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PREFACE

This book tells the story of the 1549 rebellions. It does so for three reasons: it is a story that is worth telling; the story illuminates key themes in late medieval and early modern history; and the story highlights fundamental changes in mid-sixteenth-century society and popular politics. Perhaps most of all, this book aims to dispel the notion that the ‘masses of the Tudor period’ were ‘inarticulate’. In place of the characterisation of the rebels of 1549 as ‘simple men and boys’, it is here argued that popular political culture in Tudor England was rich, sophisticated and vibrant and that it deserves to occupy an important place in the historical interpretation of the period.¹ It is my intention, then, not only to add to the stock of knowledge about 1549, but also to suggest new ways in which a fuller appreciation of the lives of early modern labouring people might change historical interpretations of the period as a whole.

This book straddles two genres of historical writing: that of political history and social history. Its claim to occupy this interpretive high ground is based upon, firstly, the emergence of a post-revisionist history of politics and religion in sixteenth-century England; secondly, the development of new approaches to popular politics in late medieval England; and lastly, the emergence of a new social history of politics. Moreover, the book aims to break down some key historiographical boundaries: that which divides the late medieval from the early modern; and that which separates political history from social, cultural and economic history.

Over the past decade, the political history of Tudor England has gone through some significant changes. Just over ten years ago, the editor of an important collection of essays raised the possibility that a study might be written of the ‘symbols, rituals and mentalities of popular political culture’; yet the essays that comprised that collection remained resolutely focused

¹ Quoting B. L. Beer, Rebellion and riot: popular disorder in England during the reign of Edward VI (Kent, OH, 1982), 63, 82.
upon high political culture. Nowadays, it would be unthinkable too that such a volume did not deal with popular politics. Just as recent work in social history has emphasised the ways in which early modern working people negotiated an otherwise unequal social order, so Ethan Shagan has argued that ‘the English Reformation was not done to people, it was done with them’. Shagan ends with the proposition that it is only ‘by exploring popular politics that we can begin to understand the English Reformation’. Elsewhere, a similarly nuanced picture of the relationship between Crown and people is beginning to emerge. In John Cooper’s recent monograph, the parish church is presented as a key site in the organisation of political allegiance, persuasion and propaganda. In this account, the authority of the Tudors is shown to depend not only upon powerful magnates but also upon village and town elites. After a long period in which Tudor political historians were almost ostentatiously uninterested in the political beliefs of the commons, popular politics seems suddenly to be everywhere. In a brilliant essay, Shagan has deployed the correspondence between Protector Somerset and the rebellious commons of 1549 as a way of exploring the ‘relationship between Tudor court politics and “politics out-of-doors”’. For Shagan, this correspondence suggests the possibility of writing a post-revisionist interpretation of mid-Tudor politics which ‘might usefully spend less time examining the minutiae of government administration and more time analysing the government attempts at self-representation and the “feedback networks” that existed between government policy and public response’. Writing in 1999, it seemed to Shagan that this new history of the mid-Tudor polity should focus upon ‘the period’s unusually dynamic interplay between rulers and ruled’. At the heart of this analysis is Protector Somerset, whose populism appealed ‘downward for support from those outside the political establishment, creating a power-base independent of either the court or local affinities’. Addressing the creative interplay between

---

5 Shagan, Popular politics, 310.
7 See, for instance, Richard Hoyle’s observation that petitions reveal ‘the existence of popular political movements and a much richer political culture in the early sixteenth century than [historians] have hitherto assumed’. R. Hoyle, ‘Petitioning as popular politics in early sixteenth-century England’, Historical Research, 75, 190 (2002), 389.
the rebels and the Protector, Shagan argues that ‘the Somerset regime announced to the nation its support for the rebels’ programme and its willingness to accept the commons as contributors in the formation of policy’. All this amounted to ‘an elaborate courting of public opinion’ and a willingness ‘to commit the regime to fundamental changes in policy at the initiation of the commons.’ This illustrates, in Shagan’s terms, ‘the extraordinarily promiscuous relationship between “popular” and “elite” politics. Thus, the summer of 1549 witnessed a remarkable convergence of rhetoric between government and commons’. We are left with clear evidence that in the mid-Tudor period, ‘the politics of the court was inseparable from the politics of village greens and provincial protest; each fed off the other’s rhetoric, constantly interpreting the other’s position to their own advantage’. 8

