

REBELLION AND POVERTY IN EARLY SIXTEENTH-CENTURY SUFFOLK: THE 1525 UPRISING AGAINST THE AMICABLE GRANT

by J. F. POUND

SOME TEN YEARS ago Diarmaid MacCulloch came across a list of people indicted for their participation in the uprising against the Amicable Grant, Wolsey's final attempt to squeeze the maximum amount possible from the people to finance Henry VIII's French wars.¹ The rebellion itself has been dealt with in some detail by MacCulloch (1986) and others. It is sufficient to note here that it numbered some thousands of men on the Suffolk and Essex border and was serious enough to require the personal intervention of the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk to quell it.

The surviving list of those indicted provides the names and occupations of 528 of those involved, some eighty per cent of whom came from Babergh Hundred and the residue from the neighbouring Hundred of Cosford. MacCulloch made an initial analysis of the material, linking it in particular with the assessments of the 1524 Subsidy to get some impression of the financial standing of the people concerned. I propose to look at this material again, taking advantage of my edition of the Military Survey of 1522 for Babergh Hundred (Pound 1986) which appeared after MacCulloch's work, and to look at both the occupations and wealth of those involved as well as the implications for poverty which such analysis reveals.

Those indicted came from thirteen of the thirty-two towns and villages in Babergh Hundred and six of the sixteen in Cosford. The largest number, by far, came from Lavenham which had 172 people indicted, 118 of whom had not appeared in the 1522 Survey. Substantial, although decidedly smaller numbers than this came from Little Waldingfield, Long Melford, Brent Eleigh and Brettenham, with forty-eight, forty-three, forty and thirty-three people respectively listed among the rebels, many of whom, as in Lavenham, had either moved to the area since 1522 or had not been recorded in the Military Survey, presumably on the grounds of poverty. The overall picture is summed up in Table I, the four sub-headings (A–D) indicating the first appearance of such people and their listing, or otherwise, in subsequent years. Thus, two people recorded in Acton in 1522 were not taxed in 1524 but reappeared in the 1525 listing; five of them were assessed in 1522, taxed in 1524 and indicted in 1525; two were recorded for the first time in the Subsidy of 1524 and recorded among the rebels in 1525; while seven men appeared for the first time in the list of those indicted in the last year. Some people were recorded on only two or three occasions, as the table makes clear.

TABLE I

PLACES OF ORIGIN OF THOSE INDICTED IN 1525

(A=1522 and 1525; B=1522, 1524 and 1525; C=1524 and 1525; D=1525 only)

<i>Parish</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Acton	2	5	2	7	16
Alpheton	–	4	1	–	5
Brent Eleigh	4	9	9	18	40

<i>Parish</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Cockfield	–	20	4	1	25
Great Waldingfield	3	8	1	17	29
Lavenham	6	48	43	75	172
Lawshall	2	1	1	3	7
Little Waldingfield	4	10	8	26	48
Long Melford	3	12	6	22	43
Milden	1	2	1	–	4
Monks Eleigh	5	14	3	4	26
Preston	2	9	–	5	16
Sudbury	2	11	1	10	24
<i>Babergh totals</i>	34	153	80	188	455
Bildeston	–	–	5	4	9
Brettenham	–	–	15	18	33
Chelsworth	–	–	–	1	1
Hitcham	–	–	3	6	9
Kettlebaston	–	–	1	2	3
Thorpe Morieux	–	–	13	5	18
<i>Cosford totals</i>	–	–	37	36	73
<i>Grand totals</i>	34	153	117	224	528

One hundred and eighty-seven of those indicted, all from Babergh Hundred, had been named in the Military Survey itself and a comparison of the occupations in the two sources provides some interesting contrasts as well as providing details for some of those with no recorded trades in 1522. One hundred and four of these had the same occupations beside their names, while sixteen of those without listed trades in 1522 were given occupations in 1525, labourers and weavers being predominant among them. Changes of designation were commonplace among the others, thirty-five of the labourers, for example, being placed in different spheres, several being described as either fullers or husbandman.

