Introduction

POPULAR PROTEST OF ONE KIND OR ANOTHER HAS BEEN a recurring theme of contributions to *Past and Present* from its first issues; and many of them have greatly enriched our understanding of crowd behaviour, popular discontent and dissidence in the past. In the later 1960s and early 1970s in particular, the journal published a group of essays which influenced all later discussion of riot and rebellion in early modern Europe. Two contributions, by C. S. L. Davies and M. E. James, on the greatest rising in Tudor England, the Pilgrimage of Grace, reopened important questions concerning the origins and purpose of such movements, and showed how close attention to local political and social circumstances could help to answer them.[1] Still more influential were two later articles, by E. P. Thompson on food riots in eighteenth-century England and Natalie Zemon Davis on religious disturbances in sixteenth-century France. These directed attention first to popular ideology and to the profound sense of legitimacy which motivated protesters, and secondly to the structures, customs and rituals which shaped the actions of a crowd.[2]

The flow of articles has continued unbroken since then, and common to them all has been a search for the regular patterns which can be detected in the composition, organization, mentality and behaviour of the participants in popular protest. We can now see much more clearly than before that these regularities gave apparent disorders a tangible "order" of their own, and made them, in Natalie Davis' phrase, "socially creative".[3] They embodied and moulded popular social and political aspirations, and the ties of deference, obligation and community which bound people together. They were far from being the negative, instinctive and anarchic reactions of the

[1] C. S. L. Davies, "The Pilgrimage of Grace Reconsidered", *Past and Present*, no. 41 (Dec. 1968), reprinted as ch. 1 below; M. E. James, "Obedience and Dissent in Henrician England: The Lincolnshire Rebellion, 1536", *Past and Present*, no. 48 (Aug. 1970), pp. 3–78.

[2] E. P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century", *Past and Present*, no. 50 (Feb. 1971), pp. 76–136; Natalie Zemon Davis, "The Rites of Violence: Religious Riot in Sixteenth-Century France", *Past and Present*, no. 59 (May 1973), pp. 51–91.

[3] N. Z. Davis, "The Reasons of Misrule: Youth Groups and Charivaris in Sixteenth-Century France", *Past and Present*, no. 50 (Feb. 1971), p. 74.

"rude multitude" or "many-headed monster" depicted by contemporaries and by later chroniclers and historians.[4]

Only a selection of this work can be reprinted in a single volume. The essays which follow have been taken from those published in *Past and Present* between 1968 and 1982.[5] They all refer to England between the early sixteenth and the early eighteenth century, and they have been chosen to show how the various forms of popular protest and dissidence found there have been reinterpreted in recent years. Even so, they cover a wide range of topics, and this brief introduction will try to point to some connecting links as well as to indicate where other recent work has amplified or modified their findings.

I

The papers collected here fall naturally into four groups. The initial contributions concern Tudor rebellions. C. S. L. Davies' comprehensive reappraisal of the Pilgrimage of Grace of 1536 (chapter 1) remains the essential introduction to the greatest of them. It has been followed by valuable work, especially by M. E. James, on particular areas involved in the rebellion, stressing the importance of local grievances and local loyalties.[6] That approach is adopted in this volume by Diarmaid MacCulloch in his account of Kett's rebellion of 1549, and in his response to Julian Cornwall's questioning (chapters 2, 3 and 4). He shows how excessive and uncritical reliance on one contemporary narrative source, that of Nicholas Sotherton, has led historians to underestimate the extent and to misinterpret some of the causes of that rising. Detailed local research has produced similarly illuminating results in recent accounts of other Tudor rebellions, those in the west in 1549, in Kent in 1554 and in the north in 1569.[7] The provincial character of these revolts can now be fully appreciated.

[4] For some origins of this tradition, see James, "Obedience and Dissent", pp. 74–5.

[5] The articles have been reprinted as originally published, except for minor corrections and the alteration of cross-references to refer, where appropriate, to pages in this volume.

