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Abstract

This thesis demonstrates that Tudor councillors and their clients raided the armoury of rhetoric to condemn sedition for over thirty years, using persuasive techniques which crossed confessional lines. It reconstructs, in fuller detail than has ever been attempted, the Tudor literary campaigns against rebels, tracing the origin and development of the anti-sedition oration. It begins by proposing a systematic framework for classifying early modern persuasive writings. Then, in analysing the major Tudor rebellions, it argues that governments employed a highly communicative style of politics at times of crisis. They opened emergency channels of communication with subjects, condemning disobedience but nonetheless listening to rebel grievances. Loyalist authors did not intend to subject government policy to public approval, or to communicate with the monarch by garnering public support: they were simply applying the Ciceronian idea that oratory is the best way to persuade the multitude. Tudor authors normally defend government policy not by appealing to the king’s absolute authority but by pointing out that policy had been approved by the king in Parliament.
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Introduction

Wash your foul minds with tears, and those same hands,

That you like rebels lift against the peace,

Lift up for peace, and your unreverent knees

Make them your feet.[[1]](#footnote-1)

At the palace of Whitehall in the time of Henry VIII, there was a ‘hanging of Arras of thistory of David and Absolon lyned through with buckeram’.[[2]](#footnote-2) If the king had happened to lay eyes on this old tapestry at the time of the Pilgrimage of Grace, he might have reflected on its Biblical lesson: God confounds rebellion against anointed kings. Serious mass rebellion in England from the time of the First Act of Supremacy through to the death of Elizabeth I was confined to the autumn and winter of 1536-1537, the spring and summer of 1549, the winter of 1554, and the winter of 1569-1570.[[3]](#footnote-3) Fourteen months of mass rebellion in a total of sixty-eight years is not a disastrous record but the threat from disorder was obviously serious. Councillors organized the production and distribution of printed works and manuscript tracts promoting obedience during each of these periods of rebellion. Their confidence in the power of persuasion prompted the formation of a literary tradition of anti-sedition writing whose development mapped onto the tradition of mass revolt.

This thesis will demonstrate that governments resorted to a highly communicative style of politics at times of rebellion, and that their agents and supporters wielded all the tools of rhetoric to influence English subjects. They opened emergency channels of communication with subjects, condemning disobedience but nonetheless listening to their grievances. There was nothing radical about this, for as we shall see, the act of hearing and dissuading rebels had a venerable classical and native heritage.[[4]](#footnote-4) Nevertheless, Tudor rebellions were rather more dialogic than is commonly appreciated. When rebels mobilized and made demands, governments rebuked them for their insubordination but still saw fit to reply. Loyalist pamphlets were not injunctions from an absolutist state but, at least in part, reasoned responses to rebel grievances, which preferred to emphasize parliamentary consent rather than royal authority. Kevin Sharpe has suggested that when the king ‘justified royal policy’ to rebels in 1536, he became, ‘in a reversal of the discursive hierarchy, a respondent’.[[5]](#footnote-5) John Cooper has said that authors in 1549 ‘appealed to the reason… of the western rebels’.[[6]](#footnote-6) Likewise, Stephen Alford has argued that although those authors ‘exhorted subjects to obey their governors’, they ‘also engaged the rebels in a limited political dialogue’, as the rebellions ‘compelled the regime to explain itself, its dynamics, and the nature of its authority to reform’.[[7]](#footnote-7) This thesis will build on these observations, drawing on rhetorical and bibliographical analysis to reveal the lengths to which governments went to dissuade rebels. It will go one step further than previous scholars by practically demonstrating *how* books and pamphlets were designed to persuade.

Anti-sedition writing proceeded from the ancient principle that one should attempt to parley with the leaders of an opposing army before resorting to force of arms, or ‘Words before blows’.[[8]](#footnote-8) Most Tudor statesmen would have agreed with Sir Francis Walsingham that ‘to shed blood yf yt maye be saved is greatlie repugnant to the nature of a Prince’, although they also believed that execution was often necessary ‘for exsample sake and terror of the wicked’.[[9]](#footnote-9) It was also informed by the idea that opinion-formers were responsible for outbreaks of rebellion and, consequently, that the government could put rebellion down by dissuading its participants. Other causes of sedition were identified which ranged from the sensible, such as social instability and weak government, to the sensational, such as Satanic influence and divine retribution; but the belief that subjects would not rebel without persuasion was ever present. Thus, at the time of Lambert Simnel’s rising, Henry VII wrote to the Council of York to give attention to ‘the appesing of rumours’ in the city.[[10]](#footnote-10) Likewise, Protector Somerset wrote to the Lord Privy Seal in June 1549 that ‘the greate number’ of the Devonshire rebels were ‘but seduced and deceyved w[i]th false rumors’.[[11]](#footnote-11) The idea was still prevalent in 1612, when Francis Bacon wrote that ‘*Seditious Tumults*, and *Seditious Fames*, differ no more, but as Brother and Sister’.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Although writers often exaggerated this idea, there was some sense to it. A rebellion usually began with a surge of popular enthusiasm, before leaders emerged to bring coherence and a sense of puporse to the enterprise.[[13]](#footnote-13) To recruit more participants, rebels drew up and disseminated programmes of demands in defence of their various causes, and they produced proclamations, ballads and sermons.[[14]](#footnote-14) During the Pilgrimage of Grace, for example, a clerk of Bridlington Priory travelled to Flamborough to deliver a ballad to two loyalist gentlemen, in the hopes of winning their support.[[15]](#footnote-15) A minority of subjects might have been ready to rebel at the drop of a hat, especially in trying circumstances, but to encourage the inhabitants of whole regions to risk their lives and property by rising against laws imposed by a creature whom they were taught to view as God’s anointed on earth, rebels had to use persuasion. Since socio-economic problems could not be resolved overnight, and since governments were unwilling to alter policy in the face of popular protest, the demands and arguments of rebels were the most convenient object of attack. If the government could dissuade rebels from acting, it could avert immediate crises so that the deeper problems could be solved later.

Rebels did not advance much political theory and especially no kind of resistance theory.[[16]](#footnote-16) One notable exception is the traitor Thomas Stafford, who proclaimed in 1557 that Mary was ‘unrightful and unworthy Quene’ because she had married a Spaniard and showed too much favour to that nation, contrary to Henry VIII’s will.[[17]](#footnote-17) Stafford here combined the classical idea of tyranny *ex parte exercitii*, with the claim that Mary’s succession was invalid because she had breached statute law.[[18]](#footnote-18) However, resistance theories proposed by the likes of John Ponet, John Knox and Christopher Goodman typically did not find their way into rebel manifestos, and nor did Catholic resistance theories. Ponet joined Wyatt’s revolt as a participant but not, as far as we know, as a theorist.[[19]](#footnote-19) Scholars have begun to acknowledge that resistance ideas were marginal in the Tudor period. Stephen A. Chavura has noted that ‘resistance theory was never characteristic of English Protestantism’, and that ‘its appeal to historians probably owes much to its exceptional nature in the first place’.[[20]](#footnote-20) Likewise, Ryan Reeves writes that ‘by focusing almost exclusively on the doctrine of resistance as opposed to theories of obedience, historians have made the tail wag the dog’.[[21]](#footnote-21) Neither Catholic nor Protestant resistance theories made much impact on English political thought or action until the 1580s, when Catholic polemicists such as Robert Parsons began to promote tyrannicide in certain circumstances. Catholic resistance theory came to a head in the reign of James I, when Francisco Suárez and Cardinal Bellarmine famously promoted active disobedience.

All major rebellions between 1536 and 1572, possibly excepting the agrarian risings of 1549, were fundamentally *protests against government policy*.[[22]](#footnote-22) During the Reformation, English subjects became ideologically divided for the first time. Henry VIII’s closure of abbeys; the introduction of the prayer book; Mary’s restitution of papal supremacy: all such actions were bound to offend at least a large section of the English people. A scarcity of mechanisms for subjects to express disapproval of policy meant that pent-up frustrations were typically left to become tremendously dangerous. Subjects could of course petition the king, but few had access to the monarch or an influential courtier, especially if they lived outside of the capital.

Tudor rebels professed their loyalty to the king or queen and claimed to be opposing only ‘evil counsellors’, exactly as the rebels of 1381 and 1450 had done.[[23]](#footnote-23) Such claims might be interpreted as cynical self-protection, a means of steering around the Treasons Act (1351) which forbade warfare against the king,[[24]](#footnote-24) but the claims might equally indicate a genuine respect for monarchy. Tudor rebels dreamt not of reviving the feudal process of *diffidatio*, for they thought themselves the king’s men, or else recognized the benefits of identifying themselves as such. While authors who responded to rebels also tended to avoid political theory in its purest sense, there was admittedly a disconnect between rebel writings and loyalist responses. For instance, when the Norfolk rebels of 1549 gathered in camps and politely petitioned the king for private courts leet to be abolished and for weights and measures to be standardised, one pamphleteer turned to political theology to argue that ‘some must rule, some must obey’.[[25]](#footnote-25) This disconnect is partially explained by the typical intellectual background of the humanists who picked up their pen in defence of civil order, and partially too, at times, by suspicion that rebels secretly intended to depose or murder the monarch. Before John Savage agreed to kill Elizabeth I in 1585, his confederates reportedly presented him with theoretical confirmation of the lawfulness of regicide.[[26]](#footnote-26) In around 1571, however, the importance of resistance theory still lay in the future, beyond the period under discussion in this thesis.

While modern democratic governments must secure public approval by formulating policy which is or appears to be agreeable to over half of the electorate, such imperatives were clearly of lesser importance in the sixteenth century, and yet governments did need to maintain a level of popularity which would reduce the likelihood of rebellion. Lord Macaulay made this point in 1832, the year of the Great Reform Act, when he wrote in *The* *Edinburgh Review* that the possibility of mass rebellion had been the ‘one great and effectual limitation on the royal authority’ in Tudor England.[[27]](#footnote-27) If a rebellion should occur, and ‘the sovereign was not sufficiently popular to find among his subjects other halberds and other bows to oppose to the rebels, nothing remained for him but a repetition of the horrible scenes of Berkeley and Pomfret’.[[28]](#footnote-28) Most historians have agreed that Tudor governments were reliant upon the consent and cooperation of their subjects.[[29]](#footnote-29) Henry VIII’s religious innovations and his assumption of control over ecclesiastical matters increased the likelihood of widespread resistance, for it seems clear that the English Reformation was from the start a profoundly unpopular movement in many parts of the country.[[30]](#footnote-30) Some of the ways in which post-Reformation governments built support for reform included maintaining good connections between the centre and localities and promoting their cause through a variety of media including the printed word.

The species of literature with which this thesis is concerned were primarily designed to secure political compliance rather than religious agreement, although authors did also attempt to secure the latter wherever possible. Opinions and habits cannot be stamped out in a single generation, and thus while it was engaged in the slow process of changing minds, the government needed to ensure that nobody with an unchanged mind would cause trouble in the meantime. Authors in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI and Elizabeth I responded directly to documents produced by rebels, their petitions and proclamations, while in the reign of Mary I they showed an awareness of such documents while avoiding a direct treatment of them.

It is worth emphasising at this early stage that the anti-sedition pamphlets do not advance a theory of royal absolutism, a word which has started to become more popular of late.[[31]](#footnote-31) Newer proponents of early English absolutism have tended to define absolutism rather broadly, as their predecessors did.[[32]](#footnote-32) J. P. Sommerville, in a book first published in 1986, discovered many absolutists in early Stuart England purely because he defined ‘absolutism’ in a way which departed significantly from the word’s etymology and which included several entirely different traditions of thought, one of which was the idea that kings are appointed by God.[[33]](#footnote-33) One could likewise prove that jubjub birds are common in Great Britain by using the phrase ‘jubjub bird’ to refer to wrens, robins and finches; but there seem to be no compelling reasons to use umbrella terms as if they are specialist vocabulary, especially if they might cause confusion. Divine-right kingship is not a form of absolutism; the two concepts are compatible but distinct.[[34]](#footnote-34) In other civilizations, divine-right theory has even been used to legitimize rather than prohibit deposition of sovereigns: we need only consider the Chinese concept of *tiānmìng*, or the Mandate of Heaven.

The claim that a king’s office is divinely ordained did not mean that a king was free to act lawlessly, just as a headmaster who claims to have been appointed directly by the Department of Education is not thereby free to disregard school regulations or the law (although he might try his luck). Any suggestion to the contrary is a non sequitur. The notion that kings, including pagan kings, are appointed by God is almost as old as Christianity. The first definite expression of such a notion was in 181 AD, when Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch wrote that human rulers, even pagans, are ‘entrusted by God with the administration’.[[35]](#footnote-35) To follow the Sommerville definition of ‘absolutism’ to its logical conclusion, we would have to define a goodly number of the Church Fathers as absolutists too; if scholars deem this to be a sensible procedure, then so be it.

John Neville Figgis’s *The Divine Right of Kings* (first published in 1896) is still the most useful introduction to the subject of divine-right kingship, although some of its conclusions have been modified or even disproved over the years. With admirable clarity, Figgis defined the four fundamental pillars of divine-right theory: ‘(1) Monarchy is a divinely ordained institution. (2) Hereditary right is indefeasible… (3) Kings are accountable to God alone… (4) Non-resistance and passive obedience are enjoined by God…’.[[36]](#footnote-36) No subsequent scholar has improved on this definition. And yet, no historian of Tudor political thought has attempted to clarify which of these four propositions were commonplace in the sixteenth century. The anti-sedition works under discussion in this thesis usually emphasize only the first and fourth of these propositions. They claim that Tudor monarchs derive their kingly authority directly from God, and that rebellion against the king or his government is a sin; but they make no case for indefeasible hereditary right or non-accountability. The absence of the second proposition is to be explained by the obvious fact that the Tudors had a rather shaky hereditary claim to the English throne. The absence of the third is best explained by the fact that government authors respected the English constitution and did not wish to ascribe absolute power to the kings of England. As we shall see, Tudor propagandists commonly defended controversial legislation not only by appealing to the king’s authority but also by pointing out that it had been passed with the consent of Parliament. What we detect in these pamphlets is more like a nascent expression of the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty, than of royal absolutism.[[37]](#footnote-37)

I

The conditions in which anti-sedition literature was produced were broadly comparable in each reign, for there were always three principal collaborators: manager, author and printer. The first of these roles was played successively by Thomas Cromwell in 1536, by Protector Somerset in 1549, by Stephen Gardiner in 1554 and by William Cecil in 1569-1572. Additionally, tracts and treatises were produced independently during each of these crisis periods. The shops from which Londoners bought books and pamphlets were concentrated in St. Paul’s Churchyard, which would have looked like a Christmas market with printed works laid out on tables in front of the shops.[[38]](#footnote-38) Booksellers could also be found further east in locations such as the Royal Exchange, and as far west as Charing Cross.[[39]](#footnote-39) The hustle and bustle of St. Paul’s could not have been more different from a modern book shop: a mayoral proclamation from 1555 forbade Londoners from carrying foodstuffs and ‘greate vessells full of ale’ through the cathedral, as though it were a thoroughfare;[[40]](#footnote-40) and we have it on the authority of Thomas Nashe that a dog-whipper was employed in the 1590s to drive unwelcome animals from the yard every Saturday.[[41]](#footnote-41)

The print shops where books and pamphlets were manufactured were also located near the cathedral, such as the house of Thomas Berthelet, who served as king’s printer from 1530 to 1547, which was in Fleet Street near the Great Conduit and would have been identifiable by his trade sign of the image of Lucretia.[[42]](#footnote-42) Sometimes printers and booksellers were one and the same person but printed works were also distributed by third-party booksellers in London and elsewhere. The ordinary ‘communications circuit’ of book production, to borrow the popular term, ran from author to publisher (if applicable) to printer to shippers to booksellers to readers.[[43]](#footnote-43) However, during the rebellions of 1536 and 1549, and possibly also those of 1554 and 1569, a different, emergency circuit came into operation at the same time, whereby a minister collected pamphlets from the royal printer and sent them to local office holders in the regions, where they were to be distributed free of charge. This was rather more like the process by which proclamations and statutes circulated in the sixteenth century. It might be surprising that governments resorted to ‘the promiscuous and inherently open-ended medium of English language print’.[[44]](#footnote-44) The probable explanation is that print was simply the best way to command, persuade or convey information to many people. In 1505, Henry VII wrote that he had arranged for a proclamation to ‘be imprinted, so that therein no man shall nor may pretend ignorance’.[[45]](#footnote-45) Still, councillors’ use of tracts, orations and sermons to promote obedience does speak of a willingness to do government business outside of the machinery of state.

While the loyalist literature took several forms, from ballads to letters, the most consistent genre was the English anti-sedition oration, a thoroughly Ciceronian genre which was invented by Richard Morison in 1536 and which also served the purposes of the next three Tudor monarchs. The life of this genre was prolonged, as we shall see, through personal relationships as well as government prodding. The torch was passed to Sir John Cheke during Edward VI’s reign; to John Christopherson and John Proctor during Mary I’s reign; and finally, to Thomas Norton during the reign of Elizabeth I. While Cheke, Christopherson and Norton were Cantabrigians, Morison was one of the so-called Paduan humanists who had earlier studied at Oxford; and Proctor studied at Corpus Christi College, Oxford before being elected to a fellowship at All Souls.[[46]](#footnote-46) Although Protestant polemicists sang the praises of the Gospel and attacked ‘papists’, while their Catholic counterparts defended the Mass and denounced ‘heretics’, the methods of anti-sedition writers under all of the Tudor monarchs were broadly similar despite confessional differences. To borrow modern terminology, we might say that although extremists existed, there was broad bipartisan support among intellectuals for the idea that rebellion against civil authorities was a crime and a sin. Anti-sedition writers were familiar not only with rhetorical theory but also with practical applications of political rhetoric in the ancient world, such as Cicero’s orations against Catiline, the most famous anti-sedition orations ever produced, to which they had been introduced as schoolboys.[[47]](#footnote-47) Another important type of anti-sedition literature was the point-by-point treatment of rebel articles, which may be observed for instance in Henry VIII’s replies to rebels in 1536.

Although Tudor anti-sedition literature was in many ways new, authors did borrow from earlier traditions. For instance, in claiming that rebels lack the faculty of reason, they adopted a commonplace of medieval chroniclers; and in comparing rebels to animals, they followed John Gower’s portrayal of the Peasants’ Revolt in *Vox Clamantis* (*c*. 1382).[[48]](#footnote-48) The Tudor literature, in turn, seeded works of Stuart obedience literature, such as James I’s writings on kingship and the political sermons of Lancelot Andrewes, since later authors drew from the ideas, vocabulary and metaphors of their predecessors.[[49]](#footnote-49) This thesis is in large part an act of reconstruction, for by piecing together the evidence we shall reach a better understanding of how pro-government pamphlets were commissioned, composed, printed and distributed in the sixteenth century.

Books and pamphlets addressed to rebels combined what we might call concessional elements, such as negotiation and justification, with authoritarian elements, such as command and the threat of punishment. Therefore, the mere presence of concessional elements in a given work does not tell us much, aside from confirming the familiar fact that all Tudor governments relied to some extent on negotiation; the exceptional moments are those in which concession breaks its banks and saturates a work. Our questions may include whether they honestly and openly explain the government’s position; whether they use figures of speech to ingratiate the government with the rebels, or to reprove or menace the audience; and whether their argument is answerable, or else a verbal battery to which it is difficult to reply. We also need to consider the question of political force, or the substantial political function which a work performs. Does the writer promise a change in government policy? Does he agree that the rebels’ arguments are in some sense valid? What seems to be his opinion of popular engagement in politics? There were three ways to deal with a rebel demand: it could either be ignored, granted, or discussed but dismissed. It need not be supposed that political force is the really important feature of anti-sedition writings whereas the rest is paintwork, since rhetorical concession could be just as telling as real concession.

We also need to consider the readership of anti-sedition works. One art historian has recommended that we analyse Tudor artists’ ‘intent to communicate’ rather than the actual effect of their productions, which is equally wise advice for the analysis of printed works.[[50]](#footnote-50) After all, the contemporaneous effect of sixteenth-century books and pamphlets is often irrecoverable, although signs of actual readership and other snatches of evidence survive through accident and happenstance.[[51]](#footnote-51) The concept of ‘implied readership’ is a helpful assistant in this regard, since evidence of a work’s intended audience can often be found within the work itself.[[52]](#footnote-52) Still, we cannot entirely ignore the question of how persuasive works were actually received. One reason that might be suggested to doubt that the books and pamphlets against sedition were genuinely effective is that most Englishmen were illiterate, but this fact does not pose such a great problem as might first appear. Most societies are composed of intellectual, literate elements and popular, folk elements; and in sixteenth-century England it is difficult to decide which of these predominated. To illustrate: while some Londoners on the morning of 14 March 1553 would have been poring over patristic writings in their private libraries, a significant crowd was gathered in Aldersgate to witness the bizarre spectacle of a talking Protestant wall. John Strype reports that there was ‘a strange voice heard in a wall’ which ‘occasioned great flocking thither’. Although it was ‘discovered afterwards, that the words were uttered by whistle through the hole of a wall, which a wench dexterously did’, many were apparently convinced that they heard the voice of a spirit.[[53]](#footnote-53) Tudor anti-sedition writings were accordingly produced for both elite and popular readerships in a broad range of literary forms, from John Christopherson’s scholarly treatise *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion* (1554) to the popular ballads which appeared in the wake of the Northern rebellion of 1569.

Around 16% of Englishmen were literate in 1536 and by 1570 this figure had risen to around 21%.[[54]](#footnote-54) These estimates are rather higher than Gardiner’s contemporary estimate of 1% national literacy in 1547, and rather lower than Thomas More’s estimate of 60% in 1533, but both of those writers were using hyperbole rather than presenting statistical evidence and their assertions should not be taken seriously.[[55]](#footnote-55) Literacy was of course higher in the cities, especially in London, where later but indicative statistics reveal that 82% of apprentices, 72% of tradesmen and craftsmen, 70% of yeomen, 69% of servants, 22% of labourers, 21% of husbandmen and 24% of women were literate from 1580-1641.[[56]](#footnote-56) David Cressy compiled the data on which these estimates are based by counting the number of people who could sign their name on official documents. He understood the drawbacks of this method, which ‘overestimates the number able to write with ease’ and ‘underestimates the number able to read with hesitation’, but argued that it provided the best evidence available.[[57]](#footnote-57)

Heidi Brayman Hackel has criticized Cressy’s ‘problematic statistics’ on the grounds that they obscure regional variation in literacy rates, that they ignore the social status of female signers, and that they reduce ‘literacy and illiteracy to a simple binary’.[[58]](#footnote-58) The first of these points of criticism is confusing since Cressy took great pains to explain regional variation both in the form of prose analysis and in various graphs and tables which isolated findings for individual regions. The second of Hackel’s findings has more to do with the nature of the surviving evidence than with Cressy’s methodology, for, as a reviewer of Cressy’s monograph noted, ‘women were not asked to sign the Protestation Oath, the Vow and Covenant, or other affirmations of political loyalty… made far fewer wills and were far less often deponants [*sic*.] in ecclesiastical courts’.[[59]](#footnote-59) Instead of providing a method for calculating literacy rates which takes better account of female literacy, Hackel seems to advocate throwing out quantitative methods altogether.[[60]](#footnote-60) As for her third point, it is trivially true that literacy and illiteracy are not binary states, but this does not mean we should discard the terms. Of course, some people would have been able to compose flowery letters while others would have struggled to read blackletter proclamations, but there is no reliable way of knowing what percentage of literate people could read perfectly; if there were, we would want to know.

Cressy himself later saw the need to acknowledge that ‘literacy and illiteracy were part of a spectrum rather than sharply dichotomous’, while reaffirming the superiority of his earlier method of calculation.[[61]](#footnote-61) In this thesis, Cressy’s methods of determining literacy rates, although far from perfect, are accepted as the best available indicator at present. Statistics drawn from them raise the question of whether government books and pamphlets may be considered to have been successful in changing minds if less than a fifth of the population could read. Adam Fox has argued that in the sixteenth century ‘even the world of the unlettered was not immune from the influence of the written and printed word’ for, despite widespread illiteracy, no one ‘lived very far away from someone who could read a manuscript writing or a printed work for them’.[[62]](#footnote-62) While there were many who could not read, England was still a ‘fundamentally literate environment’.[[63]](#footnote-63) The act of reading aloud made the written word accessible to a wider audience, some of whom even bought books so that they could have them read aloud by a literate acquaintance when they got the chance.[[64]](#footnote-64)

II

One of the greatest difficulties for a modern observer is to sympathise with the intellectual rationale behind the production of many of the works under discussion in this thesis. We know, for instance, that Henry VIII arranged for a printed oration by Morison to be sent to rebels in Yorkshire, but could he have expected them to be anything but angered by a pamphlet which condemned them as ‘seditious traitors’?[[65]](#footnote-65) Contemporaries were aware that pro-government books could have unintended consequences: the Imperial ambassador Eustace Chapuys wrote in 1534 that although printed works defending the royal supremacy were intended to gain the favour of the people, they really ‘only irritated them more’.[[66]](#footnote-66) To understand the anti-sedition pamphlets, we must first understand the theory which lay behind them, for English humanists inherited from Roman authors the idea that rebels and rioters could be pacified with rhetoric, both directly and at second-hand through Machiavelli. This idea was but a particular expression of the classical doctrine that violence should be pacified with gentle words, although pamphleteers often did away with the gentleness, which is an idea that Edmund Spenser embodied in the character of Cambina in *The* *Faerie Queene* (1596).[[67]](#footnote-67)

In Henry’s reign, the principle of rhetorical counterinsurgency was most clearly expressed in Morison’s *Remedy for sedition* (1536), where the author closely paraphrases an anecdote from Seneca’s *De Clementia* about the conspirator Cinna’s plan to assassinate Augustus Caesar in the first century BC.[[68]](#footnote-68) When Augustus discovered Cinna’s plot, Morison writes, his wife gave him the following advice:

Sir, do as phisitions do, whiche whan they see, that their accustomed medicines wyll not serue, they proue the contraryes. By punishment ye haue hitherto done lytel or nothynge, forgeue a nother whyle, and see what clemency may do.[[69]](#footnote-69)

Augustus, who thought the suggestion seemed reasonable, summoned Cinna and ‘caused a chayre to be set for hym’ before beginning to ‘reason the mattier’. He requested leave to speak without interruption, after which Cinna would be free to reply. After listing the advantages and favours he had granted to Cinna, he asked him plainly: ‘[N]owe I praye you tell me, what cause I haue gyuen you, to desire my dethe?’ Cinna, Morison tells us, began to ‘chaunge colour, to be troubled in cou[n]tenaunce’, but Caesar showed clemency, and Cinna in turn remained loyal for the rest of his life.[[70]](#footnote-70)

The principle underlying Seneca’s anecdote was a classical commonplace. In Ancient Rome, it was first expressed by late-Republican authors such as Cicero, whose history of rhetoric, *Brutus*, mentions Marcus Valerius’ rhetorical appeasement of the plebeians and Lucius Valerius Potitius’ success in ‘assuaging the passions of the common people against the patricians’.[[71]](#footnote-71) The idea received even fuller treatment from Imperial Roman authors. In the first book of the *Aeneid*, Virgil wrote that a ‘Grave and Pious Man’ man can stay a tumult ‘with sober Words’.[[72]](#footnote-72) Livy, in the *History of Rome*, wrote that the Republican consul Menenius Agrippa ended the Plebeian Secession by telling one of Aesop’s Fables to its participants.[[73]](#footnote-73) This latter example, through its inclusion in Plutarch’s Greek-language *Life of Coriolanus*, found its way into Elizabethan and Jacobean literary works no less illustrious than Philip Sidney’s *Apologie for Poetrie* (1595), Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* and Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus* (*c*. 1608).[[74]](#footnote-74) To take one more Roman example, in around the first century AD, Tacitus devoted a long section of his *Annals* to a pair of military mutinies that had taken place during the reign of Tiberius in Germany and Pannonia, a Roman province which comprised parts of modern-day Austria, Hungary, Croatia and Serbia. According to Tacitus, military leaders attempted to quell both of these mutinies through rhetoric, which was especially significant in Pannonia since those mutineers were led by a populist soldier called Percennius, formerly a ‘leader of a claque at the theatres… whose experience of stage rivalries had taught him the art of inflaming an audience, and who had misused his rhetorical skills to stoke the fires of mutiny’.[[75]](#footnote-75)

Machiavelli adopted the Roman concept of anti-sedition oratory in the *Discourses on Livy*, printed posthumously in 1531, in which he dedicated a chapter to the subject: ‘Of the boundless authority which a great man may use to restrain an excited Multitude’.[[76]](#footnote-76) He concluded that nothing quells a riot so effectively as ‘the reverence felt for some grave person, clothed with authority, who stands forward to oppose them’.[[77]](#footnote-77) He supported this conclusion with three anecdotes, starting with the quotation from the *Aeneid* to which we have already alluded and following up with the recent historical example of the Bishop of Volterra, who was said to have calmed a mob bent on factional violence ‘by his words and mien’.[[78]](#footnote-78) Although Machiavelli made this argument regarding anti-sedition oratory in a chapter of just over 300 words, it was sufficiently exciting to catch the attention of English and European humanists. Morison mined this anecdote directly from Machiavelli to prove that eloquence can take the sting out of rebellion.[[79]](#footnote-79) In *Les six livres de la republique* (1576), Jean Bodin also followed Machiavelli in arguing that seditious disorder can be pacified by ‘vn vertueux & sage homme’, even citing the very same passage from Virgil.[[80]](#footnote-80) Authors of poetry and prose commonly dramatized the same idea: for instance, it has been demonstrated that Thomas Lodge was inspired by the above passage from Machiavelli when he wrote Arsinous’s speech in *A margarite of America* (1596).[[81]](#footnote-81)

The central position of the anti-sedition oration in Tudor literary culture may be confirmed by consulting Thomas Wilson’s famous textbook *The arte of rhetorique* (1553). Wilson, a good friend of William Cecil’s and later a privy councillor, demonstrates a familiarity with existing Tudor anti-sedition literature, even quoting from Sir John Cheke’s *The hurt of sedition* to illustrate the rhetorical feature of homoioteleuton, which he anglicises into the less barbaric but somewhat facile phrase ‘Lyke endyng, and lyke fallyng’.[[82]](#footnote-82) Wilson also illustrates various other features by advancing examples of anti-sedition rhetoric devised by himself. For instance, he invents a rhetorical question that could have formed part of an oration against the Norfolk rebels of 1549, to illustrate the technique of ‘amplification by comparison’:

By comparing of examples, we use also to encrease oure matter. As thus. Did the Maior of London thrust throughe Iacke Straw beinge but a verlet rebell, and onely disquietinge the Citye: and shall the kynge suffer Capitayne Kete to liue in Englandes grounde, and enioye the fruites of his realme, beinge a most tyrannous traytoure, and such a rebell as sought to ouerthrow the whole Realm?[[83]](#footnote-83)

Later in the textbook, Wilson suggests that writing a *prosopopoeia* in the voice of Henry VIII would be an effective way of dissuading rebels:

By this figure also we imagine a talke for some one to speake, and according to his person we frame the Oration. As if one should bryng in noble Henry the .viij. of most famouse memorie to enueigh against rebelles, thus he might order his Oration. What if Henry theight were alyue, & sawe suche rebellion in this Realme, would not he say thus, and thus? yea me thynkes I heare hym speake euen now. And so set forth suche wordes as we would haue hym to saie.[[84]](#footnote-84)

And there are more examples besides. We may doubt that rhetoric really was an effective solution to rebellion, and the evidence is generally too patchy to decide one way or the other, but what is sure is that sixteenth-century intellectuals did not entertain a like doubt. The idea was even commonplace outside of elite humanist circles. In Mary’s reign, the sheriff of Herefordshire Sir John Baskerville claimed to have calmed a riot over a disputed title ‘by gentle perswasyons’.[[85]](#footnote-85) No doubt this really was in many cases an effective peacekeeping strategy.

III

Although it will be used in this thesis as a descriptive term, the term ‘propaganda’ is of limited use as an analytical term for the Tudor period. There might be a compelling parallel to be drawn between the distribution of pamphlets among rebels in the sixteenth century and modern wartime methods of propaganda such as leaflet bombing, but we need to recognize that many of the Tudor pamphlets were much more besides propaganda. They were in part genuine acts of communication, both with rebels and with other subjects.

The changing fortunes of the concept of ‘Tudor propaganda’ may be traced in the work of Sydney Anglo. In an early work, Anglo complained that the majority of earlier work on Tudor spectacle had been ‘descriptive rather than analytic’ and he set out to correct this imbalance by analysing pageantry as propaganda.[[86]](#footnote-86) His method was to take a significant event, such as the Field of Cloth of Gold, and explain how its intricate symbolism was designed to promote a timely political purpose. Later in his life, however, Anglo began to question historians’ tendency to assume ‘governmental planning in the creation and propagation of political symbolism on the one hand; and the existence of a sophisticated and informed public response on the other’. He criticized the habit of writing ‘as though Renaissance potentates employed advertising agencies and public relations teams’.[[87]](#footnote-87) In the 1996 preface to the second edition of *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy*, Anglo reaffirmed this point by writing that he was ‘no longer convinced by a facile, and indeed anachronistic, use of the word “propaganda” with its implications both of systematic government control and of consistent theory’.[[88]](#footnote-88) The real problem with earlier scholarship, though, was that historians used the concept indiscriminately to describe too broad a range of phenomena. Like many a sensible point, this one has been stated before by Sir Geoffrey Elton, who refuted the view that on his accession Henry VII had ‘organized a propaganda campaign to support his claims and denigrate his enemies’ since there was little evidence of government planning, and that most of the works popularly called ‘Tudor propaganda’ were in fact ‘put out not by the Tudors but for them, without participation, by such people as Polydore Vergil, Bernard Andreae [*sic*.] and the rest’.[[89]](#footnote-89) The term ‘propaganda’ is unobjectionable, though, when one uses it to refer to the top-down, systematic dissemination of ideas or information.

Certainly, as this thesis will prove, councillors managed the production of propaganda, publicity material, persuasive paperwork – call it what we will – throughout the sixteenth century. Cooper, indeed, has argued that Anglo became ‘too dismissive of royal propaganda’, and to prove this he has analysed propaganda designed to condemn regional rebellion, the ‘nightmare of the Tudor state’, in 1536 and 1549.[[90]](#footnote-90) The present study builds on Cooper’s work by extending the findings of this short section in breadth and depth: the pamphlet campaigns against the rebellions of 1536 and 1549 will be reconstructed in greater detail, followed by a discussion of similar anti-sedition literature produced in the wake of rebellions in 1554 and 1569. Another well-known book about Tudor propaganda is Sharpe’s *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, one of whose main contentions is that the Reformation forced governments ‘not just to state authority but to argue it: through words, images and spectacle’. Sharpe analysed ‘representations as dialogues with subjects’ rather than as ‘top-down impositions of authority’.[[91]](#footnote-91) A similar point has been made by Markku Peltonen, who states that in ‘pre-revolutionary England’, eloquence ‘was often seen as a popular art’. Peltonen expands this statement into two different observations: that rhetoricians often addressed the common people; and that English grammar schools taught rhetoric to boys who were from neither the aristocracy nor the gentry. Since eloquence was ‘above all about speaking to the people in a style which suited them’, Peltonen claims, ‘it could be described as popular or populist’. He argues that the ‘rhetorical persuasion of the people implied taking the ordinary citizens seriously and it was thus incompatible with a straightforward notion of control and command’.[[92]](#footnote-92)

While there is some truth in this, care should be taken not to understate the authoritarian side of government pamphleteering. In Renaissance Europe, certainly, dialectic was often symbolized by a closed fist and rhetoric by an open hand, for whereas dialectic produced pure logical argumentation, the job of rhetoric was to produce arguments which could be comprehended by the common people.[[93]](#footnote-93) Still, rhetoricians could hold popular implied audiences in contempt. When Cicero famously denounced the Catilinarian conspiracy, he presented epideictic orations both ‘in senatu’ and ‘ad populum’. His speeches delivered to the senate were sober exposés of Catiline’s plot, whereas his speeches delivered to the popular assembly were characterized by hysteria and hyperbole.[[94]](#footnote-94) Likewise, in their addresses to the English commons, authors of anti-sedition pamphlets did not necessarily conceive of their readers as a politically intelligent public; the mere act of addressing a group did not necessarily grant it the equality to conduct an open dialogue. On the contrary, anti-sedition writings were often conceived of as a method of pacification. As we have already suggested, replies to rebels were usually designed to appeal simultaneously to third parties, the expectation being that they would plainly see that the government’s position was the correct one.

The main argument of this thesis, to repeat, is that Tudor rebellions prompted governments to employ a highly communicative style of politics. Loyalist authors did not intend to subject government policy to public approval, or to communicate with the monarch by garnering public support: they were simply applying the Ciceronian idea that oratory is the best way to ‘get a hold on assemblies of men, win their good will, direct their inclinations wherever the speaker wishes’.[[95]](#footnote-95) At the same time, loyalist pamphlets provide an insight into the nature of the Tudor state, for authors normally defend government policy not by appealing to the king’s absolute authority but by pointing out that policy had been passed by the king in Parliament. These propositions are demonstrated through a detailed reconstruction of four persuasion campaigns, in 1536, 1549, 1554 and 1569-1572. In the first chapter, I propose a new framework for reading early modern persuasive writings, designed to stand in for the abstract theories which scholars sometimes employ at present, and the rest of the thesis hopes to demonstrate the practical utility of such a framework. Aside from these overall arguments, each chapter also presents its own self-contained argument. The second chapter demonstrates that Thomas Cromwell was the principal organizer of the anti-sedition propaganda campaign of 1536, and that Cromwell’s humanist clients shared the political intentions of the king and his government, although some scholars have maintained the contrary. The third chapter argues that in response to the rebellions of 1549, Protector Somerset and the Council responded to rebels with greater sympathy than their predecessors had, while some councillors and independent authors followed a different strategy, which suggests the existence of serious policy disagreements within Somerset’s regime. The fourth chapter suggests that Mary I and Stephen Gardiner made more effective use of the printing press in response to Wyatt’s rebellion of 1554 than they have been given credit for. It examines the circumstances surrounding a lost anti-sedition pamphlet from this year. The fifth chapter reconstructs William Cecil’s campaign of persuasion against the Northern Rising, repudiating the suggestion that anti-sedition authors attempted to exert pressure on Elizabeth I. It offers a fresh analysis of familiar works alongside an examination of a manuscript treatise probably written in 1572.

Tudor governments’ efforts to persuade their subjects were perhaps cruder, and certainly quite different, than those of modern advertising agencies, for they had Cicero rather than Ogilvy to guide their way,[[96]](#footnote-96) but they nevertheless demonstrate that the government recognized the value of persuasion far earlier than the advent of democracy in England. No one has ever attempted to write the coherent history of the Tudor anti-sedition oration and related genres which has been attempted here. Still, many of the individual works have been analysed in other contexts, which of necessity brings this thesis into constant dialogue, and sometimes conflict, with scholars past and present. Nonetheless, its main duty is to the original sources, which it aims to analyse accurately and honestly before all other considerations. The books and pamphlets produced by councillors and their clients are a fascinating case study for examining how governments secured compliance to policy in the sixteenth century.

Chapter 1

How to Read Early Modern Persuasive Writings

Although scholars of early modern England have long been interested in polemic and persuasion, there has never been any serious attempt to formulate a framework for interpreting these works correctly. Whenever historians have used them productively, it is because they have combined a healthy amount of common sense with the source criticism skills which most historians acquire through their special form of training. However, historians have not paid enough attention to questions of rhetoric, literary style and form. To illustrate, in his lively printed lectures entitled *Bad Queen Bess?* (2016), Peter Lake collapses the concepts of genre and style of argument to define an Elizabethan genre known as the ‘libellous secret history’, which is broad enough to include government pamphlets and oppositional works; prim treatises find themselves in the same genre as gossip-column libels such as *Leicester’s Commonwealth* (1584).[[97]](#footnote-97) We need more awareness of the formal properties of anti-sedition writings, not just their abstractable content.

Meanwhile, in literary studies, the popularization of the word ‘text’ has occasionally had the mischievous effect of obscuring differences in the form, genre, purpose and even quality of various written works. Moreover, despite a general interest in manuscripts, literary scholarship sometimes lacks the archival competence necessary to establish external information, for instance whether a certain work was commissioned by the government. In the absence of any apparatus of reading, it has been tempting to fall back on interpretive abstract theories. To demonstrate that scholars should not seize upon such theories quite so eagerly, I shall begin this chapter with an examination of the concept of the ‘early modern public sphere’, before proceeding to propose a simpler, and hopefully more flexible, framework for reading early modern persuasive works. This will allow us to build a secure foundation for interpretation, without which we are unlikely to assess the conceptual content of these works accurately.

