GENERAL SERIES: G 12

KET'S REBELLION

1549

BY

S. T. BINDOFF, M.A.

READER IN MODERN HISTORY
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

Non-members may obtain copies at 1s. 7d. *each (post free), and members may obtain extra copies at* 10d. *each (post free) from the Hon. Secretary of the Association,* 21, *Bedford Square, London, W.C.*1.

PUBLISHED FOR
THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
BY
GEORGE PHILIP & SON, LTD.,
32, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.
1949

KET'S REBELLION

1549

On 20 June, 1549, the men of the town of Attleborough and of the neighbouring hamlets of Eccles and Wilby, in South Norfolk, threw down the fences recently erected by John Green, lord of the manor of Beckhall in Wilby, round part of the common over which they all had grazing rights. Their mission accomplished, they dispersed to their homes, and for over a fortnight there was no further trouble. But the week-end of 6-8 July found the men of these, and of many other, places congregated in the town of Wymondham to celebrate the festival of the Translation of St. Thomas à Becket, whose chapel stood there. It was an opportunity for exchanging information about, and venting indignation at, local enclosing activities, as well as for hearing about the commotions already in progress to the south athwart the great road which linked Norwich through Wymondham, Thetford, Newmarket and Cambridge with London. The upshot was that the saint underwent a novel translation, into a series of forays to throw down hedges on neighbouring manors. At this point a private feud intervened to become the starting-point of great events. Between John Flowerdew, a lawyer-turned-squire with an interest in two local manors, and the brothers Robert and William Ket, well-to-do tradesmen, there reigned a feud which owed its origin, or perhaps only its bitterness, to the discreditable circumstances in which Wymondham's great priory church had passed, after the Dissolution, into lay hands. It was Flowerdew's attempt, after his own closes had been thrown open, to bribe the rioters into doing the same to Robert Ket's, which brought together the two forces which were to make the Norfolk Rebellion—the force of personality of a great leader of men, and the force latent in the brawny arms and bucolic weapons of an angry peasantry. We need not believe the high-flown words which the chroniclers of the rebellion put into Ket's mouth on the occasion, nor even that the scene was laid under the great oak on the road between Wymondham and Hethersett which still bears his name. It is enough for us that, on that 9 or 10 July, 1549, the movement had found a leader.

It was with Ket at their head that the insurgents moved off, on 10 July, along the road towards Norwich. As they went they threw down more hedges and welcomed more recruits. At Bowthorpe they were met by the sheriff, Sir Edmund Windham, who

performed the Tudor equivalent of reading the Riot Act by proclaiming them rebels and ordering them to disperse. He only succeeded in annoying them and had some difficulty in making his escape. As the company neared the city, Ket demanded, but was refused, permission to march through its streets to gain the spot, on its far, or north-eastern, side, where he planned to establish his camp. He therefore by-passed Norwich to the north, crossed the river Wensum at Hellesdon, and on 12 July reached his chosen ground, the stretch of common known as Mousehold Heath. Here he took possession of Mount Surrey, the house which the sonneteer-earl had built himself on the site of a dissolved priory, and made it his palace and his prison. His followers, daily swollen by new arrivals from far and wide, encamped on the high ground stretching north and east from his headquarters. For six weeks (12 July to 26 August) Ket maintained his Great Camp on Mousehold Heath. Of the domestic organization of this vast *laager* something will be said later ; here we must confine ourselves to its external relations. The closest and most continuous of these were with the city of Norwich. At the outset the city authorities had shown themselves decidedly hostile. But there was a ' fifth column ' within Norwich, which had used Ket's approach as a signal to lay open the Town Close, the ancient common, long since enclosed, on which grazed the freemen's cattle. These malcontents made common cause with the Camp, and there was much going and coming between the two. In these circumstances discretion was certainly the better part of municipal wisdom, and during the first week several leading citizens, including the mayor, Thomas Cod, and a much respected ' elder statesman ', Thomas Aldrich, were often in the camp assisting at its deliberations and urging moderation in its plans. These two even appended their signatures to the list of grievances which Ket and his Governors drew up at this time. The Great Camp also stood in relation with various other bodies of demonstrators abroad in the shire. The largest of these, drawn from the western hundreds, had assembled at Rising Chase, as Castle Rising was then known. Failing to seize Lynn, they moved south through Downham to the Suffolk border, where for some time they commanded the passage of the Little Ouse at Thetford and Brandon. Then they travelled east, to join Ket at Mousehold—bad strategy this, for had they ' dug in ' at the river crossings they might have impeded the entry of government forces into the shire. Meanwhile, an attempt to seize Yarmouth also miscarried. A rising within the town, led by a group of men who had tried an unsuccessful *coup* there in the previous autumn, was reinforced from the Beccles-Bungay region of Suffolk. What exactly happened it is difficult to discover, but in the upshot the eastern insurgents, like the western, went to swell the thousands assembled on Mousehold.

There a new phase opened on 21 July with the arrival from London of York Herald with a promise of pardon to all who would lay down their arms and disperse. When Ket and the bulk of his following rejected this, saying that they had done nothing which called for pardon, the herald withdrew with the representatives of Norwich, and the city was hastily put into a state of defence. Cannonading began during the night and in the morning the insurgents swarmed to the attack. After some fierce fighting they forced their way in through the Bishop's Gate, and once inside quickly made themselves masters of the city. The herald, after a further fruitless attempt to make an impression, took his departure ; the mayor and several aldermen were carried prisoner to Mount Surrey ; and for a time all lawfully-constituted authority came to an end. Later the mayor was released and allowed to pass to and fro, while his deputy restored some sort of order within the walls. The government's answer to the seizure of Norwich, the second city in the kingdom, by popular insurrection was the despatch of an expeditionary force of about 1400 men, among them some Italian mercenaries, under William Parr, marquess of Northampton, brother to Henry VIII's last queen. Northampton entered Norwich without opposition on 30 July. The next day his troops beat off a determined attack from the Camp, but on the following morning a second attack led to a bloody contest on Palace Plain, which so dispirited the marquess that he abandoned the city. The rebels then assumed complete control of Norwich, manning the gates, public offices and prisons, and installing themselves where they pleased, including the cathedral. His success also encouraged Ket to make a fresh attempt upon Yarmouth. He despatched 100 men, under three of his Yarmouth supporters, to seize and hold the town for him. But Yarmouth had taken fright at the goings-on in Norwich, and instead of Ket's contingent the town admitted a naval squadron under Sir Thomas Clere and Sir Thomas Woodhouse, two local men, who took effective measures for its defence. The attack which developed from the Lothingland side about the middle of August achieved nothing but the destruction of the harbour works then in progress, and cost the attackers six guns and thirty men taken prisoner.

