

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

The National and Local Significance of Wyatt's Rebellion in Surrey

Author(s): William B. Robison

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (Dec., 1987), pp. 769-790

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2639118>

Accessed: 09/01/2013 17:42

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Historical Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE NATIONAL AND LOCAL SIGNIFICANCE OF WYATT'S REBELLION IN SURREY*

WILLIAM B. ROBISON
Southeastern Louisiana University

Though much has been written about Wyatt's rebellion, it remains controversial. There is, first of all, lively debate about the rebels' motives in rising against Mary Tudor in January and February 1554. It is generally agreed that some rebels wished only to force changes in royal policy, while others sought to replace the queen with her sister Elizabeth and Edward Courtenay, the earl of Devon. But, while D. M. Loades and his adherents contend that the rising was caused almost entirely by opposition to Mary's proposed marriage to Prince Philip of Spain, others argue – to varying degrees – that religion was significant and that many rebels were protestants seeking to thwart a catholic restoration.¹

The Marian government's handling of Wyatt's rebellion also forms part of a wider controversy about the competence of that regime in general. The traditional view is of a government in crisis, with a weak queen and an oversized privy council split into antagonistic factions headed by Bishop Stephen Gardiner and William Lord Paget of Beaudesert. Recently, however, revisionists have argued that the Marian regime was effective, that a small number of capable men handled most conciliar business, and that the extent of factionalism was greatly exaggerated by the imperial ambassador, Simon Renard, the main source of information on that subject. Neither side has yet had the last word.²

* The author would like to thank Professors Barrett Beer, Ronald H. Fritze, David M. Loades, Roger B. Manning, Ann Weikel and Frederic A. Youngs, Jr for reading earlier drafts of this paper and offering many useful suggestions. Of course final responsibility for the views expressed herein is my own. Thanks are also due to Ms Chris Leighton and Ms Emily Robison for valuable research assistance and to the Southeastern Louisiana University Development Foundation for providing equipment used in researching and writing this paper.

¹ D. M. Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies* (Cambridge, 1965) is the standard account of Wyatt's rebellion; Malcolm R. Thorp, 'Religion and the Wyatt rebellion of 1554', *Church History*, XLVII, 4 (1978), 363–80, makes a strong case for religious motives in addition to opposition to the Spanish match, as well as summarizing much of the scholarly opinion for and against Loades; another important critique of Loades is Peter Clark, *English provincial society from the reformation to the revolution: religion, politics, and society in Kent, 1500–1640* (Hassocks, 1977).

² The older view is presented most succinctly in W. R. D. Jones, *The mid-Tudor crisis 1539–1563* (New York, 1973), though it is embodied in a vast number of older works; examples of the new view are also too numerous to cite, but a good sample of the most important scholars' work can be found in Jennifer Loach and Robert Tittler. (eds.) *The mid-Tudor polity c. 1540–1560* (London, 1980); revisionism has had some influence on the old school, e.g. G. R. Elton, *Reform and*

Further research on specific functions of the central government is clearly necessary – Loades notes this in describing his recent book on Mary's reign as an 'interim report'. But further enlightenment must also come from study of developments at the local level. Peter Clark's work on Kent, though itself controversial, nevertheless has already shown that local circumstances and relationships among local magnates greatly influenced the course and consequences of Wyatt's rebellion.³ In Surrey the possibility of rebellion attracted considerable attention from the privy council, Lord William Howard arrested his local rival, Sir Thomas Cawarden, as a suspected rebel, and a number of men raised by Howard for the queen deserted to Wyatt. The following account of these events in Surrey will shed further light on and raise new questions about the extent of opposition to Mary, the rebels' motives, the council's handling of the crisis, the political intrigues of councillors – especially Gardiner – and the relationship between local politics and the rebellion's failure.

I

There was of course no rebellion in Surrey like that in Kent, nor did the official trials reveal any conspiracy there comparable to those in Kent, Devon, Herefordshire and Leicestershire. Yet the conspirators had connexions in Surrey. There was considerable potential for trouble there – surely greater than in Herefordshire or Leicestershire. In fact Wyatt was welcomed in Southwark, where there were desertions from royal forces raised in Surrey, and later in Kingston-upon-Thames. Evidence also exists, insufficiently emphasized in the past, that the central government was quite worried about the possibility of armed rebellion in the shire and may have averted it only narrowly. This is particularly interesting because it is now apparent that opposition to Mary during the earlier accession crisis of July 1553 was greater than most historians have believed in recent years.⁴ Based on the example of Surrey, the same seems to have been true during the Wyatt rising of January and February 1554.

The central figure of the story in Surrey is Sir Thomas Cawarden of Blechingley. The son of a London shearman and a mere mercer's apprentice in 1528, Cawarden by 1538 had acquired substantial monastic property in Surrey. Between January 1539 and July 1540 he became a gentleman of Henry VIII's privy chamber. All of this was accomplished thanks certainly to Thomas Cromwell. By at least the early 1540s, though almost surely earlier,

reformation: England 1509–1558 (Cambridge, 1977), but Loades continues to express some reservations in *The reign of Mary Tudor: politics, government, and religion in England, 1553–1558* (New York, 1979).

³ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, p. vii; Clark, *English provincial society*, pp. 87–98.

⁴ On the trials, see Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, ch. 4; on opposition to Mary at her accession, R. Tittler and Susan L. Battley, 'The local community and the crown in 1558: the accession of Mary Tudor revisited', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, LVII, 136 (1984), 131–9.

Cawarden was attracted to religious reform, and he would eventually become a thoroughgoing protestant. Perhaps partly because of Cawarden's religious sympathies, the king in August 1540 made him the protestant Anne of Cleves' steward of Blechingley manor, where he took up residence (and acquired substantial property under Edward VI). Despite being accused of heresy in 1543 – in an investigation which involved Gardiner – Cawarden continued to rise in royal favour. In 1544 he became keeper of Nonsuch Palace and master of tents and revels. The same year he led fifty-one horse and 200 foot in the military campaign in France and was knighted. The king in 1545 licensed him to keep forty liveried retainers.⁵

Generously remembered in Henry VIII's will, Cawarden fared even better under the new regime of Edward VI. Protector Somerset immediately made him a justice of the peace, a subsidy commissioner, and in November 1547 the first Edwardian sheriff of Surrey and Sussex. The voters of Surrey shared the central government's high regard for Cawarden – already a burgess for Blechingley in 1542 and 1547, he was chosen knight of the shire in a 1548 by-election and again in March 1553.⁶ Along with Sir Christopher More of Loseley (died 1549) and his son William More, Cawarden came to head a powerful local faction in Surrey and was one of the most influential men in the

⁵ Biographical sketches of Cawarden can be found in S. T. Bindoff (ed.), *The history of parliament: the house of commons 1509–1558* (3 vols., London, 1982), I, 599–602; Peter Hasler (ed.), *The history of parliament: the house of commons 1558–1603*, (3 vols., London, 1981), I, 569–70; Theodore Craib, 'Thomas Cawarden', *Surrey archaeological collections*, xxviii, 7–28; Leveson Gower, 'History of Blechingley', *Surrey archaeological collections*, v, 203–36; Alfred John Kempe, *The Loseley manuscripts, manuscripts and other rare documents illustrative of some of the more minute particulars of English history, biography, and manners, from the reign of Henry VIII to that of James I, preserved in the muniment room of James More Molyneux, esq. at Loseley House in Surrey* (London, 1836), pp. 15–19; and Uvedale Lambert, *Blechingley: a parish history*, (2 vols. London, 1921), I, 257–72; on Cawarden's appointment to the privy chamber, D. M. Starkey, 'The king's privy chamber 1485–1547' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1973), p. 205; on his prosecution for heresy cf. Thomas Fuller, *The worthies of England* (3 vols., London, 1841), III, 235, and James Arthur Muller, *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor reaction* (London, 1926), pp. 108–9, 360; his house at Blackfriars was a meeting place for London protestants during Mary's reign: A. G. Dickens, *The English reformation* (London, 1964), p. 274; on his lands in Surrey, H. E. Malden (ed.), *The Victoria history of the counties of England: a history of Surrey* (hereafter *V.C.H.*) (5 vols., London, 1901–12), III, 267–8; 317; IV, 57, 190, 257–8, 307–8, 311, 324, 328; for the context of his political career in Surrey, William Baxter Robison III, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey in national and county politics, 1483–1570' (unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1983), chs. 4–6 passim, and for a list of his offices, pp. 431–2. Cawarden's papers form part of the Loseley MSS, housed variously at the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Guildford Muniment Room in Surrey, and Loseley House near Guildford. The author is very grateful to Major James More-Molyneux of Loseley for permission to use those portions of the MSS in the latter two locations, to Miss Beck and Mrs Cork of the Guildford Muniment Room for their continuing help with the Loseley MSS, and to Ms Laetitia Yendle of the Folger and Professor John Loos of Louisiana State University for helping him to arrange the purchase by the Troy Middleton Library at L.S.U. of microfilm of the portions of the Loseley MSS at the Folger.