At the most basic level, it is true that persuasive pamphlets were printed in the sixteenth century, and that people read, discussed and disputed them. And yet, can it be said in any more meaningful sense that England was host to a ‘public sphere’ in this period? The sociological origin of this concept may be traced to 1962, the year of the Cuban Missile Crisis, when Jürgen Habermas published a version of his doctoral thesis entitled *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, which did not appear in English until 1989. Habermas aimed to trace the development of an ideal type called the ‘bourgeois public sphere’, which he thought came closest to actual existence in the clubs and coffee houses of eighteenth-century England where, as he described it, a critical public had been able to discuss politics as equals without coercion or manipulation, and thereby hold the state to account.[[98]](#footnote-98) He argued that there had been no public sphere in Europe in the late middle ages and Renaissance but only a ‘*publicity… of representation*’, by which he meant the representation of the monarch before the people.[[99]](#footnote-99) Habermas, who had spent his teenage years in Nazi Germany as a member of the Hitler Youth and fought on the Western Front,[[100]](#footnote-100) and who decades later became a leading member of the neo-Marxist Frankfurt School, called for a return to the Enlightenment ideal of free public discussion, which he felt had been eradicated by ‘propagandist manipulation by the media’. In his view, this was the only way to ‘ease the forcible forms of a consensus generated through pressure and temper the forcible forms of conflicts hitherto kept from the public sphere’, or in other words, to bring peace on earth.[[101]](#footnote-101) While specialists in the study of early modern England have hesitated to emulate Habermas’s idealism, they have been talking about the public sphere since at least 1997.[[102]](#footnote-102)

The most influential response to his theory by historians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was a 2007 collection of essays edited by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus.[[103]](#footnote-103) Lake has returned to the theory time and again, staking out progressively bolder claims: in 2015, he argued that while communicative methods associated with the public sphere ‘may not have caused the civil war, they did profoundly shape the sort of crisis or series of crises that it was or became’.[[104]](#footnote-104) Most recently, he has partially distanced himself from the spatial metaphor ‘public sphere’, which he now simply defines as ‘the style of public politicking produced by the post reformation in England’.[[105]](#footnote-105) Since there is much more ground to cover in this thesis, we shall confine our attention to the classic text, the aforementioned series of essays edited by Lake and Pincus. Its stated aim was to ‘show how a series of questions and issues, organized around the topos [theme] of the public sphere, can make this period look different’.[[106]](#footnote-106) The editors employ Habermas’s general body of ideas while noting that his theory does not correspond to the historical realities of early modern England.[[107]](#footnote-107) ‘The post-Reformation period,’ they write, ‘can fairly be said to have fostered public spheres of sorts’ because authors made pitches in front of ‘promiscuously uncontrollable, socially heterogeneous, in some sense “popular”, audiences’, which ‘implied the existence of – indeed, notionally at least called into being – an adjudicating public or publics able to judge or determine the truth of the matter in hand on the basis of the information and argument placed before them’.[[108]](#footnote-108)

Most scholars would certainly agree that governments and their friends used the printing press to persuade subjects: persuasion through print had begun at least as early as the reign of Henry VII. Nor would scholars be likely to dispute the fact that authors outside of government used the same methods to rouse public opinion. Members of the latter group presumably did so, assuming that they thought their methods through, either to encourage non-compliance and thereby urge the government to change a policy, or else to draw the government’s attention to a point of view which it had formerly ignored. J. Christopher Warner’s work on the period 1529-1535 has demonstrated that a group of authors whom he calls the More circle, in collaboration with the printers John and William Rastell, used literature and the printing press ‘in an effort to sway Henry’s actions’.[[109]](#footnote-109) Likewise, Greg Walker has demonstrated that loyal servants of the king aimed to temper his passions through a tactful use of literature.[[110]](#footnote-110) However, I would like to challenge one of their central claims, namely that privy councillors and their clients wrote and commissioned pamphlets to influence policy by mustering public support.[[111]](#footnote-111) Unable to persuade the queen, councillors decided that the only way to make her see reason was to get the real or imagined reading public on their side. Such claims bear the hallmark of Habermas’s theory of the public sphere, who wrote that in eighteenth-century Britain, ‘[f]orces endeavouring to influence the decisions of state authority appealed to the critical public in order to legitimate demands before this new forum’.[[112]](#footnote-112) Leaving aside the extent to which this is true of the eighteenth century, can it be true that Tudor councillors did so?

In the essay he contributed to *The Politics of the Public Sphere*, Lake draws on two main sources of evidence to argue that Elizabeth’s councillors lobbied for policy change by appealing to the public. One of these is a series of pamphlets opposing Mary, Queen of Scots which were written in the late 1560s and early 1570s by Cecil’s client Thomas Norton and, possibly, Francis Walsingham.[[113]](#footnote-113) His second body of evidence is the literary activity stimulated by the Anjou marriage negotiations of 1578-1581. He argues, in particular, that a councillor might have commissioned John Stubbes to write the infamous pamphlet *The discoverie of a Gaping Gulf* (1579), which argued that a royal marriage with the Frenchman would be ‘the uery rightest perpendicular downfal that can be imagined’.[[114]](#footnote-114) Presumably Lake has in mind Walsingham or Leicester as the brains behind the operation.[[115]](#footnote-115) And yet, both of these men (along with Lord Burghley) were co-signatories of a circular from the Council addressed to the bishops, possibly never sent, which condemned *A* *Gaping Gulf* and stated that since it had been ‘seditiouslie cast abroade and disp[er]sed in sondrie places of this realme’, the government had decided to print a proclamation which was to be declared initially in the presence of the ‘speciall noted preachers’ of each diocese so that they may understand ‘her highnes constancie and firme determination to maintaine the state of religion w[i]t[h]out alterac[i]on or chaunge’.[[116]](#footnote-116) The proclamation itself, first proclaimed at Essex on 27 September, described Stubbes as ‘a seditious author with his fardel of false reports’.[[117]](#footnote-117) Was one of the councillors who shared corporate responsibility for these reactive measures a double agent who had really commissioned Stubbes’s pamphlet? Lake cites a convoluted extract from Stubbes’s petition of 3 December 1579, which was composed after the loss of his hand but before his release from the Tower:

…even as the Lorde God directed the first examining of me to your lordship, so I hope it will please him, by the same, to give me a good issewe [outcome] of my troubles; and as, before the matter founde owte, he then gave you the deligent endevour of a vigilant magistrate to examine and resiste, by timelie foresighte, any thinge that might fall owt perilous to this common-welthe, whearof you have not the least chardge, as well in counsaile of the state as for administracion of justice; even soe, nowe that the matter is nakedlie revealed, and the worste theirof fallen upon myselffe, withowt any other disturbaunce to her Majesties common peace, whearof I thanke God more then for my life; I hope verelye, and that with mutche comforte, to finde in your lordship that noble disposition which delighteth in procuringe mercie, and that christian pittie which taketh pleasure in comfortinge oppressed hearts.[[118]](#footnote-118)

The petitioned was unquestionably Burghley. For one thing, a copy of the petition made in an unknown Elizabethan hand is entitled ‘Mr S[tubbes] his letter to the L[ord] Threasurer’.[[119]](#footnote-119) Moreover, Stubbes addressed another petition to Burghley on 31 August 1580 in which he indicated that this was not the first time he had done so.[[120]](#footnote-120) Lake appears to follow Natalie Mears’s interpretation of the 3 December petition, who thought that Stubbes was ‘alleging that an unidentified councillor had foreknowledge of the tract but failed to limit the political fall-out from its publication’.[[121]](#footnote-121) However, I would quibble with this interpretation.

Stubbes is obsequiously suggesting that God had inspired the petitioned to be watchful for any threats to the commonwealth, such as seditious books, and that for this reason Stubbes’s authorship of *A Gaping Gulf* became known to the authorities before it could do any harm; only the author has suffered from his own transgression. The petition, then, is a disappointingly unremarkable document.[[122]](#footnote-122) Lake is not the only scholar to have implied that a councillor had commissioned the *Gaping Gulf*. Back in 1988, Christopher Haigh supposed ‘that Stubbs was briefed on what to put in his book by Leicester and Walsingham’, although he provided no evidence to back this up.[[123]](#footnote-123) Wallace MacCaffrey had written something similar in 1981.[[124]](#footnote-124) In 1968, Lloyd E. Berry had pointed out that at the time it ‘was said in Paris that Walsingham had something to do with Stubbs’s *Gaping Gulf*’.[[125]](#footnote-125) His source was a letter from the Venetian Ambassador in France, hardly a man in the loop when it came to English politics, who passed on to the Signoria the false rumour that ‘the Queen, having heard that Secretary Walsingham had knowledge of this affair, had dismissed him from the Court’.[[126]](#footnote-126) It is not impossible that Stubbes’s pamphlet had a conciliar origin, and not unthinkable that it was intended to rouse opposition among those who would ultimately have had the opportunity to withhold their consent for the marriage in Parliament, but since there is no evidence that any of this is true, there is no call to build a house on the sand. For a councillor to publicize confidential information without royal warrant would have been a patent breach of his oath of office.[[127]](#footnote-127) Mears, who has undertaken the most systematic analysis of the circumstances in which Stubbes’s tract was produced, concludes that ‘the evidence linking Stubbs with Leicester and Walsingham is thin’, and that the pamphlet was more probably an independent production.[[128]](#footnote-128) There is some evidence that Leicester commissioned one of his servants to write an allegorical poem discouraging the queen from marrying, but this was intended to be presented to the queen as a private manuscript.[[129]](#footnote-129)

The suggestion that Tudor councillors used the printing press to raise public support and thereby communicate with or intimidate the prince is somewhat far-fetched, although Lake and Pincus’s model of the early modern public sphere has admittedly been the stimulus for interesting scholarly work.[[130]](#footnote-130) True, Tudor authors and preachers were wont to call for policy change in print and from the pulpit. It is also true that, in some cases, they did so at the apparent behest of councillors. In 1539, for example, Thomas Cromwell’s servant Richard Morison called for more evangelical preachers to be appointed in the north of England.[[131]](#footnote-131) Are we to assume, in this case, that Cromwell wanted to marshal public support to persuade Henry VIII to disburse patronage more generously? A better way of explaining such passages, I would argue, is that Tudor pamphlets were broadcast on multiple frequencies at the same time. Tudor elites used popular print to communicate with each other while sending quite different messages to general readers. I shall expand upon this point in due course. What we need most, to reiterate, is not an abstract theory but a flexible, serviceable framework of reading. I outline here a method of classifying early modern persuasive works under eight headings: authorship, authority, implied readership, literary form, literary mode, rhetorical style, physical form (for printed and manuscript works) and location of delivery (for oral works).[[132]](#footnote-132) Given the subject of the present volume, the framework has been formulated with an eye to anti-sedition writing, but I am confident that it can be applied with little adjustment to all forms of early modern persuasive writings.

The first component of this framework is authorship: whenever possible, we need to know who wrote a given work and to have enough knowledge of the author to assist in interpretation. Identifying authorship is in most cases an important preliminary to interpreting persuasive works correctly: when analysing loyalist works, for instance, it matters a great deal whether an author was in government employ or not. In the context of polemic, we may divide authors into six rough categories: the monarch or privy council as a corporate board; government employees (including individual councillors); freelancers with official sponsorship; independent loyalists; professed opponents of the monarch, privy council or established church; and professed loyalists who oppose only a certain, clearly delimited policy or policies. The methods of ascertaining which category an author falls into will be demonstrated practically in the following chapters.

The next component, related to the first, is authority. Whenever an author falls into either of the first three categories, we must establish the degree to which his activity was sponsored by the king or government. If we were to formulate a convincing set of criteria to decide whether a printed work was ‘official’, we might say that the term would apply to statutes, royal proclamations, publications designed to form part of the liturgy of the church, and books and pamphlets bearing the king’s name. However, this definition would conceal important differences between various types of document. To confirm this, we need only consider Henry VIII’s Ten Articles and Injunctions, both printed in 1536, for while the former were issued with the consent of Convocation, the latter were issued in the name of Cromwell solely on the basis of the king’s authority as Supreme Head.[[133]](#footnote-133)

It is more informative to differentiate between procedurally authorized documents; irregularly official documents; and unofficial documents. The latter category should be divided again into works which are and are not known to have been commissioned by the monarch or a member of his council. The text of procedurally authorized works, including statutes and royal proclamations, was approved within the official machinery of state. Statutes, of course, were passed by Parliament. A royal proclamation required the king or queen’s approval, indicated by sign manual, before a copy was sent to Chancery, whereupon the chancellor issued writs of proclamation under the Great Seal.[[134]](#footnote-134) These writs, which contained or accompanied a schedule of the proclamation text, were subsequently delivered throughout the country by pursuivants to be executed by the sheriffs.[[135]](#footnote-135) They instructed the sheriff to make proclamation in ‘several places’ within his bailiwick or city.[[136]](#footnote-136) Alternatively, proclamation could be made by heralds in the presence of sheriffs.[[137]](#footnote-137) Printed proclamations, moreover, were posted in conspicuous places.[[138]](#footnote-138) Of all those documents which were composed and distributed outside of the machinery of state, we shall give the name ‘irregularly official documents’ to those which bore the monarch’s name or were implicitly issued on his authority, and to documents on matters of state which were printed by the royal printer. The term ‘unofficial’ will be given to those which did not or were not. Confusion has often arisen from some scholars’ failure to differentiate between official and independent productions by paying little heed to external evidence, a pitfall which Elton warned against in 1972.[[139]](#footnote-139)

The third component is implied readership, or in other words the intended audience as evident from internal textual and bibliographical evidence. Early modern writings may address the monarch or council, parliamentarians, the people, a section of the people, or more usually a combination of the above. The original concept of implied readership was invented by Wayne C. Booth, who argued that an author attempts to control readers by creating ‘an image of himself and another image of his reader’, and that unless an actual reader calibrates himself with a work’s implied reader, he cannot fully appreciate it.[[140]](#footnote-140) This model might satisfactorily explain some kinds of writing – modernist novels, for example – but early modern polemicists targeted a range of implied readers. An author might address at turns supporters and adversaries, apathetic readers and undecided readers; at one moment the commons and the next moment, the king. In *Areopagitica*, for example, John Milton envisions an oppositional parliamentarian who supports the 1643 printing ordinance, aiming to convert him with the technique of *laudando praecipere* by praising the ‘undaunted Wisdome’ of the Lords and Commons. At the same time, he rallies sympathetic readers by using nationalist and providentialist rhetoric.[[141]](#footnote-141) Milton catered to multiple implied readers because any type of reader he neglected would have been a missed opportunity.

Multiple implied readership helps to explain the fact that some of the pamphlets under discussion not only defend government policy but also appear to counsel the monarch or government. Such situations need to be considered on a case-by-case basis. In some cases, an appeal to the monarch was a rhetorical technique akin to that by which government bills were presented to Parliament as commons’ petitions in the sixteenth century. Such a technique could suggest that policy had been crafted in response to the wishes of subjects, rather than imposed upon them. In 1569, when Thomas Norton called on Queen Elizabeth I ‘not to haue too great clemencie’ in her reaction to the Northern Rising, this might have been calculated to frighten the rebels, rather than to persuade the queen.[[142]](#footnote-142) In other cases, policy suggestions play a more prominent, and apparently more genuine, role in pro-government pamphlets. In pamphlets aimed at a general readership, authors often seized the opportunity to target messages at policy-makers: councillors, ‘civil servants’, members of Parliament, perhaps even the monarch. They were not attempting to exert pressure on the monarch or council by rousing public sentiment, but rather piggybacking on the medium of the public pamphlet to circulate information and arguments among the political classes.

The fourth component is literary form. The most common categories we will encounter are treatises, orations, sermons, addresses, proclamations, letters, verses and ballads, although other forms, such as plays, could also serve as persuasive tools. If an oration is constructed according to classical principles, we may specify whether it is demonstrative (intending to persuade or dissuade) or epideictic (intending to praise or blame a person or group). Cicero’s *De Inventione* recommends that orations should contain the following sections: *exordium* (introduction), *narratio* (a statement of facts), *partitio* (compartmentalization of the argument and outline of its components), *confirmatio* (proof of one’s own argument), *refutatio* (rebuttal of opposing arguments), and *peroratio* (conclusion).[[143]](#footnote-143) As we shall see, the arrangement of treatises and sermons was often influenced by the Ciceronian oratorical structure too.

The fifth component, literary mode, is somewhat more elusive than the others. We can perhaps understand the relation of literary form to literary mode as like the relation of hardware to software. For example, the form of *Hamlet* is a play while its mode is revenge tragedy. Our understanding of mode is comparable but not identical with Aristotle’s definition of genre, which was designed for his own time and included (oddly to our eyes) a combination of grand categories like epic and comedy with non-literary categories such as pipe music.[[144]](#footnote-144) Northrop Frye famously defined a variety of fictional modes relevant to modern literary criticism, including myth, romance and various species of tragedy and comedy.[[145]](#footnote-145) The main literary modes relevant to early modern persuasive works are polemic, lament and history. We cannot improve on the *OED*’s definition of polemic and lament. The former is ‘a strong verbal or written attack on a person, opinion, doctrine, etc.’, while the second is ‘a passionate or demonstrative expression of grief’.[[146]](#footnote-146)

The sixth component is rhetorical style.[[147]](#footnote-147) The pseudo-Ciceronian rhetoric textbook *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, favoured by Renaissance authors,defines three kinds of style: the grand, the middle and the simple (or plain):

The Grand type consists of a smooth and ornate arrangement of impressive words. The Middle type consists of words of a lower, yet not of the lowest and most colloquial, class of words. The Simple type is brought down even to the most current idiom of standard speech.[[148]](#footnote-148)

Putting this into an early modern context, we might place the Coverdale Bible (1535) at one end of the spectrum, and at the other, Sir Philip Sidney’s *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia* (1590). While authors in the simple style compress ideas into concise, efficient sentences, those in the grand style prize copiousness and amplification. Both the advantage and the danger of plain and lower-middle styles was their accessibility, for a colloquial address from king to commons risked forfeiting the mystery of the Crown. ‘By being seldom seen, I could not stir,’ said Shakespeare’s King Henry IV, ‘But like a comet I was wondered at’.[[149]](#footnote-149) The principal danger of the grand style was that it could turn ludicrous if applied incompetently. Cicero appreciated this, no doubt from experience of listening to lesser orators:

…the plain orator is esteemed wise because he speaks clearly and adroitly; the one who employs the middle style is charming; but the copious speaker, if he has nothing else, seems to be scarcely sane.[[150]](#footnote-150)

These broad categories, like all others, conceal degrees, for one pamphlet in the ‘grand style’ might be considerably more florid than another. For example, the Elizabethan Martin Marprelate pamphlets, laden with colloquialisms, are extreme specimens of the simple style.[[151]](#footnote-151) We will not dwell on the component of style too much in the present thesis, for most of the writings under discussion straightforwardly hit the middle style, although some are plainer than others, such as the king’s answers to the rebels of 1536.

The seventh component is physical form, which of course only applies to written works. The most common manuscript categories relevant to persuasive works are scribal manuscripts (ranging from personal memoranda to ornate presentation manuscripts), postal manuscripts (including sealed and unsealed letters) and drafts. The most common printed categories we shall encounter are books, pamphlets and broadsheets. A broadsheet or broadside is easy to define: a work printed on a large, single sheet of paper. What, though, is the precise difference between a book and a pamphlet?[[152]](#footnote-152) The printed pamphlet form was effectively codified in March 1586 when London aldermen and the Stationers’ Company decided that folio books needed to be properly sewn if they exceeded forty sheets in length and likewise with octavos if they exceeded twelve sheets.[[153]](#footnote-153) In practice, this limited the maximum length of a stitched pamphlet to 192 leaves.[[154]](#footnote-154) This is somewhat of a technical distinction but the length of a work, and whether it was stitched or sewn, affected its price and thus its audience. In London, people usually paid for pamphlets whether or not they had been commissioned by the government. The poor would have been unlikely to buy printed works since the cheapest broadsides were about the same price as a pound of beef.[[155]](#footnote-155)

The eighth and final category is location of delivery. The chief location for early modern persuasion was the pulpit, most notably St. Paul’s Cross. Also important were the market crosses in each town, where proclamations were made. It is important not to draw too firm a distinction between oral and written forms, for the simple reason that no firm distinction existed. For instance, sermons could be heard in church as well as read at home, and proclamations were not only proclaimed but also printed.[[156]](#footnote-156) Thus, a surviving persuasive work, such as a sermon, will often be classifiable according to both the seventh and eighth components of this framework. We can also bear in mind Frye’s concept of the ‘radical of presentation’, or the fundamental orality or writtenness of a literary form regardless of its actual presentation. According to Frye, ‘[o]ne may print a lyric or read a novel aloud, but such incidental changes are not enough in themselves to alter the genre’.[[157]](#footnote-157) By this reckoning, a sermon or an oration is an inherently oral literary form, even if a given specimen was never delivered aloud.

The foregoing may be more clearly presented in a table:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Authorship** | **2. Authority** | **3. Implied readership** | **4. Literary form** | **5. Literary mode** | **6. Rhetorical style** | **7. Physical form (MS)** | **7. Physical form (printed)** | **8. Location of delivery** |
| Monarch/council | Procedurally authorized | Monarch/council | Treatise | Polemic | Grand | Scribal | Book | Pulpit |
| Government employees (inc. individual councillors) | Irregularly official | Parliament | Oration (demonstrative /epideictic) | Lament | Middle | Postal | Pamphlet | Market cross |
| Freelancers with official sponsorship | Unofficial | The people | Sermon | History | Simple/plain |  | Broadsheet |  |
| Independent loyalists |  | A section of the people | Address | Supplication |  |  |  |  |
| Professed opponents of monarch/council/church |  |  | Proclamation | Panegyric |  |  |  |  |
| Professed loyalists opposing policy |  |  | Letter | Satire |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Petition |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Poem/ballad |  |  |  |  |  |

Table : A Framework of reading early modern persuasive works

As Frye once bluntly wrote, ‘Whatever is of no pratical use to anybody is expendable.’[[158]](#footnote-158) I hope that the following chapters will demonstrate the practical utility of the framework outlined above.

Chapter 2

The Rebellions of 1536

Only two years after the Act of Supremacy had passed in 1534, the government of King Henry VIII faced a series of rebellions fuelled by grievances over religion and taxes, which triggered extensive communication between rebel armies and central and local government. This chapter reconstructs the dialogue which the government conducted with the Lincolnshire rebels and the Pilgrims of Grace. It concedes that historians are right to have detected policy suggestions in some of the humanist anti-sedition pamphlets of 1536, but it insists that their primary function was to condemn sedition. It challenges the suggestion that there was a sharp distinction between the conservative and evangelical wings of Henry’s government, suggesting instead that Thomas Cromwell organized the production and distribution of virtually all the persuasive works produced in 1536. It also argues that Richard Morison acted primarily as a servant of the state, and only secondarily as an evangelical lobbyist.

The first method of communication employed by the government was the humble proclamation: at least seven proclamations of pardon and five other royal proclamations related to the Lincolnshire Rebellion and the Pilgrimage of Grace were drafted between October and December.[[159]](#footnote-159) The proclamation of pardon for the Pilgrims of Grace succeeded in disabling the rebellion, most obviously because it offered an apparently safe route for the rebels to stand down, but also because of its considered rhetoric, which combined warnings about the evils of rebellion with assurances of Henry’s ‘singular mercy and pity’.[[160]](#footnote-160) Before any royal proclamations were issued, the Earls of Shrewsbury, Rutland and Huntingdon also issued a proclamation to the commons of Lincolnshire on their own authority, warning them to ‘departe home to your houses… upon payne to lose lif, landes, and goodes’.[[161]](#footnote-161) The rebel leader Robert Aske likewise issued proclamations of his own on 11 October and 17 or 18 October.[[162]](#footnote-162)

Aside from proclamations, Thomas Cromwell arranged for the production of pamphlets responding to the rebellions, at first operating from the Court at Windsor and later, after 14 or 15 October, dividing his time between Windsor and London. The physical form of the pamphlet was more flexible than the proclamation, affording more space for extended discourse and not so bound to a strict format. Four replies were printed in pamphlet form, two of which were point-by-point responses to rebel articles. The printing costs were apparently covered by the Crown, which shortly after (according to a list drawn up by Cromwell) repaid a debt of £20 to the royal printer Thomas Berthelet.[[163]](#footnote-163) According to a report by the clerks of the Treasury of the Household, Berthelet was paid £23 4s. 2d. on 18 June 1537: this sum presumably included the £20 mentioned in Cromwell’s list.[[164]](#footnote-164) This is one of a number of facts presented in this chapter which have been overlooked by all previous scholars, and which justify revisiting territory which some might suppose has already been fully explored. Three additional tracts have survived in manuscript, one of which is known to have been written by Thomas Starkey while another was probably written by Richard Morison.[[165]](#footnote-165) These campaigns were novel in many respects. Although there were some precedents, such as Henry VII’s printing of the pretender Perkin Warbeck’s confession in 1497, never before had the English government used the printing press so extensively and systematically in response to sedition.[[166]](#footnote-166) Still, the direction of the campaigns was informed by the native tradition of government-to-rebel communication and the humanist revival of classical rhetorical principles. They can be seen, moreover, as just one episode in the literary crusade to defend the royal supremacy in England.[[167]](#footnote-167)

Communication between governments and rebels in England was no innovation. During the so-called Peasant’s Revolt of 1381, King Richard II had written multiple letters to the rebels and held conferences with them at Mile End and Smithfield.[[168]](#footnote-168) Written petitions had been drawn up in England at times of rebellion since at least 1450, and there was nothing unusual or embarrassing about listening to their demands.[[169]](#footnote-169) Of course, government-to-rebel communication was potentially humiliating if it seemed that the king had been dictated to, especially if such communication came to the attention of foreign powers. For this reason, Cromwell tried to defend the king’s policy in a letter of late December 1536 to Stephen Gardiner and John Wallop, then royal ambassadors in France, to explain that while ‘it is true that conditions were demanded by the rebels… in the end they submitted entirely to the King’s pleasure with the greatest repentance’.[[170]](#footnote-170)

Government-to-rebel communication was legitimized by the principle of paternalism by which social superiors preferred to reassure discontents than to engage them in conflict. In 1549, the Earl of Arundel managed to calm rebellion in Sussex by inviting the rebels to a feast in his castle and listening to their grievances.[[171]](#footnote-171) Sir Roger Woodhouse attempted something similar in Norfolk, where his provision of beer and food to the rebels failed to prevent his imprisonment.[[172]](#footnote-172) While there was a tradition of communicating with rebels, the communication which took place in 1536 was distinguished by the contribution made by the influential humanists Morison and Starkey, whose study of the classics had brought them to the theoretical position that by reason and persuasion rebels, traitors and conspirators could be persuaded to give up fighting. It must be remembered, too, that the 1530s were a high point in the production of pro-government pamphlets. From 1529 to 1536, an unprecedented volume of official and semi-official literature had been printed to champion the ever-shifting party line on questions of religious doctrine and practice. After 1532, much of this dealt with the king’s supremacy over the English church, which was affirmed by act of Parliament in 1534. The anti-sedition writings of 1536, although themselves a coherent unit of analysis, were connected to this broader body of supremacy literature in purpose and argument.

Finally, the importance of German printed anti-sedition writings should be recognized as they seem to have provided a blueprint for the English campaigns.[[173]](#footnote-173) During the German Peasants’ War of 1524-1525, Martin Luther responded to the Twelve Articles of Swabia with his quarto pamphlet *Ermanunge zum fride* (*Admonition to peace*), of which at least nineteen editions were printed in 1525.[[174]](#footnote-174) The work has five sections: a preamble; an address to princes and lords; a longer address to the peasants; a point-by-point rebuttal of the Twelve Articles; and finally an address to both groups. Luther adopts a fatherly tone in his address to the peasants, calling them ‘dear friends’ and ‘dear brethren’.[[175]](#footnote-175) Although he identifies the wickedness of noblemen as the cause of rebellion, he promotes passive disobedience as the only course open to Christians.[[176]](#footnote-176) Later that same year, Luther wrote a shorter, less restrained quarto pamphlet on rebellion entitled *Wider die Mordischen und Reubischen Rotten der Bawren* (*Against the Murderous and Thieving Hordes of Peasants*).[[177]](#footnote-177) Unlike the *Admonition to Peace*, Luther’s second pamphlet is addressed solely to princes. ‘There is not a devil left in hell,’ he declares, ‘they have all gone into the peasants’.[[178]](#footnote-178) Apparently, Luther changed gears because of the successes of the rebels in Thuringia and the increasing violence of their conduct.[[179]](#footnote-179) Despite widespread shock and opposition, Luther wrote a long apology for the pamphlet’s content and style, published in the same year, in which he refused to retract his former statements:

A rebel is not worth rational arguments, for he does not accept them. You have to answer people like that with a fist, until the sweat drips off their noses. The peasants would not listen; they would not let anyone tell them anything… Such pupils need a rod. He who will not hear God’s word when it is spoken with kindness, must listen to the headsman, when he comes with his axe.[[180]](#footnote-180)

Although there is no positive connection between Luther’s pamphlets of 1525 and the English pamphlets of 1536, English authors seem to have followed Luther in specifics, borrowing for instance his technique of point-by-point rebuttal in the *Admonition to Peace*. That the government authors followed Luther in this context does not, of course, mean that they subscribed to all tenets of Lutheran thought.

It is unlikely that the king and Cromwell were unaware of Luther’s anti-sedition pamphlets, given that the Council had received regular information about the Peasants’ War through Cardinal Wolsey.[[181]](#footnote-181) Henry VIII had taken up the theme of Luther’s role in the rebellion in 1527, calling the German rebels men of his ‘malicious faction’.[[182]](#footnote-182) In the same work, he showed familiarity with Luther’s writings on civil obedience, finding a contradiction in his preaching ‘obedience towarde gouernars’ and the apparent lawlessness of Lutheran doctrine.[[183]](#footnote-183) In his study of England’s relationship with the Schmalkaldic League, based on a significant body of manuscript material housed in England and Germany, McEntegart has demonstrated that Cromwell had shown a ‘close interest in things German’ since at least 1533, when his servants Christopher Mont and Stephen Vaughan had been despatched unsuccessfully as ambassadors to Catholic Bavaria and Protestant Saxony, respectively.[[184]](#footnote-184) Cromwell even commissioned Mont to translate a German chronicle into Latin in the early 1530s.[[185]](#footnote-185) The minister also seems to have been in regular correspondence with Luther by the spring of 1536, both directly and through his servant Robert Barnes.[[186]](#footnote-186) Richard Morison, who could read German at least as early as 1538, might well have been another conduit by which the German methods were imported into England.[[187]](#footnote-187) According to Fuller’s *Church History*, Morison had been sent to Germany by Henry in 1530 to acquire support for the king’s divorce.[[188]](#footnote-188) Although confirmation of this claim has not been forthcoming (and it is not mentioned in Tracey Sowerby’s biography of Morison), it would explain his knowledge of the language and the fact that in one of his 1536 pamphlets he describes German agriculture as if he had once lived there.[[189]](#footnote-189) As we shall see, Henrician anti-sedition propaganda had more in common with the *Admonition for Peace* than *Against the Peasants*, as authors preferred to reply to rebels rather than calling down evil upon them. Nevertheless, the English writings are not lacking in the rhetorical violence which suffuses Luther’s second pamphlets. Although they make some attempt to explain the royal position, each of them contains, in varying quantities, a strong dose of denunciation.

The rebellions of 1536 have received a generous amount of attention from historians. Any work on the Pilgrimage of Grace is indebted to the work of Michael Bush, most importantly his meticulous monograph *The Pilgrimage of Grace: A Study of the Rebel Armies of October 1536* (1999), which greatly eases the burden of establishing the chronology of the rebellion. Scholars also owe much to R. W. Hoyle’s book about the two rebellions.[[190]](#footnote-190) Oddly, however, both historians are almost silent on Thomas Cromwell’s role in countering the rebellions and neither attempts to reconstruct the government’s persuasion campaign in any detail. In their study of the post-pardon revolts, Bush and David Bownes mention pamphlets printed under Cromwell’s guidance in 1536 but suggest that ‘the key to understanding the government’s concern is to be found not in these… but in the letters and instructions that passed, at the time, between it and the king’s representatives…’.[[191]](#footnote-191) Analysis of the persuasion campaign has been largely confined to essays, articles and book chapters published by other historians between 1948 and 2010.[[192]](#footnote-192)

The older work, by W. Gordon Zeeveld, Geoffrey Elton and David Sandler Berkowitz, was founded on the assumption that Cromwell, in close alliance with the king, orchestrated a propaganda campaign in 1536 to condemn the rebels; or, alternatively, that Henry, through his servant Cromwell, acted as the campaign director. The first scholar to study the pamphlets of 1536 in any detail was Zeeveld, whose ideas-historical methodology has admittedly not aged very well, for instance his selective interpretation of passages in Morison’s pamphlets which allegedly prove that ‘equalitarian notions’ lay just beneath the skin of an apparently authoritarian regime.[[193]](#footnote-193) However, what we are interested in here is Zeeveld’s fundamental claim that Morison was one of ‘Henry’s propagandists’ and that the king subsidized humanists that they might support the state.[[194]](#footnote-194) Writing twenty-four years after Zeeveld, Elton held much the same view of the composition of the 1536 pamphlets, except that he emphasized (unsurprisingly) the importance of Cromwell as a propaganda director. He suggested that Cromwell commissioned men like Morison and Thomas Starkey to write responses to the rebels, and then chose the most effective works to steer through the printing house.[[195]](#footnote-195) To Berkowitz, whose edition of the four anti-sedition pamphlets was published posthumously in 1984, it was clear that the government organized a ‘campaign of persuasion’ and he even imagined Henry and Cromwell ‘peering over [Morison’s] shoulders’ as he wrote’.[[196]](#footnote-196)

The older view of the campaigns of 1536 has been challenged by Ethan Shagan, who argues that Morison was a semi-independent author. Shagan draws a distinction between the ‘official’ responses by the king and the ‘public’ responses by Morison. He suggests that Morison’s pamphlets were ‘authorized, encouraged, and perhaps even commissioned by the government’, but argues that they were not ‘mere government productions’. According to Shagan, Henry ‘grudgingly allowed people like Morison, with views of the Pilgrimage considerably different from the “official” view, to present their opinions “publicly” so long as they unambiguously condemned the rebellion’. He argues that a major difference between the condemnations of the rebellion is that Morison’s replies contain an ‘evangelical, Word-centred critique of the Catholic church’.[[197]](#footnote-197) Tracey Sowerby has advanced a similar interpretation, arguing that Morison’s 1536 pamphlets ‘reveal that even the pens working for the government were not unquestioning in their support for the king’, but were ‘yet another group jostling to promote their own policy suggestions’.[[198]](#footnote-198) She suggests, with due caution, that Cromwell sponsored Morison’s propaganda ‘to put pressure on Henry’.[[199]](#footnote-199) This assumption is part of her general argument that throughout his career Morison ‘pursued his own agenda and tried to influence the direction of Henry VIII’s religious policy… using ideas and imagery that are more commonly associated with evangelical exiles’.[[200]](#footnote-200)

Each historian has qualified his or her conclusions, but their disagreement really boils down to the question of how far the government influenced what Morison wrote in his pamphlets. To risk falling for the ‘golden mean’ fallacy, there might be some truth to both perspectives; Morison was both an evangelical and a servant of the state, who was primarily concerned, at least in 1536, to secure civil order. The sharp distinction between the evangelical wing of Henrician government (taken to be embodied in Morison’s pamphlets) and the conservative wing (taken to be embodied in Henry’s pamphlets) might have been slightly overdrawn. One fact to remember is the common house style of the four printed pamphlets: all were printed by Berthelet with the same title page compartment.[[201]](#footnote-201) The king’s printer was so called because he printed official works for the government, most commonly statutes and proclamations. That a man held the position of king’s printer did not mean that everything he printed was the king’s, for he also continued to maintain his private business interests: this is true of all the royal printers from Richard Pynson to (at least) Robert Barker. For instance, the government’s hand is by no means obvious in Berthelet’s printing of a translation of an Italian health manual in 1528.[[202]](#footnote-202) Still, the fact that he printed the four anti-sedition pamphlets with a similar house style in quick succession does little to support the idea that Morison was part of an evangelical pressure group acting independently of the king. It is also worth remembering that six fragmentary drafts of Morison’s second anti-sedition pamphlet, *A remedy for sedition*, found their way into the State Papers, which increases the likelihood that he was a hired pen.

For another thing, there is no strong evidence that Henry wrote the two royal replies himself. Thomas Wriothesley, who served both as Cromwell’s servant and in a more official capacity as clerk of the signet, drafted the *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre* and the draft was subsequently corrected by Cromwell;[[203]](#footnote-203) the latter fact was known to the anonymous editor of the *State Papers Published under the Authority of His Majesty’s Commission* in 1830but it has been entirely overlooked since.[[204]](#footnote-204) Wriothesley was also made responsible for drafting a letter by the king which arranged for the distribution of Morison’s *Lamentation* in Yorkshire.[[205]](#footnote-205) The fact that he was involved with the composition of one of the royal replies and the distribution of one of Morison’s replies is a salutary reminder that we cannot draw so clear a line between the conservative and evangelical wings of Henrician government.

People are liable to have their own opinions and priorities which may lead them to stretch or even ignore instructions. An undated letter from 1537 furnishes evidence of Morison doing just this. Morison states that Cromwell had appointed him ‘both to alter and also shortly to se printed the King’s answer touching the Mantuan Councel’, a pamphlet which appeared in various English and Latin editions between 1537 and 1538.[[206]](#footnote-206) He apologizes for not having followed Cromwell’s instructions but expresses his opinion that the word of the king should not be revised so lightly once it has already been made public.[[207]](#footnote-207) Aside from proving the obvious, that Morison had his own ideas and was not a robot programmed by his betters, this letter indicates that he did not treat lightly his own failure to follow the minister’s instructions to the letter. It also illustrates the nature of the cliental bond between Cromwell and Morison by proving what common sense would already have suggested: that the minister directly commissioned his servant to undertake writing jobs for the government. Morison’s 1536 pamphlets were the products of a collaboration with Cromwell, Berthelet, and the king, although Cromwell seems to have been more closely involved than the latter. Morison unsurprisingly seized the opportunity to promote his own preferred policies, especially in the *Remedy for sedition*,but that does not detract from the suggestion that he was a royal propagandist.

For a glimpse into the processes by which the pamphlets were written and printed, we might consider a slightly later manuscript tract addressed to the Pilgrims of Grace, probably written by Morison, which bears two alternative titles: ‘A lettre sent to the comons that rebell, wherin louyngely is shewed to them, how they eu[er]y way, ryse to they owne extreme ruine and distru[c]tion’ and the more succinct ‘Admonicion[n] to the Rebells in the North[e]to desiste’.[[208]](#footnote-208) Zeeveld suggested long ago that Morison was a co-author of this tract because of stylistic similarities to his pamphlets.[[209]](#footnote-209) He also suggested Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham and president of the Council of the North from 1530, but he did not state his reasons for so concluding.[[210]](#footnote-210) Perhaps he had noticed the similarity of the manuscript handwriting to Tunstall’s, whose recognizable features include the fact that the second stem of the h grapheme reaches back as far left as the first stem, and that the d grapheme has no terminal swash.[[211]](#footnote-211) Earlier in 1536, Tunstall had collaborated with Cromwell in drafting the Ten Articles, and in an undated letter explaining some alterations he had made to his contributions, he referred to himself in petitioner’s language as Cromwell’s ‘humble beedman’.[[212]](#footnote-212) However, there are enough graphological differences between Tunstall’s autograph letters and ‘A lettre sent to the comons that rebell’ to counter the identification. Moreover, since Tunstall seems to have remained in Norham from mid-October through to December, it seems unlikely that he wrote commissioned propaganda.[[213]](#footnote-213) The identification with Morison is much more promising. The phraseology bears his hallmark, as may be illustrated by comparing the statement: ‘the true token of a christen man is loue, peace, and charite’ with Morison’s ‘Obedience is the badge of a trewe christen man’; and the phrase ‘mischeuous mad braynes’ with Morison’s ‘madde braynes’.[[214]](#footnote-214)

If Morison was indeed the author, however, how did the manuscript come to be written in another amateur hand? The answer lies in the fact that it is apparently not an authorial manuscript but rather copy generated in Berthelet’s print shop. This is evident from the fact that each page has thirty-one lines of text, just like the *Lamentation* and *Remedy* printed by Berthelet in that year, and that both recto and verso leaves feature catchwords in the bottom-right corner. Morison had probably given Berthelet an untidy manuscript and so the compositor found it necessary to make a handwritten copy before he could proceed to typesetting. The copy was subsequently corrected in at least two different hands, one of them possibly Cromwell’s, to whom the copy must have been sent for final approval since it ultimately found its way into the State Papers. The manuscript, then, provides interesting evidence about how pamphlets came to be produced in 1536. Authors and printers were not given free rein to do their bit for the commonwealth, but seem in fact to have been closely supervised.

Responses to the Lincolnshire Articles

It is difficult to overstate Cromwell’s involvement in communicating with the rebels in Lincolnshire because his fingerprints are to be found everywhere. On 3 October, the Lincolnshire rebels sent the king a request for a pardon signed by Robert Tyrwhit, William Ayscough, Sir Edward Madison and Thomas Portington.[[215]](#footnote-215) At Windsor, the king’s answer to this request (not to be confused with his answer to the Lincolnshire Articles), was drafted by Cromwell’s servant Wriothesley and sent to the Duke of Suffolk on 15 October.[[216]](#footnote-216) Henry told the rebels that as they had finally seen through the ‘most false and trayterouse tales and deuises’ of the rebel captains, he was willing to pardon them if they surrendered their weapons at the marketplace in Lincoln.[[217]](#footnote-217) In the accompanying letter to Suffolk, however, he stressed that this address should only be delivered to the rebels if they had not already surrendered.[[218]](#footnote-218) Henry was evidently aware that persuasion could backfire if it appeared to compromise the king’s authority .

The Lincolnshire Articles, the rebels’ statement of demands, had been finalized by 8 October. According to a letter addressed to the Duke of Suffolk by the rebel leaders on 10 October, which has survived in a copy made in the 1630s by a scribe, the gentry had encouraged the drawing up of a petition in order to arrest the progress of the Lincolnshire revolt.[[219]](#footnote-219) We should not overplay the implications of this claim, however, since there were several petitions competing for attention in the early days of the rebellion and not all of them can have been commissioned by gentlemen.[[220]](#footnote-220) Numerous deponents in January 1537 told roughly the same story about the genesis of the Lincolnshire articles: they were composed by a clerk named George Staines of Haltham, who submitted them to the commons for approval before personally delivering them to every corner of the county, ‘from wapontache to wapontache’.[[221]](#footnote-221) Thomas Retford claimed that the commons had produced ‘diu[er]s artycles… but after the said Stanes had made the co[m]mons priuy to his articles they forthw[i]t[h] followid theym and forsoke their owyn articles’.[[222]](#footnote-222) According to the deponent Roger New, Staines wrote the articles ‘in the filde vppon his Saddill bowe and rode from place [to place] to set them forwarde w[i]t[h] all his power’.[[223]](#footnote-223)

One surviving version of the Lincolnshire Articles, which was sent into York, contains five clauses, of which only one clause is a demand as such, while the other four are statements of opinion.[[224]](#footnote-224) The rebels argue that the dissolution of the monasteries has been ‘a great hurt to the commonwealth’; they ask for the Statute of Uses to be repealed; they argue that a forthcoming fifteenth and tenth tax will be grievous to the commons;[[225]](#footnote-225) that the king’s low-born councillors are pursuing religious reform ‘for their own advantage’; and finally, that the king ought not to have promoted bishops who were ‘the beginnings of all the trouble’ in England.[[226]](#footnote-226) The fourth of these articles was inspired by a conviction which might seem odd coming from the mouths of rebels, that the king should be counselled only by men of noble blood, but rebels in 1450 and 1497 had in fact made similar complaints about low-born councillors.[[227]](#footnote-227) The version of the Lincolnshire Articles conveyed to the king contained an additional clause complaining about first fruits and tenths and also a request for a pardon.[[228]](#footnote-228) Among the Exchequer papers, there is another abbreviated version of all six Lincolnshire Articles.[[229]](#footnote-229) On 8 October, Staines read a proclamation appointing himself as the courier of the petition and, on allowing himself to be apprehended by Richard Cromwell on 10 October, he was handed over to Suffolk, after which point he was conveyed to the king.[[230]](#footnote-230) The articles probably reached the king between 12 and 14 October, since the infrastructure of royal standing posts instituted in 1512 under Sir Brian Tuke allowed for remarkably swift official communication.[[231]](#footnote-231)

Since the printed replies to the Lincolnshire Articles were not distributed until quite some time after 15 October, the date of the Lincolnshire rebels’ surrender, we might conclude that they missed their mark.[[232]](#footnote-232) However, it was far from clear at the time that the rebellion had been thoroughly eradicated. Richard Cromwell wrote to his uncle Thomas Cromwell on 17 October that he and the Lord Admiral Sir William Fitzwilliam had been treated disrespectfully in Lincoln the previous night by ‘as obstinate persons as ever I saw, who would scarce move their bonnets to my said lord’.[[233]](#footnote-233) On the same day, Henry commanded the Earl of Shrewsbury to remain in Lincolnshire to ensure that the rebels had been entirely appeased before marching to join the king’s forces against the new rebellion in Yorkshire.[[234]](#footnote-234) The government went ahead with responding to the rebel demands in spite of their surrender so that they could ensure the county’s compliance and concentrate their military efforts further north.[[235]](#footnote-235) Moreover, many of the revolts which comprised the Pilgrimage of Grace were initially conducted with the Lincolnshire Articles as their official statement of grievance so it made sense to disseminate a response.[[236]](#footnote-236) On 19 October, the king’s answer to the Lincolnshire Articles was sent in manuscript to Suffolk.[[237]](#footnote-237) The fact that Cromwell corrected a draft of this answer, as mentioned above, is proof positive of his oversight.