Meanwhile, in London the moral of Northampton's débâcle had been learnt. During the second week in August, commissions and instructions flowed out to all the shires around Norfolk for the levying of troops. Letters went as far north as Doncaster, where Shrewsbury, President of the Council of the North, was ordered to have men in readiness to move. The Protector Somerset was originally to have taken command, but for reasons which we can only guess at he was replaced, before 17 August, by the Earl of Warwick. Warwick acted with speed and decision. He moved by Cambridge, Thetford and Wymondham to Intwood, three miles

from Norwich, where he arrived on 23 August. There he was joined by Lord Willoughby of Parham from Lincolnshire. He then disposed of perhaps 12,000 men, soon to be augmented by the 1200 German mercenaries who were hurrying after him. From Intwood, Warwick sent a herald with an offer of pardon to all except Robert Ket himself. This was the third pardon offered, and it availed as little as its predecessors. On Saturday, 24 August, Warwick thrust his way into Norwich and after some street-fighting cleared it of rebels. But during the night some of them got in again and set fire to Conisford Street, which continued to burn all next day. This was Black Sunday for Norwich, with walls and gates broken, fire raging, troops everywhere, and outside the rebels continually on the prowl. Next morning, however, a dense cloud of smoke rising over Mousehold Heath showed that the rebels had fired their camp and were on the move towards Dussindale. There were more cogent reasons for their action than belief in the ambiguous prophecy that, as the current rhyme had it, Dussindale would be filled ' with slaughter'd bodies soon ' ; notably the fact that Warwick had cut some of their supply-lines and that to stay where they were would be to starve. But it gave Warwick the chance of using his cavalry, and on Tuesday, 27 August, he moved out with all his horse and 1000 mercenary foot, leaving his English troops (who might not have stomached the task ahead) to guard the city. A final offer of pardon was made and refused, and then Warwick's professionals went to work. Ignoring the fact that the rebels had placed their gentlemen-prisoners in front as a screen, they charged and speedily broke up the undisciplined ranks opposing them. Then the cavalry got among the fleeing peasants and cut them down, to the number, it was said, of over three thousand. A late rally, which would only have cost more useless lives, resulted instead, if we are to believe one of the chroniclers, in the acceptance of the King's pardon read on the field at Warwick's orders.

Ket himself fled from the battlefield, but was soon caught and brought back to Norwich to await removal to London. A commission of oyer and terminer was sent down to deal with the horde of prisoners. How many were executed it is hard to say. A contemporary report speaks of 300, but reliable evidence relates only to the forty-nine who were hanged at Norwich. Not all were dealt with summarily, for in the following March twenty-nine men of Norfolk then in prison, and in the following May seventeen Suffolk men, were pardoned for their part in the rebellion, and individual pardons were issued for some time after that. Robert and William Ket were tried and condemned for treason in London on 26 November, 1549, and were taken back for execution, Robert being hanged at Norwich Castle on 7 December and his brother from Wymondham steeple.

What we name, or misname, Ket's Rebellion began as a local riot, developed into a great popular demonstration, and ended in the violence and bloodshed of rebellion. These three phases of the movement, separated in point of time, also differ from one another in interest and emphasis. The first is an episode in the long-drawn-out conflict between landlords and tenants ; the second turns on the relations between governors and governed, and its framework is the county ; while in the third these local strands become interwoven with the thread of national politics.

The distinguishing thing about the events of the first phase, the phase of riot, is their lack of distinction. During the previous ten or fifteen years half a dozen, maybe a dozen, villages from one end of Norfolk to the other had been the scene of similar happenings. Two months before Attleborough's turn came, the Court of Star Chamber had been hearing evidence about a long-standing dispute, punctuated by violence, about common rights at Middleton ; in 1544 there had been an enclosure riot at Great Dunham, in 1539 at Hingham. And what is happening in Norfolk is happening in almost every county of Southern England. Everywhere landlords and tenants are at grips with one another, and the issues between them are variations upon a single theme, that complex theme which goes under the easy name of ' enclosure '. There would be little point in attempting to summarize, in half a page, the tangle of changes, and resistance to changes, whose unravelling occupies the four-hundred pages of Tawney's *Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century*. But it is both more feasible and more relevant to glance at some of the changes which had been taking place in the Norfolk countryside during the half-century preceding the rebellion. Under the early Tudors, Norfolk was already a name to conjure with in farming circles. The sandy loam of its north and east was most suited to barley, the boulder clay of its centre and south to wheat. The chalk ridges were also extensively tilled, but here the sheep was the indispensable adjunct of the plough, for the light soil was greedy of manure. On the marshlands of the west and of the north-west coast grazed large flocks of sheep. Only in the south-west, the Breckland, did Nature defy man's attempts to tame her ; and where the Forestry Commission now wields its arboreal sway the rabbit was then the master. The county was thus well-placed to benefit from the growing demand for its two staple products, grain and wool. Norfolk corn-surpluses helped to feed London, as well as going north to Scotland and east to the Continent; Norfolk wool, besides supporting the native worsted industry, was in brisk demand both by the English and the foreign buyer.

The Norfolk peasantry, whose laborious alchemy transmuted this rich earth into gold, was both a numerous and a prosperous

race. The complicated tenurial arrangements obtaining in the county make it difficult to answer many of the questions which a statistically-minded age is disposed to ask. But we know enough to say that the proportion of freeholders, who enjoyed a maximum of legal security with a minimum of tenurial obligation, was higher in Norfolk and Suffolk than anywhere else in the country, being probably not less than one in three of the total. We also know that between the freeholders and the copyholders, those who held their land according to the custom of the manor, there was, instead of the fairly clear distinction which sometimes prevailed, the utmost confusion, with many individuals falling into both categories, a situation which promoted solidarity and with it security. The density of population meant that holdings were generally small—the average falling perhaps somewhere between five and ten acres—but a few acres of Norfolk earth were worth twice that number in a poorer county. Competition for land was exceedingly keen, and there was a brisk market for even the smallest portions; on some manors land was regularly bought on hire-purchase terms. It was in these countless small units that the business of producing Norfolk's grain was carried on. That business also yielded wool and meat in substantial quantities. Sheep were everywhere desirable, and on the lighter soils indispensable, fertilizing agents, and for them there awaited the shearer or the slaughter-house. And sheep and cattle depended, in their turn, upon pasture. A few peasants accumulated enough land to provide their own; but for the vast majority the only answer to the problem of where to graze their animals was the village common.