⁶ Bindoff, *History of parliament*, I, 599; Public Record Office C 66/801/18d; *List of sheriffs for England and Wales*, Public Record Office lists and indexes series IX, reprinted (New York, 1963), p. 137. Hereafter all documents cited are in the Public Record Office, London, unless otherwise specified.

county.⁷ He was not universally popular, however. During the insurrection of 1549 he was the object of hostility in Surrey along with his friend and fellow protestant, John Dudley, earl of Warwick and later duke of Northumberland. In addition he feuded with his neighbour and fellow J. P. William Sackville.⁸ He also had more powerful enemies.

The More–Cawarden faction was the newest of three powerful political groupings in Surrey. The oldest of these interests, headed by the Browne family, was usually on good terms with the More family at least. But considerable antagonism existed between the More–Cawarden group and the Surrey faction affiliated with the Howard family. The Howards had enjoyed great landed wealth and political influence in the shire since Richard III's time.⁹ The head of the Howard clan was, of course, the ageing Thomas, third duke of Norfolk, who emerged from the Tower of London with his old ally, Bishop Gardiner, at Mary's accession. Norfolk later had the ignominious distinction of leading against Wyatt the London White-coats who deserted to the rebels on 29 January 1554. However, the local family leader was Norfolk's half-brother, Lord William Howard of Effingham, who played a major part in suppressing the rebellion at large and a key role in the events in his own county of Surrey.¹⁰

Long associated with the Howards were two important and closely linked local catholic gentry families, the Saunderses and the Skinners. Both worked closely with Lord William during Wyatt's rising. Sir Thomas Saunders of Charlwood and his uncle, William Saunders of Ewell, became J. P.s in 1540 or 1541 during the Howard resurgence which followed the fall of Thomas Cromwell. Both men had held a variety of local offices, and Sir Thomas was knight of the shire along with Cawarden in Edward VI's last parliament. James Skinner and his nephew John were of a well-established family in the borough of Reigate, a Howard stronghold for many years. James had been a J.P. since at least 1538. John obtained a place on the bench under Northumberland, despite his opposition during the insurrection of 1549 to the latter's enclosing activity in Surrey.¹¹ Lord William Howard, the Saunderses and the Skinners were to be the principal men in Surrey responsible for the

⁷ Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey', chs. 4–6 passim; William More was the overseer and a beneficiary of Cawarden's will, PROB 11/43/4.

⁸ Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey', pp. 263–7; REQ 2/5/305; STAC 3/3/49; SP 10/7/35.

⁹ The activities of these factions are a major theme of Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey'.

¹⁰ Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, pp. 57–62, 67, 69, 73.

¹¹ The first extant commission of the peace on which the Saunderses appear is dated 7 February 1541, C 66/697/12d; James Skinner first appears on a commission for 9 July 1538, C 66/678/8d, but may have been a J.P. for as long as three years, since he is shown attending quarter sessions on a pipe roll account for October 1535 to November 1538, E 372/384/Surr–Suss; John Skinner first appears on a commission for 18 February 1554, C 66/864/6d, but appears on a pipe roll account for May 1552 to January 1553, E 372/398/Surr–Suss; for the context of their careers in Surrey, Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey', chs. 3–6 passim, and for their offices, pp. 489–91, 495–6, 498; Bindoff, *History of parliament*, III, 274.

attempt to prevent Cawarden from playing an active role in Wyatt's rebellion.

Cawarden clearly supported his friend Northumberland's attempt to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne following Edward VI's death in July 1553. During Jane's brief reign he supplied tents for her defenders against Mary, co-operating with the privy council, the short-lived queen and her father, Henry Grey, the duke of Suffolk. Indeed Cawarden must have remained faithful to the last – he received a warrant for tents as late as 19 July, the day before Northumberland's capitulation. On the same day several Kentish magnates, mostly conservatives but including – very significantly – Sir Thomas Wyatt, wrote to Cawarden. They informed him that they had proclaimed Mary queen and denounced Jane as a traitor and went on to urge Cawarden to do likewise. It is probably not stretching the evidence too far to suggest that at least Wyatt and Cawarden had originally shared a common interest in keeping Mary off the throne.¹²

In any case Cawarden's enemies in the Howard faction benefited substantially from Mary's victory, as did the Brownes and religiously conservative J.P.s in general. The fortunes of most protestants declined. Although Mary had new commissions of the peace sent out on 11 August 1553, there is unfortunately none extant before those issued on 18 February 1554, *after* Wyatt's rebellion. While it is unlikely that Mary made major changes on the Surrey commission in August, she most likely removed some or all of the twelve Edwardian J.P.s missing from the later Surrey commission *before* the rebellion. But even if Cawarden (one of the twelve Edwardians) remained on the bench, he was certainly in a weaker position with regard to the Howard faction.¹³

The Howard group accounted for more than a third of the active membership still on the bench on 18 February 1554 and thus definitely on the Surrey commission of the peace in the months prior to the rebellion. Included in that list were Lord William Howard, the Saunderses, the Skinners, Cawarden's adversary William Sackville, John Caryll and, possibly by this

¹² F[olger] S[hakespeare] L[ibrary] MSS L. b. 24, 303, 504; G[uildford] M[uniment] R[oom] Loseley MSS, Correspondence 3/3; Loseley [House] MSS, v, no. 4; XII, no 139, 2014/8. Wyatt may have opposed Mary more actively than is usually credited – the anonymous chronicler in John Gough Nichols (ed.), *The chronicle of Queen Jane and two years of Queen Mary and especially of the rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyatt written by a resident in the Tower of London* (Camden Society, old series, XLVIII, 1870), p. 52, records the assertion that Wyatt had borne arms against Mary prior to the rebellion of 1554; that assertion is repeated in John Stow, *The annals of England* (London, 1605), p. 1051 (I am grateful to Professor Barrett Beer for calling this latter reference to my attention).

¹³ Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey', pp. 278–82; C 66/864/6d; the J.P.s removed by 18 February 1554 and possibly before Wyatt's rebellion were Cawarden, his ally and fellow protestant William More, Sir Roger Cholmley of London (imprisoned July–September 1553 for supporting Queen Jane), Richard Goodrich (a protestant), Henry Mannoke (an enemy of William Saunders), John Stidolph (the son of one of Thomas Cromwell's chief supporters in Surrey), Lawrence Stoughton (a protestant), Richard Taverner (a notorious protestant polemicist), John Vaughan (a protestant with connexions to William Cecil), and three relative nonentities, William Baseley, Griffin Leyson and George Powle.

time, Richard Morgan and Henry Vine. Also perhaps associated with the Howards on the bench was Sir Edward Bray, the kinsman of the Brownes but also described as the 'servant' of Norfolk. The Brownes and their allies held at least half a dozen places on the commission. But of the More-Cawarden group, only Henry Polsted of Guildford *definitely* remained a J.P. between Mary's accession and the outbreak of Wyatt's rebellion.¹⁴