There is good reason to believe that this draft had in turn been copied from a previous draft. For one thing, it contains few deletions or corrections except those introduced to sharpen the style and, at one stage, Wriothesley has written a phrase twice and eliminated the repetition, which is a kind of mistake one does not usually make during original composition or dictation.[[238]](#footnote-238) Thus, it is impossible to decide how much of the document Cromwell was personally responsible for but he certainly oversaw its production. We should be aware that on another occasion Wriothesley’s name was mooted to compose the preface to the Bishops’ Book in 1537, so we cannot necessarily assume that his role in 1536 was strictly secretarial.[[239]](#footnote-239) In the accompanying letter to Suffolk, also drafted by Wriothesley, the king wrote that he had deliberately sent the answer undated. The reply was also sent unsealed, no doubt to emphasize that it was for a general readership, and it bore the sign manual. Henry insisted that the reply should be delivered to the rebels ‘with a special commandment that it be read openly in the hearing of all men in their company’.[[240]](#footnote-240)

The document itself, which was subsequently reprinted in *Hall’s Chronicle* and the 1570 edition of Foxe’s *Actes and monumentes*, is a dissuasive plain address in the king’s voice.[[241]](#footnote-241) It has more in common with native traditions such as the persuasive proclamation than with the classically inspired humanist oration, as elegance makes way for plainspokenness and sophisticated dialectic makes way for common sense. The same voice may be heard in *A glasse of the truthe*, published under Henry’s name in 1532. His answers are not, of course, devoid of stylistic flourish. Consulting the manuscript draft provides an insight into Cromwell’s interest in maximising the dissuasive impact of the address. For example, the final phrase appears originally to have read: ‘in the vtter aduenture of totall destruction w[i]t[h] the sworde’, but this phrase was subsequently expanded into a more memorable *pleonasm*: ‘in the vtter aduenture of totall destruction by force and violence of the sworde’.[[242]](#footnote-242)

In its printed form, the *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre* is a slight quarto pamphlet of four folios with approximately five and a half sides of text. We know neither the exact date of its printing nor that of its distribution. There are five paragraphs, each dedicated to one or two of the rebel articles. The king’s name appears neither on the title page nor in the body text but his authorship is implied by the royal ‘we’. The pronouns are irregular, with the king being referred to at one moment in the first-person plural and at the next in the third-person singular, as if Cromwell and the king had confused Wriothesley by dictating alternate sentences; or, in the case of single authorship, as if the writer kept forgetting that he was supposed to be ventriloquising. The king exploits a paradox which the rebels had fallen into, for although they criticized the king for choosing low-born councillors, they themselves were offering counsel to the king as a group led in part by low-born men like the shoemaker Nicholas Melton, otherwise known as Captain Cobbler. Henry faces another paradox himself, one which all anti-sedition writers had to grapple with, namely the act of reasoning with rebels while suggesting that they are unreasonable. He deals with the rebel articles systematically, firstly rebutting the fourth and sixth articles ‘bycause vppon them dependeth moche of the rest’.[[243]](#footnote-243) He opposes these articles on the grounds that commoners are not qualified to have an opinion on the composition of the king’s council.

As for the first article, Henry replies that the dissolution was not the invention of one man but had been agreed upon by Parliament: the people had consented to it through their representation in the Commons, which is a strong piece of evidence to prove that Henry and Cromwell did not set out to defend absolute monarchy, but rather constitutional monarchy. Turning next to the second article demanding the repeal of the Act of Uses (by which Henry had consolidated his right to feudal dues at the expense of nobles and gentlemen),[[244]](#footnote-244) the king’s argument is that it is a statute authorized in Parliament, which does not really answer the rebels’ point because they had not questioned the act’s legal legitimacy but had simply stated that it was unfair.[[245]](#footnote-245) Nevertheless, it certainly supports our argument that Tudor propagandists stressed parliamentary consent rather than royal absolutism.

Next, in response to their complaint about the forthcoming fifteenth and tenth tax, he resorts to the *argumentum ad baculum*, arguing that a single shire could hardly compel the king to remit it.[[246]](#footnote-246) The king does briefly make an argument for the necessity of the tax for safeguarding the realm, but then he threatens to stop studying so hard for the preservation of the commonwealth if subjects are not going to be grateful. At the close of the paragraph, he warns that the rebels will be brought to confusion if they do not submit.[[247]](#footnote-247) He answers the missing article about first fruits and tenths by similar means, insisting that the money is necessary to maintain national security and expressing surprise that they cannot find in their hearts the willingness to pay their protector.[[248]](#footnote-248)

This clumsy pamphlet is not, and nor was it intended to be, an absolutist diatribe. The rebel leaders had earlier complained that the king’s first letter had obstructed the staying of rebel excesses by driving a wedge between the gentry and commons,[[249]](#footnote-249) and we may wonder whether his answer to their petition fared any better. Holinshed claims that after hearing the king’s ‘pythie’ answer, the Lincolnshire men ‘got them home to their houses withoute longer abode’, which is not quite true since they had largely disbanded before receipt of the reply.[[250]](#footnote-250) It might at least have entertained readers in other counties who could feel superior to the ‘rude co[m]mons’ of Lincolnshire’.[[251]](#footnote-251) Even one modern historian, in a rare moment of spite, confessed that he could not ‘resist a snigger over the King’s address to these Calibans of Lincolnshire’.[[252]](#footnote-252) Whether it was ever delivered in print to Lincolnshire is unclear, but the *Ansvvere* was apparently widely available in London. After being arrested for suspicious behaviour in 1536, Sir George Throckmorton confessed that he had read ‘the book in print, the answer to the Lincolnshire men’s demands’ and that others of his acquaintance had read the same pamphlet.[[253]](#footnote-253) It is possible that Berthelet was authorized to sell leftover copies in London after it had become apparent that differences between the Lincolnshire Rebellion and the Pilgrimage of Grace had rendered the *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre* obsolete. There might also have been a deliberate attempt by the government to form opinions in the capital, which would seem to be confirmed by the fact that slightly later, after the Pilgrimage of Grace had broken out, Cromwell commissioned Hugh Latimer to deliver an anti-sedition sermon at St. Paul’s Cross.[[254]](#footnote-254) Copies of the *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre* may also have been sent to the Pilgrim heartlands before they switched to a new set of articles on 27 October. Despite the king’s dismissive reaction to the Lincolnshire Articles and his unwillingness to make concessions, his printed reply was at least a straightforward response to the rebels’ demands. Aside from the plain *Ansvvere*, the Lincolnshire Articles also received a printed reply from Cromwell’s scholar Morison, who avoided the king’s unvarnished style of address in favour of an oration which combined the polemic with the lament mode.

II

To an even greater extent than the king’s answers, Morison’s *Lamentation* demonstrates the government’s confidence in the potency of rhetoric as a political tool. Morison first became acquainted with Cromwell when the two men were serving in the household of Cardinal Wolsey, before Morison’s stint at the University of Padua between 1532 and 1535.[[255]](#footnote-255) Elton reconstructed the sequence of events by which Morison entered Cromwell’s service in 1535, making it clear that he took the initiative of recommending himself to the minister rather than being passively recruited.[[256]](#footnote-256) One of the most useful pieces of evidence about their relationship at the time of the 1536 rebellions is an undated letter (by no means unknown) from Morison to Cromwell which must have been sent before or during the composition of his second pamphlet entitled *A remedy for sedition* (1536), since he asks for access to correspondence related to the Pilgrimage, a fact which seems to have escaped all previous commentators.[[257]](#footnote-257) In this deferential letter, he describes himself as ‘a grafte of yo[u]r lordshyps own[e] setting’ and says that Berthelet has been postponing the printing of his *Apomaxis* (which was not in the end printed until 1537) because ‘he woll knowe yo[u]r lordshyps pleasur[e]’.[[258]](#footnote-258) This passage gives us an insight into the relationship between minister, author and printer: Morison liaised directly with Berthelet but Cromwell’s approval was required before the printing could be finalized.

Morison’s *Lamentation*, was printed anonymously but Morison was established as its author beyond doubt in 1936.[[259]](#footnote-259) Zeeveld, Berkowitz and Sowerby have all suggested that there is a draft of the *Lamentation* among the State Papers but no such document seems to exist.[[260]](#footnote-260) Although the exact chronology of the printing of the *Lamentation* is uncertain, some reconstruction is possible. We know, as mentioned above, that the Lincolnshire Articles probably reached Windsor between 12-14 October. We also know that Cromwell left Court on either 14 or 15 October. He must still have been there on 14 October because on this day he co-signed a dated letter, but on the following day, Wriothesley sent him a letter from Windsor bringing him up to speed on the correspondence which had arrived since his departure.[[261]](#footnote-261) This latter document is dated ‘Sunday night’, which must mean Sunday 15 October because Wriothesley wrote another letter summarizing some more news which had arrived ‘sithens the writing of my last l[et]res’, which is clearly dated.[[262]](#footnote-262) The next piece of the jigsaw is that Cromwell and the king supervised the composition of the *Lamentation*, or at least that seems a plausible way to interpret a private undated letter from Morison to Henry Phillips, the gambling addict by whom Tyndale had been betrayed in 1535, where he states that both Cromwell ‘and the king’ are aware that he rushed to complete the pamphlet ‘in an after none and a nyght’.[[263]](#footnote-263) From this description, it seems that soon after the receipt of the Lincolnshire Articles, Morison was summoned to Windsor and arrived at about noon on 14 October, whereupon he was pressed into writing the *Lamentation* while Wriothesley sat at another desk getting down the *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre*; and that they worked into the early hours before Cromwell departed for London on 15 October with copies of both tracts prepared for printing, leaving Wriothesley behind as his representative at court.[[264]](#footnote-264) Morison presumably had access to sufficient scholarly resources in Windsor to undertake hurried research, although the main royal library was held at Richmond in Henry’s reign.[[265]](#footnote-265) Alternatively, it is possible that Morison exaggerated the king’s oversight of his writing and in fact wrote the *Lamentation* in London after Cromwell’s return on around 15 October, at which point he would have been able to receive from the minister a copy of the Lincolnshire articles, the answer penned by Wriothesley and other relevant paperwork.[[266]](#footnote-266)

Although the *Lamentation* was printed too late to make a difference in Lincolnshire, it was almost certainly sent to the Duke of Norfolk on 21 October with a note specifying its two distinct target audiences: rebels, whom it would dishearten, and loyalist soldiers, whom it would inspire to resist the enemy.[[267]](#footnote-267) Henry wrote that he was sending ‘a certaine oration made by so[m]e of o[u]r louing subiettes co[n]teyning the malice and iniquite of this rebellion’, which he also refers to as a book.[[268]](#footnote-268) Since this letter was sent before the composition of the *Ansvvere to Yorkeshire*, and since Henry specifically uses the word ‘oration’, this can only plausibly be a reference to the *Lamentation*.[[269]](#footnote-269) James Gairdner identified this oration with a certain manuscript composition entitled ‘A lettre sent to the comons’ but this cannot be so because the author of that document refers to the Five Articles which were first articulated on 27 October.[[270]](#footnote-270)

The *Lamentation* might also be referred to in another letter of 21 October which Wriothesley wrote to Cromwell from Windsor to relay the king’s command that Cromwell should ‘with all convenient diligence send out 100 bokes, to be devided by severall messangers betwen my Lordes of Suffolk, Norfolk, Stewarde [Shrewsbury], and others, to be sent abroad in to the cuntreys aboute them’.[[271]](#footnote-271) Jonathan Harris has suggested that these ‘books’ may have included copies of the King’s *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre* as well as Morison’s *Lamentation*, or both, since the Pilgrims had not yet discontinued their use of the Lincolnshire Articles.[[272]](#footnote-272) There is another possible reference to the *Lamentation* in a proclamation of pardon for the commons north of Doncaster on 2 November, which survives in a manuscript copy corrected by Cromwell, where the king declares that he has organized the distribution of books which would teach the rebels how far they had erred.[[273]](#footnote-273) Thomas Master guessed that ‘[i]t may be these Bookes were the Answere of the King, to theyr Articles’ and noted: ‘I find that they were printed’.[[274]](#footnote-274) Unless Master made an anachronistic mistake, he must have meant to suggest that the *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre* was sent to rebels in the north at this stage, since the *Ansvvere to Yorkeshire* had not yet been written.[[275]](#footnote-275) This is a possibility but, since the Lincolnshire Articles had already been replaced by the Five Articles, it is more likely that the king was referring to the *Lamentation* since it was less circumstance-specific than the *Ansvvere*.

Many scholars have analysed the conceptual content of the *Lamentation*, most notably Sowerby,[[276]](#footnote-276) so we can content ourselves to draw attention to a few structural and rhetorical features which have gone by unremarked. Unlike Henry’s *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre*, the pamphlet features identical running-titles on recto and verso sides containing an abbreviated title. There are no paragraph breaks or pilcrows to subdivide the material into manageable chunks; and nor is the paratextual material much help in navigating the text since there are only five marginal notes.[[277]](#footnote-277) Although it is a deliberative oration, the structure of the *Lamentation* bears only loose resemblance to classical rhetorical models such as Cicero’s. The sequence of Morison’s material is as follows: an exordium (sigs. A2r-A3r); an exegesis of various chapters of the Books of Samuel (sigs. A3r-A3v); a *prosopopoeia* of England personified (sigs. E4r-E4v); the Ovidian fable of the serpent’s teeth (sigs. E4v-B1r); historical examples of the dangers of dissension (sigs. B1r-B2r); a refutation of the Lincolnshire Articles which includes a sustained attack on monks (sigs. B3r-C1v); a fable of obedience from Plutarch’s *Life of Agis* (sigs. C1v-C2r); and finally, a peroration (sigs. C2v-C3v).

In the humanist tradition of mock humility, the speaker says that as his eloquence is limited he must rely instead on stirring the emotions, which is a reference to the Ciceronian concept of *movere*, and follows up with the figure of *anacoenosis*:

Take awaye the commaundementes of god, destroye all the lawes of nature and of man, may not eyther the hygh commodyties, that come of mutuall concorde betwene all the kynges subiectes, and the kynges grace, or the excedynge damages, that ensue open sedition, kepe any honest harte, in maynteynynge the one, and fleinge the other?[[278]](#footnote-278)

This type of rhetorical question*,* which calls on an audience to give their opinion, is more diplomatic than its cousins such as *epiplexis*, a question merely designed to express one’s despair. Immediately after posing the question, however, Morison waves it away with a reproachful *correctio*: ‘But in so shamefull an act, why do I speke of honest hartes?’ Setting before their eyes the disastrous and bloody consequences of rebellion, he argues that farmers, landowners and gentlemen will be ‘vtterly vndone’.[[279]](#footnote-279) Steven Gunn has argued that ‘richer yeomen and substantial tradesmen’ were the real leaders of the rising, which helps to explain why Morison empasized the risks of rebellion to this social group, as well as to the gentry.[[280]](#footnote-280)

Morison deals with the question of rightful resistance with an interesting grammatical trick which could easily be missed: ‘If our mooste gratious prince, god saue his lyfe, and theyrs that so wyshe, had giuen you some great occasion, to haue gone from hym: yet to go agaynst hym and his trewe subiectes, good cause you can haue none.’[[281]](#footnote-281) This has the appearance of a complete conditional sentence but the main clause does not specify the action that should be taken in the case that the dependent clause is fulfilled. Thus, the sentence disguises an *aposiopesis* which begins at the colon, as Morison leaves unanswered the question of what could rightfully be done in the event of royal impropriety, choosing instead to break off and assert that there has been no royal impropriety so no more needs to be said. This sentence was a fork in the road, and we might imagine Morison pausing with his pen after writing the first clause, as he decided whether to proceed down the route of practical persuasion or constitutional theory.

Later in the *Lamentation*, Morison compares the commonwealth to a ship, a Platonic metaphor which was to become a commonplace of Tudor political writings: ‘What foly, what madnes is this, to make an hole in the shyppe that thou saylest in?’[[282]](#footnote-282) This metaphor appears too in earlier Henrician writings, for instance in the anonymous *Cronycle of all the kyng[es] names* (1518), which describes Henry VIII as ‘a conquerour / Saylynge forth (a prynce inuictissimus) / Within the shyp / of hygh and great honour’.[[283]](#footnote-283) The metaphor would have been familiar to subjects rich enough to own gold coins because the angel featured the royal arms inside the image of a ship.[[284]](#footnote-284)

Following the strategy of the king’s *Ansvvere*, Morison chooses to defend parliamentary monarchy rather than absolutism:

First why may not the kynges grace by the counsail of the lordes spiritual and temporall, and the commons assembled to gither in parliament (of the which many are among your rout) do that, that all these, and the better parte of you, than thought best to be done?[[285]](#footnote-285)

In other words, the Suppression of Religious Houses Act (1536) was legitimate because it was passed by the king in Parliament.[[286]](#footnote-286) Morison does also criticize popular political intervention. One sentence in Morison’s *Lamentation* has often been quoted: ‘It farre passeth Coblers crafte to discusse, what lordes, what byshops, what counsaylours, what actes statutes and lawes are mooste mete for a common welth’.[[287]](#footnote-287) Still, the point-by-point method of rebuttal chosen by the king, and which constitutes a significant part of Morison’s *Lamentation*, is inescapably dialogic. The rebels were permitted to set the terms of the debate, and by paraphrasing or indirectly quoting from the rebels’ demands, the pro-government authors ironically provided the rebels with a larger platform when the replies were printed and distributed. Morison answers the Lincolnshire Articles by staging a dialogue between his implied author and Captain Cobbler. ‘Lyncolneshire,’ he demands, ‘brynge forth your Cobbler, what can you lay for your excuse?’[[288]](#footnote-288) The cobbler, however, remains silent so the implied author voices his arguments for him like a performer with a hand puppet. He focuses on the first and fourth rebel grievances, as numbered in the York copy of the Lincolnshire Articles. Morison’s counter-arguments bear close resemblance to those put forward in Henry’s *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre*.[[289]](#footnote-289)

He argues that the rebels’ call for the restoration of monasteries is merely a front intended to make irrational and destructive disorder seem less objectionable: ‘There was some other wylde worme, that wolde not suffre madde braynes to be at rest… Thynke you that wyse men, whiche haue sene by all histories, the ende of suche seditious traytours, do not well espie, what all your intent was?[[290]](#footnote-290) There is an echo here of the rhetorical questions which Cicero put to Catiline in his epideictic orations;[[291]](#footnote-291) we get the impression that Captain Cobbler has been conjured up as a stooge rather than a serious interlocutor.[[292]](#footnote-292) Next, Morison takes up the third article about the forthcoming subsidy payment, arguing again that the rebels cannot be serious about the grievance: ‘It is to folyshe, that ye laye for you, that for the payement of a shyllyng in the pounde, you wolde sette all Englande by the eares.’[[293]](#footnote-293) It is fortunate that Morison was a writer and not a tax collector, since it was the subsidies granted in 1534, and which were to be paid in 1535 and 1536, that had an income threshold and demanded payment of one shilling per pound of the total value of a subject’s moveable goods, while the fifteenth and tenth was to be collected according to a series of regional assessments fixed in 1334.[[294]](#footnote-294) While the Pilgrims of Grace later complained about the subsidy, the Lincolnshire rebels did not. Alternatively, it is possible that Morison did not get mixed up, but decided to defend the subsidy rather than the tax about which the Lincolnshire rebels had complained. Certainly, the government was aware that the subsidy had caused offence, even if it had not been mentioned in the Lincolnshire Articles.[[295]](#footnote-295) In any case, this passage is good circumstantial evidence that Morison received some instructions directly from the king, since Henry had presented a similar argument in a private letter sent from Windsor to Lord Darcy on 8 October, where he wrote that the 1534 Subsidy Act ‘chargethe no man that is not worthe xx li. of his owne propere goodes with the payment of oone penye, And chargeth only them that bee in value above that some with the payment of vi d. for the pownde, so that he that is worthe xl li. is not to be accompted for a true subgiett, that for the payment of xx s. wold make hym selfe a cause to rebell against his prince and souereigne liege lorde’.[[296]](#footnote-296)

Elton’s opinion was that Morison’s *Lamentation* was stylistically flawed and that its author was right to be ashamed of it,[[297]](#footnote-297) but the somewhat unpolished nature of the pamphlet, although partially explained by time constraints, was also a deliberate rhetorical strategy of the kind described in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, whose author states that there are times when for reasons of expediency orators ‘must depart from the order imposed by the rules of the art’.[[298]](#footnote-298) In writing an address so seemingly spontaneous, albeit one peppered with references to *loci classici*, Morison’s implied orator could credibly represent himself as a grief-stricken subject urging the rebels to cease, rather than a humanist scholar painstakingly dividing his material into neat sections and finetuning his prose at leisure. Why, though, did Morison choose to answer the Lincolnshire rebels using a hybrid form (lament/polemic)? Would it not have been more apt to produce an epideictic oration denouncing the rebel leaders, such as the *Inuective* he would pen against Cardinal Pole in 1539? The surnames of men like Nicholas Melton would have provided enough material for malicious puns. One important reason is that the lament mode is fundamentally resistant to dialogue. Where a deliberative oration invites a response in kind, and a dialogue must give a fair hearing to both sides of an argument, a lament neither invites nor tolerates response; this phenomenon has been called the ‘monologia of elegy’.[[299]](#footnote-299) It would be unkind to tell a distraught friend the flaws in their argument.

Sowerby has argued that since Morison speaks of the king’s duties in the *Lamentation*, he must have been ‘beginning to develop a providentially tinged covenantal theory of kingship’ and that he wanted to make Henry’s kingship ‘contingent’ on his willingness to oppose papistry. While it is true that Morison had his own agenda, this is surely a step too far. One of Sowerby’s pieces of evidence is Morison’s statement that there is ‘nothynge to appertyne more to a kings office, then to redresse thynges of religion’, but this is nothing more than a statement of what certain influential Englishmen, including Cromwell and the king himself, thought to be one of the functions of kingship. Even Stephen Gardiner, though a conservative, had written to similar effect in *De vera obedientia*, first printed in Latin in 1535, that the king’s office is ‘to take charge / not only of humayne matters / but muche more of divine maters’.[[300]](#footnote-300) Likewise, the Act of Supremacy had affirmed that the king’s office was ‘to represse & extirpe all errours heresies and other enormyties & abuses’.[[301]](#footnote-301) Morison is better understood as a royal servant who skilfully addressed multiple implied audiences. To rebels he promoted the virtues of obedience and non-resistance, while to the political classes he promoted his evangelical agenda.

The Pilgrimage of Grace and Responses to the Five Articles

The first phase of the Pilgrimage extended from around 6 October until 27 October, when a truce was agreed at conferences in Doncaster and on Doncaster bridge, followed by over a month of further negotiations, until a general pardon was declared on 8 December.[[302]](#footnote-302) Most of the official responses to rebel demands were produced in the interval between the Doncaster conferences and the pardon. Cromwell first became aware of the rebellion in Yorkshire after leaving court on 15 October, when Wriothesley forwarded him the news from Lord Darcy.[[303]](#footnote-303) The Duke of Norfolk gave his opinion to the king on 26 or 27 October that on account of the military experience of the Yorkshire rebels, ‘some meanes should be found, eyther to perswade them to lay downe arms, or to sow sedition amongst them.’[[304]](#footnote-304) It is doubtful that Cromwell needed such encouragement.

After 15 October, he set to work in responding to the rebels, dividing his time between Windsor and London. He must have left Court by 15 October because this is when Wriothesley sent him a letter from Windsor bringing him up to speed on the correspondence which had arrived in his absence. It has been suggested that Cromwell was forced to leave court because of his unpopularity in the wake of the rebellions,[[305]](#footnote-305) but in fact he travelled back and forth and on 26 October he was back at Windsor, from where he addressed a letter to two royal commissioners in North Wales.[[306]](#footnote-306) He signed another letter from Windsor on 30 October.[[307]](#footnote-307) We can say quite specifically that Cromwell must have arrived again at court between Monday 23 and Saturday 28 October because Hugh Latimer, newly appointed Bishop of Worcester, wrote to Cromwell that he had delivered his 29 October sermon against the rebels ‘upon Sunday next after your departure from London’.[[308]](#footnote-308) This could be seen as referring to a trip to Mortlake from London, had we not the additional evidence of Cromwell’s signed letters. It is more plausible, then, that he went to London not to escape ignominy but to maintain closer contact with Berthelet and with his own secretariat. Cromwell’s secretariat, like the king’s court, was never housed in a fixed location but rather consisted of a group of loyal servants including Wriothesley, who also worked in an official capacity in the privy and signet seal offices, and Sadler, who worked in Chancery from May 1534 and was appointed as a gentleman of the privy chamber early in 1536.[[309]](#footnote-309) Paperwork was stored and transported in huge chests.[[310]](#footnote-310)

The sermon by Latimer to which we have alluded, delivered at St. Paul’s Cross two days after the Five Articles had been presented to the Duke of Norfolk, was the first item of propaganda against the Pilgrimage which bears evidence of Cromwell’s input.[[311]](#footnote-311) This sermon, of course, was designed to shape opinion in London rather than to dissuade the rebels themselves. Latimer wrote to Cromwell on 27 December that he had written the sermon ‘not otherwise... than according to your discreet monition and charitable advertisement, so moving to unity without any special note of any man’s folly’.[[312]](#footnote-312) His vocabulary suggests that Cromwell influenced the content of the sermon with a light touch but that this advice was followed to the letter. To speak strictly, the sermon is an exposition of Ephesians 6:10 (‘Put on all the armour of God...’) of which approximately twenty percent is a denunciation of the rebels in the north. Latimer argues that the rebels are deceitful to march under the insignia of the Five Wounds of Christ, claiming that Satan craftily decided ‘to send his warriors forth under the badge of God’.[[313]](#footnote-313) The most substantial printed responses, however, were not produced until after the Pilgrims had set forth their demands. Although there were numerous versions of their petitions, there is no question but that it was the Five Articles finalized on 27 October, and which were first presented to the royal party verbally, to which the king responded.[[314]](#footnote-314) We know this quite simply because Henry’s printed reply maps onto the articles perfectly.

The only surviving copy of the Five Articles is in poor condition but is might well be the very same copy conveyed by Norfolk to the king.[[315]](#footnote-315) In formulating the more mature Pontefract Articles, Aske and his fellow rebel leaders crowdsourced ideas from various individuals and interest groups.[[316]](#footnote-316) The Five Articles, in contrast, were shorter and less specific than the Pontefract articles; and, indeed, the rebels had needed prodding to set them in writing. It was Norfolk and loyalist earls who first demanded, during the negotiations of 24-27 October, that the rebels write a petition ‘to thentent effucion of blood myght be avoided’.[[317]](#footnote-317) By stipulating that the grievances should be ‘declared or disceded [i.e. divided] in to artacles’, the noblemen expressed a concern that the rebels should behave according to the generical conventions of commons’ revolts.[[318]](#footnote-318) We can summarize the Five Articles by comparing the damaged copy with the king’s answer. Only the first four articles make requests or demands. The first article requests the ‘maintenance of the faith of Christ’ (presumably referring to doctrine); the second asks for the maintenance of the church as an institution, along with its ‘liberties’; the third stipulates that the ‘common laws and the commonwealth’ should be used as they were at the outset of Henry’s reign, when ‘his nobles did order under his highness’; and the fourth asks for ‘subvertors’ including Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer to be ‘corrected… according to their demerits’. The fifth article asks for a general pardon and it is followed by a piece of self-justification: the Pilgrims insist that they have submitted ‘their articles to the honour of God and his faith, reformation of the church militant... [and the preserv]ation of the king and his issue’.

Shagan has warned that behind the ‘rhetorical unity’ of the Pilgrimage of Grace there was serious ‘ideological fragmentation’.[[319]](#footnote-319) After all, few corporate documents satisfy everyone whom they claim to represent. The Five Articles, however, were the most coherent articulation of the rebels’ grievances at this stage and, from the government’s perspective, an accurate statement of what the rebels wanted. On or before 2 November, the Five Articles were conveyed to the king at Windsor by Norfolk and the rebel leaders Sir Ralph Ellerker and Robert Bowes.[[320]](#footnote-320) Was Thomas Cromwell, who was probably still at court on their arrival, also responsible for organizing the production of pamphlets in response to this rebellion?

I

To begin with the king’s *Ansvvere to Yorkeshire*, there is a tradition that Henry wrote it himself. Norfolk wrote to Lord Darcy on 6 November that the king had been at ‘no small payne to make answere theryn, wrytyng the same with his owen hande, and no creature [was] pryve therevnto vnto the time the same was finisshed’.[[321]](#footnote-321) He had been instructed to say so, for the official line was that Henry ‘hath put his owne penne to the aunswering of every article’.[[322]](#footnote-322) Although the king had good reason to exaggerate the personal care which he had paid to the rebels’ demands, Norfolk’s claim has been taken at face value.[[323]](#footnote-323) To what extent can it really be trusted? There is a manuscript draft of the king’s reply to Yorkshire among the Exchequer papers in the hand of Ralph Sadler.[[324]](#footnote-324) The manuscript has a single minor correction in the king’s own hand: on the first folio he has inserted the missing preposition ‘by’.[[325]](#footnote-325) It is possible that Henry locked himself up in the privy chamber with Cromwell’s servant, who acted merely as a scribe, and that nobody else made any contribution to the document’s composition. However, similarities in argument and language with the previous *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre* suggest that others were involved in its composition.

The draft copy of the king’s *Ansvvere*, likely similar to the copy delivered to the rebels, is significantly different from the later printed copy, indicating that the text was continually tinkered with for maximum persuasive impact. Henry intended to send his answer to the rebels in manuscript by the hands of Ellerker and Bowes on 5 November, along with a proclamation conveyed by the Lancaster Herald, before changing his mind and recalling Ellerker and Bowes in the nick of time.[[326]](#footnote-326) Five copies of a cover letter from the Council, intended to be sent into rebel territories along with ‘proclamations [and] with copies of his answer to their demands which you are to proclaim in all the good towns about you, leaving copies in the hands of those who will honestly declare the same’, presumably also remained unsent.[[327]](#footnote-327) On 11 November, Lord Darcy implored Norfolk to arrange for the king’s answer to be delivered as soon as possible, since everything else was ‘taken but for persuasions’.[[328]](#footnote-328) On 13 November, Shrewsbury gave Darcy a sneak preview, assuring him that when the king’s answer eventually arrives ‘it will much persuade [the rebels] to act according to their duties and leave their follies’.[[329]](#footnote-329) At about the same time, it was claimed that the king had decided ‘to p[ro]tracte his said aunswere’ because of ‘certayne innovac[i]ons attempted’ after the Doncaster pardon.[[330]](#footnote-330) The answer was finally delivered to Yorkshire by Ellerker and Bowes on 17 November, a week after the king’s court had moved to Westminster.[[331]](#footnote-331)

The *Ansvvere* had been printed by 11 November but had not yet been distributed, and its print run was possibly of around two hundred copies. This information comes from an extant letter addressed from Cromwell to Audley on this date, where Cromwell requests two hundred copies of a proclamation ‘to thintent the same maye be sent vn to sundry p[ar]ties with the bokes of answer’.[[332]](#footnote-332) The proclamation in question, which poor Berthelet was commanded to work overnight to finish printing, was issued on 12 November.[[333]](#footnote-333) R. W. Heinze suggests that Cromwell was writing at the time of the Lincolnshire Rebellion but the letter to Audley is clearly dated 11 November.[[334]](#footnote-334) The printed edition of the king’s answer was also referred to in Henry’s instructions to Norfolk and Fitzwilliam in early November. They were told to return to Doncaster, where the conferences with the rebels had been held, and tell the rebels that the king had resolved ‘of his most inestimable goodnes and mercifull clemencye, rather to make unto the said rebells, considering they be yet his naturall subgietes, a graciouse aunswere, thenne extremely to prosecute’.[[335]](#footnote-335) The king’s representatives were also to carry ‘certayne bookes of His Hieghnes aunswere’ but to stay their distribution until the rebels had submitted themselves to the king’s mercy, for otherwise it would serve to ‘put the rebelles in to a further pryde’.[[336]](#footnote-336)

The *Ansvvere*, a plain dissuasive address, was printed as a quarto pamphlet of six folios. Slightly longer than the answer to Lincolnshire, it consists of nine sides of text, and the colophon is printed on its own page (the verso side of the sixth folio). Comparing it to the *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre*, we notice that the word ‘traitors’ has been dropped from the title. The only known surviving printed copy is to be found in the Cambridge University Library, having been bound with a copy of the king’s answer to Lincolnshire by the seventeenth-century bibliophile Humphrey Dyson.[[337]](#footnote-337) In both manuscript and printed versions of this document, the king takes up the arguments in the order in which they appear in the Five Articles. In his rebuttal of the first article, Henry enjoys the debater’s advantage of opposing an ill-defined motion, in that he can interpret the rebels’ demand in a manner which makes it easier to refute.[[338]](#footnote-338) He claims that maintaining the purity of the faith has always been his top priority and, as in the previous answer, he points out that the religious reforms had been agreed upon by himself and ‘the hole clergy in conuocation’ but, significantly, he does not mention the role of Parliament this time, perhaps to play down the extent to which laymen had been responsible for reforming the church. We are not, however, to suppose that Henry became an absolutist some time between mid-October and early November. In the manuscript draft, Henry does not mention Convocation so the detail was evidently added later to stress that religious reform had been undertaken with consent.[[339]](#footnote-339)

Turning to the second article, Henry complains that it is ‘so generall a proposicion, that without distinctions no man can well aunswere it’. He proceeds, nevertheless, to give a substantial defence of his Supreme Headship, which seems to have been an afterthought because in the surviving manuscript draft, the scribe has tagged the explanatory clause (beginning ‘but yet’) onto the original curt and dismissive response; Sadler reduces the size of his handwriting by 25% so that the last eleven lines fit onto the page.[[340]](#footnote-340) Henry then defends his proceedings by citing historical examples of English kings who had done more ‘onerous and chargeable’ things to monasteries, such as Edward III, Henry V and Henry VI, the first of whom had had turned alien priories (English priories which paid allegiance and proceeds to religious houses in Normandy and France) to his own profit.[[341]](#footnote-341)

In response to the third article, Henry ridicules the suggestion that the laws were better in 1509 than in 1536, as if he and his council had not learned by decades of experience how to run a commonwealth.[[342]](#footnote-342) ‘And touching the beginning of our reign,’ he says with a hint of dry wit, ‘where it is said that so many noblemen were councillors, we do not forget who were then of our Council’. The effect of this well-known passage is like the opening of a door, as Henry reveals the composition of his council to the common view of his subjects. He states that there were only two laymen from long-standing noble families on his council at this time, Thomas Howard, earl of Surrey (duke of Norfolk from 1514) and George Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury.[[343]](#footnote-343) In contrast, he lists eleven noblemen who presently form part of the Council.[[344]](#footnote-344) As John Guy has observed, Henry’s rebuttal here is substantially true but misleading in several important respects, including the fact that Henry includes Oxford and Shrewsbury although they were ‘senior men of uncertain activity as councillors’ in 1536.[[345]](#footnote-345) Henry defends his appointment of Cromwell and Sir Thomas Audley by arguing that ‘it is more then necessary, to haue some of our pryuy counsaylle lerned in our lawes, and acqueynted with the polycies & practises of the worlde.[[346]](#footnote-346)

Diarmaid MacCulloch has noticed that this passage is missing from the manuscript draft of the answer, and he argues that the addition reflects ‘a crucial shift of atmosphere in Court politics during that first week of November’.[[347]](#footnote-347) In other words, the king initially considered throwing Cromwell under the bus but had decided otherwise by mid-November. While this is a possibility and should not be disregarded, we are unlikely to find solid confirmation of the hypothesis. One could equally suggest that the original author of the answer (possibly Cromwell himself!) had diplomatically left out any mention of the minister, and that Henry had insisted on the inclusion of the passage. Indeed, it might be argued that if the king had wanted to abandon Cromwell to appease the rebels, and to withhold crucial information from him, he would hardly have chosen Cromwell’s servant and intimate acquaintance Sadler to draft the manuscript.

The king’s answer to the fourth article is the most interesting and also the one which is perhaps most liable to misinterpretation. Repeating the rebels’ noun, he says that he does not consider Cromwell and other councillors to be ‘subuerters’ of divine and civil law but that, if any subjects can prove the contrary, he will not hesitate to ‘procede ageynst them’.[[348]](#footnote-348) This might sound like a minor betrayal of Cromwell and an authentic invitation for subjects to prove his guilt, as if Henry were behaving as recklessly and desperately as King Richard II, who had made a similar concession in 1381. This is the view of MacCulloch, who suggests that the passage ‘could not have been written with Cromwell anywhere near the King’s chamber’.[[349]](#footnote-349) However, Henry tags on a crucial qualification which transforms an apparent willingness to yield into a threat of retribution: ‘And in case it be but a false and an vntrue reporte, as we veryly thynk it is, then it were as mete, and standeth as wel with iustice, that they shulde haue the selfe same punyshement, whiche wrongfully haue obiected this to them…’.[[350]](#footnote-350) This idea might even have been Morison’s, who wrote that among the Greek Locrian tribe, nobody was permitted to criticize a law without a cord tied around his neck, so that if the criticism was proven to be unjust, the critic could be ‘forthwith truste [trussed] vppe’.[[351]](#footnote-351)

Henry then addresses the final article, which had proclaimed that the rebels were interested in the welfare of king and commonwealth, and insists that the whole realm is united in opposition to the Pilgrims. Finally, in the peroration, he proclaims his willingness to pardon the rebels if they sue for it, for they have been beguiled by arrogant ‘wretches’ who have sought to destroy the commonwealth under the pretext of preserving it. He concludes by praising his own generosity and calling on the commons to love the king that ‘tendreth’ them and to ‘believe no mo such false and light tales’. [[352]](#footnote-352) In 1649, Edward of Cherbury made the interesting assertion that Henry’s reply encouraged the multitude in the north to do more reading, who, ‘being dispersed, began to take Books of controversies in hand, and inform themselves concerning the kings Articles of Religion’.[[353]](#footnote-353) In reality, however, the most direct effect of the king’s reply seems to have been to prompt the rebels to draw up a second, more extensive set of grievances.[[354]](#footnote-354) We should also note, finally, that the *Ansvvere* was evidently still being read by rebels two months later, or that it was at least on their minds, for on 12 January 1537, Aske wrote to Henry that some doubted the honesty of the king’s pardon of 8 December in the light of what had been written in the ‘late boke answering the first v artacles now in print’.[[355]](#footnote-355)

II

The fourth and final pamphlet on the theme of rebellion printed in 1536 was Morison’s *Remedy for sedition*.[[356]](#footnote-356) The *Remedy* is another quarto pamphlet, of roughly twice the length of the *Lamentation*, which went through two editions in the same year. Morison seems to have chipped away at this composition for several weeks without Cromwell’s close supervision, but he apparently liaised with the minister during its production. At one stage, for instance, he asked for access to ‘yo[u]r lordshyps l[et]res to mr bowes, and another vnto certain gentle me[n] of the co[n]trey’, which were no doubt to be used as research materials.[[357]](#footnote-357) Whereas the *Lamentation* was an oration addressed to the Lincolnshire rebels, the *Remedy* is a learned treatise which aims to troubleshoot the causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace; Morison does not engage directly with any version of the rebel articles. Rather than conducting a dialogue with the Northern rebels, Morison presents his arguments before an intelligent reading public; no author would follow suit until 1554 when one of Mary’s chaplains, John Christopherson, addressed an anti-sedition pamphlet to a similar implied audience. The *Remedy* is in part a diagnosis of the commonwealth’s ills in the tradition of Sir Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516) and Sir Thomas Smith’s *Discourse of the Common Weal of this Realm of England* (penned during Edward’s reign and first printed in 1581). And yet, as Elton suggested in 1990, English humanists, ‘unlike their continental colleagues, tended to agree with Morus rather than Hythlodaeus in bringing their minds to the service of the common weal’.[[358]](#footnote-358)

Who was the intended audience of this pamphlet? Tom Betteridge has said that although the *Remedy* was intended for a general audience, it is nominally addressed to the Pilgrims, in support of which he cites a sentence where Morison addresses the commons: ‘O lightness of commons, who can say so much against thee but he may seem to have said nothing?’ This is inaccurate since the sentence in question is a brief apostrophe in no way representative of the work as a whole.[[359]](#footnote-359) Nevertheless, Betteridge is right to notice that Morison addresses a general audience, rather than rebels. The print date of the *Remedy* cannot be known with any certainty, other than that it was printed in 1536. Zeeveld thought that there ‘may have been an oblique reference to *A Remedy* in Henry’s retort to Norfolk’s gloomy report on the situation in the North’ on 2 December.[[360]](#footnote-360) Although pedantic, it is worth correcting this suggestion since it has been repeated by other scholars.[[361]](#footnote-361) What Henry dictated to Wriothesley is that he, referring to himself with the royal pronoun, ‘could be aswel content to bestowe summe tyme in the reading of an honest remedye as of soe many extreme and desperate mischeues’, meaning that he would prefer to hear what positive steps Norfolk had taken rather than just reports of doom and gloom.[[362]](#footnote-362) Henry’s letter has nothing to do with Morison’s second pamphlet other than that the king happened to use the noun ‘remedye’, which contemporaries used as commonly as we use the word ‘solution’.

