

**'TO MAKE A NEW KING':
Seasonal Drama and Local Politics in Norwich, 1443**

Chris Humphrey

In recent years a number of scholars have suggested that certain medieval English dramatic texts offered enterprising actors the chance to articulate contemporary social and political grievances within the overall play performance. For example, Anthony Gash has argued that the actors of *Mankind* could have exploited the play's ambiguities to suit the differing audiences of fifteenth-century East Anglia.¹ Similarly, John Marshall has suggested that there are references in the stage directions of *Wisdom* to the heraldry and activities of the de la Pole family, and that in performance an audience with a knowledge of this family's activities would be encouraged to make a link between them and the vices that were portrayed in the play.² Both Gash and Marshall stress that the political meanings of these texts were generated *in performance*, and depended upon the active participation of the audience.³ Although there are no recorded cases of these particular plays being performed in this way in the fifteenth century, evidence from sixteenth-century sources suggests that there were several ways in which dissident political sentiments could be expressed through drama. Sandra Billington has cited a number of cases, including the well-known incident during May games in Suffolk in 1537, when an actor playing Husbandry 'said many things against gentlemen more than was in the book of the play'.⁴ In this paper, I intend to consider the evidence for a particular dramatic performance in fifteenth-century East Anglia that clearly *did* have a political meaning for the local community in which it took place: the 1443 Norwich incident that has become known as 'Gladman's Insurrection'.

As some readers will be aware, 'Gladman's Insurrection' is the name of an incident in which one John Gladman, a merchant, rode through the streets of Norwich dressed as a king in January 1443.⁵ The political climate in Norwich at this time was tense, and Gladman's Riding (as it is more appropriately called), along with certain other incidents which followed, were considered by the royal authorities to be of sufficient gravity to warrant the imprisonment of the Mayor in the Fleet and the seizure of the city's liberties. What makes Gladman's Riding of interest to students of medieval drama is the mention of a Shrovetide procession in the later of the two surviving accounts of this incident. In the earlier account, the 'official' version of events, given at an

inquiry at Thetford just over a month after the procession took place, Gladman is said to have ridden through the city 'like a crowned king, with a sceptre and sword carried before him'; furthermore, a number of others rode on horseback before him, 'with a crown upon their arms and carrying bows and arrows, as if they were valets of the crown of the lord king'.⁶ By contrast, in the city's defence of the incident made some years later, it was argued that Gladman had only taken part in a disport that was customary throughout the realm on Shrove Tuesday, namely to ride 'crowned as King of Kristmesse', with representations of the seasons before him and the figure of Lent following on behind.⁷ The differences between these two accounts raise a number of questions: which of them, for example, provides a reliable basis for establishing what actually happened on this day? Although several scholars have already examined this incident in some detail, and many more have referred to it in passing,⁸ recent advances in our understanding of the uses to which festival imagery and forms of organisation were put in this period can help to illuminate this incident further.⁹

The most detailed study of Norwich in the period prior to the 1440s is Ben McRee's recent article on peacemaking mechanisms in the city. In an analysis of the ways in which conflicts and tensions in the city were addressed by urban leaders in the period between 1369 and 1437, McRee has argued for the 'existence of a well-recognised set of active peacemaking practices that leaders habitually used to check nascent disorders'.¹⁰ Gladman's Riding, and the events which preceded and followed it, have to be seen in the light of these ongoing disputes and the various attempts that were made to resolve them.