In marked contrast to the small-scale, predominantly arable farming of the peasants were the operations of their landlords. The landlords, or their lessees, had for the most part gone out of the corn-growing business and were devoting themselves to sheep and cattle farming. They were encouraged in this specialization by the existence of the institution, peculiar to East Anglia, known as the foldcourse, or exclusive right of pasturing sheep upon specified areas, whether or not these belonged to the sheepmaster. Provided it were not abused, the foldcourse system could be mutually beneficial. But by making it possible for a man to rear large flocks without possessing land, it held the seeds of conflict between the two forms of land-utilization, and between the two classes which had become identified with them. A sheepmaster obliged to accommodate an ever-growing flock would be tempted to extend his grazing rights, if not by fair means, then by foul. Foldcourses might be converted into permanent sheepwalk by extinguishing the claims of others upon them; inconvenient enclaves could be absorbed, rights of way blocked, fences erected at strategic points. Above all, there were the commons, on which lords of manors usually enjoyed ill-defined rights of grazing sheep and

cattle alongside those of their tenants. Most commons made far from ideal pasture, but on them a lord could dump his surplus animals, especially perhaps the inferior ones. Overstocking might be followed by enclosure, the lord appropriating a slice of the common contiguous to his land or foldcourse, on the plea that the tenants would be better off with what remained if it were relieved of his animals.

The resulting situation made exorbitant demands both on the land itself and on the patience of those whose livelihood depended upon its reasonable and moderate use. The ingenious theory which sees in the agrarian revolution of the sixteenth century the sole resource left to a countryside whose soil had been exhausted by the continuous cropping of the Middle Ages finds no support from East Anglia. But one can certainly imagine that if the oppression to which the soil of Norfolk was subjected in the early sixteenth century had been long continued the result might have been a Norfolk Rebellion of another kind. However, it was the men who rebelled first. Between 1517, when Wolsey's commission investigated the progress of enclosure in the county, and 1549, the tale is one of perpetual disputes, riots and lawsuits, some between rival landlords or rival villagers, but more between landlords and tenants. In 1520 it is Sir Henry Fermour who is accused of laying down sheepwalks near Fakenham, in 1539 Sir Henry Parker who is charged with encroaching upon Hingham Common; in 1540 it is Middleton common, in 1544 Great Dunham, in 1548 Middleton again, which are in dispute. Fence-levelling had almost attained the status of a rural pastime by the time it reached Attleborough on that June day of 1549.

Agrarian grievances were to bulk large in the programme of the rebellion. Of its twenty-seven articles of complaint, thirteen relate directly to the situation outlined above. Several are self-explanatory: no lords to pasture animals upon the commons (this appears twice); copyhold land, meadow and marsh all to be rented as they were in 1485; special rents payable by lords not to be passed on to tenants; land bought as freehold not to be converted into copyhold; no lord of a manor to be bailiff to any other; no man worth 40*l*. a year or more in land to keep sheep or cattle save for his own subsistence. A radical programme, indeed, which would have clipped the wings of rural capitalism. The inclusion of only one reference to enclosures, and that marred by an ambiguity which contrasts with the prevailing lucidity, is certainly a surprising feature; but it at least bears out the view, which is supported by other evidence, that in Norfolk enclosure as such was not the outstanding grievance that it was elsewhere. A demand for the enforcement of a standard bushel of eight gallons may reflect disputes arising out of the growing corn trade, while the restriction of the number of dovecots and the fencing-in of rabbit warrens

were demands natural to a race of arable farmers who had suffered much from both.

The Attleborough riot had about it, as we have seen, a self-contained quality which gave no hint of what was to follow. It was at Wymondham, a fortnight later, that the local became general, the tip-and-run raid gave place to a major operation. What took place there can be read in different terms; there was the time, the place, the man. Of the time we shall have occasion to speak later; it is enough to say here that there are grounds for regarding the few days about 8 July as of particular significance in the national pattern of events. The place, on the other hand, gives rise to certain reflections which call for discussion here. The strategic position of Wymondham needs no emphasis; any stimulus which the Norfolk movement received from outside the county it was most likely to receive by way of the great road on which lay both Attleborough and Wymondham. But Wymondham was more than a map-reference; it was a community, it was a meeting-place, it was still to some extent a place of pilgrimage. All these things may help to explain why Wymondham became the starting-point of the great demonstration. In particular, the fact that those who remained to scoff at their 'betters' had come, if not to pray, at least to attend a prayerful occasion, prompts the question whether there was any connection between the two forms of activity.

England in 1549 was in the midst of a religious revolution. Within the last generation Henry VIII had severed the nation's links with Rome and brought the Church of England under his sway. He had confiscated much of its wealth, he had executed some of its officers. But he had not tampered with its doctrine or ritual. The reformation of doctrine he had left, on his death in January 1547, to those who should govern in the name of his infant son. Within two years the Protector of the realm, the Duke of Somerset, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, had introduced a Book of Common Prayer which profoundly modified the historic doctrine of the English Church. The compulsory adoption of this Book on Whitsunday (9 June) 1549 was the first stage of the Edwardian Reformation. It was also the signal for a serious rebellion in Devon and Cornwall. The Western Rising, the first in point of time of the upheavals of that troubled year, was aimed almost exclusively against the government's religious policy. Largely officered by their priests, the rebels demanded a return to the Henrician regime. For a few weeks they were dangerous. But they wasted time and energy over a fruitless siege of Exeter, and by the second week in August (that is, by the time that the government was taking serious measures against

Ket) they had ceased to be more than the object of mopping-up operations.

Had religion anything to do with the events in Norfolk? Bearing in mind that the initial outbreak there took place within a fortnight of Whitsunday, that the movement proper began at a commemoration of the saint against whose cult Henry VIII had waged one of his bitterest campaigns, and that the feud between the Kets and the Flowerdews was bound up with the despoiling of Wymondham church, we should not be wholly surprised if the Norfolk rebels had proved as eager to defend the old faith against the new impiety as they were to defend its ancient monuments against their new despoilers. That, indeed, seems to have been the first interpretation placed upon their proceedings by Somerset and the Council. What, in their case, gave colour to the idea was the coincidence that the Princess Mary was residing at Kenninghall, barely two miles from Eccles, and that rumour had made her servants the instigators of the disturbances which broke out at the same time across the near-by Suffolk border.[1] For Mary was the heir-presumptive to the throne, and her religious views were, as the Council told her, 'such as are openly known to be against the proceedings of the King's Majesty and the whole realm, and such as (we fear) have given no small courage to many of these men to require and do as they do'. But Mary's answer, 'that all the rising about the parts where she was, was touching no part of religion', has also become the answer of history. Not only is it inconceivable that, if the men of Norfolk had shared Mary's abhorrence of the new dispensation, they would have ignored her presence as in fact they did, but the positive evidence about them all points the other way. The new Prayer Book which the Western Rebels likened to a 'Christmas game' was regularly used by Ket's followers for their open-air services on Mousehold Heath; and it was to one of the 'new preachers', Robert Watson, that they turned for spiritual counsel. Nor, upon reflection, can we imagine it otherwise. The county which had been a hot-bed of Lollardry and Lutheranism, which was to have so high a percentage of clerical ejections under the Marian Reaction, and which in the fullness of time would become a stronghold of Puritanism, was not the county to rise in defence of the Mass or of the power of priestly order.