In the overall process fourteen people were listed as fullers in 1525, compared with no more than two in 1522: the husbandmen described as such numbered twenty-seven in 1525 compared to twenty-two three years earlier; while the number of weavers recorded increased by fifty per cent. The labourers, in contrast, had their numbers reduced from seventy-two in 1522 to forty-seven in 1525, suggesting that the listing in the Military Survey was less than specific, handworkers of any kind being loosely described as such.² Other changes may indicate no more than dual occupations, with individuals being referred to as one or the other in a rather cavalier fashion. The overall picture is shown in Table II.

REBELLION AND POVERTY IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY SUFFOLK

TABLE II

OCCUPATIONS OF THE SAME MEN IN 1522 AND 1525

	1522 occupations														1525 occupations														Totals
	Baker	Butcher	Cardmaker	Carrier	Clothmaker	Cobbler	Dyer	Fletcher	Freemason	Fuller	Horseleach	Husbandman	Labourer	Painter	Shearman	Shoemaker	Skinner	Smith	Tailor	Tallow chandler	Tiler	Turner	Weaver	Yeoman	Unspecified	Totals			
Baker	1																									3			
Beerbrewer																										1			
Butcher		4																								6			
Cardmaker			1																							1			
Carpenter																										1			
Carrier				1																						2			
Cobbler																										1			
Cooper																										1			
Cordwainer																										2			
Corser										1																1			
Draper																										1			
Dyer						1																				1			
Fletcher							2																			2			
Freemason								2																		1			
Fuller									1																	1			
Husbandman								2																		4			
Labourer										15																27			
Miller										1																4			
Painter													3													3			
Pinner														2												1			
Shearman															5											2			
Shoemaker																2										3			
Skinner										1																1			
Smith																										4			
Tailor																										4			
Tallow chandler								2																		9			
Tanner																										1			
Thatcher																										1			
Tiler																										2			
Turner																										2			
Weaver																										19			
Wheelwright																										6			
Yeoman																										1			
Totals	2	4	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	4	1	22	7	2	5	4	1	4	8	1	2	1	24	4	16	187	

The full occupational picture for those indicted in 1525 is more revealing, a majority of them having no place either in the 1522 Survey or in the first instalment of the Subsidy in 1524, a point enlarged upon below when discussing the implications for poverty in the region. All individual occupations are listed in Appendix I but the overall picture is summed up below (Table III). In both cases the picture is that presented in 1525.

TABLE III
OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES OF REBELS INDICTED IN 1525

<i>Occupational category</i>	<i>Numbers</i>	<i>Percentages</i>
Building	23	4.36
Clothing	24	4.54
Distributive	4	0.76
Farming	49	9.28
Food and drink	21	3.98
Labourers	163	30.87
Leatherwork	22	4.17
Metalwork	15	2.84
Miscellaneous	1	0.19
Professional	3	0.57
Textiles	188	35.60
Transport	6	1.14
Woodwork	9	1.70
<i>Totals</i>	528	100.00

The Table largely tells its own story. While forty-four trades were listed overall, two-thirds of the rebels were either labourers or textile workers, with husbandmen and yeomen forming a substantial minority grouping. Two hundred and twenty-four, or forty-two per cent, of these people, appeared for the first time in 1525, including seventy-five of the labourers and ninety-two of the textile workers. Loss of work, as well as fears of yet more taxation, provided the spur for many of them, a fact not lost upon Shakespeare in his *King Henry VIII* when he referred to the clothiers responding to the prospect of increased taxation by putting off

The spinsters, carders, fullers, weavers, who,
Unfit for other life, compelled by hunger
And lack of other means, in desperate manner
Daring the event to the teeth, are all in uproar,
And danger serves among them

(Act I, scene 2).

This leads to the question of how poor these people actually were. Diarmaid MacCulloch has partially explored this question in his analysis of the contributions of those rebels who had been taxed the previous year.³ The Military Survey enables us to take this a stage further, however, and to produce what might well be a more accurate picture of the economic standing of the

187 people concerned in the 1525 uprising who were listed in both 1522 and 1525. Thirty-four of these escaped taxation for whatever reason in 1524, half of whom were given nil assessments in the Military Survey and may be deemed among the desperately poor. Others, including one yeoman assessed at £6 13s. 4d., either evaded taxation altogether or had experienced a decline in their economic standing to a point where rating them would have been a fruitless exercise. The analysis below links the rebels' occupational groupings based on the trades given in 1525 to their declared wealth three years earlier.