One individual in particular, Thomas Wetherby, who was Mayor of Norwich in 1427 and 1432, played a prominent role in the disputes of the 1430s and 1440s, dividing the civic elite against itself for much of this period.¹¹ By October 1441, the city had become involved in a sufficient number of disputes that the corporation had agreed to submit to the arbitration of the Earl of Suffolk in order to reach a settlement. These disputes included the long-running battle between the city and the priory over jurisdictional matters, and the claim from the Abbot of St. Benet's Hulme that the city's newly-built mills interfered with the mills on his manor. The retrospective account in the city's *Liber Albus* of 1482 claimed that these new mills had been built to replace the city's four 'ancient' mills 'for by cause the seid auncenne mylles stodyn longe decayde in somuche that it hadde be leke to be a desolation if the Cite hadde not the newe mylles by good dysspo[s]yd peopyll'.¹² Whilst the jurisdictional matters were clearly of importance to the

city, the people of Norwich faced a more immediate problem in that any threat to the mills was also a threat to their food supply. The Earl's verdict was issued in June 1442, and one of its demands was that the city's new mills should be removed before 30 April next. As well as entering into bonds of £50 with the Prior and Bishop, the Mayor, Sheriffs and Commonalty were also to be bound in £100 to oblige them to observe all decisions made about matters between them and the Abbot. According to the *Liber Albus*, when this verdict was read to the commons 'they under stode by the warde that they shulde loos the myllys whyche shulde be an utter desolacion for the Cyte And shulde cause the pepyll to goo owte of the Cyte'.¹³

Understandably, the corporation were reluctant to put the city's seal to any documents which threatened such adverse consequences, and various legal counters to the award were attempted.¹⁴ However, matters appear to have been forced to a head in the latter part of January 1443. For an account of these events, which included Gladman's Riding, a city assembly where the common seal was borne away, and the 'siege' of Holy Trinity Priory, we have three main sources of information. First, there are the two indictments taken at the inquest at Thetford on 28 February 1443. Second, there is the city's defence of Gladman's Riding which occurs in the presentments made against Wetherby's faction, thought to have been written circa 1448. Third, there is the account in the city's *Liber Albus*, written 1482, which recalls these events.¹⁵ Whilst each of these documents is selective in what information it relates and what it leaves out, something of an overall picture can be pieced together from them.

According to the *Liber Albus* account, Wetherby's supporters and the Abbot's Council put pressure on the corporation to call an assembly where their bond could be sealed:

And after this for the dylyvere of the [a]warde Anno xxjmo [of the reign of Henry VI] grett labours were made be the seid Wederby and hys adherentes and the councell of the seid Abbott's to have hadde the seid obligacion of an C li under the Comon Seall of the Cite And the Comones wold never agree And so after warde in the day of the convecion of Seynt Poule Anno xxj H. vjti [25th January 1443] the seid Thomas Wederby and the Abbott's Councell and other that they cowde gette ouer to them come to Norwich and caused on William Hempsted that tyme beyng maire to sette a Semble And so he dede¹⁶

This account, written almost forty years after the event, reads as if the assembly was called immediately, but we might expect that some advance

notice would have been necessary in order to organise affairs. The city's fourteenth-century city Customal recommended that assemblies be called on holy days, when there were no markets in the city, for the convenience of merchants. Although this guidance was not always adhered to, a matter of this magnitude would have clearly required a full turnout, and so 25 January would have been a likely date for a meeting after Christmas.¹⁷ Thus the citizens who, according to the *Liber Albus*, had 'seid that the Abbott shude neuer have ther obligacion under ther comon Sealle in destruccion of the Kyng's Cite to performe that a warde', were faced with the prospect of a common assembly where exactly that was to be done.¹⁸ It is in this context that, on Tuesday 22 January, three days before this critical city assembly, Gladman's Riding took place. Although some commentators have expressed doubt as to exactly when it happened, the account taken at Thetford just over a month later clearly states that it was on this Tuesday that the Mayor and Commonalty, allegedly planning an insurrection, 'then and there arranged for John Gladman of the said city, merchant, to ride in the city on a horse, like a crowned king'. As we have seen, it was claimed that Gladman had a sceptre and sword carried before him, and that he was accompanied by others acting as valets of the crown, and he was also alleged to have had a hundred more people following on horseback and on foot behind. 'They went around urging people in the city to come together and to make an insurrection and riots there'.¹⁹ The city's version of these events, written circa 1448, gives a somewhat different view of the incident. Their account appears in a presentment which details the wrongs done to the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty of Norwich by Sir Thomas Tudenham and John Heydon, allies of Thomas Wetherby, and others. The city alleged that at the inquest at Thetford on 28 February 1443 Tudenham and Heydon, 'fyndyng in their conceyt no maner mater of trouthe wherof they myght cause the said meir and comonalte ther to be indited, ymagyned thus as insueth':