With religion in the sense of a particular set of theological propositions the Norfolk rebels may have been unconcerned; with religion in the sense of the proper discharge by its ministers of pastoral duties they showed a quite lively concern. What part the Norfolk clergy took in the rising is a question more easily asked than answered. How exceptional, we may wonder, was the vicar of North Elmham, who after it was all over had to appear with

[1] Was it also coincidence that Eccles had a Catholic parson who was prosecuted in 1549 for saying Mass and Vespers?

other ' comrades ' before the royal commissioners at Fakenham, doubtless as an accomplice in his parish's remarkable piece of ' open conspiracy ' ? How typical the parson of Alswiththorp[1] who was reported to have said that he wished the town of Lynn and all the gentlemen in it were on fire ? On the whole, we may guess that the clergy in general held aloof. There was certainly a good deal of anti-clericalism in the insurgents' list of grievances : priests not to be allowed to purchase any more land, and their present lands to be let to laymen ; those unable to preach to be dismissed and replaced by others chosen by either parishioners or patrons ; no priest to be a gentleman's chaplain, but all to reside in their benefices ; all clergy beneficed with 10*l.* a year or more to teach poor children the catechism and primer ; tithes to be commuted at 8*d.* in the noble, that is, at a flat rate of ten per cent. It is easier to believe that the clergy stood outside rather than within a movement which tabled such demands. The clergy could certainly not compete in popular esteem with the churches. The parish churches of East Anglia had long evoked a communal solicitude, and benefited by a communal effort, probably unequalled in England. Even a priory church like Wymondham's owed much, including its remarkable west tower, to the parishioners who enjoyed only a part share in it. Few things were better calculated to add to the resentment generated by the agrarian troubles than the wave of spoliation which accompanied the dissolution of the monasteries and chantries and the outlawing of images, relics and shrines. Men and women who had approved, or at least accepted, the desanctification of edifices and objects might none the less deplore the fate which overtook so many of them. Flowerdew's stripping of Wymondham has always found a place in the story of the rebellion. But may not Sir John Clere's looting of West Somerton, or the row over the sale of church property in Yarmouth, have made as many recruits for the cause ?

And with religion in the sense of the moral basis of society ? How far were Ket and his followers concerned with that ? Their most famous demand reads as follows :

> We pray that all bond men may be made free, for God made all free with his precious blood shedding.

This appeal to the Great Manumission of Calvary against the perpetuation of an obsolete social stigma may seem at first sight to reveal an urge towards the reconstruction of society upon Christian principles. And it is a fact worthy of remembrance that the only resounding denunciation of villeinage ever heard in Tudor England was uttered by the English peasantry in their hour of corporate articulacy. But we must beware of building too much upon these few trenchant words. It is more than likely that they

[1] The identity of this place is a matter for conjecture.

were inherited, with one or two other ideas, from the Twelve Articles of the German Peasant Rising of 1525. Now in the German movement not only had serfdom been the leading issue, but the appeal to the New Testament, as expounded by Luther, had been the dominant note, so that this demand, in this form, had been the German peasants' veritable battle-cry. In the Norfolk of 1549 the situation was quite otherwise. There personal villeinage lingered on, it is true, perhaps more stubbornly than in any other part of England ; and to those who bore its taint it was doubtless a life-long, indeed a more than life-long, slur. But their number was small, perhaps a few hundred, and the burden of their servility did not in practice weigh them down. Again, the very fame of Ket's demand for their emancipation rests largely upon its uniqueness in his catalogue. Here, and here only, does he base his appeal upon Christ and upon what was done in Judæa in the twentieth year of the Emperor Tiberius ; elsewhere his appeal is to custom and to what was done in England in the first year of King Henry VII. It may be that Ket's own religious conviction was as deep as his moral sense was lofty, and that both found expression in his championship of the underdog of Tudor Norfolk. But this justly celebrated article affords no real ground for attributing to his movement a degree of religious fervour harnessed to a social egalitarianism which few, if any, of his followers can have shared.

After the time and the place, the man. Wymondham's greatest contribution to the rebellion was, of course, Robert Ket himself. Diligent research has failed to elicit much more than the three salient facts that Ket's forbears had been established in the district for several generations, that the family was closely associated with the church which Flowerdew looted, and that Robert Ket himself, by profession and property, must be placed somewhat above the middle of the social scale. All were excellent qualifications for the part which he was to play. But none can compare in historic importance with the personal qualities to which his leadership of the movement bears witness. It was because he possessed those qualities that Ket was offered the leadership ; it is for the same reason that his acceptance was to mark a turning-point in the story. At that instant the movement underwent its first metamorphosis ; the riot was over, the full-scale demonstration had begun. The cause may have produced the man ; but it was for the man to make the cause.