TABLE IV

ECONOMIC STANDING OF THE REBELS LISTED IN THE MILITARY SURVEY

<i>Occupational grouping</i>	<i>Nil</i>	<i>£1</i>	<i>£2</i>	<i>£3-4</i>	<i>£5-9</i>	<i>£10-19</i>	<i>£20-39</i>	<i>Land only</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Building	2	2	1	-	1	-	-	1	7
Clothing	2	2	-	2	-	2	1	-	9
Distributive	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
Farming	1	3	2	1	6	11	4	-	28
Food and drink	3	2	2	2	1	2	1	-	13
Labourers	13	16	6	6	3	2	1	-	47
Leatherwork	2	2	2	-	-	3	-	1	10
Metalwork	3	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	6
Professional	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Textiles	14	14	13	3	8	4	1	-	57
Transport	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2
Woodwork	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	5
<i>Totals</i>	41	44	28	16	22	26	8	2	187

The richest man among the rebels was a husbandman of Cockfield, rated at £36 in 1522, followed by a dyer of Lavenham, with goods worth £30, and lands valued at 10s. or, perhaps, fifteen acres.⁴ Husbandmen predominated among the eight wealthiest men, only a butcher and tailor, apart from the dyer, being valued at £20 or more, both men again having landholdings to their names. At a lower level in the social scale, the occupations of those valued at sums ranging from £10 to £19 were more diverse, including representatives of the food and drink, leather, metal and textile trades, as well as a couple of labourers and a fletcher. Husbandmen were again the most numerous at this level, however, eleven of them being assessed on sums of between £10 and £13 6s. 8d.

In contrast, the poorest eighty-five of those indicted were composed almost entirely of labourers and textile workers, with weavers predominating among the latter. Significantly, the poorest among them were also the most proficient archers and billmen, several having the letters AA or BB beside their names in the Military Survey, with a number of others having the single letter A or B, indicating at least some proficiency in this respect. Altogether sixty-nine of

the men listed in the Military Survey as having some ability as either archers or billmen were among those indicted in 1525, eleven of them being archers and fifty-eight billmen.⁵

As already noted, thirty-four of the men recorded in 1522 were not taxed in the subsequent Subsidy of 1524. Of the remaining 153, fifty were taxed on the sums referred to in 1522; thirty-four had their assessments increased, twenty-six of these being men, or youths, described as being of no substance in the Military Survey but who were taxed on wages two years later when they had begun to earn something; while sixty-nine of them, or some forty-five per cent of the whole, had their assessments reduced. Where the poorest of these were concerned such reductions may indicate at least relative reality, loss or diminution of income being the spur to rebellion in 1525. With the wealthier men the situation is more problematic. The evidence for the rich having their assessments progressively reduced is overwhelming. I pointed this out for Norwich over thirty years ago and have since provided comparable evidence for Norfolk (in those Hundreds where the material survives) and for Babergh Hundred in Suffolk.⁶ The relevant Suffolk Green Book, which details the 1522 assessments for the wealthy as well as their subsequent payments to the Anticipation (when all those worth £40 and above were required to make their contributions to the Subsidy in advance) records similar wholesale reductions for the wealthy in the county as a whole in 1524, as do the printed records for Rutland, and evidence of the same kind has recently come to light for both Yorkshire and Gloucestershire.⁷ While accepting that the situation in 1525 was unlikely to be exactly as it was three years earlier I would, nevertheless, regard the earlier assessments as likely to be nearer the mark than those listed in 1524 and after, when people had realised that the 1522 assessments were actually a prelude to realistic taxation. The relevant details are given in Table V.