The Howard faction's dominance in Surrey was reflected in the elections called in August 1553 for Mary's first parliament, even though the More-Cawarden group offered more competition than might have been expected. Factional alliance and loyalty to the crown may have been more important than religion in the election of the senior knight of the shire – the Howards and the Brownes apparently co-operated to give the victory to Sir Edward Bray. He was later active in suppressing Wyatt's rebellion, but was possibly a protestant. However, the choice of the arch-catholic William Saunders for the junior seat was a clear victory for the Howards and for reaction. Cawarden, knight of the shire since 1548, did not obtain a seat anywhere for this parliament. This suggests that he stood against his rival Saunders, lost, and decided to stay out altogether. There is no apparent reason why he could not have had one of the seats at Blechingley, where, as the local patron, he arranged the return of his friend Henry Polsted and the protestant Matthew Colthurst. Of course the Marian regime may have tried to keep Cawarden out of parliament, where he was later to be a thorn in the queen's side. Outside Blechingley, William More added to his faction's success by taking the senior seat at Guildford, but the Howards controlled the elections at Gattton and at Reigate, where Sir Thomas Saunders was a burgess.¹⁵

Thus if the More-Cawarden faction's influence was by no means inconsequential at this stage, it had been surpassed by the Howard group. Cawarden had suffered a serious personal setback by his failure to regain his by now accustomed seat as knight of the shire. This must have been highly galling to him, especially if he had already lost his place on the bench. His

¹⁴ This estimate is based on the commission of the peace for 18 February 1554, C 66/864/6d. Bray married the daughter of Sir Matthew Browne of Betchworth, a powerful and cantankerous Surrey J.P.: W. Bruce Bannerman (ed.), *The visitations of the county of Surrey made and taken in the years 1530 by Thomas Benolte, Clarenceux king of arms; 1572 by Robert Cooke, Clarenceux king of arms; and 1623 by Samuel Thompson, Windsor herald, and Augustin Vincent, Rouge Croix poursuivant, marshals and deputies to William Camden, Clarenceux king of arms* (London, 1895), pp. 9, 177; on Bray and Caryll's connexion to the Howards, R. J. W. Swales, 'The Howard interest in Sussex elections 1529 to 1558', *Sussex archaeological collections*, cxiv (1976), 50–1, though in fact Bray's description of himself as Norfolk's 'servant' may simply have been the polite formula of sixteenth-century correspondents; on Morgan and Vine, Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey', p. 293; associated in various ways with Sir Anthony and Sir Matthew Browne were Sir John Gage, Sir Robert Southwell, Richard Bedon, John Scott and Bray.

¹⁵ Bindoff, *History of parliament*, i, 193–7, 491–2, 679–80, 708–9; ii, 290–1, 434–5; iii, 70–1. Bray's protestantism is problematic – *History of parliament* assumes it on the basis of his appearance on a list of those 'who stood for the true religion', but Jennifer Loach, 'Opposition to the crown in parliament 1553–1558' (unpublished D. Phil. dissertation, University of Oxford, 1971), pp. 86–7, notes that the inclusion on that list of Sir Thomas Cornwallis, a known catholic, makes it an unreliable indicator of religious preference.

misfortune undoubtedly owed something to his ardent protestantism, though adherence to the reformed faith may not have kept Sir Edward Bray from office and even Lord William Howard was religiously a moderate. Perhaps more important was Cawarden's recent complicity in the Lady Jane Grey affair. Locally his main disadvantage was the enmity of the Howard faction. At any rate he had ample cause to be dissatisfied with the new regime, which in turn could only regard him with suspicion.

The extent of Cawarden's involvement in the rebellion against that regime in early 1554 is not easy to determine. He was never indicted, nor do any of the contemporary chroniclers or gossipy foreign ambassadors ascribe to him any role in the conspiracy. Cawarden in later years maintained his own innocence, though at the time he did so he was involved in litigation to recover goods seized during the rebellion and had little reason to acknowledge guilt.¹⁶ Yet there is a great deal of circumstantial evidence which appears to link him to the plot against Mary. In addition there is no doubt whatsoever that men in both the central and local government were worried about his possible participation in the uprising. His connexions with Wyatt and Suffolk have been noted, but it needs to be pointed out that he could have had frequent contact with both men. This could have occurred at court or

¹⁶ For those indicted, Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, pp. 15–6; F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b. 44, a petition presented by Cawarden to the privy council in 1559, seeking the return of goods seized from him by Lord William Howard on behalf of the Marian government during Wyatt's rebellion (the council granted him permission to seek redress through the common law on 3 May 1559, though on 8 August 1560 they ordered the overseer of his will, William More, to drop the effort, L. b. 45); L. b. 32, a draft of the aforementioned petition, contains a fuller account of Cawarden's arrests, the seizure of his goods, and his ultimate release; the assumption of Lambert, *Blechingley*, p. 267, that Cawarden was innocent is not particularly convincing; his suggestion, p. 266, that Cawarden and Sir Thomas Saunders were friends is wrong, as is borne out by the fuller context given in Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey', chs. 5–6. In preparing this article, the author has consulted all those chronicles used by Loades in *Two Tudor conspiracies*: William Cobbett et al., *A complete collection of state trials* (London, 1816–98); John Foxe, *Acts and monuments of the English Martyrs*, ed. S. R. Cattley and George Townsend (London, 1837–41); Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles*, ed. Henry Ellis (London, 1807–8); Henry Machyn, *The diary of Henry Machyn*, ed. John Gough Nichols (Camden Society, old series, XLII, 1848); John Gough Nichols (ed.), *The Greyfriars chronicle of London* (Camden Society, old series, LIII, 1852); *The chronicle of Queen Jane*; John Proctor, *The historie of Wyate's rebellion* (London, 1554), reprinted in A. F. Pollard, *Tudor tracts 1532–1588* (New York, 1964), pp. 199–257; Stow, *The annals of England*; John Strype, *Ecclesiastical memorials* (London, 1721); Charles Wriothesley, *A chronicle of England*, ed. W. D. Hamilton (Camden Society, new series, XI, 1875); George Wyatt, *The papers of George Wyatt*, ed. D. M. Loades (Camden Society, 4th series, v, 1968). Additional chronicles consulted for this article include Gilbert Burnet, *History of the reformation in England* (London, 1681–1714); Charles Lethbridge Kingsford (ed.), *Two London chroniclers from the collections of John Stow* (Camden Society, 3rd series, xviii, 1910); John Gough Nichols (ed.), *Narratives of the days of the reformation* (Camden Society, old series, LXXVII, 1859); Nicholas Sander, *Rise and growth of the Anglican schism, published A.D. 1585 with a continuation of the history by the Rev. Edward Richton, B.A. of Brasenose College Oxford, translated, with introduction and notes by David Lewis M.A.* (London, 1877). Also examined was the correspondence of all those diplomats in London at the time of the rebellion whose papers have survived and been calendared in English in Rawdon Brown et al. (eds.), *Calendar of state papers, Venetian* (London, 1864–98); W. B. Turnbull, *Calendar of state papers, foreign* (London, 1861); Royall Tyler, et al., *Calendar of State Papers, Span[ish]* (London, 1862–1964). None of these sources mentions Cawarden in connexion with Wyatt's rebellion.

elsewhere. Cawarden had a house at Blackfriars, which was the frequent resort of protestants, and his home at Blechingley was near the border of Kent. In the days just before the outbreak of the rebellion, Suffolk was staying in Surrey at Sheen.¹⁷

Cawarden was also associated with Sir Edward Warner and William Parr, marquis of Northampton, who were arrested during the rebellion (Warner may have been indicted later), and William Knight, a radical protestant follower of Wyatt in Kent. Cawarden's links to Anne of Cleves help to account for her being held in suspension for a time during the crisis. Especially significant was Cawarden's friendship with Princess Elizabeth. Many of the conspirators wished to place her on the throne instead of her sister Mary, and it is hard to imagine that Cawarden would have objected to such a development.¹⁸

Sir Thomas's activities in the years following the rebellion also point to his possible involvement. In the election for the parliament which convened in October 1555 he arranged the return for Blechingley of William Smethwick, a protestant who had been imprisoned for his role in Wyatt's rebellion and who also had links with Elizabeth. Much more revealing was his complicity in the Dudley conspiracy of 1556, which involved some of the surviving rebels of 1554. One of Cawarden's own servants was executed for his part in the later conspiracy, though Sir Thomas himself miraculously escaped.¹⁹ But the most compelling evidence of all is the actions taken with regard to Cawarden by members of the privy council and of the Surrey commission of the peace during the first few days of Wyatt's rising.