And wher that it was so that on[e] John Gladman of Norwich which was ever and at this oure is a man of sad disposicion and true and fethful to God and to the King, of disporte as is and ever hath ben accustomed in ony Cite or Burgh thurgh al this reame on fastyngong tuesday made a disporte with his neyghburghs having his hors trapped with tyneseyle and otherwyse dysgysyn things crowned as King of Kristmesse in token that all merthe shuld end with ye twelve monthes of ye yer, afore hym eche moneth disgyrd after ye seson yerof, and Lenten cladde in white with redde herrings skynnes and his hors trapped with oyster shelles after him in token yat sadnesse and

abstinence of merth shulde followe and an holy tyme; and so rode in diuerse stretes of ye Cite with other peple with hym disgysed making merthe and disporte and pleyes; the said Thomas and John Heydon amongs many other ful straunge and untrue presentments made by perjury at the seid Inquest caused the seid meir and comonalte and the said John Gladman to ben indited of that, that thei shuld an ymaged to a made a comon rysyng and a coroune the said John Gladman as kyng with coron ceptre and diademe wher thei never ment it ne never suych thyng ymaged as in the said presentement it shewith more pleyn.²⁰

The city appears to have been arguing that a procession that was customary to Shrove Tuesday ('fastyngong tuesday') had been presented to the jury at Thetford as a common rising, and although they do not give the date of this procession, it is clear that they were referring to Gladman's Riding on 22 January 1443.²¹ The issue of why a procession that was customary to Shrovetide was put on at this time, five weeks prior to Shrove Tuesday, is carefully avoided, but the passage depends for its force on the premise that the mock kings involved in the Shrovetide celebrations are harmless enough, associated as they are with 'merthe and disporte and pleyes'.

The significance of Gladman's Riding and the problem of these two rather different accounts of it will be discussed in more detail below. First though, it is important to have some idea of the events which followed, in order to understand the relationship of the Riding to them. We continue from where we left off in the *Liber Albus*, with William Hempstede the Mayor having called an assembly on Friday 25 January:

[the] which Semble hewlde from [blank] of the Cloke tyll v after And grete importunes labours made to have hadde the obligacion sealed under the Comon Seale the Comons of the Cite gaddred them to geder in a grett number And come to the halle and token a wey the Comon Seall to that entent that the obligacion shulde nott be a Sealyd²²

Also on this day, the indictments taken at Thetford allege (so presumably after the assembly), the Mayor, Commonalty and three thousand others gathered in the city, summoned by the ringing of various bells. Shouting 'Let us burn the priory, and kill the prior and monks', they laid siege to the priory until four o'clock on the following afternoon, when the monks handed over certain evidence concerning an indenture made in 1429.²³ This document had been sealed in order to resolve an earlier jurisdictional dispute

between the city and the priory, although its outcome had been to the priory's advantage. Philippa Maddern has argued that the Thetford account of a violent 'siege' of the priory is not borne out in the surviving evidence; the only known damage done was to the priory's prison and stocks, and the besiegers even had to kidnap a neighbouring gentlemen and threaten to break his windows if he would not aim a gun at the priory walls.²⁴ Still, the disturbances were sufficient grounds for the Abbot and Wetherby to accuse the Mayor and citizens of riot and insurrection; they 'made a Subgestyon to the Kyng and hys Councell ageynste the seid maire and many other[s] that they werre rysers ageynst the Kyng'.²⁵