TABLE V

COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENTS OF MEN LISTED IN BOTH 1522 AND 1524

Nil	A = 1522							B = 1524					
	£1	£2	£3-4	£5-9	£10-19	£20-39	Totals	£1	£2	£3-4	£5-9	£10-19	£20-39
26	35	24	13	21	26	8	153	73	33	14	22	8	3

The analysis above has been confined, of necessity, to Babergh Hundred. When the Subsidy was levied in 1524, however, eighty of the rebels in that Hundred were assessed for the first time, either as newcomers or people who went unrecorded in 1522, as were thirty-seven men from the adjoining Cosford Hundred where the Military Survey does not survive. Thus the overall analysis of the 1524 Subsidy for these people is as follows:

TABLE VI

SUBSIDY ASSESSMENTS OF REBELS IN 1524

	£1	£2	£3-4	£5-9	£10-19	£20-39	Land only	Totals
A Men listed in 1522	73	33	14	22	8	3	-	153
B 1524 listings only	84	15	4	9	2	2	1	117
Totals	157	48	18	31	10	5	1	270

Significantly, just over seventy per cent of those recorded for the first time in 1524 were assessed at the minimum figure. This falls into relative insignificance, however, when compared to the 224 who were not listed in 1522 nor taxed in the subsequent Subsidies of 1524 and 1525. If these are added to the thirty-four men listed in 1522, not taxed in 1524, but who reappeared in 1525 we have a total of 258 individuals, or forty-eight per cent of the whole, who must be deemed absolutely poverty stricken. If this figure, in turn, is linked to the 157 taxed on their wages in 1524, and who must have been living on a knife-edge, we have 415 men, or seventy-nine per cent of those indicted in 1525, who must, by any standards, be regarded as desperately poor and who would have regarded additional taxation, whether direct or indirect through loss of jobs, as sufficiently serious to warrant rebellion.

The 224 men who are recorded only in 1525 are especially significant. It cannot be stressed too strongly that those named in 1522 were regarded as prospective tax payers, whether already established in work or, in the case of many of those listed as being of no substance, young men who would have begun to earn by the time the Subsidy was levied for the first time. The commissioners were largely, if not wholly, uninterested in the desperately poor – those who had little chance of being able to contribute to taxation – and many such must have been simply ignored, to appear, quite by chance, in a different document when their names were, indeed, of some significance. It is possible that some of these people were immigrants to the area and had arrived there since the Military Survey was taken, but the numbers are far too large for this to have been the case overall. Had all of them been recorded among those of no substance in the relevant towns and villages in Babergh Hundred in 1522 – and it must be remembered that these were simply those indicted, *not* the totality of the poor – the proportion of those of no substance would have risen from nineteen per cent to one third, and considerably more in some places. In Brent Eleigh, for example, the addition of the eighteen poor men recorded in 1525 would have trebled the numbers of poor and raised the proportion to an incredible sixty-four per cent. This was exceptional, but the proportion of poor in Lavenham, which also had a considerable number recorded in 1525, would have risen from a mere fourteen per cent to three times that number and the extent of poverty in the two places may well account for their acting in concert in the way discussed by Diarmaid MacCulloch (1986, 296–97). As pointed out above, a number of those described as of no substance in 1522 were actually taxed on wages two years later, and the level of absolute poverty would thus have diminished, albeit to no great extent, from that recorded in the Military Survey.

It has been customary, nevertheless, for historians, of necessity, to base discussion of poverty in the early 16th century on the numbers listed as poor, or of no substance, in 1522, assuming that where such figures are given we have something approaching the total number of adult males in that year. The details of those indicted in 1525 suggest that this may be over optimistic – and I would stress again that many of the non-indicted poor, although undoubtedly numerous, were simply not recorded anywhere – and in view of this new evidence I must revise my own estimate of poverty in Babergh Hundred considerably. In 1986, referring to Babergh Hundred as a whole, I wrote that fewer than ten per cent were not recorded as owning goods in either 1522 or 1524 (Pound 1986, 15–16). This was true of the evidence as it then stood but, even allowing for the fact that a number of people were subsequently taxed on wages, that figure must be at least doubled and even then will almost certainly be an under-estimate. Babergh and Cosford Hundreds are not Suffolk and certainly not England. Nevertheless, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, it suggests that it might be wise for historians in the future to regard figures derived from the Military Survey alone as indicating a minimum level of poverty, and to appreciate that the potential problem was a far greater one than has previously been realised.