[6] James, "Obedience and Dissent" (this article will be reprinted in a volume of Dr. James' collected papers, to be published in Past and Present Publications); R. B. Smith, *Land and Politics in the England of Henry VIII. The West Riding of Yorkshire 1530–1546* (Oxford, 1970), ch. v; C. Haigh, *The Last Days of the Lancashire Monasteries and the Pilgrimage of Grace* (Chetham Soc., 3rd ser., xvii, Manchester, 1969), chs. v and vi; M. Bowker, "Lincolnshire 1536: Heresy, Schism or Religious Discontent?" in D. Baker (ed.), *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest* (Studies in Church History, ix, Cambridge, 1972), pp. 195–212; S. M. Harrison, *The Pilgrimage of Grace in the Lake Counties 1536–7* (Roy. Hist. Soc. Studies, no. 27, London, 1981).

[7] J. Youings, "The South-Western Rebellion of 1549", *Southern History*, i (1979), pp. 99–122; P. Clark, *English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution:*

After 1569 there were no more major rebellions of this kind. Popular protest was largely restricted to the smaller-scale, more temporary and even more localized form of riot. Enclosure riots of the sort which accompanied and helped to spark off Kett's rebellion continued, and in the seventeenth century there were similar outbursts of popular opposition to interference with common rights in the royal forests and in the fens. All these have attracted scholarly attention.[8] The discussions of riot in this volume, however, refer to several other kinds of disturbance, urban as well as rural, which occurred between 1590 and 1720; and they have all been influenced by the fundamental work of E. P. Thompson. Although most of its material was drawn from the mid-eighteenth century, his seminal article on the "moral economy" of the crowd cast new light on a form of disturbance which had been common in England for at least two centuries before then, the food or grain riot. It demonstrated how the changing attitude of the political elite towards economic regulation helped to stimulate popular action, and also how patterns of popular protest were shaped by custom and circumstance. Both facets of the topic are shown to have had equal importance in the early seventeenth century in the essay by John Walter and Keith Wrightson below (chapter 6); and there has been much subsequent work on food riots in different periods, largely developing the same approach.[9]

Recent research has also directed attention to other sorts of protest which arose from and voiced a conflict between élite and plebeian attitudes and assumptions. Some of this work, on poaching, for example, has traversed the borderlands between social protest and crime, where rigid dividing lines are difficult to draw and remain

Religion, Politics and Society in Kent 1500–1640 (Hassocks, 1977), pp. 87–98; M. E. James, "The Concept of Order and the Northern Rising, 1569", *Past and Present*, no. 60 (Aug. 1973), pp. 49–83.

[8] Buchanan Sharp, *In Contempt of All Authority. Rural Artisans and Riot in the West of England, 1586–1660* (Berkeley, 1980); Keith Lindley, *Fenland Riots and the English Revolution* (London, 1982).

[9] Thompson, "Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century". See also P. Clark, "Popular Protest and Disturbance in Kent, 1558–1640", *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, 2nd ser., xxix (1976), pp. 365–82; J. Walter, "Grain Riots and Popular Attitudes to the Law: Maldon and the Crisis of 1629", in J. Brewer and J. Styles (eds.), *An Ungovernable People. The English and their Law in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London, 1980), pp. 47–84; J. Stevenson, "Food Riots in England 1792–1818", in J. Stevenson and R. Quinault (eds.), *Popular Protest and Public Order* (London, 1974), pp. 33–74; A. Booth, "Food Riots in the North-West of England 1790–1801", *Past and Present*, no. 77 (Nov. 1977), pp. 84–107; E. Richards, *The Last Scottish Food Riots* (Past and Present Supplement, no. 6, Oxford, 1982); A. J. Coles, "The Moral Economy of the Crowd: Some Twentieth-Century Food Riots", *Jl. British Studies*, xviii (1978–9), pp. 157–76.

controversial.[10] Some of it has thrown valuable light on popular culture and on the popular sanctions represented by such practices as "rough music" or charivari.[11] An example of the latter in this collection is David Rollison's account of the "Groaning" in a Gloucestershire village in 1716 (chapter 14). This episode, a ritual expression of popular opposition to offences against customary behaviour, nicely encapsulated a conflict between two cultures. Similar themes have been evident in studies of urban riots in the eighteenth century as well. Geoffrey Holmes' and Nicholas Rogers' essays on the London disturbances of 1710 and 1715 in this collection (chapters 12 and 13) show that, although urban disorder often had party-political overtones, its roots lay in an independent tradition of street politics, with rituals and symbols comparable to those of its rural counterpart.[12]