There are six fragmentary drafts of Morison’s pamphlet among the State Papers.[[363]](#footnote-363) Berkowitz, who spoke of three surviving drafts, hypothesized that a first draft was made before 27 October, a second between 27 October and 2 November, and that the text for the printed copy was finalized after 2 November and around the same time that Henry’s *Ansvvere to Yorkeshire* was penned.[[364]](#footnote-364) The only part of Berkowitz’s chronology which we can endorse with certainty is that the final text must have been completed after 26 October because Morison refers to the flooding of the Don.[[365]](#footnote-365) While his suggested dates are too specific given the lack of evidence, more convincing is Berkowitz’s broader suggestion that the earlier drafts ‘no longer fitted the political atmosphere of an environment suddenly transformed from one of combat to one of temporary ceasefire’.[[366]](#footnote-366) That Morison was regularly updated on developments in the north suggests that he was still working closely with Cromwell. If we compare the drafts to the printed text, we observe an evolution in function, as Morison initially sets out to prepare English subjects to fight against their rebellious countrymen, but eventually transforms the text into a calmer and more reflective discussion of the causes and remedies of civil disobedience. In the first draft, Morison poses the following question to his implied audience of English subjects from all classes: ‘...what greater bu[n]fitte, ca[n] ye do the[m] now, tha[n]kill the[m], whych eu[en] more must reme[m]ber how an abhominable acte it is, to go ayenst ther co[n]trey...?’[[367]](#footnote-367) The sheer number of drafts indicates the care that went into persuading subjects to obey their sovereign.

Morison argues that a functional society requires social distinctions, but he equates nobility with virtue, which he says is more important than money and land.[[368]](#footnote-368) Henry VIII has set an example, he says, in studying to become wise rather than relying on royal blood alone. Wit and virtue are the only keys to promotion, for in governance, as in all other things, ‘it lytell auayleth, whose sonne a ma[n] be’.[[369]](#footnote-369) The example is given that an athlete cannot win a race by boasting that his father could run quickly. One of Morison’s main purposes is to identify ‘euill education’ as the main cause of rebellion and to recommend that the sons of noblemen should be properly educated, since targeting them rather than trying to educate the whole realm will allow the virtues they acquire to filter down into all levels of society.[[370]](#footnote-370) Berkowitz has shown that Morison was inspired by Plato’s suggestion in the *Republic* that the most talented men should be chosen for public service.[[371]](#footnote-371) Still, we cannot simply point to Plato as Morison’s source and leave it at that, without acknowledging that Morison’s arguments are interventions in a radical tradition of social thought which imagined a more complex society than the image of a static, hierarchical commonwealth which would reach its apogee in the reign of Elizabeth. His arguments have much in common with those expressed a decade earlier by the MP and playwright John Rastell, who also became drawn into Cromwell’s circle in the 1530s.[[372]](#footnote-372) Morison opted to defend private property ownership and thereby brought an equivocal philosophy squarely into the service of the ruling class.

To a greater extent than the *Lamentation*, the printed *Remedy* is designed to turn general public opinion against rebellion. At no stage in the development of the pamphlet is there evidence that it was intended to pacify rebel counties. In the first draft, there is an extended *prosopopoeia* spoken in the voice of England, which establishes continuity with the *Lamentation*, beginning with the phrase: ‘May not owr co[n]tray, thus say vnto the ky[n]ge hys grace’ and ending when the author reverts to his own voice: ‘my contray wold say all,’ Morison writes, ‘by cawse all towcheth her, but I haue leyser inowghe to lett the rest of my mynd my silfe’.[[373]](#footnote-373) In this passage and others, Morison means to incite anxiety about the safety of the realm, asking readers to imagine what horrors might ensue if ‘master Aske’ with his band of ‘theues and murderers of the northe, myght cu[m] in to the sowthe as they intend’.[[374]](#footnote-374) Despite the title, though, Morison’s final version of the pamphlet counsels the aristocracy as much as it does the commons: he writes of the ‘damages, that of necessitie must folowe, where eyther none be, that can rule, or fewe that wyll obeye’.[[375]](#footnote-375) One of the most important passages, at least for our purposes, is the peroration, where Morison turns away from his primary implied readers to address the rebels directly:

May not I say so vnto ours? Put you the case, as you woll ymagine, you haue the better hande, howe be it, better it is to be kylled, thanne to conquere, fightyng ageynst your prince. Yet imagin, euery thinge go on your side as you desire. Can it chance so well, but many of you muste wayle? He that is ouercomme shall wepe, ye say. Trowe you they shall laugh that wynne? Thynke you myrthe can be within theym, that euermore shall thynke, god hateth them? the world abhorreth them?[[376]](#footnote-376)

Comparing the four printed pamphlets of 1536, we witness a corruption, or at least a repurposing, of the technique of addressing rebels. In the first three pamphlets, direct address was used, at least in part, to engage authentically with the Lincolnshire Articles and the Five Articles. In the *Remedy*, however, this technique has become purely rhetorical and counterfeit. Instead of summarizing and answering demands from the Five Articles or the Pontefract articles, Morison invents an indirect quotation from the rebels which is so trivial as to be easily dismissible: ‘He that is ouercomme shall wepe, ye say’.[[377]](#footnote-377) We may observe here the partial transformation of a political procedure into a literary method. Later writers, such as John Proctor in the reign of Queen Mary I, would similarly publish anti-sedition orations which addressed the rebels as a rhetorical affectation instead of genuinely responding to rebels. It was Morison who began this process of converting communication into eristic argument.

At this stage, it is worth making a few more comments about the readership of the anti-sedition pamphlets of 1536. There are some rare examples of Tudor governments printing private mass correspondence, presumably in the name of haste, so we cannot necessarily equate print with a public readership.[[378]](#footnote-378) Still, the pamphlets were printed complete with title pages and, in some cases, bibliographical flourishes such as marginal notes. As we have seen, at least one of the pamphlets, the *Ansvvere to Yorkeshire*, had a possible print run of two hundred copies. Regarding the reception of government propaganda in general, Sowerby has noted that ‘the sheer number of editions in English (eighteen by 1540) of Morison’s propaganda tracts suggests that they were taken up with at least moderate enthusiasm’.[[379]](#footnote-379) She lists government men who owned copies of Morison’s pamphlets and points out that internal evidence suggests that Morison’s 1536 pamphlets were ‘written with a London audience in mind’.[[380]](#footnote-380) The pamphlets also appealed to readers outside of the ruling classes. The title page of one copy of the *Lamentation*, once in the Bridgewater House Library and now in the Huntington, bears the following inscription in an early Tudor hand: ‘This is Iohn Ashman Boke’.[[381]](#footnote-381) No man with that name, as far as the present writer has been able to ascertain, was appointed to office in the sixteenth century so Ashman might have been of low status.

There is further evidence that the pamphlets were designed for general distribution. In the *Ansvvere to Lyncolneshyre*, the king begins his rebuttal of the first of the Lincolnshire Articles with the following phrase: ‘we woll, that ye and all our subiectes shoulde welle knowe…’.[[382]](#footnote-382) He says, moreover, that the religious reforms have not been undertaken by Cromwell’s ‘mere wyll and fantasy, as ye ful falsely wolde perswade our realme to beleue’.[[383]](#footnote-383) Here the king conceives of himself as fighting for the minds of all Englishmen against the arguments of the rebels, which had spread like an epidemic not only throughout Lincolnshire but also in the North.[[384]](#footnote-384) The pamphlets were designed to influence educated public opinion, even though their primary implied audience consisted of common rebels. The fourth marginal note in the *Lamentation* cites the source of an anecdote about Pope Urban VI taxing the people of England: ‘Loke in Froissart the fyrste parte of his Cronycle the 428 chapyter’.[[385]](#footnote-385) This strongly suggests that the book targeted multiple implied audiences and was also intended to be sent to regions that had not rebelled, unless Morison seriously considered that it would be practical to suggest that amidst the uproar of a rebel camp the reader should locate a copy of Froissart’s chronicles (a massive doorstop folio) to authenticate a minor anecdote. If the aim was simply to convey information to the rebels and persuade them that rebellion was wrong, the job could have been done by a single pursuivant. It seems obvious that the purpose was to rally broader support for the government and to allay the risk of more widespread disorder.

One surprising fact about these works is that while earlier pro-government writings, such as the divorce tracts of the early 1530s, addressed constructions like the ‘gentle reader’,[[386]](#footnote-386) three of the printed pamphlets of 1536 address a primary implied readership of common people, and, what is more, common people accused of a criminal offence. The very act of addressing an extended prose composition to the commons dignified them, at least to the extent of supposing that they were capable of literacy and of following an argument. As we shall see, leading statesmen and humanist authors in the reign of Edward VI followed the path beaten by their Henrician predecessors in applying rhetoric to the maintenance of civil order. Whereas some Edwardian anti-sedition writers were inclined to treat their implied readers with greater sympathy, others preferred to denounce rebels as Morison had done. This contrast, it will be seen, is a sign of small-scale but nonetheless noteworthy tensions within Somerset’s regime.

Chapter 3

The Rebellions of 1549

The years 1548-1549 were a crisis period for the government of Protector Somerset, as riots and rebellions occurred in virtually every English county.[[387]](#footnote-387) The most serious and therefore the most well-documented of these were the Western Rebellion and the Norfolk Rebellion (or Kett’s Rebellion), which took place between June and August 1549.[[388]](#footnote-388) While the Western rebels opposed the government’s religious policy, the leaders of the Norfolk rebels, whose demands were mostly secular, seem to have embraced reformed religion.[[389]](#footnote-389) Rebels in Devon, Cornwall, Norfolk, Suffolk, Somerset, Kent and Essex drew up petitions to the king, many of which received substantial replies in print and manuscript.[[390]](#footnote-390) Holinshed notes that the political crisis triggered the creation and distribution of propaganda, as ‘sundry wholsome and godly exhortations were published to aduertise [the commons] of their duetie, and to lay before them theyr heynous offences’.[[391]](#footnote-391) Sir John Cheke’s pamphlet *The hurt of sedition* (1549), which Holinshed reproduces, was only the tip of the iceberg. The government and its friends produced numerous solicited and unsolicited proclamations, letters and pamphlets to contain the rebellions.[[392]](#footnote-392) Ballads were also produced to celebrate the rebels’ eventual defeat, although it is not clear whether the government had a hand in producing them.[[393]](#footnote-393) Aside from the conciliar writings whose production was directed by Somerset and the Council, a range of extra-conciliar works was also produced. The rebellions of 1549 triggered a tremendous amount of communication between rebels and the government. Loyalist authors refined the rhetorical techniques which had been practised in Henry’s reign, in the hope that persuasion would help to secure civil obedience and avoid bloodshed.

The most notable fact about the corpus of anti-sedition writings in 1549 is its bipolarity: while many of the irregularly official works produced under the aegis of Somerset experimented with rhetorical and political concessions, promoting clemency toward those who had revolted against the government, many other writings were considerably less sympathetic. This fact is all the more remarkable because some of the irregularly official and unofficial responses were written or commissioned by councillors. Significantly, several of the traditionalist responses to rebels proceeded from the mouth or pen of Archbishop Cranmer. In his biography of Cranmer, Diarmaid MacCulloch poses the question of whether the archbishop had abandoned his allegiance to Protector Somerset by October 1549, and whether his friendship with Sir William Paget, Somerset’s famously plainspoken critic, had given him cause to distrust the Protector’s policies.[[394]](#footnote-394) Few other historians have observed anything but cooperation and collaboration between Somerset and Cranmer during the first part of Edward VI’s reign. This chapter should help to bring the differences of opinion between these two men into sharper relief.

There can be little doubt that we may observe in these writings, through a glass darkly, evidence of disagreements between councillors on the direction in which the ship of state ought to be steered. Michael Bush has detected a similar division of opinion in the government’s response to the spring riots:

A struggle appeared to be in progress in the spring between a party keen on pacification by means of promises of remedy and pardon, and a party which saw remedy as an encouragement to disobedience and called instead for a show of force. The struggle resulted in Somerset treating rebellion in a way which ran counter to the wishes of his colleagues.

In Bush’s estimation, this difference of opinion was soon resolved, and ‘signs of division within the Council are not so evident for the summer risings’.[[395]](#footnote-395) However, it should become clear in this chapter that councillors did not unanimously support a policy of negotiation in the summer either.

Since some of the less sympathetic writings of 1549 were written or commissioned by councillors and courtiers, are we to detect an ideological rift in Somerset’s regime? As exciting as such a conclusion would be, the evidence decisively points against it. Paget might have claimed that Somerset was motivated by ‘softnes’ and ‘opinion to be good to the poor’,[[396]](#footnote-396) but, as Bush has clearly demonstrated, the Protector is on record expressing rather nastier opinions of commons revolts. In a letter to Sir Philip Hoby, ambassador to the Emperor, dated 1 September 1549, he described the rebels in Devon, Cornwall and Norfolk as ‘vile wretches that hathe now of a lonnge time troublede the realme’; and he praised Warwick for subduing them with ‘wysdome and manlines’.[[397]](#footnote-397) The decision to appease rebels was a pragmatic decision, albeit one whose wisdom was questioned by some councillors. This fact shows through clearly in a well-known letter of 17 July to Lord Russell, where Somerset and the Council wrote that proclamations were just one weapon among many in combatting the rebels, and certified that the government was not relying on them: ‘Though ye think proclamacions can do no great good… yet they may do you some good. Hurt they can do none.’[[398]](#footnote-398) Still, there was a division of opinion among councillors in 1549. Through an examination of writings produced in 1549, previously obscure fault lines in Somerset’s regime begin to emerge.

First, for the sake of clarity, we should list in one place all the major anti-sedition works which were written in 1549. Somerset and the Council produced two replies to the Western rebels: *A message sent by the Kynges majestie to certain of his people, assembled in Deuonshire*, composed on 8 July and printed shortly thereafter;[[399]](#footnote-399) and ‘The kinges Ma[ies]tes answer to the supplicac[i]on made in the name of his hignes subiectes of Devon and Cornewall’, delivered in manuscript to the Lord Privy Seal John Russell on 27 July, along with copies (presumably printed) of the 22 July proclamation against seditious bailiffs, constables and headboroughs.[[400]](#footnote-400) These may be described as irregularly official documents because they are referred to in the Council’s dispatches;[[401]](#footnote-401) they adopt the king’s voice; and the *Message* was printed by the king’s printer while ‘The kinges Ma[ies]tes answer’ found its way into the State Papers. Still, the precise manner of their composition is uncertain. Perhaps Somerset dictated the text of these documents himself, or perhaps he commissioned a servant of the state to write them. Moreover, to rebels in Norfolk and other areas of social and agrarian rebellion, Somerset and the Council addressed a set of concessional letters.

Cranmer produced a written reply to the rebels in Devon which was completed in November or later;[[402]](#footnote-402) Peter Martyr Vermigli wrote a sermon against the Norfolk rebels for Cranmer to preach in St. Paul’s Cathedral on 21 July;[[403]](#footnote-403) Cranmer gave a second sermon there on 10 August;[[404]](#footnote-404) and another of Cranmer’s clients, Martin Bucer, produced a set of Latin notes on sedition, which he perhaps planned to develop into a sermon or discourse before succumbing to poor health.[[405]](#footnote-405) Bernadino Ochino wrote a dialogue in Italian between the king and the people, presumably under Cranmer’s direction, which was fairly tolerant of rebel arguments.[[406]](#footnote-406) The finest of all these works, from a technical perspective, was Cheke’s *Hurt of sedition*. Finally, there was a manuscript composition by Nicholas Udall, whose connections with Cranmer will be explored later, entitled ‘Answer to the articles of the comoners of Devonshere and Cornewall’ which, although relatively lenient in the early stages of its composition, was subsequently revised into a more forceful address. We might conceive of the propaganda drive of 1549 as a pair of overlapping circles, with significant connections but different goals.[[407]](#footnote-407)

The authors who assumed the traditional stance against rebels were united not by aversion to Somerset but by a commitment to ensuring that reform continued despite political instability. Several of the writers were acquaintances of Richard Morison, and they apparently decided that the manner of response represented by his iron-willed *Lamentation* was preferable to the more sympathetic writings produced by Somerset.[[408]](#footnote-408) Documentary evidence is thin but it is tempting to speculate that Morison played more than a passive role in Cranmer’s campaign. One of the authors, Ochino, was living with Morison in Whitefriars and the two remained close friends into the 1550s.[[409]](#footnote-409) Zeeveld has described Cranmer’s likely role in introducing the Paduan humanists Starkey and Morison to a younger generation of Cambridge scholars such as Cheke, Ascham and Ponet, which ensured the continuity of Tudor humanism.[[410]](#footnote-410) In any case, Morison’s influence was certainly present, if only as a literary exemplar.

There are some signs of conflict between Somerset and the other authors which predate 1549. Cheke, for example, was suspected of conspiring with Thomas Seymour in late 1547 while Somerset was fighting in Scotland.[[411]](#footnote-411) Still, we have no reason to detect the existence of a party of anti-Somerset fifth columnists. That they bore no ill will to the Protector may be illustrated by Vermigli’s open letter of 1550, translated by Thomas Norton and printed for Walter Lynne, which amicably comforted Somerset and assured him that God ‘taketh away somtimes earthly riches and worldly glory, that we maye learne the frailtye therof’.[[412]](#footnote-412) By recognizing the importance of style as well as political force, we can reach a better understanding of how certain communications with rebels differed from others. The different methods of the two campaigns may be brought to light by examining first the rival responses to the Western rebellion, and then those to rebels in the East and South, before turning finally to general condemnations of rebellion.

Replies to the Western Rebels: Somerset, Udall and Cranmer

The form of worship prescribed by the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* became compulsory on 9 June 1549.[[413]](#footnote-413) The author of its preface, possibly Cranmer, emphasized that the new liturgy stood not for innovation but for restoration. Time previously wasted on ‘uncertein stories, legendes, respondes, verses, vain repeticions, Commemoracions and Synodalles’ would now be spent on Bible reading, as the church fathers had recommended.[[414]](#footnote-414) Although the parishioners of Sampford Courtenay in Devon duly listened to the service in its entirety on 9 June, they interrupted their rector when he tried to repeat it the following day and insisted that he should celebrate a Latin mass instead.[[415]](#footnote-415) Their protest, in collaboration with likeminded men from Cornwall who mobilized first, grew into a full-blown rebellion against the Crown. Rebels in each region were extraordinarily proactive in getting their demands on paper. Of the six rebel petitions formulated in the West, the Devon petition (c. 1 July), the Devon-Cornwall supplication (mid-July) and the Sixteen Articles (c. 27 July) were those which received government responses.[[416]](#footnote-416) The Cornish rebels also made proclamations which articulated some of the same grievances to be found in the articles.[[417]](#footnote-417) As in 1536, these petitions and proclamations opened a channel of communication with the government. None of the government’s replies to the Western rebels made any significant political compromises. This is unsurprising because, unlike social and agrarian reform, religion was non-negotiable. Still, Somerset tried his level best to ingratiate himself with the Western rebels.

I

The first set of demands produced by the Western rebels which received a reply from the government was the lost Devon petition; it received no reply from Cranmer or his clients. By analysing the king’s reply, Aubrey Greenwood identified the themes of seven of the grievances expressed in this petition: baptism of children; the new form of communion; the real presence in the Eucharist; English-language services; the age requirement for confirmation; the Act of Six Articles; and legislation produced after the death of Henry VIII.[[418]](#footnote-418) The government responded to this petition by turning, as it had in 1536, to the printing press. An octavo pamphlet entitled *A message sent by the Kynges majestie to certain of his people, assembled in Deuonshire* was printed by Richard Grafton sometime after 8 July. Its title page is without a border or compartment, unlike the 1536 pamphlets, but this was not necessarily owing to haste because Grafton commonly used plain title pages. Somerset said that he had it printed ‘to thintent it might be more common and seen’.[[419]](#footnote-419) In Elizabeth’s reign, it was reprinted in Foxe’s *Actes and monuments* (1563), and Holinshed’s *Chronicles* (1577), where it is described as a ‘most gentle and louing message’.[[420]](#footnote-420) Yet, according to Holinshed, it did little good because the rebels ‘stoode still in their wicked begon rebellion, offering to trie it at the weapons poynt’.[[421]](#footnote-421)

There is a French pamphlet extant, printed in two octavo editions in Paris in 1550 and allegedly copied from an English original, which sets out a reply of the people of England to the *Message*.[[422]](#footnote-422) The existence of this pamphlet was brought to the attention of Cecil by Sir John Mason, ambassador to France, on 18 March 1551, when he wrote that the ‘lewd book’ had been suppressed by the Constable of France.[[423]](#footnote-423) Unlike the typical terse prose of rebel petitions, the author or authors of this work sustain an argument and display a command of rhetoric. We should not, however, make too much of this reply because it is probably a literary forgery originally written in French.[[424]](#footnote-424) A loyalist correspondent in the West called the king’s *Message* a ‘princely and reasonable answere’ and provides an interesting scrap of evidence about its manner of distribution:

Of the whych I receyued syxe Copies in printe from you, by M. Mohan, at his last comming fro[m] the Court to my Lord pryuey seale. And for the same I thanke you, prayng you, yf any suche lyke thynges come fourth in printe, I may haue some sent me wyth the fyrst, & yf you wyll speake to the Kynges Prynter in my name, I dare say, he wyll not denye you.[[425]](#footnote-425)

It seems, then, that the pamphlets were conveyed in small quantities to local men of authority, such as the justice of the peace Reynold Mohan, who in turn distributed them to others.[[426]](#footnote-426) The Grey Friars chronicler apparently referred to the *Message*, although he got its addressees wrong, when he wrote that on 18 July ‘there was a boke made and send up to the commyns of Cornwalle and Devynshere with alle other parttes of all the realme for be cause of their rysynge and pullynge down of inclosures’.[[427]](#footnote-427) Although we should treat this source with caution since the chronicler misunderstands or misrepresents the religious nature of the Western rebellion, his comments provide useful evidence of the extent of the book’s distribution. He also recognizes the concessional nature of Somerset’s measures, noting that subjects were exhorted to ‘be content gentylly, and within shortte space it shulde be mendyd, and so to submytte them selfes’.[[428]](#footnote-428)

There is a manuscript version of the *Message* among the Rawlinson manuscripts in the Bodleian library which has hitherto been completely overlooked.[[429]](#footnote-429) It appears in a volume of papers and letters from the reigns of Henry to Elizabeth copied out by an Elizabethan scribe. There are around three dozen minor verbal differences between the printed and manuscript versions, which could have been the result of lazy copying, but it seems that the manuscript version was in fact copied from an earlier draft which preceded the final text sent to the printer. This is suggested by the existence of some substantive differences in phraseology between the two versions. For instance, a rhetorical question in the printed version: ‘Or how can any Englishe good hart answere vs, our lawes, and the rest of our uery louyng and faithful subiectes, who in deede by their obedie[n]ce make our honor, estate, and degree?’ reads rather differently in the manuscript version: ‘...or what Englissh harte cane answere vs and o[u]r Lawes forbidding you theis vnlawfull assemblies...’.[[430]](#footnote-430) The existence of a fair copy which must have been subsequently revised once again indicates that the government was just as committed to crafting effective propaganda as Cromwell had been in 1536.

The *Message* is a plain address to the rebels which tackles the rebel grievances sequentially but without the clarity and orderliness of the point-by-point replies written by Cranmer and others. Though it does not adhere strictly to any rhetorical model, it opens with an exordium and closes with a peroration, and there are some attempts at rhetorical flair, such as the double *anadiplosis* of the last sentence: ‘…And where ye shall now here of mercie, mercie & life, ye shall then heare of iustice, iustice and death.’[[431]](#footnote-431) At no stage does the author misrepresent or misinterpret the rebel articles. He dismisses their demands, however, as ‘either all false, or so uain, that we doubte not, but after ye shall hereby vnderstand the trouthe thereof, ye wil all with one uoyse, knowlege your selfes ignourantly led’.[[432]](#footnote-432) The author uses the old word ‘Masse’ as an act of diplomacy, just as the word also appeared in the first prayer book, and the rebels are assured that ‘it is brought euen to the very vse as Christ left it, as thapostles vsed it, as holy fathers deliuered it’.[[433]](#footnote-433)

The author does at times seek to intimidate the commons and, following the example of Henry VIII in 1536, he chides them for presuming to question the wisdom of the king and Parliament. Once again, policy is defended with reference to parliamentary consent, not royal absolutism. Though he makes no actual political concessions, and though he threatens the rebels with punishment, his language is markedly placatory. With a metaphor more suited to a love poem than a state pamphlet, he writes:

GOD knoweth in whose hande our harte is: and rather for your awne causes, beyng our Christened subiectes, we would ye were perswaded, then vanquished, informed, then forced, taugt then overthrowen, quietly pacified, then rigorously persecuted.[[434]](#footnote-434)

Somerset’s rhetorical appeasement of the Western rebels was not an attempt to attract political support outside official channels; it was motivated by perceived necessity. While he may have sympathized with rebels in Norfolk and elsewhere who were really only asking for fairer working conditions and cheaper food, he had no truck with commons who wanted to restore the mass and recall the English Bible. If Somerset had denounced the Western rebels while appeasing the rebels in the East and South, we might have had a case for arguing that he conceived of a collaboration between himself and the commons who swore allegiance to the Gospel; but the fact is that he used similar strategies to appease both groups. According to Diarmaid MacCulloch, ‘Somerset and Cranmer’s circle’ tackled each rebellion differently and made ‘remarkable efforts... to reach out to the eastern camps and start a dialogue with them’.[[435]](#footnote-435) However, the differences between unofficial writings and writings produced by Somerset with the Council are more significant than the differences between those sent to rebels in favour of the old faith and rebels calling for commonwealth reform. Despite some notable differences in form and content which will be explained in the next section, the communications sent to both groups made use of similar language.

II

The second set of articles to receive a government response was the Devon-Cornwall supplication, again now lost, and which again attracted no reply from Cranmer or his clients. Greenwood has recovered eight grievances from the petition, four regarding the Book of Common Prayer (baptism restrictions; that uneducated children would be unable to prepare for confirmation; that there ought to be gender segregation at communion; and that there was no Cornish liturgy); another four which were more general religious complaints (regarding the Six Articles; baptism and burial rites; and the supposition that the reforms had been forced through without the king’s approval) and four secular (the repeal of the 1534 Treason Act; sheep and cloth taxes; untrustworthy officeholders and councillors; and widespread dearth and famine).[[436]](#footnote-436) A manuscript response was produced entitled ‘The kinges Mai[est]es answer to the supplicac[i]on made in the name of his highnes subiectes of Devon and Cornewall’.[[437]](#footnote-437) Four copies of this document exist among the State Papers.[[438]](#footnote-438) Two of these are virtually identical fair copies, one of which is damaged, with some minor interpolations; another copy is a fragment of what appears to have been another fair copy; and the other is an earlier draft which is very similar to the finished copies, except that there is an insertion which in later drafts was incorporated into the body of the text.[[439]](#footnote-439) The third fair copy and the earlier draft were both copied out in the same neat secretary hand.

The author, who speaks in the voice of Edward, stresses that he has formulated policy with counsel from ‘our most entirely beloued vncle & all our counsell’, which suggests that this is a conciliar document produced at Somerset’s initiative. Moreover, Somerset’s flagship policies are robustly defended, including his social reforms, financing of the Scottish garrisons and repeal of the Six Articles. The manuscript was apparently being drafted on around 24 July and a copy was sent to Russell on 27 July.[[440]](#footnote-440) The existence of identical drafts suggests that multiple copies were made to be distributed in manuscript, and that perhaps the three left over were spares. There is no way of knowing if copies sent out were signed or sealed, but the surviving copies are unsigned and unsealed. The author makes light use of rhetorical figures, such as his habit of asking many questions in a row to create a sense of prolonged interrogation, which rhetoricians call *pysma*. Still, the plain method of response is similar to that employed in the king’s *Message*.

The rebels are presented with serious answers to their grievances and they are informed of Somerset’s willingness to reform social injustices: ‘Yf any thing be to be reformed in o[u]r Lawes, the Parliament is nere at hand a place and tyme where men ought and euer hitherto haue been wonnte to common of such maters…’.[[441]](#footnote-441) Here we have yet more proof that government propagandists emphasized parliamentary consent rather than royal absolutism. The author briefly dismisses some grievances already rebutted at greater length in the *Message*, such as the fear that the dates on which baptism could take place would be restricted, and again the speaker persuades them that the Six Articles are undesirable by adopting the voice of a patrician who dearly loves the commons:

[W]ill yow that we shall resume the scourge agein and hard snaffle for your mouthes? ... When we are content to rule like a father w[i]t[h] all mercy and clemency do yow call for the bridell and Whippe? Ah o[u]r loueng subiectes, who be these that put this into your heades?[[442]](#footnote-442)

If the *Message* and the ‘The kinges Mai[est]es answer’ were the only addresses to the Western rebels which had survived, we might have assumed that all councillors had given their wholehearted support to Somerset’s methods of dissuasion. However, when the rebels issued their last and longest version of demands, two responses were drafted which contained nothing like the empathy and concessional rhetoric with which Somerset had been so liberal, one of which was written by Archbishop Cranmer.

III

The Sixteen Articles, which also exist in a variant state usually called the Fifteen Articles, were probably drawn up in late July.[[443]](#footnote-443) These articles, signed by rebel leaders from Cornwall and Devon, were printed by John Day and William Seres in 1549 as the appendix to an octavo pamphlet entitled *A Copye of a letter contayning certayne newes, & the articles or requestes of the Deuonshyre & Cornyshe rebelles*. This pamphlet has a literary quality but this should not necessarily lead us to conclude that it was a fabrication, since sixteenth-century schoolboys learned to view the composition of letters as a rhetorical art form. There were two editions in the same year, which, aside from improvements in the paratextual apparatus and minor verbal discrepancies, feature several substantive differences. [[444]](#footnote-444) The second edition contains an enlarged list of rebel articles and a note stating that the letter was written by a man whose initials are R. L.[[445]](#footnote-445)

There is a manuscript copy of the letter among the Rawlinson manuscripts of the Bodleian library, in the same volume as the manuscript version of the king’s printed *Message*.[[446]](#footnote-446) Frances Rose-Troup concluded that this document is either a copy of an earlier manuscript version of the letter, or else that it was copied from the original letter itself.[[447]](#footnote-447) This much is certainly true because the letter was copied neatly in the same hand as later letters in the volume, but there seems to be no sure way of telling which of the two options she proposed is correct. Aside from a handful of verbal differences between the manuscript and printed copies of the letter, the manuscript copy contains the following additional information in the title: ‘From a gentilman of deuonshier to Mr. C.’.[[448]](#footnote-448) Rose-Troup suggested, and her suggestion was later repeated by Fletcher and MacCulloch, that ‘Mr. C.’ likely refers to William Cecil,[[449]](#footnote-449) and indeed this seems like the most sensible inference; it is unlikely, for instance, that Lord Rich would be referred to as ‘Mr. Chancellor’. The identity of ‘R. L.’ has proved to be more of a mystery, which I too have been unable to solve.

The letter claims to have been written ‘from a village, nygh saint Mary Oterye, the.xxvii. of Iulie’.[[450]](#footnote-450) If we consult the Devon subsidy roll for 1543, we only find one man with those initials living in the hundred of Ottery St. Mary: Robert Lokear, whose income was only £1 a year, so he was probably not a gentleman.[[451]](#footnote-451) The Langford family had been important landholders in Devon from the thirteenth century, so our man was possibly from this stock; one Richard Langford of Devon is found litigating in Common Pleas in 1526,[[452]](#footnote-452) but without further corroborating evidence it is impossible to be sure. Like the ‘Mr W. H.’ of Shakespeare’s sonnets, our ‘gentilman of deuonshier’ may never be positively identified. The author of the letter recounts a friendly disagreement he had had with the recipient at court in Windsor in 1548, so he must have been a person with strong connections to London.[[453]](#footnote-453) He also indicates that he was once in the service of Sir Anthony Denny.[[454]](#footnote-454) We can discount Robert Langdon of Keverell, who served for decades as a JP in Cornwall, for he died on 2 November 1548.[[455]](#footnote-455) The author of the letter, in any case, defends the government’s lenient response to the rebellions, especially against those rebels who had submitted peaceful petitions, but he says that if any group of rebels deserve harsher punishment, it is the Western rebels with their intolerable religious demands.[[456]](#footnote-456)

The first substantial response to the Fifteen/Sixteen articles was an anonymous composition entitled ‘An answer to the articles of the comoners of Devonshere and Cornewall declaring to the same howe they haue ben sedused by Evell p[er]sons’. This tract, which survives in a single manuscript copy in the British Library, has been variously attributed to Philip Nicolls and Nicholas Udall.[[457]](#footnote-457) Elsewhere I have demonstrated beyond doubt that Udall was in fact the author.[[458]](#footnote-458) Further to what I wrote on that occasion, it might also be suggested that Nicolls was the author of the king’s *Message*, and was perhaps recruited for the task by Somerset through Carew;but if this were so we would have to suppose that John Bale mistakenly described Nicolls’s work as an address to the rebels of Cornwall rather than of Devon. Udall began his literary career by co-writing verses for Anne Boleyn’s coronation with John Leland in 1533.[[459]](#footnote-459) His manuscript tract against the rebels was probably written before the siege of Exeter had ended.[[460]](#footnote-460) John Cooper is rightly sceptical about the extent to which it was ‘popular propaganda’ because, as far as we know, it was never printed,[[461]](#footnote-461) and yet the manuscript’s inclusion in Bale’s *Index Britanniae Scriptorum* might suggest that it was more than merely a private draft.

There is no evidence that Udall’s s response was commissioned by the Council. It is possible that Cranmer had used Udall to gather incriminating information about Stephen Gardiner in 1548, which raises the possibility (but only the possibility) that the tract was commissioned by the archbishop, who might have been dissatisfied with the result.[[462]](#footnote-462) In any case, the tract is worth analysing in the interests of comprehensiveness. The ‘Answer’ combines traditionalist denunciation with the type of conciliation favoured by Somerset. That the author viewed his composition as a complement to Somerset’s replies may be deduced from the fact that he refers to the ‘Kinges Ma[ies]tes answer’ four times.[[463]](#footnote-463) Udall’s work, however, evidently did not harm his fortunes after Somerset’s fall, since in 1550 he was almost granted a patent to print English Bibles which would also have given him the sole rights to print Vermigli’s works in English, although for some reason the grant seems to have been cancelled before it came into effect.[[464]](#footnote-464) Perhaps this is because Udall wisely composed his tract in a manner which would displease neither the archbishop nor the Protector.

In some respects, he shares the vocabulary of propagandists such as Cheke (on whom more anon), using adjectives like ‘wilful’ and ‘sturdy’ to damn the rebel leaders, and verbs like ‘bewitched’, ‘seduced’ and ‘stirred up’ to indicate that the rank-and-file have been tricked. Still, he prefers friendly exhortation to vicious denunciation. His principal implied audience consists of decent, simple, property-owning commoners, who must be rescued from the ruffians and papists who have drawn up the rebel articles and recruited hapless Devonians and Cornishmen through lies and seduction. He never simply *answers* the rebels’ articles without theatrically lamenting their ignorance. Udall’s responses to the Sixteen Articles are remarkably thorough, even criticizing their title and concluding subscription. He takes a point-by-point approach, but he opens with a persuasive preamble before beginning to refute the articles, where he tells the rebels that he intends ‘to set up a glass before your eyes wherein ye may see… your folly and errors in which ye are yet drowned’.[[465]](#footnote-465)

When he comes to reply to the Cornish rebels’ complaint regarding the use of English in the communion service, he does not dismiss it out of hand but rather states that they ought to have made a peaceful petition in words like the following:

Where it hath pleased your most excellent Majesty… to set forth unto your most loving and obedient subjects in the English tongue one uniform way of divine service… we the Cornishmen… most humbly beseech your Majesty that… we may by your grace’s provision have the same fourme of divine service and communion derived and turned into our Cornish speech…[[466]](#footnote-466)

Udall suggests that this obsequious request is more acceptable than the rebels’ ‘high word’, which would have been ‘too much for a parishioner to say to his curate’, let alone for a subject to say to his sovereign. After disproving purgatory and defending the vernacular Bible, Udall legitimizes Somerset’s policy of leniency by citing Christ’s parable of the lost coin from Luke 15: 8-10: ‘As the widow in the gospel that had lost her groat turned up all the house to find it again... so the King hath made and still maketh all means possible to find you again’.[[467]](#footnote-467) These sympathetic passages, which punctuate the whole of Udall’s tract, sound a note of conciliation which was absent in the pamphlets of 1536. Cranmer, evidently unsatisfied by the methods of Somerset and Udall, chose a different strategy.

Cranmer’s reply to the Fifteen Articles, entitled ‘Agaynst the articles of the Deuenshire men’, has survived in a single manuscript now part of the Parker collection in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.[[468]](#footnote-468) In this tract, Cranmer shared Somerset’s general aim of fighting sedition, while avoiding his readiness to make rhetorical and political compromises. Strype printed this document in 1694 with a fair few palaeographical slips, and it was subsequently reproduced more accurately, although not perfectly, by two nineteenth-century editors.[[469]](#footnote-469) The autograph manuscript seems to have been prepared for printing but this may never have happened.[[470]](#footnote-470) It seems that Cranmer had begun to write the manuscript at an earlier date before the end of the rebellion, since in his answer to the first article he calls upon rebels to deliver up their leaders for judgment.[[471]](#footnote-471) It was not completed, though, until between November 1549 and January 1550, after Somerset’s deposition and at least three months after the Western rebellion had been defeated.[[472]](#footnote-472) The late date of completion is a noteworthy fact in itself, as if Cranmer believed that there was unfinished business; that the Fifteen Articles, which had circulated in public, had not yet been refuted to his satisfaction. It also proves that he was a loyal councillor who did not attempt to undermine Somerset’s policy in the summer of 1549, even though he had misgivings about the wisdom of the Protector’s approach.

Cranmer must have been familiar with Udall’s earlier point-by-point composition, since he borrows a couple of his phrases and arguments.[[473]](#footnote-473) Thus, he clearly saw something insufficient in Udall’s ‘Answer’, or otherwise he would have saved time and effort by arranging for that document to be printed instead. The manuscript contains numerous deletions and emendations in Cranmer’s hand, most of which were made for apparently stylistic reasons. In the opening address, Cranmer calls his audience the ‘ignorant men of Devonshire and Cornwall’, which reads like a deliberate replacement for Udall’s placatory ‘good countrymen of Devonsheir and Cornwall’, and he gives two reasons for having written the reply: ‘duty unto God, and the pity that I have of your ignorance’.[[474]](#footnote-474) He defines his methodology not as refuting the Fifteen Articles but as interpreting them. Assuming the role of exegete, he says that he will open up each article ‘that [the rebels] may see the bowels thereof’; this might be a gory pun referring to the punishment for treason.[[475]](#footnote-475) To draw a distinction between the authors of the articles and the ignorant rebels who apparently did not understand them properly, he uses a metaphorical juxtaposition of sight and blindness:

...my good-will shall be, seeing you so far wandering out of the way, and so blindfolded with evil persuasions, that you cannot see where you go, to open your eyes that you may see, and to set you again in the right way.[[476]](#footnote-476)

After the exordium, which contains a general reply to the rebels’ demands as a whole, Cranmer proceeds to examine each article in greater detail. Some of his replies, despite flashes of rhetorical brilliance, are often stylistically flat-footed and could have benefitted from more redrafting. The author even criticizes his own style on several occasions, apologising for being ‘long and tedious’ and promising to be pithier in his answers to the remaining articles.[[477]](#footnote-477)

Despite his accessible language and popular metaphors, Cranmer takes every opportunity to discourage any further response from the rebellious commons by arguing that they have two options: either to recognize that they have been tricked or else to admit themselves to be ‘not only wicked papists, but also heretics, and most heinous traitors to the king and this his realm’.[[478]](#footnote-478) While the responses to the Western rebels reveal to some extent both the degree of consensus among councillors in the summer of 1549 and the fact that some councillors and intellectuals had their doubts, these points manifest themselves even more clearly when we examine the competing responses to rebels in the east and south of England.

Replies to Eastern and Southern Rebels: Council Letters and Vermigli’s Sermon

Rebels in Norfolk set out their grievances at the greatest length in a document now known as the Mousehold articles.[[479]](#footnote-479) The sixteenth demand was the most famous: ‘We pray thatt all bonde men may be made fre for god made all fre with his precious blode sheddyng’.[[480]](#footnote-480) As Nicholas Tyacke has noted, such a demand had also been made in the Twelve Articles of Swabia produced by German rebels in 1525.[[481]](#footnote-481) The sentiment of this article ultimately found its way into chapter eight of Thomas Smith’s *De republica Anglorum*, where it is said that there are so few bondmen in England because ‘ourRealme hath receiued the Christian religion which maketh vs all in Christ brethren, and in respect of God and Christ conseruos [fellow slaves], men began to haue conscience to hold in captiuitie and such extreme bondage him whome they must acknowledge to be his brother’.[[482]](#footnote-482) The Norfolk rebels also produced other petitions, now lost; and other groups of rebels in the East and South drew up lists of grievances.

Unlike official reactions to the Pilgrimage of Grace and the Western Rebellion, the government at no stage responded with a full point-by-point response to rebel petitions submitted in the East and South. In East Anglia, the government replied to the two lost petitions of Thetford and Suffolk.[[483]](#footnote-483) Of the lost petitions of Somerset, Kent and Essex, only the latter is known to have received a reply from the government.[[484]](#footnote-484) Aside from Cheke’s *Hurt of sedition*, which was addressed also to the Western rebels, no printed pamphlets were produced to answer the social and agrarian rebels’ grievances. The government was still willing to communicate, but it did so in a different manner. Apart from proclamations, the government conducted its communications with these rebels almost exclusively through private correspondence, some of which was sealed with the king’s signet, as no English government had done since the birth of the printing press.

Historians are aware that a series of nine letters were drawn up in response to the rebels, which survive in Elizabethan copies of minutes from 1549, now housed in the British Library.[[485]](#footnote-485) We cannot be certain whether six of the letters were ever sent, but the very fact that they were drafted tells us something about what kinds of response the government considered in 1549.[[486]](#footnote-486) Three of them were addressed to rebels in Norfolk, one to Oxfordshire, two to Suffolk, one to St. Albans, one to Hampshire and one to Essex. Of the three Norfolk letters, one was addressed specifically to the rebel camp at Thetford. Eight of the letters were addressed to those still actively rebelling, but the letter to Hampshire was addressed to the spring rebels who had already surrendered, assuring them that they would receive mercy.