II

The general story of Wyatt's rebellion is well enough known for only a minimum of background information to be needed here. When Mary's intention to marry the catholic Prince Philip of Spain became unmistakably clear in November 1553, it provoked widespread dismay both at court and in the country, among a broad array of catholics fearful of foreign domination and protestants who dreaded both Philip and a return to the Roman religion. The most determined conciliar opponent of the match was no less than the reactionary Bishop Stephen Gardiner, lord chancellor of England, who preferred for the royal husband an Englishman, Edward Courtenay, the earl

¹⁷ Dickens, *English reformation*, p. 274; Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, p. 25.

¹⁸ Cawarden was associated with Warner under Elizabeth as joint lieutenant of the Tower of London, Bindoff, *History of parliament*, I, 599; on Warner's possible indictment, Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, p. 16; Cawarden was connected to Northampton through the latter's friendship with William More, e.g. Loseley MSS XII, nos. 10, 12; he was overseer of Knight's will, Clark, *English provincial society*, p. 92; he was known to be friendly to Elizabeth during Mary's reign, Bindoff, *History of parliament*, I, 602; he benefited substantially at her accession to the throne, Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey' pp. 303-13.

¹⁹ Bindoff, *History of parliament*, I, 329-30; Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, pp. 190, 210, 228, 246n., 265.

of Devon. Unfortunately for Gardiner, Courtenay was involved to some degree with the conspirators who emerged in November 1553 with a plan for a rising against Mary which would thwart the Spanish marriage and, perhaps, wed Courtenay to Elizabeth and place the realm in their control.²⁰

The crisis broke in mid-January 1554. Gardiner, who had already lost much of his influence on the privy council because of his opposition to the marriage, sent for Courtenay on 21 January and forced him to confess all that he knew. Fearing that if what he learned thereby became known he might lose more than influence, Gardiner suppressed the dangerous portion of the information and urged negotiations with the rebels. He also withheld part of what he learned from an intercepted dispatch of the French ambassador, Antoine de Noailles, who was deeply involved in the conspiracy.²¹ It is quite possible that shortly after he did the same thing with the information he obtained from Sir Thomas Cawarden following the latter's first arrest during the rebellion.

At any rate Gardiner told at least part of what he knew to Mary. On 22 January she sent a letter to the J.P.s of Surrey – and presumably letters to the J.P.s of other shires – ordering them to declare the terms of the proposed marriage and to suppress sedition and hindrance of the restoration of the catholic religion. Things now happened quickly. By 25 January Sir Peter Carew had attempted to raise Devon, failed, and decided to flee the country. Sir Thomas Wyatt had been in Kent since 19 January, was known to be fomenting rebellion, and raised his standard on the same day that Carew lowered his. At this time the duke of Suffolk was staying in Surrey at Sheen, and the privy council decided to test his dubious loyalty to the Marian regime by offering him a military command against his fellow rebels on the morning of 25 January. But Suffolk misinterpreted this interruption of his breakfast as a summons to the executioner's block and fled to Leicestershire, where plans for him to lead a rising proved pathetically abortive.²²

On the same morning, some time between eight and ten o'clock, Lord William Howard and James and John Skinner appeared at Cawarden's house at Blechingley, arrested him, and brought him before the privy council in Star Chamber. (It is an at least interesting coincidence that, like Wyatt, Cawarden was away from London and in the country at this juncture.) On 26 January, according to Cawarden's later account, Gardiner 'demanded diverse and sundry questions which [Cawarden] so answered as thereupon he was clearly discharged, dismissed, and set at liberty'.²³ Regrettably it is not known what other councillors than Gardiner were present at this examination.

At Cawarden's departure, the privy council gave him two letters. One was to discharge the sheriff, Sir Thomas Saunders, from keeping Cawarden's

²⁰ Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, pp. 12–24.

²¹ *Ibid.* pp. 23–4; E. Harris Harbison, *Rival ambassadors at the court of Queen Mary* (Princeton, 1940), chs. 4–6 for Noailles' complicity and p. 130 on Gardiner's suppression of evidence.

²² Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, pp. 25–6.

²³ F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b 32; Lambert, *Blechingley*, p. 265, erroneously has Cawarden being released on 27 January.

house at Blechingley, where he had been since Cawarden's arrest. Almost certainly Saunders had been placed in charge there, either by Howard or some of his fellow privy councillors, to prevent Cawarden's rather formidable arsenal from falling into rebel hands. Wyatt's followers seized a considerable quantity of arms in Kent, and Blechingley was not necessarily out of their reach. But Wyatt was still occupied in Kent on 25 and 26 January, and Howard and the other councillors may have feared an attempt to seize Cawarden's weaponry by rebels in Surrey itself.²⁴ Subsequent events suggest that such fears would have been justified.

The other letter which the council gave Cawarden actually ordered him to begin personally making military preparations to oppose the rebels. He was told

to put yourself in full order with as many of your servants and tenants as you can make (both on horseback and foot), to be in readiness to march and set forward upon hour's warning... And in the mean time to have good regard to the quiet order of the parts where ye dwell, causing all such idle and lewd persons as shall either by spreading abroad of untrue rumors, or by any other means attempt to stir or disquiet our loving subjects, to be apprehended and punished as the quality of their offenses shall deserve.²⁵

Thus Cawarden returned home, with Wyatt's rising in Kent already under way and with the surprising instructions to raise a body of armed men himself.

The release of Cawarden on the same day that Mary ordered the lords lieutenant to proclaim Suffolk, Wyatt and others to be traitors is curious. Odd also was the decision – perhaps instigated and at least agreed to by Gardiner – to have Cawarden raise a military force. It could be that this simply arose from confusion in the hectic early days of the rebellion. Cawarden may have had considerable military responsibility in Surrey during Edward VI's reign, while his friend the marquis of Northampton was lord lieutenant. In any case he was an important local official, possessed a large arsenal, and may have seemed a natural choice for the job, *if* he was deemed loyal by the councillors who dealt with him. It was not until 26 January, the day that Cawarden was released and given the two letters, that Mary granted Lord William Howard a special deputation to deal with the rebels in Kent, Surrey and Sussex. Howard's new authority was perhaps not yet known to all when Cawarden was given his instructions, and in any case the two would not necessarily have been contradictory.²⁶

But was Cawarden loyal or even deemed to be so? His arrest on the same

²⁴ F.S.L. Loseley L. b. 32; L. b. 341, the letter ordering Cawarden to raise troops is headed 'By the queen', but is not signed by any privy councillor.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ On Cawarden's military activities, Loseley MSS 2014/8, printed in Kempe, *The Loseley manuscripts*, pp. 121–3 – a letter from Queen Jane to Northampton and (unnamed) deputy lieutenants, confirming them in their duties as under Edward VI; since these are Cawarden and More's papers, it stands to reason that one or both of them were deputies; for Howard's appointment, F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b 70, printed in Kempe, pp. 132–4.

day that the privy council tested Suffolk, that Carew fled Devon, and that Wyatt rose in Kent makes it clear that Cawarden was under suspicion – perhaps because of his co-operation with the duke in July 1553, perhaps because of a similar relationship with Wyatt, perhaps for some other reason. Yet something persuaded the council not only to turn him loose, but to entrust him with raising a large and potentially very dangerous body of men. The risk here needs to be stressed, for Cawarden was already licensed to keep forty retainers, and he had at Blechingley weapons and equipment sufficient to outfit as many as 110 horse and over 300 foot. Moreover, he had sixteen pieces of ordnance, and when one considers the difficulty Wyatt had with cannon and the difference these pieces might have made at Southwark or Ludgate later on, they take on a very great significance indeed.²⁷

Unfortunately it is impossible to know for certain why Cawarden was released and what his intentions were as he returned to Blechingley, where he did in fact begin raising men. There are several possible explanations which must be discussed before the rest of the story is told. In the absence of more conclusive evidence, however, these can only be regarded as speculation. Significant here is that Gardiner approved and was perhaps even personally responsible for Cawarden's release. Gardiner's policy towards the rebellion was not completely discredited until 31 January, and he still had influence and supporters on the council on 26 January. It would be most interesting to know if Paget and any of his supporters were present at Cawarden's questioning. Cawarden's failure to mention Paget in his account suggests that he at least was not. If that was the case, Paget would not have been a party to the decision to release Cawarden and have him raise men. Paget did complain that no one besides himself made any attempt to gather forces to support Mary.²⁸

One admittedly unlikely explanation for Cawarden's release, though one that needs to be addressed, is that Gardiner actually *wanted* him to join the rebellion. Simon Renard certainly suspected that Gardiner and his allies on the privy council were in sympathy with the rebels. Though Renard's word is not very highly regarded these days (and with justice), it should not be overlooked entirely, for he credits Paget with having the same opinion of Gardiner. Moreover, Gardiner did have a possible motive. He and his supporters had vehemently opposed Mary's marriage to Philip. In addition, until after the rebellion was over he stoutly maintained that the marriage was its only cause and that religion had nothing whatsoever to do with it. Certainly the religiously conservative Gardiner would not have given aid and comfort to the rebellion if he had seen it as protestant. Nor would he have wished to see Elizabeth married to Courtenay and enthroned. But he might

²⁷ SP 11/2/19; *V.C.H.* 1, 375, gives the estimate of the number Cawarden could have armed; there are numerous inventories of his arsenal in F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b 53–80; an example is printed in Kempe, *The Loseley manuscripts*, pp. 134–9.