The Mayor and others rode to Greenwich in February to seek the help of the Duke of Gloucester, but after appearing 'be fore the lords' on the 13 February the Mayor was fined £50 and committed to the Fleet, remaining there until the 26 March. In his absence, 'Thomas Wedyrby and his adherentys in the mene tym toke upon them to be rewlars of the cite'. On 10 March, they took the common seal from the common chest and sealed obligations to the Abbot of St. Benet's and to the Prior and to the Bishop of Norwich. (The bond between the Mayor and Aldermen and the Abbot was later proved to be illegal, since the Mayor had been in prison when it had been sealed.) The contested mills were also damaged to such an extent that the Bakers were sometimes forced to use mills ten miles away from the city. Furthermore, the liberties and franchises of the city were seized on 14 March, and were not restored until 12 November 1447, after a payment of 1000 marks.²⁶

Previous scholarly discussions of Gladman's Riding have tended to take the line that the two different accounts of the incident are mutually exclusive; in some cases, an explanation has been put forward for which of them is to be preferred, whilst in others, only one of the versions has been cited.²⁷ Philippa Maddern has taken the view that, in the circa 1448 document, the citizens were trying to pass Gladman's Riding off as a harmless Shrove Tuesday procession, when in fact it had been martial in character and associated with the events of 25 January:

Their whole endeavour was to prove it innocent, rather than riotous, by alleging that it was part of the customary 'merth and disporte and pleyes' of Shrovetide ... This was a lie; January 25 fell a good five weeks before Shrove Tuesday in 1443. We must therefore assume that the city hoped, by these means, to palliate an undeniable truth.²⁸

Maddern’s reasoning is that since Shrove Tuesday was at least five weeks away (on 5 March), the procession could not possibly have been part of the celebrations associated with Shrovetide.²⁹ Hence, in the absence of any explanation for why a Shrovetide procession might have occurred in January, the Shrovetide link is perceived to be a cover story designed to exonerate the city, leaving the Thetford indictment to become the ‘truth’ of what actually took place. A more overtly martial procession may also help to explain the disturbances which were to follow on Friday 25 January and over the weekend. There are certain problems with this argument, such as how those who wrote the circa 1448 passage could have hoped to pass off a misrepresentation of this magnitude, given that any recourse to the Thetford indictments would have exposed them immediately. More importantly though, the plausibility of this argument depends upon the absence of a reason for *why* a group of citizens might have chosen to put on a Shrovetide celebration at this particular time. In the remainder of this paper, I want to put forward a possible explanation for why Gladman’s Riding may have taken this form.

As we have seen, Gladman’s Riding took place several days prior to a crucial common assembly, at which the city’s representatives were due to seal a document binding the city to carry out the Earl of Suffolk’s judgement to dismantle the new mills before 30 April. My suggestion is that a group of Norwich citizens chose to stage a public display of their dissatisfaction with the situation, and it is also possible that they had the intention of affecting the outcome of the forthcoming assembly. Accordingly, they drew upon and mobilised festival imagery that was particularly appropriate to the situation that the city faced, thereby confronting its population with a symbolic dramatisation of their own predicament. The imagery deployed was the procession customary to Shrove Tuesday, presumably in a similar form to that outlined in the document of circa 1448. Clearly, the citizens and other people who encountered these celebrations outside of their usual calendar context would have been struck by their anomalous timing, and made to think about their purpose and what they signified.

Gladman’s Riding highlighted the opposition between the end of the Christmas season and the beginning of Lent; in the procession the figure of Lent followed after the King of Christmas. This image would have had an especially topical meaning in the context of the city’s disputes with a number of local ecclesiastical institutions. As Lent was a period of fasting, the personification of Lent this early in the year may have helped to focus anxieties about how the city would be victualled in the future, given the

