed and less radical than those of late medieval English peasants. According to


11 The major exception being Norman Maclaren Trenholme, *The English Monastic Boroughs: A Study in Medieval History* in *The University of Missouri Studies* 3 (1927).  


13 See, for instance, Christopher Dyer, 'Small-town Conflict in the Later Middle Ages: Events at Shipston-on-Stour, *UH*, 19 (1992), p. 208; Rodney Hilton, 'Popular Movements in England at the End of the Fourteenth Century', in *Il Tumulto dei Ciompi: Un momento di storia fiorentina ed europea* (Florence, 1981), p. 227; and Rodney Hilton, 'Towns in English Society', in *The English Medieval Town: A Reader in English Urban History* 1200–1540, ed. R. C. Holt and G. Rosser (London, 1990), pp. 19–26: ‘In practice, the most serious conflict in feudal society was that between peasants and landowners, but the tensions in urban society . . . also had to be faced’ (p. 28). A similar view was held in older, standard political and constitutional histories of England; see May McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century* 1307–1399 (Oxford, 1959), pp. 50–1: English towns experienced few uprisings because they lacked ‘the political vitality or civic independence of the great cities of the Continent’. Also, May McKisack, 'London and the Succession to the Crown during the Middle Ages', in
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Rodney Hilton, ‘[I]n so far as there was a potentially anti-feudal class in medieval society it was the peasantry.’

This book will raise questions about popular protest in English towns from the London revolt led by William fitzOsbert, called Longbeard, of 1196 to Jack Cade’s in 1450. It will describe the varieties of popular protest and consider to what extent they differed from those on the Continent, principally in Italy, France, and Flanders. Through concentrating largely on two types of sources – chronicles and Patent Rolls – the book analyses the variety of revolt and popular violence, the leadership, social composition, organization, and as best the sources allow, ideologies and motives of urban movements. In outlining patterns of revolt over time, it charts the ebb and flow of revolt against times of strong and weak kingship (including the absences of kings and their retinues from England), and against ecological disasters and economic depression, such as the Great Famine of 1315–17, the economic depression of the 1340s, the Black Death and the period of economic dislocation to c. 1375, and the general improvements that then followed in the material conditions of most commoners during the last quarter of the fourteenth century and into the fifteenth.

Studies in Medieval History Presented to Fredrich Maurice Powicke, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin, and R. W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp. 76–89. Reynolds, An Introduction, is more cautious and probably correct: ‘On present knowledge one can only conclude tentatively that so far as there was an English urban proletariat, it was less revolutionary than were the peasants.’ But what about other groups in urban society, such as enfranchised artisans, craftsmen, or the lower echelons of urban elites and the ruling councils themselves? Even more problematic, others have assumed that peasant revolt was the dominant form of popular protest across Continental Europe; see for instance, Mollat and Wolff, The Popular Revolutions of the Late Middle Ages; William H. TeBrake, A Plague of Insurrection: Popular Politics and Peasant Revolt in Flanders, 1323–1328 (Philadelphia, 1993), p. 7; and implicitly, Marc Bloch, in his famous comparison: ‘peasant revolts were as natural to traditional Europe as strikes are today’: French Rural History: An Essay on its Basic Characteristics, trans. Janet Sondheimer (London, 1966 [Antwerp, 1931]), p. 170. Later Rodney Hilton, ‘Révoltes rurales et révoltes urbaines au Moyen Age’, in Révolte et société: Actes du IVe colloque d’histoire au present, Paris, mai 1988, ed. Fabienne Gambrelle and Michel Trebitsch, 2 vols. (Paris, 1989), I, p. 25, commented that historians generally saw peasant revolts as being the dominant ones of the Middle Ages, a position with which he did not disagree, but added that they often have overlooked the class antagonism within towns. In English and French Towns, p. 150, Hilton maintained that ‘the most important class division’ in medieval society was between ‘landed aristocracy and peasants’, but concluded that the tax revolt in towns was the equivalent of revolts over feudal rent in the countryside.