²⁸ Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, p. 66; F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b 32; on Paget's complaint, *C.S.P. Span.* xii, 68 (I am grateful to Professor Ann Weikel for this reference).

have wanted a rebellion motivated by the marriage to last long enough or achieve sufficient success to frighten or force Mary into giving up the Spanish match. Of course it can be argued that Gardiner aided in uncovering and defeating the rebellion, but he in fact withheld important information and, again according to Renard, Paget believed he was sabotaging military preparations. It is necessary to remember that Gardiner was quite a Machiavellian, whether he ever wrote the Machiavellian treatise now being attributed to him or not.²⁹

However, the above explanation flies in the face of recent scholarship and is out of line with Gardiner's own history of arguing against royal policy *only* until a monarch had made up his mind (as with Henry VIII on the royal supremacy). Furthermore, a much more likely explanation can be advanced for Renard's claims about Gardiner and for Paget's viewpoint, if Renard can be taken as describing it accurately. Even assuming that Gardiner had the best of intentions, his part in setting Cawarden free and ordering him to raise men in Surrey was certain to arouse the suspicions of the paranoid Renard and probably of Paget as well. In fact it may very well have been the decision to release Cawarden that provoked Renard's remarks, which were made just afterwards. The imperial ambassador could easily have interpreted this as confirmation of the suspicions about Gardiner aroused by, among other

²⁹ Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, p. 58, and G. A. Lemasters, 'The privy council in the reign of Queen Mary I' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1971), p. 155, on Paget and Renard's suspicions about Gardiner; the idea that Gardiner conceivably could have wanted Cawarden to rebel developed as the result of a dialogue between the author of the present article and Professor Ronald H. Fritze, who has studied Gardiner's political activities in Hampshire in 'Faith and faction: religious changes, national politics, and the development of local factionalism in Hampshire, 1485-1570' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1981); the argument that Gardiner was the author of a Machiavellian treatise was made by Peter S. Donaldson (ed.), *A Machiavellian treatise by Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge, 1975), who also contends (pp. 27-8), that Gardiner had accepted the Spanish match by December 1553, at which time he was in fact working for its acceptance. However, the treaty which Gardiner supported in December contained numerous concessions to England which addressed Gardiner's own earlier objections to the marriage. Moreover, as Donaldson himself admits, Philip, after signing the treaty, then forsook it on 4 January 1554, three weeks before the outbreak of Wyatt's rebellion, and there is some evidence that Mary consented to this (*C.S.P. Span.* xii, 5, 36). This could have aroused Gardiner's opposition to the marriage once again. It is also interesting, if Donaldson is right about Gardiner's authorship, that the treatise is rather ambivalent on the subject of rebellion. Though the treatise does say that revolt is not permissible, it defends the practice of arming the English populace, claiming that its reputation for rebelliousness is undeserved and that rebellions in the past occurred because of the unfairness of the prince or because of aristocratic factionalism, pp. 36, 125-6. The treatise also contains an invented story about a law of Edward VI's reign against insult, 'allegedly designed to protect former rebels from the taunts of their countrymen' the suggestion being that this was a good idea, pp. 22-3, 129. Finally, the general tenor of Donaldson's work is that the treatise shows Gardiner as more favourable to Spain and the Habsburgs than has generally been thought. Even if this is true, however, the bulk - perhaps all - of the treatise was written after Wyatt's rebellion and is not necessarily indicative of Gardiner's attitude during the rising. Certainly Gardiner was capable of changing his mind, as he did on the role of religion as a motive for the rebellion. After the revolt's failure, with the marriage plan secure and preparations under way for Philip's arrival, Gardiner had little cause for open opposition and ample reason for wanting to appear more pro-Habsburg.

things, the latter's suppression of information in Noailles' dispatch, an act already known to Renard. In any case it soon became clear that not all of the privy council accepted the wisdom of setting Cawarden free. This points up, incidentally, the fact that there were clearly divisions in the council. Moreover, those councillors later responsible for Cawarden's second arrest failed to inform Gardiner of their action, a further indication of division, distrust and lack of co-operation.³⁰

As for Gardiner, a number of less sinister explanations for his role in releasing Cawarden are possible. According to Loades, Gardiner at this stage still clung to his fruitless hope for a negotiated settlement with the rebels, by which he thought to end the crisis and avoid embarrassment or worse to himself. Perhaps he feared that if Cawarden were pressed too hard for information by Gardiner's enemies on the privy council, he might reveal things about the conspiracy or the rebellion which Gardiner preferred kept secret. This would further undermine Gardiner's position at court and impair his ability to negotiate with the rebels. And Gardiner had already attempted to suppress potentially damaging information obtained from Courtenay and from Noailles' dispatch. Of course, if Cawarden knew enough to be dangerous he was probably in league with the rebels, in which case releasing him was risky. But Gardiner may have been forced to choose between keeping a potentially incriminating witness around to be questioned by his own enemies on the privy council and turning him loose, with the possibility that he might enter into armed rebellion.³¹

But certainly the desire to get Cawarden away from London would not have necessitated giving him an order to raise troops. So perhaps an even better explanation is that Gardiner, who did favour negotiation, talked Cawarden out of co-operating with the rebels, convinced him that the rebellion was bound to fail, and persuaded him to support the government in return for freedom from prosecution. Or it could simply be that he thought Cawarden was indeed innocent. Considerable evidence suggests that he was not, but that does not mean Gardiner did not think so. Finally, it is conceivable that, in spite of all the circumstantial evidence to the contrary, Cawarden was innocent of complicity with the rebels, and that his second arrest on the day after his release was the result of misplaced suspicion and local rivalry in Surrey.³²

³⁰ Gardiner is generally regarded as loyal to the Marian regime, e.g. Donaldson, *A Machiavellian treatise*; Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies* and *Queen Mary*; Ann Weikel, 'The Marian council revisited', in Loach and Tittler, *The mid-Tudor polity*; on divisions in the council cf. Lemasters, 'The privy council in the reign of Queen Mary I', p. 155; on Gardiner's ignorance of Cawarden's second arrest, F.S.L. Loseley MSS L.b. 32.

³¹ Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, pp. 52-4.

³² Interestingly, there is a copy of Mary's pardon to the rebels in the More and Cawarden papers, Loseley MSS v, no. 5, printed in Kempe, *The Loseley manuscripts*, pp. 129-30. Cawarden could have been given a copy of the pardon at the time of his arrest (or later) by Sir Thomas Saunders, who endorsed the copy.