impending destruction of the city's mills. Furthermore, whilst the calendar period of Lent would come and go, questions about food supply would continue to trouble the city; Easter Sunday fell on 21 April in 1443, just over a week before the deadline for the mills' demolition.³⁰ The fact that Lent was at the rear of the procession, 'in token that sadnesse and abstinence of merth shulde followe and an holy tyme', had more than just a seasonal meaning in this context: it was a literal expression of the city's predicament, and perhaps also an incitement to take action to forestall these consequences.³¹ In making this link with the question of food supply, I do not of course mean to suggest that this was the only meaning that Gladman's Riding could have had. Given the complexity of civic affairs at this time, there are no doubt all sorts of other meanings that could be drawn from this incident, and some of these have been advanced by other scholars. However, as the choice of imagery in this situation appears to have been particularly well-suited to the immediate context in which it was deployed, it seems to offer a plausible explanation for why Gladman's Riding may have taken the form of a procession customary to Shrovetide.

The appropriateness of its imagery was not the only strategic feature of the Shrovetide format. A further advantage which it offered was that if a defence of the incident became necessary, the participants could always plead that their actions were entirely harmless, just play and nothing else. This is in fact the defence that the Norwich citizens had recourse to some years later, stressing that Gladman's Riding had involved 'making merthe and disporte and pleyes', rather than the common rising of which they had been accused.³² This use of a particular discourse of play is also found in other cases where drama or games were involved in contentious matters. To cite a couple of examples: at York in February 1538 one Thomas Atkinson, merchant, 'of the aige of xxvj yeres or ther abouts', and John Bean, innholder, went to the house of Sir Christopher Painter, priest and chaplain to the mayor of York, between ten and eleven o'clock (it is not clear whether this was in the morning or the evening). Their purpose was apparently to play a practical joke on the priest by pretending to be the Mayor's servants: Thomas confessed to saying to him,

'Sir Christofer, my Lord Mayer prays you to be with hym in the mornyng betyms for he hath strangers, that he must bryng a pyke in the mornyng very tymelie about thre or iiij of the clokk for they ryd very tymly fro my Lord Mayer'.

Unfortunately for the hoaxers they were recognised and consequently brought before the city council to be examined. Thomas accused John of putting him up to it, but in his defence John declared that he, Thomas and six co-conspirators were 'all agreyd that the said Thomas Atkynson shuld say suche words unto the said Sir Christofer *for a sport and Pastyme and for noon other purpos*'. They were all committed to ward to await punishment at the Mayor's discretion.³³ Another example comes from Lancashire in 1536, in the context of the Pilgrimage of Grace. In this case it was alleged that one Hugh Parker and others, with 'their faces colored and disguysed and in harnes', visited various houses in Chorley around midnight in order to see if certain householders would be sworn to the commons. In his defence before the Justices of the Peace of Lancaster, Parker declared that he had met two men who had been playing games at an alehouse; he 'thought they had gon to make pastym for he being ignorant of their vngracious purpose foloed them *and no other thing dyd nor intended to doo but myrthe and pastyme* orels he wold not haue foloed them in nowise'.³⁴

Whilst the defendants in these two cases were not in a position to deny their actions, they could at least hope to diminish their significance by claiming that these actions were interpreted the wrong way, having only been in play or jest. In the case of Gladman's Riding, this is exactly what was attempted some years later, although it is not clear whether such a defence was used at the trial which followed the incident itself. The *Liber Albus* account suggests that Thomas Delrow, who had been appointed by Wetherby in Hempstede's absence to represent the Mayor, Sheriffs and Commonalty on 4 March 1443, relinquished their plea 'at the request of the seid Thomas Wedyrby and his adherents', and so we do not know what their defence would have been.³⁵ In the light of the defence that was put forward in the circa 1448 document though, I think it reasonable to assume that it would have been along similar lines. To sum up then, I have argued that there are two key reasons to support the view that Gladman's Riding took the form of a Shrovetide procession; first, it was an apposite comment on the city's current situation and second, it offered the participants a means of covering themselves if that proved to be necessary.