A third group of papers in this volume is concerned not so much with the form of protest — whether rebellion or riot — as with one group of participants in it, the young. On this topic the initial stimulus came from Natalie Davis' identification of youth groups as sources of ritualized "misrule" in sixteenth-century France.[13] Formalized associations of adolescents have not been so easy to find in early modern England, although Bernard Capp suggests below (chapter 10) that one fictional representation may not have been unconnected with reality. As apprentices, however, young males certainly enjoyed a group identity, as Steven R. Smith shows for seventeenth-century London (chapter 11); and other work on apprentices and the young in England has noted the traditional rituals which they employed against what they took to be deviant behaviour, as in the apprentices' annual Shrovetide riots against city brothels.[14]

[10] See especially E. P. Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters. The Origin of the Black Act* (London, 1975); D. Hay *et al.*, *Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth-Century England* (London, 1975); and the discussion in J. Styles, "'Our Traitorous Money Makers': The Yorkshire Coiners and the Law, 1760–83", in Brewer and Styles, *An Ungovernable People*, pp. 245–6; P. B. Munsche, *Gentlemen and Poachers. The English Game Laws 1671–1831* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 230–1; J. M. Beattie, "The Pattern of Crime in England 1660–1800", *Past and Present*, no. 62 (Feb. 1974), p. 73.

[11] E. P. Thompson, "Rough music: le charivari anglais", *Annales E.S.C.*, xxvii (1972), pp. 285–312; M. Ingram, "Le charivari dans l'Angleterre du XVIe et du XVIIe siècle", in J. Le Goff and J.-C. Schmitt (eds.), *Le Charivari* (Paris, 1981), pp. 251–64.

[12] Cf. N. Rogers, "Aristocratic Clientage, Trade and Independency: Popular Politics in Pre-Radical Westminster", *Past and Present*, no. 61 (Nov. 1973), pp. 70–106; N. Rogers, "Popular Disaffection in London during the Forty-Five", *London Journal*, i (1975), pp. 5–27.

[13] Davis, "Reasons of Misrule".

[14] Cf. Keith Thomas, "Age and Authority in Early Modern England", *Proc. Brit.*

The energies and frustrations of the young could also be turned to more radical and political purposes. Susan Brigden's essay (chapter 5) demonstrates for the first time their importance in the English Reformation. In the seventeenth century similarly, apprentices were often active in the political agitation of the London crowd, in the Exclusion Crisis as on the eve of the Civil War.[15]

The final group of articles refers to the Civil War itself. Here a note of apology is perhaps called for. It may seem odd that a symposium on rebellion and popular protest in early modern England contains nothing directly on the Great Rebellion or on the radicals in the English Revolution. This is partly because *Past and Present* articles on the Levellers and Diggers have already appeared in another collection.[16] But it is also in part deliberate. Much of interest has been written about popular involvement in the English Revolution,[17] but it cannot be said that we yet understand its extent or how radical it was. In the early stages much of the popular support for Parliament was certainly conservative, inspired by such traditional motives as the anti-Catholicism analysed by Robin Clifton below (chapter 7). Later in the war, popular opinion probably turned largely towards neutralism and found its most positive expression in the Clubmen movement, part of which is fully described in David Underdown's important essay (chapter 8). The New Model Army proved to be more revolutionary by the end of the 1640s, of course, but John Morrill's contribution below (chapter 9) shows how discontent in the army initially sprang from a non-ideological concern with more particular grievances, notably pay. It is clear that much remains to be discovered about the connections between popular disorder and political radicalism in the 1640s. But work on riots in the west and the fens reveals no simple alliance between the two; and the continuing researches of David Underdown and John Morrill suggest that social conservatism and a wish to preserve traditional practices may well have been the predominant features of popular attitudes throughout that revolutionary decade.[18]

Acad., lxii (1976), pp. 16–17, and *Rule and Misrule in the Schools of early modern England* (Stenton Lecture, Univ. of Reading, 1976).

[15] Below, p. 214; S. R. Smith, "Almost Revolutionaries: The London Apprentices during the Civil Wars", *Huntington Lib. Q.*, xlii (1978–9), pp. 313–28.

[16] C. Webster (ed.), *The Intellectual Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1974), chs. vi–xi.

[17] Particularly Brian Manning, *The English People and the English Revolution* (London, 1976).