III

Ultimately Gardiner and his fellow privy councillors' motives for releasing Cawarden remain obscure. Those of the men who soon arrested Sir Thomas Cawarden a second time are somewhat clearer. At the conciliar level Paget probably had something to do with the arrest. Some of the councillors certainly knew about it, and he could have been motivated by both distrust of Cawarden and Gardiner and the desire to embarrass the latter by reversing his earlier decision. The suggestion that Paget was involved is strengthened by the fact that it was Lord William Howard who carried out the arrest. Howard was later very closely associated with Paget and was probably already so. In any case at the local level, where the picture is clearer, Howard and his followers must have doubted the loyalty of Cawarden, but they were also faced with an excellent opportunity to make life difficult for their factional opponent. Undoubtedly both motives were a factor in subsequent events, though one can only speculate about their relative weight. However, it is noteworthy that the Howard faction made no attempt against William More, Cawarden's ally, a prominent local protestant, and – from Mary's point of view – a troublemaker.³³

Mary had made Lord William Howard a privy councillor, more recently lord admiral of England, and on 26 January – the day after he first arrested Cawarden – she granted him a special deputation to deal with the rebels in Kent, Surrey and Sussex. Following Cawarden's release, Howard quickly decided to arrest him again and seize his arsenal at Blechingley. This was clearly done with the consent of some of his fellow councillors, including presumably Paget, though without the knowledge of Gardiner. Lord William's loyalty to Mary at this stage (he was later a defender of Elizabeth) and his abhorrence of insurrection are unimpeachable. But there was no love lost between Howard and Cawarden, and the lord admiral must have relished his task. He certainly cannot be blamed for distrusting Cawarden and seeking to neutralize the potential threat which the latter posed, but the opportunity to injure his rival may have made him over-zealous. The later behaviour of Howard's subordinates to Cawarden was certainly not beyond reproach.³⁴

On 27 January Howard sent word to Cawarden 'to meet him a mile distant

³³ On the councillors' knowledge of the second arrest, F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b 32, 44, 70; on Howard's relationship to Paget, e.g. Weikel, 'The Marian council revisited', p. 69; on More, Bindoff, *History of parliament*, II, 625–6, and Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey', ch. 5.

³⁴ F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b 32, 70; on the baseless rumours about Howard's disloyalty, Weikel, 'The Marian council revisited', p. 68. It is tempting to speculate a bit here about the ramifications of Cawarden's release and subsequent rearrest. Did Gardiner learn something from Cawarden which led to the actions culminating in the arrest of John Harrington on 27 January (Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, p. 27)? Were the granting of new powers to Lord William Howard, the command of the London Whitecoats given to Norfolk on 27 January and the decision to rearrest Cawarden all part of a single programme, adopted by Paget and other councillors who distrusted Gardiner, because of suspicions aroused by the release of Cawarden? Was Gardiner's involvement in that release contributory to his being completely out of favour by 31 January?

from his house', obviously unwilling to encounter Sir Thomas in the presence of the latter's well-equipped retinue. Cawarden and an unnamed companion rode out to meet Howard, who was accompanied by Sir Thomas Saunders, the sheriff, and the two Skinners. Why Cawarden should have trusted Howard is not entirely clear – perhaps he felt secure, having once been arrested by his rival and then set free by the privy council. At any rate the men arrested Cawarden again, and Howard declared his authority to seize the arsenal at Blechingley for the queen's use. Cawarden, as he later told it himself, 'assuring himself to be clear, did submit and yield him with certain words in defense of his goods, though not regarded'. Lord William at first placed Cawarden in the custody of the two Skinners at Reigate, but then 'upon better advice, for the better quiet and discharge' of Sir Thomas's retinue at Blechingley, decided it would be wise to take Cawarden there with him when turning the house over to Sir Thomas Saunders. Clearly Howard regarded Cawarden's following as too dangerous to confront without the presence of their master, and was none too anxious to ride into a hostile situation at Blechingley. Only after placing Cawarden's house and armaments in Sir Thomas Saunders' custody did Howard take his prisoner back to Reigate, where he was held at James Skinner's house until 30 January.³⁵

In the meantime Sir Thomas Saunders occupied Cawarden's house, calling his uncle, William Saunders, there to help in confiscating the large store of equipment. Howard remained nervous to the point of absentmindedness about the seizure of Cawarden's gear. On 28 January he wrote from his house at Reigate to the two Saunderses that he 'was in doubt whether I put you in remembrance... that you should bring away the ordnance that is there' and ordered them 'in anywise' to do so. Though Cawarden was in custody, Howard may have been worried about what his supporters around Blechingley might do (though, as will be discussed below, another possibility is that Howard drafted into the service of the queen those men already raised by Cawarden). Blechingley was also near to western Kent, the most rebellious area of that shire. Lord William wanted to take no chance of dangerous weapons falling into the hands of rebels, some of whose fellows had already captured ordnance elsewhere. Upon further orders from Howard, the Saunderses and their men on 29 January carried away eighteen wagonloads of weapons and other gear (small wonder that Howard was concerned!). Much of the equipment was taken to the Tower of London, but some to Reigate and to William Saunders' house at Ewell. Cawarden later complained that they 'spoiled much of his hay, corn, and straw' during their stay and failed to give his wife, Lady Elizabeth, indentures for all they had taken.³⁶

³⁵ F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b 32; Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, p. 57, erroneously places Cawarden in the Tower of London on 27 January.

³⁶ F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b 32, 44, 70; on the distribution of rebels in Kent, Anthony Fletcher, *Tudor rebellions*, 2nd edn (London, 1973), p. 86, and the map in Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, opposite p. 284; the importance of Howard's preventing Cawarden's arms from falling into rebel hands is underscored by John Proctor's observation that many of Wyatt's followers were unarmed as they approached London, Pollard, *Tudor Tracts*, p. 249; *The chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 47

By this time some members of the privy council other than Howard definitely knew what was going on. Howard told the Saunderses on 28 January that he had 'writ to my lords of the council of all our doings' and that they should expect instructions from the council that evening about where to take the confiscated armaments. One wonders if the council actually authorized taking weapons anywhere besides the Tower or if the Howard faction on its own initiative decided to transfer some of Cawarden's stockpile to their own households. In any case Cawarden also claimed later that the Saunderses in confiscating his arms acted 'by pretence and color of commandment from the... council'.³⁷

But Gardiner, not in very high favour with the queen or his fellow councillors, apparently was not told. On 30 January Howard and a guard of men furnished with Cawarden's own equipment escorted Sir Thomas from Reigate to Lambeth and from there to Gardiner's house at the Clink, where they perhaps intended that he should be imprisoned. Gardiner was caught by surprise. According to Cawarden, the Lord Chancellor

admarveling to see him there, demanded what was the matter, saying he knew nothing thereof, and from thence brought him before certain of the council, sitting at St. James, who did not there charge him with any matter special or general, but with gentle words willed him to repair to his own house at the late Black friars without *bond*, with liberty for all his friends to have access to him, and there to remain until he heard further from the said Lords.³⁸

Again it is regrettable that the identity of the other councillors involved is not known. Regardless of who was present, they were apparently unwilling or unable to prove any wrongdoing on Cawarden's part and elected merely to keep him under house arrest, where he could be watched and kept out of Surrey.

Cawarden remained in this mild detention at Blackfriars throughout the remainder of the insurrection, as Wyatt marched through Surrey to London and eventual defeat. About a month after his second arrest and 'imprisonment', Gardiner summoned him, and 'he, Mr Rochester, Mr. Inglefeld, Mr. Wales, and others did discharge and set him at liberty'.³⁹ Interestingly, the three men named were all members of Gardiner's following at court and fairly

mentions that on 7 February, the day of Wyatt's final march on London, there were ten or twelve carts laden with weapons in Paul's churchyard – this could have been part of Cawarden's hoard; *V.C.H.* II, 134–5, observes of Cawarden's sixteen pieces of ordnance that 'he was not likely to have enough powder to make it very dangerous', but no reason is given why he should not have, and in fact powder could have been obtained elsewhere; Wyatt had got his hands on some pieces of ordnance, – for instance, the six pieces he obtained at the desertion of the London Whitecoats, Holinshed, *Chronicles*, iv, 14 – but apparently considered whatever number he had insufficient, since he wasted time over one piece which got stuck in the mud on his final march on London – Stow, *The annals of England*, pp. 1048–9 – thus Cawarden's ordnance could have been a significant addition.

³⁷ F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b. 32, 44, 70.

³⁸ F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b. 32; Kempe, *The Loseley manuscripts*, p. 142, interprets the words 'wthowte bounde' to mean 'without any limit of confinement', but what is clearly meant is 'without bond'.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

consistent followers at that. It seems a good bet that the 'others' did not include anyone associated with Paget. The latter accused Gardiner in the very month of March, when Cawarden was released, of acting without the privy council's consent on certain matters.⁴⁰ It is not unreasonable to think that he did so in the case of Cawarden, who was to be in plenty of trouble with the council during the remainder of Mary's reign. It is possible, then, that Gardiner shepherded the presumably unsavoury protestant, Cawarden, through the whole crisis. Certainly this was not done out of good will. A decade earlier Gardiner had pursued Cawarden for heresy. Almost immediately after Wyatt's rebellion, Gardiner changed his argument to suggest that religion *was* behind it, which would have given him an ideal excuse to go after Cawarden. But he did not.