APPENDIX I

OCCUPATIONS AND WEALTH OF REBELS NAMED IN THE MILITARY SURVEY

<i>Occupations</i>	<i>Nil</i>	<i>£1</i>	<i>£2</i>	<i>£3-4</i>	<i>£5-9</i>	<i>£10-19</i>	<i>£20-39</i>	<i>Land only</i>	<i>Totals</i>
<i>Building</i>									
Carpenters	1	1							2
Freemasons								1	1
Painters			1						1
Thatchers	1								1
Tilers		1			1				2
Totals	2	2	1		1			1	7
<i>Clothing</i>									
Tailors	2	2		2		2	1		9
<i>Distributive</i>									
Drapers					1				1
Tallow chandlers				1					1
Totals				1	1				2
<i>Farming</i>									
Husbandmen	1	3	2	1	5	11	4		27
Yeomen					1				1
Totals	1	3	2	1	6	11	4		28
<i>Food and Drink</i>									
Bakers	1					2			3
Beerbrewers			1						1
Butchers	2	1		1	1		1		6
Millers		1	1	1					3
Totals	3	2	2	2	1	2	1		13
<i>Labourers</i>	13	16	6	6	3	2	1		47
<i>Leatherwork</i>									
Cobblers		1							1
Cordwainers		1	1						2
Shoemakers	1					2			3
Skinner								1	1
Tanners	1		1			1			3
Totals	2	2	2			3		1	10

REBELLION AND POVERTY IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY SUFFOLK

<i>Occupations</i>	<i>Nil</i>	<i>£1</i>	<i>£2</i>	<i>£3-4</i>	<i>£5-9</i>	<i>£10-19</i>	<i>£20-39</i>	<i>Land only</i>	<i>Totals</i>
<i>Metalwork</i>									
Pinner		1	1						2
Smith	3					1			4
Totals	3	1	1			1			6
<i>Professional</i>									
Corsers		1							1
<i>Textiles</i>									
Cardmaker						1			1
Dyer							1		1
Fuller	2	4	2	1	3	2			14
Shearman	4				1				5
Weaver	8	10	11	2	4	1			36
Totals	14	14	13	3	8	4	1		57
<i>Transport</i>									
Carrier					1				1
Wheelwright					1				1
Totals					2				2
<i>Woodwork</i>									
Cooper		1							1
Fletcher	1					1			2
Turner			1	1					2
Totals	1	1	1	1		1			5
Grand totals	41	44	28	16	22	26	8	2	187

APPENDIX II

OCCUPATIONS AND VALUATIONS OF REBELS NAMED IN THE 1524 SUBSIDY

<i>Occupations</i>	<i>£1</i>	<i>£2</i>	<i>£3-4</i>	<i>£5-9</i>	<i>£10-19</i>	<i>£20-39</i>	<i>Land only</i>	<i>Totals</i>
<i>Building</i>								
Bricklayer	1							1
Carpenter	3				1			4
Freemason	1							1

J.F. POUND

<i>Occupations</i>	<i>£1</i>	<i>£2</i>	<i>£3-4</i>	<i>£5-9</i>	<i>£10-19</i>	<i>£20-39</i>	<i>Land only</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Painters	1							1
Tilers	3	1						4
Totals	9	1			1			11
<i>Clothing</i>								
Tailors	4	1	2	2	1		1	11
<i>Distributive</i>								
Drapers				1				1
Tallow chandlers		1	1					2
Totals		1	1	1				3
<i>Farming</i>								
Husbandmen	6	9	5	13	4	2		39
<i>Food and Drink</i>								
Bakers		2		1				3
Beerbrewers		1						1
Butchers	4	1		1				6
Millers	2							2
Totals	6	4		2				12
<i>Labourers</i>	57	12	1	5	1	1	1	78
<i>Leatherwork</i>								
Cobblers	1	1						2
Cordwainers	1	1						2
Shoemakers	4	1		1				6
Tanners		2			1			3
Totals	6	5		1	1			13
<i>Metalwork</i>								
Locksmiths						1		1
Pinner	1							1
Smiths	2			2				4
Totals	3			2		1		6
<i>Miscellaneous</i>								
Potters	1							1
<i>Professional</i>								
Barbers	1	1						2