The Norfolk movement surged forward where corresponding movements crumbled and broke because it was inherently strong and because it found a leader of first-class calibre. But is that the whole explanation ? What took place in Norfolk in July 1549

was a monster breach of the peace, a complete, if temporary, breakdown of the machinery of law and order. The fact that nowhere else, save in Devon and Cornwall, was this breakdown so complete prompts the question whether there was not some defect in the machinery itself. It is a question which in the present state of knowledge may not be capable of answer. But one or two points suggest themselves. Sixty years of Tudor government had weakened, but not eradicated, the instinct by which each county looked for guidance to those who bore its chief dignities, lay and ecclesiastical. In the case of Norfolk these were the Duke of Norfolk and the Bishop of Norwich. The bishop we can dismiss out of hand. William Rugge *alias* Reppes, who disgraced that office between 1536 and 1549, was a dead loss to both Church and State. His dismissal would in itself almost have been worth a revolt, and one of the wholly commendable results of Warwick's punitive visit to Norwich was his enforced resignation. If Norwich was a broken reed, Norfolk was a bird in a cage. Thomas Howard II appears to have made himself no sweeter a name in local than in national history, and there is no reason to suppose that the rebels wasted emotion over the catastrophe which had befallen him and his son in 1546. They did not talk of their 'good duke' as the Londoners were to talk of Somerset when he joined Norfolk in the Tower. But good duke or bad duke, Thomas Howard had been a power in the affairs of his titular county, as well as in those of his country, for a generation before his fall. It was he who had built the palace at Kenninghall. He and his son also had three houses in Norwich and what was left of the medieval fortress of Castle Rising. When in 1525 East Anglia had staged its last major protest, against Wolsey's Amicable Loan, the Duke had been cast for the rôle of pacificator. His influence may have helped to restrain Norfolk from emulating Lincolnshire in 1536. In 1545 he had been made the first Lord Lieutenant of Norfolk and the neighbouring counties. Had he been available in 1549 he would have been the obvious man for the government to call upon. But before 1549 Howard was down. And his fall may have contributed something to the rebellion. For he had concentrated not only power and prestige, but also property, in the county. In particular he had received the lion's share, something like forty manors, of the monastic lands seized there at the Dissolution. Thus it was only after 1546 that the dispersal of these lands began in earnest. Of the Howard manors in Norfolk, twenty-two were settled in 1548 upon the Princess Mary, who thus came to reside at Kenninghall. But smaller parcels began to go elsewhere. Early in 1549, for instance, Richard Fulmerston, an ex-steward of the duke's, bought all his property in Thetford, as well as some of his other Norfolk manors, one of which he sold (such was the momentum of the process) the day after he acquired it. At the same time the chantry lands,

which by the act of 1 Edward VI had followed the monastic lands into the hands of the Crown, began to follow them out again. The Norfolk chantries were surveyed early in 1548, and within twelve months many of them had been disposed of.

Is it fanciful to see in the fall of the great house a stimulus to the rivalries among the county families which had so long been constrained to pay it court and beg its favour? That fall created a vacuum in local politics which no other individual or family was sizeable enough to fill. But there were gentry enough and to spare ready to fight for the largest morsel of the wealth and power which now dropped, pancake-wise, among them. Norfolk had long been noted for the number of its gentlemen. Had not the duke himself pointed to the fact in 1536 as a safeguard against rebellion? But the events of 1549 were to belie him, and we are certainly disposed to see in their superabundance an element of weakness rather than of strength. That it contributed to their unpopularity is undeniable; that it helped to justify their unpopularity is likely enough. Intensity of competition tends to vary with the number of competitors, and the competition for wealth, place and prestige in the Norfolk of 1549 must have been a fierce business. Such conditions do not promote solidarity. Here and there we get hints of inter-family feuds, Lestrange against Townshend and Knyvet, Drury against Woodhouse, Paston against Clere. The Norfolk gentry may have been caught in 1549 with its ranks divided.

One section of it flourished like the green bay tree, the lawyers. The litigiousness of the county had long been proverbial. In the previous century it had furnished the worst spectacle of legal racketeering to be met with anywhere, and the statutory limitation in 1455 of its attornies to the number of eight did not prevent it from continuing to have, in the sixteenth, more lawyers than any other. The most enterprising of them went to London to make their fortunes—the names of Hobart, Yelverton, Gawdy and Coke are Norfolk names—the stay-at-homes practised in Norwich, Yarmouth and Lynn. The lawyer-turned-squire was the *bête noir* of the rebels of 1549. It was no accident that John Flowerdew, whose misplaced trust in the power of the purse helped to turn a riot into a rebellion, was one of the tribe. Then there was Master Hobart of Morley, son or grandson of Henry VII's attorney-general, whose fences were levelled; John Corbet, a gentleman-lawyer sprung from Norwich freeman stock, who in 1548 had bought with Southwell M. R. the chantry of Sprowston, and whose house and dovecot there suffered at the rebel's hands; and Thomas Gawdy of Harleston, who was taken prisoner. Their misliking of lawyers also comes out in one or two of the rebels' demands. Of particular interest is the request that no feodary shall in future be legal adviser to any man during his term of office. The work of the feodary,

the county representative of the Court of Wards responsible for all matters relating to land held of the king by knight service, was peculiarly susceptible to pressure by interested parties, and its severance from private legal practice was a *sine qua non* of its honest discharge. The demand that no-one holding less than 10*l.* a year in land should be required by the escheator or feodary to submit to an inquisition into his property was designed to protect the small landholder from inordinate expense. But both demands gain their chief interest from the fact that the escheator of Norfolk during the year preceding the rebellion had been none other than John Flowerdew of Hethersett. What tale of private vexations, we may wonder, lies behind the bland impersonality of these two demands?

The same circumstances which help to explain the origin of the movement may also throw some light upon its development. For the riots which heralded it no particular blame attaches other than to the landlords who had invited them. Faced with such local outbreaks, county officials could not be expected to do more than to check their spread. But this is where the Norfolk authorities conspicuously failed. It appears that the demonstrators first incurred the censure of authority on 10 or 11 July, when the sheriff harangued them at Bowthorpe. By that time they were well on their way towards Mousehold and were little disposed to abandon an enterprise so auspiciously begun. The sheriff's tone, moreover, was ill-suited to men who did not admit that they were doing wrong. But might not an earlier and more tactful intervention have checked the movement, or better still have diverted it into a lawful channel? The keen sense of order which, under Ket's leadership, permeated the whole undertaking would have favoured such an outcome. But although we know that several justices of the peace resided in the immediate neighbourhood, we hear of no such attempt to intervene at this early stage. On the contrary, the inactivity, tantamount to abdication, of the justices is, like the silence of the watchdog in *Silver Blaze*, one of the most remarkable features of the story. The Norfolk commission of the peace was a very full one, containing fifty-four names, forty-six of them those of local knights and gentlemen. Of very few of these men do we hear anything during the rebellion, of fewer still anything to their credit. If it was public spirit which led Roger Woodhouse of Kimberley to seek out the rebels at Hellesdon on 11 July, bearing an olive branch in the shape of carts laden with bread and beer, his ill-usage and captivity were certainly a poor reward. It was a pity that he was so unpopular. But the epic of Nicholas Lestrange of Hunstanton, late sheriff and knight of the shire, makes sorry reading. He and Sir William Woodhouse fled by cock boat into Lincolnshire, leaving his brother and son as hostages, and Lestrange at least seems to have avoided going back until he could tack himself

on to Willoughby of Parham's relieving force. Compared with this, Sir Edmund Knyvet's sortie from his fortress of New Buckenham to attack a rebel outpost sounds heroic. The silence which covers so many names might, of course, have been an enforced one. But the reported imprisonment of gentlemen in large numbers and from all parts of the shire seems to be a legend. The gentlemen whom we can prove to have been taken are very few, and all came from the immediate neighbourhood of the camp. Moreover, several of the Norfolk J.P.s reappear in the train of either Northampton or Warwick. The inference is that most of them 'disappeared' during the storm, either lying low in their manor houses or, like Lestrange, removing themselves out of harm's way.