The irony of Gladman's Riding is that some of the individuals who stood against the city were opponents of equal creativity and resourcefulness. At the Thetford inquest on 28 February, Tudenham and Heydon chose to represent the procession as an usurpation of royal authority, thereby framing all of the events which followed in a narrative of rebellion and insurrection. Also, according to the *Liber Albus*, efforts were apparently made by the

Abbot to have the Mayor and other citizens arrested as traitors even before their appearance at Westminster on 13 February. Whilst in London, Benedict Joly was confronted by a sergeant-at-arms, who asked him if he was from Norwich, and Joly replied that he was. 'Than seid the seriant of armys that he was a traytour And a Ryser ageynst the Kyng And that he was one of thoo[se] for to make a newe Kyng And so he ledde hym forth to pryson'.³⁶ The narrative of insurrection was clearly persuasive at the time, even perhaps being one reason why the Norwich citizens abandoned their defence on 4 March and, as we have seen, it has had an influence upon modern scholarly accounts of these events. Followed by the destruction of the city's mills, the imprisonment of the Mayor and the loss of the city's liberties and franchises, Gladman's Riding does not appear to have been very much of a 'success' in the short term. In the longer term however, to quote Philippa Maddern, 'the city's policy of calculated bravado did it no harm. Suffolk's hated award of 1442 was never properly sealed; after 1447 the city repaired the broken mills, argued their case again with the abbot of St Benet's Hulme (1481), and, after renegotiating the dispute with the priory (1517-24), finally brought it to a more favourable settlement'.³⁷

Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York

NOTES

I would like to thank Felicity Riddy, Jeremy Goldberg and John Arnold for their helpful discussions of the Norwich evidence. Gladman's Riding and the issues that are raised in this paper are dealt with at more length in my D.Phil thesis, 'The Dynamics of Urban Festal Culture in Later Medieval England' (University of York, forthcoming 1997).

1. Anthony Gash 'Carnival Against Lent: The Ambivalence of Medieval Drama' in *Medieval Literature: Criticism, Ideology and History* edited David Aers (Harvester, Brighton, 1986) 74-98.
2. John Marshall "Fortune in Worldys Worschyppe": The Satirising of the Suffolks in *Wisdom' Medieval English Theatre 14* (1992) 37-66.
3. Gash 'Carnival against Lent' 94-96; Marshall "Fortune in Worldys Worschyppe" 37-38. For a discussion of audience responses to Tudor drama, see Paul Whitfield White 'Politics, Topical Meaning, and English Theater Audiences 1485-1575' *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 34 (1995) 41-54.
4. Sandra Billington *Mock Kings in Medieval Society and Renaissance Drama* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1991) 218-19; 218.
5. Transcriptions of the documents which relate to this incident and its context are brought together under the heading of 'The Riot called "Gladman's Insurrection"'

in *The Records of the City of Norwich* edited William Hudson and John Cottingham Tingey, 2 volumes (Jarrold, Norwich, 1906) 1 338–356. As Hudson edited the first volume and Tingey the second, all future references will be to the *Records of the City of Norwich* only, followed by the volume number.