Most of the letters were first printed in the appendix to an influential article by Shagan, although two of them had been transcribed in a doctoral thesis nine years earlier.[[487]](#footnote-487) Shagan argued that they reveal a ‘remarkably high level of interaction between the rebels and the government’ and ‘a great deal of “feedback” between government policy and rebel demands’.[[488]](#footnote-488) He suggested that this was unprecedented because Henry VIII’s concessions to the Pilgrims of Grace were less radical than those made thirteen years later.[[489]](#footnote-489) According to Shagan, although Somerset’s condescending style accorded with tradition, the content of his letters was radical because of his willingness to yield.[[490]](#footnote-490) Shagan’s ambitious argument that Somerset was playing ‘an aggressive game of popularity politics’ in 1549, attempting to build support ‘outside the political establishment’, was subsequently challenged by George Bernard and Michael Bush.[[491]](#footnote-491) Bernard suggested that the letters were too small a body of evidence to support Shagan’s conclusions, while Bush wrote that Somerset’s ‘emergency measures’ were the same as those employed in 1525 and 1536.[[492]](#footnote-492) Although Bush was right to stress Henrician precedent, he did not draw sufficient attention to the unique aspects of the counterinsurgency methods of 1549, such as openness of communication and the breadth of approved concessions.

The documents are clearly letters, not proclamations. Unfortunately for scholars, Chancery under the administration of John Yonge, Master of the Rolls (1507-1516) had begun to neglect its duty of entering writs of proclamation on the Patent or Close Rolls, and therefore these records, which would have provided conclusive evidence, are missing for the period 1514 to 1551.[[493]](#footnote-493) We can still, however, say quite confidently that they were letters. For one thing, they address subjects directly rather than using the third-person pronouns typical of royal proclamations. Some of them begin *in medias res*, possibly due to exclusions by the copyist, but two begin with the friendly preamble ‘We greete yow well’, which was the formula for corresponding with knights and other gentlemen.[[494]](#footnote-494) Three more begin with the phrase ‘We com[m]ende vs vnto yow’.[[495]](#footnote-495) For another thing, they are not included in Grafton’s 1551 collection of proclamations.[[496]](#footnote-496) Moreover, the narratives of Kett’s rebellion recorded by Nicholas Sotherton and Alexander Neville describe only one proclamation sent to the rebel camp at Mousehold: a proclamation of pardon first delivered by York Herald on 21 July, which was repeated on 24 July and again, as a final warning, on 23 August.[[497]](#footnote-497) From Sotherton’s description, we may conclude that this was almost certainly that which was printed on 12 July 1549.[[498]](#footnote-498) Alexander Neville’s alleged version of this proclamation, as translated by Richard Woods, bears little resemblance to the text of the 12 July proclamation but its hyperbole and overblown language lead us to suppose that Neville applied a fair amount of poetic license.[[499]](#footnote-499) The absence of any mention of further proclamations in the narratives of Sotherton and Neville suggest that if these documents were delivered to rebel camps, including the three addressed to Norfolk, they were delivered as letters.

The first key question is: who wrote them? Shagan proposed that letters one, two, three, five, six and nine were written by Somerset, and that the remaining three letters are at least ‘consistent with his handiwork’.[[500]](#footnote-500) Can their provenance be identified more precisely than that? Shagan writes, correctly, that in letter nine, ‘the author refers to “us and the rest of his highness’ council”, an example of Somerset’s common practice of using the royal “we”, a practice which irritated many of his peers on the Privy Council’.[[501]](#footnote-501) We must not forget, however, that the Council also used plural pronouns in its letters. Although every one of the nine letters contain plural pronouns, these pronouns are of three types: the king’s ‘we’ (letters one and five), Somerset’s ‘we’ (letter nine), and the conciliar ‘we’ (letter six).[[502]](#footnote-502) As we shall see, this distinction is clear in each case from internal evidence.

Letter nine unquestionably features Somerset’s ‘we’, for it refers to ‘vs and the rest of his highnes counsell’, neatly discounting the other two possibilities.[[503]](#footnote-503) Thus, it surely originated in his personal office rather than at the Council board. The same is probably true of the letters written in the king’s voice. However, for all we know, they could have been presented to the Council to be signed, as signet letters sometimes were.[[504]](#footnote-504) Another question ought to be raised: who did the Protector’s writing for him? He was unquestionably intelligent in many matters, not least in military affairs, and yet prose composition does not appear to have been among his skills. As Barrett L. Beer straightforwardly notes, ‘there is little evidence to suggest that he was a learned man’.[[505]](#footnote-505) He apparently spoke French, but knowledge of French was more of an aristocratic skill than a humanist skill: even Richard Morison could not speak it.[[506]](#footnote-506) The untidy sentences in Somerset’s autograph letters are often difficult to read: ‘This mornyng betwene onne and tow I receyvid yo[u]r letar the first part ther of I like very veri well mary that the wille shuld be opunyd tylle fardar co[n]sultacion and that it myght be well considerid how myche ther of wer nesesary to be pupelyshid for diuars respectes I think it not co[n]uenyent.’[[507]](#footnote-507) By what miracle, then, did he come to write such tracts as the *Epistle to Scotlande* (1548), which contained flights like the following?

Yet this shalbee a witnesse afore God, and all Christian people, betwixte you and vs, that wee professyng the Gospell of Christ accordyng to the doctrine thereof, doo not cease to call and prouoke you, from theffusio[n] of your awne blood, from the destruccio[n] of the realme of Scotland, from perpetuall enemitie and hatred, from the finall eradicacion of your nacion, and from seruitude to foreyne nacions: to libertie, to amitie, to equalitie with vs, to that, whiche your writers hath alwayes wisshed, mighte once come to passe.[[508]](#footnote-508)

The answer might lie in the name of William Cecil, who had been appointed as personal secretary to Somerset by 13 July 1548 at the latest.[[509]](#footnote-509) The responsibilities which attached to Cecil’s role as personal secretary remain obscure, but he might have received detailed assignments from Somerset, on the receipt of which he obediently turned out elegant prose. I have found that Cecil borrowed books from the London Guildhall in January 1549, including the works of St. Augustine, which seems to suggest that he acted as a researcher and writer for Somerset, not merely a scribe.[[510]](#footnote-510)

Once we compare the 1549 letters with each other in light of the distinction between the three types of ‘we’, two conclusions suggest themselves: firstly, that the decision to negotiate with the summer rebels was conciliar policy, not Somerset’s autocratic policy; and secondly, that there were elements on the Council who objected to this policy, although their opposition should not be overstated. To substantiate the first of these conclusions, we may compare letters five and six. These letters are answers to the lost Suffolk petition which was conveyed to the king by a delegation of rebels.[[511]](#footnote-511) Letter five, dated 18 July, is written in the king’s voice. The speaker refers, for instance, to ‘o[u]r dearest vncle Edward duke of Som[er]set’.[[512]](#footnote-512) As Shagan has observed, the voice of the king is strong evidence that Somerset drafted this letter.[[513]](#footnote-513) It was almost certainly issued because the coda contains the words ‘yeven &c. of Richmonde’, which is an abbreviated form of the phrase ‘given under our signet at our manor of Richmond’. This fact is not noted by Bush, although he observes that the full phrase in letter one indicates that the latter was issued.[[514]](#footnote-514) Letter six, dated 19 July, is also addressed to the rebels of Suffolk but it is written in the voice of the Council. This is obvious from the fact that the speakers refer to the king in the third person, and to themselves as a plural entity:

And at that time ye shalbe assured as we be all men of honor and owe truthe to god and o[u]r prince we wilbe most forwarde readie and diligent to further everie ar[ti]cle in yo[u]r said booke contained…[[515]](#footnote-515)

Although letter five was drafted by Somerset while letter six was probably drafted at the Council board, both follow a common strategy. Somerset writes that the king has always been ‘most readie and willinge to p[ro]vide for yo[u]r ease quiet and comforte as much as ever prince hath bene for his subjects’, while the Council declares that the Suffolk rebels’ petition is ‘for the most parte founded vppon great and iust causes’.[[516]](#footnote-516) The decision to respond diplomatically to rebels, then, was definitely conciliar policy, steered no doubt by Somerset but not enacted autocratically by him.

That is not to say, though, that the Council was in total agreement. This becomes most apparent when we compare letter one (to Norfolk, dated 18 July) with letter two (to Norfolk, dated 17 July). The text of letter one is very similar to that of letter five. It was again written in the voice of the king and was, according to the coda, issued under signet. Letter two contains first-person plural pronouns but these are clearly not the king’s ‘we’ because the letter refers to the king in the third person. Likewise, they are unlikely to be Somerset’s ‘we’ because the letter is worlds apart from Somerset’s preferred policy of appeasement. Thus, we can conclude that this is a letter drafted by the Council, or else by a single councillor on behalf of the Council.

Interestingly, it appears to be very likely that letter one was conveyed to the rebels by the sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk, Sir Nicholas L’Estrange, who wrote to Cecil in September 1549 that ‘as yow know I came to London seyking meanyes at the cowncelles hand to quyett the rebelles, of whome I receyvyd letter [*sic*.] to declar vnto the same’.[[517]](#footnote-517) This reminds us of the fact mentioned earlier, that the JP Reginald Mohan visited London to collect printed matter against the Western rebels, and indicates quite a high degree of government initiative in distributing propaganda. Since letter one is so similar to letter five, we need not describe its contents again. It contains the same mixture of mild threat and sweet-talk which is also on display in the printed *Message* and ‘The kinges Mai[est]es answer’ to the West.

The author of letter two, however, assumes a much tougher stance. Unlike Somerset, who tried to second-guess the Norfolk rebels’ demands by consulting the Suffolk petition, the author of this letter makes no such attempts, resorting instead to denunciation and dissuasion. In the spirit of Udall and Cranmer’s responses to the Western rebels, he implements a policy of divide and conquer, indicating to hardworking commoners that the rebellion has been stirred up by idle criminals.[[518]](#footnote-518) At first his chastisement is understated enough, with a slap on the wrist for the commons who had decided to ‘cluster in numbers’ rather than seek redress legally; but soon the denunciations spiral into outrage. He uses an *anacoenosis* which has rather too many parts and is expressed in language too loaded to permit serious reflection:

Can the madnes and furie of such naughtie and corrupt members of the co[m]mon welthe so farre enter into yo[u]r stomacks as you wilbe content to serve their tornes to vndoe yo[u]r selves [and] lose the most plentifull fruites of the earthe w[hi]ch by the goodnes of god yow should now gather together to live in winter w[i]thall[?][[519]](#footnote-519)

Commonplaces are drawn from the stock of Tudor obedience argument, such as the suggestion that men will lose their wives and property if rebellion succeeds. Rebels are said to be worse than ‘brute beastes’, because even ‘the selye Ante or Pismire whome we treade dailye vnder o[u]r feete hath... considerac[i]on to the winter foode’.[[520]](#footnote-520)

Letter two was probably never sent. This would seem to be supported by the fact that letter one repeats the preamble of the earlier letter almost word-for-word, as if it were a second attempt.[[521]](#footnote-521) Even more importantly, the author of letter two states that he is sending a herald to receive the rebels’ grievances, although it is stated in the first that no herald would be sent back and forth because slow communication might imperil the realm.[[522]](#footnote-522) Nevertheless, the very fact that such a letter was drafted indicates that some on the Council attempted to pull away from Somerset’s policy of appeasement. The limp phrase ‘some on the Council’ is unsatisfactory, of course; can we be more accurate? The letter’s rhetorical flair suggests that the author had received a solid humanist education, which narrows down the shortlist of potential authors to fourteen of the twenty-seven councillors active before October 1549 who had been to a university.[[523]](#footnote-523) Since Sir Thomas Smith was still on his sickbed at Eton at the time, his name can also be eliminated from the running.[[524]](#footnote-524) It is therefore possible that Cranmer wrote this letter, although we cannot say so with any confidence.

Letter two was the only one which truly ran contrary to the conciliar policy that had been settled upon in the summer of 1549. Why was it drafted in the first place? Rebels who quoted from Scripture, and who claimed to be loyal Protestants furthering the king’s wishes, posed an embarrassing and complicated problem. Councillors found themselves in a situation similar to that faced by German reformers in 1525: like Luther, some no doubt believed that it was important to make a public repudiation of evangelical rebels, to deny the connection between reformed doctrine and civil disobedience. It seems certain, on the basis of the evidence which we shall now discuss, that Cranmer was of this opinion.

I

In July, the Court of Aldermen in London began to prepare for a siege. It ordered that the gates should be repaired, made an inventory of ordnance, requisitioned gunpowder and strengthened the city watch.[[525]](#footnote-525) The children of city officers living outside London were brought home for their ‘sauf Custodye... in the tyme of this styrryng of the people’, possibly to prevent them from being taken hostage.[[526]](#footnote-526) The common serjeant even met with the Chancellor to ensure that the staff of the superior courts and Chancery should be ‘honestly and quyetly governed’.[[527]](#footnote-527) At the same time, it was thought good to ready the hearts of men as well as their defences. Most importantly, Archbishop Cranmer preached a sermon against rebellion at St. Paul’s Cathedral on 21 July. It was not his own work but an English translation of a Latin text by Peter Martyr Vermigli. This sermon proposed ideas which Vermigli would continue to emphasize in his lectures during the reign of Elizabeth, such as the obligation to obey princes and the unlawfulness of active resistance.[[528]](#footnote-528) The sermon was apparently delivered on the spur of the moment, for the Greyfriars chronicler writes that Cranmer ‘came sodenly to Powlles’ to deliver it.[[529]](#footnote-529) Here, before the London elites, Cranmer read the following words of Vermigli’s:

And yet it is reported, that there be many among these unlawful assemblies that pretend knowledge of the gospel, and will needs be called gospellers; as though the gospel were the cause of disobedience, sedition, and carnal liberality, and the destruction of those policies, kingdoms, and commonweals, where it is received. But if they will be true gospellers, let them then be obedient, meek, patient in adversity and long-suffering, and in no wise rebel against the laws and magistrates.[[530]](#footnote-530)

Vermigli supports this argument by reminding the audience that Christ and his apostles were poor and homeless, so rebels cannot say they are following Christ when they seek to seize other men’s possessions. He strips away the rebels’ self-proclaimed evangelical zeal by associating them with ‘the Romans Catiline, Cethegus, and Manlius’, and ‘in England, Jack Straw, Jack Cade the blacksmith, Captain Aske, and divers other rebels’.[[531]](#footnote-531) These lists serve to dishonour the eastern and southern rebels by associating them with past leaders of commons’ revolts who had motivations other than love of the Gospel. Their claims may be new, Vermigli implies, but their disobedience is the same old crime. Vermigli’s second argument establishes a parallel between English evangelical reform and the introduction of Christianity in the Roman empire:

The empire of Rome never appeared to be in worse case, or in a more troublous and unquiet state, than when Christ’s religion was preached and received among them. Whereupon arose neither few nor small complaints of the heathen, ascribing all these adversities unto the receiving of the gospel and the religion of Christ. To whom the godly and learned fathers and martyrs made answer, that it was not long of Christ’s doctrine and religion, which teach things most virtuous and godly, that such calamities did ensue; but it was long of the corrupt execution and negligent observation of the said religion.[[532]](#footnote-532)

Torrance Kirby has argued that this passage was an oblique criticism of the government policy of Somerset, whom Cranmer blamed for failing to stress the importance of obedience, hierarchy and order.[[533]](#footnote-533) Vermigli and Cranmer were, in Kirby’s opinion, ‘party to a closing of ranks by the ruling elite, a maneuver leading to the exclusion of the king’s uncle from power’.[[534]](#footnote-534) His chronology might be questioned since the sermon was delivered to city elites in July, but in fact it has been proven beyond reasonable doubt that the conspirators started to make substantial plans for ousting Somerset at least as early as late August;[[535]](#footnote-535) perhaps Cranmer had sensed which way the wind was blowing in late July.[[536]](#footnote-536) While such observations are doubtless of great importance, they are only one side of the story – and perhaps exaggerated.

For one thing, Cranmer continued to support the policy of rhetorical appeasement (of the Western rebels) at the Council board. Between 18 July and 12 September, Somerset and Cranmer were co-signatories of at least eleven letters sent from the Council to Lord John Russell instructing him how to deal with the Western rebellion and its aftermath.[[537]](#footnote-537) Of particular interest are the letters of 25 and 27 July, which respectively promise an answer to the ‘Commons of Cornewalles supplicac[i]on’ if the rising is not swiftly subdued, and defend the government’s extensive use of proclamations against Russell’s scepticism.[[538]](#footnote-538) Secondly, we should remember that Cranmer ultimately remained at Windsor with the Protector when Warwick and other councillors conspired against the Protector later that year. On 8 October, he signed a letter addressed to the Council along with Sir Thomas Smith and William Paget, attempting to negotiate between the two parties and advertise the Council of Somerset’s willingness to resign.[[539]](#footnote-539) The reason for this apparent paradox is that although Cranmer’s first loyalty was to the Gospel, his second was to the Protector. While he evidently thought that excessive pandering to rebels was unwise, he continued to support government policy as best he could.

General Censures of Rebellion: Ochino, Cheke and Bullinger

Aside from responses which were directed explicitly to the Western rebels and to rebels in the South and East of England, three more responses exist which were general denunciations of all rebellion. An analysis of these works will complete our picture of the persuasion campaigns of 1549, and briefly indicate the manner in which independent loyalists used rhetoric to defend civil order. Firstly, Bernadino Ochino wrote a tract entitled ‘A dialogue betwene the kinge and his people’, which is broadly in line with the Council strategy.[[540]](#footnote-540) This has survived in two manuscript versions: an Italian original in Ochino’s handwriting and an English translation of unknown authorship.[[541]](#footnote-541) This was the first piece of anti-sedition literature in English which took such a form. While the point-by-point responses to rebel demands published in 1536 and 1549 were dialogic, Ochino’s was the first accumulative dialogue. In other words, he developed an argument by having two interlocutors responding to each other, rather than presenting official answers to a predetermined list of demands. Although Ochino allocates many more lines to the king, who makes the traditional case for obedience, his choice of form made the composition rather more than a traditionalist set-piece.

Ochino does not respond to any one version of rebel demands, but extracts a variety of grievances from petitions in the East and West to express in the voice of the people. Ochino’s king takes the rebels’ social grievances seriously. Drawing on his own experience of exile, Ochino is even willing to play devil’s advocate: his king says that even if the mass is ‘necessary to salvac[i]on’, that is still no grounds for rebellion because those who believe so ought to ‘haue gonne, and soughte an other Cuntrey to haue dwelte in’.[[542]](#footnote-542) Ochino beats a middle path between Somerset’s open and Cranmer’s closed approach, which one scholar suggests is because he was, ‘a differenza del Vermigli, un figlio del populo’.[[543]](#footnote-543) Perhaps so, but we should also bear in mind that Ochino was Somerset’s panegyrist. In the final section of his *Tragoedie or dialoge of the vniuste vsurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome* (1549), translated by John Ponet, Ochino staged a dialogue between Somerset and the Council, in which the former speaks of his intention to ‘vtterlye ba[n]nishe out of our kingdome the name of Antichrist and his Iurisdiction’, while the councillors fawn over him for his courage and wisdom.[[544]](#footnote-544) Fortunately, Ochino ultimately ‘survived having backed the wrong horse’ when Somerset fell later that year.[[545]](#footnote-545) In the end, Ochino’s dialogue remained unpublished – its editor says that it probably ‘gathered dust in Lambeth or Canterbury’ – and it was Cheke’s composition which enjoyed widespread influence.[[546]](#footnote-546)

I

Cheke’s pamphlet, which we have had cause to mention already, marked the most conspicuous departure from Somerset’s efforts to concede and communicate. It is undoubtedly an eloquent pamphlet, perhaps the finest of all the sixteenth-century writings against sedition, which is not surprising since it was composed by a man whom Burghley described in 1578 as ‘one of the sweetest flowers’ of the garden of rhetoric, and whom Nashe described eleven years later as ‘the Exchequer of eloquence’.[[547]](#footnote-547) And yet, as many scholars have noticed, it is also an incredibly violent pamphlet; James Holstun has stretched this observation the furthest in an essay applying Marxist theory to the events of 1549, arguing that Cheke was a psychopath traumatized by his own socially conditioned cruelty.[[548]](#footnote-548) Still, few have noticed that the most important thing about Cheke’s conventional cruelty is that it was so different from Somerset’s more diplomatic rhetorical solutions.

Cheke might have started planning the oration in May, against the spring rebels, when he asked Peter Osborne to send him a ‘reme of paper’ from London.[[549]](#footnote-549) There were two editions in 1549, both of which were printed by John Day and William Seres, likely before the defeat of Kett’s rebellion in Norfolk.[[550]](#footnote-550) Since Cheke was still in Cambridge as late as 9 August,[[551]](#footnote-551) he must have sent the manuscript to one of his contacts, who saw it through the printing press on his behalf. A likely candidate is Sir Thomas Smith, who was already in correspondence with Cheke in the summer of 1549 on the subject of the Royal Visitation of Cambridge, and who was definitely back in London by 22 July, on which date he co-signed a Council letter from Richmond.[[552]](#footnote-552)

The pamphlet was not designed primarily to be sent to rebels, although this might have happened, but ‘to be sold at the new shope by the lytle Conduyte in Chepesyde’.[[553]](#footnote-553) This shop, which had opened by 1548, stocked copies of the Matthew Bible and would also have been the first port of call for any Londoner wishing to buy Protestant pamphlets.[[554]](#footnote-554) The shop appears to have been initially a joint venture by Day and Seres, but Seres either dropped out or was cut out of the business in 1550.[[555]](#footnote-555) The pamphlet may also have been available eventually in regional bookshops. In Exeter, it could perhaps have been bought in the shop of John Gropall, alias Lumbard.[[556]](#footnote-556) In Norwich, we know of a bookseller called Robert Scott, active in the 1570s, who had possibly also been in business in 1549.[[557]](#footnote-557) Primarily, however, it was written for a London audience.

Cheke was a courtier but not yet a councillor in 1549. Was he a freelancer with official sponsorship or an independent loyalist? Strype, in a mysterious parenthesis, indicates that Cheke’s ‘plain and earnest address’ to the rebels might have been written ‘by order from above’.[[558]](#footnote-558) With similar elusiveness, Elizabethan Evenden has suggested that the ‘Edwardian powers’ arranged the printing of Cheke’s pamphlet.[[559]](#footnote-559) And Stephen Alford says that it was produced by the ‘regime’, albeit ‘less officially’ than other works from 1549.[[560]](#footnote-560) Can we say anything more specific about the genesis of the pamphlet? It is possible that Cheke was acting as an independent author, since he was not at Court but in Cambridge at the time of its composition, ‘within striking distance of the Norfolk rebels’.[[561]](#footnote-561) On 9 August he sent a letter, apparently to his wife, describing the rebels’ military defeats and confidently proclaiming that they would soon be ‘plainlye ouerthrowne’.[[562]](#footnote-562) Cheke’s proximity to the scene of the action no doubt energized his prose.

Anne Overell has said that Cranmer employed Cheke to write the pamphlet, although she does not explain how she arrived at this conclusion.[[563]](#footnote-563) Mueller has suggested that Cheke may have been ‘urged by friends at court, such as Cranmer’.[[564]](#footnote-564) To be sure, there is compelling evidence of Cheke’s intimacy with the archbishop. Winthrop S. Hudson has briefly traced the relationship between Cheke, Cranmer, Bucer and Vermigli in the 1540s.[[565]](#footnote-565) Cranmer, Bucer and Cheke were already collaborating on a translation of and commentary on the Gospel of Matthew in 1549 which, as McCulloch suggests, might explain why Cheke was living in Cambridge in May, in contrast to the traditional view that he left Court after temporarily falling from political favour.[[566]](#footnote-566) Since Cheke was already on a literary team with these men before rebellion broke out, it is at least possible Cranmer commissioned *The* *hurt of sedition*, or that it was produced in consultation with him.

The *Hurt of sedition* is an octavo pamphlet of eight quires. Prominently displayed on the title page is the royal coat of arms and the date of publication. The pamphlet’s frontispiece features a woodcut illustration based on 2 Samuel 17: 9-15, which narrates the rebel Absalom’s death after getting his luxurious hair caught in a tree. Above the illustration is the wry caption: ‘The rewarde of Absalon the Rebel.’ The text is printed in textura gothic type. Alternating running headings ‘The true subiect’ (verso) and ‘To the rebell’ (recto) run throughout the book with variations in spelling. The colophon names John Day and William Seres as the printers. The tract has little paratextual material; there are no long-winded dedicatory epistles or other materials appended to the text. According to Strype, the book was ‘committed to the press to be dispersed, as well among them [the rebels], as elsewhere in the realm.’[[567]](#footnote-567) If judged on rhetorical quality, Cheke’s pamphlet is the best of the works produced in 1549, whose authors cannot match the quality of Cheke’s metaphors nor his ability to balance heightened eloquence with the stark vernacular: ‘Why, be ye Houlattes & backes [bats] that ye cannot looke on the lyght?’[[568]](#footnote-568) To measure the subtlety of Cheke’s craftsmanship, we can try replacing the preposition ‘on’ with ‘upon’: the adverbial clause becomes too smooth and iambic and the double-punch effect of the words ‘looke’ and ‘lyght’ is diminished.

C. S. Lewis granted Cheke’s pamphlet *The hurt of sedition* (1549) half a page in his literary history of the sixteenth century. The pamphlet, in Lewis’s opinion, is ‘better than anything of the same sort would be likely to be in our own days’, an interesting remark to make in the age of the Ministry of Information, but he concludes that ‘the fads which may have impressed the combination-room make a thin sound across the centuries’.[[569]](#footnote-569) Cheke’s was the first English anti-sedition pamphlet structured as a strict classical oration. There were innumerable variants of the basic oratorical structure vying for pre-eminence in the Renaissance, some classical but others of recent invention. Cheke’s editor Joan Eileen Mueller claims that he did not follow the Roman oratorical structure exactly, but she seems to suppose that the rhetorical model proposed in Thomas Wilson’s *Arte of rhetorique* (1554) is identical to that proposed in Quintilian’s *De Institutione Oratore* and the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.[[570]](#footnote-570) The structure of Cheke’s oration adheres closely to the six-part Ciceronian structure, except that he reverses the order of the proof and the refutation, which Mueller notices is in line with ‘Aristotle’s recommendation for an answering orator’; Cheke refutes the most significant points in an early section of the oration, and weaves the other, more minor refutations throughout the remainder of the pamphlet.[[571]](#footnote-571)

To frame the oration, he installs a collective implied speaker who condemns disobedience on behalf of all faithful Englishmen and a collective implied interlocutor who represents rebellious subjects. This could be the set-up of a dialogue but the interlocutor is only a passive, silent recipient. Immediately after the *partitio*, Cheke forestalls opposition with a dogmatic anadiplosis based on Romans 13:2: ‘He that fauteth, fauteth agaynste goddes ordinaunce, who hath forbidden all fautes…’.[[572]](#footnote-572) Anadiplosis is an effective figure for the propagandist because it provides a memorable means of arguing that there is no type of a given action which may not be defined in a singular way. There is a similar specimen in the 1547 obedience homily: ‘whosoeuer resisteth, resisteth the ordinaunce of God’.[[573]](#footnote-573)

Facing the Western rebels first, Cheke paraphrases rebel grievances, taken from the Fifteen/Sixteen articles, before rebutting them, including ‘Ye wyll haue that the Cannons do establyshe’ and ‘You wold haue the bibles in agayne’, which makes this part of his discourse seem similar in arrangement to that of the ‘point-by-point’ anti-sedition tracts.[[574]](#footnote-574) He is mimicking the peremptory grammar of the rebel articles: the demands of the Western rebels, in their various forms, had not been written in the polite language expected of commons’ petitions, and their first-person plural pronouns might even have seemed like imitations of the royal ‘we’. Cranmer made a similar criticism in the first section of his ‘Answers’: ‘Is this the fashion of subjects to speak unto their prince, “We will have?” Was this manner of speech at any time used of the subjects to their prince since the beginning of the world?’[[575]](#footnote-575)

Like the Henrician propagandists, Cheke defends the prayer book by making a case not for royal absolutism but for the authority of Parliament:

But why should ye not lyke that whiche Gods word establisheth, the primatiue churche, hath authorised, the gretest learned me[n] of this realme hath drawen, the hole consente of the parliament hath confirmed… Ye thyncke it is not learnedly done. Dare ye commons, take vpon you more learnynge, then the chosen Byshoppes and Clearkes of this realme haue? Thynke ye folly in it? Ye were wont to iudge your Parliamente wysest, and nowe wyll ye sodenly excell them in wysdome?[[576]](#footnote-576)

The king and council are notably absent from this passage: Cheke’s argument is that the Edwardian religious reforms must be accepted because they were approved by an omnicompetent Parliament. Then, turning to the Norfolk rebels, Cheke spitefully tells them that they merely ‘pretende a commune welth’.[[577]](#footnote-577) One of the most astonishing passages, marked with a paragraph break and a printed manicule, is on the subject of equality. ‘But what meane ye,’ Cheke asks, ‘by this equalitie in the commune welth?’[[578]](#footnote-578) He makes the idea seem absurd by conflating economic equality with physical and intellectual equality, asking the rebels if they would banish particularly strong or clever men from their commonwealth. None of the sets of rebel articles include the noun ‘equality’ but several of the Mousehold Articles call for economic equality or at least economic rebalancing; they request for instance that ‘freeholders and copieholders may take the profightes of all comons’.[[579]](#footnote-579) Cheke shows little patience for such sentiments. He insists on the necessity of civil obedience with a string of a fortiori arguments, some of which take the form of those body politic correspondence arguments for which the Tudors are famous: ‘If the members of our naturall bodie all folows the head, shall not the members of the politicall bodie all obey the kynge?’[[580]](#footnote-580) The antithetical adjectives ‘natural’ and ‘vnnatural’ occur frequently in the tract as Cheke makes a distinction between the proper structure of society and the diabolical levelling that rebellion can lead to.

Cheke especially deplores the rebels’ treatment of Edmund Sheffield, 1st Baron Sheffield, who was killed near Norwich Cathedral, who is represented as a wise, grave and benevolent martyr whose murder was only possible because the rebels had inhibited ‘al discourse of reaso[n]’. [[581]](#footnote-581) Imagining the consequences of the rebellion had it been allowed to continue, Cheke damns the rebels on the grounds of a hypothetical: ‘…no doubt thereof ye would haue falle[n] to slaughter of men, rauishing of wiues…’.[[582]](#footnote-582) Then he commends the staunchly Catholic Exeter for its civic loyalty in an unfavourable comparison with Norwich and domineeringly presents the rebels with a typical paradox: ‘…your reason gaue ye againste all reason’.[[583]](#footnote-583) Later, when he denounces rebels’ treatment of gentlemen, Cheke stages a masterclass in inductive reasoning: ‘Thinke small examples to take place in greate matters…and thereby learne to iudge of greate thinges vnknowen, by final thinges perceiued.’[[584]](#footnote-584) Cheke makes a series of sweeping claims about rebellion leading to vagrancy and seizes back the word ‘equality’ from the straw man argument he set up previously:

The kynges maiestie by thaduise, et cet. [i.e. Somerset] entended a iuste reformation of all suche thynges as poore men coulde truely shewe them selues oppressed with[,] thinking equalitie of iustice, to be the diademe of his king dome, and the safegard of his comunes.[[585]](#footnote-585)

From this passage, we see that Cheke was cautious not to criticize Somerset’s social reforms and we may note that, in order to achieve this, the author follows exactly the same manner of argument as the author of the Copye of a letter, arguing both that the Protector’s reforms were virtuous and that rebellion is wicked. The phrase ‘diademe of his king dome’ is an instance of one of Cheke’s favourite rhetorical weapons: a concise metaphor featuring two nouns or noun phrases, one in the nominative case and the other in the genitive. These metaphors mix abstract with concrete and rely as much on sound as on image: ‘whirlepooles of mischiefe’ is one of the most arresting examples.[[586]](#footnote-586)

Winthrop S. Hudson has noticed the seeming contradiction in the ‘streak of harshness’ exhibited in *The hurt of sedition* and the unanimous contemporary report that Cheke was a lovely man.[[587]](#footnote-587) The solution to this dilemma is to understand that Cheke, like Cranmer and Vermigli, thought that a harsh response was necessary in 1549 to protect Protestantism from the charge that it bred sedition. He also had more personal reasons for taking the hard-line approach, for by doing so he set on record printed proof that he was neither Somerset’s creature nor committed to his more controversial social policies such as apparent permissiveness shown to rebels. No doubt this helped Cheke to avoid sharing in the Protector’s fall, for although he was initially suspect for his connections to Somerset, he soon managed to secure Warwick’s trust. On 3 January 1550, he was granted lands with a value of £118 for ‘diligence in instruction of the king and other causes moving the king’s liberality’; and he was knighted on 11 October 1551.[[588]](#footnote-588)

II

The final work we should mention to round off our picture of the persuasion campaigns directed by Somerset and Cranmer was not an original composition but an English translation of a Latin work: Bullinger’s nineteenth sermon, according to the standard numbering, which was printed on 23 August 1549 to deny any possible Scriptural grounds for disobedience and, implicitly, to refute the conservative justification for rebellion proposed by the Western rebels and the evangelical justification proposed by rebels in areas like Norfolk and Essex. Bullinger’s sermon was printed in octavo format, possibly by William Powell, for Walter Lynne, who did not own his own printing shop.[[589]](#footnote-589) Bullinger was unlikely to have had anything to do with the printing himself but John Ab Ulmis informed him on 20 October that ‘some books’ of his had ‘lately been translated into English’.[[590]](#footnote-590) Lynne, a Flemish native, had moved to London in 1540 where he began to work in the book trade in around 1547. According to his biographer, Lynne was known for publishing English translations of European reformers including Luther and Ochino.[[591]](#footnote-591) He had connections both with Somerset, to whose wife Anne he dedicated three books, and with Cranmer, whose *Catechism* he printed.[[592]](#footnote-592) Bullinger’s sermon was printed with the subtitle: ‘much fruitfull and necessarye for this tyme, concernynge magistrates and obedience of subiectes’. This book has not received much attention from scholars.[[593]](#footnote-593)

On the verso of the title page, three Scriptural passages are printed, followed by a passage based on Proverbs 20: 2 and Proverbs 24: 21: ‘The kynge oughte to be feared as the roaring of a Lyon...’ In an introductory epistle, Lynne addresses the king himself and implies that he has arranged for the printing of this sermon to express his gratitude for the benefits he has received in England. He says that after searching out ‘some necessary doctryne, whiche coulde do all my countrye men good’, he lighted upon a sermon which is ‘for this tyme moste necessary’.[[594]](#footnote-594) The main point of the sermon is to prove that it is lawful for a Christian king to go to war against his enemies, and yet it contains a section on the obedience that subjects owe to magistrates. Bullinger admits that kings cannot be obeyed if they command subjects to contravene God’s law, but he makes it clear that subjects so commanded have recourse to no action but passive disobedience: ‘The Apostles and christianes of the primatiue church wold rather be imprisoned, banished, spoyled deuoured of beastes, slayne wyth sword, burned with fier and hanged, than to obey wycked and vnlawful commaundementes.’[[595]](#footnote-595) Several of the sentences in the peroration are printed in larger type with the marginal notes ‘A golde sentence’ and ‘Good subiectes marke this lesson’:

The iust concorde of subiectes auayleth more in peace and out of peace, than monye uniust. And stronger is the realm with lesse aboundaunce, and more concorde betwyxt the superiours and inferiours, than with infinite treasures, where magistrates and subiectes do not agree.[[596]](#footnote-596)

While the sermon itself counsels magistrates as much as subjects, warning them for instance that war should not be declared lightly, Lynne’s paratextual material is concerned primarily with the duty of subjects to obey. After the peroration, for instance, the reader is provided with citations for various Biblical passages on the subject of disobedience with the instruction: ‘Of sedicion Insurreccion, and rebellion, and their punyshemente reade these places.’[[597]](#footnote-597) Lynne’s decision to print an existing sermon rather than commissioning new material allowed him to plot a relatively safe course between the condemnation favoured by Cheke and the clemency favoured by Somerset.

The literary activity of Cranmer, Vermigli and Cheke in the last days of the Protectorate was not designed to win public approval for a future coup against the Protector. It was designed to help Protestants distance themselves from the Protector’s social policies while avoiding outright betrayal; and it robbed conservatives such as the earls of Arundel and Southampton of the ability to discredit Cranmer and Warwick by associating them with Somerset’s party when they attempted to seize power later that year. The continuity of religious reform in England had been secured – at least for a while. Just five years later, the king of course would die, and the hopes of Cranmer and his evangelical friends would be buried along with Edward’s body in Westminster Abbey. As his successor, Mary I, began to restore Catholic practice in England and to transfer ecclesiastical control back to Rome, her decision to marry a Spaniard would trigger another major rebellion.

Chapter 4

Wyatt’s Rebellion

When Mary I acceded to the throne on a wave of popular support, she was greeted immediately with ballads and pamphlets celebrating her victory as an act of providence, and lauding her as England’s answer to Biblical queens and prophets such as Deborah and Esther.[[598]](#footnote-598) A large minority of English subjects, however, looked on the festivities as Hamlet looked on King Claudius’s wedding banquet. *Their* providential queen was not Mary but the unfortunate Lady Jane Grey. Pro-Marian authors certainly recognized the dangers of a national division of opinion, for they made a point of condemning sedition right from the start of Mary’s reign. One balladeer attempted to make obedience to the queen a civil rather than a religious issue, drawing a parallel between the rebellions against Henry VIII and Edward VI and the failed attempts to install Jane as queen.[[599]](#footnote-599) While only a part of the English people would approve a return to the Roman church, the rightful accession of the daughter of Henry VIII was a more universally marketable event which many Protestant subjects could conceivably support. Such authors’ efforts were well-advised, for English Protestants did indeed begin to foment sedition only six months after Mary was crowned. This chapter argues that Mary I and Stephen Gardiner deserve credit for effectively weaponizing the printing press in response to Wyatt’s rebellion of 1554. It demonstrates that Mary’s government was just as willing as its Protestant predecessors to counter rebellion through persuasion and communication.

The best history of Wyatt’s rebellion is now over fifty years old.[[600]](#footnote-600) Originally, plans for a ‘fourfold popular rising’ were drawn up on 22 December 1553, with forces to be raised by Sir James Croft in Herefordshire; Sir Thomas Wyatt in Kent; Sir Peter Carew and the Earl of Devon in Devon; and the Duke of Suffolk in Leicestershire; but only Wyatt got his rising off the ground. The main battles, at Charing Cross and Temple Bar on 7 February, were something of an anti-climax, for Wyatt was easily persuaded to surrender himself to the royal herald. In this chapter, it will be seen that in the opinion of Mary and her councillors, the events of 1554 forced the government to compete with anti-Spanish propagandists for the good opinion of English subjects. The government kept alive the conviction of its predecessors that eloquence could douse the fires of rebellion. It might have been expected that the anti-sedition oration, indebted to Lutheran arguments and peppered with quotations from vernacular Scripture, would have died out in the reign of Mary, but the opposite is true.

Three pamphlets directly responding to this rebellion probably proceeded from official initiative.[[601]](#footnote-601) A fourth pamphlet in response to the rebellion, written by James Cancellar, is sometimes dated to 1553 or 1554 but it was actually more likely to have been printed in 1558. The anti-sedition campaign indicates that the Marian regime was at least as alive to the possibilities of applied rhetoric as its predecessors had been. While many of the pamphlets printed in 1536 and 1549 had been intended at least in part as real acts of communication with the rebel armies, the Marian anti-sedition works, with one possible exception, were designed to influence public opinion more broadly after Wyatt’s rebellion had been crushed. These works would have been available to purchase in London, of course, but they were possibly also distributed through regional booksellers. Kentishmen would perhaps have been able to buy them in the shop of John Domeright, provided that he was still in business in 1554, which had stocked English Bibles and printed statutes in the reign of Henry VIII.[[602]](#footnote-602) While the evidence for royal and governmental involvement in the production of each work will be examined in due course, it is worth bearing in mind that a proclamation of 21 August 1553 had stipulated that the queen herself would personally examine every printed book to decide whether it should be licensed.[[603]](#footnote-603) It seems that the work of examination was really delegated to councillors such as Stephen Gardiner, who is known to have suppressed a 1554 work entitled *A Memorial of suche Princes*, the text of which went on to form part of William Baldwin’s *A Mirror for Magistrates* (1563).[[604]](#footnote-604)

Much that has been written about Marian propaganda has centred around the question of whether the queen’s government made effective use of the printing press. It used to be customary to suppose that Marian propaganda was ‘puny’.[[605]](#footnote-605) J. W. Martin once suggested that the Marian regime had an ‘incomplete awareness of the difference printing had made in matters where public opinion was substantially involved’.[[606]](#footnote-606) The most recent version of this case was made by Glen Bowman, who argued that evangelical exiles were more capable polemicists than their Marian Catholic counterparts.[[607]](#footnote-607) Studies of Mary’s reign written over the past three decades, however, have stressed repeatedly that her reign was neither as disorganized nor as unsuccessful as had previously been suggested.[[608]](#footnote-608) On the subject of print in particular, William Wizeman has recently argued that Mary’s government seized the propaganda offensive, which he proved through an analysis of works printed in 1556-1557.[[609]](#footnote-609) Similarly, Jennifer Loach maintained back in 1986 that Mary recognized the advantages of print and she took issue with J. W. Martin in particular, who had relied on the ‘shaky method’ of counting entries in A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave’s *Short Title Catalogue* to determine how many more books had been produced under Edward than under Mary.[[610]](#footnote-610) Loach’s reservations were subsequently confirmed by Peter W. M. Blayney, who demonstrated that scholars have drawn inaccurate conclusions by relying on statistics compiled by Maureen Bell and John Barnard, who in turn relied exclusively on an index produced by Philip R. Rider, rather than on STC entries themselves.[[611]](#footnote-611)

Although relying entirely on book production statistics may be fraught with difficulties, such statistics do reveal general trends. For example, more polemical works were printed by Protestants in English between 1553-1558 than by Catholics: one scholar has calculated that 105 such Protestant works were printed in contrast to 94 Catholic.[[612]](#footnote-612) It is possible, we should note in passing, that by a twist of fate the former pro-government author Richard Morison may have written some of the anti-Marian pamphlets printed on the Continent, although the evidence is far from conclusive.[[613]](#footnote-613) Never before had printed works opposing government policy, religious or otherwise, outnumbered those in defence of it.[[614]](#footnote-614) However, the number of Catholic polemical works is still an impressive figure considering that most of the leading lights of scholarship, along with numerous printers, had fled to the Continent after Mary’s accession in the greatest brain drain of the sixteenth century.[[615]](#footnote-615) Moreover, although this suggestion should not be pushed too far, the figures might have been distorted by the priorities of Elizabethan and Jacobean book collectors to whom Catholic polemical works would have been unattractive acquisitions. A case in point is Tobias Matthew, who served as Archbishop of York under Elizabeth and James, whose library contains copies of Cheke’s *Hurt of sedition* along with Elizabethan anti-sedition pamphlets but no Marian anti-sedition pamphlets.[[616]](#footnote-616)

By taking anti-sedition literature as a case study and closely analysing books and pamphlets printed to condemn Wyatt’s rebellion, we may learn more about how the Marian regime and its friends viewed the importance of print while moving beyond the suggestive but insufficient method of book counting. This choice of focus is fitting because the government’s response to Wyatt’s rebellion has often been used as a litmus test to judge its competence.[[617]](#footnote-617) Anti-sedition writings had been closely connected with reformed belief since 1536 but Marian pro-government authors modified arguments and rhetorical devices inherited from their Henrician and Edwardian predecessors into a form which suited a Catholic government. A careful reading of the pamphlets of 1554 is enough to provide a serious qualification to Martin’s argument that Mary was ignorant of the importance of public opinion. Of course, it is wrong merely to invert the traditional terms of reference by arguing that Mary did in fact use print effectively, because judging the effectiveness any piece of writing is notoriously difficult. While it is possible to differentiate between excellent and mediocre prose, the writings judged most effective by scholars or critics are not necessarily those which work the greatest effect on a general readership. Some better lines of enquiry are the extent to which Mary shared her predecessors’ interest in the political potential of print; and which aspects of the Marian print offensive were conventional, which innovatory.