[18] Sharp, *In Contempt of All Authority*, p. 264n; Lindley, *Fenland Riots*, chs. 4, 6; D. Underdown, "The Problem of Popular Allegiance in the English Civil War", *Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser., xxxi (1981), pp. 69–94; J. Morrill, "The Church in England

II

The conservatism of popular aspirations is indeed the theme common to all the pieces in this collection, with the notable and important exception of Dr. Brigden's on the Reformation. Religious faith could legitimize a break with the past, whether it was Protestantism in the sixteenth century or Puritanism for some in the Civil War. On the whole, however, popular protest was directed against novelty; it appealed for sanction to traditional customs, voiced traditional ideals, and took traditional forms. As a result episodes of popular disorder were complex phenomena which can rarely be attributed to any single cause. In the simplest case, that of food riots, high bread prices were clearly a necessary condition for disorder; but it is also evident that they are not a sufficient explanation for it. It required some sense that traditional norms of behaviour were being flouted to produce communal action in a riot, instead of that rise in the incidence of petty theft which was a more usual consequence of dearth.

Economic hard times were much less important in other sorts of protest. There was no correlation, for example, between bad harvests and the most serious Tudor rebellions.[19] Economic grievances played a part in them, but they were never alone. In the Pilgrimage of Grace opposition to enclosure and high entry fines figured prominently in the north-west, but the defence of monasteries, of holy days, and of the wealth of parish churches was equally important elsewhere. The various strands came together in a coherent movement, just as opposition to the sheep tax and to religious innovation in the west in 1549 produced a single rebellion without apparent strain. As Dr. Davies suggests, it is anachronistic to draw a strict dividing line between religious and material factors in these revolts.[20] Their participants did not make that distinction, but defended a whole way of life which seemed to them to be under threat.

Even Kett's rising, the most obviously "economic" of Tudor rebellions, grew into something more than a complaint about agrarian innovation. It became a demonstration against the manifold abuses of local officials and local landlords; and in setting up a rudimentary local government himself, Kett tried to show what good governance

1642–9", in J. Morrill (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642–1649* (London, 1982), pp. 89–114.

[19] C. S. L. Davies, "Peasant Revolt in France and England: a Comparison", *Agric. Hist. Rev.*, xxi (1973), p. 125. Cf. below, pp. 19-20, 112-13, 147-8, 244-5, 285-6.

[20] Below, p. 25. On the west, see Youings, "South-Western Rebellion", pp. 103–7.

ought to be. The rising thus acquired a definite political import. Like the food rioters and those who defended customary common rights in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Kett's rebels were demonstrating their notion of "order" in the expectation that the political élite needed only to be shown it for reform from above to follow.[21]

The political élite had in fact a crucial role to play in rebellion and popular protest. It was a participant as much as an audience, although the degree of its participation varied from outbreak to outbreak and is often difficult to reconstruct from biased evidence compiled after the event. There are essentially three aspects to its role. First, public authority was responsible for the ideas which validated protest. The "moral economy" of food rioters rested on Tudor policies of market regulation embodied in the Books of Orders.[22] Attacks on Catholics in the seventeenth century and Dissenters in the eighteenth had ample sanction from the past publications and pronouncements of governments. Enclosure riots and Kett's rebellion could find authorization in proclamations against agrarian evils which seemed to encourage people to take the law into their own hands.[23] Secondly, the political élite might be influential because of its absence from the scene. The death or disgrace of the natural leaders of a local society could leave a political vacuum which permitted rebellion: the absence of the Howards and the Courtenays from Norfolk and Devon in 1549 are the best-known examples.[24] Equally, of course, authority might deliberately abdicate its responsibilities, not striving to suppress disorder before it got out of hand. But this sort of passive tolerance of disturbance was, and is, difficult to distinguish from the third and most controversial sort of élite involvement, active incitement to riot or revolt.

It would be possible to spend a good deal of time, with little profit, debating the question of whether popular revolts were the result of conspiracy on the one hand or of spontaneous popular combustion on the other. Neither hypothesis will do on its own, and the balance between the two elements altered with circumstances. Clearly no riot, let alone a rebellion, is wholly spontaneous. It needs leaders who can

[21] Below, p. 53. Cf. P. Williams, "Rebellion and Revolution in early modern England", in M. R. D. Foot (ed.), *War and Society. Historical Essays in honour and memory of J. R. Western* (London, 1973), pp. 229–30.
[22] Below, pp. 118, 123; P. Slack, "Books of Orders: The Making of English Social Policy 1577–1631", *Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser., xxx (1980), pp. 3–4, 17.
[23] S. K. Land, *Kett's Rebellion* (Ipswich, 1977), pp. 16–17.
[24] Below, p. 46; Youings, "South-Western Rebellion", pp. 116-17. Cf. Harrison, *Pilgrimage of Grace in the Lake Counties*, p. 38.