A similarly dynamic picture of late medieval popular politics has started to emerge over the past few years. R. B. Goheen has argued that ‘English peasants participated in the Crown’s provincial politics partly at least on their own terms and for their own ends, and in the process they influenced both the form and contents of these politics’. In particular, Goheen emphasises ‘the effectiveness of peasant politics’. Goheen’s work leaves the strong impression that office-holding villagers were able to ‘speak unmistakably of clearly perceived political interests’ articulating a ‘political will’ which enabled them to maintain ‘an active political discourse with the Crown that influenced the politics of the countryside’. I. M. W. Harvey has gone further, claiming that ‘popular politics not only existed but grew in importance in the fifteenth century . . . common people . . . began to act as if they thought they mattered in politics, as if they were part of the political commonweal’. Harvey observes that, even if their rebellions were ‘temporarily crushed . . . [the commons] were never permanently deterred from talking and behaving as if they had a stake in the country’s political life’. 9 Very similar to Shagan’s notion of ‘feedback’, John Watts has discussed the dynamic interplay between elite and popular politics in the crisis of 1450–2. 10 Most recently, David Rollison has made a case for the existence

---
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of a popular political culture that spanned the period 1381–1649. These historiographical developments may well mark a lasting change in approaches to the political history of late medieval and Tudor England.

In reconceptualising politics, however, it is not enough to note that the commons occasionally intervened in the world of their governors. As Heide Wunder has observed, it is too often the case that ‘peasants . . . only turn up in political history when they attempt rebellions or peasant wars’. Instead, a fuller appreciation of the subject requires a close focus upon the micro-politics of small communities, coupled with the radical redefinition of what is meant by ‘politics’. In 1996, Keith Wrightson published an influential essay which laid the basis for the rewriting of popular politics. In this piece, Wrightson argued that early modern plebeian political life comprised five dimensions. In his analysis, these comprised the politics of patriarchy; of neighbourhood; of custom; of reformation and state formation; and of subordination and meaning. Wrightson’s insights, combined with Patrick Collinson’s call for ‘a new political history, which is social history with the politics put back in, or an account of political processes which is also social’, has inspired recent attempts to reconnect social and political history. Over the past few years, there has emerged what Steve Hindle has called the ‘new social history of politics’, a history of power relations built not only upon a new dialogue between social and political history, but also upon a broad definition of politics. Thus, for Hindle, politics comprises ‘the pursuit, maintenance and control of power’. The renewed interest amongst early modern social historians in the material basis of politics – oddly, at the same time that historians of the modern epoch are retreating from materialist analyses – has entailed a close study of the micro-politics of local communities: as Hindle puts it, ‘the most ubiquitous and therefore perhaps the most significant politics in early modern England were the politics of the parish’. In his investigation of state formation, Mike Braddick has likewise been drawn to micro-politics, arguing that ‘by concentrating on the everyday use of political power through the whole network of . . . agents [of the state] a larger range of

functional uses emerges. This [approach] tends . . . to give . . . prominence . . . to problems of social order and the importance of vested social interests.’ Hence, Braddick emphasises ‘the ways in which . . . [the state] impinged on ordinary lives’.16 Throughout, the organising assumption of this new social history of politics is that early modern political life comprised more than the affairs of the central state, internal debates within ruling circles or the deeds of great men (or, rather less often, of great women). Instead, this rather gritty historical work has been preoccupied with conflicts over the distribution of power and resources.17

This book aims to link together these historiographical shifts. It is divided into three parts, each containing two chapters. Chapter One begins by defining the mid-Tudor crisis as a crisis of legitimation which affected both politics and social relations. The mid-sixteenth-century crisis is shown to stem both from the short-term context of the Duke of Somerset’s protector-ship and from longer-term, deeper-rooted social conflicts. This crisis climaxed in the rebellions of the spring and summer of 1549 and in the Earl of Warwick’s subsequent coup against the Duke of Somerset in the autumn of that year. Much of Chapter One is dedicated to exploring the course of the ‘commotion time’ of 1549. Chapter Two looks at the bloody aftermath of the insurrections, at later attempts to organise popular rebellion and at plebeian involvement in state politics during the latter part of the reign of Edward VI. The central purpose of Part I is to lay out a narrative of the 1549 rebellions and of their immediate aftermath. The intention is to provide a context within which the more interpretive Parts II and III are to be set.