6. A translation of this indictment is given by Norman P. Tanner *The Church in Late Medieval Norwich, 1370–1532* (Studies and Texts 66: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto, 1984) 149–151; see 149. Tanner's translation is preferred over that of Hudson, *Records of the City of Norwich* 1 340–41, whose version 'is much abbreviated and not always accurate' (Tanner 151 note 51).
7. *Records of the City of Norwich* 1 345–46; see 345.
8. The most detailed examination of this incident and its context is given by Philippa C. Maddern *Violence and Social Order: East Anglia 1422–1442* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992) 192–205. Other notable discussions (in chronological order) include Francis Blomefield *An Essay Towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk* 11 volumes (2nd edition, Miller, London, 1805–10) 3 147–55; R.L. Storey *The End of the House of Lancaster* (Barrie and Rockliff, London, 1966) 220–5; Tanner *The Church in Late Medieval Norwich* 146–52; Gash 'Carnival against Lent' 85–6; Billington *Mock Kings* 18–20; Eamon Duffy *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400–c.1580* (Yale University Press, London, 1992) 14, and R.H. Hilton *English and French Towns in a Feudal Society* (Cambridge University Press, 1992) 123–5.
9. Thomas Pettitt, in his article "'Here Comes I, Jack Straw: English Folk Drama and Social Revolt' *Folklore* 95 (1984), has set out the different features of festive customs that can be identified in English revolts between the Middle Ages and the nineteenth century. I would argue that Gladman's *Riding* shows that festive custom also had a place in disputes of a more local, non-revolutionary character.
10. Ben R. McRee 'Peacemaking and its Limits in Late Medieval Norwich' *English Historical Review* 109 (1994) 831–66; see 834.
11. McRee 'Peacemaking and its Limits' 854.
12. *Records of the City of Norwich* 1 349–50; 350, and Maddern *Violence and Social Order* 193–4. Blomefield suggests that the new mills were built in 1430 (*Essay Towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk* 3 147 note 4).
13. *Records of the City of Norwich* 1 349–50; and Maddern *Violence and Social Order* 194–95.
14. Maddern *Violence and Social Order* 195–96.
15. For translations and summary, see above note 6. Maddern has briefly summarised both indictments (*Violence and Social Order* 196–97). Extracts from the presentments against Wetherby's faction written circa 1448 are given in *Records of the City of Norwich* 1 343–46. The 1482 *Liber Albus* account is given in *Records of the City of Norwich* 1 350–52.

16. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 350–51.
17. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 191–92 (chapter 45). There is a mitigating clause to this recommendation: ‘unless it be that it ought to be done for some special business specially touching the lord King or very urgent business of the whole city wherein turns peril to the same, in which case no consideration of any time can be had’ (Hudson’s translation). Whilst the latter situation could no doubt be said to apply in this case, the corporation had hardly acted as if it did — by the time the assembly met, over seven months had already passed since the award was issued.
18. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 350.
19. Tanner *The Church in Late Medieval Norwich* 149–50.
20. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 345–46.
21. Some commentators have read ‘on fastyngong tuesday’ as the actual date of Gladman’s Riding, but it is clear that we should envisage a comma after this phrase (see for example Hilton *English and French Towns* 125). The city were only claiming that Gladman had put on a procession that was *customary* to Shrovetide, and did not in fact mention a date at all, since presumably it would be obvious enough which procession they were referring to, and at what time of the year it took place.
22. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 351.
23. Tanner *The Church in Late Medieval Norwich* 150.
24. Maddern *Violence and Social Order* 182–83 and 197–98.
25. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 351.
26. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 351–52. The action taken by the Abbot of St. Benet’s in respect of this obligation in 1481 is given on 353–54, and the certificate of the imprisonment of Hempstede, sealed 3 July 1482, on 354–55. An exemplification of the restitution of liberties, granted 1 December 1447, is given on 355–56.
27. Tanner, for example, suggests that the Thetford indictment ‘seems nearer the truth than the city government’s version for several reasons’, including the fact that ‘the city government offered no explanation why a “disport” such as was customary on Shrove Tuesday took place more than a month earlier’ (*The Church in Late Medieval Norwich* 148 and 148–49).
28. Maddern *Violence and Social Order* 197.
29. *Handbook of Dates for Students of English History* edited C.R. Cheney (Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 4: Royal Historical Society, London, 1945) 144.
30. Cheney *Handbook of Dates* 144.

31. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 345.
32. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 345–46.
33. *York Civic Records* edited Angelo Raine, 8 volumes (Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Wakefield, 1939–53) 4 28–29 (my emphasis).
34. *REED: Lancashire* edited David George (Toronto University Press, 1991) 11–13 (my emphasis).
35. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 352.
36. *Records of the City of Norwich 1* 351. A further irony was that the Mayor and other citizens were boarding at 'the Kyng's Hedde in Chepe'.
37. *Maddern Violence and Social Order* 205.