15 For the contours of these changes and their effects on the well-being of various classes and social groups across the Middle Ages, see Christopher Dyer, Standards of Living in the Later Middle Ages: Social Change in England c. 1200–1520 (Cambridge, 1989); Christopher Dyer, Everyday Life in Medieval England (London, 2001); and Christopher Dyer, Making a Living in the Middle Ages: The People of Britain 850–1520 (New Haven, 2002).
The book will make several overarching hypotheses: firstly, that urban revolt in England was more frequent and important than historians have assumed. With the exception of the English Peasants’ Revolt of 1381 (which in fact combined revolts in towns and the countryside), urban protest generally had a more pronounced impact on national and royal politics than corresponding disturbances in the countryside. On the other hand, revolts in English towns were less frequent than on the Continent, especially as regards movements of disenfranchised artisans, or artisans in guilds against mercantile elites or their employers in textiles or other handicraft industries. Secondly, in contrast to the Continent, urban artisans rarely led challenges against municipal governments or the Crown. Thirdly, revolts in English towns fit more neatly with models of so-called ‘pre-industrial revolt’ that may later have become more or less common in early modern states of Western Europe. Certainly, they fit these models better than late medieval ones on the Continent. In contrast to those in Italy, France, and Flanders, (a) leaders of English revolts came less often from the rank-and-file of artisans and workers and instead relied heavily on those outside their social ranks – on barons, wealthy mayors, aldermen, and the clergy, from itinerant priests such as John Ball to the Archbishop of York; (b) far more often than on the Continent, urban movements in late medieval England were stimulated by, attached to, and organized to a considerable degree by larger baronial movements against the monarchy that originated outside towns; (c) more often than on the Continent, English insurgents idealized, or at least praised, the monarchy in rallying their supporters and relied on it to resolve their conflicts with other authorities such as monasteries, cathedral priories, employers, or entrenched oligarchs within towns. In contrast to the Continent, English rebels often expressed awe and respect for the monarch and blamed his corrupt advisers for their oppression, most famously seen with peasants’ and townspeople’s insignia and pleas to Richard II at London in mid-June 1381. Rarely did insurgents declare open war against their monarchs (even when they actually rebelled against the king, as with their participation in baronial wars or when Bristol’s rebels refused to allow agents of the Crown to enter the town’s gates or collect royal tallages). The Lollard revolts of the last decades of the fourteenth and early fifteenth century and immediately after Cade’s in 1450 may have begun to break this mould; however, Cade’s revolt firmly upheld the traditional lines. These rebels refused to attack the king directly and instead blamed his ‘evil’ advisers. Finally, women appear more often in official lists of English insurgents and in chronicle descriptions of revolts than on the Continent. Occasionally, they even emerge as leaders.
In addition to describing and arguing for these differences, the book attempts to explain why late medieval English urban revolts differed from contemporaneous Continental ones. In brief, we argue that the differences stem from the precocious nature of the English monarchy, its ability to intervene rapidly and effectively in local affairs of towns (at least compared with the Continent), and its oversight of and attention to resolving social conflict and suppressing urban threats to government both at municipal and national levels. As a result, more than on the Continent, the chronology of urban social movements in England clusters in periods of transitional and weak kingship, as with the troubled periods of baronial warfare and civil war, or when the king was overextended, waging wars, or absent from England. Not only could ruling elites in English towns, whether secular or religious, turn to the more effective and stronger repressive powers of a centralized monarchy, but other avenues of conflict resolution – appeals to the king and use of his commissions and courts – were more readily available than on the Continent. Even though the royal commissions, and courts such as King’s Bench, almost invariably ruled in favour of elites, lower classes continued to rely on these legal channels through the two-and-half centuries studied in this book. The same, moreover, can be said of the London courts, as seen in their Letter-books and in the mayor’s memoranda, explored in Chapter 2. By contrast, while peasants and artisans might petition their urban rulers on the Continent, few cases appear there of artisans, workers, or other groups, c. 1200 to 1425, pooling resources to resolve grievances against local rulers or employers in legal tribunals. According to historians, increased access to legal alternatives became a vital escape valve in early

16 See numerous cases scattered through this book; and for rural villeins’ collection of fees to pay lawyers to bring cases against their lords, see Christopher Dyer, *An Age of Transition? Economy and Society in England in the Later Middle Ages: The Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in Hilary Term 2001* (Oxford, 2005), p. 35.