win recruits, and unfortunately the processes of recruitment are the most shadowy area of our whole subject, at any rate before the eighteenth century. The apprehension in London of a man "enticing men's servants and apprentices to go with him to the rebels at Norwich" in 1549 provides a rare glimpse of part of the process.[25] Yet planning and deliberation there must have been, and it sometimes came from the gentry. On occasion even small-scale riots were manipulated or incited by the élite, as the essays below make clear.[26] More important, there is a good deal of evidence that political disputes at the top, at Court as well as in the country, provided a vital stimulus and support for the Pilgrimage of Grace.[27] Yet to suggest that such a revolt was essentially, if not solely, a conspiracy is surely to throw out the baby — that is, most of the participants in the event — with the bathwater. It ignores those positive elements of organization and motivation at the popular level which form the subject of many of the essays in this book; and it overlooks the fact that other rebellions of the period, those of 1549, managed without gentry — or at least upper-gentry — leadership.

Just as élite and plebeian attitudes and behaviour interacted in the complex theatre of the food riot, so in circumstances of rebellion there were always expectations and uncertainties on both sides. Popular dissidence and political conspiracy often needed each other if they were to have any chance of success. The two came together in the Pilgrimage, and both elements account for the danger presented by Wyatt's revolt in 1554, and for the fact that Monmouth's rebellion in 1685 ever got off the ground at all.[28] But the Rising of the North in 1569 was arguably weakened by a lack of independent popular support, and Essex's conspiracy like the later Jacobite rebellions was ruined by the same limitation.[29] On the other hand, the major risings

[25] B. L. Beer, "London and the Rebellions of 1548–9", *Jl. British Studies*, xii (1972), p. 22. The fullest evidence of how risings were recruited comes from Oxfordshire in 1596 and is discussed in John Walter, "A Rising of the People? The Oxfordshire Rising and the Crisis of the 1590s", *Past and Present* (forthcoming).

[26] Below, pp. 145-6, 217-18, 255-6, 282.

[27] See James, "Obedience and Dissent", *passim*; Smith, *Land and Politics*, pp. 198-208; and for the most forceful conspiracy argument, G. R. Elton, "Politics and the Pilgrimage of Grace", in B. C. Malament (ed.), *After the Reformation. Essays in honor of J. H. Hexter* (Manchester, 1980), pp. 25–56. For rather different views, see below, pp. 23-4; Davies, "Peasant Revolt in France and England", p. 134; Harrison, *Pilgrimage of Grace in the Lake Counties*, pp. 85–7.

[28] There is still no full account of the Monmouth episode, but there is useful information in P. Earle, *Monmouth's Rebels* (London, 1977).

[29] James, "Concept of Order", pp. 70–2; P. Williams, *The Tudor Regime* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 344–5; B. Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain 1689–1746* (London, 1980), pp. 118–20, 125, 258–9.

of the summer of 1549 seem to have owed little to gentry conspiracy. In the west, a Courtenay faction may have played a minor part, but leadership came from the clergy, as it was to do in so many rebellions and riots of the period.[30] In East Anglia, as Dr. MacCulloch shows, some of the gentry had good reason to dabble in revolt, but all the evidence suggests that the lead was taken by those just below the gentry class: prosperous tradesmen and lesser office-holders in towns, yeomen and churchwardens in villages, men accustomed to organizing their neighbours on occasions such as musters.

If the nature of the leadership of popular protest presents historical problems, so too does the identity of the rank-and-file. The role of the young in many instances, though not in all,[31] has already been mentioned. Women were common participants in food riots.[32] But the ubiquitous presence appears to be that of the artisan. Artisans and craftsmen, often including shoemakers,[33] turn out to be prominent in riots and rebellions of all kinds. To an extent this may be a distortion created by official records, which marked a trade against a name even when a man's primary occupation was in fact that of a farmer or farm labourer. Clearly, men engaged predominantly in agriculture figured largely in Kett's rebellion, and in the Clubmen movement and agrarian riots of the seventeenth century; hence the importance of a knowledge of farming regions in explaining their location and composition.[34] But it is worth stressing that the term "peasant revolt" which is often applied to sixteenth-century disturbances may well be a drastic oversimplification. Not only have rural artisans been found taking a leading part in many agrarian riots,[35] but urban residents were often involved in what seem superficially to be rural disturbances: in Kett's rebellion, as Dr. MacCulloch shows, in enclosure riots, and even in the great Midland Rising of 1607.[36] If "peasants" pure and