Mary’s council was not as quick to respond in print as its Henrician and Edwardian counterparts had been, for only one of the pro-government books or pamphlets written in response to Wyatt’s rebellion, namely James Cancellar’s *Brief treatise wherein is declared the pernicious opinions of those obstinate people of Kent*, was conceivably printed while the rebellion was still ongoing. The government did, however, compose five proclamations between 27 January and 3 February, which had a variety of functions, from a general condemnation of the rebel leaders as traitors to the offering of a reward for Wyatt’s arrest.[[618]](#footnote-618) By issuing these proclamations, the government opened a channel of communciation similar to the channels which had been opened in 1536 and 1549. To put these proclamations in their context, we should first recognize that Wyatt and his co-conspirators also composed two proclamations. The first of these, proclaimed at Maidstone on 25 January, has survived only in a transcription in John Proctor’s *Historie of Wyates rebellion* (1554). [[619]](#footnote-619) The second, proclaimed at Tonbridge on 27 January, has survived in two copies among the State Papers.[[620]](#footnote-620) There is also a faithful transcription of the Tonbridge proclamation in Proctor’s *Historie*, which convinces us of the integrity of his transcription of the Maidstone proclamation.[[621]](#footnote-621)

In the Maidstone proclamation, addressed to the commons, the rebels declared that their only complaint was the queen’s intention to marry a stranger, and that they were confident of popular support ‘because you bee oure neighbours, because you be our frendes, and because you be Englishemen’.[[622]](#footnote-622) They also implied that the commons would be able to contribute their ideas about how the rebellion should be conducted, summoning them to ‘assemble & determine what may be best for the aduauncement of libertie and commen wealth in this behalfe’.[[623]](#footnote-623) In the Tonbridge proclamation, the rebels tried to muddy the waters by accusing Lord Abergavenny, Sir Robert Southwell and George Clarke of disloyalty to the queen and of leading her subjects down the road to ‘p[er]petuall seruitude’.[[624]](#footnote-624) The first of the government’s proclamations is of most interest to us because it was a direct response to the Maidstone proclamation. Recognizing that subjects might well have been tricked by the rebels’ claims to be the queen’s true representatives, or at least that they could claim to have been tricked by them, this proclamation declared that the commons had been deceived and it offered a pardon to all who would disperse within twenty-four hours of hearing it.[[625]](#footnote-625) While the first proclamation was addressed only to Wyatt’s supporters, the second proclamation commanded officeholders throughout the country to declare the rebels traitors and advertise them of the government’s preparations to defeat them.[[626]](#footnote-626)

By the end of the year, moreover, two substantial pamphlets and one book had been printed in response to the rising. The council’s continued interest in condemning sedition was no doubt stimulated in part by the seditious bills and rumours of further rebellion which continued to circulate in London in the spring of 1554.[[627]](#footnote-627) In 1940, E. Harris Harbison characterized the Imperial ambassador Simon Renard as the pre-eminent propaganda director in 1554, a man who ‘had something of the faith of a twentieth century dictator in the power of propaganda’.[[628]](#footnote-628) It turns out that this statement is supported by the thinnest of evidence: firstly, a sentence from a letter sent by Renard to the Emperor on 6 November 1553 claiming that the English people would support a Spanish marriage if informed of the benefits it would bring; and secondly, that Renard was the prime mover behind drawing up and ‘publicizing’ the marriage treaty, which eventually became an act of Parliament.[[629]](#footnote-629) However, Renard’s interest in the treaty seems to have been chiefly legal and political and, although the marriage articles were distributed in January 1554 to reassure the people that England was getting a fair deal, there is no evidence that Renard was behind this.[[630]](#footnote-630) If anyone should be credited as the *de facto* Minister of Information in 1553-1555, then Gardiner would be a better choice. As will be seen, he commissioned the production of works against reformed religion and in defence of government policy and the queen’s interests, even composing some himself. To take one example of his own works, on 30 September 1554, Gardiner gave a sermon at Paul’s Cross in praise of Philip to an audience of perhaps ten thousand people.[[631]](#footnote-631) Following the examples set by Cromwell in 1536 and Somerset and Cranmer in 1549, Marian authors recognized the importance of popular opinion and produced anti-sedition writings accordingly, the difference being that they went further than ever before in treating their audience as an intelligent reading public. Despite Gardiner’s importance, however, some of the pamphlets under discussion in this chapter, one of which is lost, cannot be securely attributed to the initiative of Gardiner or any other statesmen. This does not mean, of course, that Gardiner was not involved in commissioning them but we cannot be sure either way. The clearest way to analyse the propaganda related to Wyatt’s rebellion is to take its three principal authors in turn: James Cancellar, John Christopherson and John Proctor.

A Lost Pamphlet by James Cancellar

Two Marian pamphlets on the theme of obedience bear the name of the queen’s chaplain James Cancellar. Cancellar was of the type of men who could ‘waye with all windes’, as Bale said of Bonner,[[632]](#footnote-632) or we might more charitably say that he was practical enough to adapt his loyalties according to the demands of the present situation, for he produced both Catholic propaganda under Mary and evangelical prayers in the reign of Elizabeth. His *Alphabet of prayers verye fruitefull to be exercised and vsed of euery Christian man* (1565), dedicated to Robert Dudley,was apparently very popular, having gone through six editions by 1610. Cancellar also wrote a lost work entitled *The pearle of perfection* (1558), whose title is recorded in Maunsell’s catalogue and which was entered into the Stationers’ Register.[[633]](#footnote-633) This book, printed by Thomas Marsh, was apparently a humanist meditation on the active and the contemplative life. The author was a fan of literary gimmicks such as acrostics, which appear in several works in whose production he had a hand.[[634]](#footnote-634)

Cancellar’s first foray into print was with a now-lost octavo pamphlet entitled *A brief treatise wherein is declared the pernicious opinions of those obstinate people of Kent* (1554).[[635]](#footnote-635) William Herbert gives the date of this pamphlet as 1553,[[636]](#footnote-636) perhaps repeating an old-style date from bibliographical information contained in a copy of the pamphlet, so it is probable that the printer had used an old-style date and that the pamphlet was printed before 24 March 1554. It is possible, in fact, that it was already in print before 7 February 1554, the date of Wyatt’s defeat. Another possibility is that Herbert got the date wrong and that the pamphlet was actually printed after 25 July, since according to Bale, Cancellar referred to Philip as king of England, but this could equally be Bale’s mistake. Miraculously, the author of Cancellar’s *ODNB* entry seems to quote from this work but, on closer inspection, he confused it with another of the author’s works.[[637]](#footnote-637) In 1979, Edward Baskerville suggested that *A brief treatise* was either a manuscript copy of Cancellar’s *Pathe of obedience*, or else an early printed copy of that work which was subsequently lost.[[638]](#footnote-638) However, in 1986 he revised this hypothesis after finding additional references to Cancellar’s treatise in Andrew Maunsell’s 1595 catalogue and in a manuscript composition by John Bale.[[639]](#footnote-639) The first surviving printed reference to the *Brief treatise* was made by Maunsell, who described it as an octavo pamphlet ‘written in Queene Maries time against the professors of the Gospell’.[[640]](#footnote-640) Two centuries later, the *Brief treatise* was listed in the 1785-1790 edition of Joseph Ames’s *Typographical Antiquities*,which indicates that there were copies available at that time. Since the listing does not appear in the first edition of 1749, it is possible that Herbert, who revised and expanded Ames’s text, merely lifted the reference from Maunsell, but this is unlikely since he included the new information of the pamphlet’s print date.[[641]](#footnote-641) Herbert probably did not personally own a copy of the pamphlet since it is not listed in the sale catalogue of his books drawn up by his son in 1795, so he probably consulted it in another private collection.[[642]](#footnote-642)

The manuscript composition by Bale, mentioned above, is entitled ‘A retornye of Iames Cancellers raylynge boke vpon his owne head, called the pathe of obedyence’.[[643]](#footnote-643) Baskerville later transcribed and published a small part of this manuscript.[[644]](#footnote-644) As the title suggests, it is a rebuttal of Cancellar’s *Pathe of obedience* but there is a digression in which Bale criticises Cancellar’s first pamphlet, giving its title as ‘A briefe treatyse’. From Bale’s description, we can glean that after the title page there was an epistle of dedication to Sir Robert Rochester, Comptroller of the Household, in which Cancellar described himself as ‘a worshypfull gentleman of the kynges and quenes honourable chappell’.[[645]](#footnote-645) In 1896, Edward Arber complained that there was ‘no organized method in existence’ for the recovery of lost books, and unfortunately the same is true today, so it is unlikely that the book will be recovered unless it is stumbled upon.[[646]](#footnote-646) Little more can be said about the contents of Cancellar’s pamphlet, but he was apparently rewarded for his labour. On 22 November 1554, possibly as a reward for his services, he was granted a lease of the lands associated with the rectory of West Witton in Yorkshire.[[647]](#footnote-647)

Cancellar put his name to a second pamphlet on a similar theme whose original title reads: *The pathe of obedience, compiled by Iames Cancellar, one of the Quenes Maiesties most honourable chapell* (1558?). Bale claimed that Cancellar lacked the ability to write such a pamphlet and that, in reality, Miles Huggarde and the learned schoolmaster and Oxford graduate John Twyne were the brains behind its composition.[[648]](#footnote-648) Two undated editions were printed by John Wayland, who held the royal patent for printing primers and private devotional works.[[649]](#footnote-649) Valerie Schutte has proposed that the editions were printed in 1553 and 1556 respectively, basing the first of these dates in part on the incorrect observation that ‘there is no mention of a specific conspiracy, so the tract could have been written for any of the conspiracies plotted against Mary or just to encourage obedience to Mary in general as the new ruler’, when in fact, Cancellar refers to the defeat of Wyatt’s rebellion.[[650]](#footnote-650) As for the 1556 date, she simply follows the suggestions of the Universal Short Title Catalogue (USTC) and Early English Books Online (EEBO). The fact is that both editions must have been published between 1556 and 1558 since both refer to Cranmer’s withdrawal of his recantation on 20 March 1556.[[651]](#footnote-651) More specifically, we can suggest that both editions were printed in 1558, since according to Bale, writing in 1561, the *Pathe* was printed after *The pearle of perfection*, which had been registered by 9 July of that year.[[652]](#footnote-652) As such, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to analyse the pamphlet.

John Christopherson’s *Exhortation*

John Christopherson had not been among the pragmatists whose consciences had allowed them to serve under both Edward and Mary, but he had emigrated to Louvain to escape conformity with religious reform. He was not just any conservative but a conservative trained in the Protestant-dominated methods of humanism. In the later years of Henry VIII’s reign, he had studied at St John’s College and Pembroke College, Cambridge, during the ascendancy of Sir John Cheke. There he developed the typical humanist love affair with the Greek language and mastered the arts of rhetoric which would prove crucial to his work as a pro-government author. In 1542, Trinity College, Cambridge was founded by royal grant and Christopherson was appointed to be one of its first scholars under the master John Redman.[[653]](#footnote-653) His fellow scholars can hardly be called luminaries, although John Dee, later to become a noted polymath and astrologer under Elizabeth I, was among their number. It is unclear when Christopherson was appointed as one of Mary’s chaplains, and whether he had served in that capacity prior to his exile in Edward’s reign, but he described himself in 1554 as ‘her graces Chapleyne’.[[654]](#footnote-654)

The *Exhortation*, too long to qualify as a pamphlet, is an octavo book set in textura type. Its title concludes with the injunction: ‘Reade the whole, and then Iudge’.[[655]](#footnote-655) The colophon bears the print date 24 July, the day before the queen’s marriage. This fact in itself strongly suggests conciliar involvement because the government was anxious at this time that the arrival of Philip would stimulate further unrest. A later government commentator, writing of the efforts made to arrange a peaceful union in the summer of 1554, noted that the Council ordered standing armies to be mustered by trusted noblemen in every shire, with special attention given to areas within a ten-mile circumference of London and to counties through which the royal couple would progress, ‘to preuent and withstand any sudden mutinie or rebellion’.[[656]](#footnote-656) Christopherson’s book complemented these military preparations. The copy of the *Exhortation* in Jesus College, Oxford, once owned by Anthony Wood, has its original limp vellum binding intact, as does the Peterborough Cathedral copy previously owned by Bishop White Kennett, but most later owners had the book rebound, either to repair damage or to beautify its rather utilitarian appearance.[[657]](#footnote-657) Marginal notes cite Scriptures and help to guide the reader through the maze of Christopherson’s argument.

Some editions of the book contain a folding table illustrating the genealogy of Mary and Philip of Spain, which was designed to allay fears of Spanish dominion by showing that Philip had English blood. Ironically, it may have had the opposite effect since the genealogy could alternatively be interpreted as proof that Philip had a claim to the throne in his own right; of this possibility the author of an anonymous Elizabethan defence of Thomas Wyatt darkly wrote: ‘Let others judge what that [the genealogy] intended. I will not gesse.’[[658]](#footnote-658) Christopherson and Cawood might have been inspired by the work of the Dutch printer Steven Mierdman, whose 1549 edition of *The laboryouse iourney [and] serche of Iohan Leylande*, enlarged by John Bale, features a folding map of Ireland stitched over the front page.[[659]](#footnote-659) One of the Cambridge copies of Christopherson’s pamphlet contains the genealogy fixed in the wrong position (between sigs. M6v and M7r) but, since it has been rebound, the error could have been introduced later.[[660]](#footnote-660) Another Cambridge copy of the book, which is bound with a 1549 copy of the *Hurt of sedition[[661]](#footnote-661)* and two other pamphlets, has a copy of the genealogy pasted onto the back board of its later binding.[[662]](#footnote-662) Possibly it had originally been sewn into the book and was pasted in after it became separated, but it is cut and folded differently from the other Cambridge copy of the genealogy so alternatively it might be one of the copies which circulated as standalone sheets, which was pasted into the book by a later owner. On examining another copy of the *Exhortation* in the Wren Library, once owned by the antiquarian Thomas Barker, it is clear that its copy of the genealogy was formerly fixed in the correct position (between sigs. M5v and M6r) but it has been cut out.[[663]](#footnote-663) In the Cambridge copy we first mentioned, the genealogy is folded three times lengthwise and five times crosswise, so the information is revealed incrementally as one unfolds it; the first part we see is the very top of the tree: ‘Edward the thirde, kinge of England, father to…’[[664]](#footnote-664) Interestingly, the content of the genealogy was later turned into a pageant in August at the little conduit at Cheap, extending the audience of this document even further.[[665]](#footnote-665)

Christopherson’s printed version is worth consideration as one of the strongest pieces of evidence that the *Exhortation* was officially commissioned. Christopherson writes that he made the genealogy himself by compiling information from English and Spanish chronicles.[[666]](#footnote-666) Sarah Duncan has suggested that it had been printed earlier as a separate broadsheet,[[667]](#footnote-667) which seems to be supported by the fact that Renard wrote to the Emperor on 6 May 1554 that Gardiner had arranged the printing of a genealogy ‘to show that his Highness is allied to the House of Lancaster’.[[668]](#footnote-668) Strype refers to this earlier genealogy as a book, not a broadsheet, but from his reading of Foxe he seems to have conflated the genealogy itself with a book of verses which presented the same argument.[[669]](#footnote-669) This lost book, commissioned by Gardiner, apparently contained verses penned by Gardiner’s chaplain and then bishop of Lincoln, John White.[[670]](#footnote-670) John Bale, writing in 1554, also credited the genealogical verses to Gardiner’s initiative and suggested that the genealogy itself, of whose production he sanctimoniously says that Saint Paul advised against, was commissioned by Edmund Bonner rather than Gardiner.[[671]](#footnote-671) It is impossible to say for sure which of these attributions is correct but Renard was more likely to have been accurately informed than a Protestant exile living in Switzerland. In any case, Christopherson would hardly have wasted time producing a genealogy of Philip and Mary if there was already one in circulation, so it must be concluded that Gardiner, or possibly Bonner, commissioned him to produce it; and it follows, therefore, that whichever of these two men did so probably also commissioned him to write the *Exhortation* of which the genealogy formed a part.

On 3 April 1553, Renard informed the Emperor that the chancellor ‘was taking as great pains to render his Highness’s landing secure as if his own life depended upon it’, and that he ‘would not cease to devise every means by which his Highness’s person might be protected in this kingdom’.[[672]](#footnote-672) It is likely that the production of the *Exhortation* was one of the means by which Gardiner aimed to secure the success of Philip’s arrival. It was wisdom to persuade the public on this matter since, in the words of Strype, ‘every man’s mouth was almost opened against the match’.[[673]](#footnote-673) Bale, for his part, suggested in late 1554 that the government should expect another rebellion, this time an apocalyptic catastrophe such ‘as England felt neuer the lyke’, for it is a ‘hygh waye to sedicyon… to suffer so manye newe straungers to enter into the land’.[[674]](#footnote-674) The other two pieces of evidence of the Council’s involvement, discussed already by Jennifer Loach, are Christopherson’s position as royal chaplain and the involvement of the royal printer, John Cawood, who printed numerous works of official propaganda during Mary’s reign such as *The saying of Iohn late Duke of Northumberlande vppon the scaffolde, at the tyme of his execution The. xxii. of Auguste* (1553).[[675]](#footnote-675)

It is not to be expected that Cawood was proud of the printing job, which, it must be said, was rather shoddily done. For instance, the compositor does not seem to have realized how long the *prosopopoeia* was going to be, because at first he decided to indicate its separateness from the main text by setting running quotation marks on every line (from sig. P5v), before eventually realizing that it was much longer than he had anticipated and discontinuing the quotation marks at an arbitrary point (sig. Q7r). Most of the editions have a final leaf listing the ‘Fautes escaped in printing’.[[676]](#footnote-676) These faults must have been spotted before the printing was finished because this page forms a part of the same quire as the previous pages, rather than having been sewn in separately. Furthermore, the Jesus College, Oxford copy and one of the Trinity College, Cambridge copies of this leaf features a faint mark of the device on the bottom of the previous leaf, which might indicate that the final quire was folded while the ink that had been applied with the woodcut block was still wet.[[677]](#footnote-677) Some copies contain further handwritten corrections made by the author or the printer before distribution: for example, Christopherson describes Martin Luther’s wife as a‘lousye Nonne’ but, in at least six copies, the adjective ‘lousye’ has been struck out and replaced in the margin with the word ‘lusty’.[[678]](#footnote-678) Since not all of the copies contain such corrections, some had evidently been distributed before the second set of errors was spotted. It is ironic that so many mistakes were found since Christopherson was a stickler for textual accuracy, which led him, for instance, to criticize a translation of Philo in 1553 for containing ‘so many errors... that readers’ minds many be tortured in reading it’.[[679]](#footnote-679) Perhaps Christopherson supervised the printing himself and exerted pressure on Cawood, whom we might expect to have been frustrated with the author’s perfectionism, to undertake continuous correction.

The size of Christopherson’s *Exhortation*, compared with earlier anti-sedition works, might indicate the author’s intention to write a lasting work of scholarship rather than an ephemeral polemic which would quickly become irrelevant. In the opinion of Herbert Grabes, the *Exhortation* is ‘long-winded’ and its author ‘hardly an experienced pamphleteer’.[[680]](#footnote-680) In the rather different opinion of A. G. Dickens, Christopherson was the only sure exception to the rule that Marian propagandists were all ‘devoted mediocrities’.[[681]](#footnote-681) Nevertheless, although many scholars have quoted from it, there has been little substantial scholarly discussion of the book’s contents. The most intensive analysis has been undertaken by Bowman, who compares the works of Christopherson and John Ponet to argue that the latter was a more capable polemicist.[[682]](#footnote-682) Bowman offers little convincing evidence for his value judgements and he does not begin to assess the political significance of Christopherson’s pamphlet.

In Christopherson’s Greek play in manuscript entitled ‘Jephthah’(1544), the Biblical protagonist scolds her father for weeping upon learning that he had unwittingly promised to sacrifice her. ‘Thou shouldst be strong,’ she says, ‘’Tis shameful to lament’.[[683]](#footnote-683) In like manner, Christopherson’s *Exhortation* undertakes not to lament but to troubleshoot and explain. Its form partakes of the characteristics both of oration and of learned treatise. The structure of the book is as follows: a dedication to the queen (A2r-A8r); an exordium (B1r-B3r); a rebuttal of common arguments used by rebels (B4r-B6v); a definition of the types of rebellion (B7r-B7v); a discussion of the general causes of rebellion followed by an explanation of why none of these are justified (B7v-K8v); a discussion of the causes of Wyatt’s rebellion in particular (L1r-O4r), including a defence of Philip of Spain and his nation (M5r-N8r); examples from Scripture, natural law and English history against regicide and disobedience (O5r-P3r); a *prosopopoeia* in the voice of a loyal Englishman which takes up the rest of the tract (P5v-2E8v), composed of a paraphrase of the Guildhall speech (Q1r-Q1v); a partisan history of the Edwardian reformation along with a defence of Catholic doctrine and practice (Q8v-2B3v); an analysis of contemporary and medieval rebellions in England and Europe (2B2v-2C8r), including a speech allegedly delivered by the Kentish rebels before their death (2C4r-2C5v); a summary of the evil consequences of sedition (2D3r-2D6r); an argument for the importance of dutifulness and unity (2D8v-2E5v); a peroration (2E6r-2E8r); and finally two closing prayers (2F1r-2F5r).

Even from this summary alone it is clear that Christopherson’s book is more complex than equivalent works printed in 1536 or 1549. As such, the author at times struggles to marshal his broad range of disparate material. The numerous divisions in the text, starting as early as the dedicatory epistle, seem not so much elegant dialectical apparatus as attempts to restore order to a straying argument.[[684]](#footnote-684) What the work loses in structural cohesion, however, it gains in subtlety and intrinsic interest. Christopherson makes use of the same manner of classical, Scriptural and historical places as previous anti-sedition writers, borrowing arguments and anecdotes from commonly cited authors such as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Seneca, Polydore Vergil and the church fathers, but he also uses more unusual sources such as the chronicle of Johannes Nauclerus and Luis de Ávila y Zúñiga’s *Comentario de la guerra de Alemaña hecha de Carlos V* (1548), first published in Spanish but translated into Latin two years later.[[685]](#footnote-685) Christopherson also quotes liberally from Eusebius, which is unsurprising since this was his specialist subject; by 1553, Christopherson had completed a translation of Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* into Latin.[[686]](#footnote-686) This work was never printed in England but it was eventually printed in Louvain eleven years after its translator had died.[[687]](#footnote-687) Christopherson’s use of the source seems to have influenced other Marian writers, even Protestants, for the anonymous author of a discourse ‘Whether it bee vnlawful to be present at Mass’ also mined information from Eusebius.[[688]](#footnote-688)

In the dedication to Mary, Christopherson uses the traditional metaphor of a sick commonwealth and, using a noun which had been pressed into the service of counterinsurgency in 1536, he says that he intends to find a ‘remedye’ for sedition before it is too late.[[689]](#footnote-689) After an anecdote from Herodotus is brought in to legitimize counsel by private persons, Christopherson states that the best cure for sedition is ‘that seditiouse mens hartes by gentle exhortatio[n] may be thoroughly persuaded’.[[690]](#footnote-690) He identifies four main propositions which he hopes to persuade people to believe: that rebellion is a sin against God, that it threatens life, that it endangers private property, and that it leaves England susceptible to destruction; and expresses confidence that ‘no man is so farre from al reason’ that they will be untouched by these compelling arguments.[[691]](#footnote-691)

In the breezy exordium, he uses language similar to Udall’s in 1549, addressing his readers as ‘mooste deare and welbeloued country men’.[[692]](#footnote-692) Then, in the next section, he reveals his awareness of the late-medieval and Tudor tradition of popular revolt, pointing out that rebel leaders have commonly argued that they only want to correct social injustices, to restore old rents, to return common land to general ownership, and so on; and that they typically proclaim loyalty to England and its prince.[[693]](#footnote-693) But these, he says, are but ‘goodly paynted wordes to blynde the symple people’; and every reader would do well to follow the example of Ulysses by stopping his ears, and those of his acquaintances, against such siren songs.[[694]](#footnote-694) Even if subjects did have a good cause to resent royal policies, he says – and here he is no doubt thinking of the Edwardian reforms – then passive disobedience would be the only permissible action.[[695]](#footnote-695) To validate this conclusion, he borrows the argument popularized by Luther that wicked rulers are sent as a plague from God.[[696]](#footnote-696)

He defines three kinds of rebellion: mental grudging, slanderous words, and military action; and, immediately thereafter, he opens a long section dedicated to identifying its general causes.[[697]](#footnote-697) Following Aristotle’s *Politics*, he names covetousness, oppression, ambition, loss of honour, times of prolonged peace, crooked princes, and diversity of manners as potential causes of sedition.[[698]](#footnote-698) As an example of covetousness, he writes of the Norfolk rebels who resisted their sovereign in the hope that all things would be made common.[[699]](#footnote-699) He expands the definition of the final cause to include religious diversity, which may lead to resentment if ‘the Prince be of one fayth, and manye of his subiectes of another’.[[700]](#footnote-700) While Aristotle proposed these causes as determinants of sedition, Christopherson treats them as if they were grounds for sedition deliberately selected by rebels; and so proceeds to examine whether any of them are justifiable. Covetousness among the poor he denounces by defending social hierarchy, memorably claiming that the nobles protect the poor as ‘the hyghe trees in euery forest do defende the vnderwoode from all stormye and violente blastes’.[[701]](#footnote-701) As for covetousness among the rich, he reveals its foolishness by giving the analogy of a merchant losing great wealth after risking it in the quest to earn some more.[[702]](#footnote-702)

Turning next to oppression, Christopherson cites the example of the Israelites under Pharaoh to argue that oppressed commoners ought to complain rather than rebel.[[703]](#footnote-703) Social injustice should trigger the following procedure: firstly, subjects should petition the prince; if that does not work, they may petition his council; and if all else fails, they must petition God and patiently consign the matter to him.[[704]](#footnote-704) The point is hammered home with Livy’s fable of the belly and its members which, as mentioned in the introduction, would later become a favourite anecdote of Elizabethan authors. Next, Christopherson examines rebellion for ambition’s sake through the Roman exemplars Catiline and Pompey and the Old Testament exemplar Absalom, and deals cursorily with rebellion for restoration of wealth, that for fear of punishment, and that borne of contempt, before commencing a review of the crucial question as to whether men can justly rise in the cause of religion.[[705]](#footnote-705)

Notably, Christopherson defends the legitimacy of passive disobedience. He writes that although Christians are duty-bound to disobey royal instructions which conflict with their faith, they must without violence suffer the consequences that result therefrom.[[706]](#footnote-706) Christopherson supports this doctrine with the example of Christ’s rebuke of Saint Peter for cutting off the ear of Malchus.[[707]](#footnote-707) Clearly, then, we need to be very careful about assuming that passive disobedience is closely related to ‘resistance theory’.[[708]](#footnote-708)

Christopherson’s use of Eusebius leads to one of the book’s most astonishing features, namely the heroization of passive disobedience. Ignatius the martyr, we are told, was more heroic than Roman captains; and Sanctus the martyr was more heroic than Alexander the Great.[[709]](#footnote-709) However, if in all this Christopherson seems to have been playing into the hands of later Protestant martyrologists, he marks an important turn when he writes that everyone should make sure whether his faith is sound before he spends his life in its cause, for many of the heretics lately executed in England, France and Germany are ‘false martyrs’.[[710]](#footnote-710) Since this point is so central, Christopherson confirms it with quotations from manifold ancient and modern authorities, including Augustine, Origen, John Gastius and Cyprian.[[711]](#footnote-711) A simple test is proposed to discover whether a given person has God’s spirit or the devil’s: do they accept the authority of the church or rail against it by calling Catholics ‘work wongers’?[[712]](#footnote-712) He condemns the arrogant spirit which leads men to recommend the discovery of truth by comparing Scripture ‘place with place’.[[713]](#footnote-713) While he is on the subject, he takes a digression to treat of heresy in more detail, subdividing heretics into those who are misinformed and those who have realized their error but carry on regardless for fear of seeming inconstant.[[714]](#footnote-714)

After winding down the preceding section, Christopherson turns his attention to the causes of Wyatt’s rebellion. Two causes of the rebellion, he writes, have been identified by wise men, namely the delivery of England from strangers and the restoration of Protestantism, although he asserts that the first of these was a false cause to deceive simple subjects, who were as helpless as birds lost in a snowstorm.[[715]](#footnote-715) Since Mary has prayerfully chosen a husband whose presence will benefit the realm, how dare subjects ‘lyke rigorouse tyrauntes’ force her to marry whom they will?[[716]](#footnote-716) Readers are presented with an alleged fragment of the rebels’ rhetoric:

Shall men suffer this, or shal we haue our heades thrust vnder a straungers girdle, & become his bondmen? Or shal we suffer our wiues and doughters to be rauyshed by vyle velaynes? What true English hart can abide this?[[717]](#footnote-717)

Such phrases appear in neither of Wyatt’s proclamations as they have come down to us and it is of course possible that Christopherson invented them. The following defence of Philip proclaims the fact that he is in fact no stranger but ‘one of the bloude royall of Englande’, since like the queen he is descended lineally from the line of Edward III.[[718]](#footnote-718) The next five pages or so contain further arguments in favour of Philip and the Spanish generally, before the author concludes that even if readers cannot bring themselves to love the Spanish king, they should at least pretend to until they are won over by his gentle qualities.[[719]](#footnote-719) After explaining that international marriages are the normal business of princes, he borrows a metaphor from Mary’s Guildhall speech, suggesting that the marriage issue was merely a ‘Spanish cloke’ to hide the rebels’ true intent.[[720]](#footnote-720) Religion, he maintains, was the ‘verye cause’.[[721]](#footnote-721)

Allusions are made to the Marian exiles, described as the ‘dispersed bretherne’ of ‘heresyes guylde and fraternitie’, whom Christopherson imagines biding their time in expectation of restoring their doctrine in the future.[[722]](#footnote-722) In the next short section, Christopherson praises the queen’s bravery during Wyatt’s rebellion and offers some traditional proofs of the necessity of obedience, such as the account of David’s guilt after cutting Saul’s cloak; and he makes deft use of the example of Richard III, based on Polydore Virgil and More’s *History of Richard III*, suggesting that he was punished for his bloody conduct without implying that Henry VII’s victory at Bosworth was an act of rebellion.[[723]](#footnote-723) Soon after begins the *prosopopoeia*, a rhetorical device which features in another anti-sedition work of 1554, Proctor’s *Historie*, as it had also featured in Morison’s *Lamentation* two decades earlier. This takes the form of an oration within an oration, as the fictional loyal subject opens with an exordium of his own, addressing his audience as ‘most dearly beloued country men’.[[724]](#footnote-724) In the first subsection of the *prosopopoeia*, previous arguments are developed at greater length and some strange claims are made, such as that Mary’s personal life is so painful that her only reason to live is to maintain the welfare of England, and that Englishmen had been about to be turned into peasants after the French manner before Mary came to their rescue.[[725]](#footnote-725) Christopherson’s subsequent paraphrase of Mary’s famous speech in the Guildhall is substantively similar to other surviving versions of the speech.[[726]](#footnote-726)

At this stage, Christopherson begins the most fascinating part of the book, his partisan history of the Reformation. In 1534, the evangelical preacher Thomas Swinnerton had written *A litel treatise ageynste the mutterynge of some papistis in corners*.[[727]](#footnote-727) Twenty years later, Christopherson pointedly turned the same phraseology against the reformers by arguing that their religion is ‘grounded only vpon the consent of a few in corners’.[[728]](#footnote-728) He asks how it can be taken seriously when it is scarcely two hundred years old, compared with Catholicism’s fifteen-hundred-year-old history. Readers are supplied with the threefold criteria from Vincent of Lérins’ *Commonitory* for judging the trueness of a religion: its antiquity, its universal reception, and its approval by the whole church.[[729]](#footnote-729) This fifth-century Gallic ecclesiastic was a favourite of Marian authors: John Proctor translated another of his works, which was printed on 22 October 1554.[[730]](#footnote-730) Vincent’s testimony is used by Christopherson to prove that truth is more important than wit and eloquence; and Wycliffe, Hus, Bucer, Bullinger and Calvin are compared unfavourably with the church fathers.[[731]](#footnote-731) Should we rather trust Irenius, he asks, who forsook his bishopric and life for the sake of the church, or Wycliffe, who forsook Christ because he could not win the bishopric of Worcester?[[732]](#footnote-732) Anything worthy that may be found in Protestant books has been taken from the ancient writers; for as Plautus wrote that old wine and old comedies are superior, so the same also holds true for theology.[[733]](#footnote-733) To prove that the new religion bears evil fruit, he uses England as a case study, which by the king’s ‘monstrouse’ supreme headship had been transformed unnaturally into a whole body instead of a single body part.[[734]](#footnote-734) He unpicks the vocabulary of the reformers, observing that they called each other ‘men of a good iudgement, which was a great commendation at that time’; and that a ‘watchword’ of theirs was to say ‘the lord saue vs’ instead of ‘our lord saue vs’, which beggars eventually caught on to as a way of obtaining more money from evangelicals, who were pleased to give aid to brothers in Christ.[[735]](#footnote-735)

The author shows an awareness of the Protestant literary campaign, referring by name to John Philpot’s *Trew report of the dysputacyon had and begonne in the convocacyon hows* (1554), published that very year in Emden, ‘wherin are scarcely two lines true together’.[[736]](#footnote-736) He also knows that there is an audience for this literature, the sort of men who continue to preach the 1552 communion service ‘in hucker mucker [in secret] agaynste the lawes of thys realme’.[[737]](#footnote-737) In case this sort should be tempted to raise another rebellion, Christopherson writes, they should bear in mind that rebellion for religion’s sake always fails, which is clear from the examples of Jan Hus, Jan van Leiden, the German peasants’ war, the Oldcastle revolt, and finally the ‘tragicall ende’ of Wyatt’s rebellion.[[738]](#footnote-738) Then, Christopherson prints a speech which was allegedly delivered by many of the rebels before their execution:

Good people, seyng that god for my most greuouse offence commytted agaynst the Quenes highnes hath thus worthely plaged me and punished me with this vile and shamefull death, I beseche you al for your owne sauegarde, learne by myne example euermore to beware of rebellion… And I praye God, that all Englyshe menne maye take hede by me and learne to obeye theyr Prince by mine example, and waxe wise throughe my folie.[[739]](#footnote-739)

This is entirely different from the speech recorded by the Tower chronicler which Wyatt was said to have made before his death.[[740]](#footnote-740) Possibly the government prepared separate speeches to be delivered by the rebel leaders and the rank-and-file, of whom no more than one hundred seem to have been executed.[[741]](#footnote-741) It was not uncommon for English traitors to recite a prepared script before their death, and their willingness to do so has been explained as the consequence of several probable factors including ‘coercion, the dread of a traitor’s death, family pressure and the agonies of imprisonment’.[[742]](#footnote-742)

After the speech, Christopherson returns to listing failed rebels and rebellions, from Jack Straw and Wat Tyler to the rebellions of 1536 and 1549.[[743]](#footnote-743) Recycling the statements of those before him, he claims that rebellion leads to the ravishing of wives and the threat of foreign conquest, although these old-hat arguments are spruced up with interesting proofs, such as that William the Conqueror had won England because it had in the eleventh century been thrall to sedition.[[744]](#footnote-744) He launches an *ominatio* based on Jeremiah 15, describing the evils that will befall the realm if rebellion reigns, and calls on nobles, gentlemen and magistrates to perform their duties in supressing rebellious subjects.[[745]](#footnote-745) Parents are exhorted to steer their children away from heresy, and masters to do the like with their apprentices.[[746]](#footnote-746) Christopherson concludes with a peroration whose theme is how subjects may imitate the queen in all respects, in order to confirm the saying that ‘such as the prince is, such are the people’.[[747]](#footnote-747) It is recommended that the prayers appended to the end of the tract are recited ‘daylye of all her faythful subiectes’.[[748]](#footnote-748)

These are the contents of Christopherson’s book; by whom was it designed to be read? The author appeals to a multiple implied audience of nobles, gentlemen, yeomen and commons. Each of these groups he singles out to explain the benefits they may draw from obedience and order.[[749]](#footnote-749) However, he appeals primarily to literate men in a position of authority. The complex arguments and frequent classical references suggest that Christopherson was less interested in making his work accessible to a general readership than Morison and Cheke had been; and moreover, despite the title, his work is less oratorical than equivalent works produced under the former kings. He refers to all readers and to himself with the repeated possessive adjective ‘our’, condemning ‘oure abhominable blasphemy’ and ‘oure wicked geastyng’, a notable act of diplomacy which avoids the finger-pointing nature of second-person pronouns.[[750]](#footnote-750) The book was evidently popular because the account book of an unknown Marian stationer records that he had made ‘ganes’, or profits, from selling copies of the book.[[751]](#footnote-751) Some surviving copies of the book are heavily annotated, such as the copy now in the Library of Congress, to which an enthusiastic reader of the sixteenth century added many brief notes, marking scores of passages with the word ‘notable’.[[752]](#footnote-752) The quantity of his annotations proves that it is not only modern historians who have read the book carefully, from cover to cover. In 1556, the polemicist Miles Huggarde directed his own readers to Christopherson’s book, writing that he need not rehearse examples of failed treasons since ‘mayster Iohn Christoferson deane of Norwith hath moste abundantly treated vpo[n] the same in a godly & lerned worke whiche he made, intitled: *An exhortacion against rebellion*’.[[753]](#footnote-753) Huggarde’s book was printed by Robert Caly, who also printed a pro-government historical account of Wyatt’s Rebellion in 1555; to this work we now turn.

John Proctor’s *Historie of Wyates Rebellion*

John Proctor’s first published work was an octavo book printed in 1549 entitled *The fal of the late Arrian*, which refuted the beliefs of an anonymous heretic who is usually identified with a priest named John Ashton.[[754]](#footnote-754) This work was to have an interesting afterlife because a handwritten excerpt from it, which was either discovered or planted among the papers of Thomas Kyd in 1593, was used by the authorities to incriminate Christopher Marlowe of atheism.[[755]](#footnote-755) Proctor’s *Historie of Wyates rebellion with the order and maner of resisting the same* was first printed on 22 December 1554 and again in a second edition on 10 January 1556.[[756]](#footnote-756) In 1808, it was attractively reprinted in a four-volume set of rare documents which is worth consulting, as few of the surviving 1554 or 1556 copies are completely legible.[[757]](#footnote-757) Since the pamphlet has been thoroughly analysed by Alan Bryson, it only remains here to tidy up some loose ends and to discuss a few aspects of the tract to which he gave little attention.[[758]](#footnote-758)

Firstly, the question of official involvement needs to be briefly revisited. Barrett L. Beer described Proctor’s *Historie* as ‘unadulterated government propaganda’ but he submitted no evidence in favour of this description.[[759]](#footnote-759) Bryson has wrongly implied that the phrase ‘Cum priuilegio ad imprimendum solum’ in the colophon means that the book was ‘granted a royal license’,[[760]](#footnote-760) when in fact, as Peter W. M. Blayney has shown, the phrase only meant that Caly had been granted a general royal privilege.[[761]](#footnote-761) All books were supposed to have been licensed before printing in England so there was no need for a special phrase to indicate this.[[762]](#footnote-762) Martin has proposed two arguments for there being a ‘good circumstantial case’ for the government’s involvement in Proctor’s book: that Proctor was called before the Council in April 1554, and that the author seems to have had access to official paperwork.[[763]](#footnote-763) We may add to the first argument that Sir Robert Southwell seems to have brought Proctor to the Council’s attention by mentioning his loyal assistance in a letter dated 24 February 1554.[[764]](#footnote-764) As for the second, Proctor may actually have acquired most of his sources personally in Kent,[[765]](#footnote-765) and his knowledge of events in London could just as well have been imparted by a well-informed observer as by the Council. Another piece of evidence which might suggest official involvement, however, is the role of Caly, who printed several pro-government including *A traictise declaryng and plainly prouyng, that the pretensed marriage of priestes, and professed persones, is no mariage* (1554), which was printed under the name of Gardiner’s client, Thomas Martin, although Bale claimed that its real author was Gardiner himself.[[766]](#footnote-766) Although there is no decisive evidence, it seems at least plausible that the Council commissioned or encouraged Proctor to write the pamphlet.