They need not have been so scared. For a gentleman to fall into the hands of the rebels was far less dangerous than for a beaten rebel to fall into the hands of the gentlemen. There were no hangings, no roastings in ovens, no torturings. Imprisonment in fetters was the worst that would have befallen them until the very end, when a place of danger on the battlefield became, not without a certain grim justice, the final ordeal. But it needed no other trial than the test of events to convict the knights and gentlemen of Norfolk on the indictment against them—that they were unfit to govern. They were unfit to govern because they had proved themselves unable to govern; and they were unable to govern because they had forfeited the respect upon which government such as theirs rested. Immersed in their family fortunes, their fine houses (Norfolk is rich in Early Tudor), their sheepfarms, their feuds and their lawsuits, they neither knew nor cared enough about what was going on around and underneath them. Sir Thomas More had described government in his day as 'a conspiracy of rich men seeking their own commodities'. The government of Norfolk in the years before the great rebellion must have approximated to that description.

We can dilate on the shortcomings of the Norfolk gentlemen because we know who they were. In attempting to appraise the deeds of the Norfolk rebels we are under the grave handicap of not knowing who they were. One of the overdue tasks relating to the rebellion is the compilation of a list of those who took part in it and of their places of origin; material is not wanting, and the result, however imperfect, could not fail to be instructive. Lacking such a list, we must do our best with the names available. A map showing the towns and villages represented by seventy of Ket's company reveals an interesting pattern. Over the greater part of the county the distribution appears fairly even, with a hint of two concentrations, one in the triangle Burnham-Lynn-East Dereham, the other along the axis Attleborough-Wymondham-

Norwich. It is tempting to identify these two areas with the two main assemblages, at Castle Rising and Mousehold. The extension of the places involved into north-east Suffolk might similarly be linked with the attempt on Yarmouth. By contrast with this wide belt of country, stretching from the neighbourhood of Hunstanton on the Wash to that of Southwold on the coast of Suffolk, south-west Norfolk, that is, the region south and west of a line drawn from Lynn to Diss, is hardly represented at all. The omission of place names in this region from so fragmentary a list as ours would obviously be too slender a basis for theorizing but for two other facts. There is, first, the historical fact that of the eight Norfolk hundreds unrepresented in the only known list of Ket's Governors, seven lie contiguously within this region and, indeed, taken together practically cover it. The inference is obvious, that Ket found least support in this part of the county. And this inference, in turn, tallies with the second fact, a fact of geography: the region in question includes what has always been the poorest and most thinly settled part of Norfolk. Here, it is safe to conclude, there was little of that pressure of wants upon land which prevailed elsewhere in the county; here, that is to say, there were largely lacking the conditions which gave rise to the rebellion. If we may accept this contrast between south-west Norfolk and the rest of the county in their attitude towards the rebellion, then its significance is readily apparent. It must have conduced to isolationism. Norfolk is bounded, as to roughly one-half, by the sea; and to rebels who were for the most part landsmen and who had in any case failed to seize a port, the sea was the limit of expansion. If, in addition, at least one-half of the remaining land-boundary constituted a sort of natural *cordon sanitaire*, then the rising must have been largely sealed off from the beginning. It is hard to believe that if Ket had staged a rising in, say, Warwickshire, it would have displayed the centripetal tendency which characterized the movement in Norfolk.

To say this, however, is not to make the mistake of representing this tendency of the Norfolk movement to look inwards rather than outwards as something imposed upon it by external circumstances instead of as something springing logically from its very nature. If Ket had wanted to emulate the Western Rebels by setting off for London, he could doubtless have done so. He might indeed have outdone them by reaching it, since he had less than half their distance to travel and no Exeter to mask or capture on the way. But such an operation formed no part of Ket's programme. To the Western Rebels the government at Westminster might be a hostile power to be persuaded or coerced into abandoning its religious policy; to the Norfolk rebels that government was an ally to be encouraged to persevere in, and to be helped to enforce, its agrarian policy. It was the government on the spot

which had to be supplanted, the man up at the Big House who needed a lesson. Ket remained in Norfolk because that was where his task lay. In leading his followers to Mousehold and making it the scene of a sort of vast sit-down strike Ket was obeying the inner logic of the whole enterprise. Here, on a site traditionally associated with popular movements—did they remember how their forefathers had gathered there in 1381?—they would eat, drink, and be merry, worship God and live in brotherhood, debate and legislate and give good justice to their fellows. It was a grand conception, and the extent of its realization is a measure both of the spirit of the rank-and-file and of the genius of the leader. How easily might the whole thing have dissolved in dissension and ended in pantomime. But moral seems to have remained high and discipline good until the end, the bitter end. And, indeed, why should we expect it to have been otherwise? From the graveyard of Dussindale, from the charnel pits of Norwich, there sounds a ghostly challenge. What sort of people do they think we were? Do they think of us as a disorderly rabble consumed by greed, hatred, and lust to destroy? 'Not men but brute beasts indued with all cruelty', 'the refuse of the people' (for so our enemies called us)? For shame. We who lie here were honest, sober, sturdy folk, having God and the commonweal before our eyes. No hirelings we, but men with a stake in the country, having our farms and our flocks as our fathers had done before us. No simpletons, either, for whom law and government were bottomless mysteries. Was it not commonly said of us that we carried Littleton's 'Tenures' at the plough tail? And did we not, year in and year out, help to rule ourselves, in our manor courts and our courts leet, in our parish councils and on our sworn juries? How then should it be that, when we were met together for the redress of our just grievances, we should not quit ourselves like the law-abiding, order-loving, constitution-minded folk that we were?