17 Penelope Tucker, *Late Courts and Lawyers in the City of London 1300–1550* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 327–37, maintains that the mayor’s and sheriff’s courts, if not the Husting Court, were accessible to a wide social range of plaintiffs, and informal assistance occasionally was granted to the poor. However, ‘the type of dispute resolution offered to the poor … differed from and was limited compared to that available to wealthier individuals’. She points to factors such as the physical environments of courts, and language barriers, but does not chart the success or failure of litigants based on class differences.

18 See, for instance, the peasant petitions beseeching tax breaks and other matters in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Florence; Samuel K. Cohn, Jr, *Creating the Florentine State: Peasants and Rebellion, 1348–1434* (Cambridge, 1999). Peasants and townsmen also presented petitions to the king in late medieval England, and these sources (which have not been tapped in this study) deserve systematic attention for the history of popular protest.
modern England that lessened the pressure and frequency of open revolt. By our evidence, that alternative was already alive in the later Middle Ages.

Before embarking on the sources and analysis of English urban revolt, the four terms of the book’s title – English, town, popular, and protest – must be defined. To be sure, the English sources concern much more than what constitutes England today, partly because issues outside the island impinged on it, such as the decisions of popes or the territorial ambitions of kings and members of the royal family, as with the involvement of Henry III’s brother, Richard of Cornwall, in the Holy Roman Empire, John of Gaunt’s forays into Castile and, later, Portugal, or the marriage of Lionel of Antwerp (Edward III’s third son and Duke of Clarence) to Violante, daughter of Galeazzo Visconti, and possible ambitions by the throne to have him become Lord of Milan, or even the Holy Roman Emperor. More significantly, England ruled vast territories in present-day France – the Pas de Calais, Ponthieu and Aquitaine, which at different moments covered territories in Saintonge, the Agenais and the dioceses of Limoges, Cahors, and Périgueux, and extended into the Massif Central. Following the English conquest of Rouen in 1419, England controlled Normandy and parts of northern France, including the Île de France and Paris, under the Dual Lancastrian Monarchy until the mid-fifteenth century resurgence of French power under Charles VII. In addition, England attempted to exercise overlordship to all or parts of Wales, Ireland, and Scotland during periods covered by this study. While attentive to revolts outside


20 For these ambitions, cut short by Lionel’s early death soon after his marriage, see W. M. Ormrod, Edward III, Yale English Monarchs Series (New Haven, 2012), p. 443.

21 For the shifting of the boundaries of English sovereignty and control in France during the reign of Edward III, see ibid., especially chapters 15 and 18.

present-day England, we have not concentrated on them. For instance, the Welsh rose against the English on numerous occasions from 1200 to 1450, in 1212, 1244–5, 1256, 1275–6, 1281–3, 1285–6, 1287, 1288–90, 1294–5, 1314–15, 1316, and 1400–9.23 We have not investigated these to ask to what extent they may have been acts of war between two competing kingdoms or possible examples of popular insurrection against foreign occupation. The one Welsh revolt to find some analysis in this book, that of Owain Glyn Dŵr, 1400 to 1409, has been viewed not for its causes and inner dynamics (which have been the subject of numerous studies) as for its impact and spread across the marches into towns of present-day England.24 We have spotted only two incidents possibly of popular insurrection from Scotland – an insurrection of 1222 against the former bishop and abbot in Caithness (probably not a town even by late medieval Scottish standards) and in Berwick-upon-Tweed, a town fiercely contested between the two kingdoms during most of the period of this study.25 The protests and revolts we have discovered in chronicles and Patent Rolls cluster overwhelmingly in southern and eastern England, from Canterbury to Bristol to York with a few from Cornwall in the far west, Carlisle in the northwest, and Newcastle in the northeast. (See maps 1 and 2.) Further-flung regions of the English Crown may have been as rebellious or even more so than the centre, as has been argued for other frontier places during the central Middle Ages26 and can be seen at times in the later Middle


25 As Frame, The Political Development, has commented: ‘in Wales, Scotland and Ireland the silence of the popular voice is deafening’ (p. 199). To what extent this reflects the historiography, the sources, or realities is not clear. On the pivotal political and economic importance of Berwick during the fourteenth century, see Ormrod, Edward III, pp. 158–9, 178.

26 James Given, Society and Homicide in Thirteenth-Century England (Stanford, 1977). For the fifteenth century, see the characterization of violence and disorder in the marches of