Proctor’s pamphlet is dedicated to the queen and addressed to ‘the louyng reader’. Unlike pamphlets in 1536, 1549 and 1569 which were partly designed for circulation in rebel camps while the crises were still ongoing, the *Historie* was written for an educated audience after the fact. One of Proctor’s purposes was to defend the Kentish gentry in general from being tarred with the same brush as the rebels, and for this reason his book remained popular with Kentishmen for over a century.[[767]](#footnote-767) For instance, a copy was owned by James Watts, rector of Burmarsh in the time of Charles II.[[768]](#footnote-768) And yet Proctor was not motivated solely by provincial pride. He also intended to ensure that any future rebellions would fail to win widespread support. One of the least remarked upon features of the pamphlet is that Proctor appended to it a pair of anti-sedition orations entitled ‘An earnest conference with the degenerates and seditious, for the searche of the cause of their greate disorder’ and ‘A Prosopey of Englande vnto the degenerat Englishe’. In these orations, Proctor addressed an implied audience of rebels in imitation of the methods of 1536 and 1549. He was presumably familiar with Cheke’s *Hurt of sedition* because he adopts unusual vocabulary from that pamphlet including the verb ‘broile’ and the adjective ‘bleared’.[[769]](#footnote-769) Edward Arber omitted these orations ‘for want of space’ when he printed the *Historie* in his collection of Tudor tracts,[[770]](#footnote-770) and Alan Bryson consigned himself to a summary of their arguments.[[771]](#footnote-771)

Although these orations are given separate titles, Proctor elegantly weaves them together by introducing the second at the close of the first. The first oration has a fairly strict classical structure although one not without its imperfections, such as that the sections which comprise the *confirmatio* lack clear definition so that the various arguments tend to bleed into each other, and that Proctor introduces main arguments which are absent from the *partitio*.[[772]](#footnote-772) Proctor begins, like Christopherson, by addressing his ‘louyng countremen’ but he promptly opens an apostrophe to speak to the rebel ‘degenerates’, who remain his imagined audience for the duration of the address.[[773]](#footnote-773) In the *refutatio*, Proctor follows Christopherson in identifying the main rebel grievance as the Spanish match and arguing that they intend to restore Protestantism in England.[[774]](#footnote-774) He refuses ‘to defende by argumentes (as a doubtfull matter) that [which] soo manye wise men haue allowed’, and yet he presents readers with convincing premises and repeatedly asks questions beginning with phrases such as ‘Coulde you require greater prouffe’, ‘Coulde you haue a greater euidence’ and ‘Could ye desire playner demonstration’.[[775]](#footnote-775)

The second oration has no overriding arrangement but is rather an extended *prosopopoeia* in which England addresses the rebels. The form of this oration suggests that Proctor was familiar with the work of his predecessor Richard Morison, whose *Lamentation* had included a paragraph-long *prosopopoeia* of the same nature. A very similar example may also be found in John Aylmer’s *Harborovve for faithfull and trevve subiectes* (1559).[[776]](#footnote-776) In January 1536, Proctor had been elected a scholar at Corpus Christi College, Oxford;[[777]](#footnote-777) and we may imagine him poring over Morison’s *Lamentation* with his fellow scholars when it came off the press in the autumn of that year, for it must have been exciting for men whose lives were largely devoted to the teaching and study of rhetoric, to see an administration willing to restore that art to the political importance it had enjoyed in ancient Rome. In the ‘Prosopey’, Proctor’s anthropomorphized England castigates rebels but the diction sounds a note more of despair than of rage. The tract opens with a vocative interjection and the figure of *epiplexis*: ‘O you seditious and degenerat, knowe you what you doe…?’[[778]](#footnote-778) The most serious reproach, an allusion to Christ’s interjection in Matthew 16:4, is followed immediately by a tender appeal: ‘O cursed and hellishe generation. I beseche you consider bothe me and youre selues…’ .[[779]](#footnote-779) Proctor’s England suggests that patriotism and obedience are inseparable, and implies, with the admonitory tone of a schoolmaster, that the rebels ‘newly imbraced learnyng’ must be no such thing if it leads to such ‘ungodly motions’.[[780]](#footnote-780) While these orations were written in the same tradition as Morison’s *Lamentation* and Cheke’s *Hurt of sedition*, their function was quite different because although they addressed an implied audience of rebels in the present tense, the reality was that Wyatt’s rebellion had been crushed months before. They still served a political purpose but this was to denounce rebellion in general rather than authentically dissuading men still in rebellion at the time of reading.

The books and pamphlets written by Cancellar, Christopherson and Proctor form an important part of the Tudor tradition of rhetorical counterinsurgency, and yet their form was different in some important respects to anything that had come before. While its structure marked it out as a straightforward Ciceronian oration, Christopherson’s *Exhortation* was also a big, scholarly book; and while Proctor wrote anti-sedition orations, these were appended to a well-researched historical narrative of the rising. That Catholic polemicists were self-conscious about the form of their printed works is clear from Miles Huggarde’s criticism of the ‘threehalfpennye bookes’ in which Protestant exiles set forth their arguments.[[781]](#footnote-781) While John Cheke’s readers in 1549 had been offered little more than fallacies and curses, Marian readers were treated seriously enough to be presented with extended factual information on subjects ranging from military strategy to the heredity of Philip of Spain. One reason for this was that Wyatt’s rebellion presented a different kind of challenge to those of the preceding decades.

Penry Williams has suggested that 1549 was a watershed in the history of English revolt, for the rebellions of that year were the last ‘large-scale protest movements’ until the Midland Revolt of 1607, while most later rebellions were ‘real struggles for power’.[[782]](#footnote-782) His distinction between these two classes of rebellion lacks clarity but he does observe more specifically that rebels of earlier years had produced lists of grievances which were absent from the rebellions of the latter half of the century.[[783]](#footnote-783) It is inaccurate to conclude, as Williams appears to have done, that a rebellion with a petition was a popular protest, whereas one without a petition must have been an aristocratic or gentlemen’s coup. Other popular rebellions failed to produce written grievances, such as the Amicable Grant rising of 1525.[[784]](#footnote-784) And it would be wrong to underplay the many similarities between the Pilgrimage of Grace, the Western rebellion and the Northern Rising (1569), which were conducted according to similar complaints and whose leaders used similar iconography. Still, a distinction should be drawn. As Michael Bush has explained, most serious rebellions between 1381 and 1549 were conducted within the genre of commons risings, where subjects from a range of social classes united, ostensibly at least, to protest against pressures on the commonwealth and mistreatment of the commons.[[785]](#footnote-785) Rebellions in this genre featured the drawing up of petitions, a ritual which was especially pronounced in 1536 and 1549.[[786]](#footnote-786)

Conversely, rebels in 1554 and 1569 relied solely on proclamations, to whose composition the commons were not permitted to contribute, either meaningfully or nominally. Although rebels had also used proclamations since the middle ages,[[787]](#footnote-787) the transition to an exclusive reliance on them was symbolic, for rebels shed the humility of the supplicant and ventured to replicate the devices of government. One explanation for why the medieval form of rebellion should have ended in 1549 is described by Richard Hoyle as ‘Wrightsonian Incorporation’.[[788]](#footnote-788) This concept, initially proposed by Keith Wrightson and developed by later scholars, is that by the late sixteenth century the English yeomanry, having come to associate themselves with the gentry rather than the commons, were therefore unlikely to organize revolts.[[789]](#footnote-789) Although this concept is widely accepted, we should bear in mind the cautionary qualifications made by Hoyle, who notes that the incorporation of the yeomen was more complicated than has been recognized, and that some of the weaknesses of Wrightson’s argument as developed by Andy Wood are that it is difficult to prove; that it ignores later developments, most obviously the civil war; and that there were other contributing factors to the end of the medieval tradition of revolt such as the new laws introduced to check disorder from around 1550.[[790]](#footnote-790) In any case, the commons featured less prominently in Wyatt’s rebellion as a political group, which helps to explain why the pamphleteers neglected them. The new form was to be short-lived, for when the Northern Rising flared up fifteen years later, loyalist authors reverted to the earlier, more simplistic methods of denouncing rebels.

Chapter 5

The Northern Rising, 1569

From January 1569, Mary, Queen of Scots was a state prisoner in the custody of the Earl of Shrewsbury, and her presence was an understandable concern to those who feared that she could serve as a rallying point for a rebellion against Elizabeth.[[791]](#footnote-791) Mary’s attempts to marry the Duke of Norfolk, a conservative aristocrat in his prime and at the height of his power, added insult to injury. Most alarmingly of all, Norfolk’s allies the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland staged a rebellion in 1569 under the banner of the five wounds of Christ.[[792]](#footnote-792) In towns across the north of England, many rallied to the earls’ cause, throwing down communion tables and burning Bibles and other official books. By acting in this manner, rebels followed the example of their predecessors in 1536 who had also burned Bibles and service books.[[793]](#footnote-793) The burning of the homily books was especially symbolic, since the first volume, completed in 1547 and reprinted frequently during Elizabeth’s reign, contained the official statement in favour of hierarchy and order entitled ‘An exhortacion to obedience’.[[794]](#footnote-794) After the rebellion had died down, the papacy added further fuel to the fire by issuing the infamous bull *Regnans in Excelsis* on 25 February 1570, which claimed to absolve English Catholics of their duty of obedience to Elizabeth. Once again, the government responded to this crisis by opening a channel of communication with the rebels, and by seeking to persuade the public more generally.

WilliamCecil had already been busy making contingency plans before the rebellion broke out. In March 1569, he had issued instructions to gentlemen and sheriffs across the country to muster soldiers in preparation for military conflict.[[795]](#footnote-795) Some of his thoughts may be read in a pessimistic but practical memorandum drawn up earlier in 1569 which is familiar to scholars, entitled ‘A short memoryall’.[[796]](#footnote-796) The first section of this document is a brainstorm of which Petrus Ramus would have been proud, in which Cecil laid out in diagrammatic form the perceived strengths of Mary, Queen of Scots in contrast with the weaknesses of Elizabeth. ‘The Q. of Scottes strength standeth’, he believed, ‘by the probable opinio[n] of a great multitude both in scotland and england’.[[797]](#footnote-797) This statement proves that Cecil was aware of the importance of public opinion and also suggests that he recognized the urgent need for what was described over a century ago (before Jürgen Habermas had even been born) as a ‘semi-publicity’ campaign against Mary.[[798]](#footnote-798) The outbreak of the Northern Rising had the effect of speeding up this work.

Additionally, it also triggered the production of pamphlets which were primarily designed to shut down mass rebellion, for Cecil was convinced that persuasion should be a major aspect of the official counterinsurgency strategy. These pamphlets were straightforward attempts to persuade the English people that rebellion was wrong, that Catholics were malevolent and that the Scottish queen was dangerous. Following contemporary nomenclature, historians have distinguished between two main groups of Catholics in Elizabethan England: church papists, who attended Protestant services, and recusants, who refused to do so.[[799]](#footnote-799) The pamphleteers of 1569-1572 did not specifically target any one of these groups, but rather aimed to persuade an implied general readership consisting of Protestants, church papists and recusants alike. Arguments presented by one’s own side can help to reinforce existing beliefs, at the same time as they aim to change the minds of the other party.

Peter Lake has argued that the anti-sedition pamphlets of this period ‘defended the regime not so much as it was, but rather as it should be’ and that they ‘operate almost as much as *sotto voce* criticism of the status quo as straightforward defences of it’.[[800]](#footnote-800) This argument rests on an implied conflict between a conservative queen and a Protestant regime pushing for further reform. While this picture has been drawn many times, most famously by Sir John Neale and his student Patrick Collinson, it is still a debatable one.[[801]](#footnote-801) It was invented in the 1560s by Catholic polemicists, who had good reason to present English policy as heresy forced on the queen by her councillors.[[802]](#footnote-802) As far as modern historians are concerned, it seems to rest mainly on the fact that Elizabeth intermittently displayed a candle and a silver crucifix in the Chapel Royal until the 1570s, and that she refused to abolish priestly vestments.[[803]](#footnote-803) There are some curious facts, such as Sir William Fitzwilliam’s testimony that Elizabeth and her nobles heard mass in the old form in the privy closet in 1558, before the queen returned to the privy chamber without taking the sacrament;[[804]](#footnote-804) but such events are thoroughly explained by the uniqueness of the changeover period between the death of Mary I and the finalization of Elizabeth’s religious settlement.

After all, Elizabeth is the ‘conservative queen’ who lamented in 1589, after the assassination of King Henry III of France, that Catholics wanted to retard the progress of ‘the true and evangelical religion’.[[805]](#footnote-805) To investigate the theory here would be too sharp a digression: suffice it to say that this particular banner does not stand upon a mountain of evidence. As Norman Jones has argued, Elizabeth wanted to make sure that religion was ‘edifying and reverential’, and this explains her unwillingness to interfere with features of established religion such as church vestments.[[806]](#footnote-806) In Elizabethan England, the government’s policy was by definition the queen’s policy, a rule which applies in every case where there is no strong evidence to the contrary, so Elizabeth and her secretary Cecil were in this sense ‘the front and rear legs of a pantomime horse’, as Collinson tended to doubt.[[807]](#footnote-807) While Stephen Alford for one has implied that Cecil steered the ship of state largely independently of Elizabeth in the 1560s, he did not take sufficient account of the distinction between the executive and advisory functions of the privy council: Elizabeth was indeed as apathetic towards paperwork as her predecessors had been, but this does not mean that she was not the well-spring of state policy.[[808]](#footnote-808)

Lake’s main point is that Norton was part of ‘a campaign to persuade Elizabeth to deal summarily with both the duke of Norfolk and with Mary Stuart’.[[809]](#footnote-809) He suggests that Elizabethan councillors arranged for the production of pamphlets in 1569-1570 to rally public opinion and thereby exert pressure on the queen herself. Other scholars have made similar claims about the function of Norton’s pamphlets.[[810]](#footnote-810) On the surface, such explanations are attractive, and obviously informed by modern politics. It would not be a great shock in England at present if a cabinet minister were to turn to the press after being unable to sway the prime minister in private. However, in an age before the advent of universal suffrage, referenda and legal protest, why would a minister raise popular support for a policy he personally preferred? He would hardly have brooked a rebellion; why not simply write a letter to the queen? He might, conceivably, have hoped to convince the queen that there was political consensus for a certain policy, but it is not entirely clear how pamphlets by an author in government service would have achieved this goal. The only other reason I can think of is that by sending an anonymous manuscript by unidentified courier to a printer, patrons would be able to conceal their involvement by two or three degrees of separation, and their identity would thus remain a secret if the printer were to be interrogated under oath – but even this is a stretch and it has nothing to do with getting the public on one’s side. If such practices were used, the plans were executed so well that no evidence has remained, so there can only be speculation. While it may be true that Elizabeth herself found popular propaganda distasteful, especially when it was directed against a fellow sovereign, there is no need to go quite as far as Lake does. If a work of persuasion was written by a privy councillor or a councillor’s client and addressed to a general readership, by the law of parsimony we can only assume that it was designed to convince English subjects. The further assumption that it did so in order to pressure the queen, while distantly possible, would need stronger evidence to stand up.

It is well known that Cecil and Elizabeth sometimes found themselves at cross purposes. In ‘A short memoryall’, Cecil complained frankly about the ‘boldnes growe[n] in the multitud of hir subiectes by hir Ma[ies]tes soft and remiss gou[er]nment’.[[811]](#footnote-811) A prepared statement of 6 October certainly suggests that Cecil found it necessary to persuade the queen to deal sternly with Mary and Norfolk, but not that he was unsuccessful in doing so.[[812]](#footnote-812) Since there is no indication that Norton’s pamphlets were written without the queen’s knowledge, the simplest explanation of their existence is that they were designed to promote government policy and to rid Englishmen of any sympathy with Mary’s cause. Cecil would hardly stir up popular disapproval of royal policy as the only way to cut through Elizabeth’s real or supposed stubbornness. Even if it were established that the Council organized the production of certain manuscript tracts or printed pamphlets behind Elizabeth’s back, another interpretive leap would still have to be made to arrive at the conclusion that they were written to force the queen’s hand. More probably, any misgivings Elizabeth might have had regarding anti-Marian polemic had dissolved upon the discovery of Norfolk’s plan to marry the Scottish queen in October. In the case of Thomas Norton, his relationship with Cecil suggests that his mid-Elizabethan pamphlets were more likely attempts to build consensus in public and in Parliament.[[813]](#footnote-813)

At St John’s College, Cambridge, Cecil had been a diligent student of John Cheke’s (we are told that he awoke at four o’clock every morning) with whom he shared the humanist conviction that rhetoric could take the sting out of sedition.[[814]](#footnote-814) Scholars have long recognized that Cecil commissioned propaganda in 1569, although they have usually failed to distinguish between conciliar and independent productions. Gerald Brenan wrote in 1902 that ‘crafty Cecil’ attempted to restore order in the north by ‘sending an army of hireling ballad-writers and hack pamphleteers to vilify the earls’, but that his methods were unsuccessful partly because the ballads were written in a southern dialect.[[815]](#footnote-815) We should be aware, however, that the printed works came in two distinct waves: firstly, there was a series of pamphlets apparently composed and printed at the behest of the Council, most of which were in circulation before the rebellion had been crushed; and then, from 1570-1572, there was an explosion of pamphlets and ballads, the majority of which were written after the rebellion had already ended in January 1570. The rising understandably continued to be a talking point long after its collapse: on 6 June 1570, a cobbler called Richard Wyatt was imprisoned in one of the London compters and then set on the pillory ‘for sclaunderous speches in favour of the rebelles’.[[816]](#footnote-816) Authors and booksellers reflected, and even capitalized on, continuing public interest in the rebellion. Most of the later works were unofficial, although two were of government origin. In terms of the sheer volume of publications, this explosion had no precedent in English literary history. The ballads were apparently popular throughout the country, for a Norwich bookseller named Robert Scott bought twenty-five copies of ballads on the subject of the Northern Rising.[[817]](#footnote-817)

To proceed to specifics, we shall now briefly describe the proclamations and counter-proclamations produced by loyalists and rebels, before turning to the longer works printed in response to the rebellion, assessing the evidence of conciliar involvement in their composition and discussing the arguments and rhetoric by which their authors sought to shape the opinions of the English people. After examining the first wave of literature, which consisted of two pamphlets written by Thomas Norton and a verse pamphlet probably written by William Seres, the chapter will proceed to analyse the two official compositions from the time of the second wave: an anonymous manuscript tract on the subject of the rebellion probably composed in 1572, and the famous *Homilie agaynst disobedience and wylful rebellion* (1570). It would of course be preferable to discuss everything, but for want of space, it seems wise to focus on those works which were most likely commissioned by the government. The ballads, for instance, will not be discussed in detail, mainly because there is no strong evidence that they were commissioned.[[818]](#footnote-818)

The pamphlets and ballads produced in the wake of the rebellion have received some scholarly attention. James K. Lowers’s study of polemical literature pertaining to the 1569 rebellion, written with students of literature in mind, is somewhat thin as a work of history but is commonly cited as the standard account.[[819]](#footnote-819) Also worth consulting is a short but interesting article by Daniela Busse, who calculated that in immediate response to the rebellion there were 22 ballads printed (11 of which survive) and 11 pamphlets or tracts (8 of which survive).[[820]](#footnote-820) My own count has turned up the slightly different figures of 22 ballads (12 of which survive), 6 verse pamphlets (all of which survive), 7 prose pamphlets (6 of which survive) and one surviving single-sheet prose work. Since Busse does not state her method of aggregation, the reasons for these discrepancies can only be guessed. The method used here was to count surviving printed pamphlets and single-sheet works directly on the theme of the Northern Rising printed between 1569-1572 which are listed in STC, and to add this figure to the number of entries in the Stationers’ Register within the same range of dates which refer to lost works whose titles leave no doubt that they treated directly of the same theme.[[821]](#footnote-821) Like the anti-sedition writings produced under Elizabeth’s predecessors, the pamphlets of 1569 to 1572 were not only overbearing condemnations but also public responses to the rebels.

Following the example of rebels in 1536, 1549 and 1554, Northumberland and Westmorland composed at least five proclamations to rally support. From the testimony of the loyalist Sir George Bowes, we know that the first was proclaimed at Durham Cathedral on 14 November, of which no copies have survived.[[822]](#footnote-822) According to the rebel Thomas Norton (not to be confused with the pamphleteer), this proclamation was penned at Brancepeth ‘by whome he knoweth not’.[[823]](#footnote-823) Although this lost proclamation is sometimes identified with the second proclamation, whose text does survive, it is probably a different document because, according to Bowes, the earls proclaimed at Durham that ‘no man, before theyr pleasur knowne, shuld use any servyce’, an injunction which appears in none of the proclamations whose texts have survived.[[824]](#footnote-824) The second proclamation was proclaimed at the ancestral seat of the Neville family, Staindrop, on 15 November.[[825]](#footnote-825) The Staindrop proclamation evidently had a wide circulation, for it even found its way to France, where it was printed in translation in 1570.[[826]](#footnote-826) The third was proclaimed at Darlington and Richmond on 16 November.[[827]](#footnote-827) The fourth may never have been proclaimed at all, for which reason we might prefer to avoid calling it a proclamation, but it is written in the same style as the other documents. ‘Nov. 28.’ is written on the verso side of one of the surviving copies of this ‘proclamation’ in a later hand; and on the copy forwarded by Derby to William Cecil, the recipient has jotted down ‘26 Nou[em]ber’.[[828]](#footnote-828) Bowes said that it was sent in written form to noblemen such as the Earl of Derby and Lord Mounteagle on 27 November, and this date is confirmed by a surviving copy of the letter from the rebel earls to Derby.[[829]](#footnote-829) The fifth surviving proclamation, proclaimed on 12 December and more specific than the rest, commanded the tenants of the Bishop of Durham to pay their overdue rents.[[830]](#footnote-830)

The Staindrop proclamation, addressed to the ‘trewe & faythful Subiectes… of the owld & Catholicke religion’, declared that the earls wanted to rid Elizabeth of evil councillors ‘by force’ and thereby ‘to see redresse of these thinges amysse, restouringe the awnciente customes & liberties toward the churche & this nobille realm’.[[831]](#footnote-831) The government replied to the rebel proclamations with proclamations of its own. On 24 November, the queen issued a highly rhetorical printed proclamation, claiming that although the earls had tried to deceive the government into thinking them obedient, ‘the fire of their treasons which they had covered was so great as it did newly burst out more flames’.[[832]](#footnote-832) Proclamations were also made in the north by the Earl of Sussex on 12 November, 19 November and 28 November.[[833]](#footnote-833) Moreover, two pamphlets by Thomas Norton were printed in direct response to this proclamation. In addition, there was a verse response probably composed by its printer William Seres.These were apparently distributed in the north, as will presently be seen, but they also had important propaganda value in London, where officials were apprehensive of the spread of sedition; in late November 1569, some commoners of the city were pilloried, whipped naked and imprisoned for ‘the openn speakinge of verye sedicious and rebellious wordes’.[[834]](#footnote-834)

The First Wave: Thomas Norton and William Seres

In the introduction to his *Orations of Arsanes agaynst Philip the trecherous kyng of Macedone* (1560), Thomas Norton had stressed the importance of obedience to one’s king and praised classical historians for having composed orations which fulfilled the true purpose of ‘eloquence in co[m]mon weale’, namely to apply knowledge ‘to the information[,] warning or advise of other’.[[835]](#footnote-835) Putting this principle into practice, he used the occasion of the Northern Rising as an opportunity to serve the cause of the government, although we may suppose that he was also conscious of the opportunity to boost his literary career. Tacitus wrote in the *Dialogue on Orators* (*c*. 102) that rhetoric ‘comes to the front more readily in times of trouble and unrest’; and Cicero’s oratory, Tacitus reminds us, shone most brightly in his condemnations of criminals like Catiline.[[836]](#footnote-836) Like Cicero, Norton tempered the sword of eloquence in the fire of political crisis.

Member of Parliament and man of letters, Norton had received an education not unlike that of his literary predecessors Richard Morison, John Cheke and John Christopherson. He had studied at Michaelhouse, Cambridge from 1544 to around 1550, and later, from 1555, at the Inner Temple.[[837]](#footnote-837) From 1550, or possibly earlier, Norton had also worked in the household of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset.[[838]](#footnote-838) Historians have disagreed fundamentally on how to define this complex man. To Sir John Neale he was a parliamentary puritan but to Michael Graves and Geoffrey Elton he was a ‘man of business’ doing the Council’s work. Patrick Collinson and Thomas Freeman, while largely agreeing with the revisionists, have more recently reasserted that Norton was somewhat of an independent puritan after all.[[839]](#footnote-839) I would tend to side with the Graves-Elton view, since Norton expressed his opinions not only in Parliament and print but also in white papers drawn up for the private information of councillors.[[840]](#footnote-840) What is clear is that from an early stage Norton had accepted the humanist ideal of applying learning to the service of the state.

How did Norton conceive of the function of anti-sedition oratory? In Act V, scene i of *Gorboduc*, a play co-written by Norton, Eubulus, the secretary to the king who resembles Cecil in some respects, suggests that rhetoric ought to be used to drive a wedge between rebel leaders and the rank and file:

Let us therefore use this for present help:  
 Persuade by gentle speech, and offer grace…  
 This shall, I think, scatter the greatest part…  
 When this is once proclaimed, it shall make  
 The captains to mistrust the multitude  
 Whose safety bids them to betray their heads…[[841]](#footnote-841)

Scholars usually assume that this act was written by Thomas Sackville purely because the title page of the 1565 edition says so, but there are obvious problems in trusting the authority of a pirated quarto.[[842]](#footnote-842) In any case, it is good to be aware of this piece of theorizing about rhetoric and anti-sedition which would have been intimately familiar to Norton, even if it cannot be taken as his last word on the subject.

As already mentioned, Norton wrote two pamphlets in direct response to the 1569 rebellion. In 1570, three more of his anti-Catholic pamphlets were printed (which were written in response to the papal bull) and all five were subsequently stitched together as a convenient ‘nonce collection’, the bibliographer’s term for a re-issued compilation of various existing editions under a new title page.[[843]](#footnote-843) The editors of STC suggest that this compilation was issued in 1570, adding a full stop to this supplied date, which according to the conventions of STC means that ‘there is virtually no doubt’ that it is correct.[[844]](#footnote-844) However, it is difficult to see what evidence the editors found to be so sure, since the only apparent evidence of its issue date is the phrase ‘lately published’ in the new general title. Whether it was issued in late 1570 or early 1571, after which point the word ‘lately’ would have started to become stretched, this collection would have been a useful way for MPs, who were arriving in London for the Parliament which had been summoned on 17 February 1571 and which assembled on 2 April, to read up on the issues of the day. The pamphlets may conceivably (although there is no proof) have been sold in York by the stationer Anthony Foster, whose business was apparently well-established by 1571.[[845]](#footnote-845) Norton’s anti-sedition pamphlets were clearly authorized since both of their titles include the phrase ‘Seen and allowed according to the Queenes iniunctions’.[[846]](#footnote-846) This phrase meant that the pamphlets had been expressly licensed by either the queen herself, six of her privy councillors, the archbishops of Canterbury and York, or the bishop of London.[[847]](#footnote-847)

It is often said that Norton wrote another octavo pamphlet entitled *A discourse touching the pretended match betwene the Duke of Norfolke and the Queene of Scottes*.[[848]](#footnote-848) The date of this pamphlet’s composition or printing is unknown but it must have been in print before 15 March 1570, the date of a manuscript response whose author says he has read the *Discourse* in print.[[849]](#footnote-849) The pamphlet is variously attributed to Thomas Norton, Thomas Sampson and Francis Walsingham. The attribution to Sampson, the puritan divine, seems to have originated in the eighteenth century and I can find no support for it.[[850]](#footnote-850) Graves assumes that Norton was the author without explaining why.[[851]](#footnote-851) Derek Wilson claimed that he was correcting a common error when he attributed it to Norton rather than Francis Walsingham without providing evidence.[[852]](#footnote-852) However, although the *Discourse* went through three printed editions and has survived in at least three manuscript versions, not one of these documents bears the name of Norton.[[853]](#footnote-853) One of the manuscripts does, on the other hand, credit the pamphlet to Walsingham, who was not yet a councillor at this time.[[854]](#footnote-854) Although a manuscript attribution does not constitute an unassailable case for Walsingham’s authorship, it is certainly weightier than the evidence for Norton’s, which is virtually nil. The unadorned style of the pamphlet makes it dissimilar to most of Norton’s other compositions, although he did compose such tracts as ‘Some lynkes of the chaine of treasones’ which err on the side of plainness.[[855]](#footnote-855) Lake’s evidence for assuming Norton as author is that the *Discourse* was ‘included in Day’s 1570 collection of tracts allegedly written by Norton’.[[856]](#footnote-856) However, neither of the two surviving copies of this collection contains the *Discourse*.[[857]](#footnote-857) Perhaps Lake was guided, like Graves before him, by the fact that one of the two surviving copies of *All such treatises* was bound at a later date with the *Discourse*,[[858]](#footnote-858) or that some collectors made their own Sammelbände containing Norton’s pamphlets along with the *Discourse* and writings by other authors.[[859]](#footnote-859) In the late eighteenth century, William Herbert claimed to own a printed copy of the *Discourse* which contained the following note ‘in ancient MS.’: ‘Don by M. Norton, the first thing that ever he did, 1570’.[[860]](#footnote-860) We should not be too willing to trust this anonymous comment since its author got the facts wrong: if it was Norton’s first polemical pamphlet, it must have been printed in 1569 because we know that another of his pamphlets came out in that year; and in any case *Gorboduc* had been printed in 1565. Unless any more evidence comes to light, we cannot say with any confidence that Norton wrote the *Discourse*, although it is possible, and the first printed polemical work he definitely wrote was *To the Quenes Subiects*.

I

Lowers spares only one short paragraph to summarize the contents of Norton’s *To the Quenes Subiects* and makes only several brief references to it thereafter.[[861]](#footnote-861) It deserves closer attention, being the only original prose oration against sedition which circulated before the rebellion was over. The pamphlet seems to have been registered with the Stationers’ Company on 1 January or thereabouts because it was entered into the Register flanked by ballads celebrating the new year.[[862]](#footnote-862) However, it was evidently distributed before registration. Sir Henry Neville, gentleman of the privy chamber, seems to have read Norton’s pamphlet before 12 December. In a letter of this date addressed to Cecil from the Tower of London, where he was keeping the Duke of Norfolk prisoner, Neville wrote that ‘theris here a very prety book set owt derected vnto the rebels w[hic]h I shewyd vnto the duke who lyks it not in som few placys forthat he thynks he meanes by hym som part of his wrytyng’.[[863]](#footnote-863) From the description, this could only refer to Norton’s pamphlet or to the metrical *Aunswere to the proclamation of the rebels in the north 1569*. Since there was only one edition of the latter, which was not entered into the Register until around Christmas time, it seems that Norton’s is the pamphlet referred to.

Henry Bynneman was its printer rather than the more likely candidate John Day, who was both Cecil’s client and Norton’s friend.[[864]](#footnote-864) Elizabeth Evenden suggests that this was because Day was too busy printing the first edition of Foxe’s *Actes and Monuments* at the time.[[865]](#footnote-865) In any case, Bynneman had recently shown himself a capable servant of the government when he had been commissioned to print an advertisement for the first national lottery in 1567.[[866]](#footnote-866) There are four surviving editions of Norton’s pamphlet with some variations on the wording of the title, all of which were printed in 1569 or by March 1570 at the latest.[[867]](#footnote-867) Three of these editions are octavo pamphlets and the other (STC 18680) is an octavo in fours. One of the editions describes itself as ‘newly perused and encreased’ but its text is virtually identical to the other editions, apart from an expanded set of marginal notes.[[868]](#footnote-868) The text of this revised edition was that which became incorporated into the nonce-collection. STC 18681 was the first edition and also, one might assume, the one sent to rebels in the North. For one thing, it is a very plain pamphlet, not the sort of thing one would expect to sell. It is also the only edition which did not identify the author’s name, just as Morison’s *Lamentation* and Cheke’s *Hurt of sedition* had been addressed to rebels anonymously in 1536 and 1549. Tara Lyons has made some interesting surmises about the potentially lucrative nature of Norton’s pamphlets. She argues that printing *To the Quenes Subiects* must have been ‘good business’ for Lucas Harrison and Henry Bynneman because there were so many editions in just two months.[[869]](#footnote-869)

Aside from being good business, the pamphlet also served a crucial political purpose. Natalie Mears has warned us not to conclude automatically that Elizabethan men of business were ‘council stooges’, but is there is evidence that Norton’s anti-sedition pamphlets were commissioned.[[870]](#footnote-870) In 1961, Conyers Read discussed the difficulties of assigning Elizabethan pamphlets to government initiatives before noting that certain pamphlets could have been discreetly sponsored by the Council, and that Norton’s*To the Quenes Subiects* was ‘officially inspired’.[[871]](#footnote-871) More recently, Peter Lake used several tiers of qualification when he wrote that Norton’s pamphlets of 1569 and 1570 were ‘something like (pseudo-)official propaganda’.[[872]](#footnote-872) Busse has claimed more plainly that Norton is ‘a good example of how writers were used by government for propaganda purposes’, for which conclusion she seems to rely on the work of Graves.[[873]](#footnote-873) In his 1994 biography of Norton, Graves wrote that ‘it would not have been possible for a freelance writer to have organized the printing and distribution in such a short space of time without official assistance’.[[874]](#footnote-874) This argument relies on the assumption that Norton’s pamphlet circulated among the rebels, for which the evidence is a statement made by Norton himself while imprisoned in 1582: ‘The little treatise I wrote in the rebellion was among the rebelles, and I have heard it did good service’.[[875]](#footnote-875) Graves’s argument may also be strengthened by the fact that Cheke’s *Hurt of sedition* was reprinted on 14 December 1569 by Seres[[876]](#footnote-876) and that Norton made a direct reference to it:

Reade (I beseech you) the excellent treatis of sir John Cheke Knight, of the Hurt of sedition, there see as in a glasse, the deformitie of your faulte, learne to wype away those spots that haue so fowly arrayed you…[[877]](#footnote-877)

Norton probably did not expect readers, whether inside or outside the rebel camps, to have had a copy of a twenty-year-old pro-government pamphlet to hand unless he had been aware of plans to circulate newly printed copies.[[878]](#footnote-878) Norton also instructed the rebels to ‘beleeue the Queenes Maiestie her selfe speaking in her Proclamations’.[[879]](#footnote-879) It thus seems likely that the Council sponsored the production of Norton’s pamphlet along with the reprinting of Cheke’s as part of a deliberate campaign of persuasion.[[880]](#footnote-880) That is, unless London printers and booksellers had made the arrangements themselves, have-a-go heroes in defence of the commonwealth, or else vultures hoping to use what could have been the greatest domestic crisis of late Tudor England as an opportunity to sell more books. Incidentally, Seres’s reprint of the *Hurt of Sedition* proved to be enduringly popular with defenders of the monarchy, such as the royalist divine Lionel Gatford (*d*. 1665) who owned a copy in which he proudly wrote his own name under the printer’s.[[881]](#footnote-881)

Another reason to suspect official involvement is the privileged information to which Norton had access. It is doubtful that Norton could have known that the rebels had desecrated communion tables at Durham and elsewhere unless he had seen the letters of 15 and 17 November from Sussex to the queen and the Council.[[882]](#footnote-882) Even more importantly, in an unpublished document entitled ‘A declaration of the queen’s proceedings since her reign’, which was co-written by Cecil and Elizabeth herself in January 1570, the authors almost certainly allude to Norton’s pamphlet.[[883]](#footnote-883) They write that during the rebellion ‘the vulgar and common sort’ were reminded of Elizabeth’s good government, and that this strategy ‘did so work universally in all other parts of our realm by proof of the constancy and willing service of all the rest of our subjects, both noble and others, saving only that small portion which our rebels occupied by force’.[[884]](#footnote-884) The policy of dissuasion was so effective because ‘there was good proof made… of the readiness of all the other of our subjects to serve us with their lives against that small portion of the rest that were stirred to rebel’.[[885]](#footnote-885) None of the persuasive proclamations contain any passages which fit this description but Norton’s pamphlet does: in the peroration he tells the rebels that ‘the whole number of her highnesse true subiects [is] ready to die vpon you’ and he asks them: ‘Trow you this match be wel made? a corner against a Realme…?’[[886]](#footnote-886) With all of this evidence, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Norton’s pamphlets were commissioned by Cecil, and that the queen was aware of their contents. The government’s unwillingness to advertise its involvement with Norton’s propaganda while the rebellion was ongoing is hardly surprising. As in 1536, it would have been advantageous to package some pamphlets as royal communication and others as ostensibly private persuasions. Norton certainly emphasized his authorial persona as a benevolent third party: ‘The considering of these your perils, with much compassion… hath moued me to write vnto you.’[[887]](#footnote-887)

Norton’s exhortation resembles orations made before popular assemblies in Republican Rome in its combination of *auctoritas* with a profession of care for the good of the people.[[888]](#footnote-888) He stresses that he is addressing the commons to save them from their inevitable failure and execution, not because they pose any real threat to the state. He tries to minimize the danger of representing his audience as politically active citizens by ridiculing them at every opportunity; for instance, their rebel meetings are sarcastically described as a ‘noble Parlement & Conuocation’.[[889]](#footnote-889) Although he engages in a political dialogue with the rebellious commons, he exploits his rhetorical high-ground to shut down popular political participation rather than welcoming it. The title of the pamphlet indicates its intention and procedure clearly enough. Norton presents the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland as the real villains while their followers are rebuked mainly for their ignorance. Norton tellingly describes popular participation in the rebellion in the passive voice: ‘drawen into rebellion’, thereby partially divesting the common rebels of responsibility.

The structure of the oration may be summarized thus: an exordium (sigs. A2r-A3r); a *partitio* (sig. A3v); an examination of the true causes of the rebellion (sigs. A3v-B1v); a rebuttal of the Staindrop proclamation (B1v-F2v), including a defence of Queen Elizabeth (B3v-B4r), a denunciation of papistry as necessarily antithetical to obedience (B4r-B4v), a defence of nobility (C2r-C2v) and a defence of the Council (C3r-C4r), a description of the earls’ disorderly conduct (C4r-E2v), a recommendation of harsh reprisals against the rebels (E2v), claims that the other counties will remain loyal (E3r-E3v), a defence of the Reformation (E3v-E4v), a discussion of the rebel claim that strangers will be liable to invade (E4v-F2v); a passage of epideictic rhetoric against the earls’ character (F3r-G1r), a discussion of the gravity of the rebels’ sin and the impossibility of their success (G1v-G3v) and finally a peroration (G3v-G4v). Norton’s oration hits the classically defined middle style, but he makes liberal use of colloquialisms, describing the rebel Thomas Markenfield as a ‘runneaway with a yong wild braine tickled to see fashions’.[[890]](#footnote-890) There is a solitary Latin phrase in the oration in the form of a quotation from Terence, ‘Hinc illae lacrimae’ (‘hence those tears’), which Norton uses to suggest that women who call for an end to clerical marriage would like to be priests’ whores.[[891]](#footnote-891)

Norton lifts some arguments from Sussex’s proclamation of 28 November, such as the observation that no nobleman had died during Elizabeth’s reign.[[892]](#footnote-892) The Pauline equation of obedience to God and obedience to civil authorities, based on Romans 13: 2, popularized by Luther and a favourite argument of English obedience theorists from Tyndale on, also finds its inevitable way into Norton’s text: to rebel, he writes, is ‘to resist the ordinance of almightie GOD’.[[893]](#footnote-893) The language of the Gospel infuses certain passages of the oration, such as the instruction to ‘discerne the tree by the frutes’ (from Matthew 7:16),[[894]](#footnote-894) but Norton does not make a practice of quoting directly from Biblical passages or invoking Biblical authorities to support his arguments, for possibly he supposed that Biblical verses quoted in the vernacular would carry little weight with rebels who had burned the English Bible. Similarly, Norton does not appeal to classical authorities, a logical decision since he addresses the commons, although he makes a single, conspicuous reference to Catiline and his co-conspirators.[[895]](#footnote-895) In the place of a more scholarly marginal note, Norton or his printer decided to include the following passage in the revised edition, printed alongside Norton’s discussion of clerical marriage: ‘Shrift was a shrewd pick lock to womens chamber dores, and Lent was lewd preestes haruest to store them of harlots for all the yeare after.’[[896]](#footnote-896) This note was one of the minor additions for which the book was called ‘newly perused and encreased’. Norton appeals in one passage to English history in a highly compressed form, where he rapidly describes the evil influence of the papacy from the reign of John to the reign of Mary I.[[897]](#footnote-897)

The author’s conception of the causes of rebellion in this pamphlet is rather simpler to that of his later *Warning*. As he says, the rebels have been tricked by ‘other mens words and writing’, and so, consequently, he wishes to present them with his own ‘pore cou[n]sel’ to bring them back to obedience.[[898]](#footnote-898) The implication is that he is competing with the rebellious earls in a rhetorical persuasion contest to win the allegiance of the generality, a conception familiar to us, for instance, from act 3, scene 2 of Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*, where Brutus and Antony compete to sway the popular opinion in their own favour. Norton’s exordium begins with one of those winding, hypotactic sentences which were a staple of early modern prose:

Albeit I knowe not by what name wel to call you, sithens you have lost the iuste name of Englishmen by disturbing the common peace of Englande, with cruell inuasion and spoile lyke enimies: and the Quéenes Subiects you can not well be named, hauing throwne away your due submission and obedience…[[899]](#footnote-899)

This sentence resembles a passage from Thomas Wilson’s *Arte of rhetorique* (1553), where in the section on *dubitacio*, or doubtfulness, the author wrote that we may use this figure to ‘make the hearers beleue, that the weight of our matter causeth us to doubte, what were best to speake’, and illustrated it thus:

As when a kyng findeth his people unfaithfull, he maie speake in this wise. Before I begin, I doubt what to name ye. Shal I call you subiectes? You deserue it not. My frendes ye are not. To cal you enemies wer ouerlitle, because your offence is so greate. Rebelles you are, and yet that name doeth not fully vtter your folie. Traitors I maie call you, and yet you are worse than traitors…[[900]](#footnote-900)

Either Norton had turned to Wilson’s textbook for inspiration, or else both authors had used the same classical source: Tacitus’ *Annals* attributes a very similar passage of *ratiocinatio* to the general Germanicus, who denounced the German mutineers in AD 14.[[901]](#footnote-901) At length, Norton settles on calling his audience ‘traitors and rebells’, but he stresses that this phrase is only a description of their present state; for, switching to the perfect tense, he reminds them that they ‘haue ben… Englishmen… subiects… Christian men’.[[902]](#footnote-902) Norton then omits the second part of the Ciceronian arrangement, a statement of facts, which is in line with the principle, advised for instance by Melancthon, that *narratio* is seldom necessary in deliberative orations.[[903]](#footnote-903) Instead, he moves straight on to the division of the argument, which is framed in an imperative sentence beginning with ‘Call I pray you to remembrance’.[[904]](#footnote-904) The beginning of the first section is indicated in all editions but the first with a marginal note which reads: ‘Their cause and intent’.[[905]](#footnote-905) The switch to a third-person pronoun sets up a curious bibliographical pecking order, where the text itself is addressed to rebels but the apparatus is addressed to an unspecified third party, perhaps those concerned with crushing the rebellion. In this part, Norton introduces a second division, summarizing the nine or so arguments (depending on how they are separated) extracted from the Staindrop proclamation which are to be rebutted.[[906]](#footnote-906)

Most of the pamphlet is given up to a rebuttal of these arguments and he does not return to the second and third points of his initial division until near the end of his oration. The structure of the argument, in other words, is driven predominantly by *confutatio* so we cannot accuse him of failing to consider opposing views, although at times the logical calibre of his refutations leaves much to be desired. This approach affords Norton several moments of critical brilliance during which he shows a playful sensitivity of verbal nuance, but the drawback is that the orator seems constantly to be on the defensive. He detects coded treason in the rebels’ use of the phrase ‘God saue the Quéene’ in their proclamations, suggesting that their actions ‘haue plainly shewed it is not our quéene, Quéene Elizabeth that they meane’.[[907]](#footnote-907) Likewise, he mischievously reads an adjective in the rebel proclamation as an adverb so he can misconstrue their meaning: he suggests that when they say ‘they rise to redresse thinges amisse’, they mean ‘not things amisse to be redressed, but things to be amisse redressed’.[[908]](#footnote-908) Norton never admits that the rebel arguments have even a modicum of validity but he does present readers with one interesting hypothetical: ‘And yet if errors had ben taught, this is not the way to come to amendement.’[[909]](#footnote-909)

Like many propagandists before him, Norton defends council policy not by insisting on royal prerogative but by reminding the rebels that the Elizabethan settlement was enacted with the consent of both houses of Parliament:

Make they any laws, require they any Subsidies, do they the greatest thinges, without assent of the whole Realme, your owne assent by your deputies & burgeses, yea your owne forsworne captains, in open parliament, wherunto her Maiesties assent is had?[[910]](#footnote-910)

This is a far cry from Tudor absolutism, to put it mildly. Once again, this passage seems more like an incipient expression of the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty, for saying that all important decisions have been authorized by Parliament is only one step away from agreeing that all important decisions *must* be authorized by Parliament.