No popular commotion was ever less like the conventional notion of a *jacquerie* than the Norfolk Rebellion, at least until a foretaste of its brutal suppression induced some lowering of its standards. Being arrived, with a minimum of disturbance *en route*, at Mousehold the company quickly constructed its own machine of government to replace the broken-down machine of the county commission. Under Ket himself as leader and supreme law-giver, there sprang into existence a 'county council' composed of two representatives of twenty-four out of the county's thirty-two hundreds, plus a representative of the Suffolk contingent. These representatives, or Governors, were doubtless men of standing in their own districts. One of the few of whom we know more than the name is Edmund Belys or Beles, who, with Robert Sendall, represented the hundred of Eynsford. Beles was a copyhold tenant of Lord Morley's at Twyford. Some twenty years before he had been

stung into a protest, in the form of a Star Chamber bill, against the man who had leased Morley's rights in the hundred and who was using the court leet as an engine of oppression. With such testimony as his to guide them, the rebels might well request the king to take back all leet jurisdiction into his own hands. Another Governor (although here identification is not certain) was Thomas Clerke, a tanner of Yarmouth. Clerke had been one of the accomplices in John Rotheram's attempt of the previous autumn to lay open the Yarmouth Town Close and in other ways to challenge the rule of the bailiffs. Despite his active part in the rebellion, he was one of those who survived its suppression (doubtless because he was then in the relative safety of Yarmouth gaol) and was eventually pardoned. William Doughty (North Erpingham) may have been the wickner or sub-reeve of the village of Southrepps; William Howlyng (Mitford) probably belonged to the well-to-do family of that name in Shipdam. Such stray identifications could doubtless be multiplied by methodical work among the local sources.

Of the rank-and-file we know even less than of their leaders. A list of forty-seven persons known to have taken part distribute themselves occupationally as follows: seventeen were husbandmen, seven butchers, four tailors, two labourers, two tanners, two fishermen, two millers, two coopers, two shoemakers, with an inn-keeper, a mason, a baker, a waterman, a hatter, a mercer and a rat-catcher. Such a list, with its nursery-rhyme flavour, will at least serve to remind us that this was no exclusively agrarian movement. It had a considerable urban element, recruited principally from Norwich and Yarmouth, which were responsible for most of the trades enumerated above. But, to be sure, the antithesis which we make between town and country is far less valid when applied to their Tudor counterparts. Enclosure itself was not exclusively a rural phenomenon, witness the many town riots against it at this time. Conversely, the economic problems of towns, like the depression of the worsted industry in Norwich, must have had repercussions in the surrounding countryside. In general, the evidence of the Norfolk rebellion bears out the view that the rising of 1549 was a rising of the common man, the man in the street as well as the man in the field.

The orderliness of Ket's demonstration was matched by the attention to form and procedure which characterized its public acts. What importance the demonstrators attached to this, and how they managed to achieve a standard answering to their wishes, appear from the story of Thomas Godsalve. Son of the Sir John Godsalve, lawyer, clerk of the signet and comptroller of the mint, whose foxy features live for us in one of Holbein's most revealing portraits, Thomas Godsalve was one of the gentlemen carried

prisoner to Mousehold at an early stage in the proceedings. 'At which time of his so being there' (so runs his own version of the episode) 'he was by the said Ket and divers other rebels then there assembled compelled as well to write such bills as were by the said rebels devised to be made and written as also to read such bills, complaints, writings and commissions as were brought or did come into the hands of the said rebels.' Godsalve, in short, acted as Ket's secretary of state. His was the hand that penned those instruments, running in the king's name and issuing from 'the king's camp', by which Ket sought to govern Norfolk; his, too, perhaps, the hand which wrote the list of grievances for transmission to Westminster. For his misprision of treason, Godsalve afterwards pleaded the king's pardon and he was given office by Mary Tudor, whose godson he was. There was more in this observance of forms than mere play-acting. Not only was it the way in which men like Ket and his Governors, with their long acquaintance with affairs, might have been expected to act; it was the way in which, being launched upon their present enterprise, they had to act. They sent out their writs in the king's name because they were about the king's business; they commandeered supplies in a fashion reminiscent of royal purveyors. Having supplanted the gentlemen who had so long misgoverned the county, they addressed themselves directly to their master the king in the manner of representatives asking for instructions and full powers. They wound up their list of grievances with the request that the king should commission their chosen leaders to purge the shire of evils and evil-doers.

How was it possible, we may ask, for a man like Ket to indulge in such a fantastic and fatal misconception? To represent rebellion as an attempt to deliver a good king out of the control of evil counsellors was, of course, part of the stock-in-trade of the rebel in the age of personal monarchy. But Ket's appeal lay not to the king against wicked counsellors; it lay to the king's good counsellors against his wicked local officials. And the antithesis was no mere creation of a disordered mind. For in the summer of 1549 the king's counsellor-in-chief was the Duke of Somerset; and the Duke of Somerset was, in the eyes of the common man, the embodiment of that 'gentleness' which was so far to seek among the gentlemen. Had not Somerset, within a year of Henry VIII's burial, buried all that monarch's ferocious treason legislation? Had he not re-established and revivified the Court of Requests, that Court of Poor Men's Causes in which the little litigant could find speedy and inexpensive justice? Had he not patronized that group, the 'commonwealth men', who were labouring to diagnose the causes of the country's economic ills and to prescribe remedies for them? Above all, had not Somerset addressed himself, the first leading statesman since Wolsey thirty years before, to the

burning question of enclosure? His issue, in June 1548, of a commission to tour the counties chiefly affected by enclosure and to collect evidence on the spot was a gage of his determination to make the statutes against enclosure something more than the pious futilities they had become. His poll-tax on sheep, in the following November, threatened to make the new sheepwalks not only illegal but—nightmare of nightmares—unprofitable.

This was royal counsel after the peasants' own heart. But they knew—who better?—the opposition which it would arouse and the scale of the effort needed to translate it into fact. What was their part to be? Official spokesmen urged them to do nothing except supply the commissioners with evidence of enclosures in their districts. It was unpalatable advice, but during the commission's first spell of work in the summer of 1548 the peasants seem to have done their best to abide by it. The result, to minds as angrily impatient as theirs, must have been disappointing. Only in a number of south midland counties had the commission really got to work; and there, while something had indeed been achieved, landlord obstructionism had already shown itself a formidable obstacle. By the spring of 1549 there must have been many who felt with Bishop Latimer that 'in the end of the matter there cometh nothing forth.' Somerset himself probably shared their feelings, for he returned headlong to the attack. In May 1549 he set forth another proclamation denouncing enclosures. On 14 June he issued a general pardon to those who had taken the law into their own hands by throwing enclosures open. This last date is significant: it was four days after the outbreak of the Western Rising, six days before the riot at Attleborough. Three weeks later came the real crisis. After a series of disturbances in all the surrounding counties, the men of South Norfolk assembled at Wymondham decided upon action. Simultaneously, government policy underwent its first significant change. Whether their coincidence in time sprang from any connection between these two events we shall probably never know. But if the leaders at Wymondham did receive any hint of what was happening in London, it might well have helped to make up their minds. For the news from London was of an onslaught upon Somerset's kid-gloved handling of riot and rebellion, an onslaught in which those who, like Paget, hated weak government were joined by those who, like Warwick, hated social reform. Shaken by the uproar in the country and by the accusations of his fellows, Somerset yielded, and on 8 July a spate of instructions to local magnates and officials to repress disorder bespoke the change of attitude.