Part II, comprising Chapters Three and Four, is concerned with the politics of language. In this, it owes something to the ‘linguistic turn’ which preoccupied social historians of modern Britain during the 1980s and 1990s. Materialist historians have tended to dismiss the historical focus upon language as a ‘retreat’ from the analysis of class conflict. But as James Epstein has suggested, ‘the turn to language cannot be viewed simply as a retreat; new openings and possibilities have emerged’.18 In Part II, we therefore concentrate upon struggles over speech and meaning. One way in which an appreciation of language might enrich the social history of early modern England concerns the meanings given to speech and silence. It is significant, for instance, that the early modern gentry and nobility conceived of popular politics in auditory terms, as a ‘commotion’ or a ‘hurly-burly’. This was

17 For my attempt to survey this literature, see A. Wood, Riot, rebellion and popular politics in early modern England (Basingstoke, 2002).
18 J. Epstein, In practice: studies in the language and culture of popular politics in modern Britain (Stanford, CA, 2003), 3.
because speech represented a highly sensitive point in both everyday social relations and in political practice. Labouring people were meant to keep silent in the presence of the gentry and nobility; where they did not, and in particular where they discussed political matters, they were often felt to have trespassed upon the territory of their rulers.

Chapter Three deals with how labouring people achieved the right to speak, with the ways in which the state monitored and regulated plebeian political speech, and with how the gentry and nobility attempted to impose silence upon their subordinates. Chapter Four is concerned with what labouring people had to say about politics. In 1997, John Guy recognised that language represented an important element of political life in Tudor England.\(^\text{19}\) Chapter Four extends this perspective further down the social scale, looking at popular political language. This chapter is especially concerned with struggles over the meanings of political keywords. It also looks at the ways in which the commons understood the Reformation; at the significance of ideas of order and disorder within rebel politics; and at how plebeians interpreted power relations in the period. Throughout Part II, we are concerned with the politics of rumour. As Shagan has recognised, ‘What made rumours so important was that they were unofficial, spreading and changing along channels that were not only independent of the royal government but were uncontrolled and uncontrollable. It was exactly this freedom of movement that made rumours “political”, since every person spreading them was implicated in the creation of their meaning.’\(^\text{20}\)

Part III focuses on the long-term significance of 1549. Chapter Five looks at the causes of the decline of the late medieval tradition of popular rebellion. It is especially concerned with the relationship between state formation and social change and argues that in the later Tudor and early Stuart period, the wealthier villagers and townspeople who had hitherto led popular rebellion were increasingly drawn into state structures. The result was a broader, more stable polity which, while inclusive of the ‘better sort of people’, excluded poorer social groups. Chapter Six is concerned with the memory and historical representation of the 1549 rebellions. It looks at immediate popular recollections of the commotion time; at the politics that underlay later sixteenth-century historical accounts of 1549; at the role played by polemical accounts of the rebellions in sustaining the social order; and at the ways in which the commotion time became embedded within popular memory. Finally, the book concludes by looking at how the meanings given to Kett’s


rebellion underwent fundamental change in the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The book privileges the story of the Norfolk rebellion led by Robert Kett. The intention is not to downplay the significance of the insurrections elsewhere in England. There was, of course, large-scale rebellion in other parts of East Anglia, in the East Riding of Yorkshire, in south-eastern and southern England, in the Midlands and in the western counties. The book pays attention to those insurrections. In Chapter One, we map out the broad geography of the commotion time. Similarly, in Chapter Two, we look at attempted rebellion across England after 1549. Chapters Three and Four draw on a wide array of evidence, concerning both the 1549 rebellions and earlier insurrections, together with a bulk of evidence taken from the 1530s. Nonetheless, in all the chapters, and in Chapters Five and Six in particular, special attention is given to Kett’s rebellion. There are good reasons for this. Most obviously, and most importantly, the archival evidence for Kett’s rebellion is much richer than that for the other insurrections. Moreover, in the later sixteenth century Kett’s rebellion became the subject of a number of important narrative accounts. Empirically, therefore, it is possible to describe Kett’s rebellion in much greater detail than is the case for the other insurrections. But there is another reason for this focus upon Norfolk. This county was one of the most socially divided and economically precocious of all those in mid-Tudor England. The intensity of the violence within Norfolk in 1549 contrasted with the relative restraint exercised by rebels in many other parts of England in that year. The reason for this, it is argued, is to be found in the particular sharpness of social relations in Norfolk which in 1549, in a clash of arms and ideas, pitted the ‘poor commons’ against the gentry.

This book, then, takes a set of events that have traditionally been regarded as the territory of political history and subjects them to social-historical analysis. All through the book, we seek to contextualise the events of 1549 within the inherent politics of everyday life. We go on to look at the 1549 insurrections as a key moment in longer-term processes of social and economic change. Throughout, the intention is to do more than merely insert the commons into a predetermined, elite-centred, high-political narrative, but instead to look at the Tudor polity from the bottom up.