Towards the end of the pamphlet, when he comes to describe the rebel leaders, he switches from deliberative to epideictic rhetoric to condemn them with astonishing intemperance before an implied audience of the commons. Westmorland is described as ‘a very euill chosen chastiser of disordered life’ who is unfit to judge matters of religion.[[911]](#footnote-911) Northumberland receives the brunt of the verbal onslaught, a man of ‘no credit, no wisdome nor gouernaunce, no abilitie, no vertue’, whom none of the common rebels ‘(as mad as ye be) would priuately trust with ordering of a mean houshold’, let alone the government of the whole realm.[[912]](#footnote-912) Norton tries to stop this invective from inspiring general disrespect for nobility by making a distinction between men who are ‘noble’ and those who are merely ‘notable’.[[913]](#footnote-913) This point was picked up in another response to the Staindrop proclamation, where the rebel nobility are described as ‘noble well by name, / but farre from noble harts’.[[914]](#footnote-914) In the spirit of Morison’s *Remedy* of 1536, Norton suggests that regardless of the illustriousness of one’s ancestors, a man may only be judged noble if he is honourable and virtuous.[[915]](#footnote-915) He tries to balance a promotion of the social order with a criticism of the unqualified loyalty shown to local magnates which in the North appeared to have overridden loyalty to the queen. Thus, he says that while bonds of kinship and fealty are admirable ‘in all honest quarels’, they are ‘no causes at all to draw any man to stand with any man in rebellions and treasons’.[[916]](#footnote-916) Elsewhere, he deliberately appropriates an image of chivalric honour, claiming that the earls ‘haue put on a visour of great vertue’ to mask their nefarious intent.[[917]](#footnote-917)

Just before the peroration comes the most thrilling piece of writing in the pamphlet. Norton presents two images to his audience, the first depicting a weak, poorly equipped, disorganized rout of rebels with nowhere to escape; and the second depicting a terrible alliance of ‘God the Lord of hostes’ and the queen’s armies ‘infinitely exceeding your petit multitude’.[[918]](#footnote-918) Scholars often point out that the Tudor state relied on persuasion because it had no standing army, but it did have an *armoury*, founded by Henry VIII at Greenwich. Norton warns the rebels that Elizabeth has ‘so great store as neuer had any of her auncesters, weapon, armure, shot, pouder, & all sorte of munition’.[[919]](#footnote-919) Indeed, from 28 November, the city of London had also taken the initiative to make preparations of its own, ordering the chamberlain to ‘repaire the cities gownes [guns] and put them in a redines and... provide gonne powder and shott in a redines to serve as occasione shall require’.[[920]](#footnote-920) Norton was making no idle threat; his warning was very real. Finally, in the peroration, after threatening the rebels with death and hell, Norton changes tack and holds out the hope of mercy both secular and divine, if the rebels deliver their leaders to the Crown and surrender.[[921]](#footnote-921)

It is interesting to realize that Norton’s implied readership consists both of Catholics, who were the group who presumably needed to be convinced above all others, and of committed Protestants. He rallies the latter group by condemning ‘the treason of Popish Religion’, while to the former group he extols the virtues of Protestantism by indicating that it is Bible-based: ‘If you will haue the Religion of Christ, I hope you will best beleve himselfe to tell you what it is.’[[922]](#footnote-922) Whatever one thinks of Lake’s theories about early modern pamphlets, *To the Quenes subiectes* was designed to influence not the queen but the people. The only policy recommendation in the entire pamphlet, which comes at the end of Norton’s defence of the nobility, is that the queen should not deal too kindly with the rebels once she defeats them.[[923]](#footnote-923) Although this passage is important as evidence of state-sponsored lobbying, it would be inaccurate to describe *To the Quenes Subiectes* as a piece of counsel or social critique, as if the whole tract were written for the sake of this sentence alone. In fact, Norton’s brief petition is performing two duties because it doubles up as a threat to the rebels, warning them not to expect leniency if they refuse to come to order. Norton’s second pamphlet, however, contains rather a lot more policy suggestions; what are we to make of them?

II

It should be recognized that Norton’s two pamphlets in response to the rebellion were written to serve different purposes in distinct literary modes. This fact has never been sufficiently understood: even Strype claimed that Norton’s *Warning* ‘seconded’ the first pamphlet.[[924]](#footnote-924) While *To the Quenes Subiects* is an anti-sedition oration addressed primarily to rebels, the *Warning* is a treatise primarily addressed to policy makers. In writing this two-part set, Norton seems to have consciously followed the example of Morison, who had likewise published both a popular anti-sedition oration and a diagnosis piece in 1536. The *Warning* was printed by John Day in two undated editions, both octavos in fours. The first edition seems to have been printed either late in 1569 or in the early months of 1570, followed by a reissue containing the phrase ‘Sene and allowed’ on the title page.[[925]](#footnote-925) The reissue was intended to be ‘solde in Paules churchyarde at the signe of the Crane’.[[926]](#footnote-926) A second, ‘newly perused’ edition followed shortly thereafter.[[927]](#footnote-927) At least some of the editions seem to have been printed in 1570, since the title was entered into the Stationers’ Register after epitaphs for William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, who died on 17 March 1570.[[928]](#footnote-928) While the *Warning* was designed to condemn sedition and defend harsh reprisals against the Northern rebels, its additional purpose was to promote stricter measures against Catholics and to rally the people against the queen of Scots, for, Norton writes, ‘what soeuer shinyng thyng they wold set vp’ in place of Elizabeth ‘is no right Sunne, but an vnlucky Comete’.[[929]](#footnote-929) The key point, repeated again and again, is that all papists are traitors; and faithful subjects, Norton writes, should watch out because Catholics ‘note euery one of vs with theyr eyes and register vs to be destroyed’.[[930]](#footnote-930) He does, however, admit that some Catholics may be loyal to the queen; this is the same strategy which he later followed in the paper ‘For discouery of vnsownd subiects towardes the Quene’.[[931]](#footnote-931)

In his historical account of English rebellions, Norton notices continuities between the Pilgrimage of Grace and the Northern Rising, suggesting that, due to Henry VIII’s clemency, some of the rebels of 1536 ‘haue lived to this day to raise a new rebellion’.[[932]](#footnote-932) He writes that Catholics also stirred up revolt in the reign of Edward VI, and that rebels had ‘endangered… the Realme and the Quéenes owne person in her sisters time’.[[933]](#footnote-933) This statement is a clever way of skirting over the fact that Protestants were involved in Wyatt’s rebellion because it is sufficiently vague to bear multiple interpretations: it could mean that Wyatt’s rebels endangered Elizabeth by associating her with their rebellion, or even that Mary’s government consisted of rebels against Lady Jane Grey. He supposes that men who oppose Elizabeth’s ecclesiastical supremacy must wish to transfer it to the Pope, for he is convinced that English subjects must have thoroughly absorbed the correspondence arguments drummed into their heads through government propaganda: ‘I am sure that after so many parables and examples of bees and beastes and other thynges, they will not now haue any particular church hedlesse and desititute of a supreme gouernor’.[[934]](#footnote-934) He condemns men of a contrary disposition who, ‘like kestrelles or troutes… euer flye agaynst the wynde, or swimme agaynst the streame, in queene Maryes time great Gospellers, now great Papistes’.[[935]](#footnote-935) Conversely, he also attacks nicodemites such as Gardiner, Bonner and Tunstall, who hide their true allegiance for the sake of political expediency, comparing them to pirates who deceitfully display false flags of various countries to pass by in peace.[[936]](#footnote-936)

Next, Norton considers the actions of the Northern rebels in more detail, analysing the clauses of the Staindrop proclamation to demonstrate their evil intent.[[937]](#footnote-937) He refers to Stephen Gardiner’s sermon delivered on 2 December 1554 at Paul’s Cross, in which he had publicly renounced De vera obedientia and, according to Norton, had dressed up the Catholic rebellions of 1536 and 1549 ‘with cleanly names, as enterprises and assemblies, as our late rebels doo in both their first and second proclamations’.[[938]](#footnote-938) He presumably has in mind the Staindrop proclamation and the fourth proclamation, which are the only proclamations which contain such language.[[939]](#footnote-939) The rebels had said in the Staindrop proclamation that if they did not restore the true faith, then foreigners would do it for them, and Norton reads this as a coded way of celebrating the idea of ‘strangers coming to inuade and destroy the realme’.[[940]](#footnote-940) Norton recommends that to perceive the cruelty of papists, readers ought to consult Foxe’s *Actes and Monumentes*, printed by John Day in 1563 and reprinted in the same year as the *Warning*,[[941]](#footnote-941) ‘where as in a glasse doth euidently appeare what nature... reigned or rather remayned in the furious hartes of Papistes, how smothly soeuer the hypocrites wyth Crocodiles teares or wild Irish laughter, do faine, flatter and abuse those in whose power they be’.[[942]](#footnote-942) Although Norton’s second pamphlet shows an awareness of the Northern rebels’ methods of legitimising rebellion against the queen, rebutting their arguments is not his primary purpose. It should be read in the context of both the Northern Rebellion and the Mary Stuart affair, both of which made it advisable for Cecil to sponsor the production of opinion-forming pamphlets to minimize the likelihood of dissent. Both pamphlets were carefully read either by Elizabethans or later readers, judging by the amount of underlining and marginalia in some of the surviving copies.[[943]](#footnote-943)

III

Aside from Norton’s pamphlets, one other significant work from the first wave of anti-sedition literature deserves our attention. An octavo pamphlet entitled *An aunswere to the proclamation of the rebels in the north. 1569* was printed by William Seres, who also reprinted Cheke’s *Hurt of sedition* in the same year with a similar title page, featuring both the royal arms and the arms of the Stationers’ Company. Seres is typically assumed to have been the author of the *Aunswere*, not just its printer, because it is signed ‘W. S.’ on the verso side of the final leaf.[[944]](#footnote-944) This hypothesis is reinforced by the fact that Seres had tried his luck as a poet before, appending one of his own compositions to his edition of an anti-Catholic dialogue by Walter Haddon.[[945]](#footnote-945) Although it seems to have been written before the rebellion had ended, the *Aunswere* was apparently registered with the Stationers’ Company between Christmas 1569 and 1 January 1570 because it was entered into the register after a book of Christmas carols and before a series of new year’s day ballads.[[946]](#footnote-946) Around six weeks had passed since the earls had made the Staindrop proclamation and the rebellion had already effectively collapsed on 20 December.[[947]](#footnote-947) Thus, this metrical pamphlet was patently designed to influence public opinion rather than to open real communication with the rebel leaders.

Seres’s involvement in the production of the pamphlet is also circumstantial evidence of government initiative, for he had long been Cecil’s servant and client. Elizabeth Evenden suggests that he adopted the hedgehog as his trade sign as a nod to Cecil, but she seems to have confused the Sidney crest, which features a porcupine, with the Cecil crest, which does not.[[948]](#footnote-948) Still, there is no question that the two men were close. Not only was Seres at one stage a member of Cecil’s household, but he had even rented property from Cecil in March 1549.[[949]](#footnote-949) Two years after the printing of the *Aunswere*, Cecil procured for Seres and his son the exclusive rights to print all prayer books, primers and psalters in Latin and English.[[950]](#footnote-950) Moreover, there is no evidence that the Staindrop proclamation was circulated in London outside of official circles in 1569, so it is unlikely that Seres could have acquired a copy without Cecil’s cooperation. The pamphlet is composed of 210 couplets, each couplet being composed of one line of iambic tetrameter and another line of trimeter, which gives the poem a monotonous but memorable rhythm. The first sixteen lines follow an ABAB rhyme scheme but the author soon switches to an ABCB scheme, perhaps realizing that this would allay the risk of running out of rhyme words. Seres begins with an eight-line invocation to God (sig. A3r), followed by an address to the rebel leaders (sigs. A3r-B1v), before concluding by addressing common rebels (sigs. B1v-B3v). In his address to the earls, Seres reads the Staindrop proclamation as if it were a petition of grievance, dividing it into thirteen articles, which leads to some absurdity as the author finds himself interpreting single words as complete units of expression. As Cranmer had criticized the Western rebels in 1549 for using the phrase ‘We will have’, so Seres criticizes the Northern rebels for using the first-person plural pronoun in their writings, which should be reserved as the ‘Princes phrase’.[[951]](#footnote-951) Borrowing an argument that had been used in 1536, he writes that Elizabeth has settled all religious questions with the assent of lay nobles, bishops and commons in Parliament.[[952]](#footnote-952) Moreover, he suggests that the rebel leaders are at risk of legitimizing popular rebellions in the tradition of those stirred up by ‘Captaine Cobler’ and ‘Jack Strawe’ in 1536 and 1381. Turning finally to the rank and file, he advises them to ‘take counsell yet in time / afore yee go to farre’.[[953]](#footnote-953)

In writing a metrical response rather than a prose oration, Seres seems to have been inspired by the Yorkshire schoolmaster Wilfrid Holme’s *Fall and Euill Success of Rebellion*, which was written in reaction to the Pilgrimage of Grace but remained unpublished until 1572.[[954]](#footnote-954) If Cecil did indeed commission Seres to write and print the *Aunswere*, it seems that he was ready to experiment with different forms of literary counterinsurgency in the wake of the Northern Rebellion, perhaps suspecting that balladry might work a stronger effect on people’s minds than oratory. Unfortunately, the pamphlet does not seem to have been a success, judging by the fact that some copies were never folded or stitched but were instead sold as waste to the junior printer Richard East and his partner Henry Middleton, who used them to line the binding of an edition of the Psalms with Calvin’s commentary, printed for Lucas Harrison in 1571.[[955]](#footnote-955)

The Second Wave: ‘A Brief Discourse’ and the *Homily Against Disobedience*

After the rebels had been defeated and punished, another response to the rebellion was drawn up which apparently never made it into print, entitled ‘A Brief discourse of the Traiterous attempts and practises of the Earles of Northumberlande and Westmoreland and other Traytors and Rebbels assembled in the north parts of England 1509 [*sic*.]’. This tract must have been written after 22 August 1572 since it refers to the execution of the Duke of Northumberland.[[956]](#footnote-956) It survives in two manuscript copies drawn up in the early seventeenth century. Both of these copies are among collections of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century state tracts, one in the British Library and the other in the library of Trinity College, Dublin.[[957]](#footnote-957) The existence of the Trinity copy was once mentioned in a footnote by Conyers Read but otherwise the tract has gone entirely unnoticed.[[958]](#footnote-958) Curiously, both copies feature an incorrect date in the title: the title of the Trinity copy contains the date 1589 and the Stowe copy, 1509.[[959]](#footnote-959)

On examination of the shape of the numbers in the Trinity copy, it seems as if the scribe originally wrote ‘1509’ before correcting the date to ‘1589’. It is possible that he had been instructed to correct the date to 1569, but mistakenly added a stroke to the base of the zero rather than the top, thereby introducing another incorrect date. That the scribe began with the date 1509 makes it very likely that the Trinity copy was originally copied from the Stowe copy, or else that they were copied from a shared original. In any case, the original Elizabethan source is lost so it is unlikely that we shall ever positively identify the tract’s author or learn anything more specific about its composition. If a name might be suggested, it is that of Francis Walsingham. ‘A Brief discourse’ is written in the same matter-of-fact, humourless style as the *A Discourse touching the pretended match*, which as we have seen was probably written by Walsingham. The signposting with which ‘A Brief discourse’ opens, moreover, might suggest that it was designed as a sequel to the earlier pamphlet: ‘First imediatlie or not longe after the late Duke of Norfolk had practised to marrie the Scottishe queene hee sent one of his seruants to haue theire good wills and aides therein…’.[[960]](#footnote-960) It is clear, at least, that the author had access to official letters and papers because he refers, for instance, to correspondence between the queen and the rebel earls.[[961]](#footnote-961) The threefold purpose of this tract is quite obvious: it presents an official narrative of the events of the Northern rebellion, refutes the arguments of the Staindrop proclamation, and offers a justification of the government’s severe execution of justice.

Unlike Norton, the author begins by naming the ringleaders of the rebellion, before describing the preparations made by the earls and the queen’s loyal servants in the North.[[962]](#footnote-962) He lifts an argument from Norton’s address *To the Quenes Subiects* when he writes that the rebel earls ‘made proclamac[i]ons in the Queenes name not meaning Queene Eliza[beth] & therefore it was saide they meante the Scottishe Queene’.[[963]](#footnote-963) Next, he presents a summary of the arguments of the Staindrop proclamation and proceeds to rebut them point by point.[[964]](#footnote-964) In response to their complaint about evil councillors, the author argues that they really intended to depose the queen and that ‘the like findinge of faulte w[i]th Counsellors is euer parte of such as Rebell againste theire princes’.[[965]](#footnote-965) As for their intent to restore Catholicism, he claims that they ‘neuer vnderstoode’ Elizabeth’s religious settlement, and that the rebel leaders ‘themselves in Parliamente were at the makinge of the lawe for vniformitie of Common prayer and knew it to be godlie done by the assent of the Parliam[en]t and not by anie priuate councellors’.[[966]](#footnote-966) This is precisely the argument which had been expressed in the king’s response to the Lincolnshire rebels in 1536 regarding the dissolution of the monasteries.[[967]](#footnote-967)

After each point of the proclamation has been rebutted, the author continues his narrative of the rebellion, describing the manner in which the rebels destroyed copies of the Bible, Erasmus’s *Paraphrases*, the homilies, ‘Mr Jewells bookes’ and ‘all other good bookes they coulde get’.[[968]](#footnote-968) The rebellion was not, it is suggested, a truly popular movement since the rebel leaders ‘deceiued the ignorant and blinde people in all places nighe vnto them and inforced them to resorte to them in Armour’.[[969]](#footnote-969) After setting forth the narrative, the author then proceeds to defend the reprisals taken by the government against the rebels. He estimates that out of a total of ‘30000 or 40000’ rebels, there were no more than ‘60 indicted and attainted’, and of those only ‘10 or 12 executed and those of small behauiour and substance & the rest pardoned except those fewe that be fledde’.[[970]](#footnote-970) There were ‘3 or 400 of such poore persons as raised the people by the precepts & commandm[en]tes of the saide Earles onelie executed by marshall lawe, yet theire wiues and children had their landes farmes and goodes’.[[971]](#footnote-971) As for the rest, there were ‘aboue 4400 that submitted themselues to her mercie and paide uerie small fines & were pardoned and had their liues landes and goods to theire vses’.[[972]](#footnote-972) The author’s estimate of deaths by martial law is broadly in agreement with a carefully researched estimate by Susan E. Taylor, who suggested that around four or five hundred men were killed.[[973]](#footnote-973)

To hammer home the wickedness of the rebels, the author then summarizes the speech which Northumberland had delivered at the scaffold in York:

…neither did hee acknowledge her highnes to be his soueraigne, nor acknowledge his offence to her ma[ies]tie nor praie for her nor require anie goodnes at her handes for his wife and children… but hee saide the realme was a Schisme and wee Schismatiques & before his death hee saide he trusted shortlie to be in heauen w[i]th such martirs as had dyed in the late rebellion.[[974]](#footnote-974)

This passage closely follows the version of Northumberland’s speech which was sent to Cecil, by that stage Lord Burghley, by Sir Thomas Gargrave on 23 August 1572.[[975]](#footnote-975) It is likely that Gargrave’s letter was the author’s source, which provides even further evidence of Cecil’s role in organizing propaganda against the Northern rebels, and it is likely that the original plan was for ‘A Brief discourse’ to be printed, although it was possibly shelved due to a surplus of good propaganda material. In the peroration, the author concludes by calling on God to ‘giue her Maiesties subiects grace to be thanckfull loyall and true subiects from henceforth to her Maiestie’.[[976]](#footnote-976) The survival of this manuscript indicates that Cecil’s literary campaign against the Northern rebels continued long after the rebellion had been suppressed, which proves that this activity was not a last resort forced on the government by a grave emergency, but rather a policy which it willingly and actively pursued.

I

All of the other works on the subject of the rising are overshadowed by the literary achievement and political significance of that most iconic work of Tudor anti-sedition literature, *An homilie agaynst disobedience and wylful rebellion*. This was printed as a stand-alone pamphlet in six separate quarto editions in 1570, one of which features the exact date 23 June 1570 on the title page.[[977]](#footnote-977) It was first incorporated into the second volume of homilies appointed to be read in churches in 1571.[[978]](#footnote-978) This collection was probably edited by John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, and was first printed by the royal printers Richard Jugge and John Cawood in 1563. Since the homilies were written in collaboration with bishops around the country, one would have expected the contributors to have left a tremendous paper trail.[[979]](#footnote-979) It is therefore extraordinary that not a single piece of manuscript material seems to have survived; we are tempted to speculate that some seventeenth-century antiquarian collected all the material together and then lost it. The *Homilie agaynst disobedience* is no different; since no draft material survives, its author is unlikely to be identified with certainty and it may even have been the work of multiple authors.

Its conception may possibly be traced to the correspondence between the Council and Archbishop Parker in November 1569. In a letter signed by ten councillors from Windsor on 6 November, Parker was informed that the Council was labouring ‘by all good means possible… to provide speedily for the reformation and remedy’ of disorder in England, and instructed that ‘whatsoever your lordship shall think meet and needful to be granted or devised for your further assistance, thereof to advertise us’.[[980]](#footnote-980) Strype claimed that Parker commissioned the production of the sermon but did not indicate its author.[[981]](#footnote-981) To make an educated guess, the name of John Whitgift might be tentatively suggested, whom Parker later commissioned to write an answer to the puritan pamphlet *An admonition to the Parliament* (1572) by John Field and Thomas Wilcox.[[982]](#footnote-982) There are some likenesses between phrases in the homily and in Whitgift’s published writings: we might compare the homily’s ‘Surely that whiche they falsely cal reformation, is in deede not only a defacying or a deformation’ with Whitgift’s ‘This reformation you séeke for and desire, were rather a deformation’; although, as a cautionary note, this wordplay was something of a commonplace.[[983]](#footnote-983)

We would be hard-pressed to overstate the importance of the *Homilie agaynst disobedience*,since it delivered the arguments and rhetoric of the anti-sedition pamphlets into parishes across the country for the benefit of the literate and illiterate alike. There have been two modern editions of the work but neither adds much to our understanding as it has stood since John Griffiths’s superb edition of the two books of homilies in 1859.[[984]](#footnote-984) A moderate amount of critical attention has been paid to the homily, although it has been more frequently mentioned than analysed. It caught the interest of E. M. W. Tillyard for the light it sheds on Shakespeare’s history plays, who singled out certain passages for their literary merit and others for their political significance.[[985]](#footnote-985) The third part of the homily, he argued, ‘gives a better background to the four history plays Shakespeare first wrote than any passage I know’.[[986]](#footnote-986) Two proponents of the ‘cultural materialism’ movement, Alan Sinfield and Jonathan Dollimore, were subsequently outraged that Tillyard had praised the style of a work which was ‘designed to preserve an oppressive regime’.[[987]](#footnote-987) Andrew Hadfield, who misdates the homily to 1574, compares it to Henrician obedience works by Richard Morison and Thomas Starkey and points out that it was designed for a ‘mass audience’.[[988]](#footnote-988) Peter Mack has briefly analysed its rhetoric to demonstrate the sheer volume of tropes that may be found therein, including ‘aposiopesis, rhetorical question, correctio, traductio and elaboration of parts’.[[989]](#footnote-989)

The homily itself is composed of six parts followed by a prayer of thanksgiving for the suppression of the Northern Rebellion (sigs. K3r-K3v). The first part is a general presentation of the doctrine of obedience (sigs. A1r-C2r); the second part provides additional confirmation of the doctrine (sigs. C2v-D4r); the third part plumbs the depths of the sin of rebellion (sigs. D4v-F1v); the fourth part argues that private grudge can lead to rebellion and begins to examine its causes (sigs. F2r-G3v); the fifth part discusses the causes of rebellion in more detail (sigs. G4r-H3v); and the sixth part defends the Reformation while attacking rebellious Catholics (sigs. H4r-K2v). Each part was to end with the reading of a prayer for the protection of the queen, different from the prayer of thanksgiving, which is only printed after the first part but referred to thereafter as ‘The prayer: as before’ (sigs. C1v-C2r).

In the first part, before rehearsing the Lutheran argument that wicked rulers are sent to punish wicked populations,[[990]](#footnote-990) the homilist empathetically observes that since different people have different criteria by which to identify a wicked ruler, no government will be without its friends and enemies, which is why private subjects may not take it upon themselves to rebel against their prince.[[991]](#footnote-991) Interestingly, he adapts this argument to suggest that England was robbed of its ‘good Josias’ Edward VI because the people were too sinful.[[992]](#footnote-992) Using the figure of *anthypophora*, the homilist follows the example of Norton in doubting whether rebels may be rightly called subjects, since they are committed to the destruction of their own people.[[993]](#footnote-993) In the second part, he progresses predictably to the example of David’s refusal to lay hands on King Saul, although more originally he specifies that Saul was out of God’s favour for having spared King Agag, whom God had commanded to be slain, which we might read as a deliberate exception clause to the rule that princes may never be killed, included to provide for the eventuality that Mary, Queen of Scots, who had already been deposed in 1567, might be executed one day.[[994]](#footnote-994) Next, a dialogue is staged between loyal King David and a disloyal rebel, whose speaking parts are marked in the margin with the alternating notes ‘The demaunde’ and ‘The aunswere’.[[995]](#footnote-995) The six demands are roughly identical as the rebel finds multiple ways of saying the same thing: ‘Are not they (say some) lustie and couragious captaynes, valiaunt men of stomache, and good mens bodies, that do venture by force to kyll or depose theyr kyng, beyng a naughtie prince, and theyr mortal enemie?’ David responds piously and equally repetitively that kings may not be touched, insisting that they must let even a bad king live ‘vntyl god appoynt and worke his ende’. After David, the second Biblical example of an obedient subject is the Virgin Mary, who obeyed Augustus’ command to return to Bethlehem to be taxed, even though she was ‘of the royal blood of the auncient naturall kynges of Iurie [Jewry]’.[[996]](#footnote-996) The homilist’s third and final Biblical role model is Jesus Christ himself, who lived his life in obedience to the superior authorities until death.[[997]](#footnote-997)

In the third part of the homily, we are told that rebellion is not just one sin but a conglomeration of all possible sins ‘heaped together’.[[998]](#footnote-998) Rather than leaving this as an exaggerated assertion, he actually proceeds to substantiate it by taking the ten commandments one by one and explaining how rebels have broken each of them.[[999]](#footnote-999) To prove that the seventh commandment had been violated, he makes the commonplace argument that ‘the forceable oppressions of matrones and mens wives, and the violating and deflowryng of virgins and maydes’ are typical behaviour among rebels. Apparently feeling that even more proof was needed, he moves on to the seven sins and argues that the rebels have committed all of these as well.[[1000]](#footnote-1000) To reinforce the point, he offers a nauseating description of a filthy rebel camp: the ’corruption of the ayre and place where they do lye, with ordure and much filth’.[[1001]](#footnote-1001) If this were not enough to divest rebels of any pretentions to valour, the homilist uses a typological argument to suggest that rebellion is ‘the expresse similitude of hell, and the rebelles them selues are the very figures of feendes and devyls, and their captayne the vngratious paterne of Lucifer and Satan, the prince of darknesse’.[[1002]](#footnote-1002)

At the beginning of the fourth part, subjects are exhorted to check their hearts regularly because God hates even those who ‘do onlye but inwardly grudge, mutter, and murmure against their gouernors’.[[1003]](#footnote-1003) Unsurprisingly, he follows the example of previous authors on this theme by invoking the bad examples of Absalom, Achitophel and the ‘fourtie thousande of rascall rebels’ who shared their fate.[[1004]](#footnote-1004) In an oblique reference to Northumberland and Westmorland, the homilist distinguishes between commons’ rebellions and aristocratic rebellions, noting that even ‘men of great wit, nobilitie, and aucthoritie haue moued rebellions against their lawfull princes’.[[1005]](#footnote-1005) An allusion is then made to the Staindrop proclamation, for we are told that aristocratic rebels ‘pretende sundrye causes, as the redresse of the common wealth… or reformation of religion’.[[1006]](#footnote-1006) He goes on to rebut these two claims in more detail, suggesting that everyone with ‘halfe an eye’ can see that rebels destroy the commonwealth, whereas Elizabeth’s councillors have ‘by the experiment of so many yeres proued honourable to her Maiestie’.[[1007]](#footnote-1007) Subjects are discouraged from following the banners of rebels, whether they are painted with the five wounds of Christ or with the image of a plough and the phrase ‘God speede the plough’.[[1008]](#footnote-1008) While this former banner had been used by rebels in 1536, 1549 and 1569, there is no concrete record of the latter having been used in 1569.[[1009]](#footnote-1009) It is possible that the Northern rebels had marched under such a banner, since Norton concluded his Warning with the phrase ‘God spede the ploughe of England’, and in 1570 William Elderton wrote *A ballad intituled, Prepare ye to the plowe*, so both of these authors might have been deliberately appropriating the rebels’ branding for the purposes of loyalism.[[1010]](#footnote-1010) At the very least it seems obvious that there were numerous banners; according to Camden, the rebels had also set up the banner of the Chalice of the Eucharist.[[1011]](#footnote-1011) We can be sure, moreover, that the plough banner had been used in 1536 because in January 1537, a deponent from Horncastle was specifically asked what it symbolized.[[1012]](#footnote-1012)

In the fifth part, the homilist turns his attention to the causes of rebellion, but his simplified arguments are a far cry from the thorough, Aristotelian reflection on the same theme which had appeared in Christopherson’s *Exhortation* just over fifteen years earlier. While admitting that there are countless causes of sedition, he says that the most important are ambition and ignorance.[[1013]](#footnote-1013) More specifically, he defines the former as a desire to climb to a higher estate than that in which one has been placed by God, and the latter not as ‘unskilfulnesse in artes or sciences’ but rather as ‘lacke of knowledge of Gods blessed wyll declared in his holye worde’. Applying this framework to classify rebels themselves, he distinguishes between two types: ambitious leaders and ignorant followers.[[1014]](#footnote-1014) His implied audience, he writes, consists of men of the second type, for he wishes to teach them how to identify men of the first type and avoid their company.[[1015]](#footnote-1015) The sixth and final part opens with the assertion, common since the days of Henry VIII, that the bishops of Rome have deliberately kept the commons in ignorance by withholding from them the word of God; and this ignorance, he adds, fuels rebellion.[[1016]](#footnote-1016) Among the proofs chosen to back this up, he gives the example of a dispute between the Pope and King John of England over Stephen Langton’s candidacy for the diocese of Canterbury, in consequence of which the barons shamefully sided with Frenchmen in rebellion against the king’s right because they did not know the word of God.[[1017]](#footnote-1017) Progressing to more recent history, it is claimed that the rebellions of 1536 and 1549 were only possible because ringleaders misled ‘the ignoraunt people’.[[1018]](#footnote-1018) And to stir up the rebellion of 1569, he writes, popish priests whispered ‘in the eares of certaine Northen borderers, being men most ignoraunt of their duetie to GOD and their prince of all people of the Realme’.[[1019]](#footnote-1019) He follows up these claims with a potent mixed metaphor in the tradition of Cheke, asserting that the Pope would have ‘brought those seely blinde subiectes into the deepe dytche of horrible rebellion… had not GOD of his mercie miraculously calmed that raging tempest… without any shipwracke of the common wealth’.[[1020]](#footnote-1020) ‘Thus,’ he concludes, ‘haue you hearde the sixt parte of this Homilie, nowe good people let vs pray.’[[1021]](#footnote-1021)

The homily against rebellion gained a permanent place in the life of the church when it was approved by Convocation in 1571 along with the rest of the Elizabethan homilies as a statement of ‘godly and wholesome doctrine’.[[1022]](#footnote-1022) It was to be the most important source from which literary authors such as Shakespeare, Sidney and Spenser drew the commonplace arguments and rhetorical devices which they subsequently used to dramatize the efforts of loyalists to defeat rebels through eloquence.[[1023]](#footnote-1023) Shakespeare possibly alluded to either the 1547 or the 1570 anti-sedition homily in *Antony and Cleopatra*, where the queen wryly gives the following reason to explain her willingness to yield to Octavius Caesar: ‘…I hourly learn / A doctrine of obedience, and would gladly / Look him i’th’face.’[[1024]](#footnote-1024)

Truly, the homily was the apotheosis of the Tudor anti-sedition oration. It has traditionally been seen as the *start* of a tradition, namely that of Elizabethan and Stuart divine-right theory,[[1025]](#footnote-1025) but there were few arguments or rhetorical features in the homily which had not been staples of obedience writing for at least thirty years. It was the culmination of a cross-confessional tradition of Ciceronian anti-sedition oratory which began with Richard Morison’s *Lamentation* in 1536, and which included John Cheke’s *Hurt of sedition* in 1549 and John Christopherson’s *Exhortation* in 1554. The operating principle of these works, as defined at the outset, was the classical belief that rhetoric was a cure for civil disobedience. And yet, the homily broke free from the ephemeral form of the pamphlet and became enshrined in the official practice of the church.

Conclusion

This thesis has demonstrated that Tudor loyalists resorted to a highly communicative style of politics at times of rebellion. In doing so, they were not making any kind of ‘public pitch’ in the modern sense but rather operating under the quite different, Ciceronian assumption that oratory is an effective way of securing civil obedience. There is much to be said for the traditional view that Tudor governments sponsored pamphleteers in order to promote policy to English subjects. They appealed not only to the class of literate men which provided members of Parliament, and which therefore had a real influence on legislation, but also to common men and women, who could otherwise demonstrate their opposition by mobilizing in rebellion. The concept of multiple implied readership has helped to clarify why certain of these works contain policy suggestions.

The thesis has also revealed that pamphleteers commonly defended royal or conciliar policy by pointing out that it had been executed with the consent of the whole realm as represented in Parliament. Such arguments are only a few steps away from the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty, as famously defined by A. V. Dicey:

Parliament… has, under the English constitution, the right to make or unmake any law whatever; and… no person or body is recognised by the law of England as having a right to override or set aside the legislation of Parliament…[[1026]](#footnote-1026)

In fact, it has been argued that the first clause of this definition had already been established by the time of the death of Edward III.[[1027]](#footnote-1027) The proliferation of anti-sedition writings in the Tudor period did not encourage the growth of royal absolutism; quite the opposite was true. The thesis has endeavoured to examine all the available evidence surrounding the anti-sedition pamphlets of the Tudor period in order to establish as accurately as possible which of them proceeded from the monarch or privy council, and what function they were designed to serve.

Aside from these general arguments, the key arguments of the thesis have been the local ones contained within each chapter. The second chapter demonstrated that Thomas Cromwell organized a campaign of persuasion in 1536 and that Richard Morison was a servant of the state, albeit an opinionated one, not a loose cannon. The third chapter uncovered serious policy disagreements within the Council in the summer of 1549, for Somerset preferred to experiment with clemency while some of his colleagues favoured a traditional, hard-line condemnation of rebels. The fourth chapter suggested that Mary and Gardiner deserve credit for the efficient propaganda campaign of 1554, and argued that Christopherson’s *Exhortation* was very probably commissioned by the government. The final chapter demonstrated that there were two distinct waves of propaganda responding to the Northern Rising, of which the first was directed by the Council and the second was a mixture of conciliar and independent works. It insisted that Thomas Norton’s pamphlets against the rebels were simply attempts to persuade the people, both Catholic and Protestant, not an attempt to rally public support to pressure the queen.

Elizabethan authors did not cease to produce anti-sedition orations, addresses and treatises in 1572. In 2018, for instance, Dennis McCarthy and June Schlueter brought a treatise to the attention of the scholarly community entitled ‘A Brief Discourse of Rebellion and Rebels’, written by George North in 1576.[[1028]](#footnote-1028) This was not an anti-sedition treatise with an immediate political intention, unlike many of the works which have been discussed in this thesis, but rather a literary work dedicated to Lord North. McCarthy and Schlueter claim that this treatise was a major source for several of Shakespeare’s plays, including *2 Henry VI* and *King Lear*. While many of their arguments do indeed appear compelling, we should perhaps bear in mind that McCarthy used similar methods in 2011 to argue that Sir Thomas North was the ‘secret genius’ who wrote Shakespeare’s plays.[[1029]](#footnote-1029) In any case, North’s treatise is interesting in its own right as a colourful piece which mixes classical scholarship with rhetorical zeal, prose with verse, and commonplace arguments with more original passages, such as his description of the 1478 Pazzi conspiracy.[[1030]](#footnote-1030)

Moreover, the queen faced numerous threats to her safety in the 1580s and 1590s and dozens of works were therefore produced to denounce treason and treachery, such as George Whetstone’s *The censure of a loyall subiect upon certaine noted speach & behauiours of those fourteen notable traitors* (1587), a response to the Babington Plot; and Richard Cosin’s *Conspiracie, for pretended reformation viz. presbyteriall discipline* (1592), a response to the attempted rising of William Hacket, printed by deputies to the royal printer. The notion that rhetoric was an effective cure for rebellion remained a commonplace of Elizabethan literary culture. In a 1586 formulary of epistles, Angel Day gave the following example of how to ‘dehort a man from rebellion or infidelitie towardes his country’:

I will touching the action, shew how vnnaturall the cause is he taketh in hand, being against his natiue soyle: how horrible, by laying out the greatnes of the offence: How vniust, in respect that it is against his alleageaunce to his Prince: How impious, in that it retaineth no piety, turneth to the disturbance of a quiet state, and breedeth the subuersion of all peaceable gouernment. How insufferable, by reason that good and holesome lawes are thereby infringed, all sortes of honest and good men wronged, and consequentlye the common-wealth by such meanes topsie turuie tourned.[[1031]](#footnote-1031)

Richard Crompton likewise noted in 1599 that ‘good perswasions and mild spéeches are thought… conuenient to be vsed to appease such vprores’, and he presented his own exemplary exhortation against an imagined future rebellion against Elizabeth.[[1032]](#footnote-1032) The later Elizabethan literature was sufficiently abundant that it could provide the subject for a doctoral thesis in its own right, so it is impossible to discuss it adequately here. It is worth bearing in mind, however, that the years 1569-1572 were an important watershed because the later writings were responses to plots and treasons rather than mass rebellion. Since these enemies of the state produced no statements of grievances or proclamations, the old imperative of responding to the demands of rebels was no longer an issue. In this respect, then, there was a distinct literary tradition from 1536 to 1572, in which authors applied the arts of rhetoric to promote obedience to the monarch and the government.

The prevalence of anti-sedition orations in Tudor England is of interest not only to political historians but also to literary scholars, for they provide an important frame through which to understand the significance of the anti-sedition orations which abound in the drama and prose of the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Shakespeare’s works yield many examples, such as his contribution to the play *Sir Thomas More*, quoted at the outset, where the undersheriff pacifies anti-alien rioters with an oration, insisting that they are ‘in arms ’gainst God’.[[1033]](#footnote-1033) Likewise, the 1st Earl of Westmorland delivers a counterinsurgency oration to the Percy Rebels of 1403 in Shakespeare’s *2 Henry IV* (IV.i). The influence of political pamphlets on imaginative literature confirms the common suspicion that political historians and literary scholars have something to learn from each other, and this thesis has hopefully demonstrated that these two fields of enquiry can be brought into harmony without recourse to the analytical theories which presently underlie much interdisciplinary work.

One question, however, hangs in the air. To what extent did English subjects accept the claims of Tudor writings on obedience and rebellion? Seventy-five years have passed since E. M. W. Tillyard famously argued that the Elizabethan ‘world picture was ruled by a general conception of order’.[[1034]](#footnote-1034) Although his argument has been savaged from many quarters, critics have often been more concerned with opposing his apparent sympathy for the Elizabethan idea of order, rather than raising questions about the strength of his arguments.[[1035]](#footnote-1035) There is, in fact, no question that the concept of degree permeated the thinking of early modern intellectuals,[[1036]](#footnote-1036) but whether it ever gained a foothold in popular thinking is more difficult to know for sure.[[1037]](#footnote-1037) My own view is that it takes many centuries to define and dispense liberties, and that a strong state, even when it acts oppressively, is a better protection of life and property than a state of anarchy. It seems reasonable to suppose that many subjects accepted this, and put their hands to the plough, and enjoyed at least the personal protections which the common law could afford.
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