It was this change which converted the Norfolk demonstration into the Norfolk Rebellion. For it went far to destroy the two premises upon which, as we have seen, both the programme and the strategy of the movement were based, namely, that its aims

were identical with the aims of the government, and that the government would welcome, or at least condone, what it was doing towards achieving them. Down to 8 July both premises retained some validity, after that date little or none. There was therefore never any question of co-operation between Westminster and Mousehold; the only question was after what fashion Mousehold would be extinguished. The best that could be looked for—and that only so long as Somerset retained some influence and the Western Rebellion continued to impose prudence—was that the Great Camp should commit suicide, its hopes dashed, its aims unfulfilled, its 'scrap of paper' torn to shreds; the worst—and it would soon come to this—that those who refused this way out should be crushed as a salutary warning to others. That was the brutal truth of the matter; but it was a truth which men who had set out in the opposite belief found hard to swallow. They were given their first taste of it when the herald arrived on 21 July. Instead of a gracious answer to their petition, they received a peremptory summons to disperse and, when they refused, they heard their leader proclaimed a traitor. It must have been a smashing blow. The effect may be gauged from what followed. The withdrawal of those—the few, we may imagine—who chose to accompany the herald only purged the Camp of its weaklings, and on the next day Ket committed his one act of unprovoked aggression, the attack on Norwich. How far, granted the essential rightness of his cause, he was justified in this is a moot point. He may have argued that, since he could not maintain his camp next to a hostile city, it was better to seize Norwich before the townsmen could arm against him. But the deed itself, and its consequences, certainly gave colour to the view that he and his followers were too dangerous to be spared.

The government's next emissary was Northampton, with his puny force. Perhaps there were no more troops to spare, and the government had to make the familiar choice between sending too few or too late; perhaps Somerset cherished the illusion that to send an inadequate force was to avoid bloodshed. But Northampton's failure, and Russell's victory in the West, left no room for further argument. It only remained to settle who should have the credit, or bear the opprobrium, of taking command. Somerset's original appointment, and subsequent replacement by Warwick, have in retrospect a symbolic quality; but we do not know why either took place. Somerset might have reduced the slaughter; but apart from that it mattered little to the peasants by whom they were cut down. Their cause was already lost. They had only to go down fighting.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

All accounts of Ket's Rebellion have been largely based upon one, or both, of the two near-contemporary narratives, Nicholas Sotherton's 'The Commoyson in Norfolk, 1549' (British Museum, Harleian MSS., 1576, ff. 564ff.), and Alexander Neville's *De furoribus Norfolciensium Ketto duce* (1575; English translation by Richard Woods, 1615). Sotherton, member of a well-known Norwich family and brother to the Leonard Sotherton who played a minor part in the events of 1549, furnishes a well-informed eye-witness account; Neville's version owes its value to his intimacy with Archbishop Parker, who as a young man had addressed the assembly at Mousehold. The only other near-contemporary versions which have any independent value are those contained in Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1578) and Hayward's *Life and Raigne of King Edward the Sixt* (1630). Of the half-dozen rehashes of this material to appear within the first three centuries of the events themselves the most careful and complete was that given by Blomefield in his *Essay towards a Topographical History of Norfolk* (ed. 1805-1810, iii. 220ff.). The appearance in 1859 of Rev. F. W. Russell's *Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk* was a landmark in the historiography of the subject. Russell supplemented the literary sources by a wide range of record material, while his grasp of the nature of the movement enabled him to do it far greater justice than his predecessors. Since Russell the two most important contributors have been A. F. Pollard, who in his *England under Protector Somerset* (1900) and in the opening chapters of his *History of England from the accession of Edward VI to the death of Elizabeth* (1913) elucidated the political setting of the upheaval of 1549, and R. H. Tawney, whose *Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century* (1912) set it firmly in its context of rural change. One of Professor Tawney's pupils, Mr. R. J. Hammond, examined the background of the Norfolk movement in detail in his unpublished London M.A. thesis, 'The Social and Economic Circumstances of Ket's Rebellion,' to which I acknowledge my own indebtedness. By contrast, J. Clayton's *Robert Kett and the Norfolk rising* (1912) adds nothing to either knowledge or understanding of the subject. Recently-printed source material includes the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* 1547–1553 (1924–6) and Mrs. Hood's edition of *The Chorography of Norfolk*, an early seventeenth-century work attributed to John Norden (1938). The *Descriptive List of the Printed Maps of Norfolk* 1574–1916, *and Descriptive List of Norwich Plans* 1541–1914, by T. Chubb and G. A. Stephen (1928) is a valuable topographical aid. Among recent secondary works of value may be mentioned: Miss C. M. Hoare (Mrs. Hood), *History of an East Anglian Soke* (1918); L. M. Kett, *The Ketts of Norfolk* (1921); and H. A. Wyndham, *A Family History* 1410–1688. *The Wyndhams of Norfolk and Somerset* (1939).

THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

21 BEDFORD SQUARE
LONDON, W.C.1

THE OBJECTS OF THE ASSOCIATION are to collect and distribute information on all matters relating to the study and teaching of history, to encourage local centres for the discussion of such questions, to represent to education authorities and the general public the needs and interests of historical study and teaching, and to co-operate with other Associations in the furtherance of kindred objects.

BRANCHES of the Association, to which the Historical Association of Scotland is now affiliated, have been formed at many places in England and Wales; and there are affiliated Associations in Canada, Ceylon, South Africa and Lisbon. Members who do not belong to a Branch receive notices and publications direct from the central office. Copies of the Association's ordinary publications, including, as a rule, four pamphlets per annum, are sent gratis to members.

THE ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, including the quarterly journal HISTORY, is 12*s.* 6*d.*, paid in advance; the life subscription £10 10*s.* Without HISTORY, the annual subscription is 7*s.* 6*d.*; the life subscription £6 6*s.*

APPLICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP should be addressed to the Secretary.