REBELLION AND POVERTY IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY SUFFOLK

<i>Occupations</i>	<i>£1</i>	<i>£2</i>	<i>£3-4</i>	<i>£5-9</i>	<i>£10-19</i>	<i>£20-39</i>	<i>Land only</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Corsers		1						1
Totals	1	2						3
<i>Textiles</i>								
Cardmakers					1			1
Dyers	1			1				2
Fullers	13	5	2	2	1			23
Shearmen	5	2						7
Weavers	44	6	2	1				53
Totals	63	13	4	4	2			86
<i>Transport</i>								
Carriers				1				1
Wheelwrights		1		1				2
Totals		1		2				3
<i>Woodwork</i>								
Coopers	1							1
Fletchers			1					1
Turners	1	1						2
Totals	2	1	1					4
Grand totals	158	50	14	32	10	4	2	270

APPENDIX III

OCCUPATIONS OF ALL PEOPLE INDICTED IN 1525, INDICATING THEIR FIRST APPEARANCE IN THE VARIOUS LISTS

A = 1522 and 1525 B = 1522, 1524 and 1525 C = 1524 and 1525 D = 1525 only

<i>Occupations</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Totals</i>
<i>Building</i>					
Bricklayers			1		1
Brickmakers				1	1
Carpenters		2	2	1	5
Freemasons	1		1		2
Painters		1			1
Sawyers				1	1

J.F. POUND

<i>Occupations</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Totals</i>
Thatchers	1			1	2
Tilers	1	1	3	5	10
Totals	3	4	7	9	23
<i>Clothing</i>					
Tailors	2	7	4	11	24
<i>Distributive</i>					
Drapers		1			1
Tallow chandlers		1	1	1	3
Totals		2	1	1	4
<i>Farming</i>					
Husbandmen	2	25	13	6	46
Yeomen	1			2	3
Totals	3	25	13	8	49
<i>Food and Drink</i>					
Bakers		3			3
Brewers		1			1
Butchers	2	4	2	4	12
Millers	1	2		1	4
Ostlers				1	1
Totals	3	10	2	6	21
<i>Labourers</i>	10	36	42	75	163
<i>Leatherwork</i>					
Cobblers		1	1	1	3
Cordwainers		2		1	3
Knackers				1	1
Shoemakers		3	2	6	11
Skinners	1				1
Tanners		3			3
Totals	1	9	3	9	22
<i>Metalwork</i>					
Locksmiths			1		1
Pinner	1	1			2
Smiths	2	2	2	6	12
Totals	3	3	3	6	15

REBELLION AND POVERTY IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY SUFFOLK

<i>Occupations</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Totals</i>
<i>Miscellaneous</i>					
Potters			1		1
Totals			1		1
<i>Professional</i>					
Barbers			2		2
Corsers		1			1
Totals		1	2		3
<i>Textiles</i>					
Cardmakers		1		1	2
Clothiers				1	1
Colourmakers				1	1
Dyers		1	1	7	9
Fullers		14	9	14	37
Shearmen		5	3	13	21
Weavers	8	28	25	56	117
Totals	8	49	38	93	188
<i>Transport</i>					
Carriers		1			1
Wheelwrights		1	1	3	5
Totals		2	1	3	6
<i>Woodwork</i>					
Carvers				2	2
Coopers		1		2	3
Fletchers	1	1			2
Turners		2			2
Totals	1	4		4	9
Grand totals	34	153	117	224	528