[30] Youings, "South-Western Rebellion", p. 121. For the activity of the clergy elsewhere, see below, pp. 30-31, 171-2, 246-7, 283; Bowker, "Lincolnshire 1536", *passim*.

[31] Monmouth's supporters seem to have been mature men: Earle, *Monmouth's Rebels*, pp. 18, 207–11.

[32] Below, p. 122; Clark, "Popular Protest in Kent", p. 376; Walter, "Grain Riots", pp. 55, 62–3.

[33] Below, pp. 33, 252, 278; James, "Obedience and Dissent", p. 20; Youings, "South-Western Rebellion", p. 119. Cf. E. J. Hobsbawm and Joan W. Scott, "Political Shoemakers", *Past and Present*, no. 89 (Nov. 1980), pp. 86–114.

[34] Below, pp. 53-6; ch. 8 *passim*.

[35] This is the major theme of Sharp, *In Contempt of All Authority*.

[36] See, for example, C. Phythian-Adams, *Desolation of a City. Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 254–5; *York Civic Records*, IV, ed. A. Raine (Yorks. Arch. Soc., Rec. Ser., cviii, 1943), pp. 1–2; John Stow, *The Survey of London* (Everyman edn., London, 1956), p. 381; *The Ledger of John Smythe 1538–1550*,

simple played a lesser part in English riot and revolt than has often been thought, it is possible that townsmen played a bigger role than is commonly assumed.

The problems of leadership and composition are connected with another issue which has much exercised French historians of popular revolts: whether they were largely class-based movements directed against the propertied élite, or whether they represented vertical alliances of different orders of society against the central government.[37] Again, no simple answer can be given which covers all circumstances, at least in the English case. The Pilgrimage of Grace was clearly the second, while Kett's rebellion, in its evident antagonism towards the gentry, had some features of the first. There were other occasions too on which social resentments against "gentlemen", or more commonly against "the rich" who oppressed "the poor", were voiced. But these were prejudices rather than programmes for social conflict. It has been well said that class antagonism must be distinguished from class war.[38] Opposition to the gentry was greatest when they failed, as expected, to respond to or lead popular pressure. Social polarization was generally the consequence of frustration at the breakdown of vertical loyalties.

One of the difficulties involved in analysing motivation on these occasions, however, is the absence of anything resembling an articulate voice of revolt in the records. Even the lists of demands drawn up in Tudor rebellions were usually a hotch-potch of particular grievances without any clear validating ideology in them, whether social or otherwise. As Dr. MacCulloch demonstrates in the case of Kett, they can often be tied to particular local conditions, but it would be absurd to suppose that they embodied all that the rebels themselves wanted to say. One of Kett's demands — that "bondmen may be made free, for God made all free with his precious blood-shedding" — is wholly exceptional in its abstract justification of radical social change. It referred to the retention of bondage on the Howard estates, but its unusual wording suggests that it owed something to a similar demand by German peasants in 1525, though we know nothing of the mechanisms of transmission.[39] Usually, however, English risings and

ed. J. Vanes (Bristol Rec. Soc., xxviii, 1975), p. 23; *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, ed. M. Bateson and H. Stocks (Leicester, 1899–1923), vol. iv, pp. 59–64 (1607).

[37] For reviews of this controversy, see J. H. M. Salmon, "Venal Office and Popular Sedition in France", *Past and Present*, no. 37 (July 1967), pp. 21–43; M. O. Gately *et al.*, "Seventeenth-Century Peasant 'Furies': Some Problems of Comparative History", *Past and Present*, no. 51 (May 1971), pp. 63–80.

[38] Davies, "Peasant Revolt in France and England", pp. 132–3. Cf. Clark, "Popular Protest in Kent", p. 380; Williams, *Tudor Regime*, pp. 336–8.

[39] Below, pp. 58-9; H. J. Cohn, "The Peasants of Swabia, 1525", in J. Bak (ed.), *The*