On 24 February, with the dust of the insurrection scarcely settled, the privy council ordered Sir Thomas Saunders to return Cawarden's goods (at Gardiner's instigation, perhaps?). Saunders was apparently a little embarrassed about the whole affair, for he had apologized to Elizabeth Cawarden on 11 February for 'the rudeness of me and my fellows'. But he was not sorry enough to return the majority of Cawarden's gear, and he and the other members of the Howard faction must have been glad of the opportunity to weaken their rival's powerful presence in Surrey. The sheriff, his uncle William, and Howard returned a small portion of Cawarden's goods during the next two months, but Cawarden and later the executors of his will were still trying – unsuccessfully – to get the rest early in Elizabeth's reign.⁴¹

IV

The Cawarden incident aside, the reaction to Wyatt's rebellion in Surrey was relatively restrained, though not quite so much as has been suggested in the past. Presumably most of the denizens of the shire responded in the same way as their brethren in Kent, lying low until they saw who was going to come out ahead. The example made of Cawarden probably deterred likeminded individuals from action in most of the shire. On the other hand, if it was known very widely in the county that Cawarden favoured the rebels, that in itself may have prevented some locals from joining the insurrection. One reason that the rebel leaders in Kent and Devon failed to attract a larger following is that some of them had been involved in *suppressing* insurrection in 1549. This caused a great deal of resentment among local men in the shires. Because of this, some who might otherwise have risen again in 1554 instead opposed the rebels in that year.⁴² Sir Thomas Cawarden had helped put down the rising of 1549 in Surrey and had aroused similar animosities there. Furthermore, his

⁴⁰ Weikel, 'The Marian council revisited', p. 66.

⁴¹ F.S.L. Loseley MSS L. b. 32, 44, 45, 65, 66, 69; E 13/258 (I am grateful for this reference to Mr David Lidington); John Roche Dasent (ed.), *Acts of the privy council of England* (32 vols., London, 1890–1907), IV, 399–400.

⁴² Fletcher, *Tudor rebellions*, p. 80; Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, pp. 44, 80.

protestantism may have alienated opponents of the Spanish marriage who were, nevertheless, religious conservatives unwilling to be parties to what looked like a protestant revolt.⁴³

In fact, though, Wyatt was not entirely without support in Surrey. The rebels met little resistance in their march into the shire. On 3 February, as the anonymous Tower of London chronicler tells it,

they were sufferyd peceably to enter into Southwarke without repulse or eny stroke stryken either by the inhabitours *or by eny other*; yit was ther *many men of the contry* in the innes, raysed and brought thether by the lord William, and other, to have gone agaynst the said Wyat and Kentyshmen, but they *all* joyned themselves to the said Kentyshe rebelles, taking their partes; and the said inhabitantes most willinglye with their best entertayned them.⁴⁴

Loades argues that 'this reception was probably caused by fear of plunder and lack of resolute leadership rather than by active disloyalty',⁴⁵ but this is unconvincing. Howard certainly acquitted himself well enough as a leader in apprehending Cawarden and later in defending London.

Moreover, the rebels behaved themselves with restraint in Southwark, except for plundering Gardiner's palace and destroying his library there. This action smacks of religiously motivated malice, not the desire for loot. In addition, whether or not the people of Southwark feared plunder, such a consideration does not explain the desertion of men raised by Howard from elsewhere in Surrey. The action of these men is crucial in revealing the presence of a rebellious attitude in the county. Southwark might well be regarded as more a suburb of London than a part of Surrey. But the men raised by Lord William came from the county, not – as the chronicler specifically tells us – from Southwark. The chronicler also claims that 'all' went over to Wyatt, which suggests considerable disaffection from Lord William or the Marian regime in general, even if one allows for some exaggeration in the account. Sympathy with the rebels is the logical explanation for the desertion. Indeed, some of the deserters were most likely erstwhile followers of Cawarden, since Lord William probably 'drafted' the men earlier called to arms by Cawarden at the same time that he confiscated his arsenal. Of course if some of these men were Cawarden's adherents, they probably did not much care for Howard anyway. (It should be noted here, however, that most of the Surrey men later tried for treason did come from Southwark.)⁴⁶ The possibility exists, then, that both sympathy for the rebels and local factionalism played a role in this display of rebellious behaviour by Surrey men.

However much support they found in Surrey, on reaching the south bank

⁴³ Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey', pp. 266–7; for evidence of the antagonism aroused in Surrey by Cawarden's opposition to the insurrection of 1549 see, for example, REQ 2/5/305, which indicates hostility on both sides.

⁴⁴ *The chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 43; the emphasis is mine.

⁴⁵ Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, p. 69.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 68–70; *The chronicle of Queen Jane*, pp. 45–51; KB 8/32/13–16.

of the Thames on 3 February, the rebels found London Bridge blocked against them. Lord William Howard, who was just across the barrier in London, attempted to treat with Wyatt but got nowhere. The next day the Tower garrison began periodically to fire their ordnance into Southwark. On 6 February Wyatt gave up on crossing the bridge, fired some parting shots, and marched to Kingston-upon-Thames. He may have received a favourable reception there, since the townsmen had recently been at odds with the privy council over the possession of a quantity of church plate. The vicar there, William Albright, 'preached a last-minute sermon to the rebels at Charing Cross'. At any rate Wyatt met no resistance and was able to repair the broken-down bridge at Kingston and cross over the Thames on 7 February.⁴⁷

Again from this point the story is well known. At Ludgate the rebels were repulsed by Lord William Howard, and the royal troops soon routed the fleeing force. As part of the process of trying certain of the rebels, a commission of oyer and terminer began sitting at Southwark on 13 February. This body convicted, among others, thirty-seven men from Southwark, of whom a few were hanged. Unfortunately very little is known about any of these men. Thus the rebellion ended, though not yet its repercussions in Surrey, as elsewhere.⁴⁸

Sir Thomas Cawarden, as noted, was released fairly quickly, but for a time the fortunes of the More-Cawarden faction in Surrey seemed to be in ruins. Both More and Cawarden had lost their places on the commission of the peace, and the Howards and Brownes dominated both the bench and the elections held for the parliament of April 1554. More, Cawarden, and their ally Henry Polsted all failed to win seats, while the Howards even encroached upon Cawarden's usual territory at Blechingley. But the More-Cawarden group effected a stunning turnaround later in the year, assisted in part no doubt by the death of the duke of Norfolk. In the elections for November, Cawarden was elected senior knight of the shire, while More and Polsted took the two seats at Guildford. In the next few months Cawarden, More and two other prominent protestants earlier removed from the commission of the peace were returned to the bench. Cawarden was, however, ranked somewhat lower among the J.P.s on the commission than he had been previously. The fortunes of the More-Cawarden faction continued to fluctuate for the rest of Mary's reign. Cawarden was often in trouble – most notably with the Dudley conspiracy – but both he and More remained active in the local magistracy, continued to feud with the Howard faction, and lived to see better days under

⁴⁷ *The chronicle of Queen Jane*, pp. 45–51; Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, pp. 70–2; *V.C.H.* I, I, 376; according to one of the chroniclers in Kingsford, *Two London chroniclers*, p. 32, Wyatt resisted at Kingston, but this assertion is found nowhere else; two men from Kingston were among those found guilty of treason at the trial in Southwark; most of the men tried at Southwark were from that borough or (the majority) from Kent, KB 8/32/13–16.

⁴⁸ Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, pp. 72–4; KB 8/32/13–16; on 17 February Mary ordered Lord William Howard, Lord Clinton, Sir Edward Bray and others in Surrey to make a 'full certificate' of the number of men who had been mustered in Surrey during the rebellion, along with the names of their captains and the number of weapons in their possession, G.M.R. Loseley MSS 1330/13 – unfortunately, the certificate itself has not been found.