NOTES

- 1 The list of rebels, which Professor MacCulloch and I have referred to independently, is to be found in PR.O., KB 29/157, mm 5-6. As indicated in the text, I have recorded the names and occupations of 528 individuals. Professor MacCulloch listed 525. The difference is minimal in every sense.
- 2 Julian Cornwall (1980, 8) has noted the same phenomenon for Rutland.
- 3 MacCulloch 1986, 295-96. MacCulloch is in error in identifying *Roger Grome* as the wealthiest of the rebels with an assessment of £140 in 1524. This should have been *Robert Grome*, clothmaker, assessed on £240 worth of goods in 1522, as well as £3 6s. 8d. in lands, an amount reduced to £140 two years later (Pound

- 1986, 75; Hervey 1910, 25). Roger Grome, a weaver, who, unlike Robert, did participate in the rebellion, was assessed on £6 13s. 4d. in 1522, reduced to £2 in 1524 (Pound 1986, 79; Hervey 1910, 27).
- 4 The husbandman of Cockfield, described as a yeoman in 1522, was John Hyldyard senior, whose assessment was reduced to £20 in 1524. The dyer of Lavenham was Thomas Sprunte, whose wealth, allegedly or actually, had fallen to £5 by 1524 (Pound 1986, 122 and 77, for the 1522 assessments; Hervey 1910, 41 and 26, for the reduced amounts).
 - 5 Pound 1986, *passim*, for the military details.
 - 6 Pound 1966, 49–69; Pound 1988, 7–15; Pound 1986, 6.
 - 7 The editor of the Suffolk Green Book for 1524 printed what he assumed to be two lists of Anticipation payers side by side (Hervey 1910, 403–27). In fact, as comparison with the Military Survey for Babergh makes absolutely clear, the left-hand column relates to the assessments recorded in the Survey while those in the right-hand column refer to the Anticipation payments for the Subsidy. It was taken after the death of Thomas Spring and by then several of the wealthy had realised what was intended and had their assessments reduced accordingly. The commissioners attempted to overcome this fraud in some cases and when the Subsidy was actually levied individuals were required either to pay on the original assessment of 1522 or, at least, to pay more than their contribution to the Anticipation. Thus Thomas Smith of Long Melford, assessed on £600 in 1522, made his contribution to the Anticipation on an alleged £366 6s. 8d., but was required to pay on the full £600 in 1524 (Hervey 1910, 406 and 30). Most, however, succeeded in steadily reducing their commitments. William Rede of Beccles, for example, possibly the wealthiest man in Suffolk, was assessed on £1,000 in 1522, paid on no more than £600 to the Anticipation, and was ostensibly reduced to £466 13s. 4d. by 1525 at the time of the second payment of the Subsidy (Hervey 1910, 426 and 378). There are numerous other examples throughout the volume.
- The recent work by Dr R.W. Hoyle has provided similar evidence for both Yorkshire and Gloucestershire (Hoyle 1987, xix–xxvii; Hoyle 1993, xxi–xxxi, especially Table 5, xxvi).

REFERENCES

- Cornwall, J. (ed.), 1980. *Tudor Rutland: the County Community under Henry VIII*, Rutland Record Soc., I. Oakham.
- Hervey, S.H.A. (ed.), 1910. *Suffolk in 1524, being the Return for a Subsidy granted in 1523*, Suffolk Green Books, no. X. Woodbridge.
- Hoyle, R.W. (ed.), 1987. *Early Tudor Craven: Subsidies and Assessments, 1510–1547*, Yorkshire Archaeol. Soc., CXLV. Leeds.
- Hoyle, R.W. (ed.), 1993. *The Military Survey of Gloucestershire, 1522*, Gloucestershire Record Ser., 6. Stroud.
- MacCulloch, D., 1986. *Suffolk and the Tudors*. Oxford.
- Pound, J.F., 1966. 'The Social and Trade Structure of Norwich, 1525–1575', *Past and Present*, 34 (July), 49–69, reprinted, *inter alia*, in Clark, P. (ed.), 1976, *The Early Modern Town*, 129–47. Whitstable.
- Pound, J.F. (ed.), 1986. *The Military Survey of 1522 for Babergh Hundred*, Suffolk Records Soc., XXVIII. Woodbridge.
- Pound, J.F., 1988. *Tudor and Stuart Norwich*. Chichester.