Elizabeth. In spite of the difficulties they caused, Mary's government apparently could not do without the assistance of such men in ruling the county of Surrey.⁴⁹

V

In conclusion, several observations can be made about Wyatt's rebellion in Surrey and its wider implications. Ultimately, perhaps, the most important thing about the rebellion there and elsewhere is that it failed. But even the Marian government's staunchest defenders must acknowledge that this was not a foregone conclusion in late January and early February 1554. In slightly altered circumstances it might easily have gone otherwise. This seems all the more true given that the opposition to Mary in Surrey – represented most likely by Sir Thomas Cawarden and certainly by those who deserted Lord William Howard – was greater than has hitherto been realized. This is especially significant given the recent discovery that in Hampshire conservative J.P.s also reported considerable discontent. There was also sympathy for the rebels in Sussex – bordering on Kent, Surrey, and Hampshire. Thus it is not impossible to imagine a rising stretching all the way from Kent to Devon. Certainly the rebels must have hoped for such a concerted effort. In fact the French, who sympathized greatly with the rebels, had expected something exactly like this.⁵⁰

As for rebel motives, the example of Surrey supports the recent trend towards giving some additional emphasis to religion. Cawarden was certainly an ardent protestant, and the sack of Gardiner's palace in Southwark suggests that the rebels involved had anti-catholic sentiments. Of course it is quite true, as Loades has pointed out, that some leaders were religious conformists, many protestant gentry steered clear of the insurrection, and leading reformist clergy repudiated it. It is impossible to go back to the older view that religion was the predominant cause of the rebellion. And Cawarden's protestantism and general lack of support for Mary may have done no more than to make him vulnerable to accusations of disloyalty from his more conservative neighbours in the Howard faction. But the Howard faction made no attempt to arrest Cawarden's protestant ally, William More, other members of the More--Cawarden group, or any of the other protestant J.P.s in Surrey. Any of these could have been equally vulnerable (though it is true that none is known to have been as well armed as Cawarden). Overall it is really very difficult to

⁴⁹ C 66/864/6d – the other two protestants restored to the commission of the peace were Lawrence Stoughton and John Vaughan; Bindoff, *History of parliament*, 1, 194–7, 641, 694–6; II, 170–1, 195–6; III, 273–4, 417–8, 604, 660; E 372/400–1/Surr–Suss; SP 11/5/6; Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey', pp. 291–302.

⁵⁰ Fritze, 'Faith and Faction', pp. 272–4; it was to Hampshire that Sir Henry Isley fled from Marian forces in Kent: Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, p. 59 – did he expect aid there?; Roger B. Manning, *Religion and society in Elizabethan Sussex: a study of the enforcement of the religious settlement 1558–1603* (Leicester, 1969), p. 264; the French clearly expected 'that all the towns and counties of England would rise in the same way at the same time', *C.S.P. Span.* XII, 68.

separate fear of the Spanish prince from opposition to the restoration of Roman catholicism. The contemporary chroniclers actually seem much closer to agreement on this than has sometimes been suggested, and recent scholarship points in this direction as well.⁵¹

If opposition to the Spanish match and to catholicism were important rebel motives, local circumstances which affected the rebellion must not be ignored either. It is quite likely that in Surrey many who had been rebels in 1549 harboured resentments which prevented their being rebels again in 1554, just as in Kent and Devon. At least some of that number undoubtedly were also religious conservatives.⁵² On the other hand, if Cawarden had followers who were among the deserters in Southwark, dislike of the Howard faction may well have been intermingled with sympathy for wider rebel motives. The desertion at Southwark also supports Peter Clark's contention that the commons sometimes acted without gentry leadership, even if they had originally had such leadership from Cawarden.⁵³

With regard to the central government, it is clear that the privy council was hampered by the divisions within it in dealing with the situation in Surrey. At the very least there was a lack of co-operation between those who supported Gardiner and those with Paget. In recognizing this, it is not necessary to accept the old view that there were two clear-cut, hard and fast, long-standing factions behind these two leading councillors. Ann Weikel and other modern scholars have demonstrated that Simon Renard exaggerated this situation. But there were men who usually supported one or the other, and the division which they caused in the privy council was in evidence during Wyatt's rebellion and in the handling of affairs in Surrey.⁵⁴

On the other hand there was no serious uprising in Surrey like that in Kent. Almost certainly this was not because of a complete lack of rebel sentiment or even leadership. Presumably it also owed something to the presence on the scene of Lord William Howard, perhaps working in association with Paget.

⁵¹ For instance, the notoriously arch-catholic Nicolas Sander, *Rise and growth of the Anglican schism*, p. 222, observes that 'Wyatt made a sedition in Kent for the purpose of thwarting the marriage and the reconciliation of the kingdom by renouncing heresy'; Stow, *The annals of England*, p. 1044, says that 'the purpose of the queen's marriage was so grievously taken of diverse men, that for this and for religion... they... conspired against the queen'; Holinshed, *Chronicles*, iv, 10, says the 'marriage was not well thought of by the commons, nor much better liked of many of the nobility, who for this, and for the cause of religion, conspired to raise war'; admittedly, John Proctor, the apologist for the Marian government's position, said that religion (heresy) was the main cause, and George Wyatt, *Papers*, argued that it was not the cause at all, but both men had special axes to grind.

⁵² The earl of Arundel reported during the disturbances in 1549 that the people of Surrey disliked the sheriff, Sir William Goring of Sussex, an ardent protestant, SP 10/7/44; on the antagonism engendered by Cawarden himself, REQ 2/5/305.

⁵³ Clark, *English provincial society*, p. 94, which questions the view of Loades, *Two Tudor conspiracies*, p. 78; cf. Barrett Beer, *Rebellion and riot: popular disorder in England during the reign of Edward VI* (Kent, Ohio, 1982) and Scott Michael Harrison, *The pilgrimage of grace in the lake counties, 1536-7* (London, 1981) for other instances of the commons taking the initiative.

⁵⁴ Weikel, 'The Marian council revisited'; Lemasters, 'The privy council in the reign of Queen Mary I'.

How much Howard's quick action in arresting the potentially dangerous Sir Thomas Cawarden a second time was the result of good insight and how much of purely personal enmity remains uncertain. Circumstantial evidence suggests that Cawarden had ties to the rebels. His arrest was unique among Surrey J.P.s and the local gentry in general. But Howard's eagerness, the behaviour of his subordinates, and the general context of Surrey political history in the mid-Tudor period suggests also that Howard capitalized on the opportunity to get at Cawarden for factional reasons, regardless of his innocence or guilt.⁵⁵

As for Bishop Stephen Gardiner, his behaviour regarding Cawarden puts his whole pattern of activity during the rebellion in an even stranger light. It is at least remotely possible that he wanted the rebels to attain some measure of success in order to force Mary into giving up the Spanish match. Much more likely is that his release of Cawarden aroused the suspicions of his enemies, Paget and Renard. He may have been willing to set Sir Thomas free because he had convinced him to remain loyal to Mary, because he believed him relatively harmless (though that arsenal causes problems in such an interpretation), or because he simply thought him innocent. Regrettably Gardiner remains, at this point, inscrutable.

Finally, this episode provides an example of the Marian government's reluctance – like that of Tudor governments in general – to alienate unnecessarily those men deemed the natural leaders of their county communities. It should be remembered that only a relatively small number of rebels from among the gentry suffered for their role in Wyatt's rebellion, and very few of those later burned for heresy were men of substance. That the government tried very hard to accommodate those men who could most capably administer local government is re-emphasized by the return to the Surrey magistracy of Sir Thomas Cawarden and his fellow protestants. Whether or not he was inclined towards rebellion in 1554, Cawarden was often a nuisance to Mary's regime, yet he managed to retain a place in local magistracy. Whether the concession to the needs of local government – or even county pride – embodied in the reappointment as J.P.s of protestants like Cawarden and William More should be regarded as a sign of the central government's wisdom or its weakness is likely to be debated by traditionalists and their revisionist critics. Perhaps the fairest assessment is that the Marian government, in the wake of Wyatt's rebellion, wisely recognized the limits of its own power.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Robison, 'The justices of the peace of Surrey', ch. 5.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*; all of the Tudors exercised considerable restraint in altering the composition of the commission of the peace in Surrey, though Mary made more changes at the beginning of her reign than any of the others.